

LOUISIANA

Edward W. Cruse, Alexandria, La., in place of J. W. Lewis, Jr., resigned.

MINNESOTA

Earl W. Dressen, Green Isle, Minn., in place of J. C. Myers, retired.

MISSISSIPPI

Felix L. Sweatt, Shaw, Miss., in place of L. M. Ferriss, retired.

NEW JERSEY

Joseph W. McCauley, Millburn, N.J., in place of H. F. Jacobus, deceased.

PENNSYLVANIA

Carolyn F. Singley, Cashtown, Pa., in place of I. G. Ridinger, retired.

Edward P. O'Connell, Eagleville, Pa., in place of M. E. Honsberger, retired.

TEXAS

Milton H. Elliott, Shallowater, Tex., in place of A. J. Evans, transferred.

WISCONSIN

Fredrick W. Pagel, Watertown, Wis., in place of R. W. Lueck, Jr., resigned.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate October 10, 1962:

TREASURER OF THE UNITED STATES

Mrs. Kathryn E. Granahan, of Pennsylvania, to be Treasurer of the United States.

BUREAU OF CUSTOMS

Michael Stramiello, Jr., of New York, to be appraiser of merchandise in customs collection district No. 10, with headquarters at New York, N.Y.

DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

AMBASSADORS

John W. Tuthill, of Illinois, to be the representative of the United States of America to the European Communities, with the rank and status of Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary.

James W. Riddleberger, of Virginia, a Foreign Service officer of the class of career ambassador, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Austria.

Robert G. Miner, of New York, a Foreign Service officer of class 1, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Trinidad and Tobago.

James Wine, of Connecticut, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Republic of Ivory Coast.

UNITED NATIONS

Lucius D. Battle, of Florida, to be representative of the United States of America to the 12th session of the General Conference of the United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization.

George V. Allen, of North Carolina, to be representative of the United States of America to the 12th session of the General Conference of the United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization.

Mrs. Mildred McAfee Horton, of New Hampshire, to be representative of the United States of America to the 12th session of the General Conference of the United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization.

Walter M. Kotschnig, of Maryland to be representative of the United States of America to the 12th session of the General Conference of the United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization.

John H. Morrow, of New Jersey, to be representative of the United States of America to the 12th session of the General Conference of the United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization.

ALTERNATE U.S. REPRESENTATIVES TO THE 12TH SESSION OF THE GENERAL CONFERENCE OF UNESCO

Henry S. Commager, of Massachusetts, to be alternate representative of the United States of America to the 12th session of the General Conference of the United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization.

Herbert W. Hill, of New Hampshire, to be alternate representative of the United States of America to the 12th session of the General Conference of the United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization.

Eugene H. Jacobson, of Michigan, to be alternate representative of the United States of America to the 12th session of the General Conference of the United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization.

Robert A. Kevan, of Virginia, to be alternate representative of the United States of America to the 12th session of the General Conference of the United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization.

Joseph B. Platt, of California, to be alternate representative of the United States of America to the 12th session of the General Conference of the United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization.

POSTMASTERS

ARKANSAS

A. Cecil Oliver, Rose Bud.
Guyia D. Moore, Vilonia.

CALIFORNIA

Helen M. Lowey, Downieville.

FLORIDA

William L. Townsend, Palatka.
Rodney G. Rushing, Riverview.

GEORGIA

Joseph M. Rush, Kingsland.

ILLINOIS

Eugene E. Boeckman, Bartelso.
Elizabeth M. Schweizer, Elwood.
Fred C. Lindstrom, Evanston.
Lane Stewardson, Shelbyville.
Edward F. Swan, Wheeling.

INDIANA

Alberta C. Brandt, Arcola.
Urban H. Blank, Batesville.
Louis W. Ogden, Lawrenceburg.
Wayne E. Davis, Norman.
Robert D. White, Patoka.
Francis M. Rogers, Straughn.
Virgil E. Utterback, Trafalgar.

KENTUCKY

Chester B. Owens, Broadhead.

LOUISIANA

Toby Medlin, Marlon.

MAINE

Hector A. Lurette, Hallowell.

MASSACHUSETTS

Daniel G. Barrett, Rowley.
James P. McBride, South Acton.

MINNESOTA

Durward C. Peterson, Clearbrook.
Edward F. Zalusky, Mahanomen.

MISSOURI

Kestner E. Story, Matthews.

MONTANA

William B. Deffinbaugh, Ryegate.

NEW HAMPSHIRE

Bernard S. Murphy, Alton Bay.
Walter M. Plummer, Bristol.
Walter W. Fortier, Chocorua.
Harry E. Moses, Haverhill.
Harry D. Perkins, Smithtown.

NEW JERSEY

Edward A. Struble, Butler.
Francis M. McKenna, Closter.

Kathryn E. Legg, Dorchester.
Dorothy E. Barth, Landisville.
Isabel B. Lowden, Leesburg.
Paul J. Rudinsky, Wharton.

NEW MEXICO

Francis G. Shaw, Fort Stanton.

NEW YORK

Eleanor J. Carmichael, Canandaigua.
Robert S. Lovell, Chemung.
Carol A. Lane, Chichester.
Robert L. Steere, Falconer.
Edith L. Walker, Farnham.
Arthur J. Walsh, Fishers Island.
Edward C. Lavery, Geneseo.
Thomas J. Taylor, Golden's Bridge.
Steven M. Douglass, Hammondsport.
Ruth M. Whitney, Henderson.
Samuel M. Horwitt, Hillsdale.
Stanley W. Cermak, Holcomb.
Ronald J. Donovan, Mount Morris.
Helen S. Hobart, Bushville.
Merle C. Leonard, Savona.
John M. Hull, Unadilla.

NORTH CAROLINA

Edith C. Swann, Olivia.

OHIO

Carl J. Richards, Mesopotamia.
Max R. Westfall, North Lewisburg.
William C. Bolenbaugh, Ohio City.
Frank J. Carpenter, Swanton.

VIRGINIA

Frances W. Lugar, Eagle Rock.
Charles A. Ashe, Gloucester Point.
John R. Chandler, Onancock.
W. Morris Milliner, Onley.
Lancelot C. Lockridge, Raphine.

WASHINGTON

Theodore F. Holtzheimer, Blaine.

WISCONSIN

Byron T. Adams, Wisconsin Rapids.

IN THE NAVY

The nominations beginning William L. Adams to be captain, and ending Curtis J. Zane to be captain, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on September 26, 1962.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

WEDNESDAY, OCTOBER 10, 1962

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

Ecclesiastes 3: 11: God hath made everything beautiful in His time.

Most merciful and gracious God, in whom our loftiest aspirations and noblest impulses find their source and their satisfaction, may these moments of prayer beget in us a richer experience and a deeper appreciation of the tenderness and tenacity of Thy divine love.

Grant that in these autumn days with their beauty and loveliness, their ripeness and richness, when the harvest brings forth the treasures of its glorious season, we may long to bring to fulfillment and fruition those ideals which will make human life as beautiful and lovely as the world of nature which Thou hast created and in which we are privileged to live.

May the thoughts and activities, the plans and proposals of this new day give clear and commanding witness that we are endeavoring to live and labor faithfully, ever following Thy divine guidance as Thou dost seek to lead us from the

low valley of fear toward the heights of vision and power.

Hear us in our Master's name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

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

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. McGown, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed the following resolution:

S. RES. 413

Resolved, That the Senate has heard with profound sorrow the announcement of the death of Honorable CLEM MILLER, late a Representative from the State of California.

Resolved, That a committee of two Senators be appointed by the Presiding Officer to join the committee appointed on the part of the House of Representatives to attend the funeral of the deceased Representative.

Resolved, That the Secretary communicate these resolutions to the House of Representatives and transmit an enrolled copy thereof to the family of the deceased.

Resolved, That, as a further mark of respect to the memory of the deceased, the Senate do now adjourn.

The message also announced that the Senate disagrees to the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 1447) entitled "An act to amend the District of Columbia Teachers' Salary Act of 1955, as amended, and to provide for the adjustment of annuities paid from the District of Columbia teachers' retirement and annuity fund", requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. MORSE, Mr. HARTKE, and Mr. BEALL to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Vice President had, pursuant to Public Law 689, 84th Congress, appointed the following members on the part of the Senate to the North Atlantic Treaty Organization Parliamentarian's Conference, to be held in Paris, France, beginning November 12, 1962: Mr. FULBRIGHT, Mr. SMATHERS, Mr. CANNON, Mr. McCLELLAN, Mr. MCCARTHY, Mr. BYRD of Virginia, Mr. KEFAUVER, Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina, Mr. RANDOLPH, Mr. KUCHEL, Mr. MUNDT, Mr. JAVITS, Mr. COOPER, and Mr. HICKENLOOPER.

The message also announced that the Vice President had, pursuant to Public Law 85-474, appointed the following members on the part of the Senate to the Interparliamentary Union Conference to be held in Brasilia, Brazil, beginning October 24, 1962: Mr. Robertson, chairman; Mr. Long of Hawaii; Mr. Smith of Massachusetts; Mr. Thurmond; Mr. Stennis; Mr. Metcalf; Mr. Talmadge; Mr. Yarborough; Mr. Murphy; and Mr. Ferguson, ex officio.

CELEBRATION OF 150TH ANNIVERSARY, BATTLE OF LAKE ERIE

Mr. FORRESTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the joint resolution (S.J. Res. 208) to establish a Commission to develop and execute plans for the celebration of the 150th anniversary of

the Battle of Lake Erie, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

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

Mr. LATTA. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, and I shall not object, I want to commend the Committee on the Judiciary for bringing this resolution forward. I particularly want to thank the gentleman from Georgia, Mr. Forrester, the chairman of the Subcommittee No. 4, House Judiciary Committee; the gentleman from Ohio, Mr. McCulloch, the ranking Republican member of the Judiciary Committee; and Mr. Foley of the Judiciary Committee staff for the consideration they have given this resolution and for the many courtesies they have extended to me personally during my endeavors to have this matter brought to the House floor for consideration today.

Mr. Speaker, I wholeheartedly support this joint resolution to establish a Commission to develop and execute plans for the celebration of the 150th anniversary of the Battle of Lake Erie. Commodore Oliver Perry's victory over the British naval forces took place on September 10, 1813, near Put-in-Bay, Ohio. Commodore Perry's victory marked the only time in the history of the world that an entire British squadron surrendered to an enemy. This victory, which led to an early conclusion of the War of 1812, was not only a tremendous naval victory, but one for lasting peace between the United States and Canada. As this resolution so aptly states:

The enduring results of this conflict have cemented more strongly the cultural and economic ties which exist between Canada and the United States as a demonstration of peace and good will in a world today fraught with unrest and fear.

Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection and urge the adoption of this resolution.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, further reserving the right to object, do I correctly understand there is no money provided in this joint resolution?

Mr. FORRESTER. Mr. Speaker, in answer to the gentleman's question, there are no funds authorized. There were some funds provided in the resolution, when it came over from the other body, but there is a House amendment striking out that provision.

Mr. GROSS. I compliment the gentleman on accomplishing the difficult feat of saving the taxpayers a little money.

Mr. FORRESTER. Thank you, sir.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

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

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

Whereas the one hundred and fiftieth anniversary of the renowned naval Battle of Lake Erie near Put-in-Bay, Ohio, will occur in September 1963;

Whereas the decisive victory of Commodore Oliver Hazard Perry on September 10, 1813, over the British naval forces in Lake

Erie had profound results on the conclusion of the War of 1812 and the future of the United States as a nation;

Whereas this victory of the small squadron commanded by Commodore Perry marked the only time in the history of the world that an entire British squadron surrendered to an enemy;

Whereas Commodore Perry's report following this engagement, "We have met the enemy, and they are ours . . . two ships, two brigs, one schooner and one sloop", electrified the young Nation at that time and will ever be remembered in the annals of American history;

Whereas the War of 1812 on the land and sea areas of the United States and Canada introduced these two great English-speaking nations to a period of one hundred and fifty years of permanent peace and mutual respect along an unfortified three-thousand-mile common boundary;

Whereas this struggle resulted in memorializing the principle of international peace by arbitration and disarmament and lasting peace among nations;

Whereas the enduring results of this conflict have cemented more strongly the cultural and economic ties which exist between Canada and the United States as a demonstration of peace and good will in a world today fraught with unrest and fear: Therefore be it

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) there is hereby established a commission to be known as the "Battle of Lake Erie Sesquicentennial Celebration Commission" (hereinafter referred to as the "Commission") which shall be composed of thirteen members as follows:

(1) Four members who shall be Members of the Senate, to be appointed by the President of the Senate (two of whom shall be from the State of Ohio);

(2) Four members who shall be Members of the House of Representatives, to be appointed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives (two of whom shall be from the State of Ohio);

(3) One representative of the Department of the Interior who shall be designated by the Secretary of the Interior and who shall serve as executive officer of the Commission; and

(4) Four members to be appointed by the President of the United States.

(b) The President shall, at the time of appointment, designate one of the members appointed by him to serve as Chairman. The members of the Commission shall receive no salary.

(c) Any vacancy in the Commission shall not affect its powers, but shall be filled in the same manner in which the original appointment was made.

Sec. 2. The functions of the Commission shall be to develop and to execute suitable plans for the celebration, in 1963, of the one hundred and fiftieth anniversary of the Battle of Lake Erie.

Sec. 3. The Commission may employ, without regard to the civil service laws or the Classification Act of 1949, such employees as may be necessary in carrying out its functions.

Sec. 4. (a) The Commission is authorized to accept donations of money, property, or personal services; to cooperate with agencies of State and local governments, with patriotic and historical societies and with institutions of learning; and to call upon other Federal departments or agencies for their advice and assistance in carrying out the purposes of this joint resolution. The Commission, to such extent as it finds to be necessary, may, without regard to the laws and procedures applicable to Federal agencies, procure supplies, services, and property and make contracts, and may exercise those powers that are necessary to

enable it to carry out efficiently and in the public interest the purposes of this joint resolution.

(b) Expenditures of the Commission shall be paid by the executive officer of the Commission, who shall keep complete records of such expenditures and who shall account for all funds received by the Commission. A report of the activities of the Commission, including an accounting of funds received and expended, shall be furnished by the Commission to the Congress within one year following the termination of the celebration as prescribed by this joint resolution. The Commission shall terminate upon submission of its report to the Congress.

(c) Any property acquired by the Commission remaining upon termination of the celebration may be used by the Secretary of the Interior for purposes of the national park system or may be disposed of as surplus property. The net revenues, after payment of Commission expenses, derived from Commission activities, shall be deposited in the Treasury of the United States.

SEC. 5. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this joint resolution, but in no event shall the sums hereby authorized to be appropriated exceed a total of \$25,000.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the committee amendments.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment No. 1: On page 4, line 2, strike the period after "functions" and insert: "Provided, however, That no employee whose position would be subject to the Classification Act of 1949, as amended, if said Act were applicable to such position, shall be paid a salary at a rate in excess of the rate payable under such Act for positions of equivalent difficulty or responsibility. Such rates of compensation may be adopted by the Commission as may be authorized by the Classification Act of 1949, as amended, as of the same date such rates are authorized for positions subject to said Act. The Commission shall make adequate provision for administrative review of any determination to dismiss any employee."

Amendment No. 2: On page 4, lines 10 and 11, strike the following: ", without regard to the laws and procedures applicable to Federal agencies,".

Amendment No. 3: On page 4, line 15, strike the period after the word "resolution" and insert: "Provided, however, That all expenditures of the Commission shall be made from donated funds only."

Amendment No. 4: On page 5 at the end of Sec. 4, add the following new subsection: "(d) Mail matter sent by the Commission as penalty mail or franked mail shall be accepted for mail subject to section 4156 of title 39, United States Code, as amended."

Amendment No. 5: On page 5 strike the language on lines 8, 9, 10, and 11.

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The resolution was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

WEST VIRGINIA

Mr. HECHLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. HECHLER. Mr. Speaker, on a number of occasions during the years

1959 and 1960, I took the floor to point out the way in which the State of West Virginia was being shortchanged in defense installations, military contracts, and other projects of the Federal Government. With the largest percentage of its population enlisted in the Korean conflict, and also the largest number of killed and wounded in proportion to population of any State in the Union, it could properly be stated that West Virginia was first in war, first in peace, and last in the hearts of the Pentagon.

West Virginia, which ranked 46th in the Nation—near the bottom of the heap—in per capita amount of military prime contracts in the last year of the Eisenhower administration, now ranks 30th in the Nation under President Kennedy. For the fiscal year 1960, the total amount of prime military contracts awarded by the Department of Defense amounted to \$36,098,000, while the figures for the fiscal year 1962 showed \$133,782,000 for West Virginia. I have asked the Legislative Reference Service to prepare a ranking of the States on the per capita amount of military prime contracts. When these figures are related to population of each State, comparisons are more meaningful.

The Legislative Reference Service reports that \$19.51 per person was spent in West Virginia in the fiscal year 1960 in prime military contracts awarded by the Department of Defense. For the fiscal year 1962, this figure has rocketed to \$72.31—an increase of 370 percent.

Mr. Speaker, this is a dramatic illustration of the fact that West Virginia is no longer being shortchanged and that President Kennedy is fulfilling his campaign pledges to West Virginia.

AQUARIUM AND RESEARCH CENTER

Mr. KIRWAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. KIRWAN. Mr. Speaker, in today's RECORD you who voted for the aquarium and research center here in Washington will find an article that will be of much value to you when you go home. It is an article written by the smartest man in the country on fish, U.S. Senator BENJAMIN SMITH, of Massachusetts. He tells you how low we have fallen in research. We are fifth in the world in the matter of knowledge about fish. Peru is ahead of us with more boats and more knowledge. Red China, Japan, and Russia are ahead of us. We are fifth.

This article was published in the New York Times last Sunday. Those who voted for the aquarium and research provision will find there the answer to most of the questions that can be asked on the subject. Take it home with you and you will know how low we have dropped in an industry that once brought us many millions of dollars. Now we are only fifth.

My advice to you before you leave here is to take a copy of today's RECORD with you. Then you can tell the people what a good job you have done for them.

CUBA

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, I read in the press that supersecret negotiations are going on in Havana, Cuba, to my amazement and shock between a Mr. Donovan, who happens to be a candidate for the U.S. Senate, and Fidel Castro for the release of Cuban prisoners to result in turning \$60 million to Castro largely in foodstuffs—thus permitting Castro to overcome his food mistakes and the New Frontier to try to apologize for its Bay of Pigs mistakes.

I have sent a wire to the President, the Secretary of Defense, and the Comptroller General of the United States, asking the following questions:

1. What authority exists for anyone to negotiate for payment in U.S. Government owned foodstuffs to Castro and the Communists?
2. How much in U.S.-owned foodstuffs and other things of value are being made available for this purpose?
3. What right does Donovan or any other private citizen have to negotiate with Castro and an enemy government?
4. If Donovan is negotiating on behalf of private citizens only, what right does he have under the Logan Act to do so, let alone a violation of recent policy statement of the Congress? Does not his visit to Cuba require Government approval?
5. If Donovan is negotiating in a manner that obligates the U.S. Government to make up the difference between contributions and the \$60 million demanded, is he doing so as an agent of the U.S. Government?
6. Why has not a full disclosure of all the facts been made before the deal is closed between Castro and Donovan?

I add this following question:

According to the Department of State's reply to me by Frederick G. Dutton, Assistant Secretary, March 10, 1962, when I asked for the recognition of a free non-Communist government-in-exile been made, he said:

There are, as you know, a number of U.S. citizens who still reside in Cuba. The Swiss are trying to assist them, including some who are in prison.

Why are not actions being taken to get American citizens out of prison in Cuba?

I include the entire letter of March 10 as a masterpiece of doubletalk, wishy-washy "accommodation" policies on Cuba following my wire yesterday to the President, Secretary of State, and the Comptroller General, protesting this effort to strengthen Castro and Cuba:

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, D.C., March 10, 1962.

HON. WILLIAM C. CRAMER,
House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. CRAMER: The Department has been requested to reply to your telegram of February 3, 1962 to the President in which you expressed your concern over the plight of the Tampa cigar industry resulting from the embargo on trade with Cuba and in which you urged that additional steps be undertaken designed to effect the downfall of the Castro regime.

You may be assured that in recommending that an embargo be imposed upon trade

with Cuba, the Department carefully considered the impact this measure might have upon the domestic tobacco industry. In the light of the decisions taken at the recent meeting of Foreign Ministers at Punta del Este with respect to the Communist Castro threat to the hemisphere and considering that the Communist Cuban Government was continuing to earn dollars through sales of its products in the United States, it was determined that such an embargo would be both timely and in the overall national interest. The Department is confident that the patriotic citizens of the Tampa area comprehend the desirability of depriving the Communist regime of Cuba of badly needed dollar income.

The Department appreciates receiving suggestions which may advance our policy with respect to Cuba. Your recommendations have been particularly welcome and the courses of action you advocate have received and will continue to receive most careful consideration based upon our national interests, including our international obligations and commitments.

The Department is pleased to take this opportunity to comment on the various proposals you have made.

RECOGNITION AND SUPPORT OF A CUBAN GOVERNMENT IN EXILE

The recognition of a Government of Cuba in exile at this time is not in the national interest of the United States because neither the Government of Switzerland nor any other government could then represent U.S. interests before the Castro regime. Were a government-in-exile formed, and should the United States recognize such a government, the United States would have to look to that government and not the Castro government for the fulfillment of Cuban obligations. In addition, there are, as you know, a number of U.S. citizens who still reside in Cuba. The Swiss are trying to assist them, including some who are in prison and who can only be reached through the efforts of the Swiss Embassy in Havana.

PREVENTION OF THE SHIPMENT OF WAR MATERIAL BY THE SINO-SOVIET BLOC TO CUBA

Underlying an announcement, such as you suggest, that the United States will not permit the shipment of war materiel to Cuba by the Sino-Soviet bloc is, of course, the intention to insure that the terms of the announcement are fulfilled. Effective prevention of these shipments may entail interference with shipping on the high seas, expose the United States and its allies to reciprocal treatment, and thus exacerbate the already tense international situation. You may be assured, however, that close attention is being paid to the military buildup in Cuba, with special reference to the growing Cuban potential for intervention and subversion in Latin America.

PAYROLL AT GUANTÁNAMO BASE

The Department of the Navy has informed the Department of State that the Cuban nationals employed at the base are for the most part skilled workers who have given long and faithful service to the United States. Most of them have U.S. civil service status and represent families who have worked for the naval base for several generations. Like other employees of the base, they are paid in U.S. currency.

When consideration was given to paying these employees in Cuban pesos in order to avoid supplying the Communist Cuban Government with foreign exchange, it was determined that this plan would not benefit the United States. The peso introduced by the Castro regime in August 1961 has been rejected by free world traders as a medium of international exchange, and Cuban pesos are unobtainable outside Cuba. Therefore, in order to obtain pesos to pay the Cuban employees of the base, Guantánamo officials

would have to purchase pesos from the National Bank of Cuba for the whole amount of the base payroll for Cuban nationals at the official exchange rate set by the Cuban Government at 1 peso for 1 dollar. Since approximately 1,100 of the 3,150 Cuban nationals employed at the base now reside on the base, only a small portion of the dollar wages presently paid that group returns to the Cuban economy. Thus, fewer dollars are supplied the Castro regime under the present payment procedure than would be the case under the alternative of payment in Cuban currency.

AID TO LATIN AMERICAN COUNTRIES UNDER THE ALLIANCE FOR PROGRESS PROGRAM

As you know, the Alliance for Progress is a 10-year program of mutual cooperation among the American Republics, from which Cuba has been excluded. The contribution of effort and resources which the Latin American Republics are expected to make will outweigh by far the contribution of capital which they will receive from the United States and other sources. A number of the Latin American countries are confronted with serious domestic political problems which stem in part from the inroads made by Castro-Communists and other extremist elements. To contain and overcome such threats to their stability, the governments of these nations require our aid to improve the political, economic, and social climate in their respective countries so that orderly progress may be made within a democratic framework. To withhold our assistance would in many instances further weaken the very nations that for the above-mentioned reasons find that it is politically unfeasible at this time to undertake steps, such as sanctions, against the Communist Cuban Government.

AID TO COMMUNIST COUNTRIES

The United States extends assistance to two Communist countries, Poland and Yugoslavia. However, this aid is in no way channeled to Cuba or to any third country. The recent press report that one of the Yugoslav freighters carrying jet aircraft purchased in the United States stopped at Havana for 5 days "under a complete blackout" is unfounded. Reliable and verified information available to this Government indicates conclusively that none of the Yugoslav ships carrying these planes touched Cuba. In this connection I am enclosing for convenient reference a copy of Secretary Rusk's statement before the Select Committee on Export Control of the House of Representatives.

The Department sympathizes with the plight of the cigar industry employees at Tampa. At the Department's request, the Department of Labor has provided the following information with respect to the impact of the embargo in that area and the steps that have been taken to date by that Department:

Immediately upon announcement of the ban on Cuban imports the Secretary of Labor dispatched a representative of the U.S. Employment Service to Tampa to investigate the effects on employment of the embargo on Cuban tobacco. The area's labor force amounts to about 290,000 with about 3,800 engaged in the tobacco industry in Tampa. Local estimates indicate the supply of tobacco on hand is adequate for another 6 to 12 months of normal operations. This has been substantiated by Mr. James Corral, president of the Cigar Manufacturers Association.

As you may know, there is a special provision in the Florida Unemployment Insurance law which provides for a uniform benefit year beginning in May for cigarworkers in Hillsborough County (Tampa). This preserves and makes usable workers' wage credits prior to their layoff for a longer period of time.

Only three plants in the area use 100 percent Habana tobacco. The Secretary of Labor is keeping currently informed on the developments in this area and has taken steps to gather pertinent information to determine the magnitude of the problem and to accelerate the activity of the local public employment office in developing job opportunities for those individuals who may be affected by this action. Public employment officials in the Tampa area are also working with State and local government officials to develop plans to maintain employment stability in the industry and to provide job opportunities for unemployed workers.

Please call on us if we can be of any further assistance to you.

Sincerely yours,

FREDERICK G. DUTTON,
Assistant Secretary.

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

Regarding \$60 million foodstuffs and medicine exchange as ransom for Cuban prisoners, which by all news reports is to include U.S.-owned, taxpayer-paid-for foodstuffs to make up the difference between volunteered funds and the \$62 million demanded, I strongly protest this or any expenditure of taxpayers' money through U.S.-owned foodstuffs for the ransom of Cuban prisoners as being contrary to the basic statement of policy by Congress calling for and authorizing specific action to rid this hemisphere of Castro and communism. In view of the strong public protest against the tractors-for-prisoners proposal, and in view of the downgrading of our prestige as the leading nation of the free nations of the world by thus admitting our participation in and backing of the Bay of Pigs invasion and our conciliatory attitude toward Castro and having introduced resolutions opposing both the tractors deal and the \$62 million ransom deal, I feel I must express my deep concern and shock over the secret negotiations that are even yet not fully revealed between the United States through a private citizen and Castro. In view of the restrictive language written into the mutual security bill instructing the withholding of aid to countries that do business (trade) with Castro and the House Cuban resolution calling for strong and affirmative action to get rid of Castro and the Communists, I am specifically requesting information as to what possible authority exists for the spending of any portion of the \$60 million by the Government of the United States in payment of ransom to the enemy Communist Fidel Castro and, further, even if such legal authority exists, which is unknown to me, how can the United States be put in the position of strengthening Castro and communism on the one hand by delivering shipments to Cuba of \$60 million worth of American substance, when calling on the other hand for all other countries to stop all other types of shipments to Cuba. How two-faced can our foreign policy objectives be? How inconsistent can our actions be? How confused the entire free world must be? Historically, the United States has never paid ransom or indemnity and this precedent will come to haunt the United States and the free world in the future. I am asking that this supersecret negotiation be called to a halt before irreparable damage to U.S. prestige is done. It is further inconceivable to me that, and I question the legality of, a private citizen, namely Mr. Donovan, would be allowed to negotiate with an enemy government on behalf of the United States—with the Castro government—declared to be an enemy government by the Congress in its resolution and by the President in invoking the Trading With the Enemy Act to prevent the shipment of Havana tobacco of recent date. Such negotiations are considered a

violation of the spirit if not the letter of the Logan Act and it has been the general policy of Congress to oppose any trade with the enemy as set forth in the Trading With the Enemy Act. These basic policies for freedom and against communism are all being violated in my opinion in this abortive deal—and I strongly protest making Castro stronger, our anti-Communist efforts a laughing stock throughout the world, and the establishment of a policy of paying taxpayer money to Castro for indemnity and ransom inherent in this supersecret deal, kept secret purposely and negotiated by a private citizen. I specifically ask these questions:

1. What authority exists for anyone to negotiate for payment in U.S. Government-owned foodstuffs to Castro and the Communists?
2. How much in U.S.-owned foodstuffs and other things of value are being made available for this purpose?
3. What right does Donovan or any other private citizen have to negotiate with Castro and an enemy government?
4. If Donovan is negotiating on behalf of private citizens only, what right does he have under the Logan Act to do so—let alone a violation of recent policy statement of the Congress? Doesn't his visit to Cuba require Government approval?
5. If Donovan is negotiating in a manner that obligates the U.S. Government to make up the difference between contributions and the \$60 million demanded, is he doing so as an agent of the U.S. Government?
6. Why hasn't a full disclosure of all the facts been made before the deal is closed between Castro and Donovan?

WILLIAM C. CRAMER,
Member of Congress.

THE \$10 MILLION FISH BOWL

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa? There was no objection.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, the attempt to justify the \$10 million glorified fish bowl in Washington, D.C., as a research center intrigues me and I might add it would be humorous if \$10 million was not involved.

Mr. Speaker, I shudder to think of the millions upon millions of dollars that are already being spent for research with respect to fish. As a matter of fact, the chairman of the House Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BONNER], recently obtained from the Department of the Interior a statement showing that some 79 projects are now being conducted in research on salmon alone. There are scores of others dealing with other species.

Yes, Mr. Speaker, the New Frontier now is; Ask not what the fish can do for you, but rather what you can do for the fish.

ASSOCIATION OF GREEK SHIPOWNERS HONORS RECOMMENDATION TO HALT SHIPPING TO CUBA

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address

the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, word has just come that the Association of Greek Shipowners has decided to honor the recommendations of the Greek Government and halt shipping to Cuba. This decision stands as a signal victory in the current Cuban crisis.

In a firm and decisive statement, the Greek shipping association recommended "emphatically to its members that they abstain from all types of charter contracts for the transportation of goods to and from Cuba despite the repercussions this will have on Greek shipping in these difficult times."

Thus Greece joins the ranks of our most cooperative allies. Those other nations honoring U.S. requests for boycotting Cuba are West Germany, Turkey, and the Norwegian shippers.

Mr. Speaker, one of the most effective and immediate means of combatting communism in this hemisphere is to halt free world shipping to the island of Cuba. This would force the entire burden on the already strained Communist fleet, crimp the Cuban Communist pipeline, and make communism in this hemisphere untenable and impractical to support.

We salute our West German, Turkish, Norwegian, and Greek friends. But what of our friends the British?

CHARITABLE SOLICITATIONS IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. DOWDY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. DOWDY. Mr. Speaker, the matter about which I shall speak has nothing to do with foreign affairs. However, a few days ago there was an article which appeared in the local press relating to the fact that under the District of Columbia Charitable Solicitation Act permission had been granted to a society of homosexuals to solicit charitable contributions in the District of Columbia.

Mr. Speaker, the Superintendent of Licenses and Permits said that his office had no authority to deny a solicitation permit under the law to these people.

Mr. Speaker, the acts of these people are banned under the laws of God, the laws of nature, and they are against the laws of man. I think a situation which requires them to be permitted a license to solicit charitable funds for the promotion of their deviations is a bad law.

Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a bill to correct this situation. I trust that by the beginning of next year we will have sufficient reports from the various departments to effectively prevent this sort of action.

THE HONORABLE BRENT SPENCE

Mr. PERKINS. 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 Kentucky?

There was no objection.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, the State of Kentucky has been proud of many of its Representatives in Washington, including some of the country's greatest. Today we are facing the loss of our senior Congressman by voluntary retirement, to a rest which he has well earned by 32 years of service—including almost 16 years as chairman of the Banking and Currency Committee.

During that period of service, BRENT SPENCE has been the guiding hand in the development of legislation for housing programs that will remain a monument to his memory long after all of us have passed from this scene.

The gentleman from Kentucky, Congressman SPENCE, had become an institution in Kentucky. The only campaign he had to make was to file an application to have his name placed on the ballot and his reelection was assured. The people of Kentucky and especially northern Kentucky both loved and respected BRENT SPENCE.

Entering Congress 2 years before the beginning of the Roosevelt administration at an age when many of us are considering retirement, he became a staunch supporter of the fiscal and financial reforms sponsored by our great depression President and advanced to the chairmanship of the Banking and Currency Committee before the end of that long administration.

While his law practice began in the 19th century, he was one of those gifted individuals who was always able to look to the future, to lay the groundwork for the proper development of the America that few of us will see in the 21st century. Now, as the oldest Member of Congress, he can step aside for a well deserved rest without regrets because we are all sure that his job was well done.

His record here stamps him as one of the greatest of Kentucky's Congressmen, which includes such illustrious names as Henry Clay, Alben Barkley, Fred Vinson, and others too numerous to mention.

His splendid example remains as an inspiration to all of us.

GRANTING EASEMENTS ON REAL PROPERTY OF THE UNITED STATES

Mr. McFALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H.R. 8355) to authorize executive agencies to grant easements in, over, or upon real property of the United States under the control of such agencies, and for other purposes, with a Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

Page 3, strike out all after line 17 over to and including line 2 on page 4 and insert:

"(d) The term 'real property of the United States' excludes the public lands (including minerals, vegetative, and other resources) in the United States, including lands reserved or dedicated for national forest purposes, lands administered or supervised by the Secretary of the Interior in accordance with the Act of August 25, 1916 (39 Stat. 535), as amended and supplemented, Indian-owned trust and restricted lands, and lands acquired by the United States primarily for fish and wildlife conservation purposes and administered by the Secretary of the Interior, lands withdrawn from the public domain primarily under the jurisdiction of the Secretary of the Interior, and lands acquired for national forest purposes."

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

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, this bill was voted out of our committee unanimously. The Senate amendment is acceptable to the minority. It also takes out of the bill what little controversy there was concerning it. I ask the gentleman, is that not correct?

Mr. MCFALL. That is correct; the gentleman has stated the fact. The bill would grant authority to the heads of the executive agencies having control over real property of the United States to grant easements for rights-of-way purposes. I believe it was passed on the Consent Calendar in the House. A public lands amendment was taken from the bill as it passed the House. The Senate has included the amendment which excludes public lands, the way the bill was originally introduced. I know of no opposition to or criticism of the bill as it stands now.

MORE ON \$60 MILLION TO CASTRO FOR PRISONERS

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, further reserving the right to object—and I intend not to object—because of the limitation of the 1-minute rule earlier, I did not have the opportunity to comment on the remarks of my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. ROGERS]. I will say that it appears to me that if we are asking other nations to cut off trade with Cuba, we should set the example first and not negotiate directly or indirectly or permit negotiations by a private citizen to send \$60 million worth of foodstuffs to Cuba at the same time. I strongly oppose such action. I cannot understand this double-standard, this conciliatory attitude towards Cuba and I intend to discuss the matter in detail on my special order later today.

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

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

TO AMEND THE FOREIGN SERVICE BUILDINGS ACT

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H.R. 11880) to amend the Foreign Service Buildings Act, 1926, to authorize additional appropriations, and for other purposes, 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 Wisconsin?

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I should like to ask the gentleman from Wisconsin if he can advise the House whether the amendments of the Senate to the Foreign Service Buildings Act are germane to the legislation as it passed the House.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. They are not. As the gentleman knows, the Senate has added two bills as amendments; the equal pay bill and the bill providing for an additional Secretary of State.

Mr. BOW. That being the case, Mr. Speaker, I object.

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 Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, my objection was made with some regrets for I favor the bill as it applies to Foreign Service buildings. Furthermore, I favor the equal pay bill that was added as a Senate amendment, and I voted for that bill when it was considered as a separate measure in the House. While I am opposed to the additional Assistant Secretary of State that would be added by another Senate amendment, that is not the reason for my objection to considering this bill as it was returned from the other body.

Mr. Speaker, the rules of the House prohibit the consideration of amendments that are not germane to the measure being acted upon except by unanimous consent or, under certain circumstances, by a majority of two-thirds of the Members voting; and with one other important exception, that, under our rules, no point of order can be made against a Senate amendment regardless of how flagrantly it violates the rule of germaneness, nor is it necessary to have more than a simple majority to adopt such an amendment. This rule must be based on an overly generous application of the so-called rule of comity for it certainly is not in keeping with the other rules concerning germaneness.

The two Senate amendments to this Foreign Service buildings bill are not germane by any stretch of the imagination. I do not question the motivation behind these amendments, but regardless of the motivation I am strongly of the opinion that this is not the way this House should legislate. This measure is now a conglomerate of three bills no one of which is germane to either of the other two. I would have absolutely no objec-

tion to the consideration of each of them individually, and I would vote in favor of the passage of two as I have already indicated.

Mr. Speaker, I think the House rules, with regard to the consideration of Senate amendments that are not germane, are not logical or reasonable. At the beginning of the 88th Congress I intend to offer an amendment to the rules which will require that consideration of ungermane Senate amendments be only by unanimous consent or by a two-thirds majority vote as is required if such amendments originate in our own House. In the meantime I feel constrained to use such parliamentary means as are available to prevent amendments, such as those to H.R. 11880, coming before the House.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. GROSS. 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. 286]

Adair	Fino	Mason
Alexander	Fogarty	Michel
Andersen,	Frazier	Miller,
Minn.	Friedel	George P.
Anderson, Ill.	Gallagher	Moorehead,
Andrews	Garland	Ohio
Anfuso	Gavin	Moorhead, Pa.
Arends	Glenn	Morgan
Aspinall	Gray	Morrison
Auchincloss	Green, Oreg.	Moss
Balley	Griffin	Moulder, Mo.
Baring	Griffiths	Nedzi
Barry, N.Y.	Haley	Nelsen
Bass, N.H.	Hall	Norblad
Belcher	Harding	O'Brien, Ill.
Bell	Harris	O'Hara, Mich.
Bennett, Mich.	Harrison, Va.	O'Konski
Berry	Harvey, Ind.	Osmers
Biatnik	Harvey, Mich.	Passman
Blitch	Hays	Peterson
Boykin	Hébert	Philbin
Brademas	Henderson	Poage
Breeding	Hiestand	Powell
Brewster	Hoeven	Rains
Bromwell	Hoffman, Ill.	Reifel
Brown	Hoffman, Mich.	Reuss
Buckley	Hollifield	Riley
Burke, Ky.	Hull	Rivers, Alaska
Carey	Inouye	Roberts, Ala.
Cederberg	Johnson, Md.	Robison
Celler	Johnson, Wis.	Rogers, Tex.
Charberlain	Jones, Ala.	Roosevelt
Chiperfield	Judd	Roudebush
Coad	Karth, Minn.	Roussetot
Conte	Kastenmeier	Santangelo
Corman	Kearns	Saund
Curtin	Kee	Schadeberg
Curtis, Mass.	Kilburn	Scherer
Davis,	King, Utah	Schwengel
James C.	Kyl	Scott
Davis,	Laird	Scranton
John W.	Lipscomb	Seely-Brown
Denton, Ind.	Loser	Shelley
Derwinski	McCulloch	Sheppard
Diggs	McDonough	Shipley
Dingell	McDowell	Short
Dominick	McIntire	Shriver
Donohue	McSween	Sibal
Dooley	McVey	Siler
Doyle	Macdonald	Smith, Calif.
Durno	MacGregor	Smith, Miss.
Edmondson	Mack	Spence
Elliott	Magnuson	Springer
Evins	Mailliard	Stratton
Fenton	Marshall	Sullivan
Findley	Martin, Mass.	Teague, Calif.
Finnegan	Martin, Nebr.	Thomas

Thompson, La. Vinson
Thompson, N.J. Wallhauser
Thompson, Tex. Watts
Ullman Weis
Van Pelt Whalley
Van Zandt Williams

Wilson, Calif.
Wilson, Ind.
Wright
Yates
Younger
Zelenko

The SPEAKER. On this rollcall 248 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

PRIVILEGE OF THE HOUSE

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I offer a privileged resolution (H. Res. 831) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That Senate Joint Resolution 234, making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture and the Farm Credit Administration for the fiscal year 1963, in the opinion of the House, contravenes the first clause of the seventh section of the first article of the Constitution and is an infringement of the privileges of this House, and that the said joint resolution be taken from the Speaker's table and be respectfully returned to the Senate with a message communicating this resolution.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, on October 4, 1962, the other body messaged to the House Senate Joint Resolution 234, now on the Speaker's table. This joint resolution is an infringement on the privileges of the House, as stated in section 7 of article I of the Constitution, under which the House of Representatives has always maintained the right to originate the appropriation bills.

The priority of the House in the initiation of appropriation bills is buttressed by the strongest and most impelling of all rules, the rule of immemorial usage. As Mr. Asher Hinds relates in section 1500 of volume II of "Hinds' Precedents" at page 973—while the issue has been raised a number of times—"there has been no deviation from the practice."

Many precedents could be cited, but the most recent instance, as many of those present will recall, is reported in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 99, part 2, page 1897, where the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER], at that time chairman of the House Committee on Appropriations, offered a resolution identical with the pending resolution—and under circumstances corresponding to the situation with which we are confronted today—respectfully returning an appropriation bill originated by the other body.

Mr. TABER's resolution was unanimously agreed to, and there have been no further proceedings on the subject from that time to this.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER].

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, the precedent of March 12, 1953, to which the gentleman from Missouri, the chairman of the House Committee on Appropriations, has just referred, was, like the one which we have under consideration at this time, a clear attempt to violate that provision of the Constitution which, by uniform construction and practice, has been maintained as an exclusive privilege of the House throughout all

the years since the Constitution was adopted.

In "The Federalist," the collection of papers explaining the new Constitution in 1787 and 1788, there are some significant and I believe wholly conclusive words by Madison and Hamilton on this question. They were members of the Constitutional Convention and had a big hand in drawing it up.

I am going to read one passage because I believe it ought to be in the RECORD. This is found in volume 57, at page 405:

Notwithstanding the equal authority which will subsist between the two Houses on all legislative subjects, except the originating of money bills, it cannot be doubted, that the House, composed of the greater number of Members, when supported by the more powerful States, and speaking the known and determined sense of a majority of the people, will have no small advantage in a question depending on the comparative firmness of the two Houses.

This advantage must be increased by the consciousness, felt by the same side, of being supported in its demands by right, by reason, and by the Constitution; and the consciousness, on the opposite side, of contending against the force of all these solemn considerations.

Note the use of the words "except the originating of money bills." Those are the words I want to stress.

I will also insert in the RECORD two more quotations from "The Federalist," because they are significant, considering again that Hamilton and Madison are credited with their authorship:

From pages 406 to 407:

The House of Representatives cannot only refuse, but they alone can propose the supplies requisite for the support of Government. They, in a word, hold the purse; that powerful instrument by which we behold, in the history of the British Constitution, an infant and humble representation of the people gradually enlarging the sphere of its activity and importance, and finally reducing, as far as it seems to have wished, all the overgrown prerogatives of the other branches of the Government. This power over the purse may, in fact, be regarded as the most complete and effectual weapon, with which any constitution can arm the immediate representatives of the people, for obtaining a redress of every grievance, and for carrying into effect every just and salutary measure.

From page 463:

But independent of this most active and operative principle, to secure the equilibrium of the National House of Representatives, the plan of the Convention has provided in its favor several important counterpoises to the additional authorities to be conferred upon the Senate. The exclusive privilege of originating money bills will belong to the House of Representatives. The same House will possess the sole right of instituting impeachments: is not this a complete counterbalance to that of determining them? The same House will be the umpire in all elections of the President, which do not unite the suffrages of a majority of the whole number of electors; a case which it cannot be doubted will sometimes, if not frequently, happen. The constant possibility of the thing must be a fruitful source of influence to that body. The more it is contemplated, the more important will appear this ultimate, though contingent power, of deciding the competitions of the most illustrious citizens of the Union, for the first office in it. It would not perhaps be rash to predict,

that as a mean of influence it will be found to outweigh all the peculiar attributes of the Senate.

Mr. Speaker, each of these quotes contains language unmistakably and conclusively showing that the House, under the Constitution, was given the sole right to initiate the appropriation of money bills.

I also call attention to a statement I made in the House on March 12, 1953, which is to be found in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 99, part 2, page 1897.

In that statement I went into a complete review of the matter then pending before the House of Representatives and called attention to an article by John Sharp Williams, a Senator from the State of Mississippi. He had made a very strong and thorough study of the rights of the two Houses and supported the position of the House completely. I have always understood that exhaustive study to be regarded as a classic on the question and a frequent reference source.

At this point, Mr. Speaker, so that the RECORD will be more complete, I will insert some of the key passages from the study of the then Senator Williams. The complete document is identified as Senate Document No. 872, 62d Congress, 2d session, July 15, 1912. It traces the particulars of the point from the beginning to the end:

Mr. President, if the Senate can constitutionally originate general appropriation bills when money is in the Treasury, then it can do the same thing when there is no money in the Treasury; and thus this body, representing the States and not the people—representing chiefly the smaller States—could force either Federal insolvency—not to be thought of—or else could force the House to levy new or additional taxes; thus force the House to originate tax bills. The two things hang together. If this Senate could originate general supply bills, then it could commit the Government to a course of expenditure that would coerce the House not only into originating but into passing tax bills.

As Seward well says, speaking of the long practice under which the House always insisted upon and the Senate always conceded—the right of the House to originate general appropriation bills:

"This [practice] could not have been accidental; it was therefore designed. The design and purpose were those of the contemporaries of the Constitution itself. It evinces their understanding of the subject, which was that bills of a general nature for appropriating the public money or for laying of taxes or burdens on the people, direct or indirect in their operation, belonged to the province of the House of Representatives." (See CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 16, pt. 2, p. 959.)

He added:

"If this power be confined to the one and not to the other—that is, to the levying of taxes to get money, but not to its expenditure—then the right is useless, because we change revenue laws so seldom."

This criticism of Seward's is correct, although it was made in view of what occurred later and not of what was in the minds of the framers of the Constitution. I believe it is not too much to say that, in the minds of the framers of the Constitution, a bill to raise revenue was a budget; that is, a bill levying taxes and at the same time appropriating the proceeds of the levy, because such was the contemporaneous practice.

Mr. Sumner, of Massachusetts, said that he regarded the Senate origination of general appropriation bills as "a departure from the spirit of the Constitution." (Ibid.)

Mr. Hinds, in his incomparable work, in a note at the bottom of page 973, volume 2, concerning the question of the right of the House to originate general appropriation or supply bills, says: "But while there has been a dispute as to the theory, there has been no deviation from the practice that the general appropriation bills originate in the House of Representatives." He expressly uses this phrase as contradicting the use of special bills appropriating for single, specific purposes.

It is well to remember in this connection the Hurd resolution of January 13, 1885, which was laid on the table in the House. The fact that it was laid upon the table has been quoted very frequently, but the resolution was directed at Senate bill 398 (the Blair educational bill). It was not a supply bill, but a bill of specific appropriation; not a bill for carrying on the Government any more than a bill making appropriation for a public building would be a bill for carrying on the Government.

Our present Speaker, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK], made a statement at that time in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 99, part 2, page 1898, when the matter was under consideration. I quote what he said:

Mr. Speaker, I am sure when my friend, the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER], and my friend, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON], agree, that the House of Representatives must indeed have a sound case; but will the gentleman for the RECORD state what part of the resolution which has come from the other body violates the longstanding custom, and usage, and practice of the Congress?

Mr. TABER. This resolution, Mr. Speaker, in its entirety violates the practice. There is no part of it which could be considered as covering anything else or any other part of the subject matter.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman's statement satisfies me.

Today, in Senate Joint Resolution 234, we have a complete appropriation bill covering the whole Department of Agriculture. The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON] has indicated that he will move the adoption of his resolution which is offered to protect the privileges of the House. I hope it will be adopted unanimously.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ALBERT). The question is on the resolution.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, on that I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. ROONEY. Would a yea vote be a vote to send Senate Joint Resolution 234 back to the Senate?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman has correctly stated the situation.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 245, nays 1, not voting 188, as follows:

[Roll No. 287]

YEAS—245

Abbitt	Ashbrook	Baldwin
Abernethy	Ashley	Barrett
Addabbo	Ashmore	Barry
Albert	Avery	Bates
Alford	Ayres	Battin
Alger	Baker	Becker

Beckworth	Halpern	O'Hara, Ill.
Beermann	Hansen	Olsen
Bennett, Fla.	Hardy	O'Neill
Betts	Harrison, Wyo.	Ostertag
Boggs	Harsha	Patman
Boland	Healey	Pelly
Bolton	Hechler	Perkins
Bow	Hemphill	Pfost
Bray	Herlong	Pike
Brooks, Tex.	Holland	Pilcher
Broomfield	Horan	Pillion
Broyhill	Hosmer	Pirnie
Bruce	Huddleston	Poff
Burke, Mass.	Ichord, Mo.	Price
Burleson	Jarman	Pucinski
Byrne, Pa.	Jennings	Purcell
Byrnes, Wis.	Jensen	Quie
Cahill	Joelson	Randall
Cannon	Johnson	Ray
Casey	Johnson, Calif.	Reece
Chelf	Johnson, Md.	Rhodes, Ariz.
Chenoweth	Jonas	Rhodes, Pa.
Church	Jones, Mo.	Riehlman
Clancy	Karsten	Rivers, S.C.
Clark	Keith	Roberts, Tex.
Coad	Kelly	Rodino
Cohelan	Keogh	Rooney
Coller	Kilgore	Rosenthal
Cook	King, Calif.	Rostenkowski
Cooley	King, N.Y.	Roush
Corbett	Kirwan	Rutherford
Cramer	Kitchin	Ryan, Mich.
Cunningham	Kluczynski	Ryan, N.Y.
Curtis, Mo.	Knox	St. George
Daddario	Kornegay	St. Germain
Dague	Kowalski	Saylor
Daniels	Kunkel	Schenck
Davis, Tenn.	Landrum	Schneebell
Dawson	Lane	Schweiker
Delaney	Langen	Selden
Dent	Lankford	Sikes
Derounian	Latta	Sisk
Devine	Lennon	Slack
Dole	Lesinski	Smith, Iowa
Dorn	Libonati	Smith, Va.
Dowdy	Lindsay	Stafford
Downing	McFall	Staggers
Dulski	McMillan	Steed
Dwyer	Macdonald	Stephens
Ellsworth	Madden	Stubblefield
Everett	Mahon	Taber
Fallon	Mathias	Taylor
Farbstein	Matthews	Teague, Tex.
Feighan	May	Thomson, Wis.
Finnegan	Meader	Thornberry
Fisher	Merrrow	Toll
Flood	Miller, N.Y.	Tollefson
Ford	Milliken	Trimble
Forrester	Mills	Tuck
Fountain	Minshall	Tupper
Frelinghuysen	Moeller	Udall, Morris K.
Fulton	Monagan	Vank
Garmatz	Montoya	Waggonner
Gary	Moore	Walter
Giaino	Morris	Weaver
Gilbert	Morse	Westland
Gonzalez	Mosher	Wharton
Goodell	Multer	Whitener
Gooding	Murphy	Whitten
Graham	Murray	Wickersham
Grant	Natcher	Widnall
Green, Pa.	Nix	Willis
Gross	Norblad	Winstead
Gubser	Norrell	Young
Hagan, Ga.	Nygaard	Zablocki
Hagen, Calif.	O'Brien, N.Y.	

NAYS—1

Rogers, Fla.

NOT VOTING—188

Adair	Brewster	Doyle
Alexander	Bromwell	Durno
Andersen,	Brown	Edmondson
Minn.	Buckley	Elliott
Anderson, Ill.	Burke, Ky.	Evins
Andrews	Carey	Fascell
Anfuso	Cederberg	Fenton
Arends	Celler	Findley
Aspinall	Chamberlain	Fino
Auchincloss	Chiperfield	Flynt
Bailey	Colmer	Fogarty
Baring	Conte	Frazier
Bass, N.H.	Corman	Friedel
Bass, Tenn.	Curtin	Gallagher
Belcher	Curtis, Mass.	Gariand
Bell	Davis,	Gathings
Bennett, Mich.	James C.	Gavin
Berry	Davis, John W.	Glenn
Blatnik	Denton	Gray
Blitck	Derwinski	Green, Oreg.
Bolling	Diggs	G. In
Bonner	Dingell	Griffiths
Boykin	Dominick	Haley
Brademas	Donohue	Hall
Breeding	Dooley	Halleck

Harding	Martin, Mass.	Scherer
Harris	Martin, Nebr.	Schwengel
Harrison, Va.	Mason	Scott
Harvey, Ind.	Michel	Scranton
Harvey, Mich.	Miller,	Seely-Brown
Hays	George P.	Shelley
Hébert	Moorehead,	Sheppard
Henderson	Ohio	Shipley
Hiestand	Moorhead, Pa.	Short
Hoeven	Morgan	Shriver
Hoffman, Ill.	Morrison	Sibal
Hoffman, Mich.	Moss	Siler
Hollfield	Moulder	Smith, Calif.
Hull	Nedzi	Smith, Miss.
Inouye	Nelsen	Spence
Johnson, Wis.	O'Brien, Ill.	Springer
Jones, Ala.	O'Hara, Mich.	Stratton
Judd	O'Konski	Sullivan
Karh	Osmer	Teague, Calif.
Kastenmeier	Passman	Thomas
Kearns	Peterson	Thompson, La.
Kee	Philbin	Thompson, N.J.
Kilburn	Poage	Thompson, Tex.
King, Utah	Powell	Ullman
Kyl	Rains	Utt
Laird	Reifel	Van Pelt
Lipscomb	Reuss	Van Zandt
Loser	Riley	Vinson
McCulloch	Rivers, Alaska	Wallhauser
McDonough	Roberts, Ala.	Watts
McDowell	Robison	Weiss
McIntire	Rogers, Colo.	Whalley
McSween	Rogers, Tex.	Williams
McVey	Roosevelt	Wilson, Calif.
MacGregor	Roudebush	Wilson, Ind.
Mack	Rousslot	Wright
Magnuson	Santangelo	Yates
Mailliard	Saund	Younger
Marshall	Schadeberg	Zelenko

So the resolution was agreed to. The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Mr. Hébert	with Mr. Adair.
Mr. Wright	with Mr. Belcher.
Mr. Rivers of Alaska	with Mr. Younger.
Mr. Gray	with Mr. Siler.
Mr. Hays	with Mr. O'Konski.
Mr. Roberts of Alabama	with Mr. Martin of Massachusetts.
Mr. Anfuso	with Mr. Cederberg.
Mr. Celler	with Mr. Auchincloss.
Mr. Carey	with Mr. Halleck.
Mr. Powell	with Mr. Shriver.
Mr. Zelenko	with Mr. Conte.
Mr. Santangelo	with Mr. Berry.
Mr. Stratton	with Mr. Arends.
Mr. O'Brien of Illinois	with Mr. Mailliard.
Mr. Mack	with Mr. Kyl.
Mr. Hull	with Mr. Chamberlain.
Mr. Morrison	with Mr. Durno.
Mr. Thompson of Louisiana	with Mr. Wallhauser.
Mr. Friedel	with Mr. Sibal.
Mr. Buckley	with Mr. Anderson of Illinois.
Mr. Doyle	with Mr. Derwinski.
Mr. Haley	with Mr. Fino.
Mrs. Sullivan	with Mr. Judd.
Mr. Roosevelt	with Mr. Hoeven.
Mr. Rogers of Texas	with Mr. Glenn.
Mr. Peterson	with Mr. Kilburn.
Mr. Thompson of New Jersey	with Mr. Hoffman of Illinois.
Mr. Inouye	with Mr. Griffin.
Mr. Alexander	with Mr. Brown.
Mr. Scott	with Mr. Schwengel.
Mr. Aspinall	with Mr. Van Pelt.
Mr. Rogers of Colorado	with Mr. Fenton.
Mr. Evins	with Mr. Gavin.
Mr. Edmondson	with Mr. McIntire.
Mr. Donohue	with Mr. Harvey of Michigan.
Mr. Ullman	with Mr. Michel.
Mr. George P. Miller	with Mr. Laird.
Mr. Loser	with Mr. Bennett of Michigan.
Mr. McDowell	with Mr. Schadeberg.
Mr. Corman	with Mr. Roudebush.
Mr. James C. Davis	with Mr. Springer.
Mr. Philbin	with Mr. Curtin.
Mr. Johnson of Wisconsin	with Mr. Bromwell.
Mr. Breeding	with Mr. Osmer.
Mr. Brewster	with Mr. Van Zandt.
Mr. Denton	with Mr. Short.
Mr. Brademas	with Mr. Martin of Nebraska.
Mr. Dingell	with Mr. Hiestand.
Mr. Nedzi	with Mr. Bell.

Mr. Fogarty with Mr. Rousselot.
 Mr. Gallagher with Mr. Dominick.
 Mrs. Griffiths with Mr. MacGregor.
 Mr. Hollifield with Mr. Kearns.
 Mr. Shelley with Mr. Hall.
 Mr. Sheppard with Mr. Moorehead of Ohio.
 Mr. Watts with Mr. Reifel.
 Mr. Shipley with Mr. Wilson of California.
 Mr. Magnuson with Mr. Findley.
 Mr. Baring with Mr. McDonough.
 Mr. Bailey with Mr. Harvey of Indiana.
 Mr. Diggs with Mr. Nelsen.
 Mr. Elliott with Mr. Wilson of Indiana.
 Mr. Flynt with Mr. Teague of California.
 Mrs. Green of Oregon with Mr. Robison.
 Mr. Rains with Mr. Lipscomb.
 Mr. Reuss with Mr. Utt.
 Mr. Moss with Mr. Andersen of Minnesota.
 Mr. Moorhead of Pennsylvania with Mr. McCulloch.

Mr. Morgan with Mr. Smith of California.
 Mr. Thompson of Texas with Mr. Chiperafeld.

Mr. Williams with Mrs. Weis.
 Mr. Karth with Mr. Dooley.
 Mr. Andrews with Mr. Seely-Brown.
 Mr. Blatnik with Mr. Scanton.
 Mr. Burke of Kentucky with Mr. Garland.
 Mr. Bass of Tennessee with Mr. Curtis of Massachusetts.

Mr. John W. Davis with Mr. Scherer.
 Mr. O'Hara of Michigan with Mr. Mason.
 Mrs. Riley with Mr. Hoffman of Michigan.
 Mr. Henderson with Mr. McVey.
 Mr. Kastenmeier with Mr. Bass of New Hampshire.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, is this an automatic rollcall or is the vote being taken by the yeas and nays?

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ALBERT). The yeas and nays.

Mr. HALLECK. I cannot qualify, Mr. Speaker. If I had been present I would have voted "aye."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PUBLIC WORKS AUTHORIZATION

Mr. SMITH of Virginia, from the Committee on Rules, reported the privileged resolution (H. Res. 832, Rept. No. 2547) which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I call up the resolution just reported (H. Res. 832) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That immediately upon the adoption of this resolution the bill (H.R. 13273) authorizing the construction, repair, and preservation of certain public works on rivers and harbors for navigation, flood control, and for other purposes, with the Senate amendment thereto, be, and the same hereby is, taken from the Speaker's table, to the end that the Senate amendment be, and the same is hereby, disagreed to and that the conference requested by the Senate on the disagreeing votes to the two Houses be, and the same is hereby, agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ALBERT). The question is, Will the House consider the resolution (H. Res. 832)?

The question was taken; and two-thirds having voted in the affirmative, the House agreed to consider the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH].

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. AVERY] and now yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, this resolution which we are about to consider is to send to conference between the House and Senate the public works omnibus bill. There has been, and perhaps will continue to be considerable controversy about the measure, and I think it is necessary to make a brief statement about it.

You will recall that when the House had before it the so-called \$900 million public works acceleration authorization bill, it was pretty generally understood that if that bill was passed, there would be no general omnibus bill this year. After that bill was passed, something happened—I do not know what—but the Committee on Public Works began consideration of an omnibus bill. They held hearings. They went through the usual course and performed their function, which was entirely legitimate and proper that they should do. The bill was presented to the House, and after thorough consideration, it was adopted by the House and sent to the other body for concurrence by that body. It remained there for a short time and was then passed with amendments.

The bill, as it left the House, carried something like \$2¼ billion of authorizations. The other body adopted some 50 additional projects that had not been considered by the House and were not in the House bill. When I say that the additional projects were not considered by the House, there is one exception to that because in the House bill was what is known as the very controversial Burns Creek item. The House by a rollcall vote and a substantial majority rejected that item and struck it from the bill. The other body reinserted it in the bill by amendment. As I said, there were something like 50 new projects adopted in the other body. The bill came back here and there was an objection raised to sending the bill to conference.

There were something like 50 additional projects inserted in the bill without any consideration on the part of the House involving authorizations of something like—there is a difference in the figures, because I took them all and added them up on an adding machine in my office, and my adding machine was not big enough to carry these figures, so I had to send out and have it done elsewhere—my estimate came to \$1,700 million of authorized expenditures that the House had not considered; many of them the Budget had not even considered; many of them had not been approved by the Corps of Engineers. Over that arose this controversy, which has been pretty hot.

I would like to digress for a moment on a parliamentary question of the rules of the House. We have some rules in the House, and some of them are pretty specific and they are written in pretty plain, clear English that he who runs may read. We have a rule known as rule XX which provides that any amendment of the Senate placed on a House bill, if it should have been considered under the rules of the House in the Committee of the Whole, that involve appropriations or

tax, if it had not arisen in the House and was required under the rules of the House to be considered in the Committee of the Whole House, that it shall be subject to a point of order when it comes back to the House.

This is a perfect illustration of that rule. There were some differences over it. Anyway when they asked for this conference there was objection, and it went to the Rules Committee, and many Members of the House appeared before the Rules Committee pro and con on the bill.

While it may not be considered by some as the function of the Rules Committee to consider the merits of legislation, that is a matter, of course, of great controversy and difference of opinion around here. It has been said that the Rules Committee is merely a traffic cop, and I was criticized for considering it as something else. My reply was that I was not elected to Congress by my people to be a traffic cop; and as long as I have anything to do with it I expect to exercise my functions as a Member of this Congress. But under the peculiar circumstances the committee did hold extended hearings. They lasted from 10:30 yesterday morning until 4 something yesterday afternoon, in which any number of Members of Congress came before the committee to testify in this matter of having forced upon them projects that concerned them not only without consideration in the Committee of the Whole House but also without any consideration at all by anybody else in the House.

Some of us thought that was not the way to run this Congress. Some of us think that we have certain obligations to be somewhat cautious, and to exercise some responsibility about the authorizations and appropriations we make around here. So that led to this controversy, and we had, as I stated, any number of Members of Congress who came and protested against some of these amendments made in the other body.

The evidence was so clear that some of these projects should not be in this bill at the present time without consideration by the House that we had some discussion with the House conferees and the House leadership. I think, and I have reason to hope and expect, when this bill goes back to conference the House conferees are going to stand upon these matters that should not have been in this bill and that everybody knows they should not be in the bill. That is about all I can say on the matter.

All the information we have upon which to consider these Senate amendments—is a conference print, and that, with the amendments put on by the other body comes to 90 pages. I knew this matter was coming up, so I had an opportunity to go to the country over the weekend and spend a couple of days trying to find out what it was all about. I think I know a little bit about the matter. But no one can comprehend all of these projects and their merits in the short time and on the small amount of information we have.

I will conclude my statement by saying that I devoutly and sincerely hope

and expect that the conferees are going to stand by the House bill and not indulge in this type of irresponsible legislation.

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. SAYLOR. I want to commend the chairman of the Rules Committee, first for having the meeting yesterday and considering this bill. I was the one who objected to the bill going to conference because of the fact that these projects which have been referred to by the chairman of the Rules Committee were included by the other body, and unless we had an opportunity to go before the Rules Committee there would have been no opportunity for the Members of this House to voice their objection. With the understanding that has been agreed to, I am in favor of this bill going to conference.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. The gentleman did appear before the committee and disclosed to the committee that certain items placed in this bill had not been considered in the House but had been taken from the committee which has jurisdiction, which is his Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, that were taken over by the Committee on Public Works of the other body.

Mr. AVERY. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I do not think we need to long labor the debate on this resolution. The gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH] has pointed out the principal issues that made House action necessary to send this bill to conference.

I have some comment to make in addition to the point brought out by the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH].

In the first place, I would like to ask a question and of course this question cannot be answered. If anybody wants to answer it, I will be glad to have it for the RECORD. I wonder why we are considering a public works authorization here not in the closing weeks, or not in the closing days, but in the closing hours of a session of Congress that has been going on for 2 years. I do not believe hearings were held on this so-called omnibus public works bill for 1963 until sometime in September. And here we are trying to compress an orderly procedure, possibly authorizing the expenditure of over \$3 billion, into a few days of legislative procedure, when a substantial number of Members are not able to be present.

I consider that to be very poor management on the part of the majority, and I do not think it can be defended. If there is any defense for such procedure, I would welcome any Member of the majority stating their justification for this unwarranted delay.

Mr. Speaker, in respect to the additions that were placed in this bill by the other body, as the gentleman from Virginia told us—and I think it may be repeated later—there ostensibly has been an addition of about \$1.5 billion in projects added by the other body.

Mr. Speaker, the minority reported in the Rules Committee yesterday that this was not a realistic figure; that actually

there was half a billion dollars in addition to that amount, although it is not spelled out in this bill. There are commitments in this bill that will have to—the end result of an addition by the other body of almost \$2 billion rather than \$1.5 billion set out in the Senate amendment. So, after all, we are talking about or we may be talking about a \$4 billion commitment. Yet here we are debating it in the floor of the House with 248 Members answering to a quorum call and about 240 of those Members would like to be home.

Mr. Speaker, I do not think this is responsible procedure. But, of course, this is a bill in which nearly half of the Members of the House have very deep and sincere interests. Of course, it also has political repercussions.

Mr. Speaker, it has been frequently referred to by our friends in the press as a pork-barrel bill. That may be right. However, be that right or be it wrong is beside the point.

This is a bill that authorizes public works that are of vital concern to the economy of every State in the Union and many cities are directly or indirectly affected by projects contained in this bill. So, from a realistic standpoint, it is necessarily going to attract a considerable amount of attention from all the States in the Union and congressional action can be anticipated and expected.

Now, Mr. Speaker, one final point: I would like to break these Senate amendments down into four categories. If the conference report comes back to the House, I would hope at least that these categories will be established by the conferees and that the projects which remain in the conference report will fall into only one of the categories and final judgment will be placed on this basis:

First, there are projects in this bill that have been approved by the Bureau of the Budget and which are not controversial. The informal judgment of the Rules Committee seemed to be yesterday that there would not be substantial objection to this category of projects that was added by the other body. May I repeat that: Projects that have been approved by the Bureau of the Budget and which are not controversial—and I shall not attempt to suggest what number of projects may be in that particular context.

The second category involves projects that have been approved by the Bureau of the Budget and are controversial. There are some of these projects which are controversial even as between House Members from the same State. As the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH] told us just a moment ago, these Members resent, if you please—and I think that is the right word—that they were not afforded an opportunity even to be heard on these projects that are in the bill which are located in their districts and to which they are opposed.

Of course, the third category involves projects that are not approved by the Bureau of the Budget and are controversial.

Mr. Speaker, it was my understanding in the Rules Committee that the House conferees would reject all the projects that have not been approved by the

Bureau of the Budget and which are controversial, particularly those opposed by House Members.

Then there is the fourth separate category, as stated by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SAYLOR] that includes projects clearly beyond the jurisdiction of the Committee on Public Works, and contained in this bill.

I should hope, Mr. Speaker, that the conferees will object to those projects as well.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. CRAMER].

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, I take this time mainly for the purpose of trying to put in focus a few things that I think the membership of the House are entitled to know. No. 1: I intend to vote to send this bill to conference. I expect to be the ranking Republican conferee. I have full confidence that we will be able to bring back a clean and a good bill. I have high hopes of that. I will say that it has been my consistent position and it has been the consistent position of the minority that when a bill of this magnitude on public works authorizations, for the first time since I have had the pleasure of being a member of that committee, in 8 years, comes before this body at this late hour and is considered by our committee under specific ground rules that do not permit even Members of the House to be heard, let alone interested citizens of this country, in the proper democratic fashion to present their views on matters, many of which are extremely controversial, that we should live by specific ground rules in order to preserve the integrity not only of our committee but of this House of Representatives and the Congress of the United States, to preserve the integrity of our committee and to assure the taxpayers that we are protecting their interests in this public works bill. So my views in the conference will be the same as they have been on the floor of this House consistently since I have been a Member, and in particular the manner in which this bill has been handled in the last days of the session, to make certain that controversial projects on which people have asked to be heard, in the true democratic tradition of America, that they be given the opportunity to be heard. I, in good conscience, could not vote for projects on which American citizens have asked to be heard, who have been denied that opportunity; and on which even my own colleagues, representing their districts, have been denied an opportunity to be heard.

In good conscience and in protecting the taxpayers of the country I could not possibly vote to return them to this House as part of the conference report.

Likewise, these projects having not been heard, I could not vote to bring projects in that have not been properly cleared by the proper departments and without hearings.

I hope we can bring back a clean bill and that in so doing we shall help to speed the adjournment of this House.

Mr. Speaker, there are many good and sound projects in this bill.

It is most unfortunate that the good ones, which are in the vast majority in the bill, are jeopardized by the action of

the other body in putting in \$1.4 billion in excess of the House bill, and that does not include the additional \$400 million, if you take into consideration the true cost of the Columbia Basin projects and other multiple-purpose projects, rather than the amounts referred to in the bill that were put in without hearings.

Let me give you an example of what the other body did. On page 37 of the bill there is a certain project in Oklahoma, the Arkansas River project, between the Arkansas River and Muskogee, Okla., where they authorize a study of the project. And in the same bill—and this illustrates the irresponsibility of the manner in which this bill was handled, and why I feel it is essential, if we go to conference that we bring responsibility back to the bill—they say, "There is hereby authorized"—we do not even know what the cost is, what the project is—are hereby authorized and determined to be feasible and justified by the Chief of Engineers on approval of the President, unless within the period of the first 60 calendar days of the meeting of the 1st session of the 88th Congress such report is disapproved by the Congress.

This is a "gimmick" that the House Committee on Public Works refused to accept on other projects, which would not only provide for a survey but automatic authorization, not even knowing what the survey results are.

The other body passed a bill of \$3.7 billion, the House \$2.3 billion. I intend to stand by the House position in striking out the Burns Creek project because hearings are justified and should be had. The Knowles Dam was added at a cost of \$258 million; the Bruces Eddy Dam at a cost of \$186 million; Burns Creek at a cost of \$52 million; and Trotters Shoals, \$78 million. This is just to give you four examples.

Most of those are in the Columbia River Basin, and add some \$326 million to this bill.

I have confidence that these projects will be sound and we will have a good bill when we bring it back.

One other thought, referring to the remarks of the gentleman from Kansas: Why is this bill here so late? For 6 months the Committee on Public Works spent the time of that committee trying to justify the \$900 million boondoggle public works so-called acceleration program, on which we are going to have some discussion later. Four hundred million dollars is already in the appropriation bill which we are going to be considering on this program, which permits the President to pinpoint projects without proper consideration by the Congress on specific projects. I am going to bring out that it does not indicate what projects are involved, and they are asking for a \$400 million blank check.

Instead of voting for a proper bill, our committee spent most of the time trying to work on the \$900 million bill and the \$2 billion standby authority requested to be financed out of any unexpended balance. That is why we have this bill here at the last minute of the Congress. That is why it is jeopardized, and it should not be. It is unfortunate that these good projects and most of them were handled

through the proper authorizations of the Congress, are being jeopardized at this late date for a lot of much less justified projects.

Mr. AVERY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. BALDWIN].

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. Speaker, I feel that the House Committee on Public Works and those Members that may serve on the committee of conference on this bill have an obligation to the Members of this House in case of the controversial projects that may have been added by the other body to make sure that those projects are deferred until there is an opportunity for the Members of the House interested in those projects to be heard and to make sure also that any constituents of those Members who desire to be heard are given that opportunity. It seems to me we have to take this position to protect the integrity of the House. This bill is of substantial magnitude. It involves projects in almost all the States of the Union. When there are Members in whose districts projects may be built who have not been given an opportunity to be heard by the committee of the House handling the bill, it seems to me it is most essential that we defer those projects until the Members have an opportunity to be heard, which is the position I am going to take in the committee of conference. I think it is the only proper position we can take to protect the integrity of the House and the right of the individual Members of the House to have a hearing and have their constituents have the opportunity to be heard before a decision is made on such projects.

Mr. DORN. 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 South Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, I want to commend the gentleman from Virginia, Judge SMITH, for his forthright, straightforward, and honest stand here today, as always, for the taxpayers of the United States and for justice and fairness. I want it clearly understood that I advocate this rule permitting the omnibus rivers and harbors bill to go to conference. I appeared before the Rules Committee yesterday asking for this rule; however, I want to make it crystal clear that I am in complete agreement with the gentleman from Virginia, Judge SMITH, that every single project which has not cleared the Bureau of the Budget and which has not been heard by the Congress should be postponed until all parties can be heard.

It is incredible that projects authorizing more than a billion dollars have been added to this bill, Mr. Speaker, in many cases without consultation—without even notice to the Members of the House most affected. I can say without contradiction that the only time that I have had the opportunity to mention Trotters Shoals before a congressional committee was when the gentleman from Virginia, Judge SMITH, gave me permission to appear yesterday before his great

Rules Committee. Judge SMITH, I am grateful to you, sir, for your unquestioned integrity, for your fairness, and your willingness to speak for our people.

I know the Speaker will appoint stalwart conferees who will stand by the traditions and principles of this House. This House is not the lower body. It is the body closest to the American people and foremost in the eyes of the American people. This House is taking the lead in protecting the American people from ruthless pressure groups and unbridled bureaucracy. With the budget unbalanced, with the national debt \$300.8 billion, it is unbelievable that literally billions are added to this bill without hearings, consultation, and without adequate reports on their feasibility.

Mr. Speaker, when I say I am for free enterprise and that I detest socialism, I can truthfully say that I practice what I preach. I do not want to advocate on one hand a balanced budget, reduction of the national debt, a sound dollar and then on the other hand run to Washington with my hat in my hand begging for the taxpayers' money for my own district. I want Trotters Shoals to be heard by all parties concerned. If it can be proven feasible and beneficial, I will be for it. I do not want it railroaded through and my people "sandbagged" without Mead, the Seaboard Railroad, Bigelow-Sanford, and countless others being heard.

I believe the conferees will do the fair thing and postpone Trotters Shoals until early next year. I believe, too, Mr. Speaker, that the distinguished and able leaders of the South and the Nation in the other body will in the end be fair and just to my people and to me personally. I truly believe they will postpone Trotters Shoals till all can be heard.

I plead with them to permit Duke to go ahead now as they must have authorization this session. Duke is beyond controversy. No one has opposed Duke—not openly. There is no argument against Duke. Duke must begin the preliminary stages of its project early next year. We passed the Duke bill in the House without controversy. On its merit it should receive the same consideration elsewhere.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FLOOD].

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed out of order.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, I realize that the Members here are statesmen, not politicians, but in case they are interested in elections, here is how to run a railroad. This is a dispatch from North Korea:

North Korea's Communist regime today claimed a perfect record in the election of members of the new National Assembly.

The Korean central news agency said in a dispatch from Pyongyang that 100 percent of the voters registered in the 383 constituencies voted Monday and "100 percent of the elec-

tors cast their votes for the candidate deputies."

The Korean Communist Party had named one slate of candidates, and there were no contested races.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. WICKERSHAM].

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Mr. Speaker, inadvertently a committee clerk yesterday evidently informed the Evening Star there was one project, in conference, the Waurika project, that did not have the approval of the Bureau of the Budget or the U.S. Corps of Engineers. This is not the case. This project was included in the Senate bill. It was given a hearing and favorably reported in the other body by the Senate Committee on Public Works. It does have the approval of the Bureau of the Budget as well as the approval of the U.S. Engineers, and it was heard by the House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. Previously, it was heard by the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs and reported favorably by said committee and by the other body.

I have conferred with the House conferees about this bill, urging favorable consideration, I do hope and trust that this project, known as the "Waurika project," will be left in this bill. It is most important to 400 members of Waurika families who have been run out of that area three times in recent months by heavy floods. It is a very worthwhile project. Furthermore, it is essential to several cities as a source of needy water supplies.

I hope the conferees will agree to allow this worthy project to remain in the omnibus public works bill.

Mr. AVERY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CURTIS].

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I was very interested in the statements of the members of the Committee on Public Works on this side of the aisle who will be conferees on this matter. But, we have not heard from anyone from the other side, from the conferees on the other side. I wonder if their opinion is the same as that expressed here; and as other Members have expressed the importance of abiding by this procedure. Can anyone enlighten me? Will someone from the Committee on Public Works make a statement from the majority side of the aisle?

Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee. The conferees on the majority side are in substantial agreement with the statements made by the two gentlemen on your side.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. I thank the gentleman from Tennessee very much and appreciate it.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Montana [Mr. OLSEN].

Mr. OLSEN. Mr. Speaker, on September 22, 1960, in my home State of Montana, the now President John F. Kennedy was speaking of the Knowles

project which is the subject of my remarks today. President Kennedy said:

We will not stand by and permit our resources to be wasted or taken for partial development for the benefit of special interests. We will not stand by, for example, and permit another Hells Canyon blunder in the Clark Fork Basin. I think the next President of the United States must support early authorization of the multipurpose project in the Paradise Knowles area.

The Senate held extensive hearings on the Knowles Dam project, in Montana over a period of years on several occasions, and finally this year in the Public Works Committee of the Senate. Everyone who had any interest in the project was heard. Thus the Senate included Knowles in that body's public works program. When news reached Montana of the inclusion of this project in the proposed public works bill of 1963, telegrams commenced to arrive at my office. In the last 4 days, I have received over 200 in favor of the project and none against.

As Senator MANSFIELD said a few days ago, and as I have been quoted, as well as Senator METCALF earlier this year, we support Federal investment in Knowles Dam with three specifications:

First. A reservation of power for Montana.

Second. Substantial compensation to the Indians—it could be a block of power.

Third. Continue the guarantee of present elevation of Flathead Lake.

For many years, I have supported the policy of Montana water for Montana people and the development of Montana resources first for the benefit of Montana people; and, of course, for the benefit of everyone in the Nation.

Water is committed to running downhill. Therefore, to benefit Montana people, the water must be developed before it gets out of the State. Since time began, excess runoff of water from Montana has been going to the seas undeveloped. The run of the river dams developed by private power companies have permitted a great waste of water by failure to corral the floodwaters. The people of Montana and the Nation are entitled to full development of the river—electric power, irrigation and reclamation, flood control, and recreation. Private power companies are organized for the profit of their stockholders—in the case of Montana, about 80 percent of the stock is held outside the State. Private power companies are not organized for and do not control floodwaters, develop recreation, or irrigation and reclamation, or any of the other benefits of a great river such as the Clarks Fork of the Columbia River or the Flathead River. We must commit ourselves to the development of the whole river, complete development, in cooperation with the whole basin of the river. For instance, Hungry Horse Dam as an isolated operation would produce only 90,000 kilowatts of power.

However, the at-site power of Hungry Horse under a coordinated operation with other Federal dams on the Columbia River produces 221,000 kilowatts, plus downstream generation of 862,000

kilowatts from the reuse of Hungry Horse storage; that is a grand total of more than 1 million kilowatts. Knowles Dam; under coordinated operation, will develop 267,000 kilowatts at-site plus an additional 686,000 kilowatts downstream from reuse of Knowles storage; or a total of almost 1 million kilowatts. This should be compared with the rated possible production at Buffalo Rapids of 148,000 kilowatts, by the Flathead Indian Tribe or the Montana Power Co. because it would be only a run of the river dam and has no storage capabilities whatsoever. Knowles is the wiser choice of these possible developments at this reach of the river. These facts and conclusions are those made after 11 years of study by the Corps of Engineers of the U.S. Army; and these conclusions have been approved and the recommendation of the Corps of Engineers has been concurred in by the Board of Rivers and Harbors, the Secretaries of the Army and Interior, the Bureau of the Budget, and the President. The Knowles project would pay for itself in 50 years on a cost-benefit ratio of 1.2 to 1. The benefits of more than \$200 per acre from the 50,000 surface acres of the stored water are compared with the benefits from each of the 8,600 acres of tillable inundated lands with a gross acre revenue of less than \$44. Knowles will irrigate more than 21,000 acres. Additionally, Knowles would be beneficial to Montana:

First. Cheap power inviting job-making industry to Montana at Bonneville Postage Stamp—rate of 2.4 mills instead of private power rate of 6 mills per kilowatt.

Second. Montana obtains its rightful share of National Government investment in natural resource development.

Third. Increase in broadened tax base of local government with new industry, new families, and new homes.

Fourth. Greatly enhance fish and wildlife resources.

Fifth. Boost Montana recreation and tourist industry.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the conferees to accept the Senate amendment, the Knowles project, in the public works bill.

Mr. Speaker, I include as part of my remarks the more than 200 telegrams which I hold in my hand and submit for the RECORD:

HELENA, MONT.,
October 8, 1962.

ARNOLD OLSEN,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Our organization strongly urges you to carry on fight for Knowles Dam. Our organization of 20,000 members on record by convention action in full support of Knowles Dam.

JAMES S. UMBER,
President, Montana State AFL-CIO.

HAMILTON, MONT.,
October 5, 1962.

ARNOLD OLSEN,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Trust you won't be influenced by Montana Power Co. opposition to Knowles Dam.

Brandy,
G. M. BRANDBORG.

MISSOULA, MONT.,
October 5, 1962.

ARNOLD OLSEN,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

From information I have gathered I earnestly feel that the majority of western Montana citizens favor the construction of Knowles Dam.

GEHRES D. WEED,
Architect, Paddock Building.

MISSOULA, MONT.,
October 6, 1962.

Congressman ARNOLD OLSEN,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Strongly urge inclusion of Knowles Dam project in omnibus public works bill.

J. R. RILEY,
County Attorney Office.

MISSOULA, MONT.,
October 6, 1962.

ARNOLD OLSEN,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

I support Knowles Dam bill passage.

WILLIAM L. CLOSE.

MISSOULA, MONT.,
October 6, 1962.

Congressman ARNOLD OLSEN,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.:

Urge you to support Knowles Dam.

Mr. and Mrs. R. M. HOUGHTON.

MISSOULA, MONT.,
October 5, 1962.

Congressman ARNOLD OLSEN,
Washington, D.C.:

I expect you to give Knowles Dam your fullest support.

ANNE R. RINKE.

MISSOULA, MONT.,
October 5, 1962.

Representative ARNOLD OLSEN,
Washington, D.C.:

Strongly urge inclusion of Knowles Dam; cannot afford underdevelopment by private power against Russian competition.

EDNA MANN.

MISSOULA, MONT.,
October 5, 1962.

ARNOLD OLSEN,
Member of Congress,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

The people of western Montana are positively not opposed to Knowles. They overwhelmingly favor it. The economic dislocation is trifling compared to the economic gains to be derived. It is projects such as this which make prosperous areas out of existing rock reefs and sagebrush.

DONALD A. PADDOCK,
Attorney at Law.

MISSOULA, MONT.,
October 6, 1962.

Representative ARNOLD OLSEN,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.:

We urge passage of Knowles Dam.

ARLEN and JAQUETTA THOMPSON.

MISSOULA, MONT.,
October 6, 1962.

HON. ARNOLD OLSEN,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

We urge that Knowles authorization be added to House bill before adjournment.

LEON and ESTHER HURTT.

MISSOULA, MONT.,
October 6, 1962.

ARNOLD OLSEN,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Use your most persuasive arguments to secure Knowles for Montana.

LA VERNE TAYLOR.

MISSOULA, MONT.,
October 6, 1962.

ARNOLD OLSEN,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.:

Urge committee to retain Knowles Dam in public works bill.

ELTON and BERNICE BRECHBILL.

MISSOULA, MONT.,
October 6, 1962.

Representative ARNOLD OLSEN,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.:

We fully support the Knowles Dam. Pay no attention to the threat of the American Crystal Sugar Co. We have more beet land available on our ranch than the whole Moise Valley. At \$10.8788 per ton no return anyhow. We're a hundred percent behind you on this bill.

ELMER and MARY FLYNN.

MISSOULA, MONT.,
October 6, 1962.

Congressman ARNOLD OLSEN,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.:

I favor Knowles Dam.

LORENE LORAN.

BUTTE, MONT.,
October 8, 1962.

HON. ARNOLD OLSON,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.:

ARNOLD fight for Knowles Dam.

GEO. BLAIR,
Secretary, Boilermakers Union No. 30.

MISSOULA, MONT.,
October 8, 1962.

ARNOLD OLSEN,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Please support Knowles Dam bill this session of Congress.

DALE WARREN.

SWAN LAKE, MONT.

ST. IGNATIUS, MONT.,
October 8, 1962.

ARNOLD OLSEN,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

We're for Knowles this session of Congress.

DENNIS R. PLOUFFE.

MISSOULA, MONT.,
October 8, 1962.

ARNOLD OLSEN,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Vote for Knowles Dam during this session of Congress.

ST. IGNATIUS.

GUS PIENIAK.

MISSOULA, MONT.,
October 8, 1962.

ARNOLD OLSEN,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.:

We sincerely hope Knowles Dam will be included in bill this session.

MARGARET and HERBERT CARSON.

MISSOULA, MONT.,
October 8, 1962.

ARNOLD OLSEN,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

We're for Knowles this session of Congress.

Mr. and Mrs. FRED MILES.

ST. IGNATIUS, MONT.

ST. IGNATIUS, MONT.,
October 8, 1962.

ARNOLD OLSEN,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Vote for Knowles Dam this session of Congress.

Mr. and Mrs. L. E. DUNN.

MISSOULA, MONT.,
October 8, 1962.

ARNOLD OLSEN,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Vote for Knowles Dam this session.

Mr. and Mrs. DAN MCCOLLUM.

ST. IGNATIUS, MONT.

ST. IGNATIUS, MONT., October 7, 1962.

ARNOLD OLSEN,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

We want Knowles Dam authorized soon.

HAROLD MITCHELL, JR.

MISSOULA, MONT.,
October 8, 1962.

ARNOLD OLSEN,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

We're for Knowles Dam this session of Congress.

L. H. KROGSTAD.

RONAN, MONT.

MISSOULA, MONT.,
October 5, 1962.

ARNOLD OLSEN,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

I support Knowles Dam bill passage.

MELVIN SHUFFIELDS.

MISSOULA, MONT.,
October 8, 1962.

Congressman ARNOLD OLSEN,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

I support Knowles Dam because I feel it will benefit the entire Northwest.

MRS. GEORGE WELLS.

HOT SPRINGS.

MISSOULA, MONT.,
October 5, 1962.

ARNOLD OLSEN,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Believe Knowles Dam project in best interest of Montana business. Urge your support.

K. G. DISTRIBUTORS.

MISSOULA, MONT.,
October 6, 1962.

Congressman ARNOLD OLSEN,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Believe Knowles project in best interest of Montana, Northwest and Nation. Strongly urge authorization.

EUGENE PIKE.

MISSOULA, MONT.,
October 8, 1962.

ARNOLD OLSEN,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

We are for Knowles this session of Congress.

Mr. and Mrs. MELVIN BROWN.

ST. IGNATIUS, MONT.

MISSOULA, MONT.,
October 8, 1962.

Congressman ARNOLD OLSEN,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:
We are for Knowles this session of
Congress.

Mr. and Mrs. CHARLES R. CORDIER.
POLSON, MONT.

MISSOULA, MONT.,
October 8, 1962.

Congressman ARNOLD OLSEN,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:
I support Knowles Dam because of its
many benefits for all this area.

Mr. GEORGE WELLS.
HOT SPRINGS.

ST. IGNATIUS, MONT.,
October 8, 1962.

ARNOLD OLSEN,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:
We're for Knowles this session of Con-
gress.

ROSALIE P. MATT.

MISSOULA, MONT.,
October 8, 1962.

ARNOLD OLSEN,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:
We're for Knowles this session of Con-
gress.

WALTER RUDD.

ST. IGNATIUS, MONT.,
October 8, 1962.

ARNOLD OLSEN,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:
We're for Knowles this session of Congress.
Mr. and Mrs. CLIFFORD A. MATT.

MISSOULA, MONT.,
October 8, 1962.

Representative ARNOLD OLSEN,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:
Montana needs industry. We need cheap
power from Knowles to attract it. Urge
authorization.

GEORGE W. EVINS,
AGNES E. EVINS.

ST. IGNATIUS, MONT.,
October 7, 1962.

ARNOLD OLSEN,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:
We want Knowles Dam for western Mon-
tana progress.

RICHARD V. ORR.

ST. IGNATIUS, MONT.,
October 7, 1962.

ARNOLD OLSEN,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:
Support Knowles Dam this session. Mon-
tana needs this project.

Mr. and Mrs. ARCHIE W. OLSEN.

ST. IGNATIUS, MONT.,
October 7, 1962.

ARNOLD OLSEN,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:
People strong for Knowles Dam this ses-
sion.

Mr. and Mrs. VALENTINE M. SCHELER.

ST. IGNATIUS, MONT.,
October 7, 1962.

ARNOLD OLSEN,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:
Montana needs Knowles Dam. Hope it is
authorized this session.

Mr. and Mrs. MICHEL ASHLEY.

ST. IGNATIUS, MONT.,
October 7, 1962.

ARNOLD OLSEN,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:
Urge support of Knowles Dam for western
Montana.

Mr. and Mrs. RAY ORR.

ST. IGNATIUS, MONT.,
October 7, 1962.

ARNOLD OLSEN,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:
People want Knowles Dam this session.
Mr. and Mrs. PARLEY A. KENT.

ST. IGNATIUS, MONT.,
October 7, 1962.

ARNOLD OLSEN,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:
Community wants Knowles Dam author-
ized for western Montana.

JOHN C. BROCK.

BUTTE, MONT.,
October 7, 1962.

ARNOLD OLSEN,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.:
Consensus heavily in favor of your staying
in Washington to vote on public works ap-
propriations and other vital legislation. Rec-
ognize you have tough campaign. Offer any
assistance possible.

MARY and SARAH McNELIS.

ST. IGNATIUS, MONT.,
October 7, 1962.

ARNOLD OLSEN,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:
Appreciate support of Knowles Dam for
western Montana.

JAMES S. MORAN.

ST. IGNATIUS, MONT.,
October 7, 1962.

ARNOLD OLSEN,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:
Request your support of Knowles Dam.

MARY HOPPE.

ST. IGNATIUS, MONT.,
October 7, 1962.

ARNOLD OLSEN,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:
Everyone here strong for Knowles. Try to
keep it on bill.

JIM McCOLLUM.

ST. IGNATIUS, MONT.,
October 7, 1962.

ARNOLD OLSEN,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:
Want Knowles Dam authorized before ad-
jourment.

S. SMESRUD.

ST. IGNATIUS, MONT.,
October 7, 1962.

ARNOLD OLSEN,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:
Community urges your support of Knowles
Dam.

Mr. and Mrs. LOYAL LESTER.

ST. IGNATIUS, MONT.,
October 7, 1962.

ARNOLD OLSEN,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:
Request all possible support by you for
Knowles Dam. Montana needs this project.

Mr. and Mrs. CHARLES HUNTER.

ST. IGNATIUS, MONT.,
October 7, 1962.

ARNOLD OLSEN,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:
Hope for Knowles Dam authorization soon.
Mr. and Mrs. JOHN A. MICHEL.

HOT SPRINGS, MONT.,
October 7, 1962.

HON. ARNOLD OLSEN,
Washington, D.C.:
I believe Knowles Dam would be a great
asset to northwestern Montana.

TOM JACKQUES.

HOT SPRINGS, MONT.,
October 7, 1962.

HON. ARNOLD OLSEN,
Washington, D.C.:
I think Knowles Dam is essential to the
economy of the entire Northwest.

ALMA CARNEY.

HOT SPRINGS, MONT.,
October 8, 1962.

HON. ARNOLD H. OLSEN,
Washington, D.C.:
I support Knowles Dam because I think it
is good for the future of Montana.

Mrs. EDGAR STEVENS.

MISSOULA, MONT.,
October 8, 1962.

ARNOLD OLSEN,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:
We're for Knowles this session of Congress.

ART WARREN.

MISSOULA, MONT.,
October 8, 1962.

ARNOLD OLSEN,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:
Please vote "Yes" on bill for Knowles Dam.

CECIL G. CRUSCH.

ST. IGNATIUS, MONT.,
October 8, 1962.

ARNOLD OLSEN,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:
We're for the Knowles Dam.

Mr. and Mrs. D. D. WERNER.

MISSOULA, MONT.,
October 8, 1962.

ARNOLD OLSEN,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:
Vote for the passage of the Knowles Dam
this week.

Mrs. VERNE HARRIS.

MISSOULA, MONT.,
October 8, 1962.

ARNOLD OLSEN,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:
Knowles Dam a must. Do all you can.
November 6 will take care of itself.

Mr. and Mrs. DON WALDRON.

ST. IGNATIUS, MONT.,
October 8, 1962.

ARNOLD OLSEN,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:
Vote for Knowles Dam. We're for it.

BEN and BESSIE DORMAIER.

MISSOULA, MONT.,
October 8, 1962.

ARNOLD OLSEN,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:
Vote "yes" for the Knowles Dam bill.

Mr. and Mrs. CLARENCE JENSEN.

ST. IGNATIUS, MONT.,
October 8, 1962.

ARNOLD OLSEN,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

We're for Knowles Dam this session of Congress.

H. R. RESNER.

MISSOULA, MONT.,
October 8, 1962.

ARNOLD OLSEN,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

We're for the Knowles Dam bill.

Mr. and Mrs. MELVIN LUND.

MISSOULA, MONT.,
October 8, 1962.

ARNOLD OLSEN,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

We're for Knowles Dam. Please vote "Yes."

Mr. and Mrs. LAWRENCE CHRISTENSEN.

MISSOULA, MONT.,
October 8, 1962.

ARNOLD OLSEN,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Please support the Knowles Dam bill.

EMANUEL BELLON.

MISSOULA, MONT.,
October 8, 1962.

Congressman ARNOLD OLSEN,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

We're for Knowles this session of Congress.

Mr. and Mrs. LEO ROUILLIER.

MISSOULA, MONT.,
October 8, 1962.

ARNOLD OLSEN,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Vote for Knowles this session of Congress.

Mr. and Mrs. DERALD DELLWO.

MISSOULA, MONT.,
October 8, 1962.

ARNOLD OLSEN,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

We're for Knowles Dam this session of Congress.

Mr. and Mrs. TED COMPTON.

MISSOULA, MONT.,
October 8, 1962.

ARNOLD OLSEN,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

I support the Knowles Dam bill. Please vote "yes."

HAROLD G. TEIGEN.

ST. IGNATIUS, MONT.,
October 8, 1962.

ARNOLD OLSEN,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Vote for Knowles Dam this session of Congress.

JESS ROGERS.

MISSOULA, MONT.,
October 8, 1962.

Representative ARNOLD OLSEN,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Opposed to Knowles Dam along with majority voters Lakes County.

Mr. and Mrs. W. D. McDANIEL.

MISSOULA, MONT.,
October 6, 1962.

HON. ARNOLD OLSEN,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Vote for Knowles Dam bill. Montana needs additional power for existing and new industry to help stabilize economy. New water facilities to boost tourism. Added flood control a must for Columbia Basin.

GEROGIA WALTER.

MISSOULA, MONT.,
October 5, 1962.

Congressman ARNOLD OLSEN,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Strongly urge inclusion of Knowles Dam project in omnibus public works bill.

JACK PINSONAULT,
County Attorney.

KALISPELL, MONT.,
October 6, 1962.

Representative ARNOLD OLSEN,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

We appreciate your help in retaining the Knowles project on the public works bill.

ELMER BASTROM.

KALISPELL, MONT.,
October 6, 1962.

Representative ARNOLD OLSEN,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

We feel what you are doing for the Knowles project is great. Knowles must stay on the PWB.

BOB WILZ.

KALISPELL, MONT.,
October 6, 1962.

Representative ARNOLD OLSEN,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Knowles project must stay on the PWB. Anything you can do is appreciated.

ORVILLE RIYZEMAN.

KALISPELL, MONT.,
October 6, 1962.

ARNOLD OLSEN,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Your efforts in keeping the Knowles project on the public works bill are more than appreciated. We stand behind you.

JOE CROSSWHITE.

KALISPELL, MONT.,
October 6, 1962.

Representative ARNOLD OLSEN,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

The Kalispell Central Trades & Labor Council has unanimously supported the Knowles project. Please do all that is possible to retain it on the public works bill.

JOE CROSSWHITE.

KALISPELL, MONT.,
October 6, 1962.

ARNOLD OLSEN,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

We appreciate your help in retaining the Knowles project on the public works bill.

HAROLD SIBELRUD.

KALISPELL, MONT.,
October 6, 1962.

Representative ARNOLD OLSEN,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

By unanimous action at our regular meeting last night we are on record urging you

to do your best to retain Knowles project on the public works bill.

INTERNATIONAL UNION OF OPERATING
ENGINEERS, LOCAL 371.

KALISPELL, MONT.,
October 6, 1962.

Representative ARNOLD OLSEN,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Your efforts at keeping the Knowles project on the PWB are appreciated. Montana needs this dam.

WM. STERNER.

KALISPELL, MONT.,
October 6, 1962.

Representative ARNOLD OLSEN,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Just to let you know your efforts in keeping the Knowles project on the PWB are greatly appreciated.

MARGARET PRINCE.

KALISPELL, MONT.,
October 6, 1962.

ARNOLD OLSEN,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

I urge you to do everything possible to keep Knowles on the PWB.

JOE SZIVI.

THOMPSON FALLS, MONT.,
October 6, 1962.

Representative ARNOLD OLSEN,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

If we build Knowles it will help our economy.

VIRGINIA LOVSAUG.

THOMPSON FALLS, MONT.,
October 6, 1962.

Representative ARNOLD OLSEN,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Our area will prosper if we build the Knowles Dam.

LEONARD NOVSAUG.

THOMPSON FALLS, MONT.,
October 6, 1962.

Representative ARNOLD OLSEN,
Washington, D.C.:

A Knowles Dam supporter, let's build it.

BILL BRUCE.

KALISPELL, MONT.,
October 6, 1962.

Representative ARNOLD OLSEN,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

We like what you are doing to keep the Knowles project on the PWB. Keep up the good work.

VILA B. STERNER.

HOT SPRINGS, MONT.,
October 6, 1962.

Congressman ARNOLD OLSEN,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

We need Knowles Dam to encourage industry for the benefit of Montana.

ANDREW N. JOHNSON.

THOMPSON FALLS, MONT.,
October 6, 1962.

Representative ARNOLD OLSEN,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Favor passage of bill to construct Knowles Dam project.

JOHN A. NEWELL.

KALISPELL, MONT.,
October 6, 1962.

Representative ARNOLD OLSEN,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

We appreciate your help in keeping the Knowles project on the public works bill.
BOB JOHNSON.

KALISPELL, MONT.,
October 6, 1962.

Representative ARNOLD OLSEN,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

We stand behind you in your effort to retain the Knowles project in the public works bill.

JULIUS SKAAR.

KALISPELL, MONT.,
October 6, 1962.

Representative ARNOLD OLSEN,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

The Knowles Dam project must remain on the public works bill. Your help is appreciated.

JAMES H. CHOATE.

MISSOULA, MONT.,
October 6, 1962.

Congressman ARNOLD OLSEN,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.:

Montana cannot afford delay on Knowles. Thank you.

WILLIARD and CAROL CARTER.

MISSOULA, MONT.,
October 6, 1962.

Congressman ARNOLD OLSEN,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

We need industry and jobs to keep young people in Montana. Please authorize Knowles.

ANN and MARGARET ROBERTS.

MISSOULA, MONT.,
October 6, 1962.

Congressman ARNOLD OLSEN,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

We are praying Knowles will be authorized before adjournment.

CLAY and HULDA CARTER.

MISSOULA, MONT.,
October 6, 1962.

Congressman ARNOLD OLSEN,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.:

Break Montana power monopoly. Continue your support of Knowles Dam.

JIM SEERY.

MISSOULA, MONT.,
October 6, 1962.

Congressman ARNOLD OLSEN,
Washington, D.C.:

Full development of the Columbia is vital to the West. Do A-OK Knowles Dam.

HERBERT and ADELIN BARTRON.

CHARLO, MONT.,
October 6, 1962.

Congressman ARNOLD OLSEN,
Washington, D.C.:

People who think for themselves want Knowles for flood control, heat, power, and jobs.

FRANCIS LOGAN.

PABLO, MONT.,
October 6, 1962.

ARNOLD OLSEN,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.:

Please work hard for passage of Knowles.
Mr. and Mrs. JAMES FLEMING.

RONAN, MONT.,
October 6, 1962.

Congressman ARNOLD OLSEN,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.:

Do your utmost for the passage of Knowles.
Mr. and Mrs. JOE CHARVAT.

RONAN, MONT.,
October 6, 1962.

Congressman ARNOLD OLSEN,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.:

Favorable vote for Knowles important for Montana's economy.

Mr. and Mrs. WILLIAM SELL.

RONAN, MONT.,
October 6, 1962.

Congressman ARNOLD OLSEN,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.:

A favorable vote for Knowles important for Montana's economy.

Mr. and Mrs. JOHN HUGHES.

MISSOULA, MONT.,
October 6, 1962.

ARNOLD OLSEN,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.:

We feel Knowles project wanted and needed in Montana. Please give all possible support.

Mr. and Mrs. WILLIAM BALLARD.

MISSOULA, MONT.,
October 6, 1962.

HON. ARNOLD OLSEN,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

We urge restoration of the Knowles Dam authorization to the House bill. We need Knowles Dam now; it must not be side-tracked.

EDWINN and LEONA MARVIN.

MISSOULA, MONT.,
October 6, 1962.

ARNOLD OLSEN,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.:

We favor Knowles Dam.

BILL and ANGELINE MCCOY.

MISSOULA, MONT.,
October 6, 1962.

ARNOLD OLSEN,
Washington, D.C.:

I recommend that Knowles Dam be passed at this session.

Mrs. FRANCES WAYLETT.

PARADISE, MONT.,
October 6, 1962.

HON. ARNOLD OLSEN,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

As a businessman, Knowles Dam is what we need. Eighty percent of my customers are for it.

CARL H. DAHL.

KALISPELL, MONT.,
October 6, 1962.

ARNOLD OLSEN,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Urge all efforts keep Knowles in appropriations bill.

N. M. GIES,
Secretary, Kalispell, Mont., Building
& Construction Trade Council.

CHARLO, MONT.,
October 5, 1962.

Congressman ARNOLD OLSEN,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

We want you to support Knowles.
Mr. and Mrs. GENE MEDVED.

MISSOULA, MONT.,
October 5, 1962.

Representative ARNOLD OLSEN,
Washington, D.C.:

I am in favor of Knowles Dam for Montana's increased industrial growth.
Mrs. LEO HANSEN.

MISSOULA, MONT.,
October 5, 1962.

Representative ARNOLD OLSEN,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Please pass the Knowles Dam in the session. We need Knowles Dam.

MISS MARLEN WAYLETT.

MISSOULA, MONT.,
October 5, 1962.

Congressman ARNOLD OLSEN,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Have supported multipurpose dam in Paradise-Knowles area since 1953. We still do.

MISSOULA ELECTRIC COOPERATIVE, INC.

MISSOULA, MONT.,
October 5, 1962.

ARNOLD OLSEN,
Washington, D.C.:

Urge authorization of Knowles Dam. Believe it is for the good of Montana.

DONALD E. WOOLRIDGE.

HOT SPRINGS, MONT.,
October 5, 1962.

Congressman ARNOLD OLSEN,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

I support Knowles Dam because of flood control, power output, storage, wildlife, recreation, economic development.

BEN F. CORTNER.

HOT SPRINGS, MONT.,
October 5, 1962.

Congressman ARNOLD OLSEN,
Washington, D.C.:

I support Knowles Dam because of flood control, power output, water storage, wildlife, recreation, and economic development.

AMY A. FALLEE.

HOT SPRINGS, MONT.,
October 5, 1962.

Congressman ARNOLD OLSEN,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

I support Knowles Dam because of flood control, power output, water storage, wildlife, recreation, and economic development.

STEVEN S. SALLEE.

POLSON, MONT.,
October 5, 1962.

ARNOLD OLSEN,
Washington, D.C.:

We urge your support of legislation for Knowles Dam necessary for comprehensive river development.

LEE and ELIZABETH LARSON.

HOT SPRINGS, MONT.,
October 5, 1962.

Congressman ARNOLD OLSEN,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

I support Knowles Dam because of water storage, progressive development, and wildlife preservation.

Mrs. IVON PINEGER.

HOT SPRINGS, MONT.,
October 5, 1962.

Congressman ARNOLD OLSEN,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

I support Knowles Dam because of flood control, water storage, and economic development.

AVON PINEGAR.

HOT SPRINGS, MONT.,
October 5, 1962.

Congressman ARNOLD OLSEN,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

I support Knowles Dam because of flood control, power output, water storage, wildlife, recreation, and economic development.
CHARLES W. McMENUS.

MISSOULA, MONT.,
October 5, 1962.

Congressman ARNOLD OLSEN,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Urge passage of Knowles Dam project.
VIRGINIA L. MELTZER.

THOMPSON FALLS, MONT.,
October 6, 1962.

Congressman ARNOLD M. OLSEN,
Washington, D.C.:

Please continue your support of Knowles Dam legislation. We need development of western Montana.
S. BRUCE DELONG.

THOMPSON FALLS, MONT.,
October 6, 1962.

Congressman ARNOLD M. OLSEN,
Washington, D.C.:

Build the Knowles Dam; it will help our economy.
LELAND E. BREINER.

THOMPSON FALLS, MONT.,
October 6, 1962.

Congressman ARNOLD M. OLSEN,
Washington, D.C.:

I support Knowles Dam. We need development of our resources.
EDNA M. MOONEY.

THOMPSON FALLS, MONT.,
October 6, 1962.

Congressman ARNOLD M. OLSEN,
Washington, D.C.:

Knowles Dam will help. Please build it.
D. J. BROCKWAY.

THOMPSON FALLS, MONT.,
October 6, 1962.

Congressman ARNOLD M. OLSEN,
Washington, D.C.:

I support Knowles for development of Montana.
BERT L. VANCAMPEN.

THOMPSON FALLS, MONT.,
October 6, 1962.

Congressman ARNOLD M. OLSEN,
Washington, D.C.:

I am in favor of construction of Knowles Dam in Sanders County. Please continue support.
KATHRYN DELONG.

THOMPSON FALLS, MONT.,
October 6, 1962.

Congressman ARNOLD M. OLSEN,
Washington, D.C.:

My support is for Knowles Dam.
M. C. SUTHERLAND.

THOMPSON FALLS, MONT.,
October 6, 1962.

Congressman ARNOLD M. OLSEN,
Washington, D.C.:

Need Knowles dam for complete river development and to alleviate chronic unemployment.
STEPHEN D. BABCOCK.

HOT SPRINGS, MONT.,
October 6, 1962.

Congressman ARNOLD OLSEN,
Washington, D.C.:

Knowles Dam is needed to boost the economy and stimulate industrial growth in Western Montana.
MARTIN NEILSEN.

CHARLO, MONT.,
October 5, 1962.

Congressman ARNOLD OLSEN,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Our State needs more employment so we need Knowles.
Mr. and Mrs. REN OLSON.

CHARLO, MONT.,
October 5, 1962.

Congressman ARNOLD OLSEN,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

I would like industry in our State. Support Knowles.
Mr. and Mrs. ORLA HENSEN.

PLAINS, MONT.,
October 5, 1962.

Representative ARNOLD OLSEN,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Favor passage of Knowles Dam. Sanders County needs this project.
JOHN F. HARWOOD,
Sanders County Commissioner.

CHARLO, MONT.,
October 5, 1962.

ARNOLD OLSEN,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

We are for Knowles.
Mr. and Mrs. LESTER OLSON.

MISSOULA, MONT.,
October 5, 1962.

Representative ARNOLD OLSEN,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

I am in favor of Knowles Dam for the future industrial growth of Montana.
LORENE M. TEMPLETON.

POLSON, MONT.,
October 5, 1962.

Representative ARNOLD OLSEN,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Strongly urge passage of bill for Knowles Dam. Need for power and flood control paramount.
C. E. and ESTHER LIVINGSTON.

MISSOULA, MONT.,
October 5, 1962.

Congressman ARNOLD OLSEN,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Please continue supporting Knowles Dam. We feel its in the best interests of Montana.
MARGARET and ROY BUDDITT.

HOT SPRINGS, MONT.,
October 5, 1962.

Congressman ARNOLD OLSEN,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Work program needed badly. The allover picture a good one. We need Knowles Dam.
BETTY LIVINGSTON.

CHARLO, MONT.,
October 5, 1962.

Congressman ARNOLD OLSEN,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

We need to have Knowles built.
Mr. and Mrs. BERT OLSON.

MISSOULA, MONT.,
October 5, 1962.

Congressman ARNOLD OLSEN,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

We urge the passage of the Knowles Dam bill. Will we need it here.
Mr. and Mrs. MELVIN PALMER.

HOT SPRINGS, MONT.,
October 6, 1962.

Congressman ARNOLD OLSEN,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

I am in favor of Knowles Dam for the progress of Montana.
J. H. JOHNSTON.

MISSOULA, MONT.,
October 6, 1962.

Congressman ARNOLD OLSEN,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

I am wholeheartedly in favor of Knowles. Please continue supporting it.
WILLIAM L. CLOSE.

MISSOULA, MONT.,
October 6, 1962.

ARNOLD OLSEN,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Montana must have Knowles Dam. Please put full force of your office behind the project.
TOM DANIELSON.

HOT SPRINGS, MONT.,
October 6, 1962.

Congressman ARNOLD OLSEN,
Washington, D.C.:

I support Knowles Dam because flood control, power output, water storage, wildlife, recreation, economic development.
LILLIAN CORTNER.

HOT SPRINGS, MONT.,
October 6, 1962.

Congressman ARNOLD OLSEN,
Washington, D.C.:

Western Montana needs Knowles Dam with low-cost power to boost industrial growth.
MARCIA NEILSEN.

HOT SPRINGS, MONT.,
October 6, 1962.

Congressman ARNOLD OLSEN,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

I support Knowles Dam because flood control, power output, water storage, wildlife, recreation, economic development.
MINA ALBERT.

HOT SPRINGS, MONT.,
October 6, 1962.

Congressman ARNOLD OLSEN,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

I support Knowles Dam because flood control, power output, water storage, wildlife, recreation, economic development.
ALLEN BARNS.

HOT SPRINGS, MONT.,
October 6, 1962.

Congressman ARNOLD OLSEN,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

I support Knowles Dam because flood control, power output, water storage, wildlife, recreation, economic development.
Mrs. BEULAH SNYDER.

CHARLO, MONT.,
October 6, 1962.

Congressman ARNOLD OLSEN,
Washington, D.C.:

We need power and storage. Build Knowles now.
ANN DRISCOLL.

HOT SPRINGS, MONT.,
October 6, 1962.

Congressman ARNOLD OLSEN,
Washington, D.C.:

Am in favor of Knowles Dam. Western Montana needs low cost power for economic growth.
THOMAS NEILSEN.

ARLEE, MONT.,
October 6, 1962.

Congressman ARNOLD OLSEN,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

We favor Federal Knowles for flood control, power, recreation, economic, and democratic reasons.

Mr. and Mrs. RAY D. CARY.

MISSOULA, MONT.,
October 6, 1962.

Representative ARNOLD OLSEN,
Washington, D.C.:

I am in favor of Knowles Dam for Montana's increased industrial growth.

LEO HANSEN.

HOT SPRINGS, MONT.,
October 6, 1962.

Representative ARNOLD OLSEN,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

I support Knowles Dam because of flood control, power output, water storage, wildlife, recreation, economic developments.

R. E. SNYDER.

PLAINS, MONT.,
October 5, 1962.

Representative ARNOLD OLSEN,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Imperative build Knowles Dam.

C. C. COFFEY.

PLAINS, MONT.,
October 5, 1962.

Representative ARNOLD OLSEN,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Public works legislation must provide for Knowles Dam now. Majority here support it.

HOWARD M. ROSLYN.

PLAINS, MONT.,
October 5, 1962.

ARNOLD OLSEN,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Strongly urge inclusion of Knowles Dam in appropriation for public works. This is a must.

JOHN R. GARDEN.

PLAINS, MONT.,
October 5, 1962.

Representative ARNOLD OLSEN,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Knowles Dam must be provided for in public works legislation. Majority here demand it.

W. L. VACURA.

THOMPSON FALLS, MONT.,
October 5, 1962.

Representative ARNOLD OLSEN,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Only Knowles Dam can accomplish intelligent handling and complete development of our water.

DUKE SALLEE.

HOT SPRINGS, MONT.,
October 5, 1962.

Congressman ARNOLD OLSEN,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

I support Knowles Dam because of flood control, power output, water storage, wildlife, recreation, economic development.

MARET BLIXT.

ST. IGNATIUS, MONT.,
October 7, 1962.

ARNOLD OLSEN,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Western Montana desperately needs Knowles Dam now.

FREDERICK R. MATT.

ST. IGNATIUS, MONT.,
October 6, 1962.

Congressman ARNOLD OLSEN,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Businessmen and surrounding communities want Knowles authorized this session.

J. J. CHIPMAN.

ST. IGNATIUS, MONT.,
October 6, 1962.

Congressman ARNOLD OLSEN,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Company has paid staff to round up telegrams. Supporters of Knowles write and send their own.

CHARLES MILLER.

GREAT FALLS, MONT.,
October 7, 1962.

Congressman ARNOLD OLSEN,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Urge every effort to include Knowles Dam in House conference report.

Regards,

LEONARD KENFIELD,
President, Montana Farmers Union.

ARNOLD OLSEN,
Washington, D.C.:

Big Horn area farmers now know power dams cause summer shortage—winter flooding. Knowles unjustified.

HARLAN THOMPSON.

ST. IGNATIUS, MONT.,
October 6, 1962.

Congressman ARNOLD OLSEN,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Montana and Lake Counties desperately need Knowles Dam now.

THOMAS HOYENGA.

ST. IGNATIUS, MONT.,
October 6, 1962.

Congressman ARNOLD OLSEN,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

We appreciate your splendid support of Knowles Dam and defiance of company.

Mrs. ROXANNA GOULD.

PARADISE, MONT.,
October 7, 1962.

HON. ARNOLD H. OLSEN,
Member of Congress,
Washington, D.C.:

Knowles Dam a very worthwhile project. Vote "yes."

W. E. BARTHOLOMEW.

ST. IGNATIUS, MONT.,
October 7, 1962.

Congressman ARNOLD OLSEN,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Strongly favor Knowles. Montana needs it.

DON POSIVIO.

ST. IGNATIUS, MONT.,
October 7, 1962.

Congressman ARNOLD OLSEN,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Strongly favor Knowles. Don't give in to Montana Power.

CLETE and RUTH FEARON.

ST. IGNATIUS, MONT.,
October 7, 1962.

Congressman ARNOLD OLSEN,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Montana needs Knowles for water storage. Western Montana needs a boost.

FRANCIS MOORE.

ST. IGNATIUS, MONT.,
October 7, 1962.

Congressman ARNOLD OLSEN,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Keep up the fight for Knowles. Western Montana needs it.

CHARLES WHALEN.

ST. IGNATIUS, MONT.,
October 7, 1962.

Congressman ARNOLD OLSEN,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Do everything you can for Knowles. Montana needs it very much.

Mr. and Mrs. ARCHIE McDONALD.

ST. IGNATIUS, MONT.,
October 6, 1962.

Congressman ARNOLD OLSEN,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Am very strong for Knowles. Try your best to keep it on bill.

THOMAS D. GOULD.

COLUMBIA FALLS, MONT.,
October 6, 1962.

HON. ARNOLD OLSEN,
Member of Congress,
Washington, D.C.:

We want Knowles Dam passed this session.

Mr. and Mrs. SAM ROUILLEU.

ST. IGNATIUS, MONT.,
October 6, 1962.

Congressman ARNOLD OLSEN,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Thank you for your magnificent fight for Knowles and Montana success.

FRED AHRENS.

ST. IGNATIUS, MONT.,
October 6, 1962.

Congressman ARNOLD OLSEN,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

All my neighbors hope for approval of Knowles before adjournment.

H. DEWAYNE E. OLSEN.

ST. IGNATIUS, MONT.,
October 6, 1962.

Congressman ARNOLD OLSEN,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Most of the people strong for Knowles authorization.

G. A. ROSENBAUM.

ST. IGNATIUS, MONT.,
October 6, 1962.

Congressman ARNOLD OLSEN,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

I hope for Knowles authorization now.

R. L. WOLCOTT.

ST. IGNATIUS, MONT.,
October 6, 1962.

Congressman ARNOLD OLSEN,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Montana Power is main source against Knowles. Most of us are for it.

ARTHUR JONASEN.

ST. IGNATIUS, MONT.,
October 6, 1962.
Congressman ARNOLD OLSEN,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:
I request your support of Knowles Dam.
SHELDON GOULD.

ST. IGNATIUS, MONT.,
October 6, 1962.
Congressman ARNOLD OLSEN,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:
In favor of Knowles Dam. Pass this ses-
sion.
Mr. and Mrs. CHARLES V. CORDIER.

THOMPSON FALLS, MONT.,
October 6, 1962.
Congressman ARNOLD M. OLSEN,
Washington, D.C.:
Vote two "yesses" for Knowles Dam.
Mr. and Mrs. ERNEST M. TUFFMAN.

THOMPSON FALLS, MONT.,
October 6, 1962.
Congressman ARNOLD M. OLSEN,
Washington, D.C.:
I would like to see Knowles Dam built.
MARTHA B. TIMLIN.

THOMPSON FALLS, MONT.,
October 6, 1962.
Congressman ARNOLD M. OLSEN,
Washington, D.C.:
Build Knowles Dam, we need it.
EARL WOLLASTON.

THOMPSON FALLS, MONT.,
October 6, 1962.
Congressman ARNOLD M. OLSEN,
Washington, D.C.:
I am for the Knowles Dam.
HELEN BROWN SNIDER.

THOMPSON FALLS, MONT.,
October 6, 1962.
Congressman ARNOLD M. OLSEN,
Washington, D.C.:
I support Knowles Dam. We need devel-
opment in this area.
FRANKLIN SORENSEN.

THOMPSON FALLS, MONT.,
October 6, 1962.
Congressman ARNOLD M. OLSEN,
Washington, D.C.:
I support Knowles Dam.
JAMES L. HEIM.

THOMPSON FALLS, MONT.,
October 6, 1962.
Congressman ARNOLD M. OLSEN,
Washington, D.C.:
Please continue to vigorously support
Knowles Dam.
RUTH MARTMAN.

THOMPSON FALLS, MONT.,
October 6, 1962.
Congressman ARNOLD M. OLSEN,
Washington, D.C.:
This area needs Knowles Dam.
JIM DEAN.

THOMPSON FALLS, MONT.,
October 6, 1962.
Congressman ARNOLD M. OLSEN,
Washington, D.C.:
I am for the Knowles Dam.
BEATRICE JONAS.

THOMPSON FALLS, MONT.,
October 6, 1962.
Congressman ARNOLD M. OLSEN,
Washington, D.C.:
I am for the Knowles Dam.
D. A. MCCHESSNIE.

THOMPSON FALLS, MONT.,
October 6, 1962.
Congressman ARNOLD M. OLSEN,
Washington, D.C.:
Knowles Dam will help the entire West.
JOHN H. PYATT.

HOT SPRINGS, MONT.,
October 6, 1962.
Congressman ARNOLD OLSEN,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:
I support Knowles Dam because it would
help Montana's economy by increased in-
dustries and jobs.
MRS. W. V. EHLERT.

PLAINS, MONT.,
October 8, 1962.
Representative ARNOLD OLSEN,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:
We need Knowles Dam for future indus-
tries.
ROWANNA BROS.

EUREKA, MONT.,
October 8, 1962.
Congressman ARNOLD OLSEN,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:
The entire Northwest needs your support
on Knowles Dam project.
K. W. VINCENT.

PLAINS, MONT.,
October 8, 1962.
Representative ARNOLD OLSEN,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:
We need Knowles Dam for future progress.
WILLIE BROS.

EUREKA, MONT.,
October 8, 1962.
ARNOLD OLSEN,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:
We request you do everything possible to
assure passage of Knowles Dam legislation.
LINCOLN ELECTRIC COOPERATIVE.

GREAT FALLS, MONT.,
October 8, 1962.
Congressman ARNOLD OLSEN,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:
Fight to put Knowles in the House con-
ference report.
MAY WALTERS HOTEL AND RESTAURANT
EMPLOYEES UNION.

MISSOULA, MONT.,
October 5, 1962.
Congressman ARNOLD OLSEN,
U.S. Representative,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:
We urge approval of Knowles Dam.
JEAN PINSONEAULT.

THOMPSON FALLS, MONT.,
October 6, 1962.
Congressman ARNOLD OLSEN,
Washington, D.C.:
I support Knowles Dam.
GILBERT JONAS.

THOMPSON FALLS, MONT.,
October 6, 1962.
Congressman ARNOLD OLSEN,
Washington, D.C.:
I support Knowles Dam; we need develop-
ment of our resources.
FELIX G. CARTER.

THOMPSON FALLS, MONT.,
October 6, 1962.
Congressman ARNOLD OLSEN,
Washington, D.C.:
Sanders County and Montana need
Knowles Dam now.
ELINOR THURMAN.

THOMPSON FALLS, MONT.,
October 6, 1962.
Congressman ARNOLD OLSEN,
Washington, D.C.:
I am for the Knowles Dam.
PAT DEAN.

HOT SPRINGS, MONT.,
October 6, 1962.
Congressman ARNOLD M. OLSEN,
Washington, D.C.:
As a citizen of western Montana I urge you
to support the Knowles Dam program for
Montana.
WAYNE R. JOHNSON.

KALISPELL, MONT.,
October 6, 1962.
U.S. Representative ARNOLD OLSEN,
House of Representatives, House Office Build-
ing, Washington, D.C.:
I am one out of many who urge you to do
your best in retaining the Knowles project
on the public works bill.
KEN STERNER.

THOMPSON FALLS, MONT.,
October 6, 1962.
Representative ARNOLD OLSEN,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:
Build Knowles Dam. We need the em-
ployment in this county.
ROY A. MCKENZIE.

PARADISE, MONT.,
October 6, 1962.
Hon. ARNOLD OLSEN,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:
I am definitely for Knowles Dam.
MILDRED O. DAHL.

THOMPSON FALLS, MONT.,
October 6, 1962.
Representative ARNOLD OLSEN,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:
Western Montana must have the Knowles
Dam.
PEARL E. MCKENZIE.

HOT SPRINGS, MONT.,
October 6, 1962.
Congressman ARNOLD M. OLSEN,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.:
I favor Knowles Dam because of water
storage power output and industry.
CECILIA K. JOHNSON.

HOT SPRINGS, MONT.,
October 8, 1962.
Congressman ARNOLD OLSEN,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:
We need Knowles Dam to bring in industry
and for other favorable reasons.
MRS. LILLIAN E. CRARY.

THOMPSON FALLS, MONT.,
October 6, 1962.
Congressman ARNOLD OLSEN,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:
I support Knowles Dam.
BONNIE LIGGST.

THOMPSON FALLS, MONT.,
October 6, 1962.
Congressman ARNOLD OLSEN,
Washington, D.C.:
Backing you for the Knowles Dam.
ART CRABTREE.

HOT SPRINGS, MONT.,
October 6, 1962.
Congressman ARNOLD OLSEN,
Washington, D.C.:
We are in favor of Knowles Dam. Let's
build Montana with power.
Mr. and Mrs. D. M. MULLEN.

THOMPSON FALLS, MONT.,
October 6, 1962.

Congressman ARNOLD OLSEN,
Washington, D.C.:

I support Knowles Dam; we need development of our resources.

N. ADRIAN PRESTON.

THOMPSON FALLS, MONT.,
October 6, 1962.

Congressman ARNOLD OLSEN,
Washington, D.C.:

Vote for Knowles Dam.

DON BROWN.

HOT SPRINGS, MONT.,
October 6, 1962.

Congressman ARNOLD M. OLSEN,
Washington, D.C.:

Knowles Dam means increased business, more jobs, better water use for Montana. I'm for it.

Mrs. ANNA LAUERMAN.

HOT SPRINGS, MONT.,
October 5, 1962.

Congressman ARNOLD OLSEN,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Our support Knowles Dam for the progressive development of Sanber County in Montana.

Mrs. EMIL MARSH.

MISSOULA, MONT.,
October 5, 1962.

Congressman ARNOLD OLSEN,
Washington, D.C.:

I expect you to give Knowles Dam your fullest support.

BURLEY C. RINKE.

MISSOULA, MONT.,
October 5, 1962.

ARNOLD OLSEN,
Washington, D.C.:

Highly recommend approval of Knowles Dam.

HENRY LOZEAU.

MISSOULA, MONT.,
October 5, 1962.

ARNOLD OLSEN,
House Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Urge you to support authorization of Knowles Dam project. Montana needs it.

HOWARD R. GAVIN.

HAMILTON, MONT.,
October 5, 1962.

HON. ARNOLD OLSEN,
Old House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

MPCO statement cost taxpayers untrue. Urge build Knowles Dam. Self-liquidating in 50 years.

FOREST COOPER.

POLSON, MONT.,
October 5, 1962.

Representative ARNOLD OLSEN,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.:

Congratulations on your Knowles Dam stand; Montana and Northwest greatest need.

SAM K. SMITH.

POLSON, MONT.,
October 5, 1962.

Congressman ARNOLD OLSEN,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Please do all you can to keep Knowles in the Senate bill.

Sincerely,

CHARLES HARBALL and SALLY HARBALL.

THOMPSON FALLS, MONT.,
October 5, 1962.

Representative ARNOLD OLSEN,
Washington, D.C.:

We are in favor of construction of Knowles Dam to further the economy of county.

CARL CLARK.

HOT SPRINGS, MONT.,
October 5, 1962.

Congressman ARNOLD OLSEN,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

I support Knowles Dam because: Flood control, power output, water storage, wildlife, recreation, economic development.

EDNA REIFSCHNEIDER.

THOMPSON FALLS, MONT.,
October 5, 1962.

Representative ARNOLD OLSEN,
Washington, D.C.:

Favor passage of Knowles Dam legislation to further advancement of economy of western Montana.

EUGENE P. MAHONEY.

THOMPSON FALLS, MONT.,
October 5, 1962.

Representative ARNOLD OLSEN,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Request your continued support of Knowles Dam legislation. Only intelligent way to develop our rivers.

RICHARD T. THIEGS.

HOT SPRINGS, MONT.,
October 5, 1962.

Congressman ARNOLD OLSEN,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Work program needed badly. The all over picture a good one. We need Knowles Dam.

MAUDE K. SAGE.

DIXON, MONT.,
October 5, 1962.

Congressman ARNOLD OLSEN,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Am for Knowles Dam. One of businessmen Dixon, Mont. Would like see improvement Flathead River.

ALBERT C. PAUL.

ST. IGNATIUS, MONT.,
October 6, 1962.

Congressman ARNOLD OLSEN,
Washington, D.C.:

Build Knowles Dam. Our great State will no longer be the last frontier.

MARIE ROMSA.

ST. IGNATIUS, MONT.,
October 6, 1962.

Congressman ARNOLD OLSEN,
Washington, D.C.:

Fight for Knowles Dam vital for the economy of western Montana.

J. C. ROMSA.

ST. IGNATIUS, MONT.,
October 6, 1962.

Congressman ARNOLD OLSEN,
Washington, D.C.:

We need Knowles Dam for jobs that are needed badly in western Montana.

JOE ROMSA.

ST. IGNATIUS, MONT.,
October 6, 1962.

Congressman ARNOLD OLSEN,
Washington, D.C.:

Do not let power companies stifle the progress of western Montana. We want Knowles.

Mrs. J. K. ROMSA, Jr.

CHARLO, MONT.,
October 6, 1962.

Congressman ARNOLD OLSEN,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Urge authorization of Knowles before adjournment and construction at earliest possible date.

Respectfully,

T. W. and LEILA ROBERTS.

MISSOULA, MONT.,
October 5, 1962.

Congressman ARNOLD OLSEN,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Passage of Knowles Dam absolute necessity if all the people in Montana are to participate.

MAURICE J. McDONOUGH.

MISSOULA, MONT.,
October 5, 1962.

Representative ARNOLD OLSEN,
Washington, D.C.:

I strongly urge the addition of Knowles Dam to the House water resources bill.

Mrs. RICHARD E. RABER.

HOT SPRINGS, MONT.,
October 5, 1962.

Congressman ARNOLD OLSEN,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

I support Knowles Dam for needed water storage and recreation and for benefit of wildlife.

ANTONE A. GRELL.

THOMPSON FALLS, MONT.,
October 5, 1962.

Representative ARNOLD OLSEN,
Washington, D.C.:

Am in support of Knowles Dam and believe it will help the economy.

RAY J. NOVAK.

MISSOULA, MONT.,
October 5, 1962.

ARNOLD OLSEN,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Recommend approval of Knowles Dam at this session of Congress.

LILIS WAYLET.

PLAINS, MONT.,
October 5, 1962.

Representative ARNOLD OLSEN,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

We want Knowles Dam, it will help this community and Montana.

Mrs. ROGER D. NYGREN.

THOMPSON FALLS, MONT.,
October 5, 1962.

Representative ARNOLD OLSEN,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

I support the Knowles project. We need Knowles to help develop our area.

PAUL K. SAYLOR.

PLAINS, MONT.,
October 5, 1962.

Representative ARNOLD OLSEN,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Knowles Dam is essential to welfare of county.

CLINTON O. SPINDLER.

PLAINS, MONT.,
October 5, 1962.

Representative ARNOLD OLSEN,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Public works legislation must provide for Knowles Dam now; majority here support it.

H. C. SCOTT.

PLAINS, MONT.,
October 5, 1962.

Representative ARNOLD OLSEN,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:
Public works legislation must provide for
Knowles Dam now; majority here support it.
JOHN J. GAGNON.

MISSOULA, MONT.,
October 5, 1962.

ARNOLD OLSEN,
Member of Congress,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:
The opinions I derive from talking to
clients indicates Knowles is overwhelmingly
favored.

RAYMOND W. BRAULT.

THOMPSON FALLS, MONT.,
October 5, 1962.

Congressman ARNOLD OLSEN,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:
I support Knowles Dam. It is necessary
to control floods.

WALT GOULD.

THOMPSON FALLS, MONT.,
October 6, 1962.

Congressman ARNOLD M. OLSEN,
Washington D.C.:
I support Knowles Dam. Our depressed
area needs this development.

DEWEY L. DUFFEL.

THOMPSON FALLS, MONT.,
October 6, 1962.

Congressman ARNOLD M. OLSEN,
Washington D.C.:
I support Knowles for development of
Montana.

JESSE C. NELSON.

THOMPSON FALLS, MONT.,
October 6, 1962.

Congressman ARNOLD M. OLSEN,
Washington, D.C.:
We want the Knowles Dam. It will help
our county.

ESTER BREINER.

THOMPSON FALLS, MONT.,
October 6, 1962.

Congressman ARNOLD M. OLSEN,
Washington, D.C.:
Vote for Knowles Dam.

Mr. and Mrs. BOYD L. DAVIS.

THOMPSON FALLS, MONT.,
October 6, 1962.

Congressman ARNOLD M. OLSEN,
Washington, D.C.:
I am for the Knowles Dam.

RUTH GRAHAM.

THOMPSON FALLS, MONT.,
October 6, 1962.

Congressman ARNOLD M. OLSEN,
Washington, D.C.:
Let's push the Knowles Dam issue through
now.

LLOYD R. JOHNSON.

THOMPSON FALLS, MONT.,
October 6, 1962.

Congressman ARNOLD M. OLSEN,
Washington, D.C.:
I favor Knowles Dam.

GEORGE D. HARTMAN.

THOMPSON FALLS, MONT.,
October 6, 1962.

Congressman ARNOLD M. OLSEN,
Washington, D.C.:
We need Knowles Dam.

H. L. MAPLETHORPE.

CHARLO, MONT.,
October 6, 1962.

Congressman ARNOLD M. OLSEN,
Washington, D.C.:
I would like to see Knowles Dam built as
we need it.

Mrs. LILA EVANS.

MISSOULA, MONT.,
October 6, 1962.

Congressman ARNOLD M. OLSEN,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.:
Please continue your fight in favor of
Knowles Dam.

E. E. SOLUM.

THOMPSON FALLS, MONT.,
October 6, 1962.

Congressman ARNOLD M. OLSEN,
Washington, D.C.:
Vote for Knowles Dam.

MARIE GOODE.

MISSOULA, MONT.,
October 6, 1962.

The Honorable ARNOLD OLSEN,
Washington, D.C.:
I urge your support for Knowles Dam.

TONY COCHIARELLA.

HOT SPRINGS, MONT.,
October 6, 1962.

Congressman ARNOLD M. OLSEN,
Washington, D.C.:
Knowles Dam is vital to the economy of
our Nation and State. We must look to the
future of our young people who now must
leave Montana for employment opportu-
nities after we have invested heavily in
their education.

EARL J. BARLOW.

THOMPSON FALLS, MONT.,
October 6, 1962.

Congressman ARNOLD M. OLSEN,
Washington, D.C.:
Vote for the Knowles Dam.

Mrs. ART CRABTREE.

HOT SPRINGS, MONT.,
October 6, 1962.

Congressman ARNOLD M. OLSEN,
Washington, D.C.:
I support Knowles Dam because of its
importance in water conservation for our
Western States.

BILL EHLERT.

MISSOULA, MONT.,
October 6, 1962.

Representative ARNOLD OLSEN,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:
Strongly urge your support of Knowles
Dam legislation.

Mrs. W. L. GANNETT.

MISSOULA, MONT.,
October 6, 1962.

Congressman ARNOLD M. OLSEN,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.:
Knowles Dam sorely needed for economic
development of Montana. I strongly urge
House authorization.

ARNOLD BOLLE.

MISSOULA, MONT.,
October 6, 1962.

Congressman ARNOLD OLSEN,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.:
Congress failure to authorize Knowles Dam
will be bitter disappointment to forward
looking Montana citizens.

EDMUND FREEMAN.

RONAN, MONT.,
October 6, 1962.

Congressman ARNOLD OLSEN,
Washington, D.C.:
Knowles needed in Montana regardless of
opposition.

Mr. and Mrs. WILLIAM HOCKER.

MISSOULA, MONT.,
October 6, 1962.

Congressman ARNOLD OLSEN,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.:
Would appreciate your support for Knowles
Dam.

ROBERT H. NEWMAN.

MISSOULA, MONT.,
October 6, 1962.

Congressman ARNOLD OLSEN,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.:
I urge your continued support of the
Knowles Dam.

STELLA JEAN HANSEN.

RONAN, MONT.,
October 6, 1962.

Congressman ARNOLD OLSEN,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.:
Water power and employment makes a
better Montana. Knowles beneficial.

DOROTHY LUNDVALL.

MISSOULA, MONT.,
October 6, 1962.

Congressman ARNOLD OLSEN,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.:
Congratulate your support Knowles Dam,
Lake County property owners.

Mr. and Mrs. PETE AUNE.

RONAN, MONT.,
October 6, 1962.

ARNOLD OLSEN,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.:
Please work hard for passage of Knowles.
Mr. and Mrs. EVERETT KRUDDE.

MISSOULA, MONT.,
October 6, 1962.

Representative ARNOLD OLSEN,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.:
Knowles Dam needed for power and flood
control. Strongly urge passing of this bill.
RONALD and EVA TOLLEFSON.

MISSOULA, MONT.,
October 6, 1962.

ARNOLD OLSEN,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.:
I hope you will be successful in your sup-
port of the Knowles Dam project.

DOROTHY BARR.

THOMPSON FALLS, MONT.,
October 5, 1962.

Representative ARNOLD OLSEN,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.:
I support Knowles Dam.

ANNIE L. GILL.

THOMPSON FALLS, MONT.,
October 5, 1962.

Representative ARNOLD OLSEN,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.:
Our economy depends on passage of the
Knowles Dam bill.

HENRY L. GILL.

THOMPSON FALLS, MONT.,
October 5, 1962.

Representative ARNOLD OLSEN,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.:

Let us build the Knowles Dam.
G. V. TAYLOR.

PARADISE, MONT.,
October 5, 1962.

ARNOLD OLSEN,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.:

Give us Knowles Dam.
ROBERT E. DRAYTON.

MISSOULA, MONT.,
October 5, 1962.

Congressman ARNOLD OLSEN,
Washington, D.C.:

Request you pass Knowles Dam at this session of Congress.
JOE L. WAYLETT.

MISSOULA, MONT.,
October 5, 1962.

ARNOLD OLSEN,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

We urge the passage of the Knowles Dam bill.
STRANGER and FLORENCE TABISH.

THOMPSON FALLS, MONT.,
October 5, 1962.

Representative ARNOLD OLSEN,
Washington, D.C.:

Knowles Dam a must for our future generations.
ROBERT GILL.

HOT SPRINGS, MONT.,
October 5, 1962.

Congressman ARNOLD OLSEN,
Washington, D.C.:

I support Knowles Dam because flood control, power output, water storage, wildlife, recreation, economic development.
NIKKI BARNES.

PLAINS, MONT.,
October 5, 1962.

Representative ARNOLD OLSEN,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Imperative build Knowles Dam.
SOPHIA CECILIA ADAMS.

MISSOULA, MONT.,
October 5, 1962.

ARNOLD OLSEN,
Washington, D.C.:

I recommend Knowles be passed at this session.
NANCY JO WAYLETT.

MISSOULA, MONT.,
October 5, 1962.

ARNOLD OLSEN,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

I recommend that Knowles Dam be passed at this session.
MRS. ERMA LOZEAU.

PLAINS, MONT.,
October 5, 1962.

Representative ARNOLD OLSEN,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

We must have Knowles Dam now. Number me among its many supporters.
JOSEPH INEGARDEN.

PARADISE, MONT.,
October 5, 1962.

ARNOLD OLSEN,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.:

We need Knowles Dam badly.
NONA EVANSON.

THOMPSON FALLS, MONT.,
October 5, 1962.

Representative ARNOLD OLSEN,
U.S. House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.:

Continue your support of Knowles project for the benefit of western Montana and Sanders County.
LEVINA M. CLARK.

HOT SPRINGS, MONT.,
October 5, 1962.

Congressman ARNOLD OLSEN,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

I support Knowles Dam because of needed flood control, progressive development, and recreational purposes.
MRS. BILLY SCHAFFER.

HOT SPRINGS, MONT.,
October 5, 1962.

Congressman ARNOLD OLSEN,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

We need industry. Why educate children here and they have to go to other States to get jobs.
GORDON MARLENE.

HOT SPRINGS, MONT.,
October 5, 1962.

Congressman ARNOLD OLSEN,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

I support Knowles Dam because flood control, power output, water storage, wildlife, recreation, economic development.
BUD HOSEA CECIL.

MISSOULA, MONT.,
October 5, 1962.

Representative ARNOLD OLSEN,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

We urge passage of Knowles Dam Bill.
BOB SHAFER.

PLAINS, MONT.,
October 5, 1962.

Representative ARNOLD OLSEN,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Imperative build Knowles Dam.
HERB FISHER.

HOT SPRINGS, MONT.,
October 5, 1962.

Congressman ARNOLD OLSEN,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

I support Knowles Dam because flood control, power output, water storage, wildlife, recreation, economic development.
ALPHA O. HEDIN.

MISSOULA, MONT.,
October 5, 1962.

ARNOLD OLSEN,
U.S. Representative,
Washington, D.C.:

Let's not pet Knowles approval vet bogged down in the House. Montana needs Knowles.
PAULA KNAPP.

THOMPSON FALLS, MONT.,
October 5, 1962.

Representative ARNOLD OLSEN,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.:

I support Knowles Dam. We need more power to develop industry.
ARTHUR HARLOW.

HOT SPRINGS, MONT.,
October 5, 1962.

Congressman ARNOLD OLSEN,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

I support Knowles Dam because of water storage power output and economic developments.
TED SCHAFFER.

CHARLO, MONT.,
October 5, 1962.

Congressman ARNOLD OLSEN,
Washington, D.C.:

We urge support Knowles Dam.
DONNIE AND CLINTON DEVOE.

CHARLO, MONT.,
October 5, 1962.

Congressman ARNOLD OLSEN,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.:

This area needs authorization of Knowles Dam if possible.
JOHN AND MONICA COLTER.

KALISPELL, MONT.,
October 5, 1962.

ARNOLD OLSEN,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.:

Our council composed of four local unions in northwest Montana urge that you insist Knowles Dam be retained in the public works bill.
CARPENTERS DISTRICT COUNCIL OF NORTHWESTERN MONTANA,
P. PETERSEN, Secretary.

MISSOULA, MONT.,
October 5, 1962.

Representative ARNOLD OLSEN,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

The overwhelming majority of people I talked to tell me they want Knowles Dam.
ROBERT WATT.

KALISPELL, MONT.,
October 5, 1962.

ARNOLD OLSEN,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.:

Insist on Knowles Dam being retained in public works bill. Our 17 locals in western Montana, 9 in vicinity of Knowles, have repeatedly testified in favor of Knowles-Paradise project at all hearings held in this area.
ROBERT C. WELLER,
Secretary, Montana District Council Lumber and Sawmill Workers.

HAMILTON, MONT.,
October 5, 1962.

Hon. ARNOLD OLSEN,
Old House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Respectfully urge your continued support on Knowles Dam measure. Will stimulate permanent employment in area.
GILBERT L. JELINEK.

HOT SPRINGS, MONT.,
October 5, 1962.

Congressman ARNOLD OLSEN,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

We need industry. Why educate children here and they have to go other States to get jobs.
ANN MARLENEE.

HOT SPRINGS, MONT.,
October 5, 1962.

Congressman ARNOLD OLSEN,
Washington, D.C.:

I support Knowles Dam because flood control, power output, water storage, wildlife, recreation, economic development.
JOE BLIXT.

HAMILTON, MONT.,
October 5, 1962.

HON. ARNOLD OLSEN,
Old House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Without Knowles comprehensive development Columbia River impossible. All opposition by Montana Power.

MILES ROMNEY.

HOT SPRINGS, MONT.,
October 5, 1962.

Congressman ARNOLD OLSEN,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

We support Knowles Dam. Sanders County in the Northwest needs this project badly.

ROY R. MILLS.

MISSOULA, MONT.,
October 5, 1962.

Congressman ARNOLD OLSEN,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Al and I support the Knowles Dam proposal. Good luck.

MARGARET STONE.

HOT SPRINGS, MONT.,
October 5, 1962.

Congressman ARNOLD OLSEN,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

I support Knowles Dam because of flood control, power output, water storage, wildlife recreation, and economic development.

MILDRED O. MCMENUS.

HOT SPRINGS, MONT.,
October 5, 1962.

Congressman ARNOLD OLSEN,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

I support the Knowles Dam project because of need of flood control and progressing developments.

Mrs. THESPA A. GRELL.

POLSON, MONT.,
October 6, 1962.

ARNOLD OLSEN,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.:

Hundreds of Lake County people support your stand for Knowles Dam.

Mr. and Mrs. LEON TERRY.
Mrs. MARY MEYER.

THOMPSON FALLS, MONT.,
October 6, 1962.

Congressman ARNOLD OLSEN,
Washington, D.C.:

We need the Knowles project now.
W. BRITTON.

POLSON, MONT.,
October 6, 1962.

Representative ARNOLD OLSEN,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.:

Congratulations on your progress on Knowles Dam. Continue effort on our behalf.

Mr. and Mrs. CARREL A. HALGREEN,
Mr. and Mrs. PAUL HAVOLICH,
Mrs. DORA BRUCE.

CHARLO, MONT.,
October 6, 1962.

Congressman ARNOLD OLSEN,
Washington, D.C.:

I am in favor of Knowles being built immediately.

A. A. HERTZ.

ST. IGNATIUS, MONT.,
October 6, 1962.

Congressman ARNOLD OLSEN,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Western Montana needs Knowles Dam desperately. Urge prompt support.

DAN SEERY.

ST. IGNATIUS, MONT.,
October 6, 1962.

HON. ARNOLD OLSEN,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Urge all possible support for Knowles Dam. Western Montana needs this project.

J. E. TAPLIN.

MISSOULA, MONT.,
October 6, 1962.

Congressman ARNOLD OLSEN,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

I support Knowles Dam because of progressive development, economic development and recreational development.

C. E. LATHAM.

CHARLO, MONT.,
October 6, 1962.

Congressman ARNOLD OLSEN,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Urge authorization of Knowles Dam this session.

GRACE T. KERR.

MISSOULA, MONT.,
October 5, 1962.

HON. ARNOLD OLSEN,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Majority of western Montanans favor Knowles. You've done fine job. We support you strongly.

BERTHA PADDOCK.

CHARLO, MONT.,
October 5, 1962.

Congressman ARNOLD OLSEN,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

At least 50 percent of this area strongly supports Knowles Dam.

S. R. LOGAN.

MISSOULA, MONT.,
October 5, 1962.

ARNOLD OLSEN,
Member of Congress,
House Office Building Washington, D.C.:

Residents of the area involved favor Knowles as I do.

Mrs. ROSIE GRAY.

MISSOULA, MONT.,
October 5, 1962.

ARNOLD OLSEN,
Member of Congress,
House Office Building Washington, D.C.:

From conversations with clients it is my opinion Knowles is overwhelmingly favored.

RAYMOND P. TIPP.

THOMPSON FALLS, MONT.,
October 5, 1962.

Representative ARNOLD OLSEN,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

We need Knowles Dam.

ART THURMAN.

HOT SPRINGS, MONT.,
October 6, 1962.

Congressman ARNOLD OLSEN,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

I support Knowles Dam because flood control, power output, water storage wildlife, recreation, and economic development.

MABEL COON.

PLAINS, MONT.,
October 5, 1962.

Representative ARNOLD OLSEN,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Favor Knowles Dam. Sanders County needs this project.

Mrs. JACK HARWOOD.

PLAINS, MONT.,
October 5, 1962.

Representative ARNOLD OLSEN,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.:

We want Knowles Dam. It will help this community and Montana.

ROGER D. NYGREN.

PLAINS, MONT.,
October 5, 1962.

Representative ARNOLD OLSEN,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

It is essential to pass Knowles Dam bill. We need it.

RICHARD HARWOOD.

PLAINS, MONT.,
October 5, 1962.

ARNOLD OLSEN,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Urge passage of Knowles Dam.

Mrs. MINNIE HARMOND.

PARADISE, MONT.

HOT SPRINGS, MONT.,
October 5, 1962.

Congressman ARNOLD OLSEN,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

I support Knowles Dam because flood control, power output, water storage, wildlife, recreation, economic development.

HARRY CECIL.

CHARLO, MONT.,
October 5, 1962.

Congressman ARNOLD OLSEN,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Certainly need the power of Knowles Dam. Hope you can get it for us this session.

NICK HERIN.

HOT SPRINGS, MONT.,
October 5, 1962.

Congressman ARNOLD OLSEN,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.:

Fight for Knowles, we represent most of Perma.

Mr. and Mrs. EDWARD MULICK.

THOMPSON FALLS, MONT.,
October 5, 1962.

Representative ARNOLD OLSEN,
Washington, D.C.:

Knowles Dam a must for good of Sanders County, Mont.; United States.

JAMES L. TAYLOR.

PLAINS, MONT.,
October 5, 1962.

Representative ARNOLD OLSEN,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Urge you to pass Knowles Dam bill. We do need the boost to our economy.

Mrs. RICHARD HARWOOD.

PLAINS, MONT.,
October 5, 1962.

Representative ARNOLD OLSEN,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

We want Knowles Dam.

Good for State.
A. F. DAYLOR,
SIG DAYLOR.

PLAINS, MONT.,
October 5, 1962.

Representative ARNOLD OLSEN,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Authorized to pass bill providing for Knowles Dam. Badly needed this area.
DOROTHY VACURA.

PLAINS, MONT.,
October 5, 1962.

Representative ARNOLD OLSEN,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

We want Knowles Dam. Good for Montana.

Mrs. A. F. DAYTON.

MISSOULA, MONT.,
October 5, 1962.

Congressman ARNOLD OLSEN,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Urge passage of Knowles Dam project.
GEORGE C. MELTZER.

MISSOULA, MONT.,
October 5, 1962.

Congressman ARNOLD OLSEN,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Urge passage of Knowles Dam project.
DAVID M. MINNES.

DIXON, MONT.,
October 6, 1962.

Congressman ARNOLD OLSEN,
Washington, D.C.:

Vote for Knowles Dam.

ED CANTRELL.

PLAINS, MONT.,
October 5, 1962.

Representative ARNOLD OLSEN,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Knowles Dam is essential to county.
HAROLD E. FARRINGTON.

THOMPSON FALLS, MONT.,
October 5, 1962.

Representative ARNOLD OLSEN,
Washington, D.C.:

I support Knowles Dam. Knowles will help recreation and wildlife.

BARBARA GOULD.

CHARLO, MONT.,
October 5, 1962.

Congressman ARNOLD OLSEN,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Lots of people here strong for Knowles Dam.

JOHN YEABER.

HOT SPRINGS, MONT.,
October 5, 1962.

Congressman ARNOLD OLSEN,
Washington, D.C.:

I support Knowles Dam because flood control, power output, water storage, wildlife, recreation, economic development.

BUD COON.

MISSOULA, MONT.,
October 5, 1962.

ARNOLD OLSEN,
Member of Congress,
Washington, D.C.:

I favor Knowles Dam.

DONALD F. EGELAND.

MISSOULA, MONT.,
October 5, 1962.

Hon. ARNOLD OLSEN,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

We and our friends are in strong support of the Knowles Dam.

BEATRICE K. and EUGENE H. WEIGEL.

CVIII—1450

THOMPSON FALLS, MONT.,
October 5, 1962.

Representative ARNOLD OLSEN,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Request you act affirmatively on Knowles Dam legislation. Sanders County and the West need power.

GERTRUDE J. MAHONEY.

PLAINS, MONT.,
October 5, 1962.

ARNOLD OLSEN,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

For the common good of Montana, very important that Knowles Dam be authorized.

L. J. CARTER.

PLAINS, MONT.,
October 5, 1962.

Representative ARNOLD OLSEN,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

I vote for Knowles Dam.
DEAN D. STAPLETON.

MISSOULA, MONT.,
October 5, 1962.

Congressman ARNOLD OLSEN,
Washington, D.C.:

I recommend the approval of Knowles Dam.

NELBA H. LOZEAU.

MISSOULA, MONT.,
October 5, 1962.

Congressman ARNOLD OLSEN,
Washington, D.C.:

I strongly urge the passage of the Knowles Dam bill.

HELEN MURRAY.

FEDERAL PAY BILL

Mr. AVERY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 6 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. JOHANSEN].

Mr. JOHANSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to speak out of the regular order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. JOHANSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. JOHANSEN. Mr. Speaker, during debate on Monday and Friday of last week on the Federal pay-postal rate-retirement pay bill, I repeatedly warned that adoption of the pay provisions of this bill would trigger enormous pressures in the next Congress for very substantial pay increases at the top of the classified pay system, in the Executive Pay Act, and in the salaries of the Federal judiciary and Members of Congress.

The administration evidently has lost no time in providing confirmation of that warning.

The able staff writer on Federal employee affairs of the Washington Evening Star, Mr. Joseph Young, in his column "The Federal Spotlight," yesterday reports that administration officials already are at work on proposals to be submitted to the new 88th Congress in January.

In this same article, Mr. Young calls attention to another aspect of the chain reaction started by the ill-considered and ill-advised legislative action last week.

He points out that enactment of the supergrade, Executive Act, and congressional pay increases next year will inevitably result in new pressures for still further pay increases in the lower levels.

I quote Mr. Young's exact words:

All this has significance, too, for Federal employees in the upper-middle class and even those below these grades. For once the Executive Act and supergrade pay ceilings are raised, this will give more latitude to increasing eventually Federal pay down the line, which until now has been held down because of restrictions on the salary paid to the top grades.

If events bear out this prophecy—and I have no doubt they will unless the Congress miraculously discovers the courage to resist periodic pressure campaigns for pay increases—it will prove that the administration's proposed policy of salary comparability is a complete fraud upon the American taxpayer.

It will prove equally fraudulent the claims of sponsors of this year's pay legislation that its adoption will forestall these periodic pressure drives.

During consideration of this year's pay legislation in the executive sessions of the House Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, I offered an amendment to provide a straight 7-percent across-the-board pay raise. It was voted down. Yet this approach to the problem would have provided many justifiable pay increases—and some not so justifiable—but at the same time it would have avoided the kind of lid-raising operation that was finally carried out and which obviously is going to be pursued further when Congress returns next January.

These remarks are intended to put the next Congress on notice as to what they will face. It is also intended to put the American taxpayers on notice as to what they face.

One final comment: Mr. Clarence B. Randall, who has served as a businessman "yes-man" under both Republican and Democratic administrations, and who was Chairman of President Kennedy's Federal Salary Policy Panel, in a statement early this year published by the National Civil Service League made this incredible and totally unsubstantiated statement:

I am firmly convinced that higher Federal salaries would attract a level of competence that would so improve Government operations that there would be no out-of-pocket cost at all.

In view of the very substantial increase in payroll costs of Federal employee salary increases—of which this year's billion-dollar boost is obviously only the first installment—I wonder when the American taxpayers will begin to get a "refund" in line with Mr. Randall's preposterous prediction.

I advise the American taxpayers not to hold their breath waiting for it.

Under leave to extend and revise my remarks, I include the full text of Mr.

Young's column dealing with this subject:

THE FEDERAL SPOTLIGHT—WORK BEGINS ON INCREASING EXECUTIVE ACT SALARIES
(By Joseph Young)

Administration officials already are at work on proposals to be submitted to the new 88th Congress in January for raising Executive Act salaries, Government supergrade careerists' pay as well as the salaries of Members of Congress.

Present administration thinking is to propose a \$35,000 salary for Cabinet officers and substantial increases as well for agency heads, commissioners, assistant secretaries, etc., who come under the Executive Pay Act. The top pay for supergrade career jobs, set in the new pay raise legislation enacted by Congress at \$20,000, would be raised to \$24,500 as a result of the administration's pending proposal. Other supergrade salaries also would be adjusted upward accordingly.

President Kennedy also is expected to suggest—rather than formally recommend, since this is the prerogative of Congress—that Congress raise the present \$22,500 salary of the members to \$30,000 a year.

Discussions already are being held by administration officials with key members of Congress and the leaders and staff members of the Congressional committees which would handle such legislation. Such discussions are expected to continue during the adjournment of Congress.

The administration wants to have the features of the proposal straightened out to everyone's satisfaction so that the official proposals will get prompt action from Congress next year.

As a matter of fact in its report accompanying the Federal classified and postal employee pay raise bill which was enacted last week by Congress, the Senate Civil Service Committee "urged" President Kennedy to submit proposals next year for raising Executive Act and supergrade pay. It did not mention congressional salaries, but it is the understanding that any Executive Act and supergrade salary raise would have to be accompanied by a congressional pay raise.

All this has significance, too, for Federal employees in the upper-middle grades and even those below these grades. For once that Executive Act and supergrade pay ceilings are raised, this will give more latitude to increasing eventually Federal pay down the line, which until now has been held down because of restrictions on the salary paid to the top grades.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHANSEN. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. I commend the gentleman for his statement. Of course it was made implicit in the pay increase bill that there would be legislation in the next session of Congress to increase the pay of the executive branch of the Government as well as Members of Congress. Already there is a bill lurking around here somewhere that would increase the pay of certain District of Columbia officials because it seems that the employees of the District, whose pay was increased, will be drawing higher salaries than their chiefs; and this comes about as a result of the pay increase bill which was passed through the House with practically no explanation. I hope Members of the House are at last aware that the so-called pay increase bill also increased congressional retirement and

that those who voted for it voted to increase congressional retirement.

Mr. JOHANSEN. The gentleman is correct. I thank him for his comments, and I thank the gentleman from Kansas for yielding me this time.

PUBLIC WORKS AUTHORIZATION

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection the Chair appoints the following conferees: Messrs. DAVIS of Tennessee, JONES of Alabama, BLATNIK, CRAMER, and BALDWIN.

There was no objection.

TEACHERS' SALARY INCREASE, DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (S. 1447) to amend the District of Columbia Teachers' Salary Act of 1955, as amended, and to provide for the adjustment of annuities paid from the District of Columbia teachers' retirement and annuity fund, with House amendments thereto and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, if this bill is taken to conference as the gentleman is asking be done, I assume there will be no effort made to attach a pay increase for certain District officials who now find themselves on the lower end of the totem pole as compared with the pay increase that was voted the other day for some of the "Indians," otherwise employees of the District of Columbia.

Mr. McMILLAN. If the gentleman will yield, I would like to state those officials you referred to will be considered in another bill.

Mr. GROSS. So the gentleman will resist any attempt to increase the pay of any officials of the District government through the medium of this bill?

Mr. McMILLAN. That is correct. I would like to say to the gentleman that I agree thoroughly with him that we should never have increased the salaries of clerks in the District higher than that of the District Commissioners.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, further reserving the right to object, would the gentleman briefly explain what the bill is and the House amendment? The two are compatible? The amendment is germane?

Mr. McMILLAN. Yes. The Senate passed a salary increase bill with the amount of 14 percent. The House figure was 10.1 percent. The House left out some of the principals and the Superintendent.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. In other words, it is a matter germane to the bill the House passed.

Mr. McMILLAN. Yes.

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

The Chair hears none and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. DOWDY, WHITENER, HUDDLESTON, BROYHILL, and HARSHA.

STATE, JUSTICE, AND COMMERCE, THE JUDICIARY, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATION BILL, 1963

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (H.R. 12580) making appropriations for the Departments of State, Justice, and Commerce, the judiciary, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1963, and for other purposes, and ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers on the part of the House be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ALBERT). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I assume the gentleman proposes to take ample time to explain this conference report?

Mr. ROONEY. I do, Mr. Speaker.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

The conference report and statement are as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT (H. REPT. No. 2546)

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 12580) making appropriations for the Departments of State, Justice, and Commerce, the judiciary, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1963, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 4, 7, 8, 14, 19, 22, 23, 24, 28, 35, 51, 52, 53, and 54.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 3, 5, 6, 10, 12, 13, 16, 18, 21, 31, 32, 34, 37, 38, 39, 40, 42, 47, 50, 55, and 56, and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 1: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 1, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$141,210,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 9: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 9, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$41,950,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 11: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 11, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$1,832,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 15: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 15, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$3,800,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 17: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 17, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$3,695,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 25: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 25, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$7,025,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 26: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 26, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum named in said amendment insert "\$1,600,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 29: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 29, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$12,450,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 36: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 36, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$26,010,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 41: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 41, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$59,500,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 43: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 43, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$11,000,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 45: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 45, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$4,325,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 49: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 49, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$2,300,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

The committee of conference report in disagreement amendments numbered 2, 20, 27, 30, 33, 44, 46, and 48.

JOHN J. ROONEY,
ROBERT L. F. SIKES,
CLARENCE CANNON,
FRANK T. BOW,
JOHN TABER,

Managers on the Part of the House.

JOHN L. McCLELLAN,
ALLEN J. ELLENDER,
SPESSARD L. HOLLAND,
CARL HAYDEN,
MARGARET CHASE SMITH,
LEVERETT SALTONSTALL,
KARL E. MUNDT,
ROMAN L. HRUSKA,
MIKE MANSFIELD,

Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes

of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 12580) making appropriations for the Departments of State, Justice, and Commerce, the Judiciary, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1963, and for other purposes, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon and recommended in the accompanying conference report as to each of such amendments, namely:

TITLE I—DEPARTMENT OF STATE

Administration of foreign affairs

Amendment No. 1: Appropriates \$141,210,000 for salaries and expenses instead of \$140,710,000 as proposed by the House and \$141,910,000 as proposed by the Senate. Of the additional amount, \$300,000 is to be used for security equipment and for no other purpose.

Amendment No. 2: Reported in disagreement.

Amendment No. 3: Appropriates \$2,205,000 for acquisition, operation, and maintenance of buildings abroad (special foreign currency program) as proposed by the Senate instead of \$2,000,000 as proposed by the House.

International organizations and conferences

Amendment No. 4: Appropriates \$2,250,000 for missions to international organizations as proposed by the House instead of \$2,290,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 5: Appropriates \$100,000 for loans to the United Nations as proposed by the Senate.

International commissions

Amendment No. 6: Appropriates \$670,000 for salaries and expenses, International Boundary and Water Commission, United States and Mexico, as proposed by the Senate instead of \$620,000, as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 7: Appropriates \$1,910,000 for international fisheries commissions as proposed by the House instead of \$2,082,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Educational exchange

Amendment No. 8: Provides a limitation of \$1,000 for official entertainment as proposed by the House instead of \$2,500 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 9: Appropriates \$41,950,000 for mutual educational and cultural exchange activities instead of \$40,000,000 as proposed by the House and \$43,900,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 10: Provides that not less than \$14,515,000 shall be used to purchase foreign currencies or credits owed to or owned by the Treasury of the United States as proposed by the Senate instead of \$9,515,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 11: Provides a limitation of \$1,832,000 for administrative expenses instead of \$1,732,000 as proposed by the House and \$1,932,000 as proposed by the Senate.

TITLE II—DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

Federal prison system

Amendment No. 12: Inserts language relative to a new psychiatric institution as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 13: Appropriates \$3,545,000 for buildings and facilities as proposed by the Senate instead of \$2,595,000 as proposed by the House.

TITLE III—DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

General administration

Amendment No. 14: Provides a limitation of \$1,500 for official entertainment as proposed by the House instead of \$2,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 15: Appropriates \$3,800,000 for salaries and expenses instead of \$3,-

700,000 as proposed by the House and \$3,900,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Area Redevelopment Administration

Amendment No. 16: Appropriates \$115,050,000 for the area redevelopment fund as proposed by the Senate instead of \$115,480,000 as proposed by the House.

Export control

Amendment No. 17: Appropriates \$3,695,000 instead of \$3,480,000 as proposed by the House and \$3,735,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 18: Provides that \$1,337,000 may be advanced to the Bureau of Customs as proposed by the Senate instead of \$1,237,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 19: Provides that not to exceed \$80,400 may be advanced to salaries and expenses under general administration as proposed by the House instead of \$120,400 as proposed by the Senate.

Office of Field Services

Amendment No. 20: Reported in disagreement.

Business and Defense Services Administration

Amendment No. 21: Appropriate \$4,940,000 for salaries and expenses as proposed by the Senate instead of \$4,600,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 22: Deletes language proposed by the Senate.

International activities

Amendment No. 23: Deletes "trade missions" which was inserted by the Senate.

Amendment No. 24: Provides a limitation of \$10,000 for official representation as proposed by the House instead of \$20,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 25: Appropriates \$7,025,000 for salaries and expenses instead of \$6,500,000 as proposed by the House and \$8,300,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 26: Provides that \$1,600,000 shall remain available for trade and industrial exhibits until June 30, 1964, instead of \$2,100,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 27: Reported in disagreement.

United States Travel Service

Amendment No. 28: Appropriates \$3,350,000 for salaries and expenses as proposed by the House instead of \$3,950,000 as proposed by the Senate. The committee has not restored the reclama because the Congress will meet again in January. In the meantime the committee is investigating this service. If more funds can be justified in the next session the committee will look upon them with careful consideration.

Bureau of the Census

Amendment No. 29: Appropriates \$12,450,000 for salaries and expenses instead of \$12,250,000 as proposed by the House and \$12,598,000 as proposed by the Senate. The sum of \$200,000 is included for statistical support for the international textile agreement and \$148,000 for the survey of consumer buying intentions. No funds are included for the initiation of a national address register.

Amendment No. 30: Reported in disagreement.

Coast and Geodetic Survey

Amendment No. 31: Appropriates \$22,750,000 for salaries and expenses as proposed by the Senate instead of \$21,500,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 32: Inserts language as proposed by the Senate.

Maritime Administration

Amendment No. 33: Reported in disagreement.

Amendment No. 34: Appropriates \$220,400,000 for operating-differential subsidies (liquidation of contract authorization) as

proposed by the Senate instead of \$225,000,-000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 35: Appropriates \$3,550,-000 for research and development as proposed by the House instead of \$5,500,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Patent Office

Amendment No. 36: Appropriates \$26,010,-000 for salaries and expenses instead of \$25,-860,000 as proposed by the House and \$27,193,000 as proposed by the Senate. The additional \$150,000 is for intensified specialized training of patent examiner recruits.

Bureau of Public Roads

Amendment No. 37: Inserts "reconstruction" as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 38: Provides that the funds for improvement of the Pentagon road network are to remain available until expended as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 39: Appropriates \$2,000,-000 for control of outdoor advertising as proposed by the Senate instead of \$4,000,000 as proposed by the House.

National Bureau of Standards

Amendment No. 40: Appropriates \$500,000 for research and technical services (special foreign currency program) as proposed by the Senate instead of \$1,000,000 as proposed by the House.

Weather Bureau

Amendment No. 41: Appropriates \$59,500,-000 for salaries and expenses instead of \$58,-250,000 as proposed by the House and \$60,-076,000 as proposed by the Senate. All of the items as set forth in paragraphs 1 and 2 on page 20 of Senate Report No. 2226 are approved.

Amendment No. 42: Inserts "purchase of two aircraft" as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 43: Appropriates \$11,000,-000 for research and development instead of \$10,000,000 as proposed by the House and \$11,500,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 44: Reported in disagreement.

Amendment No. 45: Appropriates \$4,325,-000 for establishment of meteorological facilities instead of \$4,000,000 as proposed by the House and \$4,650,000 as proposed by the Senate.

General provisions—Department of Commerce

Amendment No. 46: Reported in disagreement.

TITLE IV—THE JUDICIARY

Courts of appeals, district courts, and other judicial services

Amendment No. 47: Appropriates \$5,800,-000 for fees of jurors and commissioners as proposed by the Senate instead of \$4,500,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 48: Reported in disagreement.

TITLE V—RELATED AGENCIES

Federal Maritime Commission

Amendment No. 49: Appropriates \$2,300,-000 for salaries and expenses instead of \$2,100,000 as proposed by the House and \$2,700,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Tariff Commission

Amendment No. 50: Appropriates \$2,950,-000 for salaries and expenses as proposed by the Senate instead of \$2,900,000 as proposed by the House.

U.S. Information Agency

Amendment No. 51: Provides a limitation of \$500 for entertainment as proposed by the House instead of \$2,500 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 52: Appropriates \$7,600,-000 for special international exhibitions as proposed by the House instead of \$7,474,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 53: Provides a limitation of \$10,550 for representation as proposed by the House instead of \$15,550 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 54: Inserts "and trade" as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 55: Appropriates \$8,750,-000 for acquisition and construction of radio facilities as proposed by the Senate instead of \$10,750,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 56: Appropriates \$1,000,-000 for informational media guarantee fund as proposed by the Senate instead of \$1,500,-000 as proposed by the House.

JOHN J. ROONEY,
R. L. F. SIKES,
CLARENCE CANNON,
FRANK T. BOW,
JOHN TABER,

Managers on the Part of the House.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may require.

Mr. Speaker, the bill as now before the House for consideration contains a total of \$2,025,895,700 in direct appropriations. It is \$124,680,000 higher, including \$100 million to enable the President to provide a loan to the United Nations, than the amount as it was passed by the House. However, I should explain that in addition to this \$100 million, a total of \$19,-070,000 in additional budget estimates were also considered by the other body. It is now \$10,913,000 below the amount of the bill as passed by the other body.

It should be noted that the bill as passed by the House on July 20, 1962, was \$102,962,300 below the total amount of the budget estimates presented to the House Committee on Appropriations. As it passed the other body it was \$86,-439,300 below the total amount of the budget estimates.

It is presently and as now before this body for approval \$97,352,300 below the total budget estimates for the fiscal year 1963.

The conferees feel that there is sufficient money included in this bill even with this cut of \$97,352,300 for the agencies and departments concerned to carry on in proper and ample fashion during the present fiscal year.

I should add that the pending bill also includes a total of \$3,251,200,000 for the Bureau of Public Roads to be derived from the highway trust fund.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I may at this point in the RECORD insert a table indicating the action of the conferees with regard to the various items carried in the bill.

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

There was no objection.

The matter referred to follows:

Item	Budget estimates	Passed House	Passed Senate	Conference action	Conference action compared with—		
					Budget estimate	House	Senate
Department of State.....	\$435,064,000	\$283,480,000	\$400,047,000	\$396,185,000	-\$38,879,000	+\$112,705,000	-\$3,862,000
Department of Justice.....	309,300,000	305,727,000	306,677,000	306,677,000	-2,623,000	+950,000	-----
Department of Commerce.....	1,836,099,000	781,695,000	800,447,000	793,670,000	-42,429,000	+11,975,000	-6,777,000
Bureau of Public Roads (highway trust fund).....	(3,250,500,000)	(3,251,200,000)	(3,251,200,000)	(3,251,000,000)	(-1,300,000)	-----	-----
The Judiciary.....	62,735,000	60,270,700	61,570,700	61,570,700	-1,164,300	+1,300,000	-----
American Battle Monuments Commission.....	1,550,000	1,523,000	1,523,000	1,523,000	-27,000	-----	-----
Commission on Civil Rights.....	995,000	950,000	950,000	950,000	-45,000	-----	-----
Federal Maritime Commission.....	2,900,000	2,100,000	2,700,000	2,300,000	-600,000	+200,000	-400,000
Foreign Claims Settlement Commission.....	700,000	700,000	700,000	700,000	-----	-----	-----
Small Business Administration.....	306,000,000	305,750,000	305,750,000	305,750,000	-250,000	-----	-----
Subversive Activities Control Board.....	395,000	395,000	395,000	395,000	-----	-----	-----
Tariff Commission.....	2,950,000	2,900,000	2,950,000	2,950,000	-----	+50,000	-----
U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency.....	6,500,000	6,500,000	6,500,000	6,500,000	-----	-----	-----
U.S. Information Agency.....	158,060,000	149,225,000	146,599,000	146,725,000	-11,335,000	-2,500,000	+126,000
Total.....	12,123,248,000	1,901,215,700	2,036,898,700	2,025,895,700	-97,352,300	+124,680,000	-10,913,000

¹ Includes \$115,480,000 adjustment for borrowing authority replaced in bill by appropriations.

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROONEY. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, I see in the bill amendment 12 concerning some language relating to a new prison psychiatric institution as proposed by the Senate.

I ask unanimous consent that I be permitted to revise and extend my remarks and include a letter addressed to the Honorable Robert Kennedy, Attorney General.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, and I shall not object, I wonder if the distinguished gentleman

from Texas has yet learned what General Walker was doing a week ago Sunday night on the campus of Ole Miss?

Mr. ALGER. The gentleman thinks he knows and reminds the gentleman from New York, as he did last week, when the same question was asked, this is for the court to decide.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. ALGER]?

There was no objection.

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, on several occasions last week I took the floor of the House to point out the dangers to the civil rights of all our people in the procedures which were being followed in denying equality under the law to Gen. Edwin Walker. We are all happy, I am sure, that the mistakes that were being made in the General Walker case have been somewhat corrected by the reduction of the bond asked for his release, although \$50,000 is still an unreasonable and unjustified figure, and in allowing General Walker to make the bond and be released pending a trial.

Unfortunately, we cannot allow the matter to end here. There are several questions involved in the arrest and subsequent events in the General Walker case which demand answers. It is vital that Congress and the American people have a complete explanation from the Attorney General as to the part played in this tragic affair by a Government psychiatrist, Dr. Charles Smith. According to the news media, Dr. Smith made a professional decision that General Walker should undergo a mental test on the basis of press reports and an examination of General Walker's medical record. If this is true, it is astounding that such a procedure could take place in the United States or that it could be condoned by the Justice Department. I think Congress has a right to know the identity of Dr. Charles Smith, his role in our Government, his professional background and ability, and upon what grounds, moral or legal, he could make the decision he did, upon the evidence reported. I think the Congress must know what medical record he consulted and how he obtained access to it.

In this connection I have asked the Attorney General for a full report and an investigation of the methods employed by Dr. Charles Smith. Also, by what right legally, James Bennett, prison head, transferred Gen. Walker to the Missouri Mental Hospital. If the Department of Justice is unable to undertake such an investigation and to furnish Congress with a proper report, I shall ask that the investigation be made by a duly constituted congressional committee. I include my letter to the Attorney General herewith:

OCTOBER 10, 1962.

The Honorable ROBERT KENNEDY,
Attorney General of the United States,
Department of Justice, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. ATTORNEY GENERAL: Although Gen. Edwin Walker has now been released on bond and the case has been redirected to proper legal procedures, there are several questions involved in his arrest that demand an answer. As I explained to you on the telephone last week and, as I repeated on the floor of the House, during my discussion of General Walker's arrest, I am concerned only with the protection of every American citizen against illegal arrest or prosecution. If we are to remain a free nation there must be equality under the law for all our citizens, those with whom we disagree as well as those whose cause we support.

There are some grave questions which have come up with the arrest and subse-

quent events in the case of General Walker. I think Congress has a right to know and I think the American people have a right to know your position on two matters in this connection.

First, under what legal procedures and by what authority did the Director of Federal Prisons, James Bennett, order the removal of General Walker from Mississippi to the Federal Prison at Springfield, Mo.?

Second, under what legal authority did the Government psychiatrist, Dr. Charles Smith, order General Walker held for examination? From the newspaper accounts we are informed that Dr. Smith made this decision based upon press reports and an examination of General Walker's medical record. This action upon the part of Dr. Smith is the most frightening aspect of this whole sorry procedure. How can any reputable man of medicine or any responsible Government official make a judgment of such a nature on such evidence? If this can be done with the approval of the Department of Justice, no person in this Nation is safe from the violation of his civil rights.

Mr. Attorney General, I believe that a full report on Dr. Smith's unwarranted action must be given to Congress and I propose that a full and complete investigation of the methods employed by this man be instituted at once. If the Department of Justice feels it is unable to undertake such an investigation, it will be my purpose to ask that it be done by the Congress.

I hope you will agree to the necessity of a prompt reply.

Sincerely yours,

BRUCE ALGER.

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROONEY. I yield to the distinguished gentlewoman from Ohio [Mrs. BOLTON].

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, I wanted to ask whether the gentleman could give me the amount of money for development grants and development loans applicable to Africa.

Mr. ROONEY. This is the State, Justice, Commerce, the judiciary, and related agencies appropriation bill.

Mrs. BOLTON. It has nothing to do with these grants and loans?

Mr. ROONEY. No. They are included in the foreign aid appropriation bill which was finally passed by the House last Saturday afternoon upon adoption of the conference report.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROONEY. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. This bill as it comes back from conference is \$97 million below the budget request?

Mr. ROONEY. That is correct; \$97,352,300.

Mr. GROSS. That is, it is that amount below the administration's asking price. How much is it below the expenditures for the same general purposes for last year?

Mr. ROONEY. Well, it would necessarily be substantially above the amounts appropriated last year because of the inclusion of the one item of \$100 million for U.N. bonds. The amount for 1962 was \$1,869,982,136.

Mr. GROSS. So, it is somewhere around \$200 million fatter than it was a year ago for the same general pur-

poses, minus the \$100 million for the U.N. bonds.

Mr. ROONEY. This is a mathematical matter, and I am sure the gentleman and I can sit down a little later and figure it out to the penny. Seventy-eight million six hundred and thirty-six thousand five hundred dollars was added in 1963 fiscal year for the Small Business Administration over the amount provided in 1962.

Mr. GROSS. You did not increase the food and drink bill?

Mr. ROONEY. Not one iota, if you can drink an iota.

Mr. GROSS. But there is still, when it is all added up, about \$1¼ million in this bill for food and liquor?

Mr. ROONEY. The representation allowances are in the same amount as they were when they were approved some months ago in this particular bill. I might say in this regard that it has not been easy to bring these items back so pleasing to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield to me at that point?

Mr. ROONEY. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Ohio, the ranking minority member of the subcommittee [Mr. Bow].

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, I should like to point out to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. Gross] if the gentleman will examine the reports of the other body, the gentleman will find in most instances those were increased. However, we brought the bill back in the same way in which the House passed it. We were able to prevail upon the other body to keep the House figures on those items and they are the same as they were when we passed the bill in the House.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. ROONEY. I yield further to the distinguished gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. Once again I want to thank the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROONEY] and the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Bow], for their tenacity in holding this spending down, as compared with the request of the other body. I say again that we can be thankful for small favors.

Permit me to ask the gentleman this further question—

Mr. ROONEY. I would like to say that \$97,352,300 is not a small favor.

Mr. GROSS. I am talking about the representation allowances.

Mr. ROONEY. Those are peanuts; those are peanuts and Scotch and soda.

Mr. GROSS. One and one-quarter million dollars worth of it is not exactly peanuts. Permit me to ask the gentleman this question: Under "Miscellaneous expenses," for the Chief Justice, to be found on page 43 of the bill, would that permit the Court to buy a parking lot or to start planning for a parking lot under the eaves of the Supreme Court? I understand the Chief Justice says that women employees are not safe upon leaving their work in the late afternoon.

Mr. ROONEY. Is the gentleman referring to the item on page 44 of the bill entitled "Automobile for the Chief Justice"?

Mr. GROSS. No; I am referring to "Miscellaneous expenses," to be found on page 43, I believe; "Miscellaneous expenses" to be expended as the Chief Justice may approve, \$79,000.

Mr. ROONEY. That would not include a parking lot.

Mr. GROSS. Or even planning for a parking lot?

Mr. ROONEY. No, it would not.

Mr. GROSS. I am intrigued by the fact that even the women employees of the U.S. Supreme Court are not safe on the streets near the Supreme Court Building in the late afternoon when they leave work.

Mr. ROONEY. This amount, I should point out to the distinguished gentleman from Iowa, is less than it was last fiscal year, 1962. The amount was not in disagreement between this body and the other body because the other body took this body's figures.

Mr. GROSS. How much money is in this bill, if any, for the Equal Job Opportunities Commission?

Mr. ROONEY. I am not familiar at the moment with how much is for the Equal Job Opportunities Commission.

Mr. GROSS. It is chairmanned by Vice President LYNDON JOHNSON. May I ask the gentleman this question? Is there any appropriation made to the departments covered in this bill so that they may in turn contribute to the support of the Equal Job Opportunities Commission which spends in the neighborhood, as I remember it, of some \$500,000 or \$600,000 a year? Precisely where they get their money from these various departments I have been unable to discover.

Mr. ROONEY. I suspect that there are amounts also included in a number of other bills for this purpose.

Mr. GROSS. Let me ask the gentleman this question. Is the Civil Rights Commission appropriation in this bill?

Mr. ROONEY. It is.

Mr. GROSS. The same as it was last year?

Mr. ROONEY. It is in the amount as it passed the House last July 20. There was no disagreement between this body and the other body with regard to the money for the Civil Rights Commission. The Civil Rights Commission asked for \$995,000. This body allowed them \$950,000. They were allowed \$950,000 in the other body. The item was not in disagreement, at all.

Mr. GROSS. Where will the Justice Department get the money for the invasion of Mississippi? Will that come later? That is not in this bill?

Mr. ROONEY. No one ever accused me of being a swami, and I do not have a crystal ball. I do not know when it is coming or in what amount. But I do expect that the U.S. marshals will have to be paid for their services in Mississippi and for their overtime and travel.

Mr. GROSS. That will come in some later bill?

Mr. ROONEY. I expect so.

Mr. GROSS. With respect to the \$6.5 million appropriation to the Disarmament Agency, is there any accomplishment of note since this new and plush agency was created?

Mr. ROONEY. I must say to my distinguished friend that when this item, with regard to the U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency was before this body in July, this body approved the amount \$6.5 million. This same amount, \$6.5 million, was then approved by the other body. So the item was not in disagreement.

Mr. GROSS. What are we getting for this money? Can the gentleman give me any accomplishments we have had for the \$6.5 million?

Mr. ROONEY. The gentleman knows as well as I since it was discussed when this bill was before the House for consideration some months ago, that this is an agency which is studying means of achieving peace, insofar as arms control is concerned. I have always maintained that it is worth \$6½ million to study this subject. If it can be safely done I am for it, provided the plan is approved by the military.

Mr. GROSS. Prior to jumping to \$6.5 million we were spending \$1 million a year on it, and I think accomplishing just about as much.

Mr. ROONEY. I do not know that we accomplished anything for that \$1 million. I am anxious to see what we will accomplish for the \$6.5 million.

Mr. GROSS. So am I. I am going to be very interested to see what is accomplished for the \$6.5 million.

You had a substantially increased appropriation for this purpose last year, now \$6.5 million. The new thing in the bill is the \$100 million for the phony United Nations bond issue.

Mr. ROONEY. That is the way the gentleman characterizes this item, but I do not characterize it that way. This is a good investment for peace and security insofar as this country is concerned. It is included in the bill with the overwhelming consent of both bodies. The gentleman knows this, so when he calls it phony, that is only the gentleman's personal characterization.

Mr. GROSS. I stated it as my personal view, my personal opinion, that it is strictly phony.

Did the gentleman notice the other day where two or three or four countries made token payments on the many thousands of dollars they owed the United Nations, so that they would not be in arrears and could retain their membership in the United Nations? In the light of the International Court decision and the light of the history of this thing when it was on the House floor, I do not think it is a bit good that they make a token payment of a thousand dollars of \$1,500 on a \$100,000 arrearage to the United Nations. I do not think this is good, and I do not think the gentleman thinks it is good, and I do not think he thinks that the \$100 million is ever going to be repaid.

Mr. ROONEY. Let me say I am hopeful.

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROONEY. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Ohio.

Mrs. BOLTON. On page 4 of the report in the statement of the managers, in title I, amendment No. 3, "appropri-

ates \$2,205,000 for acquisition, operation, and maintenance of buildings abroad—special foreign currency program—as proposed by the Senate instead of \$2 million, as proposed by the House." May I ask, do they think they can take care of all the buildings abroad under this appropriation?

Mr. ROONEY. I should say to the distinguished gentlewoman that this is the full amount and should be acceptable to the Department of State. The House conferees agreed to the Senate amount. This is a special foreign currency program. Of course, it is not going to carry the whole buildings program for 1963 fiscal year.

Mrs. BOLTON. Is it going to carry any of the buildings that are required for these new countries?

Mr. ROONEY. The answer is probably "No." We do not yet have an authorization in law from the House Committee on Foreign Affairs and the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations. This committee and the Congress has no authority in law to appropriate. There is now included in this bill, and there will subsequently be a motion, which is now at the Clerk's desk, to add \$10 million in addition for the purpose of maintenance, operation and repair of our buildings abroad, which together with the amount to which the gentlewoman has referred will make a total of \$12,205,000 available for this purpose.

Mrs. BOLTON. To carry on something that has been in effect?

Mr. ROONEY. That is correct.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROONEY. I yield.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. I am prompted to ask this question by reason of a news report I heard this morning having to do with the possibility of the need for increasing the gasoline taxes, and so forth, that go into the Highway Trust Fund.

Mr. ROONEY. There is nothing in this bill in connection with that.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. I realize it is not pertinent to the conference report, but I notice that in this bill there is an appropriation from the Highway Trust Fund to the Bureau of Public Roads, is there not?

Mr. ROONEY. There is money appropriated herein out of the Highway Trust Fund to the Bureau of Public Roads. I might say to my distinguished friend from Wisconsin that the function of this subcommittee and the Committee on Appropriations insofar as this particular item is concerned, is primarily a checkwriting function. We sign a check for whatever has already been obligated under the authority given the Federal Bureau of Public Roads.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. The only purpose of my asking the question was to find out what the estimated receipts going into this fund are as compared to the estimate of the cost of the program, to see whether they are getting this so far out of balance that we now have to start thinking of additional taxes.

Mr. ROONEY. The report today was the opinion of one gentleman, a former

colleague of ours, who should have waited until tomorrow before making such a statement, incidentally. We have had over 100 telephone calls on the head of it. But let me say that when the Department of Commerce and the Bureau of Public Roads were before this subcommittee many months ago, there was presented to the committee a statement in regard to revenues from excises and obligations. That will be found in the printed committee hearings.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. I thank my colleague.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the distinguished gentlewoman from New York [Mrs. KELLY].

Mrs. KELLY. Mr. Speaker, I want to commend my colleague, the gentleman from New York, for the usual excellent job he does on this particular piece of legislation. I want to make a comment on the very question raised by my colleague, the gentlewoman from Ohio. The amendment No. 3 to which reference was made is just for maintenance of buildings already in existence. I am very unhappy to report that the Federal Building Act which we worked on so long and so hard during this past year was passed by the House of Representatives but I am sorry to report that when the other body acted it attached the equal pay for equal work for women bill. As to what is going to happen to that particular bill, I do not know at this moment because the jurisdiction of the Committee on Foreign Affairs certainly does not extend to that subject. My colleague from Wisconsin today requested that these bills go to conference but objection was raised by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Bow]. Therefore, both bills were killed for this session.

Mr. ROONEY. Of course, the gentlewoman must realize that the authorization for the foreign buildings program was held up in her own committee for an unusual length of time, and that the delay in bringing it to the floor of the House was probably more responsible for the present predicament than anything else.

Mrs. KELLY. At this point, Mr. Speaker, I am almost sorry that I complimented my colleague from New York.

Mr. ROONEY. I know the gentlewoman would want me to be accurate.

Mrs. KELLY. I wish to be accurate, too, because we spent an unusual length of time going over every section of the bills requested for the different buildings abroad.

As my colleague knows, I am a member of that subcommittee and I attended every meeting and I would like to tell him that along with the gentlewoman from Ohio, and Mr. HAYS, who is chairman of that subcommittee, the committee deserves a great deal of credit for insisting that the entire bill and the buildings be considered item by item. The Foreign Buildings Act to which we refer was in the committee for this session and we of the policy committee took the same length of time the Appropriations Committee did and we do equally as careful a job in scrutinizing every item.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROONEY. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. This particular appropriation bill, as I remember, passed the House way back in July or about the middle of July; is that not about right?

Mr. ROONEY. Yes, it was on the 20th of July.

Mr. GROSS. And the other body has been sitting on it since then; is that about correct?

Mr. ROONEY. Well, it was passed in the other body about a week ago.

Mr. GROSS. One final question, if I may, if the gentleman will yield?

Mr. ROONEY. I most certainly shall; I am delighted to yield to my friend.

Mr. GROSS. There is nothing in this bill to fund the pay increase that the House voted the other day; is there?

Mr. ROONEY. There is not.

Mr. GROSS. And that will have to come up later in a deficiency appropriation bill or something of that kind?

Mr. ROONEY. I expect so.

Mr. GROSS. I thank the gentleman for his kindness and patience in yielding to me. I also would like to say to him that although I cannot support the bill, I know from reading the hearings that the gentleman from New York has worked hard in an effort to hold down spending under this measure.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the adoption of the conference report.

The question was taken.

Mr. GROSS. 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 pro tempore. 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 172, nays 76, not voting 185, as follows:

[Roll No. 288]
YEAS—172

Addabbo	Daddario	Halpern
Albert	Dague	Hansen
Ashley	Daniels	Hardy
Avery	Davis, Tenn.	Healey
Baker	Dawson	Hechler
Baldwin	Delaney	Holland
Barrett	Dent	Horan
Barry	Downing	Hosmer
Bass, Tenn.	Dulski	Jarman
Bates	Dwyer	Jennings
Battin	Ellsworth	Jensen
Beckworth	Fallon	Joelson
Betts	Farbstein	Johnson, Md.
Boggs	Fascell	Jonas
Boland	Feighan	Jones, Mo.
Bolton	Finnegan	Karsten
Bonner	Fisher	Keith
Bow	Flood	Kelly
Brooks, Tex.	Ford	King, Calif.
Broomfield	Fountain	Kirwan
Burke, Mass.	Frelinghuysen	Kitchin
Byrne, Pa.	Fulton	Kluczynski
Byrnes, Wis.	Garmatz	Kornegay
Cahill	Gary	Kowalski
Chamberlain	Gialmo	Landrum
Chelf	Gilbert	Lane
Chenoweth	Gonzalez	Langen
Clancy	Granahan	Lankford
Clark	Gray	Lesinski
Coad	Green, Pa.	Libonati
Cook	Griffin	Lindsay
Cooley	Gubser	Macdonald
Corbett	Hagen, Calif.	Madden

Mahon	Ostertag	Schwelker
Mathias	Patman	Sikes
Meader	Perkins	Slack
Merrrow	Pfost	Smith, Iowa
Miller, N.Y.	Pike	Stafford
Minshall	Pilcher	Staggers
Moeller	Pirnie	Steed
Monagan	Price	Stephens
Montoya	Pucinski	Stubblefield
Morris	Purcell	Taylor
Morse	Quie	Thornberry
Mosher	Randall	Toll
Multer	Rhodes, Pa.	Tollefson
Murphy	Riehlman	Trimble
Murray	Rodino	Tupper
Natcher	Rooney	Udall, Morris K.
Nix	Rosenthal	Vanik
Norblad	Rostenkowski	Walter
Norrell	Roush	Weaver
Nygaard	Ryan, Mich.	Wickersham
O'Brien, N.Y.	Ryan, N.Y.	Widnall
O'Hara, Ill.	St. Germain	Willis
Olsen	Schenck	Young
O'Neill	Schneebeli	Zablocki

NAYS—76

Abbitt	Forrester	Pelly
Abernethy	Gathings	Pillion
Alford	Goodell	Poff
Alger	Gooding	Ray
Ashbrook	Grant	Reece
Ashmore	Gross	Rhodes, Ariz.
Becker	Hagan, Ga.	Rivers, S.C.
Beerermann	Harrison, Wyo.	Roberts, Tex.
Bennett, Fla.	Harsha	Rogers, Fla.
Bray	Hemphill	Rutherford
Bruce	Herlong	St. George
Burleson	Huddleston	Saylor
Casey	Ichord, Mo.	Seiden
Church	Johansen	Smith, Va.
Collier	Kilgore	Taber
Colmer	King, N.Y.	Teague, Tex.
Cramer	Knox	Thomson, Wis.
Cunningham	Kunkel	Tuck
Curtis, Mo.	Latta	Utt
Derounian	Lennon	Waggonner
Devine	McMillan	Westland
Dole	Matthews	Wharton
Dorn	May	Whitener
Dowdy	Milliken	Whitten
Everett	Mills	
Flynt	Moore	

NOT VOTING—185

Adair	Durno	McDowell
Alexander	Edmondson	McFall
Andersen,	Elliott	McIntire
Minn.	Evins	McSween
Anderson, Ill.	Fenton	McVey
Andrews	Findley	MacGregor
Anfuso	Fino	Mack
Arends	Fogarty	Magnuson
Aspinall	Frazier	Maillard
Auchincloss	Friedel	Marshall
Ayres	Gallagher	Martin, Mass.
Bailey	Gavin	Martin, Nebr.
Baring	Glenn	Mason
Bass, N.H.	Green, Oreg.	Michel
Belcher	Griffiths	Miller,
Bell	Haley	George P.
Bennett, Mich.	Hall	Moorehead,
Berry	Halleck	Ohio
Blatnik	Harding	Moorhead, Pa.
Blitch	Harris	Morgan
Bolling	Harrison, Va.	Morrison
Boykin	Harvey, Ind.	Moss
Brademas	Harvey, Mich.	Moulder
Breeding	Hays	Nedzi
Brewster	Hébert	Nelsen
Bromwell	Henderson	O'Brien, Ill.
Brown	Hiestand	O'Hara, Mich.
Broyhill	Hoeven	O'Konski
Buckley	Hoffman, Ill.	Osners
Burke, Ky.	Hoffman, Mich.	Passman
Cannon	Holifield	Peterson
Carey	Hull	Philbin
Cederberg	Inouye	Poage
Celler	Johnson, Calif.	Powell
Chipperfield	Johnson, Wis.	Rains
Cohelan	Jones, Ala.	Reifel
Conte	Judd	Reuss
Corman	Karth	Riley
Curtin	Kastenmeier	Rivers, Alaska
Curtis, Mass.	Kearns	Roberts, Ala.
Davis,	Kee	Robison
James C.	Keogh	Rogers, Colo.
Davis, John W.	Kilburn	Rogers, Tex.
Denton	King, Utah	Roosevelt
Derwinski	Kyl	Roudebush
Diggs	Laird	Rousselot
Dingell	Lipscob	Santangelo
Domnick	Loser	Saund
Donohue	McCulloch	Schadeberg
Dooley	McDonough	Scherer
Doyle		Schwengel

Scott	Spence	Wallhauser
Scranton	Springer	Watts
Seely-Brown	Stratton	Weis
Shelley	Sullivan	Whalley
Sheppard	Teague, Calif.	Williams
Shipley	Thomas	Wilson, Calif.
Short	Thompson, La.	Wilson, Ind.
Shriver	Thompson, N.J.	Winstead
Sibal	Thompson, Tex.	Wright
Siler	Ullman	Yates
Slak	Van Pelt	Younger
Smith, Calif.	Van Zandt	Zelenko
Smith, Miss.	Vinson	

So the conference report was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Springer for, with Mr. Schadeburg against.

Mr. Hébert for, with Mr. Williams against.

Mr. Hull for, with Mr. Winstead against.

Mr. Kilburn for, with Mr. Lipscomb against.

Mr. McIntire for, with Mr. Hoffman of Michigan against.

Mr. Auchincloss for, with Mr. Mason against.

Mr. Keogh for, with Mr. Martin of Nebraska against.

Mr. Schriver for, with Mr. Rousselot against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Alexander with Mr. Belcher.
Mr. Henderson with Mr. MacGregor.
Mr. Scott with Mr. Hiestand.
Mr. Shelley with Mr. Sibal.
Mr. Sheppard with Mr. Wilson of California.

Mr. Peterson with Mr. Anderson of Illinois.
Mr. Rivers of Alaska with Mr. McDonough.
Mr. Shipley with Mr. Kearns.
Mr. Inouye with Mr. Hoffman of Illinois.
Mr. Brademas with Mr. Schwengel.
Mr. Morgan with Mr. Fenton.
Mr. George P. Miller with Mr. McCulloch.
Mr. James C. Davis with Mr. Bell.
Mr. Aspinall with Mr. Cederberg.
Mr. Rogers of Colorado with Mr. Robison.
Mr. Bailey with Mr. Osmer.
Mr. Kastenmeier with Mr. Glenn.
Mr. Thompson of Louisiana with Mr. Harvey of Michigan.

Mr. Morrison with Mr. Martin of Massachusetts.

Mr. Dingell with Mr. Wilson of Indiana.
Mr. Nedzi with Mr. Van Pelt.
Mr. Karth with Mr. Durno.
Mr. Denton with Mr. Gavin.
Mr. Friedel with Mr. Conte.
Mr. Gallagher with Mr. Brown.
Mr. Fogarty with Mr. Moorehead of Ohio.
Mr. Rains with Mr. Adair.
Mr. Rogers of Texas with Mr. Mailliard.
Mr. Roosevelt with Mr. Siler.
Mr. Sisk with Mr. Wallhauser.
Mrs. Sullivan with Mr. Younger.
Mr. Thompson of New Jersey with Mr. Hall.

Mr. Johnson of Wisconsin with Mr. Ayres.
Mr. Donohue with Mr. Derwinski.
Mr. Philbin with Mr. Findley.
Mr. John W. Davis with Mr. Dooley.
Mr. Wright with Mr. O'Konski.
Mr. Haley with Mr. Andersen of Minnesota.
Mr. Brewster with Mr. Curtin.
Mr. Burke of Kentucky with Mr. Fino.
Mr. Corman with Mr. Bennett of Michigan.
Mr. Doyle with Mr. Reifel.
Mr. Edmondson with Mr. Smith of California.

Mr. Elliott with Mrs. Weis.
Mr. Evins with Mr. Roudebush.
Mr. Hollifield with Mr. Michel.
Mr. O'Brien of Illinois with Mr. Laird.
Mr. Moss with Mr. Harvey of Indiana.
Mr. Loser with Mr. Hoeven.
Mr. McFall with Mr. Kyl.
Mr. Mack with Mr. Short.
Mr. Magnuson with Mr. Garland.

Mr. Reuss with Mr. Nelsen.
Mrs. Green of Oregon with Mr. Scranton.
Mrs. Griffiths with Mr. Seely-Brown.
Mr. Hays with Mr. Teague of California.
Mr. Thompson of Texas with Mr. McVey.
Mr. Ullman with Mr. Berry.
Mr. Watts with Mr. Chipperfield.
Mr. Roberts of Alabama with Mr. Dominick.
Mr. Yates with Mr. Bromwell.
Mr. Carey with Mr. Scherer.
Mr. Santangelo with Mr. Curtis of Massachusetts.

Mr. McDowell with Mr. Bass of New Hampshire.
Mr. Baring with Mr. Broyhill.

Mr. ICHORD of Missouri, Mr. ROGERS of Florida, Mr. TEAGUE of Texas, Mr. COLLIER, and Mr. ROBERTS of Texas changed their vote from "yea" to "nay."

Mr. TAYLOR changed his vote from "nay" to "yea."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The doors were opened.
The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the first amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 2: On page 4, line 7, insert the following:

"OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE OF BUILDINGS ABROAD

"For necessary expenses of maintenance, operation, repair, and payment of leaseholds of properties acquired pursuant to the Foreign Service Buildings Act, 1926, as amended (22 U.S.C. 292-300), including personal services in the United States and abroad; salaries, expenses and allowances of personnel and dependents as authorized by the Foreign Service Act of 1946, as amended (22 U.S.C. 801-1158); and services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U.S.C. 55a), \$11,000,000, of which not less than \$7,000,000 shall be used to purchase foreign currencies or credits owed to or owned by the Treasury of the United States, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That not to exceed \$1,323,000 may be used for administrative expenses during the current fiscal year."

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. ROONEY moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 2 and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the "\$11,000,000" named in said amendment, insert "\$10,000,000".

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 20: On page 25, line 9, strike out "\$3,400,000" and insert "\$3,430,000."

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. ROONEY moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 20 and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of sum proposed in said amendment, insert "\$3,350,000".

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment No. 27: On page 26, line 10, insert: "*Provided*, That the provisions of section 105(f) and 108(c) of the Mutual Educational and Cultural Exchange Act of 1961 (Public Law 87-256) shall apply in carrying out the activities concerned with exhibits and missions."

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. ROONEY moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 27 and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment insert the following: "*Provided*, That the provisions of the first sentence of section 105 (f) and all of 108(c) of the Mutual Educational and Cultural Exchange Act of 1961 (Public Law 87-256) shall apply in carrying out the activities concerned with exhibits and missions'".

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

"EIGHTEENTH DECENNIAL CENSUS

"The time limitation under this head in the General Government Matters, Department of Commerce, and Related Agencies Appropriation Act 1962 is changed from 'December 31, 1962' to 'June 30, 1963'."

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. ROONEY moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 30 and concur therein.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 33: On page 30, line 12, strike out "\$50,000,000" and insert "\$64,200,000".

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. ROONEY moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 33 and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: Immediately following the amount contained in said amendment, insert the following: ", of which not less than \$4,300,000 shall be available for the reconversion of combination vessels".

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, the amount of \$4,300,000 which is made available by the House-Senate conferees under this amendment No. 33 is to pay the construction differential subsidy on the reconversion of the combination vessels *President Cleveland* and *President Wilson* of the American President Lines, and the *Argentina* and *Brasil*, of Moore-McCormack Lines, Inc.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 44: On page 41, line 1, insert: "*Provided*, That appropriations granted under this head, in the fiscal year 1962, shall be merged with this appropriation."

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. ROONEY moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 44 and concur therein.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 46: On page 42, line 17, insert: "Sec. 304. The Bureau of the Budget shall provide the Congress, in connection with the budget presentation for fiscal year 1964 and each succeeding year thereafter, a horizontal budget showing (a) the totality of the programs for meteorology, (b) the specific aspects of the program and funding assigned to each agency, and (c) the estimated goals and financial requirements."

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. ROONEY moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 46 and concur therein.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 48: On page 47, line 8, insert: "Provided, That \$300,000 of the foregoing amount shall be available for the payment of obligations incurred under the appropriation for similar purposes for the preceding fiscal year."

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. ROONEY moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 48 and concur therein.

The motion was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider the votes by which action was taken on the several motions was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks on the conference report and on the amendments.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC WORKS

Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Public Works may have until midnight tonight to file a conference report on the bill H.R. 12135.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, will the gentleman indicate what the bill is?

Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee. It is the so-called highway bill. It has nothing to do with the omnibus flood control bill.

Mr. CRAMER. I am a conferee and do not object to the filing of the report to speed up adjournment.

FURTHER ON PRISONER RANSOM FROM CUBA

Further reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, I read a wire service report,

but before I do, let me say that I previously had expressed my concern over the fact that the administration is negotiating for a Cuban settlement for the release of prisoners.

I read from the press item, UPI wire service, a report as follows:

The Kennedy administration was prepared to help finance part of the ransom. But State Department and White House officials decline comment on any aspect of the private negotiations.

Administration officials were understood today to be hoping that the ransom payments for Cuban invasion prisoners would be made in food and medical supplies rather than cash. They do not want this country to contribute much foreign exchange which Premier Castro could use to purchase key industrial items or further his military buildup.

Everyone knows that one of the great problems facing Castro is lack of foodstuffs. He needs to bail his Communist government out of its agriculture troubles. Apparently the administration is hoping to complete negotiations for transfer through Mr. Donovan before the people get wise to the deal in progress. I think it is time the administration told the American people what this deal is before it becomes a fait accompli. The American people should have a right to express themselves as they did in opposition to the previous ransom attempt. The use of American taxpayer-supported foodstuffs is inexcusable and should be exposed.

Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

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

There was no objection.

CARRIERS OF BONDED MERCHANDISE

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on 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 ask unanimous consent that the statement on the managers on the part of the House be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, and I shall not, I want to be certain the gentleman explains the conference report, and I would like an opportunity to ask a few questions.

Mr. MILLS. The gentleman will have that opportunity.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

The conference report and statement are as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT (H. REPT. NO. 2541)

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 5700) to amend the Tariff Act of 1930 to permit contract carriers by motor vehicle to transport bonded merchandise, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendments to the text and to the title of the bill.

WILBUR D. MILLS,
CECIL R. KING,
HALE BOGGS,
NOAH M. MASON,
JOHN W. BYRNES,

Managers on the Part of the House.

HARRY FLOOD BYRD,
ROBERT S. KERR,
RUSSELL B. LONG,
JOHN J. WILLIAMS,
CARL T. CURTIS,

Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 5700) to amend the Tariff Act of 1930 to permit contract carriers by motor vehicle to transport bonded merchandise submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon by the conferees and recommended in the accompanying conference report:

Subsection (a) of section 309 of the Tariff Act of 1930 provides that articles of foreign or domestic origin may be withdrawn from customs custody free of duty and internal revenue tax for supplies of certain vessels described in such subsection. The Senate amendment added a new subsection (e) to section 309 providing that the provisions for free withdrawals made by subsection (a) were, under such regulations as the Secretary of the Treasury may prescribe, to apply to articles withdrawn for use as fuel on vessels of the United States employed as common carriers on the high seas or the Great Lakes pursuant to certification by the Interstate Commerce Commission. The Senate recedes.

WILBUR D. MILLS,
CECIL R. KING,
HALE BOGGS,
NOAH M. MASON,
JOHN W. BYRNES,

Managers on the Part of the House.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, it will be recalled that the bill H.R. 5700 was passed by the House by unanimous consent some weeks ago. It was a bill introduced by our distinguished colleague, a member of the Ways and Means Committee, the gentleman from the State of Wisconsin [Mr. BYRNES]. While the bill was in the other body an amendment was added. During the course of the conference the Senate receded from the amendment, so that the bill that comes from conference is identical with the bill that previously passed the House by unanimous consent.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 5700 as passed by the House would permit contract carriers by motor vehicle to transport bonded merchandise. The amendment added by the other body would have authorized the withdrawal from customs custody, free of any duties or taxes, of fuel for use on vessels of the United States employed as common carriers in coastwise service pursuant to certification by the Interstate Commerce Commission. As I stated, the Senate receded from this amendment.

Mr. ALGER. 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 Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, I wish to congratulate the conferees for deleting the Senate amendment from this bill.

As passed by the House, H.R. 5700 amended the Tariff Act to permit contract carriers by motor vehicle to transport bonded merchandise.

The Senate added an amendment which would have authorized the withdrawal free of any duty or taxes of fuel for use on vessels employed as common carriers in coastwise service pursuant to certification by the Interstate Commerce Commission.

The Senate amendment established a bad precedent.

The extension of the privilege of withdrawing fuel from customs custody free of duty would have had a twofold effect: The user not only will save the duty and taxes; the user will also be able to purchase oil outside of the import quota at a price considerably below the price of oil which has either been produced in the United States or imported duty-paid under quota.

While the number of vessels involved may be small—and not a matter of serious concern—it would be a basis for other carriers seeking to avoid the import quota. At present, vessels of the United States operating in international waters are permitted to withdraw fuel free of duty only because of recognition of the fact that those vessels put in at foreign ports and would otherwise take on fuel at such ports. If we grant the same privilege to certified carriers in coastwise service, there is nothing to prevent the bargelines, or other vessels in such service not certified by the Interstate Commerce Commission, and any other competitive carriers, from seeking the same privilege.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the conference report.

The previous question was ordered.

The conference report was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CONSTRUCTIVE SALE PRICE, EXCISE TAXES

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on 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 ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers on the part of the House be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

The conference report and statement are as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT (H. REPT. NO. 2542)

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to 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, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate to the text of the bill and agree to the same with amendments as follows:

Page 11 of the Senate engrossed amendments, strike out lines 4 to 23, inclusive.

Page 12 of the Senate engrossed amendments, strike out lines 1 to 16, inclusive, and insert the following:

"(d) NEW COMPANIES QUALIFYING FOR 8-YEAR LOSS CARRYOVER.—

"(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 812(e)(2)(B) of such Code (relating to nonqualified corporation) is amended by adding immediately after the words 'with any other corporation' in the first sentence, the following: (except a corporation taxable under part II or part III of this subchapter)'.
"(2) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by paragraph (1) shall apply with respect to all taxable years beginning after December 31, 1954, except that in the case of a nonqualified corporation, as defined in section 812(e)(2)(B) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 as in effect prior to the amendment made by paragraph (1), a loss from operations for a taxable year beginning in 1955 shall not be an operations loss carryover to the year 1961, and there shall be no reduction in the portion of such loss from operations which may be carried to 1962 or 1963 by reason of an offset with respect to the year 1961.

Page 12, line 17, of the Senate engrossed amendments, strike out "(f)" and insert the following: "(e) CERTAIN DISTRIBUTIONS OF STOCK OF SUBSIDIARIES.—"
Page 13, line 3, of the Senate engrossed amendments, strike out "(g) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The" and insert the following: "(f) EFFECTIVE DATE.—Except as provided in subsection (d)(2), the"
And the Senate agreed to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate to the title of the bill and agree to the same.

WILBUR D. MILLS,
CECIL R. KING,
HALE BOGGS,
NOAH M. MASON,
JOHN W. BYRNES,

Managers on the Part of the House.

HARRY FLOOD BYRD,
ROBERT S. KERR,
RUSSELL B. LONG,
JOHN J. WILLIAMS,
CARL T. CURTIS,

Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to 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, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon by the conferees and recommended in the accompanying conference report:

SECTION 1. CONSTRUCTIVE SALES PRICE FOR PURPOSES OF CERTAIN MANUFACTURERS' EXCISE TAXES

Section 4216(b)(2) of the code now provides that, in determining the base for the computation of manufacturers' excise taxes, a constructive sales price may be used where sales are made to retailers or to consumers if sales are also made at the wholesale level.

However, this provision applies only if the normal method of sales within the industry is not to sell articles at retail, to retailers, or both. The bill as passed by the House provided that this latter restriction was not to apply in the case of the manufacturers' excise taxes on refrigerators and related items, on electric, gas and oil appliances, and on radios and television sets and related items. Under the Senate amendment to the text of the bill, and under the conference agreement, this latter restriction is not to apply in the case of any of the manufacturers' excise taxes except those relating to automobiles, trucks, and buses, business machines, and matches.

Under the bill as passed by the House, this provision would have applied to sales after December 31, 1961. Under the Senate amendment to the text of the bill, and under the conference agreement, this provision will apply to articles sold on or after October 1, 1962.

SECTION 2. CONTRIBUTIONS TO FOUNDATIONS FOR CERTAIN STATE COLLEGES

The Senate amendment to the text of the bill amends section 170(b)(1)(A) of the 1954 code (relating to limitation on the amount of the deduction for charitable contributions by individuals) to add a new clause (iv). Existing section 170(b)(1)(A) provides for an additional allowance (not to exceed 10 percent of an individual's adjusted gross income) above the general 20 percent limitation for charitable contributions. Under existing law this additional 10 percent limitation is applicable in the case of contributions to churches and conventions or associations of churches, and to certain schools, hospitals, and medical research organizations. The effect of the Senate amendment to the text of the bill, and of the conference agreement, is to make the additional 10 percent provision applicable also in the case of contributions to an organization referred to in section 503(b)(3) of the code which is organized and operated exclusively to receive, hold, invest, and administer property and to make expenditures to or for the benefit of a college or university which is an organization referred to in clause (ii) of section 170(b)(1)(A) and which is an agency or instrumentality of a State or political subdivision thereof, or which is owned or operated by a State or political subdivision thereof or by an agency or instrumentality of one or more States or political subdivisions.

SECTION 3. LIFE INSURANCE COMPANIES

(a) Variable annuities and other segregated asset accounts: The Senate amendment to the text of the bill, and the conference agreement, amend section 801(g) of the 1954 code, relating to variable annuity contracts—

(1) to remove the termination provisions contained in existing paragraph (6) of subsection (g) of section 801 (which provides that such subsection (g) is not to apply to taxable years beginning after December 31, 1962);

(2) to provide for separate accounting by life insurance companies with respect to contracts with reserves based on segregated asset accounts, and to define such a contract as one—

(A) which provides for the allocation of all or part of the amounts received under the contract to an account which, pursuant to State law or regulation, is segregated from the general asset accounts of the company;

(B) which provides for the payment of annuities; and

(C) under which the amounts paid in, or the amounts paid as annuities, reflect the investment return and the market value of the segregated asset account;

(3) to provide, in effect, that income allocated to the contracts described in paragraph (2) is not to be taxed to the life insurance company; and

(4) to provide, in effect, that, in the case of qualified pension contracts for which segregated asset accounts are maintained, capital gains allocated to such contracts are not to be taxed to the life insurance company.

(b) Tax in case of capital gains: Under existing law, a life insurance company is taxed separately on its capital gains. The excess of net long-term capital gains over net short-term capital losses is taxed at a 25-percent rate, without the alternative provided other corporations to include capital gains in the regular tax base.

The Senate amendment to the text of the bill, and the conference agreement, provide that a life insurance company is to determine its tax as the lesser of the taxes computed under two methods—a regular method and an alternative method. The regular method requires that the excess of the net long-term capital gain over the net short-term capital loss be included, in effect, in life insurance company taxable income. Under this method, such excess is not taken into account in determining investment yield. The alternative method requires that the tax be determined by adding 25 percent of such excess to the partial tax computed on the life insurance company taxable income determined without such excess. The alternative method is the one required under present law. This provision applies to taxable years beginning after December 31, 1961.

(c) Limitation on certain deductions: Section 809(f)(1) of existing law limits the aggregate amount of deductions allowed to life insurance companies under paragraphs (3), (5), and (6) of section 809(d). Section 809(f)(2) imposes a priority for the application of this limitation to the three deductions. The deductions under such paragraphs (5) and (6), to the extent allowed after the application of this limitation, are added to the policyholders surplus account under subparagraphs (B) and (C) of section 815(c)(2).

The Senate amendment to the text of the bill, and the conference agreement, amend section 809(f)(2) to provide that the limitation of section 809(f)(1) is to apply first to the deduction for dividends to policyholders, then to the special deduction relating to group life insurance contracts and to accident and health insurance contracts, and finally to the special deduction relating to nonparticipating contracts. In a case where the limitation would permit the first of these deductions but not the latter two, then the latter two would not have to be added to the policyholders surplus account. This provision applies to taxable years beginning after December 31, 1961.

(d) Reduction of policyholders surplus account: Subparagraphs (B) and (C) of section 815(c)(2) of existing law require the addition to the policyholders surplus account of the amount equal to the amounts which have been allowed as deductions under paragraphs (5) and (6) of section 809(d). Under certain circumstances distributions to stockholders by a life insurance company, when it has amounts in the policyholders surplus account, may result in tax to the company.

The Senate amendment to the text of the bill provided that, to the extent that the deductions added to the policyholders surplus account under the indicated subparagraphs, merely increased a loss from operations which did not result in a reduction in tax for any taxable year to which the loss could be carried, then such additions may be removed from the policyholders surplus account without incurring tax liability.

The conference agreement does not include this provision.

(e) New companies qualifying for 8-year loss carryover: Under existing law certain new insurance companies, which are not controlled by another corporation, or which do not control another corporation, may carry over operations losses for 8 years.

The Senate amendment to the text of the bill, and the conference agreement, provide that the disqualification from the 8-year operations loss carryover will not apply where the new life insurance company is connected through stock ownership only with a corporation taxable as an insurance company other than as a life insurance company.

This provision applies to all losses to which the Life Insurance Company Tax Act of 1959 would have applied, if it had originally contained this provision, except that a loss arising in 1955 shall not by reason of this amendment be an operations loss carryover to 1961 and there shall be no reduction in the amount of such a loss which may be carried to 1962 or 1963 by reason of an offset for 1961.

(f) Certain distributions of stock of subsidiaries: Under section 815(a) of existing law a life insurance company is, under certain circumstances, subject to tax at the time of distributions of property to stockholders.

The Senate amendment to the text of the bill, and the conference agreement, provide that after December 31, 1961, and before January 1, 1964, section 815(a) will not apply to a distribution of stock of a controlled corporation, if (1) the distribution meets the requirements for a tax-free distribution under section 355, (2) the controlled corporation is an insurance company subject to tax under section 831 (relating to tax on certain insurance companies other than life and certain mutuals), and (3) control was acquired before January 1, 1963, in a stock-for-stock transaction qualifying as a reorganization under section 368(a)(1)(B).

WILBUR D. MILLS,
CECIL R. KING,
HALE BOGGS,
NOAH M. MASON,
JOHN W. BYRNES,

Managers on the Part of the House.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, the bill H.R. 8952 was introduced by our colleague from Massachusetts, a member of the Committee on Ways and Means [Mr. BURKE]. It passed the House some weeks ago by unanimous consent. While the bill was in the other body, certain amendments were added to it.

Mr. Speaker, as passed by the House, the bill H.R. 8952 dealt with the application of the restrictions imposed by present law upon the use of a constructive sales price as the base to which the manufacturer's excise tax applies. One of these restrictions precludes the use of this constructive sales price unless the normal method of sales within an industry is other than at retail, to retailers, or both. Under the House bill, this restriction was made inapplicable in the case of manufacturer's excise taxes on refrigerators, electric, oil, and gas appliances, and radio and television sets. As amended by the other body, this restriction would not apply in the case of any manufacturer's excise taxes except those relating to automobiles, trucks, and buses, business machines, and matches.

The other body also amended the House bill by changing the effective date of this provision from January 1, 1962, to October 1, 1962. The Treasury De-

partment has indicated that it has no objection to these amendments made to the basic bill.

There were certain other amendments which were added to the bill in the other body unrelated to the subject matter of the bill as it passed the House. One of these amendments, Mr. Speaker, added a provision which would make the 30-percent limitation on allowable deductions for gifts to churches, schools, hospitals, and certain medical research organizations, also applicable to gifts of foundations which are organized and operated exclusively for the benefit of State colleges and universities, including land-grant colleges. Under present law, gifts to these organizations are subject to the generally applicable 20-percent limitation. This amendment would be effective for taxable years beginning after December 31, 1960.

Your conferees accepted this amendment. This is not a new matter in the sense it has not been previously considered. I am not certain, but it seems to me not more than 2 years ago we thought we had resolved this situation by an amendment increasing this limitation on allowance, but in the process of doing so we restricted its application to contributions directly to churches, schools, hospitals, and medical research organizations. It developed that some of our State universities cannot receive moneys directly for their purposes without having to transfer those moneys immediately into the State treasury.

What we are doing here is getting around that handicap by permitting the money to be given in the form of gifts for the purposes of these universities to foundations and not directly to the universities. This is a very desirable change, and I am satisfied the House Members would have done what the conferees did with respect to it, unanimously.

Mr. AVERY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLS. I yield to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. AVERY. Mr. Speaker, I would like to express my appreciation to the gentleman from Arkansas for working out this very technical matter. It is highly important to my State of Kansas, and I understand there are seven or eight other States similarly situated.

Mr. MILLS. Yes, including the State of Arkansas.

Mr. AVERY. And including the State of Arkansas, I may say. This amendment to the code will make possible for these gifts to go beyond the 30-percent limitation which now prevails.

Mr. MILLS. I am sure the gentleman means up to the 30-percent limit.

Mr. AVERY. Yes.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLS. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Mr. Speaker, I also would like to express to the able chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means my thanks for his work and the work of the committee in bringing this matter before us. As the gentleman knows, my own State of Florida and my

own institution, the University of Florida, is very much interested in this. I believe I introduced legislation in an effort to get this problem solved. This incorporates my legislation along with other kindred legislation of this kind.

Mr. MILLS. I appreciate the gentleman taking time to call attention to that fact. I had intended to say that I hoped this amendment would in some way at least, in part, be known as the Matthews amendment.

Mr. MATTHEWS. I thank the distinguished gentleman.

Mr. MILLS. I say that since the matter was before the Committee on Ways and Means in the form of a bill introduced by the distinguished gentleman from Florida.

Mr. MATTHEWS. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, there are some other amendments that were adopted by the Senate to this bill, also not dealing with the subject matter initially contained in the bill. They have to do with the treatment of life insurance companies.

Mr. Speaker, the first of these life insurance company amendments would continue in effect for future years tax treatment of variable annuities that were provided in the Life Insurance Act of 1959. Under present law this special treatment is scheduled to be terminated on December 31, 1962. This amendment would also exempt from tax the actual investment earnings realized on assets which are maintained in segregated asset accounts and entirely apart from the other assets of these companies—as reserves for life insurance contracts which are issued under qualified employee pension plans. Under present law the earnings on assets held by qualified trustee plans are entirely exempt from tax. This amendment would provide equal treatment for non-trustee plans which are funded through life insurance contracts, thereby eliminating the competitive inequity in favor of trustee plans under existing law.

On the whole, Mr. Speaker, it can be said that what we are doing here in this amendment is continuing beyond the termination date, December 31, 1962, a provision which was enacted by the Congress and developed in the Ways and Means Committee in connection with the Life Insurance Tax Act of 1959.

Mr. Speaker, another amendment dealing with life insurance companies would treat life insurance companies like any other corporations by providing the alternative method of taxing their long-term capital gains. Under present law, life insurance companies do not have the alternative of treating capital gains as ordinary income but are required to pay a flat 25-percent tax on any long-term gains they realize even though they may be operating at a loss.

Mr. Speaker, the subject matter of this amendment was considered by the Ways and Means Committee in connection with the Insurance Tax Act of 1959. Your conferees accepted this amendment because they thought, unanimously again, that these companies should be treated like any other corporations, par-

ticularly when this amendment would benefit those companies that are operating at a loss.

Mr. Speaker, another amendment made by the other body would change the priorities specified for taking certain deductions by stock life insurance companies. Under the present law the aggregate of these deductions and the deduction for policyholder dividends cannot offset taxable investment deductions by more than \$250,000. However, present law specifies that these special deductions—which must be restored to income when distributions are made to stockholders—must be taken before the policyholder dividend deduction, which is not later restored to income. This priority is specified even though there may be sufficient policyholder dividends to offset completely this \$250,000 limitation and which, if taken before the special deductions, would not be restored to income in the future. Under this amendment, the policyholder dividend deduction would be taken before the deduction for the special items is allowed.

Mr. Speaker, this amendment also was accepted by the conferees on the part of the House.

Mr. Speaker, the other body also added an amendment which changes present law by precluding the taxation of stock life insurance companies on the distribution of amounts added to special reserves at a time when no tax benefit was received from the deduction of the reserve addition.

Mr. Speaker, this amendment was deleted by the conference committee. It developed that it could have no application to any companies perhaps for several years and it was not, in the opinion of the conference committee, as pressing as some of the other provisions.

Another amendment made by the other body would permit a life insurance company to divest itself of stock in a fire or casualty insurance company subsidiary which was acquired in a stock-for-stock reorganization, without the imposition of the phase 3 tax on distribution to stockholders. This will permit a life insurance company to return to the tax position it was in prior to the acquisition of such a subsidiary.

Mr. Speaker, the conferees on the part of the House accepted that amendment.

The final amendment made by the other body would permit a new life insurance company to have the 8-year loss carryover provision generally accorded such new companies under present law despite the fact that the new company owns control in, or is controlled by, a fire or casualty insurance company. Under present law, this carryover is denied new life companies that control, or are controlled by, other corporations, but it does not apply to all life companies that are not so owned or controlled.

Under the conference agreement all of the amendments made by the other body were retained, with the exception of the one that I earlier discussed and called attention to as being deleted in conference.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLS. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I regret to register a discordant note, but I am sure the Constitution is quite clear that tax measures must originate in the House of Representatives.

These Senate amendments are not germane to this bill. The Ways and Means Committee of which I am a member has not considered any one of these measures. There was ample time in this session of Congress for these bills to be presented in orderly fashion. I know that my people on my side rely on the members of the Ways and Means Committee to advise them in these highly complicated areas, just as on the majority side they rely, not just on the chairman and the ranking minority members, but on the entire committee.

This is a complete bypass of the Ways and Means Committee. It is in violation of the Constitution. It is bad procedure because it does not provide the orderly process.

I am willing to accommodate our friends and colleagues from the other body if they have matters where they think the tax laws need amending. I am sure any 1 of the 25 members of the Ways and Means Committee and the committee itself would be happy to have bills introduced, and consider them in an orderly fashion.

Frankly, I am shocked that we have this situation where a person like myself has to register this objection in behalf not just of the House of Representatives but in behalf of the Constitution. They are real reasons in my judgment why the Constitution provides that revenue measures may only originate in the House. I can see where there can be nongermane amendments inserted in the other body that have special reasons. None of these has. I think we shall get to another conference report where I can point out where nongermane amendments do not violate these specific principles which I think are so important.

I am forced to adhere to this position, just as I have before in the past on conference reports where nongermane matters were put in by the other body, to vote against the bill. I think that under the circumstances I am going to try to get a rollcall vote on this if I can.

Mr. MILLS. Would my friend from Missouri listen to me for a few seconds?

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. I am always happy to listen to my friend.

Mr. MILLS. I have listened to my friend's admonition about the action taken by the conferees in connection with this. Your conferees on the part of the House were five in number, and it happens that there are five Members of the House conferees who signed this conference report. I also call the gentleman's attention to the fact that there were five conferees on the part of the Senate who also signed the report.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Does that make it right?

Mr. MILLS. Just a minute until I complete my statement, then I will yield to the gentleman.

To continue, the gentleman is proceeding to set himself up here as a critic,

apparently, of any action by the Senate with respect to any amendment to any of these bills.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. No, the gentleman misinterprets my position.

Mr. MILLS. I will yield to the gentleman but I do not want him breaking in until I do.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Let me state my position.

Mr. MILLS. I said I would yield in due course. I am not yielding now. I have been listening to this for some days. I want to make a statement, if the gentleman will just listen to me for a minute.

There is not an amendment that was accepted by your conferees to this bill, for the gentleman's information, that would not have been germane to this bill under the rules of the House, let alone the rules of the Senate. The bill amends the Internal Revenue Code of 1954. These amendments amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954. The gentleman is referring to the next conference report I want to call up here when we dispose of this one. He tries to say that this conference report we are now considering involves matters which are not germane to the subject matter of the bill, but that the next conference report he can support because none of those matters are not germane.

I want to discuss that when we come to the next conference report because what we have done is call up a situation that the conferees on the part of the House ever since I have been serving as a conferee, have found themselves in with respect to amendments adopted by the Finance Committee and the other body. We cannot foreclose that body from adopting amendments. We can, when we get to conference, reason with them on the basis of the amendments, whether or not we will accept them. There is nothing in this procedure that violates the Constitution. It is entirely in accord with the Constitution and court holdings on the subject, and has been the practice for years and years. The important point is that the basic bill must originate in the House. The Senate has not forwarded to us on this occasion a Senate-numbered bill involving the revenues of this Nation. These amendments, I think, are completely germane, not in the sense perhaps that my friend from Missouri is using the word, germane to the subject matter of the specific bill, but that is also true of the next conference report that we will call up. The amendments are germane under the rules of the Senate. They are germane under the rules of the House.

In addition, we have not agreed to anything in this conference report that has not been the subject matter of a bill before the Committee on Ways and Means and with respect to which reports have been obtained by the Committee on Ways and Means from the interested departments. The gentleman from Missouri is entitled to know that those departments have all reported favorably on these amendments we are talking about here involving the insurance industry.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Now will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLS. Yes, I will be glad to yield.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. I think the gentleman is talking off the point. I know there have been reports but the Committee on Ways and Means did not consider these matters.

Mr. MILLS. The committee did not. Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. The committee did not, is the point.

This is a clear violation of House rule 20 which has been the subject of discussion on the floor of the House earlier today. This RECORD will be available for anyone to read and for people to think about. It is very true that part of our differences and the difference that I have with the chairman of the committee revolves around the definition of the term "germane." But I do not think there is any question about the meaning of both the Constitution and, certainly, of rule 20. Yes, I am critical but I am not critical as an individual. I am not setting myself up, as the gentleman so unkindly put it, as an authority. I am expressing a viewpoint as a Member of the House of Representatives that I feel very deeply about. If I am in error, the gentleman from Arkansas can contest it and so can anyone else.

I trust the RECORD will be here for many people to read and I feel certain in the long run the point of view I am trying to get across here is going to prevail because it is essential that it do prevail, if the integrity of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Ways and Means and of the Constitution is to be preserved.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I was just one member of this conference group that is making this report to the House. The gentleman from California [Mr. KING], the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. BOGGS], the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MASON], and the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. BYRNES] have signed the conference report. We did the best we could in conference. These matters are entirely appropriate for enactment, I can assure the membership. I am not in a position to bring back to the House on every occasion, Mr. Speaker, a matter just as it passed the House. I wish I could, but we cannot under the rules, as I understand them, refuse at least to entertain the consideration of amendments made by the other body. Of course, I have just as much feeling as the gentleman from Missouri about carrying out the Constitution and preventing anybody from violating the Constitution. We had a situation today earlier where a resolution was adopted returning a matter to the other body. Any time a bill is sent over by the other body with a Senate number on it, which bill has for its purpose the raising of revenues for the Government, you can expect me as long as I am here to offer to the House a resolution returning the bill to the other body such as was adopted by the House earlier. But I cannot guarantee to the House that matters which originate in the House cannot be amended by the other body. That is all that was done in this instance.

These amendments deal with taxation and the bill as it went to the other body dealt with taxation.

Mr. ALGER. 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 Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, I cannot agree to the conference report on H.R. 8952 for a very simple but important reason, bad procedure which can result in bad legislation. Are the Senate provisions replacing the House bill meritorious? We do not know.

The House Ways and Means Committee has held no hearings or executive meetings on the substitute measures substituted by the other body. The House bill, which related to the sales base of the excise tax, is replaced by tax measures which include section 1, the excise tax, section 2, changes in the tax law of the contributions to foundations for certain State colleges and universities, and section 3, life insurance companies.

The merits and/or demerits of the new language is unknown to me, since the Ways and Means Committee has not studied these measures. The conferees of House and Senate may know these provisions, but the House Members can hardly be expected to know.

I believe it is wrong for tax changes to be made in this way—in haste—in the closing days of Congress, without Ways and Means Committee work, rammed through by the other body in conference. These are bad procedures, improper procedures, and can result in very bad legislation. Even if proper legislative changes are made, this is a bad precedent. It is possible that these are excellent tax revisions. Since I have been foreclosed from learning the facts, I do not know if they are good changes or not and therefore cannot support such changes in ignorance.

It is my hope that U.S. industry and business groups will not endeavor in the future to change tax law legislation railroading tax changes through the other body.

No matter how meritorious such tax changes may seem to be at the moment, the door is open for bad legislation which at other times, by the same procedure, will do harm. Good procedures protect majority and minority groups alike, and should be observed.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The question was taken.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. 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 247, nays 6, not voting 181, as follows:

[Roll No. 289]

YEAS—247

Abbutt	Garmatz	Murray
Abernethy	Gary	Natcher
Addabbo	Gathings	Nix
Albert	Gialmo	Norblad
Alford	Gilbert	Norrell
Ashley	Gonzalez	Nygaard
Ashmore	Goodell	O'Brien, N.Y.
Avery	Gooding	O'Hara, Ill.
Bailey	Granahan	Olsen
Baker	Grant	O'Neill
Baldwin	Gray	Ostertag
Barrett	Green, Pa.	Patman
Barry	Griffin	Pelly
Bass, Tenn.	Gubser	Perkins
Bates	Hagan, Ga.	Pfost
Battin	Halleck	Pike
Becker	Halpern	Pillion
Beckworth	Hansen	Pirnie
Beermann	Hardy	Poff
Bennett, Fla.	Harrison, Wyo.	Price
Betts	Harsha	Pucinski
Boggs	Healey	Purcell
Boland	Hechler	Quile
Bolling	Hemphill	Randall
Bolton	Herlong	Ray
Bonner	Holland	Reece
Bow	Horan	Rhodes, Ariz.
Brewster	Hosmer	Rhodes, Pa.
Brooks, Tex.	Huddleston	Riehman
Broomfield	Ichord, Mo.	Rivers, S.C.
Broyhill	Jarman	Roberts, Tex.
Bruce	Jennings	Rodino
Burke, Mass.	Jensen	Rogers, Fla.
Burleson	Joelson	Rooney
Byrne, Pa.	Johansen	Rosenthal
Byrnes, Wis.	Johnson, Calif.	Rostenkowski
Cahill	Johnson, Md.	Roush
Cannon	Jonas	Rutherford
Casey	Jones, Mo.	Ryan, Mich.
Chamberlain	Karsten	Ryan, N.Y.
Chelf	Keith	St. George
Chenoweth	Kelly	St. Germain
Church	Kilgore	Saylor
Clancy	King, Calif.	Schenck
Clark	King, N.Y.	Schneebell
Coad	Kirwan	Schweiker
Collier	Kitchin	Selden
Colmer	Kluczynski	Sikes
Cook	Knox	Sisk
Cooley	Kornegay	Slack
Corbett	Kunkel	Smith, Iowa
Cramer	Landrum	Smith, Va.
Cunningham	Lane	Stafford
Daddario	Langen	Stephens
Dague	Lankford	Stubblefield
Daniels	Latta	Taber
Davis, Tenn.	Lennon	Taylor
Dawson	Lesinski	Teague, Tex.
Delaney	Libonati	Thomson, Wis.
Dent	Lindsay	Thornberry
Derounian	McFall	Toll
Devine	McMillan	Tollefson
Dole	Macdonald	Trimble
Dorn	Madden	Tuck
Dowdy	Mahon	Tupper
Downing	Mathias	Udall, Morris K.
Dulski	Matthews	Utt
Dwyer	May	Vanik
Ellsworth	Meador	Waggonner
Everett	Merrow	Walter
Fallon	Miller, N.Y.	Weaver
Farbstein	Milliken	Westland
Fascell	Mills	Wharton
Feighan	Minshall	Whitener
Finnegan	Moeller	Whitten
Fisher	Monagan	Wickersham
Flood	Montoya	Widnall
Flynt	Moore	Willis
Ford	Morris	Winstead
Forrester	Morse	Young
Fountain	Mosher	Zablocki
Frelinghuysen	Multer	
Fulton	Murphy	

NAYS—6

Alger	Bray	Gross
Ashbrook	Curtis, Mo.	Hagen, Calif.

NOT VOTING—181

Adair	Auchincloss	Blicht
Alexander	Ayres	Boykin
Andersen,	Baring	Brademas
Minn.	Bass, N.H.	Breeding
Anderson, Ill.	Belcher	Bromwell
Andrews	Bell	Brown
Anfuso	Bennett, Mich.	Buckley
Arends	Berry	Burke, Ky.
Aspinall	Blatnik	Caray

Cederberg	Jones, Ala.	Riley	Mr. Morgan with Mr. Andersen of Minne-
Celler	Judd	Rivers, Alaska	sota.
Chiperfield	Karth	Roberts, Ala.	Mr. Denton with Mr. MacGregor.
Cohelan	Kastenmeier	Robison	Mr. Corman with Mr. Roudebush.
Conte	Kearns	Rogers, Colo.	Mr. Doyle with Mr. Curtin.
Corman	Kee	Rogers, Tex.	Mr. Edmondson with Mr. Fenton.
Curtin	Keogh	Roosevelt	Mr. O'Brien of Illinois with Mr. Wilson of
Curtis, Mass.	Kilburn	Roudebush	Indiana.
Davis,	King, Utah	Rousselot	Mr. Evins with Mr. Short.
James C.	Kowalski	Santangelo	Mr. Williams with Mr. Bromwell.
Davis, John W.	Kyl	Saund	Mr. Elliott with Mr. McIntire.
Denton	Laird	Schadeberg	Mr. McDowell with Mr. Adair.
Derwinski	Lipscomb	Scherer	Mr. Johnson of Wisconsin with Mr. Judd.
Diggs	Loser	Schwengel	Mr. Shipley with Mr. Hoffman of Illinois.
Dingell	McCulloch	Scott	Mr. Sheppard with Mr. Harvey of Michigan.
Dominick	McDonough	Scranton	Mr. Ullman with Mr. O'Konski.
Donohue	McDowell	Seely-Brown	Mr. Thompson of Louisiana with Mr.
Dooley	McIntire	Shelley	Robison.
Doyle	McSween	Sheppard	Mr. Shelley with Mr. Moorehead of Ohio.
Durno	McVey	Shipley	Mr. Burke of Kentucky with Mr. Derwinski.
Edmondson	MacGregor	Short	Mr. Andrews with Mr. Gavin.
Elliott	Mack	Shriver	Mr. Baring with Mr. McDonough.
Evins	Magnuson	Sibal	Mr. Thompson of New Jersey with Mr.
Fenton	Mailliard	Siler	Laird.
Findley	Marshall	Smith, Calif.	Mr. Blatnik with Mr. Harvey of Indiana.
Fino	Martin, Mass.	Smith, Miss.	Mr. Morrison with Mr. Nelsen.
Fogarty	Martin, Nebr.	Spence	Mr. Hays with Mr. Younger.
Frazier	Mason	Springer	Mr. Moss with Mr. Seely-Brown.
Friedel	Michel	Stagers	Mr. Thompson of Texas with Mr. Van
Gallagher	Miller,	Steed	Zandt.
George P.	Moorehead, Pa.	Stratton	Mr. Wright with Mr. Scherer.
Garland	Moorehead,	Sullivan	Mr. Watts with Mr. Dooley.
Gavin	Ohio	Teague, Calif.	Mr. Anfuso with Mr. Scranton.
Glenn	Moorhead, Pa.	Thomas	Mr. Buckley with Mr. McCulloch.
Green, Oreg.	Morgan	Thompson, La.	Mr. Celler with Mr. Lipscomb.
Griffiths	Morrison	Thompson, N.J.	Mr. James C. Davis with Mr. Hall.
Haley	Moss	Thompson, Tex.	Mr. Powell with Mr. Mason.
Hall	Moulder	Ullman	Mr. Roberts of Alabama with Mr. Bass of
Harding	Nedzi	Van Pelt	New Hampshire.
Harris	Nelsen	Van Zandt	Mr. Stratton with Mr. Hoffman of Michi-
Harrison, Va.	O'Brien, Ill.	Vinson	gan.
Harvey, Ind.	O'Hara, Mich.	Wallhauser	Mr. Keogh with Mrs. Weis.
Harvey, Mich.	O'Konski	Watts	Mr. O'Hara of Michigan with Mr. Domi-
Hays	Osmers	Weis	nick.
Hébert	Passman	Whalley	Mr. Karth with Mr. Curtis of Massachu-
Henderson	Peterson	Williams	setts.
Hiestand	Philbin	Wilson, Calif.	Mr. Cohelan with Mr. Garland.
Hoeven	Pilcher	Wright	Mr. Diggs with Mr. Chiperfield.
Hoffman, Ill.	Poage	Yates	Mr. Reuss with Mr. McVey.
Hoffman, Mich.	Powell	Younger	
Hollifield	Rains	Zelenko	
Hull	Reifel		
Inouye	Reuss		
Johnson, Wis.			

So the conference report was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Mr. Hébert with Mr. Belcher.
Mr. Rogers of Texas with Mr. Michel.
Mrs. Sullivan with Mr. Schwengel.
Mr. Kastenmeier with Mr. Wallhauser.
Mr. Aspinall with Mr. Conte.
Mr. Rogers of Colorado with Mr. Schadeberg.
Mr. Alexander with Mr. Osmers.
Mr. Rivers of Alaska with Mr. Glenn.
Mr. Inouye with Mr. Hiestand.
Mr. Hull with Mr. Kyl.
Mr. Stagers with Mr. Springer.
Mr. Brademas with Mr. Martin of Nebraska.
Mr. John W. Davis with Mr. Kearns.
Mr. Donohue with Mr. Auchincloss.
Mr. Philbin with Mr. Brown.
Mrs. Green of Oregon with Mr. Martin of Massachusetts.
Mrs. Griffiths with Mr. Rousselot.
Mr. Hollifield with Mr. Smith of California.
Mr. Henderson with Mr. Wilson of California.
Mr. Scott with Mr. Fino.
Mr. Santangelo with Mr. Durno.
Mr. Carey with Mr. Bell.
Mr. Loser with Mr. Anderson of Illinois.
Mr. Mack with Mr. Mailliard.
Mr. Magnuson with Mr. Kilburn.
Mr. George P. Miller with Mr. Hoeven.
Mr. Rains with Mr. Bennett of Michigan.
Mr. Roosevelt with Mr. Siler.
Mr. Dingell with Mr. Teague of California.
Mr. Nedzi with Mr. Van Pelt.
Mr. Pilcher with Mr. Sibal.
Mr. Peterson with Mr. Cederberg.
Mr. Friedel with Mr. Findley.
Mr. Gallagher with Mr. Reifel.
Mr. Fogarty with Mr. Shriver.
Mr. Haley with Mr. Berry.

Mr. Morgan with Mr. Andersen of Minne-

Mr. Denton with Mr. MacGregor.

Mr. Corman with Mr. Roudebush.

Mr. Doyle with Mr. Curtin.

Mr. Edmondson with Mr. Fenton.

Mr. O'Brien of Illinois with Mr. Wilson of

Indiana.

Mr. Evins with Mr. Short.

Mr. Williams with Mr. Bromwell.

Mr. Elliott with Mr. McIntire.

Mr. McDowell with Mr. Adair.

Mr. Johnson of Wisconsin with Mr. Judd.

Mr. Shipley with Mr. Hoffman of Illinois.

Mr. Sheppard with Mr. Harvey of Michigan.

Mr. Ullman with Mr. O'Konski.

Mr. Thompson of Louisiana with Mr.

Robison.

Mr. Shelley with Mr. Moorehead of Ohio.

Mr. Burke of Kentucky with Mr. Derwinski.

Mr. Andrews with Mr. Gavin.

Mr. Baring with Mr. McDonough.

Mr. Thompson of New Jersey with Mr.

Laird.

Mr. Blatnik with Mr. Harvey of Indiana.

Mr. Morrison with Mr. Nelsen.

Mr. Hays with Mr. Younger.

Mr. Moss with Mr. Seely-Brown.

Mr. Thompson of Texas with Mr. Van

Zandt.

Mr. Wright with Mr. Scherer.

Mr. Watts with Mr. Dooley.

Mr. Anfuso with Mr. Scranton.

Mr. Buckley with Mr. McCulloch.

Mr. Celler with Mr. Lipscomb.

Mr. James C. Davis with Mr. Hall.

Mr. Powell with Mr. Mason.

Mr. Roberts of Alabama with Mr. Bass of

New Hampshire.

Mr. Stratton with Mr. Hoffman of Michi-

gan.

Mr. Keogh with Mrs. Weis.

Mr. O'Hara of Michigan with Mr. Domi-

nick.

Mr. Karth with Mr. Curtis of Massachu-

setts.

Mr. Cohelan with Mr. Garland.

Mr. Diggs with Mr. Chiperfield.

Mr. Reuss with Mr. McVey.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The doors were opened.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

INCOME TAX TREATMENT OF TERMINAL RAILROAD CORPORATIONS

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (H.R. 12599) relating to the income tax treatment of terminal railroad corporations and their shareholders, and ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers on the part of the House be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman explain this bill?

Mr. MILLS. That is my purpose, yes.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

The conference report and statement are as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT (H. REPT. NO. 2543)

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the

amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 12599) relating to the income tax treatment of terminal railroad corporations and their shareholders having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, and 7 and agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate to the title of the bill and agree to the same.

WILBUR D. MILLS,
CECIL R. KING,
HALE BOGGS,
NOAH M. MASON,
JOHN W. BYRNES,

Managers on the Part of the House.

HARRY FLOOD BYRD,
ROBERT S. KERR,
RUSSELL B. LONG,
JOHN J. WILLIAMS,
CARL T. CURTIS,

Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 12599) relating to the income tax treatment of terminal railroad corporations and their shareholders, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon by the conferees and recommended in the accompanying conference report:

Sections 1 and 2. Terminal railroad corporations.

The bill as passed by the House provided rules for the computation of the taxable income of certain railroad terminal corporations and their shareholders. The new treatment under the bill was applicable to all years to which the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 or the Internal Revenue Code of 1939 applies.

Senate amendment No. 3, and the conference agreement, provide additional rules relating to the application of the bill in the case of taxable years ending before the date of the enactment of the bill. The House recedes.

Senate amendments Nos. 1 and 2, and the conference agreement, also make technical changes to permit the application of section 281 to certain corporations which are common parent corporations and to certain corporations having short taxable years. The House recedes.

Section 3. Statistical studies, etc.

Senate amendment No. 5, and the conference agreement, amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to authorize the Secretary of the Treasury or his delegate to make special statistical studies and compilations involving data taken from tax returns, declarations, etc., to engage in special studies and compilations jointly with parties making such a request, and to furnish transcripts of these special studies and compilations to the parties making the request where they pay the cost of the work performed.

Amendment No. 5, and the conference agreement, also authorize the Secretary of the Treasury or his delegate to admit employees and officials of States, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, possessions of the United States, local governments of any of the above, the District of Columbia, or of foreign governments to training courses conducted by the Internal Revenue Service and to supply them with texts and other training aids. In this case the Secretary of the Treasury may require the payment of a reasonable fee not to exceed the cost of the training and training aids.

Amendment No. 5, and the conference agreement, also provide that payments for work or services performed—

(1) pursuant to the new section 7515 (special statistical studies and compilations);

(2) pursuant to the new section 7516 (supplying of training and training aids); and

(3) for a State or a department or agency of the Federal Government in supplying certain copies and data,

are to be deposited in a separate account. This separate account may be used to reimburse appropriations which bore all or part of the costs of such work or services, or to refund excess sums when necessary.

The House recedes on Senate amendment No. 5.

Section 4. Allowance of certain refunds.

Senate amendment No. 6, and the conference agreement, make a technical amendment to section 6512(b)(2) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to limit on amount of credit or refund of overpayment determined by the Tax Court). The House recedes.

Section 5. Cooperative banks.

Senate amendment No. 7, and the conference agreement, in effect provide that for cooperative banks to qualify for the special bad debt reserve provisions of section 593 of the Code (as amended by section 6 of the Revenue Act of 1962) they must meet essentially the same requirements as to the character of their investments as are provided for domestic building and loan associations. The House recedes.

WILBUR D. MILLS,
CECIL R. KING,
HALE BOGGS,
NOAH M. MASON,
JOHN W. BYRNES,

Managers on the Part of the House.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, the bill H.R. 12599 passed the House some days ago by unanimous consent, having been introduced by our colleague from Illinois [Mr. LIBONATI] and having been reported by the Committee on Ways and Means unanimously.

While this bill was in the Senate the Senate adopted some amendments to it. The other body added an amendment to the text of the bill that passed the House. I will come back to that in just a minute.

The first amendment, not related to the subject matter of the bill itself, which dealt with certain terminal railroad corporations and tax treatment of the earnings of those corporations, had to do with authorizing the Secretary of the Treasury or his delegate to make special statistical studies and supply certain training and training aids and to be reimbursed for the cost of such studies and training by the persons benefiting without adversely affecting the appropriation of the Internal Revenue Service of the Treasury Department. The Treasury Department favors the adoption of this amendment. It would permit reimbursement to the Service rather than its going into the general funds of the Treasury. There are those on the outside that also favor it, including State and local governments.

This amendment was agreed to by the conferees and is, I think, identical with the language of the bill H.R. 12030, which passed the House by unanimous consent. The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CURTIS] and I introduced companion bills on this subject matter.

The other body added an amendment to the bill which, in effect, would subject

cooperative banks to the same investment restrictions that are imposed on domestic savings and loan associations under the Revenue Act of 1962 by including them in the definition. The conference report on the Revenue Act, you will recall, was approved by this body on Tuesday of last week. In the absence of this amendment, which could not be taken in conference on the Revenue Act of 1962, cooperative banks would not be subject to any of the investment restrictions placed upon domestic savings and loan associations by the Revenue Act of 1962. It was known by the conferees on the part of the House and Senate that this matter would have to be legislated upon subsequently. The Senate has taken the initiative in doing so by adding this particular proviso to the bill H.R. 12599.

Another amendment adopted by the other body corrects a technical defect in present law relating to the allowance of refunds where the Tax Court has acquired jurisdiction of a refund suit, by making it clear that refunds can be paid where they are clearly due. This amendment restores the treatment afforded under the 1939 code and eliminates an apparent oversight in the drafting of the comparable section of the 1954 Revenue Code.

The problem arises under a very literal reading of the present statute in the case where there is multiple jurisdiction relating to a particular tax case. The amendment is retained, Mr. Speaker, under the conference report.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLS. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. In regard to this bill, I want to point out, as the gentleman from Arkansas intimated in the previous colloquy, in this instance I believe the three remaining amendments are not in violation of these principles I expressed. The purpose of getting this out in the open is so that possibly we can move forward and develop some good procedures in this area as to what is germane and what is not.

You will notice the first amendment was a bill that actually was passed out unanimously by the Committee on Ways and Means and was passed by the House. So it was a matter that had been considered by not only the House of Representatives, but by the Committee on Ways and Means itself. Technically, I think perhaps the bill could have been passed by the Senate and sent back and just enacted in that fashion. Why it was tacked on here, I do not know—but I see no harm done.

I want to commend the committee in this area. The second is a technical amendment that came in regard to a matter that had been considered at some length by both the Committee on Ways and Means, the Senate Finance Committee and the House of Representatives. There was a technical error in the bill here in defining what a cooperative bank was once we had amended the laws in regard to the Mutual Savings and Loan Act. This amendment, too, is what is

sometimes done, I might say improperly but without any real violation in conference where there is no verbiage in either the House version or the Senate version, but it is obviously a mistake or a slipup. Sometimes this is corrected in conference. I was very pleased to find the committee not doing that but coming back. So this is entirely a technical amendment and has to do with simply clarifying the terminology.

As to the third item, I must confess I have a little more difficulty when it comes to conforming to what I think are proper rules of germaneness. But it does relate to a procedural question involving two different statutes of limitations. It is not in that strictly technical sense a revenue-raising measure, but is a procedural thing.

As to the third, I certainly think it would be better procedure if it had been initiated in the House.

As to the other bill, I would like to call attention to the fact that there were very complicated amendments involving the taxation of life insurance companies. I feel it is more technical. I saw no reason and I see no reason now why this matter could not have been initiated in the House of Representatives as it should be and why it should not have been carried through in the proper fashion.

But for these reasons, and also to try to make a record, which is all I am trying to do here, I will not object and I will vote for this conference report.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased that the distinguished gentleman from Missouri can make the distinction between the amendments here involved and the amendments that were involved in the previous conference report. For the life of me, I cannot. They are matters that with the exception of the one amendment, as I started to point out earlier, are not related to the text of the matter that was in the House bill.

There is one amendment that I overlooked discussing which has to do with a retroactive application of the House-passed bill. That was suggested by our staff people and the Treasury people as a perfecting of the House bill. The conferees took that suggestion. But these basic amendments, in my opinion, involved in this conference report are not within the subject matter of the bill that passed the House any more than the others were. But I am pleased that my friend from Missouri can distinguish between them to his own satisfaction and I appreciate the right that he has to do that.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. If the gentleman will yield, I am glad the gentleman realizes the basic principle involved.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the conference report.

The previous question was ordered.

The conference report was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. LIBONATI. 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 Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. LIBONATI. Mr. Speaker, the approval of the conference report covering H.R. 12599 gives to terminal railroad corporations equitable income-tax treatment. The greatest expense of operating a railroad is terminal cost. To isolate this phase of the transportation business and ascribe to it profit, belies economic reality. H.R. 12599 represents the legislative solution to this problem in that terminal facilities are not profitable to transportation companies. This legislation has saved three lines from going into bankruptcy. I congratulate the chairman of the Ways and Means Committee, the gentleman from Arkansas, the Honorable WILBUR MILLS, and the members of the committee, for making possible the passage of this important legislation. Our Illinois dean, THOMAS O'BRIEN, was active in its support. The gentleman from California [Mr. KING], the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. BOGGS], the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MASON], and the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. BYRNES], together with Chairman MILLS guided the legislation in its passage, through the House as well as managers in the conference with the Senate.

The friendly attitude of the Senate indicated that they accepted the critical problem facing the railroads to the end that the very existence of these companies were threatened as a public service—under conditions of financial stability. Their approval was forthcoming in that H.R. 12599 authorized the permissive taxation of jointly owned railroad switching and terminal companies as partnerships. It was in good judgment that the managers on the part of the Senate, Senators BYRD, KERR, LONG, WILLIAMS, and CURTIS approved of this needed relief. Senator DOUGLAS and the gentlemen from Missouri [Mr. CURTIS and Mr. KARSTEN] also were in sympathy with the purposes of the legislation. We are proud of the House and Senate action in this matter. It instills confidence and stability of purpose in the business world to know that the Congress of the United States resolved the equities of the transportation companies and granted them the relief needed to keep them in private hands.

TAXABLE YEAR FOR CERTAIN SAVINGS INSTITUTIONS

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (H.R. 13358) relating to the taxable year for which the deduction for interest paid will be allowable to certain building and loan associations, mutual savings banks, and cooperative banks, which was unanimously reported by the Committee on Ways and Means without amendment on Friday of last week.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I do so only that we may have some time on this particular bill, because I think it does require some explanation in order that Members and the taxpayers involved may know what the committee

proposed to do and what the bill proposes to do.

I yield to my friend the gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. MILLS. I thank my friend for taking this time and giving me the opportunity to explain the bill in order that the Members may understand what is in it.

We had before the Ways and Means Committee, and the Senate Finance Committee had before it, the Revenue Act of 1962 that we agreed to on last Tuesday finally in the House. Our attention was directed to the fact, or possibility, that some building and loan associations might change their practice of paying the so-called dividend, or interest, from December of this year to January of 1963, and continue to pay the four quarterly payments that will be developed from earnings within the year 1963, making altogether five payments that could be deducted from gross income by the savings and loan association for interest paid, for purposes of determining the net income of the institution.

There are about 2,500 of these associations in the United States that would have had the privilege under the 1962 Revenue Act of changing their payment from say December 31 to January 1 or 2, and would have so affected their gross income and their net income for tax as to substantially reduce their 1963 taxes.

We on the committee are presumed to be smart enough always to anticipate these things, but we did not, and I must admit that the very fine, outstanding staff that works for the Ways and Means Committee and for the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation did not discover it. It was brought to our attention by people in the savings and loan business after it was said by the Treasury that they knew about it but they also overlooked calling it to our attention in the morass of work. I do not know whether the Treasury is entitled to credit or the savings and loan institutions themselves are entitled to the credit for first bringing this situation to our attention. They both contacted us.

But in view of the fact this simple change in the payment of interest in 1962 by some 2,500 institutions from December 31, 1962, into the taxable year January 1, 1963, could reduce revenues that we estimated would be received in 1963 from these mutual savings banks and building and loan companies from \$200 million to \$100 million, I would say there is room in all of these developments for both the Treasury and the people in the industry itself to claim some credit.

There is \$100 million, we understand, involved in this. If it does not pass, the net effect is that we would reduce the revenue-raising side of the Tax Revenue Act of 1962 by \$100 million and create more of a deficit between the cost of the bill and the revenue to be developed under that last bill.

This I discussed this morning with a representative of the industry, and he assured me that the industry is satisfied with this bill; that they will not object

to it; and, that they think the bill is required. We suggested that perhaps some alternative ways of doing it could be formulated, but they had not had an opportunity to consider those alternative ways. They said they have had an opportunity through their accountants and through their lawyers to consider this particular bill, and I was assured it was entirely agreeable to them.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. I want to thank the chairman for a very clear explanation, and also point out that the savings and loan companies came in and called attention to this. I make that statement because I read some press reports which I thought were quite unfair, suggesting that the way this was found out was because some of the savings and loan institutions were sort of boasting and joking about this loophole. That is in error. They came forward forthrightly and called this matter to the committee's attention. I would say, and I think the gentleman from Arkansas will agree, if we do not do this it would create a situation where some would abide by the spirit of the law, and many of them would, but there are those who would not, and it would create a difficult situation.

Mr. MILLS. Permit me to agree with the statement of the gentleman from Missouri. It would, if we did not pass this bill, bring about some degree of discrimination.

The gentleman will recall I said about half of the 5,000 institutions could move forward from December 31. Those organizations which are federally chartered under the home owners loan organization cannot change their final disbursement from December 31 to January. They would have to pay more tax than those institutions who could move the date forward 1 or 2 days.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I still think we would have discrimination to an extent, and I think some action will probably have to be taken to permit the federally regulated institutions to shift their dividend payment from December to January. Good business practice on the part of these institutions will dictate that they shift from a December payment date to a January payment date in order to carry forward deductions that really accrued in 1962, but can be used in 1963. On a long-range basis I think we can say this will not have any great impact, but it would have an effect in the future upon the liquidation of some institutions. They would then be taking both the deductions they were eligible to take for 1962, which we permit under this bill if payment is made in January, plus whatever payments would have been made in the year of liquidation.

It is my opinion that good business practice is probably going to require that they shift from a December payment date to a January payment date, which is going to cause some inconvenience to quite a large number of institutions and is going to require a change of the regu-

lations of the Home Loan Bank Board to permit this shift.

This might have been avoided if instead of the amendment before the House we had provided a simple cutoff date of December 31, 1962, beyond which the deduction for interest or dividends could not be carried forward by the savings and loan associations. Such an approach would have placed all savings and loan associations on an equal basis, and would have obviated the necessity for any determinations in the future by the Secretary of the Treasury. Unfortunately, time did not permit adequate consideration of this alternate approach by the institutions affected.

Mr. MILLS. I want to join my friend, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. BYRNES], in that suggestion. The point is this: that whenever one of these institutions should be liquidated in the future, if the institution is required to continue on the fixed disbursement date of December 31 and other institutions are permitted to change from December 31 to January 1, there will be some significant difference in the treatment of the two.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. And in their tax liability.

Mr. MILLS. That is right. The regulations of the Home Loan Bank Board could be changed so as to permit these Federal institutions to change the payment from December 31 to January 1, 1963. At the same time this legislation would require the December 31, 1963, payment then to be changed over to January 1, 1964. Therefore, there would only be four payments in that year and not five as may be permitted under the provisions of existing law.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. The gentleman is right, and I certainly agree with the gentleman that something should be done to correct this oversight, because if we really accomplish what the committee and the Congress thought we were accomplishing when we passed the Tax Revision Act of 1963, this will have to be done.

Mr. Speaker, I would point out, while I have the opportunity, that we will probably have to hold ourselves in readiness to take care of other oversights. I would call attention to the fact that today we have already corrected two oversights—or we corrected one and we are now in the process of correcting another oversight—in a bill which we just finished and sent to the President less than a week ago. I think we will find that there will be other matters that the Committee on Ways and Means and the Congress must hold themselves in readiness to correct, as they become known to us.

But I certainly agree that this should be done.

Mr. Speaker, I would make one further observation, and that is this: I am not positive that this is the most logical way to make the correction or it may not be the most appropriate way. But it is a way which accomplishes the objective, at least, that we seek to accomplish.

No. 2, it does have the general approval, at least, of the people who will be bearing the burden of the tax.

One thing which I do not like, Mr. Speaker, is the authority that it gives the Secretary of the Treasury in the future to control in a sense what these institutions can do by way of when they declare and pay their dividends. I think, if it were possible, I would like to see a situation where we could have avoided this additional delegation of authority to the Secretary of the Treasury. But under this procedure that has been developed under the bill as it has been reported, we cannot avoid that situation.

Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) section 461 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to general rule for taxable year of deduction) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(e) DIVIDENDS OR INTEREST PAID ON CERTAIN DEPOSITS OR WITHDRAWABLE ACCOUNTS.— Except as provided in regulations prescribed by the Secretary or his delegate, amounts paid to, or credited to the accounts of, depositors or holders of accounts as dividends or interest on their deposits or withdrawable accounts (if such amounts paid or credited are withdrawable on demand subject only to customary notice to withdraw) by a mutual savings bank not having capital stock represented by shares, a domestic building and loan association, or a cooperative bank shall not be allowed as a deduction for the taxable year to the extent such amounts are paid or credited for periods representing more than 12 months. Any such amount not allowed as a deduction as the result of the application of the preceding sentence shall be allowed as a deduction for such other taxable year as the Secretary or his delegate determines to be consistent with the preceding sentence."

(b) The amendment made by subsection (a) shall apply only with respect to taxable years ending after December 31, 1962.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to further extend my remarks on the bill just passed and that the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. BYRNES] may also be permitted to further extend his remarks.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, the bill, H.R. 13358, which was unanimously reported by the Committee on Ways and Means concerns the taxable year for which mutual savings banks, domestic building and loan associations, and cooperative banks will be permitted to claim a deduction for interest paid to depositors in these institutions. The enactment of this bill has been urged by the Treasury Department.

The Members of the House will recall that the Revenue Act of 1962 contains provisions which are designed to increase the share of the tax burden that

is to be borne by savings institutions commencing in 1963. However, the Treasury Department has advised your committee that these institutions may substantially limit their 1963 tax liability or the tax liability of some future year, by "bunching" their interest deductions in such year. This could be accomplished by the simple expedient of, for example, postponing a scheduled December 1962 interest payment date to January of 1963 or, conversely by accelerating a normal January 1964 interest payment date to December of 1963, thereby bunching the payment of and the deduction of interest attributable to more than a 12-month period into 1 taxable year.

Mr. Speaker, this bill is designed to preclude such manipulations for tax purposes by providing, in effect, that the allowable deduction for interest payments made by these institutions in any one taxable year cannot exceed the interest attributable to a 12-month period. The bill provides regulatory authority to the Secretary of the Treasury to permit the deduction for longer periods where it is established that this does not involve tax avoidance.

Mr. Speaker, the Treasury Department has estimated that well over one-half of the increase in estimated revenues under the provisions of the Revenue Act of 1962 relating to savings institutions may be lost if this bill is not enacted. The Treasury Department estimates that in a full year of operation the provisions relating to savings institutions will produce \$200 million; the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation, \$170 million. Without enactment of this legislation this would mean the revenue loss would run in the area of \$85 to \$100 million or larger.

Information obtained from the Federal Home Loan Bank Board indicates that there are little or no supervisory restrictions which would prevent the shifting of year-end dividends in the manner indicated. The revenue consequences of a shift are large because a single quarterly dividend is likely to be about as large as the income of the institution.

I strongly urge the favorable consideration of this legislation by my colleagues in the House.

TEMPORARY SUSPENSION OF DUTIES ON CORKBOARD INSULATION

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill—H.R. 12213—to provide for the temporary suspension of the duties on corkboard insulation and on cork stoppers, with Senate amendments thereto, disagree to the Senate amendments, and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

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

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, does this bill contain any amendments added by the Senate to the bill as it passed the House?

Mr. MILLS. There are eight amendments that were added to this bill—seven to the text and one to the title. The gentleman will recall that this is a bill that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SCHNEEBELI] introduced, which was reported by the Committee on Ways and Means and passed by the House unanimously, dealing with a temporary suspension of the duty on cork board insulation. In any event, there was no objection to that bill. There were some amendments added by the Senate. I think what the gentleman has in mind is whether or not these amendments may include matters that have not been studied by the Committee on Ways and Means.

Mr. DEROUNIAN. That is correct.

Mr. MILLS. Amendments that have not been before the Committee on Ways and Means.

Mr. DEROUNIAN. That is correct.

Mr. MILLS. I would certainly have to admit that some of the amendments adopted fall into that category.

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Speaker, then I must object.

EXTENSION OF CONTRACT MAIL ROUTES

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H.R. 10936) to permit the Postmaster General to extend contract mail routes up to 100 miles during the contract term, 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:

After line 6, insert:

"Sec. 2. (a) Section 4369 of title 39, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

"§ 4369. Filing of information relating to publications of the second class

"(a) Each owner of a publication having second-class mail privileges under section 4354 of this title shall furnish to the Postmaster General at least once a year, and shall publish in such publication once a year, information in such form and detail and at such time as he may require respecting—

"(1) the identity of the editor, managing editor, publishers, and owners;

"(2) the identity of the corporation and stockholders thereof, if the publication is owned by a corporation;

"(3) the identity of known bondholders, mortgagees, and other security holders;

"(4) the extent and nature of the circulation of the publication, including, but not limited to, the number of copies distributed, the methods of distribution, and the extent to which such circulation is paid in whole or in part: *Provided, however,* That trade publications serving the performing arts need only to furnish such information to the Postmaster General; and

"(5) such other information as he may deem necessary to determine whether the publication meets the standards for second-class mail privileges.

The Postmaster General shall not require the names of persons owning less than 1 per centum of the total amount of stocks, bonds, mortgages, or other securities.

"(b) Each publication having second-class mail privileges under section 4355(b) of this title shall furnish to the Postmaster General information in such form and detail,

and at such times, as he requires to determine whether the publication continues to qualify thereunder. In addition, the Postmaster General may require each publication which has second-class mail privileges under section 4355(a) or 4356 of this title to furnish information, in such form and detail, and at such times as he may require, to determine whether the publication continues to qualify thereunder.

"(c) The Postmaster General shall make appropriate rules and regulations to carry out the purposes of this section, including provision for suspension or revocation of second-class mail privileges for failure to furnish the required information."

"(b) The table of contents of chapter 63 of such title is amended by striking out

"4369. Affidavits relating to publications of the second class."

and inserting in lieu thereof

"4369. Filing of information relating to publications of the second class."

After line 6, insert:

"Sec. 3. The second paragraph of section 2 of the Act of August 24, 1912, as amended by the Act of June 11, 1960 (74 Stat. 208; Public Law 86-513), and by paragraph 34 of the first section of the Act of June 11, 1960 (74 Stat. 202; Public Law 86-507), is hereby repealed."

Amend the title so as to read: "An Act to permit the Postmaster General to extend contract mail routes up to one hundred miles during the contract term, and for other purposes."

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

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object; as I understand it, this is a bill that provides for an increase from 50 to 100 miles in contract routes; and also provides for certain filing on the part of publications with the Post Office Department; is that correct?

Mr. MURRAY. That is correct.

The first section of this bill, as amended in the other body, consists of the language of the bill, H.R. 10936, as passed on the Consent Calendar by the House on September 4, 1962. The second section consists of the language of H.R. 10696, passed on the Consent Calendar by the House on October 1, 1962, to which the Senate added a three-line proviso.

Both H.R. 10936 and H.R. 10696 were unanimously approved by the House Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, and both are based on official recommendations of the Post Office Department.

The first section of the Senate-passed bill authorizes the Postmaster General to increase the one-way length of a route under a mail transportation contract in an aggregate amount of not more than 100 miles during the contract term, in place of the present limitation of not more than 50 miles.

The second section, as added by the Senate amendment, clarifies and modernizes provisions of law, first enacted in 1912, which require second-class publications to file certain information with the Post Office Department showing their entitlement to second-class entry and to publish it each year. The 1912 law is popularly known as the Newspaper Publicity Act.

The other body merely combined these two House-approved bills and added a

three-line proviso. The proviso provides for continuance of the existing practice under which trade publications serving the performing arts submit required information to the Post Office Department but do not publish it. The Post Office Department has no objection to the proviso.

Mr. GROSS. And there was a Senate amendment inserted in the bill that excepts two publications from the required filing. This would be my criticism; however, I am not going to object to the passage of the bill. My criticism is to the fact that it excepts two publications from the requirement that all other publications in the country must meet.

Mr. MORRIS K. UDALL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. MORRIS K. UDALL. Mr. Speaker, I served on the subcommittee which processed this feature of the bill to which the gentleman refers. I want to say that I share his misgivings about the provisions that the Senate inserted. I felt that the House bill really tightened up the Newspaper Publicity Act and made it much stronger. I was a little bit unhappy that the Senate saw fit to except from the provisions that we had written, the two publications to which the gentleman refers. I think, however, that the bill as it comes back to us from the Senate is such a good bill and accomplishes so many worthwhile things that I would not want to see the whole measure shot down in flames because of this one unsatisfactory provision.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I agree with the gentleman, and thank him for the sentiments he has expressed. However, I would like assurance, if I may have it from the chairman and perhaps other members of the committee, that next year the committee will hold hearings to obtain information as to why these publications were excepted.

Mr. MORRIS K. UDALL. Speaking for myself, I certainly would want the hearings, and I would be glad to cosponsor with the gentleman a bill to eliminate these two publications now excepted and get some information as to why this was done and what justification there is for their exclusion.

Mr. GROSS. If the gentleman from Iowa is fortunate enough to be reelected, he will join the gentleman from Arizona. We will do exactly that if I am reelected.

Mr. MORRIS K. UDALL. I do not think there is much doubt about that.

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. HOSMER. What are the publications that are excepted; will the gentleman state what they are?

Mr. GROSS. The bill specifies trade publications serving the performing arts, which, as I understand it, may mean Billboard and Variety. Why these two should be excepted, I do not know.

Mr. HOSMER. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. I agree with the statement that has been made by the gentleman from Iowa and the gentleman from Arizona. I hope the committee will look into this further next year. However, on behalf of the minority members of the committee, may I say that we will not object to the passage of this bill.

Mr. Speaker, I would like the legislative history on this particular bill to be perfectly clear. In the hearings it was developed that annual publication of ownership and circulation information served a very useful purpose, and that publication of this data is in the public interest. Publications are required to print the information annually at the present time. In the past nonprofit publications have not been required even to file information.

In the bill now before us, nonprofit publications will supply the information, but are not required to publish it, nor are profitmaking publications serving the performing arts.

Even though this information in these cases does not have to be printed in the publication, certainly it must be the intent of Congress that this data be available to the general public. After all, we are dealing with what is called the second-class privilege. Newspapers and magazines are carried at lower rates, and properly so, because of the public interest nature of publications which qualify for that rate. Now merely because this bill says that a few publications, whether in section 4369(a) or section 4369(b), title 39 of the code, after this bill is enacted, need only furnish ownership and circulation information to the Postmaster General, I would like to be certain that this information will be generally available and that no wall of secrecy will be created by the Post Office Department about it.

I support the bill but feel that the legislative history should show that we are not making any of this information classified. Since these publications use second-class mail for which Congress has historically made special provision, we in Congress and the general public have a right to have this information available whether or not it is published in any particular magazine.

Mr. OLSEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentleman from Montana.

Mr. OLSEN. Mr. Speaker, I wish to subscribe to the remarks of the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. CUNNINGHAM]. I also agree that we do not want the exclusion of these magazines which serve the performing arts to include any more publications than just the two that have been mentioned. Like the gentleman from Iowa, I do think there should be some hearings to determine just why these two magazines have been excepted.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

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

There was no objection.

The Senate amendments were concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

UNPATENTED MINING CLAIMS

Mrs. PFOST. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on 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, and ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers on the part of the House be read in lieu of the report.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Idaho?

Mr. SAYLOR. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, will the gentlewoman explain the bill, and yield me some time to speak on this matter?

Mrs. PFOST. I will be very glad to. The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Idaho?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

The conference report and statement are as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT (H. REPT. NO. 2545)

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the House to 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, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the House and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by the House amendment insert the following: "That the Secretary of the Interior may convey to any occupant of an unpatented mining claim which is determined by the Secretary to be invalid an interest, up and including a fee simple, in and to an area within the claim of not more than (a) five acres or (b) the acreage actually occupied by him, whichever is less. The Secretary may make a like conveyance to any occupant of an unpatented mining claim who, after notice from a qualified officer of the United States that the claim is believed to be invalid, relinquishes to the United States all right in and to such claim which he may have under the mining laws. Any conveyance authorized by this section, however, shall be made only to a qualified applicant, as that term is defined in section 2 of this Act, who applies therefor within five years from the date of this Act and upon payment of an amount established in accordance with section 5 of this Act.

"As used in this section, the term 'qualified officer of the United States' means the Secretary of the Interior or an employee of the Department of the Interior so designated by him: *Provided*, That the Secretary may delegate his authority to designate qualified officers to the head of any other department or agency of the United States with respect to lands within the administrative jurisdiction of that department or agency.

"Sec. 2. For the purposes of this Act a qualified applicant is a residential occupant-owner, as of the date of enactment of this Act, of valuable improvements in an unpatented mining claim which constitute for him a principal place of residence and which he and his predecessors in interest were in

possession of for not less than seven years prior to July 23, 1962.

"Sec. 3. Where the lands for which application is made under section 1 of this Act have been withdrawn in aid of a function of a Federal department or agency other than the Department of the Interior, or of a State, county, municipality, water district, or other local governmental subdivision or agency, the Secretary of the Interior may convey an interest therein only with the consent of the head of the governmental unit concerned and under such terms and conditions as said head may deem necessary.

"Sec. 4. (a) If the Secretary of the Interior determines that conveyance of an interest under section 1 of this Act is otherwise justified but the consent required by section 3 of this Act is not given, he may, in accordance with such procedural rules and regulations as he may prescribe, grant the applicant a right to purchase, for residential use, an interest in another tract of land, five acres or less in area, from tracts made available by him for sale under this Act (1) from the unappropriated and unreserved lands of the United States, or (2) from lands subject to classification under section 7 of the Taylor Grazing Act (48 Stat. 1272), as amended (43 U.S.C. 315f). Said right shall not be granted until arrangements satisfactory to the Secretary have been made for termination of the applicant's occupancy of his unpatented mining claim and for settlement of any liability for the unauthorized use thereof which may have been incurred and shall expire five years from the date on which it was granted unless sooner exercised. The amount to be paid for the interest shall be determined in accordance with section 5 of this Act.

"(b) Any conveyance of less than a fee made under this Act shall include provision for removal from the tract of any improvements or other property of the applicant at the close of the period for which the conveyance is made, or if it be an interest terminating on the death of the applicant, within one year thereafter.

"Sec. 5. The Secretary of the Interior, prior to any conveyance under this Act, shall determine the fair market value of the interest to be conveyed, exclusive of the value of any improvements placed on the lands involved by the applicant or his predecessors in interest. Said value shall be determined as of the date of appraisal. In establishing the purchase price to be paid by the applicant for the interest, the Secretary shall take into consideration any equities of the applicant and his predecessors in interest, including conditions of prior use and occupancy. In any event, the purchase price for any interest conveyed shall not exceed its fair market value nor be less than \$5 per acre. The Secretary may, in his discretion, allow payment to be made in installments.

"Sec. 6. (a) The execution of a conveyance as authorized by section 1 of this Act shall not relieve any occupant of the land conveyed of any liability, existing on the date of said conveyance, to the United States for unauthorized use of the land in and to which an interest is conveyed.

"(b) Except where a mining claim embracing land applied for under this Act by a qualified applicant was located at a time when the land included therein was withdrawn or otherwise not subject to such location, no trespass charges shall be sought or collected by the United States from any qualified applicant who has filed an application for land in the mining claim pursuant to this Act, based upon occupancy of such claim, whether residential or otherwise, for any period preceding the final administrative determination of the invalidity of the mining claim by the Secretary of the Interior or the voluntary relinquishment of the mining claim, whichever occurs earlier. Nothing

contained in this Act shall be construed as creating any liability for trespass to the United States which would not exist in the absence of this Act. Relief under this section shall be limited to persons who file applications for conveyances pursuant to section 1 of this Act within five years from the date of its enactment.

"Sec. 7. In any conveyance under this Act the mineral interests of the United States in the lands conveyed are hereby reserved for the term of the estate conveyed. Minerals locatable under the mining laws or disposable under the Act of July 31, 1947 (61 Stat. 681), as amended (30 U.S.C. 601-604), are hereby withdrawn from all forms of entry and appropriation for the term of the estate. The underlying oil, gas, and other leaseable minerals of the United States are hereby reserved for exploration and development purposes, but without the right of surface ingress and egress, and may be leased by the Secretary under the mineral leasing laws.

"Sec. 8. Rights and privileges to qualify as an applicant under this Act shall not be assignable, but may pass through devise or descent.

"Sec. 9. Payments of filing fees and survey costs, and the payments of the purchase price for patents in fee shall be disposed of by the Secretary of the Interior as are such fees, costs, and purchase prices in the disposition of public lands. All payments and fees for occupancy in conveyances of less than the fee, or for permits for life or shorter periods, shall be disposed of by the administering department or agency as are other receipts for the use of the lands involved."

And the House agree to the same.

GRACIE POST,
WALTER S. BARING,
HAROLD T. JOHNSON,
GLENN CUNNINGHAM,

Managers on the Part of the House.

ALAN BIBLE,
FRANK CHURCH,
HENRY M. JACKSON,
THOMAS H. KUCHEL,
GORDON ALLOTT,

Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to 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, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon and recommended in the accompanying conference report as to the amendment to the text of the bill:

The amendment to S.3451 which was adopted in the House differed from the bill as it came from the Senate in many respects. The principal differences between the two versions and the disposition of these differences recommended in the substitute which the conference committee proposes are as follows:

1. The House version would have permitted any "seasonal or year-round residential occupant-owner, as of January 10, 1962" of improved land in an unpatented mining claim which is found to be invalid or is relinquished or which, within 2 years preceding the date of the act, was found to be invalid or was relinquished, to apply for relief under the act. The Senate version used July 23, 1962, as the critical date, required the applicant to be a citizen or declarant, and provided that the improvements should be "a principal place of residence" for him and that he or his predecessor in interest should have been in possession of the claim for at least 7 years. The conference committee recommends, in substance, adoption of the Senate

"principal place of residence," 7-year possession, and July 23, 1962, tests, and omits the citizenship provision as unnecessary and the retrospective 2-year provision as inconsistent with certain other provisions of the conference amendment.

(The conference committee notes that the amendment it proposes does not require the mining claim to be the principal place of residence of an applicant. It requires, rather, that it be a principal place of residence. This is intended to avoid problems in cases in which weather and topography make the site, though suitable for continuous occupancy for several months each year, impossible for the remainder of the time. It also eliminates, on the other hand, the occasional weekender who cannot, in good faith, be said to use the site as a principal place of residence. It is also noted that the expression "occupant-owner" is not intended to ratify claims of ownership in the usual sense of the word; it is used to describe persons who have constructed improvements, regardless of whether title might ultimately be found to be in them or in the Government.)

2. The House version did not explicitly provide for conveyance of anything less than a fee simple. The Senate version, however, provided for conveyance of a life estate or lesser interest in appropriate cases. The conference committee version follows, in effect, the Senate provisions in this respect.

3. The House version would have allowed applications to be filed at any time during the next 3 years and required a lieu-selection right to be exercised within 2 years from the date it is granted. The Senate version provided 5 years in each of these cases. The conference committee recommends adoption of the Senate provisions on these points.

4. The House version provided that if an applicant is not permitted to acquire a home-site on his mining claim because such acquisition is inconsistent with the public interest or because the necessary consent is not given by an agency in aid of whose functions the land is withdrawn, the Secretary of the Interior "will" grant a "preference" right to purchase certain other lands. The Senate version made the granting of such a right a matter of secretarial discretion and omitted the "preference" phraseology. The conference committee version adopts these features of the Senate bill. It provides, however, that an in-lieu right may be granted only if the Secretary finds that conveyance of an interest in the original mining claim lands would be "justified" but cannot be granted because necessary consents cannot be had.

5. The House and Senate versions limited the lands that could be used for lieu selections to certain unappropriated and unreserved lands of the United States and certain lands which are subject to classification under section 7 of the Taylor Grazing Act. To this the Senate version added provision for conveyances of life interests in withdrawn lands, such conveyances to be made by the head of the department for whose benefit the lands are withdrawn. The conference committee version deletes the provision covering withdrawn lands since it is in large measure fully covered by other provisions of the bill, and in the form in which it appeared in the Senate version, would have scattered authority to make conveyances and would have allowed an agency administering land under temporary withdrawal to grant life interests outrunning the period for which the withdrawal is effective.

6. The House version provided for payment of fair market value of the lands conveyed, this value to be determined as of the date of the act. The Senate version provided for payment of not less than \$5 per acre nor more than fair market value, determined as of the date of appraisal, in

the case of fee transfers of lands held more than 20 years; \$5 or fair market value, whichever is greater, in the case of other fee transfers; and not less than \$5 per acre nor more than 50 percent of fair market value for transfers of a life estate or lesser interest. It also provided that in making an appraisal "the Secretary shall consider and give full effect to the equities" of the applicant and that, in the case of transfers of a life or lesser interest, he might provide for payments "on an annual payment schedule." The conference committee version provides that fair market value shall be found as of the date of appraisal, fixes a minimum sale price of \$5 per acre and a maximum price of fair market value, requires the Secretary to take equities into account when determining the purchase price, and allows him to accept installment payments.

7. Both the House and the Senate versions reserved all minerals to the United States, withdrew the locatable minerals, and provided for the leasing of leasable minerals. The House version included, but the Senate version omitted, provisions permitting grantees to allow exploration for locatable minerals and to purchase them from the United States at any time. The Senate version included, and the House version omitted, provision that lessees of the leasable minerals should not have rights of ingress or egress to the surface of lands conveyed under the act. The conference committee version adopts, in substance, the Senate version with respect to minerals. The committee notes that, although surface ingress and egress is not reserved, many minerals (particularly oil and gas) can frequently be extracted by such means as slant drilling and that the reservation from a conveyance of the leasable minerals for exploration and development includes exploration and development by all means which do not involve an invasion of the surface during the term of the estate or interest conveyed.

8. The Senate version included a requirement that the conveying agency, before making a conveyance, should consult with local authorities "to determine the effect of a proposed conveyance upon the services of Government which might be then required." The House version contained no such provision. The conference committee version follows the House in this respect.

9. The Senate version included provisions with respect to the disposition of moneys received under the act. The House version included no comparable provision. The conference committee version adopts the Senate language which substantially reaffirms the law that would apply in any event.

10. The Senate version provided that the execution of a conveyance should not relieve the occupant of an unpatented mining claim of liability for unauthorized use of the lands conveyed to him that had theretofore accrued "except to the extent that the Secretary of the Interior deems equitable in the circumstances." The House version omitted the quoted language. So, too, does the conference committee version.

In addition to the points noted above, the conference committee version of the bill contains many minor clarifying language changes from the text of the Senate or House versions of the bill.

GRACIE PFOST,
WALTER S. BARING,
HAROLD T. JOHNSON,
GLENN CUNNINGHAM,

Managers on the Part of the House.

Mrs. PFOST. Mr. Speaker, it is with real pleasure and a sense of achievement that I bring before the House for approval today the report of the committee of conference on S. 3451, an act

that will provide essential relief to residential occupants who have placed valuable improvements on lands held on mining claims and who now, for the most part, through no fault of their own, are unable to proceed to obtain title to the land under the mining laws.

This is a bill that will save the homes of small families. It will save the homes of hard working American families that have been occupying public lands in good faith in anticipation of obtaining title.

I shall not dwell further on the purpose and background of the bill except to remind the House that on September 17 last this body suspended the rules and passed S. 3451 with an amendment that substituted the language of the House bill (H.R. 12761) by the gentleman from California [Mr. JOHNSON].

The bill we passed was a good one; but I earnestly recommend to the House the bill that has come out of conference as an even better one, and I will hit the high spots of what we have accomplished in conference.

As recommended by the conference committee, an applicant to qualify will be required to have been a residential occupant owner as of July 23, 1955, on a mining claim which for him constitutes a principal place of residence. In the bill passed by the House last month, the critical date of occupancy was January 10, 1962. The House conferees, in recommending that the House recede from its position, recognized that July 23, 1955, represents a logical date from which to base occupancy because that is the date on which a statute became effective making it clear for the first time that mining claims were not to be used and occupied for nonmining purposes. The effect of using this date is to eliminate from possible consideration to receive the benefits of the legislation now before the House any persons who might have sought to subvert the mining laws.

The varying versions passed by the House and the Senate both contemplated that there might be conveyances to occupants of an interest less than fee title. However, the Senate bill made this explicit and the House conferees recommend this provision so that the administrators will have no doubt about their authority to grant, for example, a life estate in an area where the Government itself has a long-range requirement for the property.

The final major item in disagreement relates to the formula to be used in determining the monetary consideration to be paid by a residential occupant for the purchase of his property. The committee of conference recommends the procedure we have agreed upon, which requires the Secretary of the Interior to determine the fair market value of the interest to be conveyed; thereafter the Secretary would take into consideration any equities of the applicant and his predecessors in interest and establish a purchase price that would be no more than the appraised market value but not less than \$5 per acre which, I should point out, is the amount that, generally speaking, would have to be paid if title to the property were being acquired under the mining laws. This price formula is a com-

promise between the provisions that were contained in the House and Senate bills. We think it is fair to the occupant while protecting the interest of the United States.

There were, of course, other differences between the bills; but they were not of such significance, Mr. Speaker, as to require detailed analysis. Each and every difference and the recommended solution is set forth in great detail in the statement of the managers on the part of the House which I hope each Member has at his desk.

This legislation is needed and it is needed now. Unless we act promptly, some of these families may face eviction from their long-established homes. It would be tragic to have any family evicted and then have the same land put up for sale on the open market merely because there is no provision in general law whereby the present occupant can obtain a preference or priority right.

I urge adoption of the conference report.

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. PFOST. Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SAYLOR].

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, I find it necessary for me to take exception to the conference report which has been filed in this case. This bill was brought up under suspension and at the time I asked the House to vote in favor of suspension of the rules. I did so because the action of the other body in handling this bill led me to believe the Senate was cognizant of the evils which had arisen as a result of certain uses of mining claims and were conscientiously attempting to remedy a bad situation. I say they were conscientiously trying to remedy a bad situation because the original author of the bill in the House, the gentleman from California [Mr. JOHNSON], called the attention of our committee to certain cases where there had been real hardships.

For example, he pointed out one or two towns and he gave us the maps together with the overlay showing that the people had originally gone into an area that had been actively used for mining, filed mining claims and had built homes. Those homes have been there not for just 7 years, as provided in this bill, but they have been there for three and four generations in some cases. They have been handed down from father to son. They have been sold. Unless something is done to give these people relief, a real hardship will take place.

However, there is another group of people who have filed mining claims who never intended to prospect for any minerals whatsoever. What they were looking for was a nice place in a national forest or some beautiful spot in our public domain for the purpose of building a nice weekend cottage; and they have it. This has become almost a national scandal. The late Bernard DeVoto was responsible for writing a series of articles calling this to the attention of the American people and calling attention to this use of mining claims for summer cottages, other illegal uses, and they have been stopped.

The Comptroller General of the United States in May of this year published a report and I quote from a portion of that report:

The use of unpatented mining claims for purposes not related to mining is not in accord with the intent of the mining laws. Judicial decisions dating back to the 19th century state that possession of an unpatented mining claim does not confer the right to take timber or otherwise make use of the surface of the claim except as may be necessary for mining. * * *

Mining claims, many of which are located in areas where there are vast quantities of merchantable timber, are hindering the effective administration of national forest lands by preventing Forest Service access to Federal timber and other resources. In some cases we reviewed, planned sales of many millions of board feet of timber, some of which was overmature, diseased, and insect-infested, had been postponed for long periods because of lack of rights-of-way across mining claims. * * *

Mining claims, many of which are located in areas where there are vast quantities of merchantable timber, are hindering the effective administration of national forest lands by preventing Forest Service access to Federal timber and other resources.

However, the more than 1,100,000 unpatented claims in the national forests may in the future constitute an even greater hindrance to management of the forests because, as patents are obtained on claims, the Government usually loses all rights to the use of the claims, including rights-of-way across them.

Numerous unpatented mining claims in national forests are apparently being used for purposes not related to mining. Permanent residences, summer homes, townsites, orchards, commercial enterprises, farming, and a house of ill repute are examples of uses made of some unpatented claim sites.

Forest Service officials stated that the primary objective of increasing numbers of people who have mining claims is simply a desire to have a place in the mountains to go to and enjoy and ultimately to own, without regard to requirements of the mining laws.

This conference report goes even further than the House bill. The House bill that the gentleman from California [Mr. JOHNSON] introduced said that anyone who did not have a claim on the 10th day of January 1962, when he filed this bill, would have no right whatsoever. The conference report updated that to the 23d day of July 1962, and put a provision in here that it should be not the principal place of residence, but it should be a principal place of residence. Further that the only requirement should be that the present occupant or his predecessor in interest should have been in possession for at least 7 years.

The Forest Service is opposed to this type of legislation.

It is for these reasons that I feel that this conference report should be rejected. The situation which the gentleman from California [Mr. JOHNSON] originally intended to take care of in his bill is one of real hardship, and I could say to him that I would be happy to cooperate, if reelected to the 88th Congress, to see to it that these people are taken care of. But I am opposed to bills of this type which will allow the actual rape of the national forests and our public lands.

This is the challenge that we have before us and I hope that we will measure up to that challenge.

I realize that opposing a conference report is rather difficult, but I intend to ask for a vote on final passage, and I sincerely hope that the House will reject this conference report.

The date that should be adopted is January 1, 1920. On this date you can take care of all of the people who went into the mining areas during World War I and before that time and did a job and have since considered that their home. But if we adopt the date of July 23, 1962, all we will do is enrich a number of people who have performed in the first instance an illegal act.

I hope that the conference report is turned down.

Mrs. PFOST. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. JOHNSON].

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the conference report.

Mr. Speaker, I want to say that the article or the investigation referred to by the gentleman from Pennsylvania has no application to this report whatsoever. There is no change in the mining laws. The Secretary of Agriculture through the Forest Service or the Secretary of the Interior through the Bureau of Land Management has a right today to move in on any mining claim as to the validity of the mining claim. Therefore, we have not changed that in this particular piece of legislation.

When we met in conference, we went into this matter, and as far as the Forest Service is concerned and the Department of Agriculture, they are not in opposition to the conference report. I might say all conferees, both on the Senate side and the House side, with the exception of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SAYLOR] agreed to this conference report.

As far as the Bureau of Land Management is concerned, the only time this will come into effect is when the Bureau of Land Management is wanting to dispose of some land as they are throughout the West at the present time.

This would give the present occupant of an unpatented mining claim, who has his place of residence there, a preference, or a privilege to ask for the right to purchase that piece of property at fair market value, with all of the mineral rights being retained by the U.S. Government. This is certainly no giveaway. This land in the West is being disposed of each and every day of the year.

In this conference report we give a right to the agency of the Government to grant a life estate or lesser estate or to grant up to and including a fee title. I am certain that the Bureau of Land Management wants to grant a fee in the land that they dispose of, because at the present time in these areas they are disposing of many tracts of land under the Small Tracts Act. In these cases the individual will only have the right to purchase up to 5 acres. It has been my experience in California in the areas where this is being done at the present time under the Small Tract Act that

those lands were less than 5 acres, and they were sold at fair market value. Fair market value was as high as \$1,100 an acre.

I am sure no Member in this Congress would want to deprive an American citizen of a place to live in this country. These people have filed these claims. They were legitimate claims and many of them are just as legitimate today as in the days when they were filed upon. These people are very hard pressed. In my country, in many of the counties, 85 percent of the land is owned by the Federal Government. We have very little private land left. These people are living in their homes that were built there, and they are only asking for a preference if and when this land is going to be put up for sale they may go in and negotiate with the agency of Government and pay the fair market value at the time the lands will be acquired or sold.

Since coming to the Congress I have watched all sorts of redevelopment measures. We have furnished housing throughout the United States for many people. We have furnished housing throughout the world for many of the people in undeveloped countries. We are only asking for a right or a preference to go in there and purchase this land from the U.S. Government at fair market value. This is no raid upon the Federal land reserves. These are only lands that the Government wishes to dispose of, and in the instance of the lands within the National Forest reserves there will be no land sold.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

Mrs. PFOST. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman 5 additional minutes.

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of California. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. SAYLOR. The gentleman from California speaks of land that is being put up for public sale. This is land that is presently under the control of the Secretary of the Interior and the Bureau of Land Management; is that correct?

Mr. JOHNSON of California. In some specific cases it is also land that is under the jurisdiction of the Department of Agriculture.

Mr. SAYLOR. The ones in the national forests are not being put up for sale?

Mr. JOHNSON of California. That is correct. Most of the lands are mining claims that are being considered by the Forest Service. If the applicant is willing to waive the surface rights, then the applicant is left to remain there and live there.

Mr. SAYLOR. In other words, he is given a license or a permit to live there for a period of years?

Mr. JOHNSON of California. He is not given a permit. He merely remains there and so far has not been disturbed.

Mr. Speaker, this bill would allow the Forest Service to give him a life estate or lease.

Mr. Speaker, since this bill has been before the Congress for a considerable length of time—the House passed a version under suspension of the rules and

the Senate passed a version under a unanimous vote—the bill has been thoroughly considered in conference. All the conferees with the exception of one, the gentleman from Pennsylvania, have agreed to this conference report.

Mr. Speaker, I am sure that there is nothing in this bill that would harm or raid the Federal land reserves. We are merely trying to take care of Americans so that they might have a place to live.

Mr. Speaker, I might say that in these mountain counties about which I speak and which are found elsewhere in the West, this is about the only place we have on which to build a home. Most of them are straight up and down. Many of these claims are on level areas where people have placed their homes and have lived there for a long time. In many of the communities which it is my pleasure to represent practically the entire town is located on mining claims.

Mr. Speaker, I think this Congress certainly wants to take care of that type of American citizen who is willing to take care of himself and is willing to pay a fair market value for the small parcel of land which he is going to use for his home.

Mrs. PFOST. Mr. Speaker, I think three points made by the gentleman from Pennsylvania need to be answered.

First is the reference to the presence of a house of ill repute on an unpatented mining claim which, I say, is an attempt to get headlines on this legislation. It has no bearing, because in the report of the Comptroller General, although made in 1962, it is pointed out that a court injunction enjoining and restraining the illegal operation had been obtained in December 1957.

The Federal Government, through that action and the commendable diligence of the Forest Service, regained possession of the property in July 1960. This shows that our administrators are enforcing the law. In addition, these people in any event would not be qualified under this legislation because it applies to residences and such illegal use would not be embraced.

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mrs. PFOST. Yes.

Mr. SAYLOR. I might say to my good colleague, the gentleman from Idaho, if I were seeking to get headlines, I would have referred to that part of the report which says there was a nudist colony conducted on one of these areas. Also, had I been given an opportunity to read further, I would have advised further that the house of ill repute for 7 years was closed, the nuisance was abated, and the mining claim was declared null and void.

Mrs. PFOST. Mr. Speaker, since the gentleman from Pennsylvania has brought up the question of the nudist colony, I want to point out that it was located on patented land and has no relationship to the legislation now under consideration.

Mr. Speaker, there are two other points which I should like to bring up.

The proposal to go back to January 1920 as the date of occupancy for qualification under the legislation has no basis

in logic. It is intended to destroy the effectiveness of the bill that is before the House today.

I submit, Mr. Speaker, that the date of July 23, 1955, as the base time from which an occupant or his predecessor in interest must have been occupying an unpatented mining claim is a reasonable, logical, compromise solution of a difficult problem. Like all compromises it is not perfect.

The House bill approached the problem on the theory that this is relief legislation and that therefore the relief should be available to all occupants as of the approximate date on which the proposed introduction of legislation was announced. This date was January 10, 1962; and the House bill would have permitted residential owner-occupants of unpatented mining claims of that date to qualify for the purchase of their homesites. We thought this made good sense in keeping with the general principle behind relief legislation: wipe the slate clean as of the date on which you decide to provide relief.

The Senate version referred to 7 years occupancy prior to July 23, 1962, thereby establishing the July 23, 1955 date. There is considerable merit to this approach both from the standpoint of the fact that, against anyone but the Government, a person could in many States in 7 years obtain title through adverse possession; likewise, the date coincided with the enactment of the Multiple Use Act of 1955 which limited surface use of mining claim areas to mining activities. From that date forward, persons staking mining claims did so under a law that specifically limited their rights of occupancy.

When we went to conference, the dispute on this point was January 10, 1962, versus July 23, 1955. We have adopted the more restrictive Senate approach; we have recommended that the House recede from its position; and we think we have a date that has been justified both in fairness to the occupants and in protecting the national interest.

I would also like to restate this point: If we are going to grant relief to these people, we could not go back any earlier than 1955 without destroying the very basis and concept of the legislation.

Mr. Speaker, let us remember that this act is discretionary and will not give benefits to those who do not act in good faith. It is permissive and discretionary legislation.

Mr. Speaker, in further support of the conference report on S. 3451, I want to set the record straight as it relates to certain statements that were made on the floor of the House by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DINGELL] at the time this measure was originally passed by the House.

First. The statement that 1.1 million people have mining claims that would result in 2.2 million acres of the public domain being disposed of under the bill is an erroneous conclusion.

The report of the Comptroller General of the United States submitted to the Congress in May 1962 indicates that there are approximately 1.1 million unpatented mining claims within the na-

tional forests. I think that everyone knows that the great majority of such claims are not occupied. The bill would apply only to lands used for residential purposes and upon which valuable improvements have been constructed. I am advised that the gentleman from Michigan was told that there were probably about 10,000 such unpatented mining claims in the national forests which, based on his arithmetic of 2 acres per claim, would result in a maximum of 20,000 acres being eligible for transfer under this legislation.

Actually, nobody knows exactly how many of these claims exist, nor how many people have them. The estimate that we have was furnished to the Subcommittee on Public Lands on May 1, 1962, in the testimony of Arthur W. Greeley, Assistant Chief of the Forest Service, who stated:

Our guess, and I would have to call it that, although we believe it is an educated guess, is that there are probably about 10,000 claims within the national forest upon which this type of improvement has been constructed and upon which some kind of action under this legislation would be called for.

So we see that the threat of a million acres of forest land being disposed of is reduced by 98 percent.

Second. It is inaccurate to think that all claims that are eligible will be turned into disposals. First of all the legislation is strictly discretionary. There is no "right" to purchase as suggested by the gentleman from Michigan and, in fact, there are provisions requiring the Secretaries of the executive departments to withhold from sale property that is needed for some public purpose. Second, it is not only possible but probable that, particularly in the national forests, many of the occupancies will be converted into life estates rather than fee transfers.

So even the 20,000 acres that might be eligible for consideration under the bill will be reduced further.

Third. It is inaccurate to state that the type of occupancies involved in S. 3451 are instrumental in blocking access to timber sale areas. As a matter of fact the very cases pointed to by the gentleman from Michigan, based on the Comptroller General's report, are cases that would not qualify under the legislation now before the House.

Furthermore in at least three of the forests mentioned by the gentleman from Michigan there appear to be no residences on any unpatented mining claims, and the Comptroller General's report itself specifically stated that access in these forests was blocked by owners of patented mining claims.

Fourth. Other misleading statements were the references to the presence of a house of ill repute, gambling casinos, and a nudist camp in these areas. However, these activities do not constitute residential occupancies, and therefore would not be involved in this legislation.

As I pointed out to the House in response to the gentleman from Pennsylvania, when the Comptroller General's report was released in May, the house of

ill repute had long since ceased to operate and the nudist camp was on patented lands. Finally, with reference to having read in the paper about the gambling casinos, responsibility requires at least a reference to the source, but none was given.

These are the major points and now the record is straight. I do, however, want to add one further word of explanation. There is a difference between unpatented and patented mining claims. Once the land has been patented it is improper to refer to it as a claim; a patent under the mining laws transfers full fee title with all of the rights of private ownership. The Comptroller General has suggested that Congress consider the possibility of changing the mining laws. But I submit to my colleagues that we should not try to do so in connection with a piece of discretionary relief legislation such as S. 3451 and, secondly, we should not use such arguments as a smokescreen in an attempt to change basic law through indirection.

In view of the facts and that discretion will be vested in the Secretaries, I urge the adoption of the conference report on this relief legislation.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the conference report.

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, I should like to advise the Chair that I intend to ask for the yeas and nays.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman advises the Chair that if the question on agreeing to the conference is put he will 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?

Mr. SAYLOR. That is correct, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, further consideration of the conference report will be postponed until tomorrow. There was no objection.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Speaker, on roll-calls 288 and 289 I am recorded as absent. My absence was due to my attendance at memorial services for our late colleague, Clem Miller. I should like the RECORD to show that had I been present I would have voted "yea" on both roll-calls.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM FOR THE BALANCE OF THE WEEK

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. BYRNES].

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I asked for recognition to inquire of the majority leader if he can tell us the program for tomorrow and any subsequent days.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Of course, I yield.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I can only announce now that the unfinished business is agreeing to the conference report on S. 3451, unpatented mining claims, following that, the following con-

ference reports are ready and it is expected they will be taken up tomorrow in the following order:

H.R. 12276—conference report on the District of Columbia appropriation bill.

H.R. 12135—conference report on the Federal Highway Act of 1962.

It is also expected that S. 1447—conference report on the District of Columbia teachers salaries will be ready tomorrow.

Any further program we shall announce tomorrow.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire of the gentleman if a public works conference report is filed tonight whether that will come up tomorrow.

Mr. ALBERT. On the appropriation bill?

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. No; the general public works bill that was sent to conference.

Mr. ALBERT. We shall be happy to program that just as soon as it is ready, I advise the gentleman. We shall announce any other matters that may be ready as soon as we are aware that they are ready.

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HORAN. May I inquire with reference to the public works appropriation bill which I understand on the Senate side is more comprehensive than it was on our side, when that will come back to the House?

Mr. ALBERT. The distinguished chairman of the Committee on Appropriations has advised me that he is not ready to call that report up but will advise us as soon as he is in a position to do so.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman.

FILING OF CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the conferees on the bill S. 1447 may have until midnight tonight to file a conference report.

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

There was no objection.

REPORT ON THE 87TH CONGRESS

Mr. MATHIAS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MATHIAS. Mr. Speaker, from time to time during the 87th Congress I have issued reports to my constituents in the Sixth Congressional District of Maryland. These reports form a chronological summary of the activities of the Sixth District's Congressman. I am appending herewith excerpts of these reports hoping they will prove of interest to my colleagues in the House and my constituents in Maryland.

AGRICULTURE, 1962

Farm bill: Living as I do in the midst of one of the most fertile farming regions in America I was appalled by the proposals contained in the original 1962 farm bill. The Secretary of Agriculture once again urged increased controls and restrictions on the production of crops. The experience of the past 30 years has proven this approach to be no answer to the farm problem. Portions of the farm bill affecting milk and dairy products, particularly important to Maryland's Sixth District, are in direct conflict with the administration's 1961 higher price supports for milk to stimulate production. Relying on that new policy, farmers enlarged their herds and expanded their facilities. Less than 1 year later, they were ordered to cut milk production. This was confusing to the farmer, confusing to the Congress and confusing to the Nation.

Congressional reaction to such contradictory proposals in the original farm bill was recorded last June when, following a dramatic several days of debate, the House voted 215 to 205 in a bipartisan action to recommit the farm bill to committee, killing the administration's proposal.

Secretary Freeman's recommendations proved too dictatorial for the Agriculture Committee and harsh penalties proposed by the administration, including criminal penalties, were deleted from the bill as being totally foreign to American thinking and to American agricultural practices. Nevertheless, the spirit of regimentation remained in the bill.

The House action came after a record number of amendments were offered to the proposed bill in an attempt to make it acceptable. A bipartisan group of Members sent the bill back to committee so that a program might evolve which would be helpful to American agriculture.

Congress bipartisan opposition to the bill was reflected in these remarks of Senator WILLIAM PROXMIRE, Democrat, of Wisconsin, after the Senate OK'd the controversial bill. He stated:

The No. 1 victim of the administration farm bill just passed by the Senate is the dairy farmer. If you are a dairy farmer, your feed grain production will be reduced or limited, and you alone among the Nation's farmers cannot look forward to a penny's increase in income. The real injustice in this administration bill is that although you suffer this serious production limitation, you won't get 1 cent more for your milk.

I voted to recommit the bill, joining with my colleagues who felt the administration's program did not meet the needs of agriculture in America.

Feed grains: The 1961 measure and the 1962 clause in the feed grain bill, in my judgment, were little more than an economic gun placed in the hands of the Secretary of Agriculture. If he can sell surplus grains at less than the support price, he can force compliance with farm programs that are advertised as voluntary. I strongly opposed these measures.

By authorizing the Secretary to set price support for feed grains at not less than 65 percent of parity and establishing a conservation and land retirement program subject to terms and conditions set by the Secretary, we moved closer to a system whereby the Government sets the farmer's prices, controls his production, markets his produce, and thereby impairs a competitive market system. The cost burden is passed on to the housewife, the retailers, and farmers who are livestock, dairy, and poultry producers.

U.S.-INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS

Foreign affairs: Ominous events in various parts of the world, especially the Berlin crisis, provided a somber background for the consideration of the foreign aid program.

Foreign aid, 1961: The administration sought a moderate shift in emphasis last year from military to economic aid. In his 1961 message to Congress the President adhered largely to the foreign aid budget proposed by former President Eisenhower. President Kennedy requested a \$2.4 billion economic aid program. The administration's additional request for a 5-year authorization for development loans, to be borrowed from the Treasury rather than through annual appropriated funds, faced prolonged debate. This request was compromised by authorizing long-term development programs to be financed by annual appropriations.

There is no disagreement with the program's large expenditures for purposes which are vital to the security of the United States and the entire free world. Responsible government requires, however, that Congress annually examine the effectiveness of any program, seeking ways to root out waste and inefficiency in its administration.

Foreign aid, 1962: A significant action preliminary to approval of the 1962 foreign aid program was the limitation placed on the assistance to Communist countries.

This resulted from amendments, the first offered by the gentleman from Texas, Representative BOB CASEY, Democrat, and the second a modifying amendment by the gentleman from Pennsylvania, Representative THOMAS E. MORGAN, Democrat, chairman of the House Foreign Affairs Committee. The language finally approved by the House by a vote of 277 to 4 provides as follows:

No assistance shall be furnished under this Act, as amended, to any Communist country. This restriction may not be waived pursuant to any authority contained in this Act unless the President finds and promptly reports to the Congress that (1) such assistance is vital to the security of the United States; (2) the recipient country is not controlled by the international Communist conspiracy; and (3) such assistance will further promote the independence of the recipient country from international Communism.

This language was reported by Chairman MORGAN to be agreeable to the President. Recent Senate action on the foreign aid bill ratifies this policy in substantial degree.

It should also be noted that a compromise foreign aid bill gradually emerged from Congress in reference to monetary allotment provision. The Senate restored a portion of the funds previously reduced by the House. The resultant Senate version is still considerably below the original administration requests, but has been accepted by the President.

I believe that this bipartisan program is a necessary burden of the cold war and I think a drastic reduction in aid at this time is unwise. At the same time I share the concern of many throughout the Nation that the program be administered both wisely and well.

Trade bill: The most important and far-reaching international measure passed by the 87th Congress is the trade expansion program. The bill approved by the House altered considerably the legislation originally proposed by the President. The alterations include addition of strong and definite guidelines with respect to the exercise of authority granted by the bill. There is now a basis in the legislation for providing protection for segments of American industry where such protection is shown to be vital.

I voted in favor of the trade expansion program because I believe we must expand our foreign trade on the basis of the free trade principle by reducing artificial barriers to international commerce. We must encourage trade and we must participate in it. It will stimulate the exchange of goods and the growth of our economy, provided we are able to compete. In order to compete we must improve our domestic ground rules.

At the time the trade bill was being debated on the floor of the House, I warned that in order for American business and labor to compete in world markets we must shore up our domestic economy by providing: First, a comprehensive reform of our tax structure; second, a realistic depreciation allowance; third, elimination of inflationary trends and Federal deficits; and, fourth, encouragement of private investment in expanding markets of the world.

U.N. bonds: There were valid arguments on both sides of the question of whether the United States should purchase \$100 million in United Nations bonds. The U.N. certainly has not lived up to all the hopes of mankind, but it has an important role to play as an instrument for the conduct of international relations and as a force, in many areas, for the improvement of human welfare.

Failure to approve the bond issue might have been fatal to the United Nations, and to kill the United Nations would be an irremedial act. To lend it a limited amount of money on stated conditions is an act that can be reversed if it is in error.

THE POTOMAC RIVER VALLEY

Antietam, 1961: Because the National Park Service had considerable funds remaining from appropriations, there is today a large sum available for the acquisition of Civil War battlefield sites. For the coming fiscal year 1963, the National Park Service will allocate \$260,800 for the purchase of additional lands at Antietam Battlefield making a total of

approximately \$1 million appropriated for Antietam by the 87th Congress.

The C. & O. Canal: A \$150,000 grant for stabilizing the banks of the C. & O. Canal in 1963 was approved by a congressional conference committee. This is a small but important step in preserving the national monument and I look forward to the day when this work will be incorporated into the canal property as part of a National Historical Park.

The National Park Subcommittee of the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee of the House of Representatives recommended to the full committee that the C. & O. Canal be established as a National Park. The C. & O. Canal is near large centers of population and is easily accessible to many people for recreational facilities. There is a continuing national interest in the history of the valley of the Potomac.

It is to be hoped that the confusion incident to the end of a session and conflict on other park and conservation legislation will not deny the Nation this urgently needed national park before the 87th Congress adjourns sine die.

Potomac River Basin: The Congress recently appropriated \$75,000 for the collection and dissemination of information regarding a pending Army Corps of Engineers report proposing future development of the Potomac River watershed. Public hearings will be needed before Congress makes any decisions on basin development. The residents of the area must be fully advised of the facts and the proposals before they come to those hearings and express their opinions. I was glad to support this item because I believe the people of the Potomac Valley have a right to be heard and to review all the information available on this matter. It is important to people along the upper tributaries that some development take place there and that it come soon. There can be no industrial expansion in western Maryland until there is better utilization of our water.

Water pollution: A 1961 congressional authorization extended Federal grants to assist community programs of water pollution control from the present levels of \$50 to \$100 million by 1964. I preferred State matching fund provisions for grants in excess of \$50 million and supported such a motion. Upon its failure, I voted for the bill rather than have this important program interrupted.

TRANSPORTATION AND METROPOLITAN LEGISLATION

Highway construction: The current program has been extended until 1971 with a continuation of pay-as-you-go financing, established during the Eisenhower administration. I supported the final conference bill which retained the billboard regulations provisions. Maryland was one of the first States to take advantage of those incentive provisions, thereby insuring the preservation of scenic beauty along our interstate roads.

Various sections of our Sixth District will figure prominently in specific congressional appropriations for highway construction.

Defense: The problem of balancing the budget is immediately related to the immense size of the appropriations for our Defense Establishment. During the 1st session of the 87th Congress, I supported the defense appropriation bill for fiscal year 1962 amounting to \$42 billion. Earlier this year, I joined a majority of my colleagues in the House of Representatives in passing a record defense appropriation bill of some \$47 billion, more than half the Government's entire income. This is a staggering amount of money and it is hard to comprehend its size, but in my opinion it is an important and necessary burden to maintain our security.

In January of 1962, the vast cost of maintaining our defense preparedness was brought home to me in a graphic and personal way. At that time, as a lieutenant commander, U.S. Naval Reserve, I flew to an aircraft carrier in mid-Atlantic operating on actual anti-submarine patrol. During my Reserve assignment, it was encouraging to observe great progress in modern methods of detecting and destroying submarines. In contrast with my World War II naval experience, I was impressed with the added complexity of electronic equipment that is necessary in modern defense weapon systems. The expense of maintaining this modern Defense Establishment rises with its complexity and its efficiency, but my observation led me to the conclusion that we have no choice, however staggering the cost may be.

Urban affairs: In Maryland's Sixth Congressional District there are 46 municipalities, representing a majority of our people, which must cope with established Federal agencies. They came to me seeking help in providing easier ways to deal with the various departments, agencies, and bureaus. From my experience as a former city attorney, I could readily understand the reasons advanced for urging greater efficiency in coordinating existing Federal programs dealing with municipal problems.

The administration's original legislative proposal to create a new Cabinet level Department of Urban Affairs never came to the floor of the House for a vote. It was tabled by the Rules Committee on January 24, 1962. On January 30, 1962, the President undertook to reform the Housing and Home Finance Agency by Executive order. Under the law such a reorganization plan is subject to congressional veto. As limited by the Reorganization Act the plan could not have added any new functions to the Agency, although it changed the Agency name and gave Cabinet status to its chief officer. It was designed to pull together and coordinate existing functions under one roof in order to achieve efficient, consistent policies in urban affairs. The House rejected the plan, but I voted for it in the interest of meeting the critical problems of the Sixth District's municipalities and the metropolitan communities of the Nation.

THE GOVERNMENT AND FISCAL POLICY

The budget: The President made a record peacetime request for a \$92.5 billion budget for fiscal year 1963, which

began on June 30, 1962. When the budget message was delivered to Congress the administration predicted that revenues of \$93 billion in 1963 would permit a half billion dollar reduction of the national debt. Present projections of Federal revenues and expenditures, however, indicate an approaching fiscal 1963 deficit of some \$7 billion. This is cause for serious concern. I have pledged my support in helping to achieve a budget that is balanced in fact as well as in theory. I am convinced that national defense needs, improved foreign trade, a stable economy and a satisfactory growth rate all depend on squarely fulfilling this fiscal necessity.

Government economy to balance increased spending: In an effort to meet our vastly increased military budget requirements, and to eliminate waste and duplication in Federal spending and increases in deficit financing, I have written the President on several occasions urging him to implement present laws which would effect economies. It is my belief that much needed economies in Government can be obtained if we will but carry out certain recommendations of the Hoover Commission. As an example, I urged the President specifically to establish a common purchasing system for all the armed services. I am glad to report that the new Defense Supply Agency has been established and will result in substantial savings to the American taxpayers.

Economic growth and tax reform: In recent months there has been growing concern over the state of our economy. The discussion that has accompanied this concern has not yet provided any meaningful interpretation of the many economic indicators which report on the health of our economy.

I am sure we can all agree, however, that the American economic structure must not only remain sound, it must be increasingly vigorous to challenge new times, new concepts, and new expectations.

Unfortunately, it is increasingly apparent that there is an unsatisfactory rate of economic growth in the Nation. The American economy is not experiencing the strong, rapid expansion that had been anticipated by most people. In the place of conviction, we find uncertainty, and in place of advancement, we find hesitancy and a wait-and-see attitude.

The 1962 tax bill: The administration promised the Nation a complete tax overhaul which is still purported to be inchoate on the Secretary of the Treasury's desk awaiting a future unveiling. The plan for such tax reform as was actually submitted to the Congress this past year proved to be unresponsive to the wishes of the American people. An example was the proposal for the withholding of taxes on interest and dividends. Consequently, the tax bill was in large measure rejected by the Congress, and the Nation is still without much-needed tax reform. New proposals to revise our tax laws are now promised for next January. I hope the bill will be responsive to the desires of Americans and will be a sensible, reasoned proposal

capable of invigorating growth in our economy.

I have long advocated a general revision of the Internal Revenue Code with emphasis on such overdue reforms as a new schedule of realistic depreciation rates. The 1962 tax bill was written behind closed committee doors after a year of study and debate. It was presented to the House of Representatives on March 29, but no amendments were permitted during the final debate. Individual Members of Congress like myself had no chance to improve the bill by changes based on their experience or special skill and knowledge of tax law. I, therefore, voted against that bill because its effect was to discriminate against every taxpayer in the United States. Instead of closing some alleged tax loopholes it would have created certain special tax privileges.

The 1962 tax legislation that finally emerged from Congress was a watered down version of the original proposals. In my opinion neither the original nor final version of the bill adequately met the new demands occasioned by our contemporary economic structure.

Depreciation allowances: The administration in 1962 took executive action to liberalize depreciation allowances. I have long advocated the tax reform, but feel that the responsibility for establishing meaningful rules in this vital area belongs to the Congress. It should not be left to the whims of executive edict as in the past. I personally favor much more liberal depreciation allowances than those granted by the administration. The Congress must also approve other programs of reform. It must be prepared to make up for the deficiencies of the Executive in the area of economic policy.

Increase in national debt: On June 14, 1962, the House approved an increase in the amount of bonded indebtedness to \$308 billion, a new record for this country. I voted against raising the debt limit to this figure. On two previous occasions in the 87th Congress I voted to raise the temporary debt limit, first from \$293 to \$298 billion, and later to \$300 billion. I had voted for additional military items that were required by the Berlin crisis as well as for other military expenditures. For these reasons I felt the increases to be justified and that the only responsible thing to do was to vote to authorize the sale of bonds to pay the bill.

In voting on the latest increase, I felt differently. When the President came back for an additional \$8 billion authority I felt that we were reaching a danger point at which the brakes must be applied. We are reaching a saturation point as far as the bonded indebtedness is concerned. Unless the people of this country are alert to the danger inherent in the rapid growth of the national debt, we are in for serious fiscal troubles. For these reasons I voted to limit the increase to \$306 billion and when that motion failed, I voted against the increase to \$308 billion.

ECONOMIC LAG AND COUNTERACTION

Unemployment: In my circuit riding trips through the Sixth District I have

been saddened by talking with families which have separated because of the harsh necessity of the husband and father having to look elsewhere for work. Some families are buying groceries only through the industry and courage of wives who have turned the living room into a home workshop.

Unemployment figures in the Sixth District during the past three winters compared to the national average are as follows:

[In percent]			
	Feb- ruary 1962	March 1961	March 1960
Hagerstown labor market area.....	13.1	13.6	13.2
Cumberland labor market area.....	10.5	10.5	10.4
National average.....	6.46	6.7	5.56

I have repeatedly called on the Area Redevelopment Administration and the Small Business Administration for help. I have continued to work with the administration to secure defense contracts for Maryland industry. I have personally solicited support for a Western Maryland Economic Council to help coordinate all these efforts. I have supported the Area Redevelopment Act, popularly known as the depressed area bill, with its concomitant promise of assistance to our economically depressed areas of western Maryland. Most recently I supported the administration's Public Works Acceleration and Coordination Act which will provide substantial assistance to areas with chronic unemployment and depressed economic conditions. It is good to be able to report that these efforts are achieving positive and substantial results. The latest unemployment figures show that the rate for the Cumberland labor market area has fallen to 6.3 percent, and the rate in Hagerstown area is now at 5 percent, its lowest figure for many years. Incidentally the Hagerstown rate is now below the national average of 5.8 percent.

Area redevelopment: For 30 years the western counties of the Sixth District have suffered from fluctuations in employment and industry. A purposeful effort is being made to find both short- and long-range solutions to this problem. I organized an economic conference for western Maryland and I support plans for a permanent economic council to coordinate redevelopment throughout the district.

New and expanded industry is essential to relieve our plight. The possibility of tourism as a new source of jobs should be emphasized. The Sixth District has the setting for it: Mountain scenery, wild woodlands, rivers, and lakes; and proximity to the metropolitan areas of the East.

I voted for the area development, or depressed areas, bill which provides \$394 million to communities classified as areas of substantial and persistent unemployment. Hagerstown and Cumberland should benefit under this act.

Public works bill: Both Houses of Congress approved the \$900 million Pub-

lic Works Coordination and Acceleration Act. As long as thousands of people in western Maryland are unemployed and underemployed, no valid opportunity to create jobs should be denied them. For this reason, it seemed essential to me to join with the other Appalachian area Congressmen of both parties in supporting this bill. The Presidential power to turn the program off and on at will was deleted and, the funds must be expended in depressed areas.

It is a matter of regret that in our own Sixth Congressional District we have had three such areas. It is my intention to work with the agencies involved to see that some of the funds provided under this public works bill will be expended in our district where help is desperately needed. Unemployment there has been a persistent problem for a number of years and has been acute during the past several winters.

EDUCATION

Education bill, 1961: Congressional consideration of the 1961 education bill was fraught with discussion over Government assistance to private schools and administration parliamentary maneuvering. Events in the House saw the President's education bill abandoned in the Rules Committee and hurriedly superseded by another sponsored by the gentleman from New York, Chairman ADAM CLAYTON POWELL. Copies of this compromise bill were only made available to Members of the House late on a Tuesday afternoon with action called for in the House the next day under a parliamentary procedure known as Calendar Wednesday. In other words, less than 24 hours was provided to read and study the proposed alternate education bill of 1961, and to seek necessary answers to pertinent questions concerning this bill.

I voted against granting the request of Chairman POWELL for bottailed debate and abbreviated consideration on Calendar Wednesday. It was with the hope of more responsible committee behavior than this that I voted last year to enlarge the House Rules Committee. The intention of that action was to promote a full, constructive flow of ideas and proposals from the committee to the entire House.

Impacted area assistance: I have always supported the view that some assistance for local education by the Federal Government is both appropriate and necessary. One of the first bills I introduced in Congress provides for continuation of the time tested and equitable impacted area program by which the Federal Government has assisted local school boards in meeting increased educational expenditures which arise as a direct result of Federal activities within the country. This legislation was enacted in 1961.

Aid to teachers of the deaf: I cosponsored legislation to establish a Federal program for the training of teachers for the deaf. The bill establishes a 10-year program for providing funds to train teachers and to provide additional persons to train the teachers in institutions of higher learning. This bill is now law.

College tuition income-tax deduction: In order to alleviate the economic bur-

den on those currently paying the rising cost of higher education, I introduced legislation to allow an individual an itemized deduction for the amount of tuition paid to a college, university, or other institution of higher learning. The maximum deduction would be \$500, subject to a limitation of educational benefits paid by the Federal Government under present laws. I believe that it is proper and necessary to extend deductions to those individuals paying tuition to institutions as well as to continue currently authorized deductions for contributions to the same academic institutions. Unfortunately consideration of this and similar measures was postponed until next year.

Higher education bill 1962: The failure to enact an education bill for the college and university level in the 87th Congress borders on national tragedy. Due in great measure to a lack of forceful leadership, much needed Federal assistance for higher education was either abandoned or disapproved. I voted for this Federal assistance to higher education, but the measure was defeated. Defeat of the college aid bill reflects a tragic disregard of the evident needs of our American system of higher education. Inaction of Congress deprives American youth of necessary new college facilities and tuition assistance. Although while America's youth may be the first to suffer because of congressional failure, the Nation is the ultimate loser.

General aid to education: No bill to provide general Federal aid to elementary and secondary schools came to a vote in the House of Representatives during the entire 87th Congress.

JUDGESHIPS

We think of a day in court as a right which every American can demand when he needs it. This right has been virtually denied as a result of political delays in creating new Federal judgeships to carry the workload in the courts. I voted to authorize the appointment of 73 new judges. It is to be hoped that ability and integrity, not politics, will be the major criteria in the selection of new judges.

MINIMUM WAGE

The central question in minimum wage legislation was not money, since both sides agreed in debate on identical wage increase proposals. The difference lay in the legal approach: whether or not to adhere to the constitutional principles governing interstate commerce. I felt that we should do so, and was therefore unable to vote for the bill approved by the majority.

SOCIAL SECURITY BENEFITS

The 1961 bill provided for increases in minimum retirement benefits for retired workers and widows of covered workers; optional retirement for men at age 62 as well as women, at proportionately reduced benefits; and a slight increase in the \$1,200 outside earning limitation. I voted for this legislation and for similar extension of railroad retirement benefits.

HOUSING

I voted against the administration's \$4.9 billion housing bill in the first session. I was disturbed by such items as the increase in the President's request for a facilities program which was raised from \$50 to \$500 million only a matter of days after the President had come personally to the Congress to seek a curtailment in and to specifically ask Congress not to enact bills that increased his spending requests. In rural housing, as an example of what happened, the President had requested an extension of an unexpended balance of \$207 million. This figure was doubled by the House committee to \$407 million. Exaggeration of this sort was out of line with the needs of the country. We must assess the urgent needs in housing in the light of our heavy but necessary defense expenditures. I voted for extension of the current housing program for a year at a cost of \$1.1 billion.

OTHER LEGISLATION

I have introduced legislation in various fields including bills to: permit withholding of State income tax from Federal payrolls as a convenience to Government employees; exempt Government employees from the prohibition of the Hatch Act in municipal and county elections; extend the benefits of the Library Services Act to areas either lacking public libraries or with inadequate library facilities; provide an increase in the salaries of teachers for the District of Columbia; and improve firefighting services in the Washington metropolitan area.

OMNIBUS RIVERS AND HARBORS AUTHORIZATION BILL

Mr. SAYLOR. 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 Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, now that the omnibus public works bill is being taken to conference, I should like to call to the attention of my colleagues the importance of standing fast against Senate attempts to create voluminous alterations in our version of the bill. Perhaps I am being unfair in presupposing the attitude of our friends on the other side of the Capitol with respect to H.R. 13273, yet failure of that body to recall the bill for adoption over the past several days would indicate a measure of controversy for the conferees.

Mr. Speaker, there is no question about the importance of our getting away from Washington as quickly as possible. While personal appearances in our constituencies cannot take precedence over emergency work that needs to be done here in the Capitol, voters rightfully expect us to make every attempt to get back as quickly as possible so that we may report to them on a personal basis and answer any last minute questions that may arise. I regret that we have been held here into the month of October. I think many unnecessary delays took place almost from the time that

the second session convened last January. Now we have less than 1 month until election day, yet we cannot afford to be less conscientious in our sworn duties than if the session were just beginning.

I have extreme confidence in the distinguished gentlemen serving on the conference on the omnibus public works bill. If, however, the Senate remains adamant in its proposal to keep its many unwise and unnecessary projects that it added to H.R. 13273 last week, then we must pledge ourselves to see this battle through regardless of how much longer we must remain on duty. I was deeply gratified at the impressive House vote to delete the proposed Burns Creek Reservoir and power project from the bill. The attempt to sneak this Snake River project through Congress in this manner after it had been rejected by a standing committee was an affront to recognized congressional procedure. This action by the 87th Congress will serve as a rallying force on the side of good government if and when similar tactics are attempted in the years to come. For us to have voted otherwise would have set a dangerous precedent from which legislative confusion and chaos would emerge and spawn at the expense of the Nation's taxpayers.

Mr. Speaker, it is unnecessary for me to reiterate the many bad features of the Burns Creek project. I have studied every facet of it and I have reported time and again that Congress would be grossly derelict in its responsibilities if it were to endorse this wasteful, undesirable, and unnecessary proposal. Our Interior and Insular Affairs Committee has had 5 long years to study Burns Creek, and we have had a parade of witnesses from both sides. We have found no excuse whatsoever for accepting the plan to spend \$48 million on a project which has nothing to do with reclamation but is primarily a power project—and a most uneconomic and highly unfeasible one at that.

Burns Creek is probably the most outstanding example—save for the Hanford reactor project—of the designs and aspirations of the public power crowd. Here was a deliberate attempt to inflict upon the taxpayers a costly and extravagant proposal that admittedly has no value other than in the production of electric power. As such, its principal effect would be to create unemployment and extend economic distress. Oh, by putting \$48 million—and you can be sure that the cost would skyrocket before the project was completed—into this sort of thing, you can get a lot of people into temporary jobs. If half of the estimated investment were to be spent for wages and it took 3 years to build Burns Creek, 2,000 men could realize an income of \$4,000 each for that period. Then, after the last hopper of cement dried and the generators were ready to begin whirring, the men who make their living without Federal subsidy would begin to feel the pinch.

The Burns Creek project was designed with a capacity of 90,000 kilowatts and would dilute the amount of coal consumed in the area by 250,000 tons per

year, thus creating a loss of \$275 million in mine payroll and a \$100,000 annual reduction in payment to the United Mine Workers of America welfare fund. Burns Creek has been strongly opposed by both the United Mine Workers of America and the coal industry, as have the myriad of public power projects that are coming before us all the time.

Burns Creek would be another link in the national power network that has been on the drawing board of the public power group for many years.

Incidentally, the Senate version of the public works omnibus bill contains projects totaling more than 2,800,000 kilowatts of installed capacity—enough to displace almost 9 million tons of coal annually. The total cost of these projects is \$1,350,700,000.

Fortunately, Congress took the steps necessary to remove from consideration the project that would have been a key to all-out realization of the public power program. By insisting that the atomic energy authorization bill be amended to preclude the Federal Government from assuming any liability in the construction or operation of the atomic generating plant at Hanford, Wash., the 87th Congress established a precedent which we hope succeeding Congresses will retain and apply to other public power proposals. Parenthetically I remind my colleagues that the Hanford project was referred to by the United Mine Workers Journal as "a new scheme to defraud the taxpayers." Since, however, it was agreed to permit the Atomic Energy Commission, the Bonneville Power Administration, and the Washington Public Power Supply System to enter into the negotiations for so-called private construction of a generating plant at Hanford, Congress must watch closely to see that its will is not circumvented through loans from such agencies as the Housing and Home Finance Corporation, the Rural Electrification Administration, and/or other Federal offices.

Hanford would have had an 800,000 kilowatt capacity. Add these and the scores of other public power projects already in existence and in the dream stage, and there would be enough electricity available to close half the coal mines in the United States. I am not exaggerating. Down at the Department of Interior you will find a map on which existing and projected transmission lines encircle this land from Washington to California to Florida and Maine and back again, with interties crossing every single region of the country. With the sharp increase in the efficiency of long-distance transmission lines, it would be possible to bring electricity from hydroelectric plants and atomic energy generating stations right into the very heart of the coalfields. Yesterday, Assistant Secretary of the Interior Holum included this statement in an address before a cooperative association in South Dakota:

A five-man task force has completed its study and report on the proposed Pacific Northwest-Pacific Southwest intertie. The technical significance of the report itself has been extremely noteworthy because it establishes that d.c. transmission makes possible

and economic the transmission of energy between points 1,000 and 2,000 miles apart. The electric load in Chicago is within practical transmission distance of the cheap lignite fuels in the Dakotas.

To complete this analysis, Mr. Holum could have pointed out that every coal-consuming center in the United States is within deliverable distance of electric energy from hydro projects. Every city and community in Pennsylvania is within a thousand miles of the hydroelectric plants on the Niagara River, in the Tennessee Valley, and within the periphery of the Southeast Power Administration. If Mr. Holum is correct in stating that economic transmission of energy is now possible over distances up to 2,000 miles, then Philadelphia public utility coal markets could expect to be offered subsidized service from water-powered generating stations in the Missouri River Basin and in the Fryingpan-Arkansas project approved by this Congress this year.

He, incidentally, mentioned, in the course of his remarks, some of the super plans which his Department has in store in the way of creating unemployment in the coalfields through hydroelectric projects. The Bureau of Reclamation alone undertook construction of hydroelectric plants in 1962 that will have a total capacity of 1,857,900 kilowatts. As a consequence, the coal industry will lose about 6 million tons of business, with a wage loss of \$12 million to miners. For the United Mine Workers welfare fund, this tonnage would amount to \$2,400,000. These losses, I remind you, are a result of Bureau of Reclamation activities exclusively. They do not include Army Engineers projects or the Government-sponsored atomic energy power projects, all of which serve to enhance the labor losses brought about by these subsidized miner-displacement programs. If the network of public powerlines were ever to become a reality, today's conditions in surplus labor areas of mining States would seem ultra prosperous by comparison. A growing number of coal miners would join the queues at unemployment compensation counters, with thousands of railroaders now working on coal-carrying roads standing beside them. The depressing economic force would affect railroad shops, local business houses, and every community in central and western Pennsylvania as well as in all other coal-producing States.

I am confident that we are not going to permit Burns Creek to be restored to the omnibus public works bill. I am certain that the Members of Congress on both sides of the aisle who rejected this proposed monument to waste will not change their position merely because the public power gang is trying to catch us in a vote-for-anything mood as the curtain is lowered on the 87th Congress. Members of Congress from both parties who recognize the danger that Burns Creek and associated projects hold for the American economic and social order, will have no more of Burns Creek or anything else that resembles it.

TRIBUTE TO HON. BURR P. HARRISON

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, as this, the 87th Congress, draws to a close and as we pause to reflect on the events of the days just passed, I cannot fail to take this means of expressing my deep regret that one of our most respected, admired, and beloved colleagues in the House of Representatives is retiring after completion of this session.

The gentleman from Virginia, BURR POWELL HARRISON, is one of those rare individuals about whom one can truly say that "this place is better for his having passed this way" in his journey through life. In him are combined those qualities of greatness which are given to so few but which benefit so many. He is possessed of a big heart, a gentle and modest manner, a kind and generous disposition, a humility and respect for his fellow man, as well as those attributes of sharpness of mind, tenacity of purpose, and soundness of judgment found only in the greatest of our public servants. He is at once a historian and a scholar, a lawyer and a judge, a legislator and a statesman. He has been my friend and will continue to be, I hope, for many years.

BURR HARRISON'S public record in this House will stand the test of time and events. All of us who have had the privilege and honor of working with him know that his positions on legislative issues were never lightly taken nor easily assailed. In his service here, BURR HARRISON has contributed much that is great, much that is lasting, and much that is in the public interest of his State and Nation. The keenness of his political instincts is well known.

Because BURR occupied the seat next to me in the Committee on Ways and Means for more than a decade, I speak with some experience. I know the force of intellect, the background of history, and the soundness of judgment which he has brought to bear on the great issues of the day, particularly those which have fallen within the realm of the Committee on Ways and Means, such as our internal revenue laws, our Federal social security laws, unemployment compensation, tariffs, reciprocal trade, highway financing and all the other great fiscal measures handled by the Committee on Ways and Means.

Our good friend, BURR, has never hesitated to measure swords or enter the lists against those forces or causes which he thought to be wrong in principle or result and he has been both steadfast in support and eloquent in his oratory in expressing himself in behalf of those things he believed to be right.

He is one who fills with honor, dignity and high intelligence the seat which was filled years before him by his father. His is the second generation of service in

this body representing the same district of the great Commonwealth of Virginia, and one can truly say that BURR HARRISON is wise in his generation and is a public servant deserving of emulation by those who follow him.

He has a keen good humor and an invariable sparkle in his eye. As one who has on occasion felt the razor edge of his wit and his lightning mind, I say that this quality is one which we shall all remember well and which we shall miss from day to day after he leaves this House for other endeavors.

I know I speak the sentiments of every member of the Committee on Ways and Means on both sides of the aisle when I say to him that we will always welcome him and we hope that we will often have the benefit of his advice and counsel during the months and years to come. As he returns to the practice of law which he entered in 1926, and from which he became State's attorney, State senator, circuit court judge and then Representative of the Seventh District of Virginia, we all express to him our regret that he has concluded voluntarily and for personal reasons, his service in the House, but we extend to him sincere best wishes in all of his future endeavors.

PRESIDENT'S POLITICAL HARRANGUES WON'T SOLVE NATION'S PROBLEMS

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. 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 Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, this past weekend President Kennedy was campaigning in Michigan and Minnesota for the election of a Democratic Congress.

I was amazed and disturbed by a newspaper report on the theme which the President is adopting in his political speeches. According to the Wall Street Journal of October 8—

Current economic problems either are laid at the door of the Eisenhower administration or blamed on obstruction by Republican Congressmen. Unemployment may be high but it's down from the fall of 1960; the rate of economic growth is bad now, but has been too low "for the past 5 years;" and the economy is operating far below potential because Congress won't enact "the kind of program which will make it possible for this very rich country of ours to fulfill its promise."

There are two things in particular about this report which I find disturbing. In the first place, the President's assertion that unemployment is down from the fall of 1960 is misleading, to say the least. In September 1962, the seasonally adjusted rate of unemployment was 5.8 percent. In September of 1960, the rate was 5.7 percent. If we look at the actual unadjusted number of unemployed persons, we find that this September there were over 3.5 million jobless men and women, while in September of 1960 there were somewhat less

than 3.4 million. In other words, there are about 125,000 more people unemployed today than in September of 1960. In effect, the unemployment situation is virtually unchanged.

But there is one big difference between September 1960 and September 1962. Today—or at least so the President has repeatedly said—we are riding the crest of a prosperity wave. By contrast, we were on the way down the business cycle in September 1960, and actually hit bottom in February 1961.

In other words, we have about as many unemployed during this so-called Kennedy prosperity as we did approaching the bottom of the 1960-61 recession. The big question now is what kind of an unemployment rate are we going to have in the next recession, which some economists now say is only months away?

Notwithstanding the President's assurances of the progress we have made, I am deeply disturbed at the prospect of an unemployment rate more severe than any we have seen since the early 1940's. Clearly, the President has failed to deliver on his campaign promise made on October 15, 1960, in Sharon, Pa., to "move at once to put our people back to work."

The Wall Street Journal also reported that President Kennedy now blames his economic failures on Congress, which, he says, will not enact "the kind of program which will make it possible for this very rich country of ours to fulfill its promise."

The President has certainly puzzled me and, I am sure, many other Americans by his sudden about-face on whether this has been a productive or an unproductive Congress. As recently as August 13, in his television address to the Nation, he said:

This Congress has done more in the last 18 months to combat the recession and strengthen the economy than any Congress since the end of the Second World War.

Which is it, Mr. President? Is your overwhelmingly Democratic Congress a good one, which presumably does not need more Democrats to carry out your programs? Or, is your overwhelmingly Democratic Congress a bad Congress, in which case it could use some more Republicans? I think the country deserves a clear and straightforward answer.

Instead of spending his time belaboring the Republican minority for the failures of his Democratic Congress, the President could better serve the country by discussing and encouraging debate on his program to get this country moving again.

In the area of employment and unemployment, I think this country is sadly behind the times in its thinking. We are living in a dynamic and technologically advancing economy in which millions of jobs are becoming obsolete while millions of new jobs are opening up. There are about as many jobs going begging today as there are unemployed men and women.

This unemployment is not caused by inadequate demand—as the President and his advisers maintain. Their prescription of more Government spending to spur demand does not solve the un-

employment problem, but it does hamper the search for a genuine solution and results in retarding our economic growth.

Our task is to upgrade the skills of our people through a vast national public-private program of education and training. In addition, we must improve our economic statistics and try to identify job vacancies and skill needs. Along with this we should set up a national clearinghouse which will make this information readily available to the job-seeker. We should also make certain changes in our tax laws and in our unemployment insurance system which will encourage training and retraining and greater voluntary mobility of the labor force.

With so many subjects of deep importance to our people to discuss, it is a pity that the President has chosen to launch out on this political vendetta. Political harangues, after all, are not going to put the unemployed back to work or speed up this country's economic growth.

DEBT MANAGEMENT

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. 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 Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, both the Ways and Means Committee and the Joint Economic Committee held hearings in July on the question of whether or not we should have a quickie tax cut in order to stimulate our economy.

I asked most of the witnesses with some monotony how they figured that a tax cut in face of a budget already out of balance would stimulate our economy in light of the fact that any tax cut would immediately create added problems in the field of debt management.

I was shocked to find not one witness, even Dr. Heller, the chairman of the President's Council for Economic Advisers, had given serious consideration in their prepared statements to the problems of debt management. The response of the witnesses to my question of what debt management problems would be presented and the economic impact of solving these debt management problems might be, was clearly a matter of momentary improvising and not the result of considered thinking and judgment.

Perhaps it is only the members of the Ways and Means Committee and the Treasury Department who have to think of how we are to market our Federal bonds when we spend more money than we collect in taxes. Maybe that is why so many people are willing to go along with the President in treating deficit financing and further Federal debt as a matter of little consequence, a shibboleth, a piece of outmoded thinking.

Perhaps the real reason for passing the matter of debt management off so lightly is that very few people know much about it. President Kennedy is most fortunate in having a man in his

administration, Under Secretary Treasurer for Monetary Affairs Robert V. Roosa, who knows a great deal about it. On October 2, 1962, Mr. Roosa addressed the annual convention of Mortgage Bankers Association of America at Chicago, Ill. His subject was debt management and the capital markets. This is an excellent discussion of the realities of debt management. I was pleased that Under Secretary Roosa looks upon the past record so rosy, when he says:

The relatively sparing use which we have made of the commercial banking system in financing the deficit of the past 20 months testifies, I would suggest, both to our intent and our ability to finance any future deficits in a manner which does not generate an inflationary potential.

I hope he is correct. However, I would like to explore in some depth how he would have handled an additional deficit of some \$5 to \$10 billion or whatever was to be the amount of the quickie tax cut without generating an inflationary potential. Furthermore, I trust he has some plans in mind to handle the oncoming deficits of fiscal 1963 and 1964 which seem to be rather definitely in the cards and together will total close to \$20 billion.

Here is the speech, an excellent one: DEBT MANAGEMENT AND THE CAPITAL MARKETS (Remarks of the Honorable Robert V. Roosa, Under Secretary of the Treasury for Monetary Affairs, at the annual convention of the Mortgage Bankers Association of America, at Chicago, Ill., Tuesday, October 2, 1962, 10 a.m.)

A meeting of the Mortgage Bankers Association is a particularly appropriate forum for a discussion of debt management—the problems, the policies, and the results. For mortgage bankers and the managers of the Federal debt have a vital interest in common: a continuing concern with the state of the capital markets, with the forces of supply and demand at work in them, and with the behavior of interest rates that results from these forces.

The mortgage market is by far the largest single component of our long-term capital markets in this country. The net increase of mortgages outstanding in a single year consistently exceeds the entire outstanding total of all Federal debt in the 20-year-and-over maturity range. For example, after allowing for all repayments and refundings, your industry placed last year a volume of long-term debt that was larger than the total of long-term Federal debt now in existence as the combined and cumulative result of everything that all of the managers of the Federal debt have been able to accomplish in that area of the market since World War II. So I approach you very humbly, seeking both the sympathy and the suggestions of the successful.

I would like to review with you the range of varied objectives that we have to try to fulfill, and to reconcile, in managing a Federal debt that is distributed through all maturity sectors of the money and capital markets. And, in the light of that review, I will then trace through some of the results we have had in working toward those objectives during the past 20 months.

I

The process of decisionmaking in debt management is complicated by the sheer number and diversity of objectives which we must pursue simultaneously. Some are the cost and efficiency considerations appropriate

to any borrowing operation; some are peculiar to the inescapable fact that our operations must almost always be large; and some relate to the special responsibilities and opportunities inherent in any exercise of public policy. This means that anyone engaged in Federal debt management must, among other things, keep in mind the impact of any given Treasury debt operation on the liquidity needs of the domestic economy, on the long-term capital markets, on our balance of payments position, and on the interest cost of carrying the debt as a whole. Moreover, against the inexorable pressure of the passage of time, the debt manager must continually strive to turn over to his successor a suitably balanced debt structure.

Very broadly, these objectives of debt management may be divided between those that are more largely of a housekeeping character and those that are more closely related to the Government's economic policy.

One of the first on either list is the aim of minimizing interest costs and the burden of the debt on the taxpayer, to the fullest extent consistent with other compelling objectives. Another housekeeping aim is that of promoting and maintaining an active and broadly based market for Government securities, not only in the interest of the Treasury and of investors in Government securities, but also in the interest of the Federal Reserve, which must operate through this market in adjusting, on a day to day basis, the reserve position of the banking system.

Our further housekeeping objectives must be to establish and maintain a maturity structure for the debt which will assure a reasonable range of flexibility for the Treasury debt managers in the future, a structure which will also facilitate rather than inhibit the execution of appropriate monetary policies, and one which will provide appropriate quantities of securities in the various maturity areas to meet the needs of the investing public.

Very often we are asked why the Treasury does not finance solely through short-term securities. Such borrowing seems always to be more easily carried out. And, since short-term rates are usually lower than long-term rates, would not such a policy also save the taxpayers money? Not many of those who ask this sort of question would carry it to its ultimate extreme and argue that the Treasury ought to finance its operations solely through greenbacks—demand obligations which carry a zero interest cost. The hazards of greenback financing are well known. Unfortunately, the hazards of an excessive concentration of short-term financing are less well known.

Perhaps our housekeeping objectives can best be understood by pointing up some of these hazards. First and most important, if we were to concentrate our financing entirely in short-term securities, we would be courting the danger of excess liquidity and the inflationary potential which excess liquidity creates. Short-term Government securities are a close substitute for money; they can be turned into money very quickly and with little risk of loss. To be sure, an advanced economy, such as ours, has need for a large stock of liquid instruments that are free of credit risk; such a stock is needed for the ready reserves of our financial institutions and other organizations. And, as our economy grows, the size of the appropriate stock of liquid instruments will also grow. But this does not mean that all of the debt can be in short form. For the stock of liquid instruments can exceed the needs of the economy at going prices and practicable rates of output. And, to the extent that such an excess occurs, a threatening inflationary potential will have been created in the economy—even an economy that is not, throughout its many sectors, fully employed.

Furthermore, it does not follow that, if the Treasury were to concentrate its fin-

ancing solely in the short-term area, the interest cost on the Federal debt would be reduced. The level of interest rates for any given maturity area reflects not only the state of expectations, but also the quantity of securities supplied to the market in that maturity area. If the Treasury were to add to the supply of short-term securities well beyond the needs of the economy for this kind of instrument, short-term rates on Treasury securities would inevitably rise relative to long-term rates.

This sort of situation is illustrated by the actual experience of 1959 and early 1960, when the Treasury was forced to concentrate an excessive amount of its financing in the 1 to 5 year maturity area. As a result, a "humped" yield curve was produced, with yields in the 1 to 5 year area being substantially higher than yields on the longest-term Government securities. And partly as a result, total budgetary interest costs for the fiscal year ending June 1960, were larger than those for either of the two following fiscal years, even though the total outstanding debt was actually increasing over those later years and, at the same time, a considerable lengthening of the average maturity of the debt was being accomplished.

Another major hazard of an excessive concentration of short-term Government securities is that it may severely inhibit the execution of monetary policy. It can do so in several ways. To the extent that more of the Federal debt is concentrated in short maturities, other than Treasury bills, there will inevitably be a need for more frequent, large refunding operations by the Treasury.

The reason that the turnover of our short debt is now accomplished with relatively little disturbance to the money market, and without serious impact on the flexibility of the Federal Reserve, is that the volume of short-term securities is still well within the absorptive capacity of the economy. However, if the Treasury, because of an excessive concentration of short debt, was forced to engage in very frequent and very large refunding operations of the sort which might be disruptive to the money markets, the Federal Reserve would find itself with only very short intervals of time within which it could freely and independently work out gradations of change, or shifts, in monetary policy without risking an undue disruption not only of the markets but also of the Treasury financing operations themselves.

Since February 1961, the Federal Reserve has extended open market operations throughout the entire maturity range of Government securities, instead of concentrating its efforts solely in the short-term sector. This is a change in procedure which the Treasury has welcomed. However, if the Federal Reserve is to be able to release or absorb reserves through transactions in any part of the maturity range that is appropriate for its policy objectives, the quantity of outstanding securities in the various maturity areas must be adequate to provide an active and broadly based market in which such transactions can actually be conducted.

It is particularly important, so far as the implementation of monetary policy is concerned, that the maturity composition of the Federal debt include a significant volume of long-term debt. For at times when monetary controls should be reaching through to the longer maturity areas—influencing the supply of funds that may or may not be released to flow into mortgages, for example—significant changes may be brought about in market expectations by relatively small changes in the daily flows of funds into or out of Government securities, and the related small changes in interest rates. If there were not an adequate supply of tradable Government securities, the effects of any needed monetary policy would have to be

expected to work their way out toward the longer area by means of tentative and possibly erratic efforts at private arbitrage. The alternative for monetary policy, if there were no tradable volume of longer term Government securities, would be a great lengthening of the time needed for monetary controls to take hold and a great intensification of the severity of the other actions that would actually have to be taken by the Federal Reserve to accomplish a given result. It can indeed be argued that a tradable quantity of outstanding Government debt in all maturity sectors is a precondition for any broadly effective monetary policy in the United States today. And that case is strong whether or not the Federal Reserve itself chooses to operate directly in all maturity sectors.

For very short periods, the objective of maintaining a balanced maturity structure for the debt may be subordinated to shorter-run economic policy considerations. But this is very much like deferred maintenance on a railroad or an industrial plant. If the practice is continued long enough, the basic structure may deteriorate to such an extent that it may be very difficult to restore a sound basic structure again. It is often said that there is never a time when the Treasury can freely place securities in the longer-term area of the capital market—when business is slack, no diversion from private investment can be risked, and when business is booming, interest costs are too high. The debt manager must, nonetheless, place long-term debt into the market without being hung from either of the horns of this dilemma, and, if possible, while furthering all of the other housekeeping objectives we have just reviewed, and while also fulfilling the economic policy aims which I will now briefly describe.

II

Debt management cannot escape involvement in economic policy. The present size of the debt alone virtually compels a continuous interrelationship between what is done to refund the steady stream of maturities and what the Federal Reserve is doing to influence the supply of money and credit. We now have a debt of more than \$300 billion, almost \$90 billion of which will mature and have to be refunded during the year ahead. Apart from that, in recent years, the ordinary seasonal swings in the Treasury's cash borrowing requirements have been running around \$10 billion.

Thus, with about \$100 billion of indicated borrowing requirements, whether or not there are further budget deficits, the very magnitude and frequency of Treasury borrowing operations is necessarily such that Treasury operations can scarcely avoid having some impact on all of the other markets for fixed income securities—the corporate bond market and the market for State and local Government securities, as well as the mortgage market. The challenge to debt management planning is, therefore, so to channel the influence of Treasury debt operations upon these various other markets and activities that it will, wherever possible, help to further the objective of Government economic policy—domestically and with respect to the balance of payments.

Much has been said in other countries about a presumed necessity for combining monetary control and debt management into a single policy instrument. And, in some countries, both are administered by a single agency. But in accordance with the principle of checks and balances, and the diffusion of power, which characterizes our political institutions generally, these functions have most appropriately been divided in the United States between the Federal Reserve and the Treasury. Two separate centers of responsibility appraise the needs of two interrelated spheres of action. And

the results for each, given a full flow of intercommunications and a genuine desire for harmonious cooperation, are greater than any conceivable result of an enforced consolidation. Certainly there is no country in the world today in which the independence of these two functions is more clearly respected; yet I doubt if there is any in which the integration between monetary policy and debt management is more effective.

There are three areas of economic policy in which monetary policy and debt management come together. First, there is that of maintaining an appropriate level of liquidity—not only for the routine needs of the domestic economy, but also to sustain a strong rate of economic growth—without creating a potential inflationary hazard. The Treasury's decisions on the volume of short-term Government securities to be issued play a part in determining the volume of "near money" liquidity in the economy. The influence exerted is necessarily similar to, although, of course, much less potent than that of the Federal Reserve in regulating the volume of bank reserves and thereby the quantity of money itself.

A second general policy area that is common to debt management and monetary management is that of helping to create conditions in the credit and capital markets which will be conducive to the most appropriate flow of funds into long-term private investment. I need not tell this group that not only the amount, but also the manner and the timing, of Treasury borrowing efforts in the longer-term market can have important effects on the flow of private investment funds. And as to the influence of Federal Reserve action—even the significance of expectations as to what that action might be—surely no elaboration is necessary.

A third important area of economic policy concerns the impact of debt management and monetary policy on our balance-of-payments position. Over the past 2 years and more, this has meant that both debt operations and monetary actions have had to be directed, in part, toward keeping our short-term rate structure in reasonable competitive equilibrium with rates abroad. The purpose has not been to put a floor under rates at any particular level. Our concern is not with the absolute rate levels, but with relative levels. The aim is to keep our short-term rates, if possible, in line with foreign short-term rates, after adjusting for the cost of covering the forward exchange risk. The result thus far, as many of you know, is that very little money has flowed out of this country for interest arbitrage over most of the past 2 years.

In addition, we have begun to use debt management itself as an active instrument of balance-of-payments control. In recent months, we have borrowed from official agencies at short term in two foreign currencies—the Swiss franc and Italian lira. We have converted the proceeds into dollars at an overall cost that compared favorably with the costs of borrowing here. The incidental result has also been a net absorption of excess dollars abroad that might otherwise have ultimately been used to purchase gold here. Though what we have done is still tentative and exploratory, we are increasingly impressed with this new dimension of debt management—an approach originally foreseen by Russell Leffingwell, then Assistant Secretary of the Treasury, when we asked Congress for the necessary legislative authority before the close of World War I. To be sure, however, this is not an approach that would be relevant to a very sizable part of our total debt management program.

Every time a judgment is taken in debt management, however, some aspects of all three of these areas of economic policy, as well as our various "housekeeping" goals, must be weighed in the light of all known

conditions, at that particular moment in time. Quite obviously, no single answer can produce the optimum result every time for each of these diverse objectives. The objectives themselves may even occasionally be in conflict. The best we can hope for, probably, is reasonably well-balanced progress toward meeting all of these objectives, over a period of time.

III

Having thus briefly paraded the problems of debt management, I trust it is now safe for me to review what we have been trying to do in debt management during the past 20 months. Perhaps the best starting point is to examine the economic environment within which policies were initially formulated.

In January, 1961, we faced a conjuncture of a number of serious problems; a recession which had been underway for the past half year; an inadequate rate of growth which had been slackening for a number of years; and, as if these two problems were not enough, we were faced with a critical balance-of-payments problem, with world confidence in the dollar deteriorating.

In developing a policy framework which would embrace all of these problems, we placed the central focus of our policies on encouraging and raising the level of private investment. Increased private investment would help pull us out of the recession. At the same time, more investment could be the key to quickening our growth rate and reducing the continuing high rate of unemployment. And, in a longer range sense, through increasing the productivity of American industry, more investment would also make the most fundamental and long-lasting contribution toward strengthening our national competitive position in the world and thereby righting our balance of payments.

All of our policies, then—fiscal policy, tax policy, and debt management, as well as monetary policy in its coordinate role—were oriented toward this common goal. The joint evolution of monetary policy and debt management, which had been underway since the summer of 1960, had two major aspects: to help create conditions in the capital markets which would promote a large flow of long-term capital into productive investment while, at the same time, averting any changes in the short-term interest rate structure which would set off significant outflows of short-term capital seeking interest rate advantages abroad. To achieve both of these objectives simultaneously required new operating techniques and new kinds of emphasis in the decision-making processes of both the Federal Reserve and the Treasury.

In monetary policy, this new policy orientation was reflected in the decision by the Federal Open Market Committee to conduct open market operations wherever necessary over the full maturity range of Government securities. In debt management, the new emphasis was initially reflected in the development of the following key elements of policy:

That the Treasury would conduct the great bulk of its cash borrowing operations in short-term securities, thereby exerting a maximum of pressure to sustain an appropriate international relationship for interest rates on Treasury bills and the constellation of surrounding money market instruments; that, in ordinary refunding operations, the Treasury would largely concentrate on short-term and intermediate-term securities in a maturity range out to around 10 years; and, that to offset the deterioration in the maturity structure of the debt which would otherwise have occurred, the Treasury would seek, through the technique of advance refunding, to extend further out into the long-term area substantial quantities of

long-term debt already in the hands of the public, but which the passage of time was moving steadily closer to the intermediate and short maturity range.

In concentrating its cash financing largely in the short-term area, the Treasury had, of course, several objectives. By placing upward pressure on short-term yields from the supply side of the market, debt management helped enable the Federal Reserve to expand the monetary base without sacrificing our balance-of-payments objectives. Moreover, from the standpoint of the liquidity position of the domestic economy, there was a positive need for an expansion in the quantity of liquid assets to support a further increase in economic activity. In statistical terms, the economy had apparently grown up to the excess liquidity created during World War II, and the relationship between the money supply and the gross national product had returned to the level which had generally prevailed during the first 30 years of this century. In practical terms, a number of financial and business firms were actively seeking more short-term investments.

And at the same time, by concentrating its own cash borrowings in the short-term area, the Treasury in effect was reserving the flow of new long-term savings for the use of private investment in housing, industrial and commercial plant and equipment, and for State and local public facilities.

Of course, no matter what we think we are trying to do, for housekeeping purposes or in the interest of broad economic policy, we also have the bedrock problem of designing issues that will sell, will hold their place in the market, and will make participation in the distribution of Government securities a reasonably rewarding as well as a patriotic undertaking. The fine art of tailoring our issues to the prevailing market has no formulas. Each actual offering is always a combined product of the advice we receive in many ways from the market itself (notably our splendid advisory committees), the technical expertise of our career staffs, the lessons of recent experience, and a pinch or two of hunch and intuition.

IV

In appraising the results of our efforts during the past 20 months, I should start with a word on savings bonds. They account now for almost one-sixth of the entire outstanding debt. They provide, without exposure to market risk, a convenient opportunity for every individual to have some part in the debt financing of Government. And they pay rates of interest that are, year in and year out, better than any alternative savings instrument that has other investment attributes of even rough comparability. Since the continued success of this program is a vital part of the whole debt management effort, and since it depends so heavily on the support of a volunteer program, it is gratifying that savings bonds have kept their place in our debt structure during these recent months when the competitive pressure from higher rates on bank deposits and savings and loan shares, in particular, has been of unusual intensity.

In turning to the marketable debt, perhaps I can best sketch the outlines of most of the significant developments if I focus on three visible indicators: the behavior of interest rates, the change in the maturity structure of the Federal debt, and the change in the ownership of the debt.

For a period that has consisted mainly of sustained economic expansion, the interest rate behavior of the past 20 months has been most unusual. Since January 1961 short-term interest rates have been moving within an upward-rising range, while long-term rates have remained stable or moved lower. The yield on 3-month Treasury bills, for example, has gone up from 2¼ percent to the

recent range of 2½ percent to 3 percent. Yet corporate bond yields are now at about the same level as in January 1961, when we were close to the bottom of the recession, and rates on municipal bonds and mortgages are actually lower than they were then. Just how much of this unusual behavior of interest rates should be attributed to the influence of monetary and debt management policies and how much would have occurred in any event, I would not venture to say. However, one thing is clear: This is precisely the sort of interest rate behavior that should have been expected to occur if the economic policy aspects of the monetary and debt management programs of the past 20 months were to be fulfilled.

The favorable climate in the capital markets during the past 20 months has been reflected, as you know, in a record combined flow of long-term capital into corporate securities, State and local government bonds, and mortgages. The corporate sector alone has not set new records, so far as market borrowing is concerned, but both of the others have expanded remarkably. New record highs have been reached in the first half of 1962, with \$5 billion flowing into State and local government bonds and more than \$10 billion flowing into mortgages.

Meanwhile, the total outstanding public debt has grown by \$10 billion over the full course of the 20 months from the end of January 1961 through September 1962. Of this, \$9 billion has been in marketable issues and \$1 billion in nonmarketables, such as savings bonds. What has happened in the maturity composition of these marketable issues? The total outstanding in the under-1-year category has risen by almost \$9 billion, the debt in the 1- to 5-year maturity area has declined by almost \$13 billion, and the debt maturing beyond 5 years has risen by almost \$13 billion. But note that, while the rise in very short debt has been about equal to the rise in total debt, the increase in the over-5-year debt has been 40 percent greater than the \$9 billion total increase in the marketable debt during this period.

The decline of roughly \$13 billion in the 1- to 5-year debt is very significant from the standpoint of the maturity structure of the debt. The under-1-year debt can increase in two ways: it can be increased by deliberate action, as we have done in order to maintain upward pressures on the bill rate, or it can increase automatically as, with the passage of time, more debt falls within the 1-year area. The substantial reduction in the quantity of debt maturing in 1 to 5 years means that the short-term debt is under better control, since the potential for automatic increases in the very short debt has been substantially reduced.

We are convinced that the shifting of \$13 billion of debt from the 1- to 5-year area out beyond 5 years has produced a significant improvement in the overall maturity structure of the debt. Statistically, this has been reflected in an increase of 6 months in the average maturity of the debt, from 4 years and 6 months in January 1961 to 5 years at the present time, the highest level in 4 years.

The developments in ownership of the Government debt have been equally interesting. While the total debt has gone up by \$10 billion, and the marketable part by \$9 billion, commercial bank holdings have risen by only \$1½ billion. The Federal Reserve has, to be sure, added about \$3½ billion to its holdings of Government securities. This means that \$5 billion, or one-half of the total increase in the debt, has been financed outside the banking system.

The subject of financing deficits through the banking system has been much discussed in recent weeks. That is as it should be. But some of the public discussion has seemed to me to proceed in oversimplified terms. The issue is not simply whether the Treasury

sells securities to the banking system or not, but whether the amount of securities that remains in the banking system becomes so excessively large that the credit base is expanded well beyond the needs of the economy and an inflationary potential is, thereby, created. This, I can assure you, is a situation which both the Treasury and the Federal Reserve are able and determined to prevent. The relatively sparing use which we have made of the commercial banking system in financing the deficit of the past 20 months testifies, I would suggest, both to our intent and our ability to finance any future deficits in a manner which does not generate an inflationary potential.

It is important to remember, too, that the distinction between financing a deficit through the banking system and financing it through savings is not a sufficiently clear-cut basis for evaluation. For, in addition to their demand deposit function, the commercial banks are one of the most important financial intermediaries engaged in attracting and investing the savings of the public. Since January 1961 time and savings deposits at commercial banks have grown by about \$21 billion. The \$1.5 billion increase in commercial bank holdings of Government securities represents only about 7 percent of this increase in time and savings deposits.

And so far as Federal Reserve acquisitions of Government securities are concerned, these have all been an incidental byproduct of providing an adequate, but noninflationary, reserve base for the commercial banking system. I would indeed suggest that there is no evidence—in terms of the expanding money supply, the overall growth of bank credit, or in the broader context of price behavior in the economy—that Federal Reserve credit has grown too much.

v

To sum up the record of the past 20 months, though there is obviously much more we would like to have done, we believe that we have had some success in working toward both our economic policy and "housekeeping" objectives. Throughout the period, we have managed to avoid the sort of persistent, sizable gaps between short-term interest rates in the United States and rates abroad which would have encouraged substantial outflows of short-term capital. At the same time, the availability of funds and long-term interest rates have remained at levels consistent with the promotion of a large domestic flow of investment capital.

While the rate of increase in corporate investment has not been up to our hopes and expectations this year, it does not appear that the flow of corporate investment is being constrained by the level of money rates or the availability of long-term funds. So far as Government is concerned, it is probably in the area of tax policy that we must look for further means to stimulate corporate investment.

In pursuing the various economic policy objectives, the Treasury has not sacrificed its longer-term interest in a balanced maturity structure. The maturity structure of the debt is, in fact, despite a rise of \$10 billion in the outstanding debt, in better balance than it was 20 months ago—a result largely attributable to carrying forward the creative innovations in debt management introduced by the preceding Treasury administration.

Looking to the future, the only generalization that can be made with absolute certainty is that debt management policy, like monetary policy, must adapt to changing circumstances. It must continually evolve in response to changes in the liquidity needs and the investment requirements of our domestic economy, changes in our balance-of-payments position, and modifications in the overall policy mix through which the gov-

ernmental part of the solutions to our economic problems may be sought.

From time to time, new debt management procedures may be needed to meet both our economic policy objectives and our housekeeping objectives. In recent months, we have tentatively introduced borrowing arrangements with governmental bodies abroad. We have already announced our intention to test another new procedure in the capital market here—the sale of long-term bonds on the basis of competitive bidding. And as our experience grows, as conditions alter, and experts such as those gathered here supply us with further suggestions, there will be further changes in the techniques and the policies that guide debt management and its relationship to the money and capital markets in the United States.

AMENDMENT TO LEGISLATIVE REORGANIZATION ACT

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, in 1946 there was enacted the Legislative Reorganization Act, one section of which—section 132—declared that the Congress should adjourn sine die not later than the last day of July except in times of war or during a national emergency proclaimed by the President. In 1950, following the outbreak of the Korean war, such an emergency was proclaimed and we have found this emergency, nearly 10 years after the last shot was fired in that war, used as the reason to keep the Congress in session long after the day set for its adjournment under the Legislative Reorganization Act.

I believe it would be well for us to adhere to the policy which was established by the Legislative Reorganization Act. I believe we can and should gear our legislative calendars to finish the business of the Congress in the 7 months which the act provides. In the second session of this Congress—a session which bids fair to last until mid-October—we could have done our work in the time allotted by the act. The second session of any Congress is but a continuation of the first; the work that was done in the first should blend smoothly into the second session and the Congress should buckle down to work from the first day it returns. This session what happened? From our first meeting in January until the end of March the House was in session 44 times for a total of 138 hours 21 minutes, an average of just over 3 hours per meeting. The atmosphere was relaxed; 27 public laws were signed between the start of the second session and the end of March and during the same time 43 private laws were signed. This was a leisurely pace, and a more ambitious pace would have allowed us to finish our work earlier and avoid the unfortunate tactics that seem to crop up at the end of every Congress when procedures are pushed aside and haste rather than wisdom dictates the course of our deliberations.

Aside from stirring the Congress into earlier action, abiding by the July 31 adjournment date would, in my opinion, strengthen the process of representative government. A Congressman comes to Washington to work for his constituents. He must know them and their thoughts and upon this knowledge he must apply himself to the task of studying in depth the issues which others in his community can, because of the pressure of time, look into only in a limited way. He must use his best ability conscientiously to come to an understanding of issues and evaluate them in the light of the national interest and the interest of his community as he understands it. And he must, once the decisions have been made on the issues, stand ready to return to his constituency and report to them on what has taken place in Washington, what he has learned in his study of the issues and why he has voted the way he has on those matters which touch upon the interests of those he serves. These interminable sessions which we have experienced of late severely restrict the Congressman in doing his duty. He is taken away from his home and his community, he loses the touch which he must have with the thoughts and feeling of his constituency if he is to really represent them. He loses the opportunity to report to them and to give them his feelings, fully explained, about the issues. The help which he has in his task—the mass media—are often little help; indeed, they often tend to obscure the real issue. I do not say this in scorn of the mass media, for many in the professions associated with them are conscious of this failing and working hard to try to correct it. I only point out that, as an instrument of reporting to the people, they have been inadequate.

In sum, I believe we should well turn to the limit set by the Legislative Reorganization Act and not continue to subvert its purpose by the flimsy ruse of a national emergency proclaimed for a war whose guns have long been silent. For this reason I have today introduced a bill to amend the Legislative Reorganization Act. It provides, in substance, that insofar as it affects the date of adjournment of the Congress, the national emergency proclaimed in 1950 shall be considered as terminated. This does not say that future wars or national emergencies cannot be effective in extending the length of the congressional session; nor does it eliminate the provision which also appears in the act that the Congress may, if it desires, extend the session. It does reaffirm the policy which was wisely laid down in 1946 that Congress should terminate its session by the end of the month of July. Let me urge my colleagues to give close attention to this idea, for I believe that in enacting this bill we will take a step in the direction of improving our National Legislature.

TAX INCENTIVE TO SPUR MODERNIZATION OF AMERICAN INDUSTRY

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House

for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include an editorial.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, travelers returning from Europe bring reports of the ultramodern factories whose efficiency is a real competitive threat to the older plants and equipment in the United States.

Under the Trade Expansion Act which is necessary for reasons that I shall not detail at this point, foreign competition will endanger some American industries unless we offer them incentives to invest in modernization programs.

The new tax bill, granting business a tax credit for this purpose is a step in the right direction. Although it will result in a loss of tax revenue to the Government, this will be temporary.

In the long run, the encouragement given to our industries should help to bring many of them up to date and thus strengthen our ability to compete in world trade. This will result in profits for industry and a larger revenue income for the Government. This provision of the new tax bill was one of the most constructive achievements of the 87th Congress.

I bring to you an assessment of this legislation in an editorial titled "Measure of the Tax Bill" that was published in the October 8, 1962, issue of the Lawrence Eagle-Tribune:

MEASURE OF THE TAX BILL

The new tax bill, we think, will be measured by the effect of the section that grants business a tax credit for investment in new machinery and equipment.

Purpose of the section is to stimulate modernization of the American industrial plant. Modernization is needed to enable American industry to compete more effectively with foreign industry. European and Japanese manufacturers in general enjoy more modern plants than American manufacturers.

Foreign plants in numerous instances were destroyed by war. When peace came Europeans and Japanese started from scratch and built new plants. American plants, unharmed by war, remained serviceable, but, compared with new foreign plants, were inefficient.

If the investment credit section is taken advantage of by industry, the Government will lose tax revenue.

With this fact in mind, the President called for a withholding tax on savings and dividends. Public protest of this plan, however, rightly was vigorous and persuaded Congress to reject the plan. So the President got only half of the principal items in his tax program. The failure means that the Government will lose revenue.

Despite such praiseworthy provisions as those to prevent individuals and some businesses to avoid American taxes by establishing themselves abroad, net loss to the Government in tax revenue by the new bill is estimated by the Treasury at \$200 million a year and by Congress at \$545 million.

If, however, industry seizes the tax credit opportunity and thereby increases its profitable activity, the long range effect of the new bill can be good for the Government in terms of tax revenue and for everybody else too.

THE AMERICAN ASSOCIATION OF UNIVERSITY PROFESSORS

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, teachers, men of learning, true intellectuals, have always been admired, respected, and honored by civilized societies. I am glad to say that this condition prevails in the United States today. The American people recognize the great contribution many intellectuals have made—and are now making—to our Nation. This applies not only in the field of defense, where we are dependent on them to such a great degree for our very survival, but in other fields such as the arts, humanities, and political theory.

Despite this, it must be said that there is in the minds of a considerable number of Americans a certain suspicion of intellectuals. This unhappy fact has not been brought about by the majority of intellectuals, nor is it due basically to a failing of the American people. Contrary to what some so-called intellectuals would have us believe, the people of this country are not ignorant, primitive-minded clods who are fundamentally anti-intellectual and, therefore, distrustful of education and mental ability, and development as such. Rather, this distrust of intellectuals is caused by the fact that a minority, but very vocal and aggressive, element in the intellectual community—an element composed, for the most part, of those who have achieved no real eminence in it and which has been exalted far beyond its worth in the liberal press—has, by its words and actions, given the American public a false image of what the intellectuals of this country are really like. They have created a picture of a group of eggheads, educated beyond their mental capacities, living in a completely unreal world, uninformed about the basic issues related to national survival and incapable of thinking about them intelligently.

A good example of how this misleading picture has been created was provided within the last few days by the American Association of University Professors—an organization which has done the same kind of thing on more than one occasion in the past.

What did the AAUP do this time?

It denounced and censured George Washington University here in Washington, accusing it of "gross irregularities."

Why?

Because George Washington University got rid of a professor who had refused to tell the university officials, as well as a congressional committee, whether he was presently a member of the Communist Party.

Now, the AAUP is not truly representative of the intellectuals of this country. It is not even truly representative of the professors of this country. It is

very definitely a professional minority group. It claims membership equal to about one-fifth of the total number of professors in this land. However, because the way the Washington Post and some other newspapers play up the organization, many people have been led to believe that it speaks for the majority of our college and university professors. Its inanities thus tend to discredit many intellectuals who deserve to be held in much higher esteem by the American people.

What are the facts in the George Washington University case?

On May 1, 1959, the university signed a 2-year contract with Prof. Richard W. Reichard to teach four history courses beginning September 1 of that year.

On July 22, 1959, Professor Reichard, in response to a subpoena, testified before the House Committee on Un-American Activities. He invoked the fifth amendment when asked if he had joined the Communist Party while at Harvard during the years 1946-49, if he had been leader and branch organizer of the student Communist Party unit at Harvard, if he had been a member of the Communist Party while teaching at Washington College in Chestertown, Md., during 1956-58, and if he was presently a member of the Communist Party.

Dr. Reichard was suspended by George Washington University after his appearance before the committee. Three of the courses he was scheduled to teach were withdrawn, and the fourth was given to another professor. In December 1959, George Washington University announced that it had withdrawn Professor Reichard's appointment on the ground that he had been found "unsuitable and unqualified to join the faculty."

I want to stress the fact that this was not a hasty action on the part of the university taken without consideration of Professor Reichard's rights and without giving him a chance to state his case or clear himself. As soon as Professor Reichard received his subpoena from the Committee on Un-American Activities, there were informal discussions between administrative officers of the university and Professor Reichard concerning his case. This was followed by an interview with a special faculty committee made up of five members of the university's history department and two deans. Dr. Reichard's advisor was with him at this interview. The special faculty committee recommended withdrawal of his appointment.

This interview was followed, in turn, by a hearing before a special committee of university trustees. Professor Reichard was represented by counsel at this hearing. This special committee of university trustees agreed with the finding of the faculty committee and recommended that his appointment be withdrawn.

Professor Reichard was paid all the time his case was under consideration by the university, and he has now been paid \$12,400—the salary he would have earned under his contract if he had taught four courses at the university for a period of 2 years. He has, to put it

simply, received 2 years' pay for doing nothing. He never taught a day at George Washington University.

Yet, the American Association of University Professors now brazenly accuses George Washington University of "gross irregularities" in handling his case. It denounces the university on the fantastic charge that it made "no provision for a final clearing up of the charges against him. Officials of the university, of course, have rejected the charge, and Professor Roderic H. Davison, chairman of the university's history department, has sent a letter to the AAUP, in behalf of the entire department, expressing complete disagreement with the AAUP accusation.

It is more than evident that there are "gross irregularities" in the operations of the AAUP, rather than George Washington University. It may appear startling that an organization of university professors should be so irresponsible in its actions. An analysis of the AAUP's past record, however, indicates that this is just what we should expect of the organization. Here are some of the things it has done:

It has censured the University of Washington for the "dismissal of the two faculty members whose sole offense was membership in the Communist Party."

It has censured the University of California because, by adopting a policy of not employing members of the Communist Party at the university—the AAUP said—it failed "to maintain conditions of freedom and tenure."

It has censured Temple University, among other reasons, on the ground that that university "seems to place on a faculty member who refuses to cooperate with a legislative committee a duty of demonstrating that he should be permitted to continue in the discharge of his teaching responsibilities."

It has censured Ohio State University because, by adopting a policy of excluding from the faculty not only Communists but persons suspected of communism, it had adopted "measures inimical to academic freedom."

It has censured the University of Michigan because it dismissed a professor who was an identified member of the Communist Party "on the theory that present membership necessarily involves acceptance of illegal and immoral principles and methods of action."

It has censured New York University because it adopted a policy which "regarded membership in the Communist Party as disqualifying a teacher from employment" at the university.

I could go on, but I think that this brief recitation of past AAUP actions should be sufficient to discredit the organization in the mind of any thinking person.

How does the AAUP rate in the eyes of those members of the intellectual community in this country it claims to speak for?

In 1956 the AAUP produced a report on academic freedom and national security. The following are some of the

reactions to that report from the intellectual community:

Twenty professors at North Dakota Agricultural College resigned from the organization, stating that they were doing so as a protest against the type of AAUP leadership that "condoned a biased and distorted report."

Prof. William Flemming, chairman of the department of political science at Ripon College, stated:

On July 11, 1949, an investigation committee of the AAUP stated that teachers had a right to belong to the Communist Party. According to the committee, only proved disloyalty constituted ground for dismissal. * * * Unfortunately, once more the AAUP has chosen to minimize the danger of possible subversion and fifth columnists in the field of education.

John L. Childs, professor emeritus at Columbia University, asked:

What moral influence will an action carry which is premised on the notion that an instructor should be defended in his position even though he deliberately subjects himself to the discipline of a party ideology that is shaped and reshaped to meet the demands of the Kremlin?

Frederic Heimberger, vice president of Ohio State University, said:

There is only one really new and crucial issue in the recommended statement of policy. It is the proposal to deny flatly the right of any institution to dismiss a faculty member for the sole reason that he is an avowed Communist.

He then went on to point out a glaring inconsistency in the AAUP statement. He asked:

By what strange logic is it proper to refuse to employ a Communist but, at the same time, praiseworthy to allow one to continue to teach once he has been appointed, unwittingly or otherwise?

Raymond Moley, the well-known Newsweek columnist, wrote:

The American Association of University Professors resolved this month in annual convention to nail its pink flag to the mast and go down fighting. * * * For its so-called principles not only damage the dignity but reproach the intelligence of the profession which the association professes to represent.

Mr. Moley pointed out that he had been a member of the AAUP, but that its actions of recent years had impelled him to make an investigation of it. As a result, he said:

I dropped my membership with but one regret—that I had not done so years before.

Perhaps the most stinging indictment of the AAUP and its report on academic freedom and national security came from Prof. Sidney Hook, of New York University, well-known liberal and former member of the AAUP's council. In an article in the New Leader magazine, Professor Hook raised the question of whether the report actually represented the views of the organization's membership. He also pointed out that of the 18 institutions covered in the report, only 2 had been actually visited by an AAUP investigating committee.

The committee—

Professor Hook said—

conducted itself like a kangaroo court, and based its findings on "facts of public knowl-

edge" even though these admittedly did not represent all the facts.

He stated, without qualification, that the principles in the AAUP report "will be gravely damaging to the AAUP and, more important, to the cause of academic freedom."

The report of the special committee—

Professor Hook stated—

reflects its ignorance of the Communist Party and its ways.

He then went on to say that "this is not the first time that a committee of the AAUP has portrayed either ignorance of, or indifference to, the nature of communism and the Communist Party." He pointed out:

It was the business of the special committee to assess these charges against members of the Communist Party thoroughly and honestly in the light of the ideals of professional ethics which the AAUP always stressed. They did nothing of the sort. They made no study of Communist Party activities in the colleges. They made no study of Communist Party directives to its members to abuse their professional trust. They cited no literature on the question. They met none of the arguments showing why supervision and observation of the behavior of Communist Party teachers in the classroom was morally undesirable and pedagogically impractical. They contented themselves with the pious statement that the academic community has a duty "to defend itself from subversion of the educational process."

Professor Hook made two more points which I think are most important to bring to the attention of this House and to the American public. He stated that—

1. The AAUP committee "goes on to advocate a policy which seemingly suggests that a college is actually failing in its educational duty unless members of the Communist Party are teaching on the campus."

2. The odd thing about the position of the AAUP on this question [of the Communist professors] is that it has never permitted its membership to discuss the issue fairly in the pages of its bulletin or to hear it debated by competent representatives of both sides before a national meeting. It has loaded the pages of the bulletin with only one position. It has refused point-blank to invite any speaker known to differ with the official position.

This then is the record of the American Association of University Professors. This is what professors of eminence and educational leaders think of the organization. These are facts which go far toward explaining why, when certain segments of the press play up the AAUP as an organization truly representative of the intellectuals of this country, many Americans—with justification—begin to wonder about our intellectuals. The AAUP is an organization of so-called intellectuals that has brought, and continues to bring, discredit on the true intellectuals of this country.

In view of the record of the AAUP, I believe that every Member of this House should be pleased that a university in our Capital has won the censure of the organization. Had it won praise from the American Association of University Professors, there would be cause to be concerned about George Washington

University. I, for one, wish to take this opportunity to extend my congratulations to the university for the action it took in the case of Professor Reichard and to assure it that its censure by the AAUP will in no way discredit it in the eyes of thinking Americans.

OIL IMPORTS

Mr. STEED. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and 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, as we draw to the close of this session of Congress, America's domestic oil industry still stands in Washington, hat in hand so to speak, pleading for an administration oil policy that will give this industry some hope for survival, and with its survival, the survival of the Nation.

Strong boasts are heard of the great legislative record we have compiled. We have touched on almost every field of American economic life, yet the one indispensable industry finds itself growing weaker day by day because of the unchecked flow of foreign, tax-free oil that is allowed to come into this country because of an inadequate import control policy.

Many Members of this Congress were assured by White House spokesmen that if they would go along with the Trade Agreements Act without insisting on amendments to the national security clause, where the oil industry was led to believe it could obtain relief, that the President would soon bring forth this relief in the form of an effective Executive order.

Knowing the seriousness of the situation, those of us who have made this problem our chief concern can only renew our plea that the President act and act quickly. We can only hope that the apparent influence of the huge, greedy oil importing companies will no longer block or forestall this desperately needed relief. They have had their way far too long for America's safety.

It was a matter of grave concern to these domestic oil producers, who have waited long and expectantly for help, to review the comment made on Wednesday last by the President at his press conference.

The President was asked this question:

Mr. President, several weeks ago the Director of the Office of Emergency Planning presented to you a study on crude oil import control program. Have you anything to say at this point particularly as to when there might be a decision, or what direction the decision might take?

The answer:

The report was not wholly accepted by me, so that I don't expect any announcement will be made about the matter at the present time.

After a year and 8 months, with study after study having been made, America's oil producers are asking: Why cannot

this administration come up with some dependable policy regarding its oil industry?

PERSONAL STATEMENT

Mrs. GRANAHAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 2 minutes.

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

There was no objection.

Mrs. GRANAHAN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take a few moments before the end of this session to make a personal statement. I shall keep it short; otherwise, I might not be able to complete it without an unseemly show of emotion.

My husband loved this House. He was a conscientious legislator of strong convictions, but he made friendships here on both sides of the aisle which he treasured. In the past 6 years, I have come to understand how he felt about this House. I shall always cherish these past years of service here.

To the Speaker, and to the leadership, I say thank you deeply for your gallantry and your wonderful encouragement and help. To my colleagues generally, I say, thank you for your friendship and your graciousness. My constituents have honored me by permitting me to serve them in the Congress of the United States. My colleagues here have made that service a source of immeasurable pleasure. I am deeply grateful to the Democratic leadership in Philadelphia, and particularly to our chairman, for the original opportunity to run for Congress.

The President has designated me for a new assignment, which I shall certainly try to perform to the best of my abilities. I am profoundly impressed by the confidence he has placed in me. It is my prayer that I shall never let him down—and my determination to serve him as ably as I can.

But in whatever work I shall be doing, I shall never lose my love for this House and my gratitude for the friendships I have made here. May God bless this House.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. GRANAHAN. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. ALBERT. First of all, I want to advise the House that the distinguished gentlewoman from Pennsylvania has been appointed Treasurer of the United States, and her appointment has been confirmed by the Senate. For that we all sincerely congratulate her.

Second, I want to say that there is no one, to my knowledge, who has served in this House since I have been a Member who is more loved and respected and admired by all Members, and certainly by me, than the distinguished gentlewoman from Philadelphia. She is a soldier, she is a gentlewoman indeed, and she is a Representative of the highest caliber. I hope at some future time the situation will be such that she will desire and will be able to return to us as a Member. We will miss you

KATHRYN. We wish you every success and happiness.

Mr. Speaker, I personally extend to Mrs. GRANAHAH my sincere thanks for the loyalty she has given me. Her friendship is one of the finest treasures of my life. There is no Member of the House who is more respected or more entitled to respect than our distinguished and charming colleague, KATHRYN GRANAHAH.

Mrs. GRANAHAH. I thank my colleague.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. GRANAHAH. I yield to the distinguished Speaker of the House, the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I join in everything that my distinguished friend, the majority leader, has said. The gentlewoman from Pennsylvania [Mrs. GRANAHAH] has made her mark in this legislative body. Her late husband was a distinguished Member of the National House of Representatives and the distinguished gentlewoman from Pennsylvania succeeded him. But in her own right, she has made an outstanding name for herself as a Member of this great body.

She has been one of the most loyal supporters that the late Sam Rayburn had and that I have had as Speaker, and the Democratic leadership has had. Her record as a legislator in all respects is outstanding. She has been a stalwart supporter of a strong national defense and a firm foreign policy. In the domestic field, the gentlewoman has supported progressive legislation in the best interests of our people.

As majority leader and as Speaker in this session of the Congress, I never had any doubt as to where Mrs. GRANAHAH would be—I knew she would be supporting the leadership in the passage of progressive and forward-looking legislation, and that she would be supporting President Kennedy and the leadership in the House of Representatives in bipartisan action in connection with a strong national defense and a firm foreign policy.

Mr. Speaker, President Kennedy properly recognized her great services as a legislator and her great capacity for service to our country in the future by appointing the gentlewoman from Pennsylvania as Treasurer of the United States, a position of great importance and of great trust.

With the distinguished gentlewoman on the assumption of her new position in this new field of activity in public life go the sentiments and best wishes of all of her colleagues without regard to party. We all know that she will make an outstanding success and will make one of the greatest Treasurers of the United States in the entire history of our country.

You will always be a Member of the House of Representatives in the hearts of those who have served with you in this great body.

Mrs. GRANAHAH. I thank the distinguished Speaker.

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. GRANAHAH. I yield to the gentlewoman.

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, I want very much to express my own regret that the gentlewoman from Philadelphia is not returning here as a member of the "Dove Party" in the House of Representatives. We have very much appreciated her gentleness, her firmness, and her charm. We women do not take sides; we just do our work, but it has been a particular pleasure to me to have little contacts with Mrs. GRANAHAH, and I am happy to have this opportunity to wish her well and to say that we shall miss her while she is away and hope, as the distinguished majority leader said, that she will be back someday as a Member of the House of Representatives.

Mrs. GRANAHAH. I thank my distinguished colleague, the gentlewoman from Ohio.

Mrs. MAY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. GRANAHAH. I yield to the gentlewoman.

Mrs. MAY. We certainly shall miss you, KATHRYN GRANAHAH—those of us who represent what we might say is perhaps a special minority in this body of Congress. But I would like to say that the women of this body, representing all the women in America, are always particularly gratified when one of us receives an appointment and the high honor that goes with it because of her outstanding qualifications and her ability. There is not one of us who has served with you, KATHRYN, who does not believe that the gentlewoman from Pennsylvania has been given this appointment on the basis of ability, competence, and effectiveness as demonstrated by her record of public service and public life. So it becomes a matter of gratification on the part of all of us, because it is an honor we share with you.

I personally have enjoyed the privilege of being a colleague and friend of the gentlewoman from Pennsylvania, and I am happy personally and proud of the honor that has been conferred upon her which she so richly deserves.

Mrs. GRANAHAH. I thank the gentlewoman from Ohio.

Mrs. PFOST. Mr. Speaker, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. GRANAHAH. I yield to the gentlewoman from Idaho.

Mrs. PFOST. Mr. Speaker, I, too, would like to join my colleagues, the distinguished Speaker [Mr. McCORMACK], the distinguished majority leader [Mr. ALBERT], and our other colleagues who have paid such wonderful and well-deserved tribute to the gentlewoman from Pennsylvania this afternoon.

All of us on both sides of the aisle will miss the gentlewoman from Pennsylvania. She has performed a tremendous service particularly in a public relations way with those of us who have worked closely with her. She has grown right into the hearts of all of us. When the gentlewoman from Pennsylvania, KATHRYN GRANAHAH, had some project she was particularly interested in, we all knew it

very shortly, and she had such practical wisdom she sponsored and furthered the type of legislation that we could generally support. I particularly wish to congratulate her upon the excellent work she did on the Post Office and Civil Service Committee as a most able and dedicated subcommittee chairman.

And while we are relinquishing her to the administrative branch downtown, we will look forward to seeing much of her in the future. I know she will serve in her capacity as Treasurer of the United States in a dignified, efficient, and able manner.

Had the gentlewoman from Pennsylvania chosen to run for reelection in her district, I am confident she would have been overwhelmingly elected. We are very proud to have been associated with the gentlewoman from Pennsylvania and give her our best wishes in her new assignment.

Mr. FLYNT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. GRANAHAH. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. FLYNT. Mr. Speaker, in addition to congratulating the gentlewoman from Pennsylvania on her recent appointment as Treasurer of the United States, I think it would also be appropriate to congratulate the President of the United States on the good judgment which he showed in selecting the gentlewoman from Pennsylvania for this very high position in Government.

It was a pleasure to the gentleman from Georgia upon first being elected to Congress to have served on the same committee with the gentlewoman's husband, the Honorable William T. Grana-han, the late Representative from the State of Pennsylvania. During the period of our service together we were very warm personal friends. With the election of the gentlewoman from Pennsylvania to the seat of her distinguished husband it has been my pleasure during the period of our service together to consider the gentlewoman from Pennsylvania my very warm personal friend.

A few days ago, the gentlewoman may recall, I had the pleasure of introducing a group of my constituents to her, and I want to join in one of the comments one of my constituents made to the next Treasurer of the United States when he said we would all like to make a substantial collection of her autographs.

Mrs. GRANAHAH. I thank the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. GRANAHAH. I yield to the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. As a representative of the deep South, South Carolina, and having been in Congress for 22 years, having known the gentlewoman's distinguished husband, I was glad to see you succeed him. Because I knew of the closeness of your family ties and the principles you stood for, I felt you would serve the highest traditions of the City of Brotherly Love. This you have done. Your engaging conversation, your intriguing personality and your fine friendliness to

all of us, North, East, South and West, have made all of us love you and respect you for what you are. When your name graces the currency of the United States the hearts of those who know the gentlewoman so well will swell with pride, because we know this currency will have an indefatigable defender for the most sacred thing a nation possesses, the sanctity of its currency and the guardian of its economy. We know that you will do just exactly this and that you will represent our President and our people in the greatest tradition of those who have held this great position before you.

We wish you every success in your new undertaking.

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Mr. Speaker, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. GRANAHAH. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Mr. Speaker, I feel your selection is one of the wisest selections the President has made since women's suffrage. I know our colleague has the same motto as Will Rogers.

I know each and every one of us have met the gentlewoman from Pennsylvania not only like and respect her but love her. It was my great privilege to serve with her husband. Both are wonderful people. I feel that the value of the dollar will be strengthened hereafter.

Mrs. GRANAHAH. I thank the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. GRANAHAH. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, in the Second District of Illinois the name of KATHRYN GRANAHAH is better known than the name of BARRATT O'HARA. I have received thousands of letters from the young men and young women of my district who look upon you as a saint of purity. Your work has made your name one of love, of respect, and inspiration in my district.

For myself, the Granahans have given my congressional service a deep graciousness. When I came here as a freshman your late beloved husband's office was across from my office. He was my mentor. He instructed me and inspired me. When he went to his reward, you came here, and during these years whenever I met you and encountered your smile and heard your words of optimism and encouragement I have said, "This is a grand world, and it is a great thing to be in the Congress with Congressman Granahan, and then with Congresswoman GRANAHAH."

Whenever I take a greenback from my pocket in the future and I see the signature of KATHRYN GRANAHAH, before I spend the bill I will kiss the signature.

Mrs. GRANAHAH. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. CHENOWETH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. GRANAHAH. I yield to the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. CHENOWETH. Mr. Speaker, I want to join my colleagues in paying tribute to the distinguished gentlewoman from Pennsylvania. I had the great pleasure and privilege of also serving in

this House with her late husband, and I had a great admiration and respect for him.

It has been a real privilege to serve in this body with the distinguished gentlewoman from Pennsylvania. She has rendered outstanding service to the Nation.

I want to take this opportunity to commend her upon the effective work she has done in an effort to stamp out obscene and pornographic literature in this country. She deserves the gratitude of every American citizen for what she has accomplished in this field, as chairman of the subcommittee of the House Post Office and Civil Service Committee. I sincerely feel that the gentlewoman from Pennsylvania has rendered a most valuable service to the youth of our Nation. I was greatly pleased when I learned of her appointment to this high office. I wish her success and much happiness as she assumes the duties of Treasurer of the United States.

Mrs. GRANAHAH. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. GRAY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. GRANAHAH. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. GRAY. Mr. Speaker, I consider it a great honor to join my colleagues in extending congratulations and best wishes to the gentlewoman from Pennsylvania as she prepares to accept her new post as Treasurer of the United States. We will miss her. We will miss her smile, her warm heart. We will miss the great service she has rendered not only to her district in Pennsylvania but to the entire country. I wish it were possible when she affixes her signature to the money bills that she could put the picture of her smiling face on the bills.

I think we could put more money into circulation. We also would appreciate the opportunity of being reminded of the great friendships and service the gentlewoman from Pennsylvania will leave here.

Mr. Speaker, I know there are a number of our colleagues who would like to join our great Speaker, the majority leader, and others who have spoken, in wishing for the gentlewoman from Pennsylvania the best of success in her new post.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks on this subject.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. LIBONATI. Mr. Speaker, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. GRANAHAH. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. LIBONATI. Mr. Speaker, I am very proud to associate myself with my colleagues relative to honoring the gentlewoman from Pennsylvania [Mrs. GRANAHAH], on this day. I know that the fortunes of politics sometimes place one in probably the deepest depressing cir-

cumstances which one can experience as a human being and which one can withstand.

Mr. Speaker, I know the gentlewoman loves the House of Representatives, its work and its membership. Her honest sense of direction on legislation created for her many, many admirers throughout the Nation, especially in the fact that the subject matter of the bills which she fostered and sponsored were such that every mother and father realized the importance of the legislation and its effect upon the lives of the young.

Mr. Speaker, to place her now in a position of importance within the administration reflects the honor and credit that is due her from those in authority to grant her one of the most important positions in our Government, one of trust, one that will reflect upon her and the honesty of purpose that she has always adhered to in all of her work and her consideration of others.

Mr. Speaker, I know that the gentlewoman from Pennsylvania leaves us with a heavy heart. I know what her suppressed desires really are. I appreciate the fact that in the enjoyment of this moment with her colleagues giving her the encomiums that she deserves, she leaves here with a better attitude and understanding of what she truly means to all of us.

Mr. Speaker, in the kindness of this moment may I say God bless you in the future and that we will welcome you back at any time you are desirous to return to the House of Representatives.

Mr. Speaker, I know that in the gentlewoman's retirement there were thousands of people in the State of Pennsylvania who were critical of the party that she so truly represented and who are having to be forced in some way to make a decision which in one respect the gentlewoman accepts. The courage of your choice is such to contribute to the party, to the strength of the Democratic Party in Pennsylvania, that you acceded to this request and campaigned for your colleagues, who in some measure took your place. That reflects fine character which brings out the true sentiments of a loyal Democrat to the party and to the purposes which that party espouses.

May God bless you in your future endeavorment to your party, to the administration and in your service.

Mrs. GRANAHAH. I thank the gentleman from Illinois. I thank my colleagues for these many, many kind words. I want all of you to know it is very difficult for me to leave the House of Representatives.

Mr. NIX. Mr. Speaker, my colleague, the gentlewoman from Pennsylvania, Mrs. KATHRYN E. GRANAHAH, who in 1956 succeeded her late husband as Representative of the Second District of the great Commonwealth, will depart for another distinguished post as Treasurer of the United States. She has served her constituency well while dedicating her energies at all times to the best interests of our Nation. Although we regret her departure; and we shall miss her infectious personality and her

reassuring presence, we heartily congratulate her, confident that the country shall continue to benefit from her knowledge and perseverance and integrity.

On behalf of the people of her entire district, and all of the people of the city of Philadelphia and the citizens of the United States as well, I wish her continued success and good health to perform those duties which the President has assigned her.

Mr. TOLL. Mr. Speaker, Philadelphia is proud indeed of her distinguished daughter, KATHRYN E. GRANAHAN. We are particularly proud of the latest honor to come her way—her appointment by the President to the high office of Treasurer of the United States.

It was my privilege to have known Mrs. GRANAHAN's late husband, the Honorable William T. Granahan, who represented the Fourth District of Pennsylvania in the House of Representatives. Bill Granahan, a man of warm "diplomatic" personality, was a gentle and effective representative of the people. His successor, the gracious gentlewoman from Pennsylvania, has exhibited the same wonderful qualities. She has continued her husband's industrious and devoted attention to duty in her service in the Congress. On numerous occasions when talking with people from her district, as well as other Philadelphians, they have praised her service to them personally and to the community.

Among KATHRYN GRANAHAN's contributions in the legislative field, has been her strong program to rid our country of obscene and pornographic material, which is so detrimental to the youth of our Nation. I had occasion to work with her on proposals to strengthen the procedure in the Post Office Department to weed out pornographic mailings.

I am proud to have served with KATHRYN GRANAHAN in the House of Representatives. As she moves on to assume her new important post as Treasurer of the United States, she takes with her the respect and fond wishes of her colleagues in the Congress—and her thousands of constituents and friends in a grateful city.

Mr. DAWSON. Mr. Speaker, I would like to express my appreciation for the valuable services of Hon. KATHRYN E. GRANAHAN who is leaving us after years of fruitful efforts in the Congress. The members of the Committee on Government Operations and of our Subcommittee on Executive and Legislative Reorganization on which she served have profited immensely from our association with her. Congresswoman GRANAHAN's unfailingly pleasant disposition and keen attentiveness to her duties have made her one of the most respected and beloved of our colleagues. We are particularly proud of her authorship of amendments to the Travel Expense Act which have proved so helpful to Government employees.

We congratulate her on her appointment to the high office of Treasurer of the United States and wish for her much success in carrying out the important responsibilities in that position.

Mr. BYRNE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I want to take this opportunity to join with many others in the House of Representatives in paying tribute to my friend and colleague, the Honorable KATHRYN E. GRANAHAN, who has been honored by the President in her appointment as Treasurer of the United States.

KATHRYN has been a conscientious and effective Member of the House of Representatives, as was her late husband who was also my good friend. When she leaves these Halls she will leave her mark, a lasting impression of charm, good looks, graciousness and efficiency. I am certain she will add the same distinction to the Treasury Department upon her installation there. Needless to say, she will take with her my whole-hearted wish for continued success and happiness. We will most assuredly miss her presence here in Congress.

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. Speaker, I was very pleased and happy to hear of KATHRYN GRANAHAN's confirmation as the Treasurer of the United States. I know our President selected the finest candidate for this very important post; and I further know that Mrs. GRANAHAN will do a splendid job.

I do, however, regret the fact that she will no longer be a Member of this House, where she has done an exceptional job for her country and her constituents.

I have known KATHRYN GRANAHAN for many years. She is a brilliant lady who has been blessed with compassion and understanding for her fellow man. We have worked together on many projects of concern to our City of Brotherly Love and her wisdom and understanding is remarkable.

As you know, Mr. Speaker, I will represent a major portion of Mrs. GRANAHAN's district in the 88th Congress and have had an opportunity to meet many of her people. They have the highest regard for her and I only hope I can in a small measure fill her footsteps.

To you, KATHRYN, I wish you every success in your new assignment and will pray for your continued good health and happiness.

Mr. MONAGAN. Mr. Speaker, we are all delighted with the nomination and confirmation of our colleague, the gentlewoman from Pennsylvania [Mrs. GRANAHAN] as Treasurer of the United States. She will fill this position with grace and with distinction.

On the other hand, there is no Member of the House who does not regret her departure from our midst and we shall all be sorry that her charm and her warmth will no longer help to ease the burdens of the long sessions which we necessarily experience.

I was privileged to serve with Mrs. GRANAHAN on the House Committee on Government Operations and I am keenly aware of the contribution that she made to that committee as well as her outstanding work on the Post Office and Civil Service Committee where she did so much to bring before the country the difficulty and the importance of the problem of distributing pornographic literature.

Mrs. GRANAHAN has been a responsible and constructive Member of this body

and on leaving it she will have the great satisfaction of knowing that a lasting contribution will remain behind.

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, it affords me a great deal of pleasure to pay tribute to my former neighbor and longtime friend, KATHRYN O'HAY GRANAHAN, the distinguished Member of the Pennsylvania delegation.

I had the pleasure of serving in this body with her late husband, who also was a conscientious Representative of his constituents. I certainly was pleased when KATHRYN succeeded him as a Member of the congressional delegation from Pennsylvania.

KATHRYN's family were neighbors of mine in our native Easton, Pa.

As chairman of a House Post Office and Civil Service Subcommittee, Mrs. GRANAHAN has distinguished herself for her devotion to duty. She has won worldwide recognition from all decent Americans for her fight against obscene literature.

I am positive that as she goes forth into her new position, that of Treasurer of the United States, she goes with the best wishes of every Member of this House. I am as equally positive that KATHRYN O'HAY GRANAHAN, my longtime friend, will serve in her new position with distinction just as she has done here in this great body.

Mr. RYAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I wish to take this opportunity to congratulate the distinguished gentlewoman from Pennsylvania [Mrs. GRANAHAN] upon her appointment as Treasurer of the United States.

In my short tenure of office as Congressman from the State of Michigan, I have become acquainted with her quite well and have found her to possess the qualities of leadership, friendliness and, above all, graciousness. I wish to be numbered among those who are sorry to see her leave this distinguished body, but I know that she will assume her new position in a new field of public activity with competence and effectiveness based on her ability shown in this House of Representatives.

It is with deep regret that this honorable body loses a valued Member; however, the President of the United States has full confidence in her abilities and has selected her to become our next custodian of public funds as Treasurer of the United States.

The gentlewoman from Pennsylvania has performed a tremendous service to the Nation as a Member of this House during the past 6 years. I know that she will cherish these memories as a Member of this honorable body. She has been a most loyal supporter of the Democratic Party and backed the party in its position for a strong national defense and firm foreign policy.

Mr. Speaker, President Kennedy properly recognized her great services as a legislator and her great capacity to further serve our country in the position of great importance and great trust. Again, I wish to congratulate her on the attainment of this high honor and humbly pray that God continues to bless her in her new tasks.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, I want to take this opportunity to express my regret that our distinguished colleague from Pennsylvania, the Honorable KATHRYN E. GRANAHAN, is terminating her service in the House of Representatives at the close of the present Congress.

During her term of service she has made a place for herself as a respected and influential Member of the House. It is gratifying to all of us that she will continue to serve the Nation as Treasurer of the United States.

I am sure that I express the consensus of the House of Representatives when I state that it has been a privilege to be associated with her and that all of us have benefited from her presence among us.

She has represented the people of her district in an outstanding manner while giving the fullest consideration and highest priority at all times to the national interest and the well-being of her fellow Americans throughout the Nation.

I want to congratulate Mrs. GRANAHAN on her new appointment and to assure her of the continued friendship of the House. We hope she will be a frequent visitor to the House Chamber where she will always find a warm welcome.

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, with each session of the Congress that passes into history we must endure the departure from amongst us of some of our most beloved and respected colleagues. Sometimes, such departures are occasions of grief, for we shall no longer ever see some of those colleagues on this earth. At other times, they are occasions of sadness, that the political tide we must all breast has for the moment overcome them. Then, there are those times when while we regret the loss to this great body, we are gratified and proud that our former colleague will continue to serve our Nation and her citizens with the same dedicated, effective effort, though in a new capacity.

So it is today.

Since her arrival in the House, I have been privileged to know the gentlewoman from Pennsylvania. Even before her arrival as our colleague, I was privileged, for in the 7½ years of my service before KATHRYN joined us, I knew her as the lovely, gracious lady of the distinguished late gentleman from Pennsylvania, William T. Granahan. Bill Granahan was one of the truly great young veterans who helped me when I first came to the House. He was a dear friend, a valued, respected counselor. And to have known him and served with him could not but generate a predisposition to respect KATHRYN when she was elected to take his place.

Immediately, however, KATHRYN won our admiration and respect on her own merits alone. On domestic legislation, or that on foreign policy, she has firmly, unflinchingly supported bills that will maintain our Nation as the leader of the free world, while giving to all our citizens the rights that are properly theirs. On the floor, or in her commit-

tees, KATHRYN has been one of our most courageous, effective leaders.

Now she leaves us. But thankfully, she will not be far away. On some recommendations and actions by the President and his Secretary of the Treasury there has not always been unanimous approbation from both sides of the aisle. In selecting KATHRYN GRANAHAN to be Treasurer of the United States, I know, however, that the President and the Secretary have the genuine congratulations of all our colleagues.

We shall miss you, KATHRYN. We look forward to seeing you soon, as soon as you have the time to break away from downtown. We shall not forget the work you have done here. We shall not forget you.

May God bless you always with good health and the strength to continue to serve as you have always served.

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Speaker, I want to join my colleagues in congratulating our distinguished colleague from Pennsylvania, the Honorable KATHRYN E. GRANAHAN, on her appointment by President Kennedy and upon her confirmation as Treasurer of the United States. I am happy to have been among those who urged her appointment.

It has been my privilege to serve with the gentlewoman from Pennsylvania [Mrs. GRANAHAN] since her election to the 84th Congress. She has served her district and the Nation with great distinction. The entire country is grateful for her vigorous and fruitful efforts to remove smut from the mails. The people of my district in Cleveland, Ohio, were very well aware of Mrs. GRANAHAN's work and instructed me to support her program, which I did.

My best wishes go to the gentlewoman from Pennsylvania [Mrs. GRANAHAN] on her new responsibilities. She is eminently qualified to be the best Treasurer in history. I know she will make the effort.

Mr. DADDARIO. Mr. Speaker, I wish to join in expressing my congratulations to the distinguished gentlewoman from Pennsylvania [Mrs. GRANAHAN] upon her selection and appointment to be Treasurer of the United States.

A brief review of Mrs. Granahan's career indicates to anyone her devotion to human beings and compassionate causes. Interested and experienced in welfare problems, she has taken part in many programs relating to better medical care for our people, and holds an honorary degree from St. Joseph's College in Philadelphia.

I have watched her with admiration since joining her in the Congress and want to pay tribute to her indefatigable efforts. The Nation can be grateful for the special work she has done in combating the flow of indecent materials in the country.

The Congress will miss her, but the Nation will gain a fine public servant in her new role. The President should be congratulated for his outstanding choice of a new Treasurer.

Mr. GARMATZ. Mr. Speaker, it is indeed a privilege to join my colleagues in paying tribute to the Representative

from the Second District of Pennsylvania, KATHRYN GRANAHAN.

I knew Mrs. GRANAHAN very well while serving in the Congress with her late husband and was greatly pleased with her election as his successor. She has upheld his ideals and principles and has been an outstanding Member of the House. Having served with her on the Committee on Government Operations, I was able to observe firsthand her fine work, devotion to duty, her ability, and her dedication. We will miss her very much in the House and regret that circumstances make it necessary for her to resign.

However, our loss will be another Government agency's gain, and as Treasurer of the United States, she will have the opportunity to continue the splendid record of service which has characterized her entire adult life. In both civic and political life she has set an excellent example for all of us, one worthy of emulation.

My heartiest congratulations to Mrs. GRANAHAN on her new appointment and my best wishes and prayers go with her in her new duties.

Mrs. KELLY. Mr. Speaker, our colleague, Congresswoman KATHRYN E. GRANAHAN, has undertaken the duties and responsibilities of administering the office of the Treasurer of the United States. Since the 84th Congress Mrs. GRANAHAN has served the needs of the people of Pennsylvania; she has the distinction of being the first woman elected to Congress from the city of Philadelphia. Her work as a legislator has earned her commendable citation. Her dedicated service, industry and energy have, I am sure, prompted the President to appoint her to this highly responsible post.

KATHRYN GRANAHAN succeeded her husband, the late Congressman William T. Granahan, who had until the time of his death served the people of Pennsylvania. The Granahan family has, therefore, made its distinguishing mark in Congress during an important decade in American history.

In her new role, Mrs. GRANAHAN, will assume the responsibility for the receipt, custody and disbursement of public moneys, and for maintaining the records in connection with the source, location, and disposition of U.S. funds. This is a staggering responsibility when one considers the universal recognition accorded the integrity of the U.S. dollar, and its use as a benchmark of value by all nations. She will, among other duties, maintain close liaison with the Federal Reserve Board, commercial banks, and our postal savings system through her many office divisions. Her alertness and energy will go far in maintaining confidence in our monetary and fiscal systems.

KATHRYN GRANAHAN will, we know, perform this difficult job with the same closeness of attention to detail and versatility with which she addressed herself to her congressional duties, during which time she has earned and merited the friendship and confidence of the memberships of both sides of the aisle. In joining the executive branch she will bring to that portion of our Government

a talent and ability which will assure good government, trust, and the faithful discharge of the duties and responsibilities of her new office.

While we regret with a deep sense of loss her departure from Capitol Hill, it is reassuring to know that her services will continue for the benefit of all the people of the United States.

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, now that Congresswoman KATHRYN E. GRANAHAN, of Pennsylvania, has been nominated by President Kennedy and confirmed by the U.S. Senate for the position of Treasurer of the United States, I want to express my heartfelt congratulations to KATHRYN, knowing that she will fill this important position with honor and great ability. We will certainly miss her here as one of the outstanding Members of the House, however.

My husband served with KATHRYN's husband, Bill, on the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. During the first 3 years of my service here, Congressman Granahan was a gracious and helpful colleague, and since 1956, I have been privileged to enjoy KATHRYN's friendship as a colleague. She has distinguished herself as a leader against the misuse and abuse of the mails for transmitting filth and pornography, and I am sure her efforts and the legislation she sponsored will continue to have a great effect in combating the flood of obscene materials aimed primarily at children.

Mrs. GRANAHAN has also been an outstanding friend of Government employees and particularly of the postal workers, as a ranking member and a subcommittee chairman in the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service. And her devotion to the well-being of her constituents is well known to all of us here. She has, therefore, built a substantial and admirable congressional record of achievement.

The redistricting of the Pennsylvania congressional districts cannot help but result in an injustice to the people whom KATHRYN represented so ably, and it is most unfortunate that her district was divided and eliminated. However, she accepted this great disappointment in her usual manner, and will now put her very effective talents into a new assignment where her charm, intelligence, and devotion to duty will make her a truly outstanding official of the Government of the United States, as Treasurer of the United States.

My very, very warm wishes go with you, KATHRYN, as you prepare to start on the important responsibilities you are undertaking in the administration of President John F. Kennedy.

Mr. GIAIMO. Mr. Speaker, I join in extending my heartiest congratulations and best wishes to our colleague from Pennsylvania [Mrs. GRANAHAN] as she leaves the House of Representatives after a distinguished 6-year record of service to become Treasurer of the United States.

As a member of the Post Office and Civil Service and Government Operations Committees, Mrs. GRANAHAN became an outstanding expert in the intri-

cacies of the Postal Establishment. By her diligent work on the Post Office Committee she led the fight against pornographic literature in the mails, a fight which won for her the praise of parents, churches, and civic groups throughout the country.

It has been a pleasure to serve with such an outstanding legislator and conscientious public servant. We wish Mrs. GRANAHAN every happiness on her challenging new assignment in the executive branch.

H.R. 10508 WOULD CURB TESTING ABUSE IN SCHOOLS

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, I have introduced H.R. 10508 which would curb abuses in many of the testing programs which are being conducted in our schools throughout the United States. Its purpose is to assure that parents be apprised of tests of a nonacademic nature which are to be administered to their children. It is based on the positive belief that parents are primarily responsible for the upbringing of their children and that schools are partners in that sphere, along with the church and home, and not preeminent. All too many educators are taking the view that education is the exclusive province of the schools. I believe there is an urgent need for this legislation so that proper guidance and counseling will not be confused with brainpicking and interference.

The U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, in its booklet No. OE-25003 (1962) notes that—

Tests are classified in terms of the purpose for which they are designed, for example: mental ability, intelligence, or scholastic aptitude tests; achievement tests; interest inventories; and personality inventories.

The latter two areas render themselves subject to wide abuse if not properly administered and constitute, in many cases, an outright invasion of the privacy of the home and family life.

On page 10, this booklet, entitled "Understanding Testing," states:

A personality inventory is designed to measure personal adjustment, to describe a person in terms of his personality traits, or to discover the nature of his problems. Such tests differ in purpose, types of items, and the traits they purport to measure.

It can be seen at the outset that all children are deemed to have problems. A well-adjusted, successful pupil is tested right along with the rest. In all of the testing which I have researched, the tests are uniformly administered to all students and not merely those who have problems.

On the same page, booklet OE-25003 honestly admits the dangers inherent in this shotgun approach of testing by this cautious injunction:

Much care should be exercised in the use and interpretation of results, for much dam-

age can be done when inadequately trained people interpret inventory scores.

HEW sees no danger, however, in the overall invasion of privacy that comes when children are asked questions such as these:

My father is a tyrant.
I feel there's a barrier between me and my parents.

My parents play favorites.
I'm ashamed of my father's job.
I'm ashamed of my parents' dress and manners.

My parents avoid discussing sex with me.
I wonder if I am normal in my sexual development.

I want to know about venereal disease.
I need an acceptable vocabulary to discuss sex.

I think about sex a good deal of the time.
How far should high school students go in love relations?

I'm confused in my religious beliefs.
I'm bothered by thoughts of heaven and hell.

Is there a conflict between the Bible and my school subjects?

I'm losing faith in religion.
Is it wrong to deny the existence of God?

These are but a few of the 298 questions which are contained in the SRA Youth Inventory, published by the Science Research Associates, one of numerous testing services available to our high schools. It is my contention that non-academic tests of this type should be given only with parental consent. At the present time they can be given without any prior notice to the parents. A school would be in serious trouble if it would undress young students for examination or inoculate them with some serum without parental permission. Yet, virtually the same thing is being done all of the time through these brainpicking tests which literally undress young people and interfere in private areas which would better be left alone by schools.

Many tests call for difficult or impossible answers—in some cases pitting loyalties of religion, home, and parents against each other. Take the following excerpts from one moral value inventory exam, for example:

Which is worse: (1) spitting on the Bible; (2) spitting on the American flag?

Which is more important: (1) taking the oath of allegiance to the United States; (2) joining a church?

Which is worse: (1) denying the existence of God; (2) laughing while the Star-Spangled Banner is being played?

Which of the following men contributed more to the progress of mankind: (1) St. Paul (in the Bible); (2) Abraham Lincoln?

Guidance and counseling received a big boost through the enactment of the National Defense Education Act of 1958. Section V carries the high sounding name "Guidance, Counseling, and Testing: Identification and Encouragement of Able Students." The purpose of the title V was set out as follows:

To provide financial assistance to the States to establish and maintain (1) a testing program in secondary schools to identify students with outstanding aptitudes and abilities, and (2) a program of guidance and counseling in the public secondary schools to encourage students to complete their secondary school education in preparation for their entrance into institutions of

higher education and to enter such institutions.

Nothing here would seem to foster or encompass the nonacademic, psychological testing aforementioned. The 1961 amendment restated the same purpose and expanded the program to include the seventh and eighth grades.

One point should be made clear. Testing of this type could be done without the NDEA. It has been through the NDEA that guidance and counseling has become vogue. Most of this testing would seem to be legitimate when directed toward the principle of encouraging students in developing their abilities and goals. Office of Education Commissioner McMurrin testified that during the 2 years of operation of title V, a 50-percent increase occurred in the number of qualified full-time counselors employed by secondary schools. The counselor-pupil ratio, he stated, had improved throughout the Nation during this period from 1 to 750 to 1 to 610, a substantial step toward the ratio of 1 to 300 acknowledged by leaders in the field to be the acceptable proportion. The NDEA has been a vehicle to enhance testing at the high school level.

On the face of it, HEW has maintained that there is no authorization in the National Defense Education Act for testing projects of the type referred to in my legislation. Counselors in high schools who are supported by HEW funds, however, are currently conducting such tests. Laws on the State level are obviously needed to further block the loopholes for these nonacademic invasions of privacy.

Here is the test which is currently being given to secondary school students in my State of Ohio and elsewhere throughout the Nation:

SRA YOUTH INVENTORY

(Form A, prepared by H. H. Remmers, Purdue University and Benjamin Shimberg, director of Educational Testing Service guidance inquiry)

MY SCHOOL

1. I have difficulty keeping my mind on my studies.
2. I wish I knew how to study better.
3. I wish I knew more about using the library.
4. I have difficulty taking notes.
5. I don't know how to prepare for tests.
6. I wish I could be more calm when I recite in class.
7. I spend too much time studying.
8. I would like to take courses that are not offered in my school.
9. I dislike my courses.
10. I have too much homework.
11. I hate school.
12. I feel sleepy in class even when I've had enough sleep at night.
13. I wish I could quit school now.
14. I doubt the value of things I study.
15. I am too restless to stay in school.
16. I have difficulty keeping my mind on what goes on in class.
17. My courses are too far removed from everyday life.
18. I must select a vocation that doesn't require college.
19. I would like to get some practical work experience.
20. I have difficulty expressing myself in writing.
21. I need some individual help with my courses.

22. My teachers give me no encouragement.
23. My teachers make fun of me.
24. My teachers don't make assignments clear.
25. My teachers aren't interested in me.
26. My teachers are too strict.
27. My teachers are too impersonal.
28. My teachers play favorites.
29. My teachers don't understand me.
30. Class periods are not well organized.
31. My teachers aren't interested in the things that interest me.
32. My teachers don't like me.
33. I have difficulty expressing myself in words.

AFTER HIGH SCHOOL?

34. What are my real interests?
35. What shall I do after high school?
36. For what work am I best suited?
37. How much ability do I actually have?
38. I would like to know more definitely how I am doing in my school work.
39. I need advice in choosing courses.
40. I want to know more about what people do in college.
41. Should I go to college?
42. What are the requirements for college?
43. How shall I select a college?
44. Can I get into the college of my choice?
45. I wish I could afford college.
46. Should I borrow money for college?
47. What are some ways of financing a college education?
48. How do you fill out application blanks for college?
49. Do I have the ability to do college work?
50. I would like to have more vocational courses.
51. How can I get apprenticeship training?
52. What are some careers for girls?
53. I want to learn a trade.
54. What courses will be most valuable to me later on?
55. What fields are overcrowded?
56. What career shall I pursue?
57. What training do different vocations require?
58. How will the draft affect me?
59. What are the opportunities in different fields?
60. What jobs are open to high school graduates?
61. How do I get about finding a job?
62. Where can I go for help in finding a job?
63. I wish I could write good letters of application.
64. How can I prepare for a job interview?
65. For what kind of job should I apply?
66. How should I act during an interview?
67. I have no work experience.
68. What's expected of me on a job?
69. What is proper office etiquette?
70. Am I likely to succeed in the work I do when I finish school?

ABOUT MYSELF

71. I'm easily excited.
72. I have trouble keeping my temper.
73. I worry about little things.
74. I'm nervous.
75. I can't sleep at night.
76. I can't help daydreaming.
77. I have thoughts of suicide.
78. I feel guilty about things I've done.
79. I'm not popular with (boys) (girls).
80. I often feel lonesome.
81. I feel "low" much of the time.
82. My feelings are easily hurt.
83. I need to learn not to let people push me around.
84. I don't see much future for myself.
85. I often do things I later regret.
86. People dislike my race or nationality.
87. I lack the drive others have.
88. People stare at me.
89. I feel that I'm not wanted.
90. I have a "crush" on an older person.

91. I'm not ready for any job when I graduate.
92. I hesitate to take responsibility.
93. I feel that I'm not as smart as other people.
94. I must always be "on the go."
95. I prefer to be alone.
96. I must learn to "keep my head" when things go wrong.
97. I would like to discuss my personal problems with someone.
98. I wonder if I am normal in the way my mind works.
99. I worry about tests.
100. I'm unsure of myself.
101. I feel that I'm different from the other kids.
102. I'm trying to get rid of an undesirable habit.
103. I'm afraid of failure or humiliation.
104. My nose is ugly.
105. I bite my nails.
106. I can't help feeling bad when I can't get my own way.
107. I don't know why people get angry with me.
108. I don't know what is expected of me.
109. I wish I could overcome being care-less.
110. I'm always thinking up alibis.
111. I'm afraid of making mistakes.
112. I'm afraid to speak up in class.
113. I can't do anything right.
114. I don't want to leave home for a job or college.

GETTING ALONG WITH OTHERS

115. I want people to like me better.
116. I don't know how to introduce people properly.
117. I wish I could carry on a pleasant conversation.
118. I don't know how to treat people whom I don't like.
119. I wish I were more popular.
120. I want to make new friends.
121. I need to develop self-confidence.
122. I need to be more tactful.
123. I wish I knew how to drop a person I no longer want for a friend.
124. I don't know how to act on formal occasions.
125. I'm ill at ease at social affairs.
126. I want to learn to dance.
127. I want to feel important to society or to my own group.
128. I wish I had things to talk about in a group.
129. I can't live up to the ideals set by groups to which I belong.
130. I need to learn how to keep from being too aggressive.
131. How much initiative should I take in getting invited to parties or dances?
132. I need to learn to be a good listener.
133. I need to learn to be more tolerant of other people's opinions.
134. I need to learn how to plan a party.
135. There aren't enough places for wholesome recreation where I live.
136. I don't know what clothes to wear on different occasions.
137. I get stage fright when I speak before a group.
138. I'd like to learn proper table manners.
139. I need to learn how to get along with people my own age.
140. I need to learn to be a "good sport" in games.
141. I'm often left out of things other kids do.
142. I need to learn how to select the right clothes for my figure.
143. I wish I knew how to use cosmetics properly.
144. I don't know how much of my inner feelings to reveal to my friends.
145. I need to learn to be on time for appointments.
146. I need to learn how to order food in a restaurant.

147. I need to learn how to work for the good of the group.
 148. I'd like to know how to become a leader in my group.
 149. I have difficulty deciding between my own standards and those of the crowd.
 150. I can't find a part-time job to earn spending money.
 151. I need money for social affairs.
 152. I don't have a (girl) (boy) friend.
 153. I am not attractive to the other sex.
 154. I can't seem to live up to the ideals I have set for myself.

MY HOME AND FAMILY

155. I have no quiet place at home where I can study.
 156. I can't get along with my brothers and sisters.
 157. There is constant bickering and quarreling in my home.
 158. I feel that I'm a burden on my parents.
 159. I have to do too many chores around the house.
 160. My allowance is too small.
 161. I feel there's a barrier between me and my parents.
 162. I can't discuss personal things with my parents.
 163. My father is a tyrant.
 164. I don't like to invite people to my home.
 165. I don't feel that I belong in the family.
 166. I am seldom consulted in family decisions.
 167. I want to be accepted as a responsible person by my parents.
 168. My parents play favorites.
 169. My parents interfere with the spending of the money I earn.
 170. My parents are trying to decide my vocation for me.
 171. My parents are too strict about letting me use the family car.
 172. My parents are too strict about dating.
 173. My parents won't let me make my own decisions.
 174. I get no encouragement at home.
 175. My parents don't usually respect my opinions.
 176. My parents don't trust me.
 177. My parents expect too much of me.
 178. My parents are too strict about my going out at night.
 179. I am criticized for dating someone older than I am.
 180. I am criticized for dating a person of whom others do not approve.
 181. I have too many dates.
 182. I wish I could get my parents to treat me like a grownup.
 183. I wish I had my own room.
 184. I am ashamed of my father's job.
 185. I am ashamed of my parents' dress and manners.
 186. I wish I could gain the confidence of my parents.
 187. I want to get married soon.
 188. I feel like leaving home.
 189. My family tries to hold me down.
 190. I am afraid to tell my parents when I have done something wrong.
 191. I must turn over my earnings to the family.
 192. I feel disloyal because I do not share the views of my parents.
 193. My parents are too strict about permitting me to date on school nights.
 194. My family is always worried about money.
 195. My parents often pry into my private affairs.
 196. My parents object to my following fads.
 197. My parents continually nag about studying.
 198. My parents neglect me.
 199. My parents interfere in my choice of friends.

200. My parents disapprove of my social activities.
 201. My parents won't let me do my own shopping.
 202. My parents hate to admit that I'm sometimes right.
 203. My parents are cold toward my friends.
 204. My parents aren't interested in what I accomplish.
 205. My parents criticize me too much.
 206. My parents don't let me decide in which activities I can take part.
 207. My parents avoid discussing sex with me.

BOY MEETS GIRL

208. I seldom have dates.
 209. I don't know how to ask for a date.
 210. There is no place to dance in the town where I live.
 211. I'm bashful about asking girls for dates.
 212. I don't know how to keep (boys) (girls) interested in me.
 213. I don't know what to do on a date.
 214. What are good manners on a date?
 215. How do I refuse a date politely?
 216. I'm bothered by dirty stories or vulgar talk.
 217. I wonder if I am normal in my sexual development?
 218. I don't know how to break up with a person I have been dating without causing bad feelings.
 219. Is there anything wrong with going places "stag"?
 220. Is it all right to accept "blind dates"?
 221. Is drinking harmful?
 222. I am dating a person of a different religion than mine.
 223. How can I keep (boys) (girls) from taking me for granted?
 224. Should I go steady?
 225. Should I kiss my date the first time we go out together?
 226. Must I neck to be popular?
 227. I'm embarrassed in any discussion of sex.
 228. I wonder if high school students should pet and make love.
 229. I need an acceptable vocabulary to discuss sex.
 230. I think about sex a good deal of the time.
 231. How far should high school students go in love relations?
 232. I need more correct information about sex.
 233. I don't understand how children are born.
 234. I have conflicting information about sexual matters.
 235. I want to know about venereal disease.
 236. What things should one consider in selecting a mate?
 237. How long should people know each other before getting married?
 238. How can I prepare myself for marriage and family life?
 239. What things cause trouble in marriage?
 240. I want to gain (or lose) weight.
 241. I want to learn how to select foods that will do me the most good.
 242. I smoke too much.
 243. I am crippled (or have some other handicap).
 244. I am bothered by menstrual disorders.
 245. I'm concerned about improving my figure.
 246. I want to improve my posture and body build.
 247. My stomach is upset easily.
 248. What can I do about bad breath?
 249. Is smoking harmful?
 250. What can I do about body odor?
 251. I worry about my health.
 252. I don't get enough exercise.
 253. I get tired easily.

254. I don't get enough sleep.
 255. I have no pep.
 256. My teeth need attention.
 257. I have frequent headaches.
 258. I have frequent colds.
 259. I don't hear very well.
 260. My muscles are poorly developed.
 261. I have no appetite.
 262. I want to get rid of pimples.
 263. I sometimes feel faint.
 264. I wonder if I am normal in my energy and endurance.

THINGS IN GENERAL

265. I'm concerned with what life is all about.
 266. I'm confused in my religious beliefs.
 267. I'm bothered by thoughts of Heaven and Hell.
 268. Is there a conflict between the Bible and my school subjects?
 269. I feel that I'm not living up to my religion.
 270. I'm searching for something to believe in.
 271. How does one set standards of "right" and "wrong"?
 272. I'm concerned about cheating.
 273. I'm having difficulty deciding what's important in life.
 274. I'm confused on some moral questions.
 275. Can I believe the newspapers and radio?
 276. How can I help get rid of intolerance?
 277. How can I help to make the world a better place in which to live?
 278. What can I do about the injustice all around us?
 279. I'm mixed up about world affairs.
 280. I'm worried about the next war.
 281. Is there something I can do about race prejudice?
 282. Is there any way of eliminating slums?
 283. What can I do to help get better government?
 284. How can I learn to use my leisure time wisely?
 285. I have difficulty budgeting my time.
 286. How can I learn to get the most for my money?
 287. Does one have to take advantage of people to be successful?
 288. What can I contribute to civilization?
 289. I'm losing faith in religion.
 290. I need to develop a satisfactory philosophy of life.
 291. I can't decide whether or not money is the major thing to work for in life.
 292. How can we get honest government?
 293. Can I believe advertising?
 294. What is eternity?
 295. Does it really pay to be honest?
 296. I wonder about the after-life.
 297. Is it wrong to deny the existence of God?
 298. What makes people selfish or unkind?

A typical type test which deals with wishes, desires and impulses is the *Wishing Well*, published by the Bureau of Educational Research, Ohio State University, given to youth in grades 4 through 7. Here are a few of the eight score wishes which the child is supposed to answer:

I wish I did not feel so different from my parents.
 I wish I could talk over important things with my parents more often.
 I wish I felt like a real member of the family.
 I wish my parents did things that would make me feel more love toward them.
 I wish I could be sure my father would always have a steady job.
 I wish our family could afford to give each other better presents at Christmas and on birthdays.
 I wish I knew how you can believe that God is always right and at the same time believe that you should think for yourself.

I wish I knew how you can make lots of money and still be a very good citizen.

I wish someone would help me to see the place of religion in my life.

I wish I liked Negro children as well as white children.

I wish I knew how you can like your own country best and at the same time like people in other countries too.

I wish I knew why factories sometime shut down when people need the things factories make.

I wish I knew why people say that everyone is equal when some people have more money than others.

A parent could well ask what all of this has to do with the educational process. Suggestions often plant seeds of doubt. Children who are normal may begin to think they are not normal. To read all of the 160 questions tends to give anyone an inferiority complex.

It can be seen that tests of this type go far beyond any superficial goal of testing academic prowess or even the proper role of assisting a student to select his vocational pursuit. These tests are based on the premise of so-called life adjustment by which the student is psychoanalyzed and then fitted into the group by adjustment. Miss Emily Cuyler Hammond conducted an intensive study of the surge toward togetherness in the Germany of the thirties and refers to these testers as a dedicated cult of hidden persuaders "using the Freudian art of motivation research to reach and manipulate young minds." She added:

These are not the Madison Avenue hucksters of bubble gum, station wagons or other materialistic accouterments of belongingness. These are the modern educationists and guidance counselors, selling not only packaged, sugar-coated, easy-to-take lessons but the necessity of adjustment to togetherness, or belongingness, itself.

In a free society, education should be directed toward teaching the child to think. Not to think what I might think or the testers might think but to think for himself and make his own decisions. The home, the church, the overall sense of morality which we imbue into our children implant the sense of right and wrong which make the ability to think meaningful. To develop patterns referred to in UNESCO booklets as "right attitudes" is indeed a dangerous one in a free society and can well lead our youth down the path to collectivism and internationalism whereby they gradually lose their loyalty to home and nation.

There is ample room for doubt of the validity of these so-called personal inventory exams. Pitirim A. Sorokin, one-time head of the Department of Sociology at Harvard, in his book, "Fads and Foibles in Modern Sociology and Related Sciences," observes that—

At the present time in Western countries almost every individual is tested from the cradle to the grave, before and after the important events in his life. He is given a battery of various tests after his birth, in his nursery school and kindergarten, in his elementary school, high school, and college, before and after his draft into the Armed Forces, before and during his marriage, before and after his gainful employment, and so on, up to the tests preceding and following his death. His life-career is largely de-

termined by these tests. Beginning with intelligence tests and ending with the tests of loyalty and subversiveness, various testers have replaced the old-fashioned angel-guardians that supposedly guided the life-course of each person. We are living in an age of testocracy. By their tests of our intelligence, emotional stability, character, aptitude, unconscious drives, and other characteristics of our personality, the testocrats largely decide our vocation and occupation. They play an important role in our promotions or demotions, and in our successes and failures in social position, reputation, and influence. They determine our normality or abnormality, our superior intelligence or hopeless stupidity, our loyalty or subversiveness. By all this they are largely responsible for our happiness or despair, and, finally, for our long life or premature death.

The enormous influence of tests is primarily due to the supposedly scientific and infallible character of these tests. The testocrats have succeeded in selling their tests as strictly scientific, precise, operational and unerring. As such they are rarely challenged and hardly ever questioned.

In this testomania, Sorokin observes that the defectiveness of the tests is notably increased by the conditions under which they are administered. They are for the most part not continuous but sporadic ad hoc tests, given only once or a few times. Results tend to be somewhat accidental and may be entirely unrepresentative of the knowledge or the traits of the testee.

The most notable complaint that can be lodged against these personal inventory examinations is that the results are autocratically decided by the testers. Many questions in the above SRA examinations ask for wishes, desires, aspirations, preferences, tastes and other subjective evaluations by the testee. It is entirely possible that the testers are not right, especially when it comes to sociological problems. In many cases it can be shown that the right answers are wrong. Sorokin points out that when these tests deal with psychosocial phenomena:

For instance, when they probe the psychological, psychiatric, sociological, anthropological, economic, political, historical, philosophical, ethical, juridical or aesthetic values of the tested person—the unreliability of the tests is still more increased for the following reason. In these fields there are few generally accepted concepts, definitions, theories, methods, uniformities and values. In these disciplines we have, instead, different theories, approaches, generalizations and values. Insofar as the testers are all too human, they are inclined to regard their own denominational creed. In this way new elements of subjectivity are introduced into the tests.

Although they would never admit it, I am sure it is hitting close to home.

THE GENESIS OF BRAINPICKING

The trend toward testing programs of this type has its genesis in the Freudian concept of psychiatry. Supposedly, these people are specially anointed to solve all of the ills of the world by ridding man of his delusions, repressions, frustrations, and problems up to and including wars. When their theory is reduced to practice we have life adjustment curriculum in schools whereby the student "adjusts" to his various neuroses. These neuroses are spotted

by the eye of the tests given not to check academic achievement but rather through subjective brainpicking tests which probe into the deepest recesses of the mind and deal with opinions, attitudes, and ideas—many of which have always been private through good taste and modesty.

Dr. G. B. Chisholm, renowned psychiatrist, solemnly told a group of his compatriots:

With the other human sciences, psychiatry must now decide what is to be the immediate future of the human race. No one else can. And this is the prime responsibility of psychiatry.

He was giving the William Alanson White Memorial Lectures on "The Psychiatry of Enduring Peace and Social Progress" and this address was printed in the February 1946 issue of "Psychiatry—Journal of the Biology and the Pathology of Interpersonal Relations."

What stands in the way of attaining the goals that Dr. Chisholm wanted? He states:

For many generations we have bowed our necks to the yoke of the conviction of sin. We have swallowed all manner of poisonous certainties fed us by our parents, our Sunday and day school teachers, our politicians, our priests, our newspapers, and others with a vested interest in controlling us.

He makes it about as clear as one can. Morality is the culprit—our burdensome sense of right and wrong. Pierce this iron veil of stultifying restraint and you will have progress. Impeding progress are the forces of the home and church—they must go.

If the race is to be freed from its crippling burden of good and evil it must be psychiatrists who take the original responsibility.

How will all of this be done? He has an easy answer—the upbringing of the child. He states:

The most important thing in the world today is the bringing up of children. It is not a job for economic or emotional misfits, for frightened, inferiority-ridden men and women seeking a safe, respectable and quickly attainable social and emotional status. * * * It is therefore necessary that, for so long as it may take to change the bringing up of children in enough of the world, our close watch on each other and everyone in the world should not be relaxed for a moment.

By proper training children will not grow up as their elders did with a "warped" sense of guilt emanating from the antiquated sense of sin. In fact, sin is the arch-enemy of progress and has caused all of our troubles. According to Dr. Chisholm—

The only psychological force capable of producing these perversions (note: preventing the rational use of intelligence) is morality, the concept of right and wrong, the poison long ago described and warned against as "the fruit of the tree of the knowledge of good and evil." We have been very slow to rediscover this truth and to recognize the unnecessary and artificially imposed inferiority, guilt and fear, commonly known as sin, under which we have almost all labored and which produces so much of the social maladjustment and unhappiness in the world.

Freedom from moralities, says Dr. Chisholm, means freedom to think and behave sensibly. By a program of reedu-

cation a new world can be molded and children be prepared for world citizenship.

Who is this man? A crackpot? He has influenced your life more than you would care to admit. My study of this area has extended over several years and many related subjects. Brainpicking tests and life adjustment education are part and parcel of this field. Dr. Chisholm cannot be dismissed lightly—if for no other reason than the positions he has held. He was Director-General of the World Health Organization in its formative years and president of the World Federation for Mental Health, 1957-58—how about those for qualifications. It is not surprising to also learn that he is honorary president of the World Federalists of Canada.

Cut out of the same cloth are the recommendations of another United Nations agency, UNESCO, which would redesign the upbringing of our youth if it had its way. In their "Toward World Understanding," we see the same line of reasoning:

The kindergarten or infant school has a significant part to play in the child's education. * * * Not only can it correct the errors of home training, but it can also prepare the child for membership * * * in the world society [page 9]. It is sufficient to note that it is most frequently in the family that the children are infected with nationalism by hearing what is national extolled and what is foreign disparaged. * * * The school should therefore use the means described earlier to combat family attitudes. * * * As long as the child breathes the poisoned air of nationalism, education in world-mindedness can produce only rather precarious results [pp. 54-58].

UNESCO, the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization, has set out in the nine volumes of "Toward World Understanding" the means of instructing young people toward the day when their first loyalty will be to world government and not to country. The above excerpts were taken from volume V, "In the Classroom With Children Under 13 Years of Age." The same target is present in all of these schemes—the upbringing of the child.

All of these—Freudian psychiatry, UNESCO and brainpicking tests—point toward the same goal—detect and then indoctrinate. Kept to their proper use as a tool of education which will help develop the intellect and the ability to think for one's self, testing programs would not meet with objections from the parents. It is the effort to play God and to indoctrinate which meets our strenuous opposition.

U.S. OFFICE OF EDUCATION

It is significant to note that these theories are coming into more prominence in the U.S. Office of Education. In an early publication of the Federal Security Agency, Office of Education—Bulletin 1951, No. 3—entitled "Vitalizing Secondary Education—Education for Life Adjustment," it is solemnly proclaimed:

In summary, educational research has found that youth learn chiefly what they experience * * * [and] the impact of democratic experiences upon individual personality is more significant than the mas-

tering of figures and facts and the learning of rules and regulations (p. 10).

This John Dewey or Mann approach to education is closely tied to educational testing through increased development and use of educational statistics, testing techniques, and community surveys which has pointed out the need for democratizing the processes of learning as well as the operation of the high schools. The booklet emphasizes the importance of bringing real life into the curriculum and practicing democracy—whatever that means—and in "orienting" the thinking of the secondary student. On page 101, under the heading "Functions Schools Should Serve," the report states:

School programs should provide the understandings and experiences necessary to meet the demands for democratic world citizenship. * * * Schools should help youth understand the patterns of the new social structure and the changed social relationships which advancing technology brings. In short the modern school should induct youth by stages into full membership in the dynamic local, State, national, and world communities in which they live.

This is almost exactly the way that the UNESCO Commission also puts it. This 104-page booklet outlines many good goals and changes but throughout is the overall theory of indoctrination and orientation which are a far cry from the educational goals of teaching young people to think for themselves and to make decisions for themselves in a free society. UNESCO calls this developing right attitudes.

This is exactly what the progressive educators, the Chisholms, the UNESCO crowd, the personal inventory-type testers and the Office of Education all have in common. The testing program is an integral part of developing the attitudes cited. The new social order referred to is socialistic and the world communities is very clearly the one-world of the internationalists in which American sovereignty becomes subservient to the United Nations.

In the foreword to "Vitalizing Secondary Education," eight staff members of the Office of Education were credited with writing the report, one of whom was John R. Ludington.

In a 1961 HEW-Office of Education document "Guidance Counseling and Testing Program Evaluation," No. OE-25020, the foreword contains the names of the same John R. Ludington, Director, Aid to State and Local Schools Branch, and E. Glenn Featherston, Assistant Commissioner, Division of State and Local School Systems. It is my understanding that Mr. Ludington will move up even further and become chairman of the Office of Education Civil Service Review Board.

Mr. Speaker, last year I read into the RECORD the HEW publication, "A Federal Education Agency for the Future," which presented the Office of Education blueprint for making American education Federal rather than local in nature. Many of the recommendations made in that bureaucratic design have already been implemented. It is especially interesting to note that in recent reorga-

nizations within the Office of Education, staff and contributing members of the group or so-called mission which drew up the document are now in the driver's seat. I pointed out these changes in my July 26, 1962, speech to the House. Here are some of the promotions which have moved those officials up the ladder:

Mr. Arthur Harris, a member of the Committee on Mission and Organization, became acting Associate Commissioner and Director of the new Bureau of Educational Assistance Programs.

Mr. Ralph C. M. Flynt, an ex officio member of the Committee on Mission and Organization, became acting Associate Commissioner and Director of the new Bureau of Educational Research and Development.

Mr. John F. Hughes, another ex officio member of the Committee on Mission and Organization, became acting executive officer and Director of the Office of Administration in the new Office of the Commissioner.

Mr. Charles P. Dennison, a member of the Committee on Mission and Organization, became acting executive officer under Mr. Flynt in the Office of Educational Research and Development.

Mr. Thomas E. Cotner, a member of the Committee on Mission and Organization, became acting Deputy Associate Commissioner in the Bureau of International Education.

Mrs. Sonia O. Ashworth, a staff member of the Committee on Mission and Organization, became acting budget assistant under Mr. Flynt in the Bureau of Educational Research and Development.

Mr. Edward Cunningham, a staff member of the Committee on Mission and Organization, became acting personnel assistant under Mr. Harris in the Bureau of Educational Assistance Programs.

Mr. E. Glenn Featherston, author of a confidential report to the Office of Education Committee on a Federal Education Agency for the Future, became Deputy Associate Commissioner under Mr. Flynt in the new Bureau of Educational Assistance Programs.

Now, Mr. Speaker, in this instance we are not buying that famous pig in a poke—because these various authors of the discredited pamphlet, who have, as it were, written their own job-promotion tickets, have some pretty telltale quotations to their credit or discredit. For example:

Mr. Featherston, in his advisory memorandum to the committee, observed:

Without question the Office of Education has and will continue to exert leadership through the collection of information, through research, through consultation and through the administration of programs. However, it is to a broader type of leadership I am referring here and that is the deliberate and planned effort to influence on an extensive, nationwide scale, thinking in American education * * * What changes should be made in elementary and secondary school curriculums? This would open up a tremendous area of activity and through the proper role the Office could bring about a great change without dictating.

If American education is directed and controlled by those bureaucrats it is certain, in my opinion, that they will

move us in the direction of indoctrination rather than education. Control education and you write the future. If we allow these people to "teach" according to their social, economic, political, and international proclivities we will truly be a different America.

Another indication of the type of leadership that is being installed in the Office of Education is indicated by a memorandum of May 9, 1962, which notes this promotion:

Eric R. Baber, presently regional representative, Office of Education, Chicago, Ill., to Director, Division of Elementary and Secondary Education, Bureau of Educational Research and Development, effective May 14, 1962.

Now just who is Eric R. Baber, you might ask, and what is significant about this appointment. William H. Whyte, Jr., in his 1956 best seller, "The Organization Man," told us quite a bit about Mr. Baber. On page 428 of his book, Mr. Whyte gave considerable attention to Mr. Baber, then superintendent of Park Forest, Illinois, High School. He noted that:

What makes Park Forest's high school unique is that, where in traditional communities what has been called the life adjustment curriculum has been introduced a bit at a time, at Park Forest it has been the foundation.

He goes on to tell of Baber in these terms:

Five years ago, when the school was still in the planning stage, Baber told parents that the trouble with U.S. education is that it is concentrated far too much on the intellectual aspect of education.

Mr. Whyte quotes a letter from Dr. Baber in which he said:

If I were to attempt to define the bases of our educational program, I believe it would be in terms of three fundamental concepts: (1) the philosophy of experimentalism, compromised somewhat by the pressures of tradition, (2) an organismic (or Gestalt) psychology, and (3) democratic educational leadership.

Now you begin to see why Dr. Baber is so significant. Like Dr. Chisholm, he would make a slight concession by having his experimentalism compromised by the pressures of tradition but life adjustment education is to be the cornerstone. When coupled with testing programs you can see just what this means. Dr. Baber proudly proclaimed that all aspects of family group life are open to study. On page 432, Mr. Whyte gives one of the keys we see in all of these progressive educational programs when he says:

The testing program is extensive. In addition to a battery of achievement tests, such as the Iowa tests, and intelligence tests, the school has given students the Kuder vocational preference record, the Bell adjustment inventory, and the California personal adjustment test.

The Department of Health, Education, and Welfare scrupulously denies that any testing of this type is carried out under the National Defense Education Act. In a letter from Mr. Featherston, he stated:

Under title V-A of the act, Federal allotments are made to State educational agencies to assist them in establishing and main-

taining programs of guidance, counseling, and testing in the secondary schools. States desiring payments under their allotments have submitted a State plan to the U.S. Commissioner of Education for approval. State plans set forth the programs for which the funds will be spent. Payment under the Federal allotment is made in an amount equal to one-half of the State and/or local funds expended for the programs.

In connection with testing under title V-A, the act provides that, if a State is not authorized by law to make payments to cover the cost of testing students in any one or more secondary schools in the State, the Commissioner will arrange for the testing of such students and shall pay one-half the cost thereof out of the State's allotment.

Under regulations which we have issued pursuant to title V-A, "testing" means "the use of tests which measure abilities from which aptitudes for the individual's educational development validly may be inferred." We have advised the chief State school officers, in the enclosed bulletin, that there can be no Federal financial participation in expenditures for "tests, scales, inventories, or other devices for the collection of information relative to the student's social, moral, spiritual, or family values, relationships, or adjustments."

This may be the Department's position but it is done anyway. This is why I feel we need legislative action rather than an administrative regulation. Guidance counselors who are receiving Federal funds as part of their salaries have been conducting these brain-picking tests in many schools. In some cases, bureaucrats get the same thing accomplished if by a roundabout method. The heading of one test of the so-called inventory-type carried the following heading: "Kansas Junior High School Student Survey—Conducted by the University of Kansas, Bureau of Child Research, Lawrence, Kans.—Supported by Grants From the U.S. Public Health Service and the University of Kansas."

I have included this particular test in the appendix following these remarks. Note that this test was supported by grants from the U.S. Public Health Service.

CONCLUSION

One of the pronounced tendencies of these tests is to stress the materialistic side of life and place little emphasis on the moral or spiritual. As Archbishop O'Hara so aptly put it on April 8, 1958, when addressing the National Catholic Education Association:

I am afraid that sometimes some of our teachers overlook the fact that the philosophy of secularist counseling is based on the exclusion of God and the soul from the educational process. I mention this because counseling is the subject of a piece of legislation now before the Congress. A bill presented at this session proposes Federal subsidies for enlarged counseling services available to students in both public and nonpublic schools.

The archbishop was referring of course to the National Defense Education Act of 1958 which opened the door on counseling of this type.

My bill, H.R. 10508, would not, as some educators charge, prohibit such tests. It would merely bring these tests out into the open. It would not be the whole answer but it would be a start. It specifically requires that reasonable notice be given to parents of students to whom

such examinations are to be given, that the parent be given the opportunity to view the test. If they so desire, the parent could then refuse permission to the school officials to administer the test to their child. My bill reads as follows:

H.R. 10508

A bill to limit the purposes for which funds appropriated or otherwise made available to the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare may be used

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, notwithstanding any other provision of law, no funds appropriated or otherwise made available to the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare shall be expended, granted, or otherwise used for the purpose of giving an examination to any student in an elementary or secondary school, or to pay or supplement the salary of an individual administering an examination taken by any such student, if any information is to be requested or obtained by means of such examination which relates to such student's personality, environment, home life, parental or family relationships, economic status, religious beliefs, patriotism, sexual behavior or attitudes, or sociological or psychological problems, unless (1) reasonable notice is given to parents of students to whom such examination is administered of the giving of such examination and of the right of any such parent (A) to see or hear each question that will be given or asked during such examination, and (B) to refuse to permit the giving of such examination to his child; and (2) the rights described in subclasses (A) and (B) of clause (1) are accorded to each such parent.

SEC. 2. If the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare determines that there is failure to comply substantially with the provisions of the first section of this Act in carrying out any program in whole or in part with funds appropriated or otherwise made available to the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, he shall take such action as may be necessary to assure that no more of such funds are expended to carry out such program until he is satisfied that there will no longer be any such failure to comply.

Martin L. Gross, writing in Life magazine, recently stated:

Some State education laws, which prevent a licensed physician from giving a child an aspirin without parental permission, allow school testers to diagnose "maladjustment" or "potential schizophrenia" and have it entered on the child's record without informing the parents.

Mr. Speaker, this article is included in the appendix to these remarks because I believe it is timely indeed. I do not believe we want George Orwell's "1984" with Big Brother watching over all of us. In the first place I do not believe these people are that smart. Most educators do not invade the privacy of the home or fashion themselves as junior psychiatrists. Most educators are interested in academic development and reject these questionable tests. It is obvious that we need State laws to plug these loopholes in addition to my bill which would prevent the use of Federal funds for these purposes. Let the words of Dr. Chisholm ring in your ears:

Let us be our own authority. We know far more than any of our ancestors. Scientists of this generation have no obligation to admit superiority of knowledge or of wisdom in any body of traditional belief or authority.

There is no room for authoritarian dogma in the field of human relations.

Let us discard the bromides which have kept us drugged, obedient to the old people, and afraid of their displeasure. Let us accept our own responsibility to remodel the world in bolder, clearer, more honest lines. Let us stop prostituting man's noblest and highest development, his intellect, to the service of guilt and fear and shame.

By alerting American fathers and mothers to the dangers inherent in these nonacademic brainpicking tests we can encourage them to be ever vigilant lest their children be guinea pigs in some classroom. My bill H.R. 10508 would help plug this gap but in the final analysis it is going to be an alert and vigilant citizenry which will rectify this erroneous usurpation of the privileges and responsibilities of the home and church.

Mr. Speaker, appendixes 1 and 2, to which I have referred, follow:

APPENDIX 1

THE NEW TESTS IN OUR SCHOOLS—THE THREE R'S AND A P (FOR PSYCHE)

(By Martin L. Gross)

(Life Magazine, September 1, 1962)

In the first few weeks of the new school year several million pupils from the first grade through senior high will open examination booklets that pose some surprisingly personal questions.

"Are you too nervous?"

"Have you often felt that you would rather not live at home?"

"Do many of the people you know seem to dislike you?"

Grade-school children will be required to answer these questions with a simple "Yes" or "No." Or they will be asked to mark "problem check lists" which state such childhood concerns as "I wish my father had a higher level job."

These nonacademic interrogations are standard procedure in schools throughout the country where an effort is being made to find out why Johnny can't read—or won't read—by probing deeply into his psyche. While parents and PTA's have been debating the merits and shortcomings of IQ and aptitude ratings, a far more controversial program of personality testing has been gathering momentum in public school systems. Few students in the United States will graduate from high schools without having come under this careful psychological watch.

Most parents are amazed to learn that their child's "personality" is all recorded in black and white in the locked files outside the principal's office. These personality probes are often conducted in a confidential atmosphere by guidance counselors. And pupils are not inclined to talk about the exams. The child who may return home and sadly admit he didn't know the answer to the question "Who fought in the War of 1812?" is unlikely to admit he wrote "Yes" next to the question, "Do you sometimes feel lonely at home?"

But the discovery of these tests can bring sharp reaction. Last spring in Hicksville, Long Island a candidate ran—and won—a place on the school board through his campaign pledge to eliminate the "Blacky" test, a psychoanalytic-based device that, with a series of dog cartoons, attempts to evaluate a fifth grader's "castration anxiety" and "oral eroticism," among many other traits.

The most common school personality probes are "inventories" and "check lists," including the California Test of Personality-Primary, the Mooney Problem Check List, the Science Research Associates Junior Inventory, the Minnesota Counseling Inventory. Each of the tests views children's

psyches in somewhat different terms (calmness or nervous symptoms—freedom from or conventionality). But the quizzes cover considerable psychological grounds; a child's worries and fears, nightmares, sex problems, insights into mom and dad, sister and brother, and, among teenagers, menstruation. The scores, which often become part of a child's permanent school record, are marked on graphs provided by test publishers and connected into "personality profiles." With the help of national "norms" teachers and guidance counselors may attempt to compare the child's psyche with those of his classmates and decide whether or not the youngster is "emotionally well- or mal-adjusted." Unfortunately, few guidance counselors or teachers have had enough psychological training to make such decisions.

Because school personality probes stress intimate family details, mother's attempts to keep family business private are becoming distressingly futile. The popular California test of personality, used in 1,370 schools last year, asks 12-year-olds these questions about their home life:

Have you often felt as though you would rather not live at home?

Do you prefer to keep your friends away from your home because it is not attractive?

Another popular test, the SRA junior inventory (844,000 schoolchildren have taken this and other SRA inventories since 1956), tries to tap a student's adjustment with a list of 168 weighty problems which fourth through eighth graders must finish in 45 minutes. Some of the problems are casual: "I wish I could take music lessons." But others can have strong psychological impact: "I am too nervous," "I am not very happy," "I wish I could be a girl." The SRA youth inventory for 7th to 12th graders, probes further: "My parents play favorites," "I want to know about venereal disease," "I'm losing faith in religion," "My family is always worried about money."

The teacher or counselor doubling as amateur psychologist has some bizarre tools to experiment with, including the clinical Minnesota Counseling Inventory, which was derived from an adult test that compared hospitalized psychotics with those of a normal sample. Some statements on the MCI check list are:

"Most of the time I wish I were dead."

"I hear strange things when I am alone."

"I am afraid of losing my mind."

Although the teacher is often pressed into service as a personality tester, most of the work is handled by guidance counselors who have become essential members of school staffs. The guidance counselor keeps a close watch over the confidential results of personality tests. High scorers, supposedly more maladjusted, are singled out for further testing, counseling, or referral to the school psychologist. The results, say counselors, provide hints on areas to discuss with parents during conferences and even emotional background information for some college entrance blanks.

"We find that inventories and checklists are wonderful timesavers," says one counselor who administers a checklist to a seventh-grade class. "Through it, we can often find children in need of help whom we might not have found otherwise. Even if a child leaves his test blank free of problems, it doesn't mean that he is worry free. This itself might be an indication of a greater underlying problem."

Most tests give the students a chance to indicate whether or not they wish to discuss their problems further. "We may call them in anyway if we feel they are troubled enough," says one counselor.

Some professional psychologists, however, not only question the usefulness of personality testing but consider it more harmful

than helpful. In Denver, Colo., school psychologists and other guidance personnel in the school system protested the wide use of a personality quiz for individual evaluations. ("Do you sometimes suffer from a trembling feeling in your muscles?" the test asked.) The test has been dropped by the Denver schools this year because, as a Denver guidance official admits, "Some teachers used the results to play God."

Efforts by unorganized groups of parents to halt similar tests have had mixed success. In Whitehall, Ohio, parents complained that the SRA Youth Inventory was a threat to "parental authority and privacy." But the test has been retained as acceptable to the Ohio Education Department. In the suburb of Island Trees, Long Island, complaints from several parents that their 12-year-olds were being quizzed on sex and dating habits in written examinations did stop the use of the youth inventory exam in the seventh grade.

"I take a dim view of current personality tests and I think the general public is being much too frequently taken in by the mumbo-jumbo that goes with them," says Dr. Henry S. Dyer of the nonprofit Educational Testing Service in Princeton, N.J. "The inventories, the projective tests—all of them—are scarcely beyond the tealeaf reading stage."

Gilbert M. Trachtman, past chairman of the School Psychologists' Division of the New York State Psychological Association, describes personality quizzes as rough group instruments that are not accurate enough for individual evaluations. "There is too much overbuying and overselling of them by naive people," he says.

Why, then, are they so commonly used by reputable school administrators? Guidance Expert John W. M. Rothney, of the University of Wisconsin, suggests that it is the result of "amazing psychometric innocence" on the part of teachers, administrators and guidance people, "round-the-clock hucksterism" by test publishers, and the desire to impress with an "array of scores seemingly supported by pedantic jargon."

The popular interest tests—the Kuder Preference Record, the Strong Vocational Interest Blank, the California Occupational Interest Inventory—have met with the same skepticism. This year some 2 million schoolchildren will bring home their "Kuder graphs" as vocational guidance evidence. The results may indicate the child is suited for a career in engineering because he checked, among other things, that he would like to "visit a factory in which typewriters are made." Most studies indicate that children's interests change rapidly and radically. Children usually do not enter occupations indicated by interest tests taken in junior or senior high.

A parent may be amused or even impressed by marks on the Kuder graphs, but he would likely be confused by the results of the personality tests. Even if given the opportunity, few parents are equipped to evaluate the findings of these tests. The knowledge that they are being given in local schools often produces dismay or resentment. But the individual parent can do little about it. Some State education laws, which prevent a licensed physician from giving a child an aspirin without parental permission, allow school testers to diagnose maladjustment or potential schizophrenia and have it entered on the child's record without informing the parents.

Despite the public's growing awareness of and opposition to personality tests, there is no letup in their use in schools. The standard college entrance examination and the National Merit Scholarship Corp. are preparing ways to spot personality traits in student applicants. The national testing program, Project Talent, given under direction of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare in 1960 to 440,000 high

school pupils, plans to check up for the next 20 years on the personality scores of those who took the exams—and may discover that a test paper is no place to probe a student's psyche.

APPENDIX 2

KANSAS JUNIOR HIGH SCHOOL STUDENT SURVEY—CONDUCTED BY THE UNIVERSITY OF KANSAS, BUREAU OF CHILD RESEARCH, LAWRENCE, KANS.—SUPPORTED BY GRANTS FROM THE U.S. PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE AND THE UNIVERSITY OF KANSAS

FACTS ABOUT YOURSELF

Please answer all questions completely.

5. How old are you? (Check only one answer.)

- (1) ----- 11 years or younger.
- (2) ----- 12 years old.
- (3) ----- 13 years old.
- (4) ----- 14 years old.
- (5) ----- 15 years old.
- (6) ----- 16 years old or older.

6. Sex:

- (1) ----- Boy.
- (2) ----- Girl.

7. What grade in school are you now in?

- (7) ----- Seventh grade.
- (8) ----- Eighth grade.
- (9) ----- Ninth grade.

8. Are you (check only one answer)—

- (1) ----- An only child?
- (2) ----- The youngest child in your family?
- (3) ----- The oldest child in your family?
- (4) ----- Neither the youngest nor the oldest child?

9. How many living brothers and sisters do you have?

- (0) ----- None.
- (1) ----- One.
- (2) ----- Two.
- (3) ----- Three.
- (4) ----- Four.
- (5) ----- Five or more.

10. What was the highest grade your father finished in school?

- (1) ----- Eighth grade or less.
- (2) ----- Some high school.
- (3) ----- Finished high school.

PART I. RULES WE ALL BREAK

The questions in part I are about more personal things concerning you and your friends. Do not put your name or address on this questionnaire. We want to assure you that your answers will be kept completely secret and confidential. No one will ever know how you answered any of the following questions. We encourage you to be completely honest with your answers.

For the purpose of this study, we are interested in the things you have done during the last 2 years only.

11. Damage or disfigure furniture in schools, such as chairs, tables, and desks:

- (1) ----- No.
- (2) ----- Yes.

12. Steal goods from warehouses or storage-houses:

- (1) ----- No.
- (2) ----- Yes.

13. Damage cemetery property:

- (2) ----- Yes.
- (1) ----- No.

14. Damage or destroy public signs or road markers:

- (1) ----- No.
- (2) ----- Yes.

15. Steal automobile parts such as hubcaps, mirrors, ornaments, etc.

- (1) ----- No.
- (2) ----- Yes.

16. Kicked, bit or scratched a student of about your own age:

- (3) ----- Three or more times.
- (2) ----- Twice.
- (1) ----- Once.
- (0) ----- Never.

17. Get out of going to school by writing a fake excuse for yourself:

- (2) ----- Yes.
- (1) ----- No.

18. Steal or siphon gasoline from cars, trucks, or other kinds of vehicle equipment:

- (2) ----- Yes.
- (1) ----- No.

19. Damage or destroy mailboxes:

- (1) ----- No.
- (2) ----- Yes.

20. Steal more than \$2 (money) from your parents:

- (2) ----- Yes.
- (1) ----- No.

21. Puncture or cut automobile tires, bike tires:

- (1) ----- No.
- (2) ----- Yes.

22. Steal materials or equipment from buildings that are being constructed:

- (2) ----- Yes.
- (1) ----- No.

23. Kicked, scratched or bit an adult relative (mother, father, guardian, or uncle, for example):

- (0) ----- Never.
- (1) ----- Once.
- (2) ----- Twice.
- (3) ----- Three or more times.

24. Damage or destroy toys or games that belonged to persons your own age:

- (1) ----- No.
- (2) ----- Yes.

25. Steal from buildings that are being torn down:

- (1) ----- No.
- (2) ----- Yes.

26. Tied a person up with rope, string, or wire to a tree or similar object and then left them that way:

- (0) ----- Never.
- (1) ----- Alone.
- (2) ----- With one or more others.
- (3) ----- Both alone and with others.

27. Steal things from your parents that were worth more than \$2:

- (2) ----- Yes.
- (1) ----- No.

28. Teased severely, hurt, or killed a cat or dog.

- (1) ----- Alone.
- (2) ----- With one or more others.
- (0) ----- Never.
- (3) ----- Both alone and with others.

29. Scratch the paint on someone's car on purpose:

- (1) ----- No.
- (2) ----- Yes.

30. Steal more than \$2 (money) from your brothers or sisters:

- (2) ----- Yes.
- (1) ----- No.

31. Skip school with one or more friends or classmates:

- (2) ----- Yes.
- (1) ----- No.

32. Steal articles of clothing worth more than \$5 from clothing or department stores.

- (1) ----- No.
- (2) ----- Yes.

33. Become so mad or angry that you threw things at or hit a teacher or principal or other school official:

- (3) ----- Both alone and with others.
- (0) ----- Never.
- (1) ----- Alone.
- (2) ----- With one or more others.

34. Steal a bicycle from anyplace other than a place that sells bicycles (like from neighborhoods, schoolgrounds, or public places where bikes may be parked):

- (2) ----- Yes.
- (1) ----- No.

35. Remove spark plugs or wires from cars:

- (1) ----- No.
- (2) ----- Yes.

36. Steal a car for joyride without the owner's knowledge or permission:

- (2) ----- Yes.
- (1) ----- No.

37. Break or crack windows in automobiles:

- (1) ----- No.
- (2) ----- Yes.

38. Skip school with three or more friends or classmates:

- (2) ----- Yes.
- (1) ----- No.

39. Steal articles of clothing worth less than \$5 from clothing store or department store:

- (1) ----- No.
- (2) ----- Yes.

40. Damage flowerbeds or gardens on purpose:

- (2) ----- Yes.
- (1) ----- No.

41. Steal gasoline from gas stations, farms, or other private places:

- (1) ----- No.
- (2) ----- Yes.

42. Taken part in fights where knives or switchblades were used:

- (1) ----- No.
- (2) ----- Yes.

43. Steal a bicycle from a store that sells or repairs bikes:

- (2) ----- Yes.
- (1) ----- No.

44. Skip out of certain class periods, but not the whole day, without permission (like gym class or student assemblies):

- (2) ----- Yes.
- (1) ----- No.

45. Fought physically and bodily with an adult relative such as mother, father, or aunt (that is, fought in anger or fear, not in sheer fun):

- (0) ----- Never.
- (1) ----- Alone.
- (3) ----- Both alone and with others.
- (2) ----- With one or more others.

46. Steal things (not money) from your brothers or sisters that were worth more than \$2:

- (2) ----- Yes.
- (1) ----- No.

47. Get out of school early by pretending to your teacher that you were sick or not feeling well:

- (2) ----- Yes.
- (1) ----- No.

48. Steal anything because an adult asked you to steal it:

- (1) ----- No.
- (2) ----- Yes.

49. Beat up a person much older than yourself in a fight?

- (0) ----- Never.
- (2) ----- With one or more others.
- (1) ----- Alone.
- (3) ----- Both alone and with others.

50. Steal more than \$2 (money) from your friends or classmates:

- (2) ----- Yes.
- (1) ----- No.

51. Damage parking meters on purpose (break glass, jam slot):

- (1) ----- No.
- (2) ----- Yes.

52. Steal jewelry worth more than \$2 from jewelry, department, dime or drugstores:

- (2) ----- Yes.
- (1) ----- No.

53. Skipped school or stayed out of school without a genuine excuse for more than 1 day:

- (1) ----- No.
- (2) ----- Yes.

54. Damage or break coin machines of any kind on purpose:

- (1) ----- No.
- (2) ----- Yes.

55. Damage or ruin personal clothing of classmates or other schoolchildren:

- (1) ----- No.
- (2) ----- Yes.

56. Get out of going to school by pretending to your parents that you were sick:

- (2) ----- Yes.
- (1) ----- No.

57. Steal more than \$2 (money) from candy, coke, or cigarette machines:

- (2) ----- Yes.
(1) ----- No.

58. Leave home with intention of going to school, but just never making it to school (without a good reason):

- (1) ----- No.
(2) ----- Yes.

59. Injured or hurt someone not in your family, but arranged matters so that someone else got the blame:

- (1) ----- Alone.
(2) ----- With one or more others.
(3) ----- Both alone and with others.
(0) ----- Never.

60. Steal more than \$2 from school:

- (2) ----- Yes.
(1) ----- No.

61. Leave school early without permission:

- (2) ----- Yes.
(1) ----- No.

62. Try to "get by" without paying the bill in restaurants, cafes, soda fountains:

- (1) ----- No.
(2) ----- Yes.

63. Skip school by yourself without good excuse from parents:

- (2) ----- Yes.
(1) ----- No.

64. Taken part in a gang fight against another gang or against one or two other persons:

- (1) ----- Once.
(2) ----- Twice.
(3) ----- Three or more times.
(0) ----- Never.

65. Steal things from inside of parked cars:

- (1) ----- No.
(2) ----- Yes.

66. Break windows on purpose in vacant homes, garages, or other buildings:

- (1) ----- No.
(2) ----- Yes.

67. Damage or destroy anything because someone "dared" you to do it:

- (1) ----- No.
(2) ----- Yes.

68. Steal things worth more than \$2 from foodstores:

- (2) ----- Yes.
(1) ----- No.

69. Damage school property other than chairs, tables, and desks:

- (1) ----- No.
(2) ----- Yes.

70. Curse or use obscene language in speaking to a teacher or other school official:

- (2) ----- Yes.
(1) ----- No.

71. Steal anything and then sell it to an older teenager or adult:

- (1) ----- No.
(2) ----- Yes.

72. Damage or destroy anything that belonged to another person, in order to "get even" with that person:

- (1) ----- No.
(2) ----- Yes.

73. Steal money from public telephones or parking meters:

- (1) ----- No.
(2) ----- Yes.

74. Hit or strike a teacher, coach, or other school official:

- (2) ----- Yes.
(1) ----- No.

75. Take part in fights where BB guns, air-pellet guns, or slingshots were used:

- (1) ----- No.
(2) ----- Yes.

76. Tease or embarrass someone by stripping or taking his or her clothes off?

- (2) ----- Yes.
(1) ----- No.

77. Damage or destroy anything "just for the heck of it":

- (1) ----- No.
(2) ----- Yes.

78. Steal less than \$2 (money) from candy, coke, or cigarette machines:

- (2) ----- Yes.
(1) ----- No.

PART II. ALONE OR WITH OTHERS

Instructions: We are interested in how certain rules are broken. Some people break

rules only when they are with others, some break rules only when they are alone, and others break rules both when alone and when with other persons. For each item, check the box that applies to you. If it does not apply to you, leave that item blank. In the last 2 years, did you:

Table with 4 columns: Item description, (1) Only when alone, (2) Only when with other persons, (3) Both alone and with other persons. Rows 11-26.

PART III. YOUR SOCIAL ACTIVITIES

Instructions: In this section are statements about what some boys and girls do most of the time in their time after school and on weekends. Read each statement and decide whether it fits you or does not fit you as you are right now or during this year. If the statement is true of you, that is, if you would say "Yes" to the statement, put a No. 1 next to it. If the statement is not true of you, that is, if you would say "No" to the statement, put a No. 2 next to it.

Be sure to read and to answer each statement with a 1 or a 2. If it fits you fairly well but not exactly, put a 1.

Answers: Put 1 for a "Yes." Put 2 for a "No."

- 27. I spend a lot of time with one special friend who is not a member of my family.
-----28. I stick pretty much to myself.
-----29. I never disobey my parents.
-----30. I spend a lot of time with one friend at a time, although I have several close friends.
-----31. I spend a lot of time with two or three friends. The group of us play together.
-----32. I do some talking about or listening to talk about sexual matters when I am with my friends.
-----33. I play with a large group of four or more children in or near my home neighborhood.
-----34. I mostly play alone or with my brothers or sisters.
-----35. I belong to a group that is often chased after by some adults such as storekeepers, police, or homeowners.
-----36. I never catch cold in the winter or spring.
-----37. I play with friends my parents do not like.
-----38. I never tell lies.
-----39. I often share secrets and ideas or hopes with my friends.
-----40. I have taken part in kissing and necking while on a date or while alone with a person of the opposite sex.
-----41. Most of my friends are my own age or between 11 and 14.
-----42. I have never spent a night in a detention home or jail.
-----43. Most of my friends are 2 or 3 years older than I am.
-----44. I have petted with a person of the opposite sex while on dates or when we were alone.

- 45. Most other boys and girls like me.
-----46. I try to get other boys and girls to like me.
-----47. I have gone further than petting with a person of the opposite sex.
-----48. I care a great deal about what other boys (or girls) think of me.
-----49. I want to be different somehow from others in my own age group.
-----50. I have answered ads in comic books or other magazines which advertised pictures, photographs, or stories about sexual matters.
-----51. I like most of all to spend my free time alone.
-----52. Some of my friends do not like the way I act.

PART IV. LEISURE ACTIVITY AND FAMILY LIFE

Instructions: The statements in this section are like those in the section you just completed. But these have to do with how you spend your spare time and how you are treated by your parents.

Read each statement. If it applies to you as you are right now or have been during this year, mark the statement with a 1 for a "Yes." If it does not apply to you, mark it with a 2 for a "No."

The statements: Write 1 for a "Yes," and 2 for a "No."

- 53. Do you spend more of your free time with your friends than with your family?
-----54. Do you go to dances more than once a month?
-----55. Do you go out with your mother or father more than once a month? (Movies, dining, social events, etc.)
-----56. Is your father fairer about punishment than your mother?
-----57. Do you study school work at home less than five times a week?
-----58. Is your mother fairer about punishment than your father?
-----59. Do you work at a part-time job job once or more a week?
-----60. When you do something extra good, do your parents reward you with praise or special privileges or without money?
-----61. Do you help around the house doing chores almost every day?
-----62. When you have done something wrong or "bad" do your parents try to reason with you?
-----63. Do you usually attend at least one movie a week?

- 64. Are some children in your family punished more severely than others?
- 65. Do you spend time after supper at a local hangout (drugstore, soda shop, bowling alley, etc.) at least two times a month?
- 66. Do your parents get all the facts before they punish you?
- 67. Do you usually have one or two dates a month or more?
- 68. Are the children in your family punished more severely than in other families?
- 69. Do you think that your friends have better ideas than your parents do about what a young person should do in his spare time?
- 70. Do you usually spend three or more evenings a week away from home?

- 71. Are the children in your family ever punished when they do not need it?
- 72. Does your father punish you when your mother does not think you should be punished?
- 73. Would you like to spend more of free time with your friends than your parents now allow?
- 74. Does your mother punish you when your father does not think you should be punished?
- 75. Do you feel your mother punishes you fairly?
- 76. Do you feel your father punishes you fairly?

77. Below is a line that stands for your grades or marks in school this year, thinking of them lumped together. Make only one check where you best fit.

- 24. I wish I could afford to go to the movies as often as many of the others in my school.
- 25. I wish my family could take me on vacation trips like those that many of the persons in my school have enjoyed.
- 26. I wish I were able to dress as well as most or many of the persons in my school.
- 27. Many of the students in my class will get to go to college some day, but I probably won't get the chance.
- 28. I wish I were physically better built or more attractive.
- 29. I wish I were as attractive to the opposite sex as many of my schoolmates.
- 30. I wish I could join the Boy or Girl Scouts like many of my classmates.
- 31. I wish my parents were more understanding, like the mothers and fathers of many of my classmates.
- 32. I wish my family had nearly as much money as the families of many of my classmates.
- 33. I might like to be an engineer or a scientist when I grow up, but I probably will not get the chance.
- 34. I won't have as good opportunities when I grow up as many of my classmates.
- 35. I wish my parents were not so strict with me, and more like the parents of many of my classmates in this way.
- 36. I wish my parents were a little more strict with me, like the parents of many of my classmates.
- 37. I wish my father and mother were better educated, like the parents of many of my classmates.
- 38. I wish my father had as good a job as many of my classmates' fathers.
- 39. I wish I could go on dates the way many of my classmates do.

Now write down one wish that you have felt strongly about this past year.

100	90	80	70	60
"A" or best possible	"B" or high	"C" or average	"D" or below average	"F" or failing

PART V. GUESSING CAUSES

Instructions: Reprinted below is a news story that appeared not long ago in the Kansas City Star. After you read the story carefully, pretend that you are talking the story over with some school friends. None of you knew the boy in the story directly or indirectly, but you are all guessing about why he did what the police claim he did. Then answer the questions that follow the story, indicating what your guesses would probably be. (Names and places in the story have been added or changed.)

The story

"The Kansas City police last night arrested Walter Stevens, age 13, who was caught by Police Sergeant Daniels. Daniels charged the boy with stealing coins from the coin machine and the washing machines in the Whirlaway Laundromat. The policeman said he saw Stevens pry open the coin slots on the machines and remove quarters and dimes. He had \$15 in coins in his pocket when arrested.

"The boy's mother, Mrs. William Stevens, said she thought her son was at work at his part-time job in the nearby Roll 'Em bowling alley. He had worked there 2 nights a week for 2 months, she said, and had been earning about 60 cents an hour. The boy's father, William Stevens, 48, is a clerk in the central post office. He works the night shift and was away at the time of the arrest.

"Walter Stevens is a seventh grade student at Wiltmore Junior High School. The Wiltmore principal, Mr. John Savage, reported that young Stevens had been doing very poorly in school for several months, and said that he had been expelled once for breaking school property and had often skipped school.

"When interviewed, young Stevens told this reporter that his father had to work such long hours that he was very seldom home and that his mother was often ill and had to remain in bed. He claimed, 'Nobody at school understands me or tries to help me.'

Instructions: Now check the statements below that you think provide the best possible explanation for why Walter Stevens did what he did. Remember that these are guesses and that all of them may be true or all may be false.

- Put a 1 if you agree, and a 2 if you disagree.
- 11. Walter wanted to get more money than he could earn at his job in order to help his poor parents.
- 12. Walter was lonely and unhappy at school, where no one understood him.

- 13. Walter was raised by bad standards and had not been taught properly what was right and wrong.
- 14. Walter had everything against him. He was bound to get into trouble when everything at school and at home went wrong.
- 15. Walter was fired from his job at the bowling alley but didn't want to worry his mother, who needed the money he had been giving her.
- 16. A gang of young boys managed by a professional thief had organized stealing from laundromats and other service stores, and Walter had fallen in with this gang through his acquaintances at the bowling alley.
- 17. Walter liked to steal and had probably been stealing one thing and another for several years before he was caught.
- 18. Walter was sick, mentally or physically, but no one at school or at home understood this and helped him.
- 19. Other children at school had been selfish and unkind in the past and had kept Walter from building any friendships. His loneliness led him to steal.
- 20. Older boys in a gang really broke the coin machines and did the stealing, but they left Walter, who thought they were his friends, when they heard the police car and dumped the coins into his pocket.
- 21. Walter's parents had never taken him to Sunday school, where he could have learned what is right and wrong.
- 22. Walter wanted to find a way to get decent clothes and money for an allowance. His parents could not give him these things, but he needed them to try to make friends at school.

PART VI. WISHES

Below are listed some wishes that have been expressed by boys and girls in other junior high schools. Read each wish carefully. Then check the wish with an X if you feel it is a wish that you have made or thought about any time during this year. If the wish does not fit you, leave it blank. Check (X) here

- 23. I wish I could buy my lunch in the cafeteria more often.

PART VII. SOCIAL VALUES AND FEELINGS

Please answer each question by making a check in the space next to agree or disagree. There are no right or wrong answers. Just report your opinion.

40. Watching television programs such as "Sugarfoot" and the "Donna Reed Show" and "Dobie Gillis" is boring or dull and a waste of time:

- (0) ----- Agree.
- (1) ----- Disagree.

41. Having a coke in a drugstore with other boys and girls after school or on a weekend is dull and a waste of time:

- (0) ----- Agree.
- (1) ----- Disagree.

42. Watching school athletic contests is boring and a waste of time:

- (0) ----- Agree.
- (1) ----- Disagree.

43. Watching school basketball or football games is fun:

- (1) ----- Agree.
- (0) ----- Disagree.

44. Television programs such as "Cheyenne" and "National Velvet" and "Lassie" are fun to watch:

- (1) ----- Agree.
- (2) ----- Disagree.

45. The people who get the best jobs when they grow up are usually the people who have friends who do favors for them, rather

than the people who are best trained or educated:

- (0) ----- Agree.
 (1) ----- Disagree.
46. Teachers give their praise and recognition to the students who find a way to become their special favorites, whether these students are good workers in school or not:

- (0) ----- Agree.
 (1) ----- Disagree.
47. Most teachers do not really like to help students:

- (0) ----- Agree.
 (1) ----- Disagree.
48. Teachers give their praise and recognition to the students who work the hardest and learn the most:

- (1) ----- Agree.
 (0) ----- Disagree.
49. The popular children in any school are the ones who have earned the respect and admiration of other students:

- (1) ----- Agree.
 (0) ----- Disagree.
50. Teachers have such different ideas about what you are supposed to learn in school that it is impossible to get a clear idea of what is best:

- (0) ----- Agree.
 (1) ----- Disagree.

51. People have such different ideas about what is right and wrong that you can't ever get clear ideas on this question:

- (0) ----- Agree.
 (1) ----- Disagree.

52. Once some teachers decide that a certain boy or girl is "bad" or a "troublemaker," there is nothing you can do to change their minds:

- (0) ----- Agree.
 (1) ----- Disagree.

53. Teachers can usually tell quite well who is learning a lesson and who is not:

- (1) ----- Agree.
 (0) ----- Disagree.

54. Most parents have very clear ideas about how their children should act on dates and about matters like kissing:

- (1) ----- Agree.
 (0) ----- Disagree.

55. People in any town have a lot to say about how their town government is run:

- (1) ----- Agree.
 (0) ----- Disagree.

56. The children and adults in any town can help the police do a good job of enforcing the law:

- (1) ----- Agree.
 (0) ----- Disagree.

57. Students in junior high schools never have any say or influence in what they are taught in their classes.

- (0) ----- Agree.
 (1) ----- Disagree.

58. So many other people voted in the national election last fall that it didn't matter to me whether my parents voted or not.

- (0) ----- Agree.
 (1) ----- Disagree.

59. If a group of children decide they do not like you, there is nothing much you can do to change their minds.

- (0) ----- Agree.
 (1) ----- Disagree.

PART VIII. WAYS OF DISCIPLINING YOUNG PEOPLE

Below are various ways by which many parents discipline children and young people. Please answer each question by checking the choice which best tells how your parents have disciplined you during the last 2 years. Answer each question for your mother and your father separately.

Do your parents take away your allowance?

61. Father:
 (0) ----- Never.
 (1) ----- Very seldom.
 (2) ----- Sometimes.
 (3) ----- Frequently.

62. Mother:
 (0) ----- Never.
 (1) ----- Very seldom.
 (2) ----- Sometimes.
 (3) ----- Frequently.

Do your parents refuse to speak to you?

63. Mother:
 (1) ----- Very seldom.
 (2) ----- Sometimes.
 (3) ----- Frequently.
 (0) ----- Never.

64. Father:
 (2) ----- Sometimes.
 (0) ----- Never.
 (3) ----- Frequently.
 (1) ----- Very seldom.

Have your parents slapped you or given you spankings?

65. Mother:
 (3) ----- Frequently.
 (2) ----- Sometimes.
 (0) ----- Never.
 (1) ----- Very seldom.

66. Father:
 (2) ----- Sometimes.
 (3) ----- Frequently.
 (1) ----- Very seldom.
 (0) ----- Never.

Do your parents forbid you to do something that you were especially planning on doing?

67. Father:
 (3) ----- Frequently.
 (2) ----- Sometimes.
 (0) ----- Never.
 (1) ----- Very seldom.

68. Mother:
 (3) ----- Frequently.
 (2) ----- Sometimes.
 (0) ----- Never.
 (1) ----- Very seldom.

Do your parents tell you to leave home, or to find a new home if you can't be better?

69. Mother:
 (1) ----- Very seldom.
 (2) ----- Sometimes.
 (0) ----- Never.
 (3) ----- Frequently.

70. Father:
 (2) ----- Sometimes.
 (0) ----- Never.
 (3) ----- Frequently.
 (1) ----- Very seldom.

Do your parents spank you with a stick, belt, hairbrush, or things other than their hands?

71. Mother:
 (1) ----- Very seldom.
 (0) ----- Never.
 (3) ----- Frequently.
 (2) ----- Sometimes.

72. Father:
 (0) ----- Never.
 (3) ----- Frequently.
 (2) ----- Sometimes.
 (1) ----- Very seldom.

Do your parents take away some special privileges?

73. Mother:
 (2) ----- Sometimes.
 (3) ----- Frequently.
 (0) ----- Never.
 (1) ----- Very seldom.

74. Father:
 (2) ----- Sometimes.
 (3) ----- Frequently.
 (0) ----- Never.
 (1) ----- Very seldom.

Do your parents say they don't love you or warn you that they will stop loving you?

75. Father:
 (3) ----- Frequently.
 (2) ----- Sometimes.
 (0) ----- Never.
 (1) ----- Very seldom.

76. Mother:
 (2) ----- Sometimes.
 (3) ----- Frequently.
 (1) ----- Very seldom.
 (0) ----- Never.

Have your parents beat you up (using their fists, etc.)?

77. Father:
 (2) ----- Sometimes.
 (0) ----- Never.
 (3) ----- Frequently.
 (1) ----- Very seldom.

78. Mother:
 (3) ----- Frequently.
 (2) ----- Sometimes.
 (1) ----- Very seldom.
 (0) ----- Never.

HON. JAMES CURRAN DAVIS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LANDRUM). Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. FORRESTER] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. FORRESTER. Mr. Speaker, when this session adjourns it will mark the end of the magnificent service of our friend and colleague, Hon. JAMES CURRAN DAVIS, in the Congress of the United States.

The services of this great patriot and legislator have seldom been equalled, and that is conceded by everyone familiar with his record.

Congressman DAVIS was born in Heard County, Ga. He was a country boy of honest, courageous, and Christian parents. They had little money to speak of, but it was the lack of character rather than the lack of money which was, and is, frowned upon in that little community. Courage, character, and fortitude were his birthright.

There is no such thing as a self-made man, but he personally contributed greatly to his development and, as always, he used good material in the making. He never had any patience with anyone complaining that they were "second class citizens," for he thought anyone whomsoever was exceedingly lucky to live in the United States. He thought the right to pursue happiness and good fortune was all that anyone was entitled to, and that the one who deserved higher status could, with that right, obtain it.

JAMES C. DAVIS read law in the office of Bryan and Middlebrooks, Atlanta. No scholarship was given him. With the help of his family and friends, he climbed the ladder of success by hard work and devotion to duty. He served in the General Assembly of Georgia from 1924 to 1928; as judge of superior courts of his circuit from January 1934 until January 1947, when he left that office to take his seat in the U.S. Congress. In 1917, he enlisted in the U.S. Marine Corps and served his country with the same devotion and fidelity that have characterized him in every undertaking.

Congressman DAVIS was a national Congressman, conscious of the fact that he represented the entire State of Georgia although elected from the Fifth District. He was my people's Congressman, representing them in the highly important, exceedingly laborious, and exacting civil service field, the postal service, and the manpower commission committee in Congress. Every Georgia Congressman represents his entire State, and they have fully accepted that responsibility. We are on different committees, and the only way our people can

be served in all phases of government is for each Congressman to know he is the servant of all. Congressman DAVIS was superb in that role.

Probably no Congressman was ever more honored by his southern colleagues. I am certain that no Congressman ever rendered more ardent and magnificent service to his southern colleagues. In the many fights on the floor involving the rights of the States, constitutional government, and so forth, he was the Parliamentarian and handled that high responsibility with a dedication and ability that gained national recognition.

Mr. Speaker, my office was next door to the office of Congressman DAVIS for a number of years, and we were together almost daily. I had ample opportunity to know this man and to find out if there was anything cheap or selfish in him. I say there was not, for had there been I had ample time to find it. He is the hardest working man I ever knew. He is thoroughly dedicated to his work and profoundly respected by everyone, and his most ardent critics admit he is honest, brilliant, fair, and dedicated. He stands for constitutional government, the rights of the States, and economy in government. He thinks what he stands for is priceless, and I think so, too. He never hurt his people by any act or deed of commission or omission. When you look upon his completed work, everyone must say it is superb.

This country needs men like JAMES DAVIS as never before. He will be missed in this Congress as few have ever been missed. We have lost a valiant man, and this is a blow to good government and to the world. We have this consolation, however. JAMES DAVIS will fight on and on. Who knows but what there is still a great work for him to do back home or with the National Government. He will certainly be found fighting in the ranks trying to lead us back to the Government and the ideas that we, in our better moments, know are imperative, though sacrifice and devotion are required.

To sum it up, I would say that Congressman DAVIS is the type man you would choose as the executor of your estate, without bond, with perfect assurance that your loved ones would receive everything bequeathed them exactly as provided in the will.

To count JAMES DAVIS as a friend is a cherished possession. We will all miss him and his devoted and splendid wife and daughter. We have the comfort, however, of knowing that they will never be found wanting in working for and fighting for our common country and destiny.

Mr. WHITENER. Madam Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FORRESTER. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. WHITENER. Madam Speaker, I join with our distinguished colleague from Georgia in paying tribute to the service of the Honorable JAMES C. DAVIS, of Georgia, who leaves the House of Representatives at the conclusion of this Congress.

I have had the privilege of working rather closely with Judge DAVIS on the

floor of the House and more particularly on the Committee on the District of Columbia of the House of Representatives. Everything the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. FORRESTER] has said about our distinguished colleague, Judge DAVIS, is supported by the record. Judge DAVIS has at all times been in the public eye with his views. He has not hidden his views and impressions of the right course to follow. I think those of us who have had the privilege of serving with him can take a great lesson from his legislative life of courage, character, and hard work.

I appreciate the fact that my esteemed colleague the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. FORRESTER] has taken this time to say in the RECORD of this body the things which he has said about the work and service of Judge DAVIS. I appreciate it as I know many, many others who have shared the experience of working with this great American, Judge DAVIS, will appreciate it, I thank the gentleman from Georgia and join with him in saying to our other colleagues and to the Nation that this legislative body is losing a great legislator as Judge DAVIS goes into retirement at the end of this session of Congress.

Mr. FORRESTER. I am exceedingly grateful to the gentleman from North Carolina. I know that Congressman DAVIS holds him in the highest esteem.

Mr. ALBERT. Madam Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FORRESTER. I yield to our majority leader.

Mr. ALBERT. I thank the gentleman for yielding, and I thank him for taking this time to pay tribute to one of the very finest gentlemen and colleagues it has been my pleasure to know in my time in the House of Representatives. JIM DAVIS and I came to Congress together 16 years ago. His wife, Mary Lou, and my wife became friends during our first week here in the House.

Madam Speaker, JIM DAVIS and I sat side by side on the House Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, where he was a tower of strength and ability, during my first term in the House. He has since become one of the finest legislators ever to have served on that great and important committee.

JIM DAVIS is a man of rare judgment and of great ability with unswerving loyalty to his country and to his convictions. His departure is going to leave a void among us who know him. He has served his district and his country with distinction. He is my friend—one of the finest friends I have made in this House. I shall miss him. Mrs. Albert and I wish for him and Mrs. Davis every possible happiness and prosperity in their retirement.

Mr. FORRESTER. I express my deep gratitude to our majority leader and I know that the gentleman from Georgia, Congressman DAVIS, will receive much satisfaction and gratification from the gentleman's generous remarks.

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. Madam Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FORRESTER. I yield to the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the 1 hour special order assigned to me to follow the gentleman from Georgia be given to the gentleman from Georgia at this time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. GRANAHAN). Without objection it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. Madam Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FORRESTER. I am happy to yield to my distinguished friend from South Carolina, a devoted friend of the gentleman from Georgia, Congressman DAVIS.

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. I am grateful to the distinguished gentleman from Georgia for yielding to me and appreciate our colleagues of the Georgia delegation permitting me to speak at this time.

Madam Speaker, I want to congratulate the gentleman for taking this time to eulogize a man whose indefatigable energy and unimpeachable character and dedication to duty will last as a hallmark in this Congress as long as representative government exists on this earth. The vicissitudes of politics are many and they attack us in various ways. JIM DAVIS is paying the price of defending the Constitution and States rights, and defending the law against expediency and the pressure groups. If one has to be defeated, I think I would rather be defeated on the grounds by which JIM DAVIS has been defeated because his defeat is not really a defeat, it is a defeat for the principle which he espouses and the convictions which he possesses. We who know him love him for his unswerving allegiance to those things for which he has given his illustrious life. We will miss him, as the majority leader has said, and this void will not be filled in the distant future either in Georgia or in Washington, D.C.

As the days come and as the days go and as time comes and as our problems wax more and more vexing, we will miss JIM DAVIS' counsel and his inspiration whose band—our band—grows smaller and smaller each day in the fight for those causes in which we believe. But his work and his dedication to those principles of States rights will inspire us to carry on the fight which he has waged. I want to thank the gentleman for taking this time. We will miss JIM DAVIS and the country will miss him, and mark you this word—Atlanta, Ga., will miss him.

Mr. FORRESTER. I appreciate the splendid remarks of our friend from South Carolina [Mr. RIVERS].

Mr. FLYNT. Madam Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FORRESTER. I am delighted to yield to my colleague, the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. FLYNT. Madam Speaker, I would like to associate myself with the remarks of my colleague, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. FORRESTER] and the remarks of the majority leader of the House of Representatives and with the

others who have spoken and those who will hereafter speak on this occasion.

I personally shall miss JIM DAVIS when he leaves the House of Representatives. He has been the living exemplification of courage, of loyalty, and of devotion to duty. He has been a dedicated Member of the House of Representatives just as he, during his entire lifetime, has been a devoted and dedicated patriot who believes in this country, who believes in the basic instrument of our Government, the Constitution of the United States.

JAMES C. DAVIS, a Representative from Georgia, representing the Fifth Congressional District, was born in Fayette County which is one of the 15 counties comprising the Fourth Congressional District. I cannot remember when I did not know him. I really believe I have known him all my life. JIM's father and my father served together in the General Assembly of the State of Georgia. They were good friends. They remained good friends during the lifetime of my father.

Judge DAVIS served in World War I. He served as county attorney for De Kalb County. He served as a member of the General Assembly of Georgia. He served as a distinguished judge of the superior courts of Stone Mountain judicial circuit of Georgia. He was serving in the capacity of judge of the superior court when in 1946 he was elected to represent the Fifth District of Georgia in the 80th Congress. Since his election to the House of Representatives he has remained staunch and steadfast in adhering to those principles in which he believes. He has held fast to those things in which he believes, knowing, but not fearing, that the position which he should take might bring about his defeat for renomination to this body. He has campaigned hard, he has campaigned well; in each election up until the one of last month he has heretofore emerged as victor.

I want to say this, on the morning after the runoff primary in our State, JIM DAVIS showed himself in defeat to be a good loser as he has always demonstrated himself to be a good Congressman. When someone asked him to what he attributed his defeat, his reply was quick and unreserved. He said: "The only thing to which I attribute my defeat is the fact that my opponent received more votes than I did."

There is no bitterness in the heart of JAMES C. DAVIS. He is a big man, he is a truly great man, he is a courageous man. He has a heart, a mind, and a soul dedicated to this country which we love and which we cherish, and to the principles which have caused it to grow to a position of leadership among the nations of the world.

Madam Speaker, it is with a tinge of sadness that we say our final goodbyes to JAMES C. DAVIS, a Representative from Georgia. We wish for him every success in whatever he undertakes, and a long life and many years of service to his country, to his State, and to our people.

We say to you, JIM DAVIS, as you return to private life: It has been a pleasure and a rare privilege and a high honor to have served with a man of your prin-

ciple, of your courage, and of your prestige. We wish you good luck and Godspeed. May God bless you and your loved ones.

Mr. FORRESTER. Madam Speaker, I yield to one of the staunchest and best friends that the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. DAVIS] had. I believe he wants me to recognize him. Therefore, I take great pleasure in recognizing the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. COLMER]. We all know that they would like for me to prefer him in order that he might speak in regard to a friend and one who battled all the way with him during the entire time he was in Congress.

Mr. COLMER. Madam Speaker, I am grateful to my very good friend the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. FORRESTER] for yielding to me and for arranging this program so that some of us who were close to JIM DAVIS in his service in the House might have an opportunity to dwell upon his virtues and to wish him well as he leaves this Chamber.

Madam Speaker, so many people have already said what is in the minds and hearts of all of us about JIM DAVIS that there is really very little left to say. However, I do want to emphasize one of the things that has been said, and that is that JIM DAVIS never counted what the popular side of an issue was. He decided rather what was for the best interests of his people whom he had the honor to represent, and of his great country that he was so devoted to.

JIM DAVIS to me symbolized a virtue that I must confess I have found to be too rare in political life, and that is political courage. I worked with JIM DAVIS throughout his stay here in an effort to preserve this Republic to which he was so dedicated and its institutions.

Many, many times, when we met informally to discuss the approach to certain assaults that were being made upon the Constitution of the United States, and when a question was raised about the impracticability of doing anything about it, when someone would suggest, "That is fine, but we cannot get anywhere with it," his favorite reply was: "Well, if George Washington had sat down there on the front porch in his rocking chair at Mt. Vernon instead of going to Valley Forge, we might not have had this Republic."

Madam Speaker, in my book this Chamber and this Nation have lost the services of a true patriot.

Mr. FORRESTER. Madam Speaker, I yield to our distinguished colleague from Georgia [Mr. LANDRUM].

Mr. LANDRUM. Madam Speaker, I personally became acquainted with JIM DAVIS when he was judge of the superior court sitting in De Kalb County. While I knew him in this position as a practicing attorney only casually, I learned while he was in that position that he was a careful student of the law, a very thorough student, as a matter of fact.

It was not, however, until I had the privilege of coming to Congress that I got to know JIM on the intimate terms that we learn to know each other here and develop friendships. While here it was not long before I learned that JIM DAVIS was a man of deep convictions. As the gentleman from Mississippi who

just preceded me so eloquently stated, he is a man who possesses rare political courage.

Madam Speaker, JIM served with absolutely no fear of the political consequences. He was a thorough student of all the legislation with which we are confronted here in the House of Representatives. If he did not have all of the information concerning a particular bill or a particular matter then pending before the House, he would search out a Member whom he thought might have that information and discuss it with him. While doing so, he impressed one as an extremely good listener. While he was a very good listener, he was not one just to listen and not disagree. If the one with whom he was discussing the matter took a position with which he disagreed or interpreted a matter of legislation in a different fashion from his interpretation, he could challenge that position with the grace, the ease, and the knowledge rarely found in an individual today. Associating with one who demonstrates such qualities as these which I have tried to enumerate is always pleasant. But to me it has gone beyond being a mere pleasant association, for I can say that his example as a thorough student, as a sound defender and a courageous defender of his own convictions, has been a reward for me in the form of a friendship that I shall not forget.

Madam Speaker, the friendship which I have been privileged to enjoy with him here shall continue with me through the years. It will be one which I shall always cherish and which I shall look upon as a source of inspiration at times when courage is needed.

Mr. PELLY. Madam Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FORRESTER. I would be delighted to yield to my colleague, the gentleman from Washington [Mr. PELLY].

Mr. PELLY. Madam Speaker, I would not want the RECORD to indicate that the admirers of our colleague, the gentleman from Georgia, JIM DAVIS, all come from one State of this Nation or from one section of the country or indeed from one side of the aisle.

Madam Speaker, I have served with our colleague for 10 years, and I think while he might not recognize it, I have always looked upon him as a person of the highest integrity. In some respects at times I may have differed as far as convictions were concerned, but never once have I ever failed to recognize that our colleague was motivated by the highest integrity and the utmost in intellect.

Certainly it comes to me that this House will be losing something we need very much when in the next session of Congress JIM DAVIS will not be here. We will be losing that something that has made this a great deliberative body. That something is a quality in a Member of the Congress which impels him to do what he thinks is right, to study every question and then to act as he thinks best.

Madam Speaker, I believe truly that when JIM DAVIS leaves this body he will have set an example to many of us who hope to return and will leave with us

the hope that as we serve we may be as true to our ideals as he was to his.

I thank the gentleman.

Mr. FORRESTER. Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. STEPHENS].

Mr. STEPHENS. Madam Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman's yielding to me so that I may have this opportunity to join with the Georgia delegation and other Members of the House in paying tribute to our colleague who is retiring, the Honorable JAMES C. DAVIS of the Fifth Congressional District of Georgia.

As I have listened to my colleagues in the House, I know that JIM DAVIS is highly respected and well loved by everyone who has known him here. But there is one thing that has impressed me most of all as the Members have spoken about Congressman DAVIS. They have emphasized one word, and I think that one word personifies the career of the Honorable JAMES C. DAVIS. That is the word "service." We are talking today about the end of his congressional service.

We have also spoken about the fact that he performed a service as judge in the courts of Georgia. We have also heard that he performed legislative service in the State of Georgia as a member of the Georgia Legislature. But there is one character of service that has not been mentioned, and that is the personal service that JIM DAVIS performed for every one of us.

I have been here for 2 years and whenever I asked him to do a personal service for me he never hesitated and went the extra mile to give me that personal service that perhaps I did not deserve but which he was unstintingly willing to give and gave most pleasantly and in every way performed as any deep friend could.

Before I actually took my seat in the House from the 10th Congressional District of Georgia I came here to visit and sat in the gallery with a man who pointed out various Members of the House to me. At that time they were only names. This man pointed out JIM DAVIS, of Georgia, and he said to me then that JIM DAVIS is one of the very few Members of the House of Representatives whose principles are so steadfast that he would rather go down in defeat than compromise his position. I think that is what happened to him in the present situation.

Madam Speaker, I would like to express one final thought about the Honorable JAMES C. DAVIS. Knowing the pressures that were placed upon him, and knowing the pressures that are placed upon a Member of Congress, the deepest inspiration to me in my first term in the House of Representatives came from the way that he was able to withstand those pressures and to say stanchly that he would not compromise doing what he thought was right. That is the way I characterize him and shall always characterize him; he always did what he thought was right.

I thank the gentleman for giving me this opportunity.

Mr. FORRESTER. Madam Speaker, I yield to our colleague from Georgia [Mr. HAGAN].

Mr. HAGAN of Georgia. Madam Speaker, I certainly appreciate also the

opportunity which has been afforded me by my distinguished colleague, Congressman FORRESTER, to add a few comments to the many wonderful statements which have been made here this afternoon by those who have had the privilege of serving with Congressman DAVIS longer than I have. Certainly it has been a great privilege for me to serve this 1 term with our distinguished colleague, JAMES C. DAVIS. I had the privilege of knowing of him for many years and the privilege of meeting him a number of years ago while I was serving as a member of the State Legislature of Georgia. It has been a great experience to be closely associated with him here in the Congress of the United States. Last year, after being sworn in, I was named to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service and had the added privilege of serving on the same committee with him.

To the many statements that have been made about his personal integrity and his political courage, and these other fine comments about JIM DAVIS, I can say that I personally know that he is a man of great character and great ability. I wish it were possible to add up in sums of money the amounts that JIM DAVIS has been personally responsible for in savings to the taxpayers of this Nation while serving on that particular committee as chairman of the Subcommittee on Manpower Utilization, as well as his other actions on that committee and as a Member of this body.

He is a great individual to know. I will close my remarks by saying that it has been a rare privilege and pleasure for me to have served with JAMES C. DAVIS in the Congress of the United States. To him and his charming lady, my wife and I extend our best wishes for the future. May their greatest years be yet to come.

Mr. FORRESTER. Madam Speaker, I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Arizona [Mr. RHODES].

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Madam Speaker, I could not be on the floor on such an occasion and not join my colleagues from Georgia in paying tribute to a very fine gentleman, the Honorable JAMES C. DAVIS.

When we come to Congress, of course, we have preconceived notions. I had an image of what the perfect southern gentleman should be—I thought. But I can truly say after having served 10 years in the House with JIM DAVIS that my image of a perfect southern gentleman now is almost a perfect likeness of the person and character of JIM DAVIS.

He is a man who has the courage of his convictions and the ability to articulate his convictions and, better than that, to stand up for them. We have too few people like that. I think on both sides of the aisle, whether or not we agree with everything said by the gentleman from Georgia, the Honorable JAMES C. DAVIS, we agree that this House will be the poorer because he will not be here. The reason this is so is that we will have lost a man who has the kind of courage which is becoming altogether too rare in this country. He combined this courage with the ability to point out the de-

fects in our Government and laud those parts of it he thought praiseworthy. He has the quality of being not only a fine Congressman but a good citizen.

I can also say that he is a friend whom I will miss personally. I wish to him and to his fine wife, as they go into much deserved retirement, all of the best of everything which the good Lord can provide to people who deserve the best.

Mr. FORRESTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. JOHN W. DAVIS] may extend his remarks at this point.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. JOHN W. DAVIS. Madam Speaker, strange as it may seem, I was not personally acquainted with my esteemed colleague from Georgia prior to the time I came to Washington as a Member of the 87th Congress, even though we bear the same surname and have backgrounds which are in many respects similar.

My acquaintance with him soon developed into lasting friendship, and my life has been made richer by virtue of my association with JIM DAVIS.

I do not think I ever saw a man more dedicated to his job, more conscientious in the performance of his work, more unswerving in his devotion to duty, or more uncompromising when it comes to choosing between right and wrong.

JAMES C. DAVIS is loved and respected on both sides of the aisle, and he is noted for his keen ability to get to the heart of matters. His contributions to the work of this body have been many and will be long remembered.

Despite the many responsibilities imposed upon him by the work of his committees, he has always taken the time to inform himself of every important piece of legislation under consideration. Although he has assumed great responsibilities, he has always been most considerate, kind, and helpful to anyone who came to him regarding problems of government, legislation, or politics.

He leaves the House of Representatives a better legislative body because he served in it, and his record is one which deserves the emulation of every Member of Congress.

Mr. LIBONATI. Madam Speaker, our colleague, JAMES DAVIS, of Georgia, affectionately called "the Judge," retires from the Congress where he has served for 16 years. He was unswerving in his loyalties to the philosophies and traditions of the South. His conservative attitudes in Government fiscal problems marked him as a keeper of the taxpayers' purse. His tight rein on legislation involving the expenditures and increased cost reforms of the District of Columbia's government earned for him both commendation and criticism.

He was a valued legislator in the economy bloc and frowned upon loose spending on new Government services that meant added funds.

He was uncompromising in any position that he took that he felt was right.

His philosophy of life was that of the true southern gentleman what must be, must be—let well enough alone. With

his retirement a deep sense of nostalgia seizes us and we regret his passing into retirement. He treated his subject with finesse—although there was no question where he stood.

In sensitive areas of discussion as on civil rights he would hew straight to the line—he clung tenaciously to the social stratification of the white superiority of the race.

He was an industrious and active House Member. Even though we did not agree with his arguments in debate, yet his effort showed great preparation and meticulous care in arranging his facts and data. He cultivated a mental control over the sequence of evidence in his argument that sometimes were on their face irrefutable.

A great southern leader is leaving an old scene to him—16 years of membership in the House, 80th to 87th Congress. We bid him on his way with the good will and admiration of his colleagues and the blessings of good fortune in his future pursuits.

Mr. GROSS. Madam Speaker, it has been my privilege since coming to Congress 14 years ago to serve on the Post Office and Civil Service Committee with the Honorable JAMES C. DAVIS, of Georgia.

It has also been my privilege to serve with him on the Manpower Utilization Subcommittee of which he is the chairman and I the ranking minority member. Through this service and association I became intimately acquainted with him and I wish to say that there is no Member of Congress whom I hold in greater respect and esteem.

JAMES C. DAVIS, or Judge DAVIS as we often addressed him, has those rare qualities of courage, conviction, capability, and integrity. His word is his bond. Having taken a position, having reached a conviction, he does not waver nor succumb to pressure and blandishment.

It has been both a privilege and a pleasure to serve under the chairmanship of JAMES C. DAVIS, for he was fair at all times. Although of different political affiliation, I can say without fear of contradiction on the part of my colleagues on the subcommittee that Chairman DAVIS was never unfair to the minority members; never did partisan politics enter into the work of the subcommittee.

It may not be realized, but I want to say here and now that the retirement of JAMES C. DAVIS is a loss the Fifth District of Georgia, the State of Georgia, and the House of Representatives could ill afford.

Madam Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. FORRESTER] for offering this opportunity to make known my feeling toward my good friend, a true conservative American.

Whatever the future, I wish for Judge DAVIS and his wife, Mary Lou, the health and contentment they abundantly deserve.

Mr. McMILLAN. Madam Speaker and Members of the House, I want to join all my colleagues in saying a few words concerning the fine service my colleague, the Honorable JAMES C. DAVIS, of Georgia, has rendered the people of his State and country during the 16 years he has been a Member of the U.S. House of

Representatives. It has been my pleasure and privilege to serve on the District Committee with Judge DAVIS and I am certain that my colleagues will agree with me that he has been solely responsible for saving the taxpayers of this country more than a billion dollars during the time he has been serving in the Congress.

Judge DAVIS is a great advocate of States' rights, law and order, and believes in the principles set out in the Constitution of the United States. I do not know of any man who has ever served in Congress, during the 24 years I have been privileged to be a Member of that body, who has made a better impression on me than Judge DAVIS. He has never been known to compromise a principle. I am certain that if the District Commissioners, the President, and the courts had supported the principles and legislation advocated by Judge DAVIS during the time he has been a Member of the District Committee, there would be very little crime here in the Nation's Capital at the present time.

The State of Georgia and the entire Nation have suffered a great loss in losing Judge DAVIS' services as a Member of the U.S. Congress. I personally do not know of any man who can properly fill his shoes as a lawmaker here on Capitol Hill. As chairman of the Police and Firemen's Subcommittee which also handles numerous judicial bills and other bills relative to legal matters in the District of Columbia, he has always done a wonderful job and will leave a record second to none as a lawmaker. I know that Judge DAVIS will be greatly relieved from the terrific pressure he has always had upon him from left-wing groups who were not satisfied to disagree with his viewpoints on legislation but made an effort to destroy his character on numerous instances by handling the truth extremely recklessly.

In my humble opinion the day will come when certain people in the city of Washington and the United States will wish that they had a person of Judge DAVIS' intestinal fortitude as a Member of the U.S. Congress. Madam Speaker, I could write pages and pages of history on the good work Judge DAVIS has done during the time he has served as a Member of Congress; however, I want to take this brief moment to express publicly my opinion as to how much his services will be missed and the people of the United States, including the people of Georgia, will be the losers in this case and not Judge DAVIS.

My sincere wish is for Judge DAVIS and Mrs. DAVIS to have an opportunity to enjoy some of the good things of life, after the Judge's retirement, which they have been unable to take advantage of during the busy years Judge DAVIS has served the people of his district and the United States so well.

Mr. HUDDLESTON. Madam Speaker, JIM DAVIS, of Stone Mountain, Ga., and I have had a great deal in common during our term of service in Congress. JIM, of course, represents the district of which the great city of Atlanta is a part, and I come from the Birmingham district. In effect, Birmingham and Atlanta are sister cities, both making sub-

stantial contributions to the economic well-being of the Southeastern States.

Because of the similarity of our districts, it was natural when I first came to Congress in 1955 to immediately look up JIM DAVIS to get his advice on how best to represent the interests of my district in Congress. JIM's advice was at that time and over the years since has been most helpful and constructive.

The one quality I admire most in JIM DAVIS is his courage and the tenacity with which he stands by his convictions. I do not think that there is a Member of this House who has more strength of character and fortitude in resisting pressures than JIM DAVIS. His is a rich record of public service and his accomplishments in this body comprise a long list from which he will continue to draw great satisfaction.

JIM has represented the great metropolitan area of Atlanta well over the past 16 years and will be sorely missed by the people of Georgia's fifth district, the entire State of Georgia, and people throughout this country. I join with his many other friends, in Congress and out, in wishing him and his lovely wife, Mary Lou, much happiness in their retirement.

Mr. ABBITT. Madam Speaker, many fine Members of this body will be leaving us at the close of this session, but none, in my opinion, will be greater missed than the Honorable JAMES C. DAVIS, of Georgia. Judge DAVIS has served here with distinction for 16 years. He has given his constituents, in the Fifth District of Georgia, excellent representation—and he has given to the people of the United States the benefit of his broad experience, his calm judgment, and his considered deliberation on matters of national scope.

As a member of the House District Committee, Judge DAVIS has rendered invaluable service in helping to administer the complicated and tedious affairs of the District of Columbia. Time does not permit a recitation of the scores of District activities in which he has had a role. His battles here have not all been won but the Judge has given unstintingly of his time and energies in trying to make this a better place in which to live.

He has likewise been a valuable member of the House Post Office and Civil Service Committee. He knows the problems of the Federal worker and has given much time and attention to the activities of the Post Office Department and the Civil Service Commission.

Judge DAVIS is a stalwart defender of States' rights and is about as strong on principle as any man I have ever known. He has refused to yield to the pressure of minority groups and has taken a vigorous stand against Federal usurpation of power. The Judge believes wholeheartedly in good government—and has done all he could to promote it—but he believes that government should be the servant of the people and not their master.

Not only the State of Georgia but the Nation has suffered a loss when Judge DAVIS leaves this membership. His place will be difficult to fill. His memory will linger long.

I wish to express my personal appreciation of his friendship and extend to him my best wishes for the years that lie ahead.

Mr. DOWDY. Madam Speaker, I wish to join in paying tribute to our beloved colleague, JAMES C. DAVIS, of Georgia. I regret that the House will lose the vast knowledge, experience, and service of this able legislator next session.

I have the very highest regard for Judge DAVIS, both as a colleague and friend. I have never met a man more dedicated to serving the interests of the people than JIM DAVIS. He has spent the most productive years of his life in their service, always vigilant in the protection of individual liberty and freedom. The American way of life and its preservation is a religion in this great statesman's life, second only to his service to God.

The people of Georgia and the Nation can forever be proud of his service and accomplishments. His matchless understanding, attention to minute detail, accuracy of information and honest frankness on all matters, whether great or small, caused an immense demand for his advice and counsel by all who know and respect him.

My very best wishes and warmest personal regards go with Judge DAVIS as he leaves his place of service in the House. He deserves the plaudit, "Well done, thou good and faithful servant." I know his love for and service to our country will be no less devoted in his retirement.

Mr. BENNETT of Florida. Madam Speaker, as this session closes, we all realize that next year there will not be here with us a man from Georgia, whom we have all grown to love and to respect, JIM DAVIS. Personally, he is a living example to all that is best in Southern manhood, a true gentleman. Legislatively, he has contributed to the passage of much good legislation and to the defeat of much bad legislation. The quality that most significantly marks this man as outstanding is the quality of steadfast adherence to principle. This is the quality of public life that draws the line between men who are just politicians and those who are statesmen, too. JIM DAVIS has earned the title of statesman. As he goes back to his home State he does so with the respect and love of each of us here; and I hope that this may bring him joy in all of the days of his life.

Mr. DORN. Madam Speaker, Judge JAMES C. DAVIS and I have stood together in many a fight for constitutional government; for States rights, for freedom of government at the local level, and for a maximum of individual liberty. Judge DAVIS epitomizes the rugged individual, self-reliant, early American who carved out of this wilderness America, the greatest civilization the world has ever known.

JUDGE, in your service here, you are devoted to the great free enterprise economic and political order which caused the United States to be known around the world as the arsenal of democracy and the heart and core of freedom. JUDGE, I will always remember you as one of our outstanding Congressmen, not only of our time, but of the history of our country.

The thinking people of the Nation's Capital are grateful to you for your service to them beyond the call of duty. You have served all of America by curbing the onward march of socialism, government bureaucracy, and excessive taxation. You hold high the high traditions, the heritage, and the honor of the great empire State of the South, and the magnificent State of Georgia.

Mrs. Dorn joins me in wishing for you, Mrs. DAVIS, Mary Martin, and your fine son-in-law the very best always, and, JUDGE, come to see us in South Carolina.

Mr. ASHMORE. Madam Speaker, it is always a sad occasion when we lose a good friend. Upon the adjournment of this Congress one of the great Members of this body, JAMES C. DAVIS, will conclude his services on the floor of this House. We who have had the privilege of working with him have learned to love him because of what he is and what he stands for.

JIM DAVIS has proven to his colleagues that he is a man of principle, honor, integrity, and ability. His unimpeachable character is reflected in the respect and trust of his colleagues. His record shows that he has always been a most devoted public servant who willingly, energetically, and capably represented his constituents. I have never known anyone to be more dedicated to the responsibilities and duties of his office. Robert E. Lee said: "Duty is the sublimest word in the language," and I am sure that if Lee were here today he would join me in describing JIM DAVIS as a living example of sublime duty.

Our friend has many wonderful attributes, but one of his most admirable qualities is courage. He has spiritual, mental, moral, physical, and political courage. When necessary he can be as stoical as any man. And he is always a stoic when defending the Constitution of this Nation and the principle of States rights, both of which he believes in to the very depths of his heart and soul. Too many people who hold public office today are willing to cast thin votes and use their influence for what is best described as political expediency, but JIM DAVIS did not let political expediency control his actions and voice in the House of Representatives. No doubt he could have been reelected as a Member of this body if he had put less emphasis on the U.S. Constitution and the philosophy of our Founding Fathers, and relied more heavily on political expediency. But he preferred defeat in the recent Georgia primary election rather than the surrendering of his lifelong principles in exchange for votes.

We desperately need more men like JIM DAVIS in high governmental offices today. And not only his congressional district but the welfare of the entire Nation will suffer as a result of his defeat. In the future, though he is not with us in person, the influence and spirit of this man will linger long in this Chamber.

Mr. FISHER. Madam Speaker, during the 20 years I have served in this body I cannot recall a Member who has deserved and won such profound respect as has been true with our colleague, JIM

DAVIS. The Fifth District of Georgia has indeed been well represented. By his service on the District Committee the District of Columbia has been ably represented, in keeping with the interest of the entire Nation in District affairs. And above all, the entire country has been well represented by this great statesman from the State of Georgia.

He has been a tower of strength. He has been a leader at a time when leadership has been so useful and so valuable. JIM DAVIS has risen above the bickering and the petty partisanship to provide the courage and statesmanship that has contributed so often to the cause of good government.

JIM DAVIS has been a bastion of strength during many a House battle to maintain fiscal responsibility in this country. While others may have yielded to expediency and pressures, our friend from Georgia has been steadfast, regardless of the possible political repercussions. If it were possible for this Congress to be blessed with more men of the JIM DAVIS caliber, the future of our country would be much more secure.

His loss is indeed a tragedy for the Fifth District of Georgia, and in a broader sense it is a tragedy for the entire Nation. In these times of peril, plagued by a mammoth public debt, with our national security being challenged abroad and our free enterprise system facing an uncertain future here at home, the need for the type of courage, statesmanship, and leadership provided by JIM DAVIS is self-evident.

I join with the hundreds of others here who regret to see JIM DAVIS go. The loss of his example of good conduct and the absence of his inspiring leadership can hardly be replaced. I wish for him and his family good health, much happiness, and a continuation of his role as a citizen who loves his country and is dedicated to its preservation.

Mr. GARY. Madam Speaker, I join my colleagues in the House in paying tribute to our fellow Member, the gentleman from Georgia, JAMES C. DAVIS. He was an indefatigable worker and has established a record of which he may be justly proud. He has served his district, station, and Nation well. I extend to him my very best wishes for health, prosperity, and success in all of his future undertakings. We shall miss him here in the House of Representatives, but when he departs he will carry with him the best wishes of every Member.

Mr. HENDERSON. Madam Speaker, all of us who have had the privilege of serving on the House Post Office and Civil Service Committee during the 87th Congress with the gentleman from Georgia, the Honorable JAMES C. DAVIS, have particularly benefited from his wise counsel. His keen grasp of postal and civil service affairs, his patience, and his deep understanding of the legislative process made him a valuable and effective committee member.

As a freshman Member of Congress, I always found Judge DAVIS willing to go out of his way to assist me in every possible manner.

Washington's loss is Georgia's gain and Judge DAVIS undoubtedly will enjoy

many pleasant and fruitful years in Stone Mountain.

We shall miss him deeply.

Mr. HARRISON of Virginia. Madam Speaker, it was a great pleasure for me to find that our distinguished colleague from Georgia [Mr. FORRESTER] had arranged for this time during the busy closing days of this Congress in order that we might make this modest recognition of the extraordinary record of public service of the gentleman from Georgia, the Honorable JAMES CURRAN DAVIS.

This surely is the first time that I have referred to our colleague, JIM DAVIS, in so formal a way, for he has been, from first pleasant encounter to this day, and, I hope, will be for many years to come, just JIM DAVIS, my friend.

Friendly, forthright, conscientious, and courageous—these are just a few of the adjectives which come quickly to mind in thinking of JIM DAVIS. He has been a dedicated servant of his Nation, his State, and his district. That his counsel no longer will be available officially here is a loss to all levels of government, but we who have been privileged to serve with him know that our beloved colleague will not be lost to public service. JIM DAVIS, we know, will be called on to serve the people in some other capacity, and, as always, he will respond to the call with humility, but with determination to do his best in behalf of righteous causes.

I did not know, until I heard my friend, Judge FORRESTER, recall it, that Judge DAVIS had served as a Marine during World War I, but I was not surprised. JIM DAVIS is the epitome of the southern gentleman, but he is a fightingman. When he believes the cause just, he will not spare himself. Right is right to him, and political considerations are incidental.

Above all, our colleague reveres the Constitution of the United States. As an attorney and judge, he has studied constitutional law through the years. He has gained a remarkable insight into the genesis of this charter of our Government. He knows what its framers intended it to mean, and he knows it means the same today, despite the illicit redrafting by Federal judges turned legislators.

While he has other highly important committee assignments during his service here, I have always admired particularly his conscientious attention to his responsibilities as a member of the Committee on the District of Columbia. He has believed in the importance of making the Nation's Capital a safe place in which to live and to rear children. His investment of time and effort in support of this belief certainly meant little politically at home in Georgia, whose citizens he served devotedly here, but it is not in JIM DAVIS' makeup to slough off any responsibility. His retirement from the Congress will be as serious a loss to the District of Columbia, as it will be to Georgia, and to the Nation as a whole.

Mr. KORNEGAY. Madam Speaker, I should like to add my voice to the chorus of regretful goodbyes which are

being said to our esteemed and valued colleague, the Honorable JAMES C. DAVIS.

I have had the privilege of knowing Judge DAVIS for only 2 years, but during this time I have come to entertain for him the highest respect and regard. As a freshman Member of the 87th Congress, I recall with appreciation the many kindnesses and courtesies which he extended to me and his unflinching interest and cooperation in any matter discussed with him.

Judge DAVIS has upheld the highest traditions of this body, and his presence and his influence will be greatly missed in these Halls. His devotion to constitutional principles and his adherence to what he believed to be right, never yielding to the blandishments of political expediency or the theory of the easy way out, have endeared him to all of us as a person of high and undeviating principle. He will be missed but his influence will still be felt in his State and Nation. He is a fine southern gentleman and a distinguished public servant, whom it was an honor and a privilege to know.

Mr. MATHIAS. Madam Speaker, I want to join with my colleagues in expressing a few words concerning the loyal and dedicated service my colleague, the Honorable JAMES C. DAVIS, of Georgia, has rendered to the people of his State and country during his 16 years of service as a Member of the U.S. House of Representatives.

It has been my pleasure and privilege to serve on the District of Columbia Committee with Judge DAVIS, as he is familiarly referred to by his friends, during my first term of office. I would not want the record to show that the admirers of our colleague all come from one State, or section of the country, or from one side of the aisle. At times, I have differed as far as convictions were concerned on legislative issues with Judge DAVIS, but never once have I failed to recognize the fact that he was motivated by personal integrity and deepest concern. He had a quality to be admired by all of his colleagues, the determination to stand for what he thought was right under all circumstances. He is highly respected by both sides of the aisle and is noted for his unswerving loyalty to his country, his conscientious dedication to his job and his sterling character. His office lights burned from early morning to late at night. Judge DAVIS will be remembered as a vigorous Congressman and a stout-hearted American. I wish for him and his family much happiness and the blessing of good fortune in his future pursuits.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Madam Speaker, I am proud to join others in paying deserving tribute to Hon. JAMES C. DAVIS, of the State of Georgia, who leaves this body at the end of this session.

It has been my happy privilege to be closely associated with Judge DAVIS throughout the 16 years we have served together in the House of Representatives, both as a personal friend and fellow Congressman.

Judge DAVIS can take pride in the record of legislative accomplishments which he leaves behind. Indeed, his work as a member of the Committee on Post Office

and Civil Service has been outstanding, and much fine legislation bears his name as its author. As a member of the Committee on the District of Columbia, he has wielded a tremendous influence for good on the affairs of our Capital City. Judge DAVIS has been a relentless crusader for law and order, and perhaps the best friend the police and firemen have ever had in the Congress. Except for his work, I am sure the crime rate in the District would have been much higher, and he deserves the thanks and gratitude of all its peace-loving and law-abiding citizens.

Though Judge DAVIS' legislative record is one of great accomplishment, the qualities of character which he always exhibited in all matters, whether personal or political, have been his real hallmark of distinction.

Judge DAVIS is a man who has a profound faith in the genius of our American system. He has risen on many occasions to defend the cherished principles of our Constitution when they were being trampled upon by power-hungry political demagogues. While his people have been made the victims of political chicanery, he has always risen to their defense.

Judge DAVIS is a dedicated American patriot. He is a man of convictions, with the courage and ability to put those convictions forward.

Mr. Speaker, I regret that Judge DAVIS will not be with us next year, not only because of our warm personal friendship, but because America sorely needs his kind of statesmanship.

I am grateful for the opportunity of knowing Judge DAVIS as a friend, and I hope that in years to come, he will visit us often in this Chamber. I am sure others will join in wishing for him and his family an abundance of God's richest blessings throughout their future years.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. FORRESTER. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to extend their remarks in the RECORD on the character and service of the distinguished gentleman from Georgia [Mr. JAMES C. DAVIS].

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

HON. IRIS BLITCH

Mr. FORRESTER. Madam Speaker, it is with deep regret that this House takes note of the fact that one of those extraordinary people, our lovable and capable colleague, Congresswoman IRIS BLITCH, will sever her official relationship with this House at the end of the present year. The respect and admiration which this entire House holds for her is exceedingly genuine and it is with sadness that we see her go. We all recognize the fact, however, that sickness has caused her to make the voluntary decision to leave this body, a decision we do not believe that the voters of her district would have made. She is a great fighter for what she thinks is right, and she will certainly

be missed here. But she can leave with the knowledge that she has contributed much in the writing and making of history during the most crucial period of human existence.

Mrs. BLITCH was the first woman ever elected in Georgia for a full term in the U.S. House of Representatives. She was elected by a large majority for three other terms, or for a period of 8 years, because she was an honor to the people she served, her native State, and her country.

She had served in the General Assembly of Georgia, both in the house and senate, and during that time she was one of the leaders in those bodies. I remember now that she took a leading part in changing the laws of our State so that women might serve on juries. For many years, she was a leader in the State Democratic Party, and one time occupied the position of secretary of the State party, and later she was national committeewoman from the State of Georgia in the National Democratic Party.

During her term in Congress, she received the great honor of being named Woman of the Year in Agriculture by the Progressive Farmer; she was cited for her fine work in soil conservation in an award from the Georgia Sportsmen's Federation; and she received the meritorious service citation from the Rehabilitation Commission of the American Legion. It was almost entirely due to her efforts that the great Okefenokee Swamp, one of nature's wonders, was afforded protection and efforts made for its full preservation. Mrs. BLITCH was a member of the great Public Works Committee in the House and had the privilege of working for many of the fine flood control projects and rivers and harbors projects which have meant so much to our section and country. Her seniority, coupled with her ability and energy, has placed her where her services would have been of untold value to Georgia by bringing to our State the development of our streams.

Mrs. BLITCH resides in the little town of Homerville, and she and her husband are and have been favorites of that community. She will, together with her husband, continue to work for the good of her community and for the good of humanity in every way that her health will permit.

I know this entire House joins me in expressing our very best wishes and our great affection to this family, and our deep appreciation for what they have meant to the human race.

Mr. LANDRUM. Madam Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FORRESTER. I am delighted to yield to our colleague, the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. LANDRUM. Madam Speaker, in addition to the many splendid qualities of which the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. FORRESTER] has just spoken for the RECORD about this charming gentlewoman from Georgia, I think it can be truthfully said also that she is a real fighter for the things in which she believes.

I recall my first acquaintance with Mrs. BLITCH, at a time when the State

Legislature of Georgia was engaged in trying to decide who would be the Governor of Georgia. On that occasion I found myself on the opposite side of the aisle from her and lost. Later, through a court decision, we won; and then after the decision the side on which she was fighting was presented to the people, and we lost rather soundly. This experience told me that Mrs. BLITCH was very skilled in politics, very determined in her convictions, and very courageous in her actions.

Then I had the rare privilege of serving with her as a Member of this House and observing the items in which we were in agreement the greater part of the time—the dedication, the skill, and the courage with which she advanced the interests of the southeastern district of Georgia which she represents, the Eighth District.

She was completely dedicated to the development of the great Okefenokee Swamp, so that all of those who were privileged to tour through Georgia and particularly South Georgia might have the advantage of seeing and studying this great natural beauty and asset. Moreover, she was a determined worker for the development of our water resources in this country and in her State as well. She was a determined worker for legislation that brought greater development in our highways and in the transportation facilities of this country.

Her voluntary retirement from the Congress resulted from a breakdown in her health, which in the opinion of those who were privileged to know her well, came from her complete dedication to her duties and the zeal and vigor with which she approached her responsibilities as a Member of Congress.

It has been a genuine personal privilege, a very happy experience to have served in this great legislative body with a gentlewoman from my own State of the courage, the character, and the charm—the real southern charm—this lady possesses.

Mr. FORRESTER. Madam Speaker, I yield to our distinguished majority leader, the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. ALBERT].

Mr. ALBERT. Madam Speaker, I want to join my friends from Georgia in the tribute they are paying to our lovely and lovable colleague, the gentlewoman from Georgia [Mrs. BLITCH]. She is a wonderful person, charming, intelligent and of good humor. She has courage, both physical and moral. I have never known anyone more persistent in her devotion to duty. I have seen her sit here on the floor attending to every item of duty when she was ill and in pain. She is a real soldier.

Madam Speaker, IRIS BLITCH is a lady, a gentlewoman indeed, but she is also a knowledgeable legislator. She has fine judgment, an instinct for politics, the most difficult and yes, Madam Speaker, perhaps the most important of all the sciences and arts. She has been my friend, and I treasure her friendship. I shall miss her. I wish for her and her loved ones many years of health, happiness and prosperity.

Mr. FORRESTER. Madam Speaker, I certainly want to express our deep grati-

tude to the majority leader, both for myself and for the entire Georgia delegation, for the splendid and well-deserved remarks that were made by our colleague on Congresswoman BLITCH.

Now, with pleasure I yield to our colleague from Georgia [Mr. FLYNT].

Mr. FLYNT. Madam Speaker, it is a pleasure for me to associate myself with the remarks of the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. FORRESTER], the majority leader of the House of Representatives, and the other members of the Georgia delegation, and other Members of this body as we join together to pay tribute to the congressional service of the Honorable IRIS FAIRCLOTH BLITCH.

Congresswoman BLITCH came to the House of Representatives in the 84th Congress. During four consecutive terms she has represented the Eighth District of Georgia with honor and distinction. She probably served her district with more attentiveness, with more personal contacts and with more genuine desire to be of service than almost any individual with whom I have ever had the pleasure of serving in the House of Representatives.

IRIS BLITCH is a loyal, devoted, and faithful wife. She is a good and devoted mother to two fine outstanding children. She is a pillar of strength in the community of Homerville, Clinch County, where she has lived with her family for more than a quarter of a century. She is an active member and worker in her church.

IRIS BLITCH is and has been and will continue to be a source of influence for good in her community, in her district, in our State, and in the Nation.

My friendship with the gentlewoman from Georgia, Mrs. BLITCH, goes back to our service together in the General Assembly in Georgia in 1947-1948. At that time she represented the Fifth Senatorial District of Georgia. It was my honor to represent Spalding County in the House of Representatives. I came to know IRIS quite well during that session. I came to admire and respect her as a member of the general assembly and as the fine woman she is.

IRIS BLITCH has been an active practitioner in the art of politics in Georgia for more than 2 decades. She has been a successful politician. She has served in the house of representatives and in the senate of our State. She has served as national committeewoman of the Democratic Party and, of course, she has served 4 terms as a Member of the U.S. House of Representatives. She has filled these positions with honor and distinction, not only to herself but to the great State of which she is a Representative.

She is the first lady to be elected to a full term in Congress from Georgia. She has fully justified the confidence placed in her by the citizens of her great district.

A good many years ago, at her warm and cordial invitation, I delivered the graduation address to the high school graduates in her hometown of Homerville, Ga. I was there as the guest of her and her husband, Dr. B. E. Blitch. During part of the 2 days that I was

privileged to be in Homerville, I came to understand how and why the people of that fine community in southeast Georgia love IRIS BLITCH as they do. She has a genuine interest in people and she is never too busy to try to help alleviate the suffering of someone else and to be of service to those who need help and to be a friend to the friendless in time of need.

Madam Speaker, Mrs. BLITCH leaves the House of Representatives by her voluntary retirement. She will leave a place which will be hard to fill in this body. She will also leave a place that will be hard to fill in the hearts of those of us who love her and have served with her and who have known her so long. We are proud to have known IRIS and to have served with her in the U.S. House of Representatives.

Madam Speaker, as she voluntarily retires, we hope and pray that the Almighty in His infinite wisdom will restore her to the good health which she enjoyed when we first knew her. We have seen her during the period of her service here, particularly during the early days of this session, when she was in severe pain and suffering. As the distinguished majority leader commented a few moments ago, she made every effort possible to be here to study legislation carefully and to vote wisely in the interests of her district, her people, and our Nation.

Madam Speaker, her district certainly owes her a very great debt of gratitude for the service which she has rendered. She has been an outstanding Member of the House of Representatives and she has done her job exceedingly well.

Madam Speaker, as she will soon leave us as a Member of the House, she will continue to hold an affectionate spot in the heart of each of us. We wish for her, her husband, her children, and her grandchildren every happiness that may come her way. We wish her Godspeed and may God bless her.

Mr. HAGAN of Georgia. Madam Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FORRESTER. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Georgia [Mr. HAGAN].

Mr. HAGAN of Georgia. Madam Speaker, I am grateful to our distinguished friend and colleague, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. FORRESTER] for granting me this privilege of adding a few words to the splendid comments which have been made about our colleague, the gentlewoman from Georgia, IRIS FAIRCLOTH BLITCH, who is retiring after the completion of this term.

Madam Speaker, my association with IRIS BLITCH goes way back, as another colleague has said, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. FLYNT] to our days in the Georgia Legislature. IRIS BLITCH has performed a great service to her State and her Nation. I am glad that I have had the privilege of knowing her during all these years and of not only serving on the State level with her but also in the Nation's Congress.

Madam Speaker, IRIS BLITCH possesses rare charm, beauty, and graciousness, and yet the ability and the courage to stand her ground in the battles of politics

and legislative bodies, with those of us who may have felt at one time required strength that only men possess.

IRIS BLITCH proved to us in Georgia and in Washington that women can hold their ground in the legislatures of our States and of our Nation. I am glad to add my tribute to those which have already been paid today on her service in this body. I only wish that her physical condition could have permitted her to remain in Congress and that I could have had the privilege of longer service with her in the National House of Representatives.

Madam Speaker, I join my colleagues in expressing the hope that her health may be restored and that the years to come will be even better years for IRIS BLITCH and her fine family.

I thank my distinguished colleague again for this privilege of making these few comments.

Mr. FORRESTER. Madam Speaker, I yield to my distinguished colleague from Georgia [Mr. STEPHENS].

Mr. STEPHENS. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time to pay my respects to the Congresswoman from Georgia [IRIS BLITCH] who is retiring. I first became acquainted with IRIS BLITCH when she was in the Georgia Senate. I found out then that she was a person with whom you could readily work. She was most helpful, most cooperative. She would not only work with you but under any circumstance she would work for you. I feel that Georgia will have lost the services of a very fine person because she felt it necessary to retire.

As you have heard my colleague, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. FORRESTER] state, Congresswoman BLITCH is the first lady from Georgia to serve in the House of Representatives. When she joined the House of Representatives as the first lady to serve in that body from Georgia, she also followed another example that Georgia had set to the Nation by sending the first woman to serve in the Senate of the United States. So that she and Georgia have proven that the ladies have a definite and most important part in the political community of our State.

As she leaves the Congress, it puts me in mind of Francis S. Bartow, of Georgia, when, as a Confederate soldier he left home and what he said as he left his colleagues and friends at home was that, "I go to illustrate Georgia." Francis S. Bartow died in the First Battle of Manassas. IRIS BLITCH also came here to illustrate Georgia.

Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman.

Mr. LANGEN. Madam Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FORRESTER. I am delighted to yield to my distinguished colleague.

Mr. LANGEN. Madam Speaker, I thank my colleague for yielding. I take this time so that I may join my distinguished colleagues from Georgia in paying a proper and much deserved recognition to the services of our colleague from Georgia [Mrs. BLITCH].

It was not my privilege to learn to know her personally real well during the course of my service here, but I

should say that it would have been impossible for anyone to serve here for long without having been completely aware of her effective, untiring, and dedicated efforts. I know that many of my colleagues on this side of the aisle who have had occasion to serve with her on committees and to work with her on the many projects she had occasion to support have recognized her dedication and the effectiveness of her efforts on so many noteworthy occasions. So to that degree it has truly been my loss that I did not have the opportunity of benefiting to a greater degree from the extent of knowledge and dedication that she brought to this House.

On occasions of this kind it always occurs to me that there are no combinations of words or phrases that can possibly pay deserved praise, and certainly not compensate, for this kind of untiring effort. It would be my hope that the knowledge might be conveyed to her that the results and fruits of her efforts will live on for a good many years and will be recognized by her constituents in the district she served so effectively, and certainly throughout the United States and the world.

I should like to add on behalf of myself and others on this side of the aisle our very fond hope that the future may hold for her a very generous portion of happiness.

Mr. FORRESTER. Madam Speaker, the Georgia delegation generally appreciates the splendid remarks of our colleague, the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. LIBONATI. Madam Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FORRESTER. I would be most happy to yield to our distinguished colleague from Illinois, one who has the respect and affection of every member of the Georgia delegation, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. LIBONATI].

Mr. LIBONATI. Madam Speaker, it is difficult to speak of one who departs from this House voluntarily or otherwise. The profession of politics is a difficult one. It is not easy to determine the sacrifices one makes in following a career of public service because it is the constant application of one's service to others. This is doubly so for a woman who enters the political lists. Certainly for the gentlewoman from Georgia [Mrs. BLITCH] the fact of her having the confidence of her constituency over the years and having served four terms in this Congress is enough evidence as to the high esteem in which she is held by the electorate of her district.

Unfortunately, her health gave way under the stress and strain that even the most strong of the men feel at times in this House, as evidenced by the high casualties that occur. When one sees the retirement of a woman whose fortitude and strength of purpose are measured in the records of this House, who served so valiantly and held so strongly to her understanding of other people and her determination to make her ideas felt in her decisions, being strong in her attitude toward those things which she supported, one cannot find fault with such a courageous person. The gentlewoman from Georgia, who has served so

consistently without any regard to personal reactions on legislation, and who did so with honest strength and the feeling that what she was doing was right, deserves the commendation of all the Members of this House as well as the State of Georgia and the Nation.

Many times we are critical of others as to their point of view. But if one were only to look at a situation or a problem through the eyes of that person and understand the situation and the community as that person does, certainly, they could come to no other conclusion. Therefore, I rise at this time to pay my respects to her loyalty to her causes and to her understanding and to her work over the years—qualities that made her important to the State of Georgia and to her constituents in representing their problems and their philosophies on the floor of the House of Representatives for others to weigh and to adjudicate.

I thank the distinguished gentleman from Georgia for yielding to me at this time and extending to me this opportunity to express my sincere appreciation of this fine person.

Mr. FORRESTER. Madam Speaker, the Georgia delegation is highly grateful to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. LIBONATI] for the splendid tribute paid to our colleague, Congresswoman BLITCH.

Mr. McMILLAN. Madam Speaker, I sincerely regretted to learn that our colleague, Congresswoman IRIS F. BLITCH, will not run for reelection this year. We shall all greatly miss having the valuable services of Mrs. BLITCH during the 88th Congress. It is regrettable that this fine young lady's health would not permit her to continue to serve the people of her district and the State of Georgia in the high manner in which she has rendered service not only to the people of Georgia but to the entire Nation since she has been a Member of the U.S. House of Representatives.

I do not know of any young lady who has ever served in Congress during the 24 years I have been a Member of this body who has gained a higher respect from both sides of the aisle than Mrs. BLITCH. She is an unusually effective legislator and always studied every bill and report thoroughly before casting her vote on any subject.

I will personally miss Mrs. BLITCH as I enjoyed her friendship, agree with her philosophy on the manner in which this Government should be administered. I never heard Mrs. BLITCH say an unkind word regarding anyone and my best wishes go out to her and her family during her retirement.

Mrs. PFOST. Madam Speaker, at this time, I rise to pay a warm tribute to one of our distinguished Members who has announced her retirement from this body. Congresswoman IRIS BLITCH has served her district in the State of Georgia with dedication and honor during the past 8 years, and she will be missed when the Congress reconvenes in January.

It has been my great privilege to know the gentlewoman from Georgia, [Mrs. BLITCH] as a good friend and colleague in the House. I have worked with her on various projects over the past years and

she has always been an inspiration to all of those concerned. Her devotion and service, at all times, has been in the highest traditions of the Democratic Party and of the Nation.

Mrs. BLITCH was the first woman in the State of Georgia's history to be elected for a full term to the House. Through her fine record and the force of her personality, she easily won reelection to succeeding terms. I know that the voters of her district are most unhappy that her name is not on the ballot this November.

Mrs. BLITCH made a name for herself with the people of Georgia long before she came to serve in the Congress. She served with distinction in the State's general assembly, both in the House and the Senate. She pioneered legislation at the State level that won for women the right to serve on juries. Always a leader, she played an active role in the State Democratic Party and served as national committeewoman in the national Democratic Party.

The honors she won while serving in the Congress were many. She was selected as "The Woman of the Year in Agriculture" by the Progressive Farmer because of her efforts on behalf of the farmer. The Georgia Sportsmen's Federation presented her with an award for her efforts on behalf of soil conservation. She received a meritorious service commendation from the American Legion's Rehabilitation Commission. She has led the fight to have the great Okefenokee Swamp, one of the wonders of nature, protected and preserved for the enjoyment of future generations.

It was, perhaps, working with her on the House Public Works Committee that I got to know her best. She had a tremendous understanding and insight into the complex problems of flood control, irrigation and reclamation and the scores of other matters which were the committee's immediate business. In this regard, not just the citizens of Georgia alone, but the people of all of the United States owe her a debt of gratitude for her distinguished service on their behalf.

All of the Members of the House of both parties, I am sure, join me in this tribute to a great American. I know that Congresswoman BLITCH will continue being a great credit to her country when she returns to reside in her home in Homerville, Ga. I sincerely hope that she will be a frequent visitor to our Nation's Capital City.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. FORRESTER. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks on the character and service of our colleague, the gentlewoman from Georgia [Mrs. BLITCH].

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. GRANAHAN). Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA APPROPRIATION BILL, 1963

Mr. NATCHER submitted a conference report and statement on the bill

(H.R. 12276) making appropriations for the government of the District of Columbia and other activities chargeable in whole or in part against the revenues of said District for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1963, and for other purposes.

FEDERAL-AID HIGHWAY ACT OF 1962

Mr. FALLON submitted a conference report and statement on the bill (H.R. 12135) to authorize appropriations for the fiscal years 1964 and 1965 for the construction of certain highways in accordance with title 23 of the United States Code and for other purposes.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA TEACHERS' SALARY AND RETIREMENT AMENDMENTS OF 1962

Mr. DOWDY submitted a conference report and statement on the bill (S. 1447) to amend the District of Columbia Teachers' Salary Act of 1955, as amended, and to provide for the adjustment of annuities paid from the District of Columbia teachers' retirement and annuity fund.

REPORT ON THE 87TH CONGRESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. VANIK] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. VANIK. Madam Speaker, after debate has ended in this 87th Congress, historians can discuss the considerable achievements and disappointments of this assembly which remained in continuous session longer than any other peacetime Congress. It was a hard-working Congress which carefully deliberated every proposal. There was time to think, time to act prudently. By these standards, it will rate higher than most.

FOREIGN AFFAIRS

While the free world suffered a loss of valuable real estate in the Soviet takeover of Cuba, it must be recalled that Cuba was lost before President Kennedy took office. Since January 1961, the free world continues to strengthen and make steady gains. The phenomenal industrial recovery of Western Europe, first ignited by the Marshall Plan, has become one of the wonders of the modern world. The bitter hostility of Nikita Khrushchev to the Common Market success is testimony to the glowing success of the free enterprise system on the Soviet flank.

The dynamic industrial prosperity of free Europe threatened communism at home base. Good news travels fast and the Iron Curtain could not close it out. The publicly announced Soviet infiltration of Cuba was designed to distract from democratic victories in Europe.

Those who urge a blockade of Cuba forget that American ships are supplying troops and material to Turkey, Iran, Pakistan, and to other countries surrounding the Communists. A blockade would be reciprocated. Cuba cannot threaten the United States. Modern missiles can fly as accurately and as destructively from Russia as they can from Cuba. The grave danger of Cuba is in

the convenient base it provides for the Communist penetration of South America. Our efforts should be directed toward preventing the export of incendiary communism from Cuba to the South American Continent.

The successful formula of the Marshall Plan continues to be the wise policy of the Kennedy Administration. It is necessary to build the productive systems of the underdeveloped nations and provide military support for the allies of democracy, who must be prepared to fight communism in the distant fields and villages.

The objectives of American foreign policy cannot bear fruit in the vacuum of isolationism. The United Nations Organization is an essential tool for the preservation of international order. Without the United Nations, Korea would be totally Communist and Africa would be a political shambles. Financing the United Nations and meeting extra assessments for special services such as the restoration of orderly government in the Congo is a fact of life. This Congress very prudently responded to this need by appropriating \$100 million to replenish the operating funds of the United Nations organization under conditions which would insure mutuality in support.

The Peace Corps was developed by the Kennedy Administration as a vehicle for bettering the plight of man in the down-trodden parts of the world. The magnificent achievement of the Peace Corps is one of the really great successes of our foreign policy. These dedicated "Crusaders for Democracy" are creating an exciting new image for America as they toil to help improve life, health, and the pursuit of gainful labor among the neglected people of the world. And the gains flow both ways. When the Peace Corps workers return home laden with their rich experience and glowing from the goodness of their sacrifice, they will be informed and infinitely better prepared Americans.

THE NATIONAL SECURITY

Congress responded to President Kennedy's request and appropriated \$52.6 billion for the national security. In view of the world arms race, it is difficult to ascertain whether we are making gains or whether we are simply keeping up. We have almost 3 million men in the armed services. The superiority of our Navy and the strategic Air Force is unquestioned. Our nuclear weapons and missiles are in sufficient supply to provide total destruction.

Yet this military might is strained to meet the tremendous global requirements to defend against aggression in 45 different countries. The military is faced with the imponderable burden of placing and keeping men, weapons, and supplies at any place where trouble may erupt at any time.

In order to implement the military strength of our Nation, this Congress passed a resolution authorizing the President to call up 150,000 reservists if necessary to defend vital interests anywhere in the world. While this added reserve strength could not delay a nuclear missile attack more than 10 seconds, it can help maintain the peace and prevent a Communist takeover where these weap-

ons are not employed. For our national security, we must be prepared for defending a cold war infiltration skirmish fought by men and guns as well as a missile holocaust in which a squadron of 12 ICBM's will mutilate the enemy and the world at a cost of \$190 million.

It is regrettable that world conditions compel this otherwise needless expenditure, but there can be no price tag on freedom. We must face up to the cost of whatever is necessary to preserve our way of life.

TRADE EXPANSION

The dynamic success of the European Common Market has generated unprecedented free-trade pressures throughout the free world. To meet this trade crisis, Congress passed the Trade Expansion Act to give the President authority to reduce tariffs to meet the competition of the newly strengthened trade bloc which must eventually include the entire free world. While temporary disruptions may occur, because of foreign trade, the long-range prospects are good. American goods carry the mark of quality throughout the world. American labor is as high in productivity as it is in cost. Nowhere in the free world does the workingman or his union have more dependable respect for his employment contract.

While labor-management relationships are in peaceful productive accord in this country, an era of labor-management controversy is commencing in Europe and Japan. For example, France was plagued this year by 5,800 different strikes. Competition in a tariff-free world will require capacity for stabilized productivity. America is now ready.

THE HOME FRONT

Although all economic indicators point to 1962 as a banner year, with personal income and the gross national product breaking all previous records, there are prophets of gloom who seek to slow America down.

In September, unemployment dropped 420,000 to a September total of 3.5 million with 5.8 percent of the civilian labor force unemployed. While the national figures are encouraging, they are of little comfort to the man without a job. Automation and cost-cutting devices are dumping huge quantities of workers into the stream of the unemployed. The problem is one of creating new jobs for a million new workers each year.

The Kennedy Administration inherited the problem of 6 million unemployed. This has been reduced today to 3.5 million. Since 1.1 million new workers have been added to the work force, there are 4.6 million more people at work than there were in January 1961.

One of the grave disappointments of this session was the failure to pass the Unemployment Compensation Extension Act to provide 13 weeks of additional benefits to unemployed workers. This should be one of the first duties of the 88th Congress, particularly in view of the uncertainty in business conditions which businessmen seem anxious to promote into a tax cut.

The Manpower Development and Training Act is one of the great achieve-

ments of this session. Under the program, the unemployed head of a family may apply for retraining in a skill for which there is a demand and receive a subsistence retraining allowance. Youths between 19 and 22 are eligible for benefits where such allowances are necessary to provide occupational training.

Although this program has just begun, retraining groups are currently being organized in Cleveland for auto transmission repairmen, clerk-stenographers, machinists, machine operators, and practical nurses. Ten other new training programs are under study. Persons interested in job retraining should call at the Ohio State Employment Service at 2400 Euclid Avenue.

The ebb and flow of business conditions, employment, and consumer spending are phenomena which do not respond to national demands or hopes. Recession may come, but if it does, we can be sure that President Kennedy will take immediate steps to cushion the impact and plan long-range designs to eradicate this recurring economic blight from the American scene.

CIVIL RIGHTS

The Kennedy Administration has endeavored to use the entire resources of the executive authority for developing and preserving civil rights and insuring equality of opportunity. Executive orders were issued to bring about the appointment of qualified persons without regard to race and religion. All agencies were directed to provide equality of opportunity at all levels of the Federal service.

In late August, Congress passed a constitutional amendment abolishing the poll tax in Federal elections. Although five states of the South still cling to this archaic abuse of the electoral franchise, it remains as a barrier to voter participation. There is every reason to expect that three-fourths of the states will ratify this amendment by next July. This year's Federal elections will be the last at which certain voters will be subject to the poll tax. Although all voters in the Southern States may soon be allowed to vote free, there is much to be done to make it possible for them to vote freely.

The Mississippi outrage should constitute the last stand of prejudice by force. The issue was whether the people of a single state had the choice to accept or reject the law of the land. How long could the United States remain united if Federal law could be rejected at the border?

President Kennedy deserves the gratitude of all Americans for remaining steadfast to principle. He gave the State time to acquiesce, and then he demonstrated that the law of the land was not to be defied. Although the Mississippi affair is only a skirmish in the fight against bigotry and discrimination, it is a milestone which more clearly establishes national purpose.

The President's order against discrimination in Federal activities has successfully been extended to defense industries. In Cleveland, I have personally investigated defense industries and have

insisted upon full compliance with the Executive Order.

FEDERAL IMPACT ON CLEVELAND

Before Congress adjourned, I helped arrange for budget clearance for an allocation of \$41.2 million to construct the new Federal office building. There is every reason to expect approval in time for construction to begin late next summer. Not only is this building the key-stone to the Erieview development, it will be the basis for providing accommodations for new Federal agencies it will lure to Cleveland.

Much of my time in Washington is spent on urging additional defense contracts in the Cleveland area. While the recent announcement of the Thompson Ramo-Wooldridge \$17.5 million contract for the M-14 rifle was heartening, the real excitement came with the assignment of the \$117 million program to the NASA Lewis Research Center to develop the Centaur two-stage rocket project to land a surveyor spacecraft on the moon. In the meanwhile, activity at the Cadillac Tank Plant has been stepping up. These activities mean jobs for Cleveland and Northern Ohio. The search for important defense work has become an important part of a Congressman's work.

WHEN CONGRESS ADJOURNS

When Congress adjourns, I shall be available almost daily at my Cleveland office, 506 Federal Building, on Cleveland's Public Square. The telephone number is CH 1-7900. My staff and I will be pleased to meet constituents and carefully consider any special problem or matter relating to the Federal Government. I will try to personally meet everyone who calls. One of the most important functions of a Congressman is to personally discuss the effect Federal laws have upon the citizen as well as the needs of new legislation. It is from these discussions that I can learn how effectively Federal laws are being administered. If I am to legislate wisely, I need your help.

NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF MANUFACTURERS LAUNCH PUBLIC PROPAGANDA PROGRAM "TO CURB UNION MONOPOLY POWER"—PURPOSE: TO BRAINWASH THE PUBLIC AGAINST LABOR PROCEDURES AND THUS PRESSURE CONGRESS TO PASS ANTITRUST LABOR LAWS DESTROYING UNION RIGHTS TO BARGAIN, ETC.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. LIBONATI] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. LIBONATI. Madam Speaker, it is unfortunate for the future well-being of our economy that present standard methods and procedures in labor and capital relations in recent major controversies have resulted in industry claiming Government pressure and forced compromises on labor obstinacy and unfairness standoff stalemates unsatisfactory to both sides—resulting in continuing bitter incriminations and dis-

content against themselves. The Taft-Hartley and Landrum-Griffin approaches to establish procedures for the solution of labor and industrial troubles in certain facets widened the breach between these two powerful segments of our economy. It is well known that if certain provisions of these laws would be enforced to the letter—an industrial revolution could result—causing destruction of property and loss of lives.

Madam Speaker, I have learned through labor circles that one of our most diligent and conscientious group of businessmen, on matters of legislation, have embarked on a foraging expedition to destroy the integral unit organizations representing union labor by unconscionable and un-American practices in using accentuated forms of propaganda to influence the public mind against labor union methods used in procuring labor's share in the profit returns of industry.

It has been called to my attention that industrial leaders have already embarked on a preliminary plan to brainwash the public, first in order to stimulate support for the passage of bills in the Congress that will in effect destroy the freedom of union activity in the labor movement and curb the operation of union organizations. This can be best accomplished through Federal statutes. The antitrust laws are considered to be the answer to this accomplishment. Several bills have been introduced in this session to place labor under the antitrust laws. Labor organizations under this type of control will succumb to death by strangulation. The groundwork to prepare the public mind has already been laid—various unique methods of public propaganda, the use of the radio, television, magazines, and the press, are prejudicing the cause of labor, as against public interest.

All of the hidden persuaders so effectively used to get us to buy soaps and cigarettes will be marshaled in this program. The plan, thoroughly detailed in secret instructions, calls for the use of sympathetic journalists who will cooperate.

It calls for sponsored TV special shows which will invade the homes of America in the guise of an objective portrayal.

It calls for carefully conducted studies by panels of distinguished persons to arrive at a predetermined set of facts.

In furtherance of this method of attack, the National Association of Manufacturers have inaugurated "A Program To Curb Union Monopoly Power," through its industrial relations division at 2 East 48th Street, New York, N.Y.

The basic policy is as follows:

The NAM already has a position on monopolistic practices, as follows:

"Any action, practices, or labor agreements by a combination of employers, or of unions, or of a union or unions with an employer or employers, which result in restraint of trade or endanger the public health, safety, or security, are contrary to the public interest and should be subject to statutory regulation."—"Industry Believes," page 13.

The problem, therefore, is to implement this policy. Obviously, educational efforts on a broad scale must be undertaken, with legislation as the ultimate goal.

PROGRAM

We have a fourfold task:

1. To identify the problems, clarify the issues, and place proper emphasis on the causes of the abusive use of union monopoly power.
2. To collect pertinent information regarding the impact of union monopoly power on the economy, business, employees, etc.
3. To communicate this information to all who are interested and concerned—and to those who should be.
4. To recommend steps to management, government, public, etc., on what can be done to cope with this problem.

The blueprint for action and strategy is detailed in the long-range plan and timetable.

It calls for the heavy indoctrination of the teaching profession, which is recognized as "a major opinion molding agency."

It calls for a special essay contest, not on anything wholesome or patriotic, but on "What Union Monopoly Power Means to America" which would send the high-school kids of the country scurrying to find examples with which to bolster their attempts to win this competitive contest and thus prove the thesis which the NAM seeks to prove.

It calls for a "concerted effort to win the clergy" to the need for punitive legislation. The clergy, however, may be harder to mislead. Probably the first clergyman to read this infamous document is responsible for its disclosure. His reaction as a man of God was one of indignation at the immorality and the inhumanity of the attack that has been plotted on American labor. Let us give full credit to Rev. Claire M. Cook, Th. D., of the Religion & Labor Council of America.

I have enumerated a few of the rungs in the ladder spanning 1962, 1963, and 1964 in the timetable aimed to "accomplish the legislative goal" of forcing unions under the antitrust statutes as a monopoly.

Thus, this detailed blueprint, planned in 1961, is already part way toward completion. The long-range plan and timetable cites 11 bills already in the hopper in the 1962 phase of the schedule. It is interesting to note that the 1962 program is to be given no publicity under the plan.

I have not listed the distinguished Members of the Senate and House whose names are listed in the document as having introduced bills which are regarded as part of this grand design. Their names, however, appear in the 1962 phase of this long-range plan and timetable of the National Association of Manufacturers. Although I am inserting the entire document, more than 20 pages long, in the RECORD, it would be improper to list item 2 of the 1962 schedule naming sponsors of bills, for the good reason that it may cause embarrassment to the distinguished legislators who may innocently represent their point of view yet whose names together with the numbers of their bills, are listed in item 2 of the document.

Incidentally, the plan calls for obtaining maximum mileage on testimony or

statements presented in support of these bills.

The cast of characters who are to participate in the objective studies, planned to arrive at predetermined results in support of this timetable, are listed in these confidential documents which I am about to place in the RECORD. The personnel of these study groups includes members of the faculties of such distinguished universities as Harvard, the University of Chicago, Vanderbilt, New York University, the University of California at Los Angeles, and McGill University of Montreal, Canada.

Other members of the NAM Center for the Study of Union Power, which will function under the chairmanship of NAM Vice President Charles A. Kothe, include a list of attorneys who are expert in labor law; a staff member of the U.S. Senate Committee on Banking and Currency, six college professors, and former Congressman Graham A. Barden, who for so long was chairman of the House Committee on Education and Labor and is now practicing law at New Bern, N.C.

The 1963 schedule calls for "a hearing for a bill of our own design before the 88th session of Congress—1962 to 1963."

The first item on the program for 1964 calls for a poll by Opinion Research Corp. "regarding the need for control of union power." Even 3 years in advance of this scheduled poll, the blueprint and timetable states that "The results are certain to give us a better insight into current thinking, and therefore, some specific indication of the direction we should pursue." In other words, the blueprint calls for taking a reading early in 1964 on the success which has attended the program launched last year in brainwashing the American people and softening them up for the acceptance of the NAM drive for new straitjacket legislation to impair the effectiveness of trade unions.

A number of bills are in the hopper. The purport of the bills listed are as follows:

S. 87, introduced January 5, 1961—Labor and Public Welfare. Provides that nothing in the Labor-Management Relations Act shall be construed to nullify the provisions of any State or territorial law which regulate or prohibit strikes by employees of a public utility, or which regulate or prohibit lockouts by a public utility.

S. 2631, introduced September 23, 1961—Labor and Public Welfare. Prohibits any person employed at a strategic defense facility to engage or participate in a strike. Prohibits any labor organization encouraging any person so employed to engage in a strike. Provides for the appointment of an emergency board by the Secretary of Defense to ascertain the facts when there is a labor dispute at a strategic defense facility. Confers power on Federal district courts to enforce compliance with provisions of any order of an emergency board.

S. 2292, introduced July 20, 1961—Labor and Public Welfare—makes antitrust laws applicable to labor unions. Makes certain concerted activities—including attempts to reach a common understanding with respect to conditions of em-

ployment—unlawful when such activities interfere with commerce.

H.R. 7097 prohibits strikes, work stoppages, and slowdowns at critical defense facilities. Provides for issuance of restraining orders and injunctions.

The suggestion that labor unions should be subject to the Sherman Antitrust Act and the Clayton Act, has the vice of seeming simple. Plausible as it may sound, it turns back upon three centuries of the struggle of working men to bargain collectively. Any student of the labor movement knows that the greatest obstacle that the labor unions had to overcome was their collective action fell under common law penalty for boycott.

It was only where the law has matured to recognize the legality of collective bargaining that the felt necessity of the working man could be realized by matching the joint activities of the men against the economic strength of capital.

None but the nearsighted will deny that there have been abuses in the labor movement, just as there were abuses when capital enjoyed a totality of economic strength. However, to place collective bargaining under the restrictions of the Sherman Act, would be to destroy all of the legitimate gains of labor, without the compensatory benefits to labor. The cure for the ills of labor and management must be found within the leadership of labor and of management. If labor may not organize, collectively, except under the threat of prosecution under the Sherman Act, then you would reduce the unions to a mere social study group. The only hope for labor then will be to secure coercive action through the Government. We will then degenerate into an economic society where the Congress must set the prices of labor, the prices of materials and the prices of goods.

I submit, Madam Speaker, that it is rather not advancing our country, its economy and its people, but would put us in the economic status of Poland and Yugoslavia.

If industry continues to pursue this course of action, the reaction in labor circles will result in counter moves that can only lead to a severe disturbance in the economy and well-being of our Nation.

We are facing the most critical period of our history and to create a schism in our overall employer and employee relationship, at this time, would result in economic chaos and the loss of our leadership in the free world. Every effort has been put forth in legislative halls to promote expansion of our industries and stimulation of production to take up the unemployment slack. As patriotic Americans, we cannot afford to disturb or lessen the confidence of both industry and labor in their economic functioning balances.

It would be disastrous to the very existence of our Nation's prosperity for two of the most all-powerful segments of our economic system to take steps to destroy one another.

It would be better if industry would pay more attention to the study of our economic imbalances. They are in a

better position than any other unit to monitor voluntary regulated prices of the necessities of life, so as to arrest the spiraling of the cost of living. Industry and business are against legislation establishing ceiling regulations on prices. Yet, the discontent of labor is a result of a short weekly pay envelope to meet these rising living costs. The average home earner making \$100 per week, with a family—five persons—goes deeper and deeper into debt. Naturally, costs of services and goods must go up with the cost of living. The worker goes to the union hall and complains that the homemaker—although frugal and saving—cannot make ends meet.

Leaders in industry complain that the margin of profit is close and will not support a raise; a conference between representative leaders results in a deadlock and leads to a walk-out or to a continuance of the strike.

If specialists in the field of the economics of production costs and sale prices, also giving study to excessive advertising and other burdensome costs that influence the increase of the market retail prices of the product, then if a percentage cost control table could be established to determine the incidental costs of handling, processing, marketing, and advertising, something could be done to lower the cost of living. Thus, restoration of the purchasing power of the dollar to an actual dollar's worth of value of predeflation priced goods. A dollar saved is a dollar earned.

A little attention to the movement of plants, from one State with shallow labor pools to another with plenty of labor, unorganized, would be a good study; at least, it would point to the selfish practices of employers who, in the end, defeat their very purposes—by adding to unemployment in certain areas with a higher spending number of dollars—to an area where payrolls reduce the laborers' spending dollars. Surely, a prosperous community can only remain so if the sales, by the purchaser, increase with the number of spending dollars he has to spend. It is a circle that is never ending in its reliance upon the ability to earn dollars to spend them in trade and the money is then deposited and taken up by industry to accelerate the reproduction of goods again. Money must flow into each of these reservoirs of trade and finance, in order that the prosperity of the economy continues.

We certainly do not need more trouble in labor-management relations than we now have.

Madam Speaker, in the last 2 years, there were over 800 concerns that moved their plants to low wage foreign country areas. American industry is presently busy investing its surplus moneys abroad, only to discover that it is not going to enjoy a free hand in cheap labor markets as it has in the past. It seems that the bargaining table has found its place in England, or any one of the 32 countries into which it has extended its industries.

Secondly, it is already finding out that freewheeling management decisions, like mass layoffs, are not being swallowed anywhere nearly so gracefully in these

other countries as they are in the United States, so that these ordinary developments are an indication that some of the conditions that have made foreign investments so attractive to American business are going to be lost.

The Trainman News, of October 1, 1962, carries an interesting article by Press Associates, Inc., on the failure of runaway capital to face its labor responsibilities.

There is a movement afoot among the Ford employees internationally to unite Ford employees in all of the 32 countries where Ford is now located, in order to bargain with the employer on the level where key corporation decisions are made. This will lead to Ford workers, everywhere, harmonizing wages and workers conditions, to exchange information, to sponsor joint educational programs, to coordinate bargaining activities, to achieve an international fair labor standard and, through these measures, to maintain advancement to common goals. These goals are as follows: job security, a fair share of the product of rapidly advancing technology, policies leading to full production and full employment; and international wage and labor policies which insure social and economic justice for every Ford worker. The Ford Motor Co., expanding to 32 countries, has increased its assets to \$5 billion and is now able to make economic decisions which exceed, in impact, those of many countries of the United Nations.

On the level of foreign governments involved comes a warning that American industry abroad may not be able to have its own way, forever. Published reports from Paris reveal that the French Government is unhappy that two American corporations recently laid off 1,000 workers, because of changed business conditions, without notifying the French Government. This action violated the basic French philosophy that certain isolated enterprise practices in French industry does not constitute a responsible policy that does not respect the rights of and the social contract linking a financially powerful enterprise to the labor it employs. The French Minister of Industry, Michel Maurice-Bokanowski, was quoted by the France-Presse, further, that foreign investments must take full account of the imperative obligation existing in France, to respect the production objectives of the plan without in any way neglecting its social objectives. He threatened to examine, with the greatest of care, new foreign investments in France, particularly American. The layoffs that have shocked France and French labor, involved 700 men employees of the General Motors refrigerator plant in Gennevilliers, and 200 men, laid off by the Remington Rand portable typewriter operations in Lyons, which were being shifted to a modern plant in the Netherlands. Thus, the fact remains that, although the criticism was for domestic consumption, yet the layoffs stirred union protests strong enough for official reaction. That indicates that run-away American capital is not going to be able to run away from its labor responsibilities as easily as it once appeared.

When we consider that the Department of Commerce will not release any pertinent information about the number of American concerns that have established factories abroad, or contributed to the extension of the local industries in Latin America, Europe, and the underdeveloped countries, it is evident that a critical situation is in the offing, especially in that the following amounts of American capital have been invested in foreign enterprises:

Here is a 6-year score on foreign investments by private American investors:

	Million
Investments in Western Europe (1956-61)-----	\$5,141
Profits returned to U.S. companies--	2,261
Investments in underdeveloped areas-----	5,552
Profits returned to U.S. companies--	18,794
Investments in Latin America-----	3,057
Profits returned to U.S. companies--	4,379
Grand total investments-----	13,750
Grand total profits returned--	15,394

¹This does not count money left overseas for reinvestment, expansion, automation, and cash reserves. The less restrictions we put on imports, the more profits for our American investors overseas and their stockholders but the less wages for American workers.

I include the following article from the Washington World, issue of September 25, 1962:

U.S. BUSINESS SPENDING MORE ABROAD THAN HOME—RISING PLANT, EQUIPMENT EXPANSION CAUSED BY LOW LABOR, SUPPLY COSTS

American business is spending nearly twice as much on plant and equipment expansion abroad as it is at home, according to a recent survey from the Commerce Department's Office of Business Economics.

Projected rate of these foreign expenditures for 1962 is 14 percent above last year's outlay, compared with a domestic expansion of 8 percent. Trend in the figures: Latin American slowdown, pickup in Europe, the Near East and Africa.

Behind the expansion: Advantages of supply and low labor cost.

THIS YEAR'S OUTLAY NEAR \$2 BILLION

Capital outlays by manufacturing firms abroad this year are reported at \$1.9 billion, or 11 percent above the 1961 amount, led by a 25-percent growth in the Common Market area. Among individual industries, the transportation industry (mainly automobiles) shows the strongest rise—about \$150 million, of which two-thirds is in Common Market countries.

Outlays abroad for plant and equipment by the petroleum industry have risen consistently in recent years, reaching a projected level of \$1.8 billion for 1962, and are expected to remain at about this amount for 1963.

Continuing trends evidenced in earlier years, these capital outlays emphasize the buildup of new and improved refining and distribution systems in the rapidly growing consumer markets in Europe and the Far East, as well as the development of new producing fields in the North Africa-Middle Eastern area.

TWENTY PERCENT RISE FOR EASTERN HEMISPHERE

Expenditures in the Eastern Hemisphere are scheduled to rise in 1962 by more than 20 percent; this year's growth in the Western Hemisphere is less than 10 percent.

Mining companies expect to increase capital expenditures by one-fifth from 1961's relatively low amount, to a 1962 total of nearly \$400 million. A renewed increase of ex-

penditures in Canada, together with new projects in Africa and elsewhere, more than offset the recent completion of major expansion in Latin America.

Among other industries, capital investment in trade and distribution facilities is rising by one-fourth, to reach a level of \$400 million in 1962. Most of this increase is centered in Europe, with other areas in the Eastern Hemisphere participating to a lesser extent. Service industries are showing a moderate gain; public utilities and agriculture continue their decline of recent years, the OBE survey shows.

EUROPEAN INVESTMENT INTENSIFIED IN 1962

The buildup of investments in Europe was intensified in 1962 with \$1.8 billion, or nearly 40 percent, of plant expenditures channeled into that area. The figure for 1957, the first year for which these dates were collected, was less than 20 percent. More than half of current expenditures occur in the various manufacturing industries, with most of the remainder accounted for by the expansion of oil company facilities.

Manufacturing investments in plant facilities were highest in Germany, amounting to an estimated \$432 million for 1962 (\$318 million in 1961). In comparison, the rate of capital was in third position with \$331 million. Other Common Market countries accounted for \$160 million of manufacturing plant and equipment. Oil investments in Europe this year amount to \$597 million, about evenly divided between Common Market countries and the rest of Europe.

Expenditures in Canada, where the increase in new plant and equipment is \$60 million, totaled \$1.1 billion. Half of the increase is being chalked up by the mining industry, which is projecting expenditures of \$200 million for 1962, after having dropped to \$165 million in the prior year. Expenditures for manufacturing industries are rising by 10 percent over the 1961 total, and are expected to reach \$390 million for 1962. Little change is seen in petroleum or other industries.

LATIN AMERICAN OUTLAYS UP TO 15 PERCENT

For Latin America, the latest Office of Business Economics survey shows that U.S. companies plan total capital outlays above \$900 million in 1962, up about 15 percent from last year. Petroleum levels off at about \$350 million, but capital outlays by manufacturing companies show continued growth, with the major increase expected to occur in Argentina.

This generally higher rate of investment in fixed capital abroad tends to raise capital outflows from the United States. However, other sources of financing are growing in importance: Depreciation charges and retained earnings, along with external sources of financing abroad. The available data on direct-investment capital outflows in the first half of 1962 show some decline from the 1961 rate, indicating that the investing companies are relying more heavily on these alternative sources of funds to finance their expansion abroad.

The Office of Business Economics notes that the actual 1961 expenditures abroad now being reported are somewhat lower in major industries than those previously anticipated by the companies. On the other hand, the projections by the companies of 1962 outlays have been raised compared to those reported at this time last year, with most of the gain reported in European investments.

Madam Speaker, in an article written in the New York Times, Sunday edition, October 7, 1962, entitled "NAM Opens Fight on Unions' Power," subtitle, "Presses Long-Range Drive for Federal Law to Limit Labor Monopoly Role," Charles A. Kothe, head of the associa-

tion's industrial relations division, is quoted:

Some kind of restrictions should be designed just for labor. It might be possible—

He said—

to prohibit industrywide or perhaps countrywide, collective bargaining.

It might also be possible, he said "to prevent unions from establishing national wage and fringe-benefit policies, or from calling industrywide strikes." Mr. Kothe said he hoped that as a result of the NAM program "the public will be so filled with disgust and revulsion at the abuses he will reveal that it will descend on Congress clamoring for legislation."

Madam Speaker, after 22 years' service in the Illinois Assembly—6 years in the House, and 16 years in the Senate—and three terms in the Congress, meeting and discussing legislation with leaders of the Illinois Association of Manufacturers—at committee hearings and social affairs—I cannot understand the national organization sponsoring this type of approach to the solution of labor-management differences. It is difficult to believe that these leaders of industry from many rising ranks of workers would condone a program of rule or ruin in their opposition to labor practices. There is still time for some of our level-headed business friends from Illinois to realize that the public is quick to recognize that this fresh approach to destroy the bargaining rights of labor in any other guise will exude the same nauseating stench that permeated the "yellow dog" contracts.

The progressive minded lawmakers that are elected from so-called labor districts are the best friends of industry in certain areas of legislation affecting its stability and expansion of corporation interests. At most levels, labor and capital have parallel interests. There is only friction where their respective rights are challenged by legislation. The leaders of these respective groups are well equipped to present their views. These two segments of our society give main support to our economy and the protection of their respective interests determines its prosperity. Radical measures that would curb or destroy their freedom of operation, thus affecting their respective initiatives to stimulate the economy would be disastrous to the financial interests of the whole Nation. The elimination of the bargaining rights of labor would sterilize both labor and capital. It must be protected at all costs.

I include the following article from the New York Times, Sunday, October 7, 1962, as follows:

NAM OPENS FIGHT ON UNION'S POWER—PRESSES LONG-RANGE DRIVE FOR FEDERAL LAW TO LIMIT LABOR MONOPOLY ROLE

WASHINGTON, October 6.—The National Association of Manufacturers has undertaken a long-range campaign to get Federal legislation curbing what it calls "union monopoly power."

As the campaign gathers strength, it may provoke a battle as fierce as the one that already rages over so-called State right-to-work laws. These laws prohibit labor contract clauses that make union membership a condition of continued employment.

The central NAM argument is that labor unions have special privileges and immuni-

ties not granted business organizations, and that unions thus possess monopoly power. Through the exercise of this power, the argument runs, unions can exact from employers increases in pay and fringe benefits that are not warranted by gains in output or by competitive realities.

ACTIVITIES CALLED PROPER

Organized labor regards this as a disingenuous rationalization for what is actually an attempt to destroy the effectiveness of labor unions in bettering the condition of their members. They say the manufacturers would restrict union activities that are entirely proper.

Copies of an internal working document put together by the association's Industrial Relations Division have fallen into union hands. Titled "A Program To Curb Union Monopoly Power," the document includes a section called "Long-Range Plan and Timetable." It has been given widespread publicity by labor newspapers in the last month.

Charles A. Kothe, who heads the division, said that the document had been prepared to support the division's request to the association's executive committee for \$31,000. The money would be used to hire some graduate students to index 50,000 published items relating to union power and its abuse. However, the document was never presented because the executive committee had more pressing matters to consider, Mr. Kothe said.

GENERAL PROGRAM APPROVED

Although the specific steps set forth in the document have not been approved, Mr. Kothe said, the general program has. He said he was going ahead with parts of the program that did not require the committee's authorization for extra money.

The association established a "center for the study of union monopoly" last week. The center will collect and distribute information on the subject.

It will also draft legislation for introduction in Congress after a study of the legal issues involved.

Mr. Kothe hopes to enlist the aid of 30 leading manufacturers, educators, lawyers, and other persons interested in the issue to participate in the activities of the center.

A list of 29 names purporting to be those of "official members" of the center was attached to the program document. Mr. Kothe said, however, that the persons listed were not actually members but had attended one preliminary meeting or more. Some on the list, he said, indicated they would not participate further.

The association published in June a study of Lillian W. Kay of its research department titled "Economic Implications of Union Power."

Mr. Kothe's long-range timetable culminates in 1964 with "a full-powered drive . . . with all forces activated to accomplish the legislative goal."

Asked what the exact legislative goal was, he said he was not sure at this time. He indicated that he did not think the common business appeal to put unions under the antitrust laws was the answer.

FRESH APPROACH SOUGHT

"There should be an entirely fresh approach," Mr. Kothe said. "Some kind of restrictions should be designed just for labor."

It might be possible, he said, to prohibit industrywide, or perhaps companywide, collective bargaining. It might also be possible, he said, to prevent unions from establishing national wage and fringe-benefit policies or from calling industrywide strikes.

Mr. Kothe said he hoped that as a result of the NAM program, "the public will be so filled with disgust and revulsion at the abuses he will reveal that it will descend on Congress clamoring for legislation."

Experts on labor-management relations have been inclined to regard the labor

monopoly issue as unimportant. Many believe that, practically, it would be impossible to enforce a law requiring local bargaining. Even if it were possible, many experts believe the results would be to promote fiercer competition among unions than there is now and to drive wages higher than they would otherwise go.

Madam Speaker, if industry ever succeeded in these efforts it would itself sicken and fail, the destruction of labor unions would result in free labor with each individual worker seeking a personal advantage in employment. The training of his talents by fellow workers would be lost and his efficiency would suffer. Industries demanding large numbers of artisans or workers for the same specific employment would have to set up employment bureaus to recruit workers. Today if 100 carpenters, plumbers, electricians, or laborers are needed, a call to the union headquarters for the men will bring results—even in the case of a limited supply of artisans—the union will send out a call to other locals in the distant areas for men. The disciplining of the men in their uncooperative attitudes, and so forth, on the job are now left to the union. With the union dissolved, industry would be forced to handle the labor relations to its industry. No bigger headache can be handled to the board of directors of a corporation. Industry would do better to give its attention to friendlier labor relations with unions and, at all costs, protect the existence and operation of unit unions related to their specific industry.

Madam Speaker, grave political complications would, inevitably, result: a vast majority of the 17 million organized union workers and their families would become active workers in an independent third party movement. Thus, a battle would ensue for control of the legislative functions of government at all levels of political subdivisions, both State and National, to protect their interests in union organizations. The movement would surely entice the millions of unorganized white-collar workers to organize, as well as the farm labor groups, who are subject to and affected by consumers interest. Thus, the Farmer-Labor Party would become a potentially powerful political voice in government. In majority it would absorb one of the major parties and, even with minority representation in government, would control legislation as between two competitive parties.

Nations all over the world have experienced these changes—Britain, especially, is a good example.

A PROGRAM TO CURB UNION MONOPOLY POWER
(By Industrial Relations Division, National Association of Manufacturers, 2 East 48th Street, New York, N.Y.)

BASIC POLICY

The NAM already has a position on monopolistic practices, as follows:

"Any action, practices, or labor agreements by a combination of employers, or of unions, or of a union or unions with an employer or employers, which result in restraint of trade or endanger the public health, safety or security, are contrary to the public interest and should be subject to statutory regulation." ("Industry Believes," p. 13.)

The problem, therefore, is to implement this policy. Obviously, educational efforts on a broad scale must be undertaken, with legislation as the ultimate goal.

PROGRAM

We have a fourfold task:

1. To identify the problems, clarify the issues, and place proper emphasis on the causes of the abusive use of union monopoly power.

2. To collect pertinent information regarding the impact of union monopoly power on the economy, business, employees, and so forth.

3. To communicate this information to all who are interested and concerned—and to those who should be.

4. To recommend steps to management, government, public, and so forth, on what can be done to cope with this problem.

The blueprint for action and strategy is detailed in the long-range plan and timetable.

OUTLINE OF INTERNAL STRUCTURE

The timing is right for a coordinated, aggressive drive against union power. No time should be lost in pressing this endeavor.

The following plan is offered as an internal structure designed to get the job done:

1. Effective action to deal with the union monopoly issue will demand the best abilities available to the NAM. Furthermore, the nature and complexity of the issue require that every division of the organization bring to bear its special expertise, in full cooperation with every other division.

2. Necessarily, this is a team operation. The law department, the industrial relations division, the research department, the public relations division, the member relations division, all have a contribution to make in their respective specialties.

3. All activity of the association on this subject, of whatever nature, must head up in a single individual. There are at least two basic reasons for this:

(a) Divided management authority leads to ineffective action and confusion; sound management requires that responsibility for decisionmaking be focused in a single entity.

(b) Duplication and conflict could thus be avoided.

4. The vice president in charge of industrial relations is positioned most logically to function as the individual chiefly responsible for NAM's program and activities to curb union monopoly power. This is so because:

(a) He is the committee executive of the industrial relations committee in which policies with respect to this subject are originated, debated, and recommended to the board of directors. This question of union monopoly falls entirely within the purview of this committee.

(b) He is the chairman of the NAM Center for the Study of Union Power. Many of the individuals who comprise this group were appointed on the direct recommendations of leading Senators and Congressmen and these men themselves have written bills which are even now in the hopper.

It is important that the association make the best possible utilization of the prestige of this group, both in formulating the overall program and carrying it out.

5. The *modus operandi* would be to center total planning and coordinating responsibility in one head, as indicated in No. 4. He would draw upon the multiple resources of the association, gathering the necessary data from those in the best position to provide it, channeling assignments through normal sources.

Regarding legislation, while the Washington office would continue to carry on its activities in the formulation of a bill designed to meet the situation, these activities would also necessarily be responsive to and closely coordinated with, the designated individual responsible.

LONG-RANGE PLAN AND TIMETABLE

1962

1. Center for the study of union power will meet April 17. One or two additional meetings will be held this year. No publicity is to be given this effort.

2. A number of bills are in the hopper. The need to find and prepare potential witnesses representing industry is a priority task which should be pressed without delay.

If hearings are held on any of these bills, decision will be made as to whether we should appear or file a statement, and maximum mileage will be sought from these efforts.

3. From time to time, additional materials are being sent to forensic squads which are debating the subject, "Resolved, that labor organizations should be under the jurisdiction of antitrust legislation."

4. The 34th NAM Institute on Industrial Relations will be giving attention to the problems created by union power, in its session on collective bargaining.

5. Union monopoly will be the principal subject discussed at a series of executive conferences, scheduled for October 1962 in four key cities.

6. Coordinate the efforts of the lawyers committee and the center in the drafting of a bill or bills to be introduced, as part of the long-range program.

7. The major study of the research department, "Union Power—Some Implications for the Economy," will be published this year. (This study should be reviewed by members of the center for the study of union power.)

8. Present files on union monopoly will be overhauled and expanded to make readily available such information as:

(a) Case histories showing effect on (1) national economy, (2) individual companies, (3) nature of labor unions, (4) individual union members.

(b) Legal aspects: (1) Interpretations of present laws, (2) effectiveness of proposed legislation, (3) cases handled up to present, (4) analysis of the administrative function (e.g., NLRB).

(c) Viewpoints stated by union leaders, union members, national organizations, individuals in industry, general public.

(d) Recommendations for legislation.

The purpose is to provide authoritative statements, instantly available, for use whenever and wherever requested. By acting as a sort of clearinghouse of vital materials we can perform a valuable service.

1963

1. Continuation of studies by center for the study of union power, launched in 1962, i.e., labor unions as institutional power centers, how best to refute union arguments in defense of their practices, etc.

2. Work toward getting a hearing for a bill of our own design before the 88th Congress (1962-63).

3. Sponsorship of competitive contest among high school students offering awards for the best essay on "What Union Monopoly Power Means to America."

4. Compilation of case examples along the lines of U.S. chamber's kit on secondary boycotts—but dealing with other and broader aspects of union monopoly.

5. Recruit as cohorts and idea salesmen men and women, by geographical areas and organization, to promote the program of education and eventual legislative action set up by the center and the association.

6. Secure a sponsor and plan for a TV special, focusing on the union monopoly problem and what it means to the Nation.

7. Preparation of program materials for women's clubs.

8. Production of a speakers' kit for use by businessmen and other opinion molders, and promotion of platform opportunities in which it might be used.

9. Set up a group of sympathetic journalists to work in liaison with the center for the study of union power; similarly, a group of public relations experts who might assist us in getting out the story.

1964

1. Retain Opinion Research Corp. to conduct new poll of public sentiment regarding the need for control of union power. The results are certain to give us a better insight into current thinking, and therefore, some specific indication of the direction we should pursue.

2. Preparation of a question and answer booklet, providing industry's answers to the union case.

3. Inasmuch as the teaching profession, at both the secondary and university levels, constitutes a major opinion-molding agency, and since few have had any real exposure to industry's views on the monopoly issue, a series of 2-day seminars for professors and businessmen are proposed.

4. Presentation of the total problem and program to trade associations and bar associations at their annual meetings, to important chambers of commerce and to other national organizations which might be drawn into the effort, so that we get a multiplier effect and a broadened audience for our materials.

5. A fully documented and objective movie should be released. This should be the occasion for a press conference which points up the reasons why union monopoly power is detrimental to our economy.

6. A concerted effort should be made to win the clergy to an understanding of the need for statutory control of union excesses.

7. A full-powered drive should be undertaken with all forces activated to accomplish the legislative goal.

CENTER FOR THE STUDY OF UNION POWER

The first meeting of this center was held on November 21, 1961.

Both education and legislation were recognized as imperative action areas and it is believed that these efforts can run concurrently. In effect, our goals are to educate the public, including employer members of NAM and U.S. Chamber of Commerce; to draft legislation which could command wide support of industry; to find and prepare witnesses for potential congressional hearings.

Certain research, much of it of a living nature flowing from current developments and day-to-day evidence, will provide the raw material for achievement of these goals. The kinds of information which now represent gaps in our resources have already been in part identified by members of the center.

Six study areas were revealed through discussion. The need for:

I. Determination, union by union, of what it is key unions do that is considered improper use of monopoly power.

II. Clarification of the elements of union power—what causes it, how is it manifested.

III. Documentation of union power—whether economic, political, financial.

IV. Dramatization of union power—through case examples.

V. Identification of predatory acts by unions.

VI. Collection of current developments and evidence, day by day, as it happens.

As for the approach, there was a difference of opinion as to whether it was best to go at this problem, abuse by abuse, or attack it at the root.

Those who hold for attacking at the root claim that collection of examples is a treatment of the symptoms rather than the causes; and that while we may be making some gains in one direction, the creative minds of union officials will fashion methods to achieve these gains in other directions.

Those who support specific legislation to deal with specific abuses think this may be

a way to get around the political snafu that could ensue in any attempt to amend the antitrust laws; that it is more likely to achieve public acceptance and would not be frustrated as a hate labor maneuver.

The second meeting of this center is scheduled for April 17, 1962.

At this meeting we will attempt to arrive at a definition of "union monopoly" and to undertake specific activities in line with the above.

These eminent individuals have rallied to the cause and here displayed not only profound interest but a desire to work together in achieving the desired goals.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., September 20, 1961.

Mr. CHARLES A. KOTHE,
Vice President, National Association of Manufacturers, New York, N.Y.

DEAR MR. KOTHE: Please pardon the delay in answering your letter. It was made necessary by the deluge of correspondence and the heavy pressures of the closing days of Congress.

I consider Dr. John Van de Water, professor of law at the University of California at Los Angeles, one of the top authorities in the country. He has had a wide experience in industrial relations, is a good sound conservative, and a brilliant writer.

Mr. Kenneth McGuinness, a Washington lawyer, onetime Counsel for the National Labor Relations Board, is one of the most knowledgeable men I know on this subject.

I assume you are very close to the various corporation officials interested in this subject, and who may provide you with considerable data.

Thanks for writing, and best regards.
Sincerely yours,

EDGAR W. HIESTAND,
Member of Congress.

DR. JOHN R. VAN DE WATER, GRADUATE SCHOOL OF BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION, UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

Dr. Van de Water holds a bachelor of arts degree and a doctor of laws degree from the University of Chicago.

In his earlier years, he was a full-time member of the industrial relations staff at North American Aviation, Inc., where he served in dealing with the United Automobile Workers and other unions during World War II.

In 1946, Dr. Van de Water joined the faculty of the University of California. His first work there involved the direction of B.A. and management courses for adults. He also set up a pioneering program for the continuing education of the bar—approximately 16,000 lawyers in California.

Dr. Van de Water is a member of the faculty of the Graduate School of Business Administration and the School of Business Administration at the University of California in Los Angeles.

For 3 years, he served as director of executive development, administering and organizing course programs for senior members of management in which some 600 corporations participated. The courses were attended by presidents, executive vice presidents, vice presidents, and heads of major management functions within every type of commercial enterprise.

During this time, Dr. Van de Water lectured and made all case presentations for executive development programs in the field of labor law and industrial relations, including the economic aspects of union power and Government policy.

His teaching assignments at the University of California include management of industrial relations, labor law and Government policy, legal analysis for business managers, and organization and management principles.

Dr. Van de Water has lectured to national management associations on topics of industrial relations and government policy, on dealing with union-management affairs, ideological conflict, and American enterprise principles.

He is the author of numerous legal, industrial relations, and management articles.

As an attorney, he represents a large number of corporations, such as Borg-Warner, Ampex Computer, Packard Bell Electronics Corp., Walt Disney Productions, Litton Industries, Inc., Arrowhead-Puritas Waters, Inc., Star-Kist Foods, Inc., Hallemor Electronics Corp.

During the past 16 years, he has trained well over 1,000 management personnel who are specialists in the field of industrial relations and collective bargaining in special courses sponsored by the personnel and industrial relations association in Los Angeles. Well over 1,000 corporations were involved in this program.

He is chairman of the military relations committee on government policy and legislation for the Los Angeles Chamber of Commerce.

OFFICIAL MEMBERS OF NAM CENTER FOR THE STUDY OF UNION POWER

Acting chairman: Charles A. Kothé, vice president, National Association of Manufacturers.

ATTORNEYS

John E. Branch, Esq., Wilson, Branch & Barwick, attorneys at law, Rhodes-Haverty Building, Atlanta, Ga.

Jim Clay, legislative assistant to Senator JOHN G. TOWER, U.S. Senate, Committee on Banking and Currency, Washington, D.C.

Theodore R. Iserman, Kelley, Drye, Newhall & Maginnes, 350 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y.

Kenneth C. Kellar, Esq., Kellar & Kellar & Driscoll, attorneys at law, Lead, S. Dak.

John L. Kilcullen, Esq., McNutt, Dudley & Easterwood, attorneys at law, Barr Building, Washington, D.C.

Denison Kitchel, Esq., Evans, Kitchel & Jenckes, attorneys at law, 363 North First Avenue, Phoenix, Ariz.

John F. Lane, Esq., Gall, Lane & Howe, attorneys at law, Commonwealth Building, Washington, D.C.

Edward A. McCabe, Esq., Hamel, Morgan, Park & Saunders, 808 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

Kenneth C. McGuinness, Esq., 936 Federal Bar Building, 1815 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.

Godfrey P. Schmidt, Esq., 60 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.

Ellison D. Smith, Jr., Esq., attorney at law, Barringer Building, Columbia, S.C.

J. Mack Swigert, Taft, Stettinius & Hollister, 603 Dixie Terminal Building, Cincinnati, Ohio.

Allan Trumbull, Wilkie, Farr, Gallagher, Walton & FitzGibbon, attorneys at law, 15 Broad Street, New York, N.Y.

Joseph C. Wells, Esq., Reilly & Wells, 1120 Tower Building, Washington, D.C.

EMPLOYERS

Frederick G. Atkinson, vice president, R. H. Macy & Co., Inc., Herald Square, New York, N.Y.

R. G. Jeter, vice president, general counsel, and secretary, the B. F. Goodrich Co., Akron, Ohio.

A. B. Williamson, vice president, general manager, bearing division, McGill Manufacturing Co., Inc., Valparaiso, Ind.

Joseph A. O'Reilly, associate counsel, industrial relations, Ford Motor Co., the American Road, Dearborn, Mich.

PROFESSORS

Prof. Gottfried Haberler, Galen L. Stone, professor of international trade, Harvard University, Graduate School of Public Ad-

ministration, 326 Littauer Center, Cambridge, Mass.

Prof. Frank H. Knight, emeritus professor of social science and philosophy, the University of Chicago, Department of Economics, 1126 East 59th Street, Chicago, Ill.

Dr. James W. McKie, professor of economics and business administration, Vanderbilt University, Nashville, Tenn.

Dr. William H. Peterson, associate professor of economics, New York University Graduate School of Business Administration, 100 Trinity Place, New York, N.Y.

Dr. John R. Van de Water, University of California School of Business Administration, Los Angeles, Calif.

Dr. David McCord Wright, professor of economics and political science, McGill University, Montreal, Canada.

OTHERS

The Honorable Graham A. Barden, Barden, Stith & McCotter, attorneys at law, New Bern, N.C.

William B. Barton, manager and general counsel, Labor Relations and Legal Department, Chamber of Commerce of the United States, 1615 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.

Carroll E. French, Industrial Relations Counselors Service, Inc., 1270 Avenue of the Americas, New York, N.Y.

Lambert H. Miller, general counsel, National Association of Manufacturers, 918 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

PERSONNEL OF STUDY GROUPS, NAM CENTER FOR THE STUDY OF UNION POWER

I. "Determination of What Key Unions Do That Is Monopolistic" (including "Identification of Unions' Predatory Acts"—formerly group IV).

Chairman: John F. Lane, Gall, Lane & Howe, Washington, D.C.

William B. Barton, manager and general counsel, Labor Relations and Legal Department, Chamber of Commerce of the United States, Washington, D.C. (alternate: Joseph Fagan, Labor Relations and Legal Department).

John E. Branch, Wilson, Branch & Barwick, Atlanta, Ga.

Prof. Gottfried Haberler, Harvard University, Graduate School of Public Administration, Cambridge, Mass.

John L. Kilcullen, McNutt, Dudley & Easterwood, Washington, D.C.

Edward A. McCabe, Hamel, Morgan, Park & Saunders, Washington, D.C.

Dr. James W. McKee, professor of economics and business administration, Vanderbilt University, Nashville, Tenn.

Joseph A. O'Reilly, associate counsel, industrial relations, Ford Motor Co., Dearborn, Mich.

Godfrey P. Schmidt, New York, N.Y.

II. "Clarification of the Elements of Union Power" (sources of union power).

Chairman: J. Mack Swigert, Taft, Stettinius & Hollister, Cincinnati, Ohio.

Frederick G. Atkinson, vice president, R. H. Macy & Co., Inc., New York, N.Y. (alternate: Lester Block, counsel).

Jim Clay, legislative assistant to Senator JOHN G. TOWER, U.S. Senate, Committee on Banking and Currency, Washington, D.C.

Carroll E. French, Industrial Relations Counselors Service, Inc., New York, N.Y.

Kenneth C. Kellar, Kellar & Kellar & Driscoll, Lead, S. Dak.

Denison Kitchel, Evans, Kitchel & Jenckes, Phoenix, Ariz.

Kenneth C. McGuinness, Washington, D.C.

Dr. William H. Peterson, associate professor of economics, New York University Graduate School of Business Administration, New York, N.Y.

Allan Trumbull, Wilkie, Farr, Gallagher, Walton & FitzGibbon, New York, N.Y.

A. F. Williamson, vice president, general manager, bearing division, McGill Manufacturing Co., Inc., Valparaiso, Ind.

III. "Documentation of Union Power" (economic, political, financial).

Chairman: Dr. John R. Van de Water, University of California School of Business Administration, Los Angeles, Calif.

Theodore R. Iserman, Kelley, Drye, Newhall & Maginnes, New York, N.Y.

R. G. Jeter, vice president, general counsel, and secretary, the B. F. Goodrich Co., Akron, Ohio.

Dension Kitchel, Evans, Kitchel & Jenckes, Phoenix, Ariz. (on political facets).

Prof. Frank H. Knight, emeritus professor of social science and philosophy, the University of Chicago Department of Economics, Chicago, Ill.

Godfrey P. Schmidt, New York, N.Y.

Ellison D. Smith, Jr., Columbia, S.C.

Joseph C. Wells, Reilly & Wells, Washington, D.C.

Dr. David McCord Wright, professor of economics and political science, McGill University, Montreal, Canada.

PROPOSAL FOR INCREASE OF BUDGET TO ADVANCE THE STUDY OF UNION MONOPOLY POWER

Consistent with the basic policy position on monopolistic practices set forth in "Industry Believes," the industrial relations division has designed a program to meet the problem of curbing union monopoly power, the outline of which is attached with a timetable.

To implement the program, an outstanding committee has been appointed and has met upon two occasions for the development of an action program. A list of the personnel of the committee and the task force subcommittee serving its purposes is attached.

A preliminary study of the subcommittee on the sources of union power under J. Mack Swigert, its chairman, is also attached. In addition, special studies and literature of various task forces and symposiums are being collected and cataloged.

The scattered efforts and sporadic writings on the general subject have never been collected and classified for instant use and availability. It is estimated that there are approximately 50,000 pieces of such literature. The abundant case histories and illustrations of the impact of union monopoly power relating to unemployment, inflation, limitations upon economic growth, and strangulation of economic progress, have—because of the limited resources of the groups interested in this undertaking—never been adequately compiled and evaluated.

The limitation of the size and time available to the staff of the industrial relations division makes it impracticable to develop adequate resource information to implement legislative proposals and provide for adequate programs for public information.

A special research program has therefore been designed by one of the outstanding members of our committee, Dr. John R. Van de Water of the University of California, whose writings and insight in this field have earned for him a reputation of being one of the foremost authorities on the subject. Moreover, he is of a conservative view and dedicated to the principles of exposing as well as correcting the abusive use of union power. He and a staff of graduate students would undertake a research program within the scope of the following outline:

1. The project will deal explicitly with the uses and abuses of union power.

2. Insofar as it is relevant to the abuse of union power, studies will relate the counter-measures which management has taken, such as industrywide bargaining and court and board action, the actions of government in dealing with the abuse of union power, and the adequacy and good and bad effects of such action economically, politically, and in terms of sound public policy.

3. Specific topics on which concrete information will be collected, collated, evaluated, and made available as requested, include:

Patterns of labor-management relationships.

Union action, by specific industries.

Dispute strike settlements.

Union wage, benefit, and power policies.

Union membership requirements and controls.

Work rules and standards.

Productivity tests and influences.

Technological change and automation influences.

Self-help techniques employed by unions.

Self-help techniques employed by management.

Featherbedding.

Strikes and boycotts.

Violence and threats.

Power relations by area, methods of power production, and power comparisons between parties.

Multicompany bargaining, strikes, and lockouts.

National emergency strikes and their treatment.

Union monopoly.

Special union immunities and privileges.

Methods of reducing union power.

Competitive and noncompetitive market structures as related to union conduct and management response.

Influences on inflation and deflation.

Influences and conduct affecting employment and unemployment.

Intraunion and interunion power focuses and rivalries.

Management rights and union action.

Current legislation.

Bills before Congress.

Additional proposed legislation.

4. Sources of information will include:

National management association source materials as made available.

Journals and magazines.

Newspaper reports and news items.

Published and unpublished theses.

Books.

Court decisions and records.

Decisions and reports of relevant government boards and commissions.

Arbitration awards.

Congressional and State legislative reports and evaluations as made available.

Personal interviewing and programing.

5. Materials collected may be useful to parties interested in action programs related to answering the abuse of union power. Such materials are also expected to become a rich source of materials for writing in the field. The research program itself is not intended to produce specific books, monographs or articles; yet the writer, and others making use of information secured, can be expected to prepare materials for publication on the strength of such information.

6. In process of such collection and evaluation of material, it is expected that there will be developed a comprehensive and detailed topical outline; in time and as the project so requires, information retrieval devices for quick access to information in the specific areas; an evaluation of information sources; and a method for continuing acquisition, collation, evaluation, and reporting of up-to-date information.

7. It is expected that the program will, during this year, produce in comprehensiveness, depth and detail, information sources substantially superior in content, methods of evaluation, availability, and outline analysis, to anything which has been attempted to date; and all that is produced during the current year becomes a base upon which to build for information retrieval and reporting in the years ahead.

To accomplish the foregoing, a supplemental budget allowance is required, com-

mencing immediately and extending to the end of the calendar year.

An approach of this nature is indispensable to the ultimate success of any program that may be designed to reach a realistic solution to the problem. Absent the foregoing, it will be necessary for the business community to continue to rely upon the preachment of platitudes. There does not now exist satisfactory capacity to support those legislators who have introduced bills to correct the abuses of organized labor.

Labor organizations have set aside, through their vast research divisions, sums in the high six figures to prevent inroads upon their monopoly position. This, of course, does not include the \$2,500,000 currently being expended by unions for short courses on college campuses during the summer months of 1962, nor funds used for political purposes.

It should be recognized that this is a continuing program and will require further, but lesser, resources over a period of several years. In this connection, it should not be overlooked that the industrial relations division, through its annual institutes, has made available a fund of \$25,000 net, and has produced during the past 18 months approximately \$60,000 gross, from industrial relations clinics conducted by its vice president. The expense of this latter program is minimal and is in any event more than offset by increased revenue from renewal, increase, and new membership.

All of the several programs which the industrial relations division provides for the field are on a self-sustaining basis. The literature which it distributes has returned many times its cost through minimal charges that are made. Furthermore, it will not be overlooked that much of the amount requested for this budget has been saved this year through a streamlining of the staff. The contemplated replacements should not increase the revised budgetary limitations.

RANSOM FOR CUBAN PRISONERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. GRANAHAN). Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. CRAMER] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. CRAMER. Madam Speaker and Members of the House, I feel compelled to rise today even at this late hour to raise my voice in objection, which I did yesterday and have done before for nearly 2 years now, to the abortive proposal of the tractors-for-prisoners deal and now the \$62 million Cuban prisoner deal in the name of ransom because it is nothing more and no less than blackmail. The insulting proposals of Fidel Castro and his constant demands, extravagant demands, which he has repeated again just the other day, demanding \$62 million—now \$60 million—\$2 million has been paid, this \$62 million demand made by him in the name of indemnity for repayment for damages done in the abortive invasion in the Bay of Pigs.

I introduced a resolution in 1961 which stated very clearly my position in opposition to the tractors-for-prisoners abortive proposal. Finally, the administration itself withdrew its support on that particular proposition. Shortly thereafter, however, a new proposal was made in early 1962. This was not for tractors. This was not for \$25 million worth of tractors as indemnity and ransom and blackmail. This was for \$62 million—spendable American dollars. I brought out on the floor of the House, and it is in the RECORD, that earlier, this

demand being made in 1962, that earlier even before the demand was made, the administration had been giving consideration to and had issued an order, a preliminary regulation of the Internal Revenue Service, on December 6, 1961, to the effect that contributions to the Cuban Family Committee would be tax deductible. Now this was as far back as 1961, December, even before Fidel Castro made his money demand, changing it from tractors to money. And during a period after it was publicly announced by the President that the United States was withdrawing any support of the tractor deal.

There is not any question but what the administration has directly or indirectly been working hand in hand with Fidel Castro in an effort to get the prisoners released by negotiating for the paying of ransom of some sort, and it appears obvious as an effort to apologize for the mistakes made by the administration in the invasion of the Bay of Pigs. This was probably the most serious mistake and one of the blackest blotches in the history of this country, the refusal and failure of the President of the United States to provide air cover in order that the invasion could be successful.

Now in an effort to bail out the administration because of the mistake, there is this second abortive proposal, and now for the first time in the history of this country ransom is being negotiated to be paid to an enemy government. For the first time in the history of this country a ransom and indemnity is being negotiated with Fidel Castro, which the Nation has already stated through this legislative body as being the head of an enemy government, a Communist government, in the Cuban resolution passed by the House recently.

The administration is still negotiating the payment of indemnity to that enemy Communist government. How silly we must look. How silly we must look in the eyes of the people of the free world, let alone how weak and vacillating to the Communist governments. How silly we must look in the eyes of all the world in condoning these ransom negotiations when this body passed a resolution of recent date—Public Law 87-733—demanding strong action on the part of the administration, saying we will back the President in any efforts necessary, that the United States is "determined"—

(a) to prevent by whatever means may be necessary, including the use of arms, the Marxist-Leninist regime in Cuba from extending, by force or the threat of force, its aggressive or subversive activities to any part of this hemisphere;

(b) to prevent in Cuba the creation or use of an externally supported military capability endangering the security of the United States; and

(c) to work with the Organization of American States and with freedom-loving Cubans to support the aspirations of the Cuban people for self-determination.

Approved October 3, 1962.

Are we working toward the realization of the aspirations of freedom-loving Cubans, for the Cuban people themselves to achieve their self-determination when what we do is to make available to Fidel Castro badly needed, according to the

latest press releases, foodstuffs, paid for by American taxpayers, foodstuffs to Fidel Castro which he needs as badly as he needs military materiel, and perhaps even worse? It is common knowledge that his efforts in agrarian reform and providing agricultural products for his people are a dismal failure. And so we are bailing him out of his failure, and at the same time compounding the failure of the administration in the Bay of Pigs invasion by paying indemnity.

This House has spoken further in the Mutual Security Act, and in no uncertain terms. How foolish we must look, Madam Speaker, in the eyes of other freedom-loving nations that we are asking to refrain from trading with Cuba, not only military materiel but all trade with Cuba. We passed an amendment to the Mutual Security Act—I have it before me now—to the effect that—

None of the funds provided in this bill shall be available for assistance to any country the government of which sells arms, munitions, or implements of war to the Castro regime, or which furnishes any sort of aid, either military or economic, to the regime.

We also provided for the cutting off of funds to any country that trades with Castro, and with the Communists in Cuba or in this hemisphere.

This Government has spoken through Congress twice in unequivocal terms.

In the last consideration of the question of money or dollars for Castro I introduced a resolution in strong opposition to it, House Concurrent Resolution 459, on April 11, 1962. This was after I discovered that the Internal Revenue Service had already issued a preliminary order on December 6, 1961, that was then in effect based upon which contributions to this Cuban Family Committee were tax deductible.

I introduce an amendment to the mutual security bill which barely failed, which would have put this ransom proposal in its proper resting place—the ash can. It barely failed by a vote of 134 to 137, and it barely failed not because of a single Member on the Republican side voting against it. I was amazed at the offer by Mr. Donovan of ransom for the Cuban prisoners in the amount of \$60 million or for foodstuffs which can be interpreted only as an indemnification by this Nation for the overt acts of this Nation. This was through a Mr. Donovan, who happens to be a candidate for the U.S. Senate. This is a way of playing a little politics at the same time.

This country through its overt acts is consenting to paying or having paid an indemnity to a Communist country—Cuba.

That is blackmail, that is extortion.

This demand for ransom is reminiscent of the days of piracy on the high seas, and repugnant to every principle of decency and self-respect.

This Nation by considering this proposal and authorizing Mr. Donovan to negotiate it is kowtowing to the demands of a Communist dictator, resulting from an imprisonment order handed down through a kangaroo court which resulted in the imprisonment, thus giving recognition to the court itself—an indirect recognition of Castro's Communist

government. How can we say we do not recognize Castro on the one hand, and on the other hand recognize and negotiate with Castro through Donovan? This Nation's prestige is sinking in the eyes of the world, and as of this time this giving in to Castro's indemnity and ransom demands can only be interpreted as yielding to and being soft on and conciliatory toward the Communists and communism.

This is the thing I cannot understand. There are thousands more prisoners rotting in Castro's rathole prisons who could be traded and could be made the basis of further demands for further indemnifications from this country or its citizens. Where is the end of it? There are 100,000 of them, it is estimated, in Cuban prisons.

As a matter of fact, as I brought out earlier in the day, based upon a letter received by me from the Department of State dealing with the question, which replied to my inquiry of the State Department as to why they will not recognize the free and non-Communist government in exile to help them win back their own freedom. I could hardly believe the answer I got. But in that answer, in which the excuse was if we did so—recognize a Cuban Government-in-exile—we would not be able to continue, in effect, to do business with Castro through the Swiss Embassy, go on to say—this is from the letter of March 12, 1962, signed by Mr. Frederick G. Dutton, Assistant Secretary of State:

In addition, there are, as you know, a number of U.S. citizens who still reside in Cuba. The Swiss are trying to assist them, including some who are in prison and who can only be reached through the efforts of the Swiss Embassy in Havana.

U.S. citizens are in prison. Where is the compassion for the U.S. citizens that are in prison equal to the compassion being shown by the administration through Mr. Donovan with regard to the Cuban exiles in prison?

No one has more sympathy for them than I—the Cuban prisoners—but everyone in Cuba is a prisoner today. The whole population—millions of them are prisoners. There are also Americans who are prisoners. There are a hundred thousand who are actually incarcerated.

Thousands of Americans lost their lives in the two World Wars and in Korea fighting to uphold the dignity of America and trying to affirm their dedication to freedom. Can we do less here today? Can we compromise away to Castro the causes for which they fought and died?

These are some of the questions and I want to get an answer to them. What right does a private citizen, in view of the Logan Act and the Trading With the Enemy Act have in doing business with Fidel Castro after it is stated that this Government finds the Castro Communist regime to be an enemy of this country?

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Madam Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRAMER. I yield to the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. I think the gentleman will agree with me that there

is certainly a very great difference between the proposals as we have them by rumor and the so-called tractors-for-freedom matter. As I remember, the tractors-for-freedom deal, with which neither the gentleman from Florida nor I agreed, they were to be bought with money collected by private citizens. However, if we can believe the reports which we have had today over the wires, which reports certainly have not been denied by the White House, there is every reason to think there will be taxpayers' money used to pay the ransom for the prisoners of the Bay of Pigs under this particular proposal.

If this is true and if we are actually going to pay from this Government to another government—to a dictator, if you will—for the release of prisoners, there will never be another American released by a dictator or by an enemy for free, will there?

I think the answer is obviously "No." We are starting on a course of action here which will rise to haunt us in the future and which will cause every American, wherever he may be throughout the world, to be in danger of being kidnaped and captured and held for ransom. Once you allow yourself to be stamped with that stamp which says you are a sucker for and weak enough to give in to ransom, then you will never get through paying until you rise up on your hind legs and solve the problem by physical force.

Mr. CRAMER. The gentleman is absolutely correct. As a matter of fact, the question of ransom is not necessarily, in my opinion, whether the ransom is raised through a citizens' committee in the form of American dollars or whether it is a request for funds from the United States. Although I agree there is a differentiation as far as the taxpayers are concerned, because the people should be even more opposed and disturbed over any thought of using the taxpayer's money, their money, whether it be direct or not for payment of ransom to Castro.

Mr. Speaker, I read that there is even some possibility that U.S. cash may be involved, according to the news.

Mr. Speaker, I just read that according to the United Press "there were reports that the Kennedy administration itself was prepared to help finance part of the ransom, but State Department and White House officials declined comment on any aspect of the private negotiations."

Mr. Speaker, I thus also see by the press that this is a cloak-and-dagger operation. This is a very supersecret job. This is one of Bobby Kennedy's quickies—under the philosophy of do it before the people realize what is happening and the shock of realizing it has been done will not be quite so great—politically that is.

Mr. Speaker, I quote further from the UPI release today:

Evidence mounted today that Government officials are playing a behind-the-scenes role in negotiations for the release of 1,113 prisoners in Cuba. Whatever the role may be, it was cloaked in official silence.

Mr. Speaker, is it not the American people's right to know what deal is being cooked up with possibly their money and wealth in the form of foodstuff surpluses

or otherwise which is involved in these negotiations?

Mr. Speaker, I quote further:

But there was this evidence to link the Government with efforts, ostensibly initiated by relatives of the prisoners, to free them:

A report that James B. Donovan, Democratic candidate for U.S. Senator from New York and attorney official representing the families of the prisoners, actually was assigned to the negotiator's role last June by Attorney General Robert F. Kennedy. Kennedy said the report—published by the New York World-Telegram and Sun—is untrue, but it was known that Donovan visited the Attorney General several times in recent months.

The American people have been denied any knowledge of these supersecret negotiations on this vital matter, and I ask why.

Permit me to say parenthetically that it was reported in the press just the other day, before his most recent visit, that he visited the Attorney General's office before he went down to Havana to continue negotiations.

Mr. Speaker, quoting further the UPI report today:

A Justice spokesman declined to comment on the subject that the prisoner negotiations were discussed during these visits.

On at least one of the visits, Donovan was accompanied by a State Department specialist on Cuban affairs.

Does that not speak for itself? And further quoting:

Some Members of Congress informed on progress of the negotiations indicated that they expect Government funds to be used for part of the cost of effecting the liberation of the prisoners.

I am one of them. I have asked the President of the United States or the Secretary of State to advise me as to whether it is true or not, because all of the press releases indicate it is and I have condemned it. Under what statute and under what law, and what authority is this done, particularly in view of the strong action taken by this body recently, expecting that trade would be cut off and that any aid to Castro would be cut off? We see now that while the administration talks rough, the administration talks tough, when it comes to action it looks like it uses a powder puff. Talk tough and use a powderpuff—in dealing with the Communists seems to be the rule of the New Frontier.

Mr. PELLY. Madam Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRAMER. I am glad to yield to my colleague from Washington.

Mr. PELLY. Madam Speaker, I want to compliment the gentleman from Florida for raising this issue on the floor of this House, this issue of secret negotiations by a U.S. citizen, a private citizen, Mr. Donovan, with the Castro-Communist Government of Cuba, looking toward the payment of \$60 million of ransom.

I subscribe completely to the gentleman's protest and associate myself in asking for an answer to the questions as to the authority for such negotiations. I oppose any payment of ransom by anyone of any kind through the connivance of our Government, to anyone in Communist Cuba. And secondly, and just as

important, I want to join the gentleman's protest to the withholding of facts and information from the American people.

It would be reprehensible it seems to me to keep such negotiations secret until they were an accomplished fact and it was too late for public indignation or congressional action, or anything else, to stop them. As a matter of fact, any such devious plan might so outrage public opinion, it seems to me, that it could well invite a congressional impeachment proceeding.

Madam Speaker, the Secretary of State should make immediately available to the press and to the public a full explanation of what is going on. Certainly no dealings could have been conducted without the aid and support of the Government. And I might say that it is an odd thing—the gentleman mentioned the Attorney General; the situation legally is such that any prosecution under the Logan Act would have to be by the Attorney General. And, indeed, only the President could pardon anyone who breached the law. So this, it seems to me, is a matter between, you might say, the Kennedy family and the American people.

Madam Speaker, I compliment the gentleman. He has done the right thing in asking that all the facts be given to the American people.

Mr. CRAMER. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman and to comment further; one of the things that is so disturbing to me is this. While these negotiations are going on to pay Castro \$60 million in one form or another to help support his Communist regime—and that is the obvious result of it, it helps to keep him in power—at the very time these negotiations are going on, and inadvertently Mr. Donovan is campaigning for the Senate in New York down in Havana—we find Mr. Dorticos, the President of Cuba, calling upon the United Nations to condemn the United States, with resulting riots around the United Nations evidencing U.S. citizen distaste for Castro and communism in Cuba. So we find these negotiations for ransom continuing and we find that even while Mr. Donovan is in Havana, Castro, himself, is proclaiming again, "I am a true Communist; I believe in communism." He is telling it to the world again, so there can be no doubt about it, he is a Communist, his country under his rule is Communist, and at the same time the United States is hoping and planning to pay him \$60 million for ransom of some prisoners through Mr. Donovan—which he will use to continue to keep all of Cuba a prison.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Madam Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRAMER. I yield to the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Madam Speaker, today I sent a telegram to the President of the United States on this general subject. I ask unanimous consent to include it in the Record at this point.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. GRANAHAN). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arizona?

There was no objection.

The matter referred to follows:

OCTOBER 10, 1962.

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

The apparent involvement of your administration with the rumored \$62 million ransom deal with Castro is disturbing. As an American citizen it disturbs me because if the rumors are correct, it is further evidence of the extent to which we have departed from the principles expressed by one of our prominent forefathers who was willing to provide "millions for defense, but not one cent for tribute." As a Member of the Congress, I am disturbed because this would be further admission on the part of your administration of its involvement in the Bay of Pigs tragedy. As a Senator, you were critical of the admission by President Eisenhower of our involvement in the U-2 incident. Yet that involvement certainly did not weaken our international prestige to the extent that your self-proclaimed failure in the Cuban invasion would do.

As a member of the Foreign Operations Subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee, I am disturbed at the thought that in spite of the sentiments expressed and the safeguards adopted in both the authorizing legislation and the appropriations bill for foreign aid, funds appropriated for foreign aid may be used for the purpose of paying ransom to a Red dictator.

I respectfully request that your administration divulge the extent to which it is involved in the negotiations of one James B. Donovan, a Democratic candidate for the Senate from the State of New York, for the release of the Bay of Pigs prisoners. Specifically, I would like to have the amount of money which has been or will be committed to this purpose from foreign aid appropriations, and the categories of aid from which such commitments have been or will be made.

J. J. R.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Madam Speaker, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. CRAMER. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Is it not true that under the Logan Act the negotiations of Mr. Donovan probably are not legal; in fact, as a lawyer, having read the act, I would say they probably are not legal. If this is the situation, the only thing the Attorney General of the United States could have promised, if indeed he promised Mr. Donovan anything, is immunity from prosecution?

Mr. CRAMER. I think the gentleman is eminently correct.

I just happen to have a copy of the Logan Act before me which I placed in the RECORD in the discussion on the tractor deal, and the \$62 million deal previously. Here it is:

Title 18, United States Code, section 953: Private correspondence with foreign governments:

Any citizen of the United States, wherever he may be, who, without authority of the United States, directly or indirectly commences or carries on any correspondence or intercourse with any foreign government or any officer or agent thereof, with intent to influence the measures or conduct of any foreign government or of any officer or agent thereof, in relation to any disputes or controversies with the United States, or to defeat the measures of the United States, shall

be fined not more than \$5,000 or imprisoned not more than three years, or both.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. If the gentleman will yield further, it follows that Mr. Donovan could not have been an agent of the U.S. Government for this purpose because the Attorney General could not have appointed him to carry on negotiations with a foreign government. Does it not follow that the only thing that Mr. Donovan could have received was the assurance of the Attorney General that under this administration, at least, he would not be prosecuted for the violation of the laws of the United States?

Mr. CRAMER. If his dealing had been with the Attorney General, under the language of the Logan Act it is my opinion that the Attorney General does not have power to give "the authority of the United States," and therefore if he is not able to give the authority to negotiate, which he obviously cannot do as Attorney General, that would have to come from the President or from the Secretary of State. Then the other thing that could be promised is what the gentleman is suggesting, and that is immunity from prosecution, because the Attorney General or one of the family clan or family dynasty would be the one that would have to bring the prosecution. I think the gentleman is eminently correct.

I think this is a matter, because it has come up now two or three times in recent years under this administration, that should get, and should get immediately, the attention of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, because I do not know of a greater invasion of the rights of this body or the rights of Congress, the Senate in particular, that could be involved than to have a private person negotiating with a foreign government without the Senate of the United States, pursuant to the Constitution of the United States, having a right to look at the agreement entered into through the constitutional process of ratification.

I think that is an invasion of the constitutional rights and prerogatives of the Congress of the United States, let alone it is an invasion of the proper functions of the executive branch of the Government, the President, and the executive having the sole authority to do business with foreign governments. I know of no leaders in Congress who have—in the usual tradition—been kept advised of negotiations with this enemy government. Is not even the Congress entitled to know?

I think the Committee on Foreign Affairs, at least, ought to look into this entire matter. It ought to call Mr. Donovan before it and ought to find out exactly what this deal is and how much it is going to cost the American taxpayer, and consider the serious questions involved that I have raised.

I was coming up here on a plane just the other day, and I read my hometown paper. Interestingly enough, it did not appear in the Washington Post. I read the St. Petersburg Times of Tuesday, October 9, 1962, when Mr. Dorticos was taking off on us, condemning the United States. Here was the Associated Press

release from Havana carried in that newspaper, again I say not in the Washington Post:

The U.S. Government was reported to have supplied the difference in funds or the equivalent in supplies after Cuban exile organizations were unable to raise the amount demanded.

The article was referring to the ransom for the prisoners.

The ransom for the prisoners reportedly will consist of \$60 million worth of food and medicine which will be taken to Cuba in Cuban ships. Castro originally had demanded \$62 million for release of the prisoners.

Again:

The U.S. Government was reported to have supplied the difference in funds or the equivalent in supplies after Cuban exile organizations were unable to raise the amount demanded.

Further, from the press or otherwise my source of information because I have not gotten a reply to my wire asking that this matter be brought to public attention and asking what authority exists for such action. It clearly appears that the U.S. Government is being put by this administration in the wholly untenable position, I might say unholy position, of negotiating with Fidel Castro for the relief of these prisoners in the amount of \$60 million worth of money or foodstuffs, and it is being done in direct contravention of the statement made to the Congress of the United States in very recent months. It makes our policy in regard to non-shipments to Cuba look just as foolish as it could be. It makes our foreign policy about as two-faced as it could be. I, for one, do not understand it, and feel it is my duty to protest it. Apparently, this administration has the attitude when it comes to prisoner ransom and release: American prisoners, no; Cuban prisoners, si. That is apparently the policy.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Madam Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRAMER. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Communism has been a failure throughout the world. But of all the areas in which it has failed, it has failed most dismally in the area of providing food for its own people.

Mr. CRAMER. Right.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. It seems we are now in the process of giving food to Poland and giving food to Yugoslavia and now food to Cuba, and that apparently we are trying desperately to make up for the shortcomings of the Communist world. I congratulate the gentleman from Florida for bringing this to the attention of the House and to the attention of the American people. This is certainly a situation which, if the rumors are correct, deserves to be corrected and deserves to be investigated by the appropriate bodies of this House.

Mr. CRAMER. I agree with the gentleman and may I ask the gentleman, does he know of any excuse why the administration would keep this super-secret and not make the negotiations public?

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. I certainly do not, particularly when I remember how, during the previous administration, many people who are prominent in this administration were talking so much about the right to know, about freedom of information. I believe in the right to know on the part of the American people, and I hope the administration will begin to practice the extension of this right to know as so many of those people were preaching during the previous administration.

Mr. CRAMER. The New Frontier propagandists have been trying to make it appear that those who oppose this are not interested in the release of these prisoners, are somehow more patriotic than humane. I say categorically now and I said so in a resolution I introduced, I am interested in their release but I am equally interested in the release of all other prisoners with dignity and permanent freedom—without getting down on our knees to Castro—without humiliation. The way to release them is by recognizing a government-in-exile of the refugees and by supporting them. They would win back freedom for all Cubans.

This is not only my view, but when I introduced the resolution, House Concurrent Resolution 459, and the previous resolution, House Concurrent Resolution 479, I received a letter from Dr. Elpidio Garcia which I put in the RECORD. He happens to be a former prosecutor for the Government before the supreme court of Cuba and attorney general, and he joined me in opposing the ransom deal. Here is what he said about it:

A little over a year ago, a group of my fellow citizens, pledging their lives to their duty and their country, devoted themselves to the glorious task of reconquering their freedom and independence. The successful outcome of that valiant effort was prevented by reasons which are known to everybody. We are unable to render any other offering or tribute to the unselfishness and sacrifice of our captive brothers than our grief and self-denial as we see them imprisoned, but we cannot diminish the magnitude of their glory or of their service to the country by buying their freedom—the freedom of the unfortunate hostages in the hands of the wretch who seized them—or of the highwayman who imprisoned them—nor can we offer their hopes for freedom anything else but our unwavering determination to reconquer their freedom, even if it should cost us our lives.

Thank you very much, Mr. CRAMER, for the dignified, reasonable, and courageous bill presented by you to both the House and the Senate, which I have had the good fortune of reading and which preserves the dignity of our prisoners, the honor of our fellow citizens, and the decorum of our brothers. Grateful Cuba will know how to thank you for your noble and honorable initiative. May the Lord grant the Cubans success in the final battle for our freedom, with the aid, cooperation, and stimulus of our invincible brothers, the Americans.

That is what even the Cubans feel about this abortive ransom deal. Let us hope the New Frontier does not make the United States party to another Cuban debacle as seems to be planned and underway. God help America if we continue to compromise our honor, our dignity, and dissipate our moral strength in this fight against atheistic commu-

nism as we have been doing in Cuba and are apparently bent on doing again.

I include my wire and ask for some answers:

OCTOBER 9, 1962.

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

The Honorable JOSEPH CAMPBELL,
Comptroller General of the United States,
General Accounting Office,
Washington, D.C.

The Honorable DEAN RUSK,
Secretary of State,
Washington, D.C.

Regarding \$60 million foodstuffs and medicine exchange as ransom for Cuban prisoners which by all news reports is to include U.S.-owned, taxpayer-paid-for foodstuffs to make up the difference between volunteered funds and the \$62 million demanded, I strongly protest this or any expenditure of taxpayers' money through U.S.-owned foodstuffs for the ransom of Cuban prisoners as being contrary to the basic statement of policy by Congress calling for an authorizing specific action to rid this hemisphere of Castro and communism. In view of the strong public protest against the tractors-for-prisoners proposal, and in view of the downgrading of our prestige as the leading nation of the free nations of the world by thus admitting our participation in and backing of the Bay of Pigs invasion and our conciliatory attitude toward Castro, and having introduced resolutions opposing both the tractors deal and the \$62 million ransom deal, I feel I must express my deep concern and shock over the secret negotiations that are even yet not fully revealed between the United States, through a private citizen, and Castro. In view of the restrictive language written into the mutual security bill instructing the withholding of aid to countries that do business with Castro, and the House Cuban resolution calling for strong and affirmative action to get rid of Castro and the Communists, I am specifically requesting information as to what possible authority exists for the spending of any portion of the \$60 million by the Government of the United States in payment of ransom to the enemy Communist Fidel Castro and, further, even if such legal authority exists, which is unknown to me, how can the United States be put in the position of strengthening Castro and communism on the one hand by delivering shipments to Cuba of \$60 million worth of American substance, when calling on the other hand for all other countries to stop all other types of shipments to Cuba. How two-faced can our foreign policy objectives be? How inconsistent can our actions be? How confused the entire free world must be? Historically, the United States has never paid ransom or indemnity and this precedent will come to haunt the United States and the free world of the future. I am asking that this super-secret negotiation be called to a halt before irreparable damage to U.S. prestige is done. It is further inconceivable to me that, and I question the legality of, a private citizen; namely, Mr. Donovan, would be allowed to negotiate with an enemy government on behalf of the United States—with the Castro government—declared to be an enemy government by the Congress in its resolution and by the President in invoking the Trading With the Enemy Act to prevent the shipment of Havana tobacco of recent date. Such negotiations are considered a violation of the spirit if not the letter of the Logan Act and it has been the general policy of Congress to oppose any trade with the enemy as set forth in the Trading With the Enemy Act. The basic policies for freedom and against communism are all being violated, in my opinion, in this abortive deal—and I strongly protest making Castro

stronger, our anti-Communist efforts a laughing stock throughout the world, and the establishment of a policy of paying taxpayer money to Castro for indemnity and ransom inherent in this supersecret deal, kept secret purposely and negotiated by a private citizen. I specifically ask these questions:

1. What authority exists for anyone to negotiate for payment in U.S. Government-owned foodstuffs to Castro and the Communists?

2. How much in U.S.-owned foodstuffs and other things of value are being made available for this purpose?

3. What right does Donovan or any other private citizen have to negotiate with Castro and an enemy government?

4. If Donovan is negotiating on behalf of private citizens only, what right does he have under the Logan Act to do so—let alone a violation of recent policy statement of the Congress? Doesn't his visit to Cuba require Government approval?

5. If Donovan is negotiating in a manner that obligates the U.S. Government to make up the difference between contributions and the \$60 million demanded, is he doing so as an agent of the U.S. Government?

6. Why hasn't a full disclosure of all the facts been made before the deal is closed between Castro and Donovan?

WILLIAM C. CRAMER,
Member of Congress.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. GRANAHAN). The time of the gentleman has expired.

BONNEVILLE ELECTRIC POWER IN IDAHO MEANS INDUSTRIAL GROWTH AND OPPORTUNITY

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. GRANAHAN). Under previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Idaho [Mrs. FROST] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mrs. FROST. Madam Speaker, for years the people of my State of Idaho have been seeking ways to expand opportunities for our businessmen, to spur our industrial growth, to create a stronger economy, and to widen the horizons of our children.

I am sincerely convinced, Madam Speaker, that if Idaho is to continue to move forward, and to keep pace with the rest of the Nation, we must bring low-cost electric power from the Federal Bonneville Dam into our State.

Two moves are in the making to do this. First, the Federal Government is considering action which will assure Idaho its fair share of Northwest public power, and second, the Congress has before it legislation to retain for the Northwest, first call on Northwest power. I am sponsoring both moves.

Now, there are those who say: "Let's keep low-cost Federal power out of Idaho."

I say: "Let's get our share."

Who is really fighting for the people of the State? I contend I am, and here in my hand is the proof.

These are Idaho Power Co. bills rendered within the last year to the citizens of Idaho. This bill is for \$11.50 for 800 kilowatt hours. In Milton-Freewater, just across the State line in Oregon, the charge for the same service—the same number of kilowatt-hours—is \$7, 63 percent more in Idaho than in Oregon.

Here is another one. It is for 1270 kilowatt-hours. The cost in Idaho was \$18.88. It would have been only \$9.35 in Milton-Freewater, 102 percent more in Idaho.

Here are some other bills. This one is 62 percent higher, this one 65 percent, and this one 105 percent higher.

Kilowatt-hours	Idaho power cost	BPA cost through public utilities	Percent higher	Higher
730-----	\$10.87	\$6.65	62	\$4.25
800-----	11.50	7.00	63	4.50
890-----	12.31	7.45	65	4.86
1,270-----	18.88	9.35	102	9.53
1,310-----	19.58	9.55	105	10.03

Why are these costs so much higher in Idaho than Oregon? Because Oregon has Bonneville Power, and in the area in which these bills were rendered, Idaho does not.

Let us look at some examples of what it costs to run a business in Idaho.

Westvaco Corp. of Pocatello paid the Idaho Power Co. \$3,110,500 for electricity in 1960. With BPA power they would have saved \$1,380,000. How many jobs does that add up to?

In 1961, Monsanto Chemical Corp. paid \$2,807,799 to the Utah Power & Light Co., while Central Farmers paid this same company \$1,405,394. This is a total of almost \$7½ million.

If these three big phosphate companies had been served directly by Bonneville, they would have saved more than half of their power costs, or nearly \$4 million in 1 year.

Think what this much money could do to offset the high freight rates which plague the West, and how much more competitive it could make Idaho phosphates in a bigger marketing area—not to mention cheaper fertilizer for Idaho's own farmers. Convert that amount into plant facilities and monthly paychecks.

With lower Bonneville power rates Idaho phosphate companies could increase their production fourfold by 1980, create 3,000 new jobs in their plants and 6,000 new jobs in supporting industries and businesses. More out-of-State dollars would come into Idaho to help pay Idaho wages and Idaho taxes. Without low-cost power officials of these companies have made it clear that not only can there be no expansion in Idaho, but they may have to move their operations to another State.

I also say "let's get our share," because we are entitled to it.

Maybe you cannot tell by the color of the water, but that's Idaho water generating electricity at the Lower Snake and Columbia River Dams. Waters rising in Idaho produce almost 27 percent of the power at Ice Harbor, McNary, the Dalles and Bonneville Dams, and at John Day when it is completed.

This amounts to nearly 6 billion kilowatt-hours per year. Six billion not million—"B" as in bread and butter. Yet, only 207 million kilowatt-hours comes into Idaho, and that only in a few northern counties. And remember we are not talking about power that will be generated some time in the future, we

are talking about power that is being generated today—this very minute.

Idaho water produces for others 33 times as much low-cost Federal power as Idaho now gets from BPA; 12 times as much as the Bureau of Reclamation produces in Idaho for Idaho.

Why are we not getting our share, and at rates homeowners and industries elsewhere in the Northwest are getting Federal power? Somebody is selling Idaho down the river.

What is worse we are being sold out by Idahoans—Idahoans who raise the phony arguments of "danger to our water rights," "unfair competition," and "who is going to pay the taxes?"

Idaho water rights will not be impaired by bringing Bonneville Power Administration into southern Idaho. Bonneville does not run the dams—the Bureau of Reclamation and the Corps of Engineers do that. Bonneville just sells the power. Here in Idaho, the Bureau of Reclamation will continue to make water releases in accordance with State laws. It is a well-established policy of the Bureau and the Corps of Engineers that irrigation rights come first, and power production must be consistent with such use.

Not once since the beginning has anybody in the Columbia Basin complained that the Bureau's operation of Grand Coulee Dam for the Bonneville Power system has kept needed water from the land.

Bonneville will provide competition for our private utilities, all right, but hardly "unfair competition." Just look at what has happened to the private utilities in Washington and Oregon who face Bonneville competition. Their rates are down, and their sales and profits and stock market values are up. They have learned how to make more money by selling more power at less cost. And none of them is applying for a 13-percent rate increase. They are selling residential power for less today than they did in 1938. Idaho Power Co. is not. But their profits are just as big as Idaho Power's. They have gained, and their customers have gained.

Taxes? As their sales and profits have gone up, so have the taxes of these private utilities outside Idaho. The same will be true of Idaho Power Co. when the competition of low-cost Federal power forces it to lower rates and increase sales. Idaho will not lose any taxes from Idaho Power Co., but will get more. Even more important, low-cost Federal power will create new taxable wealth, spread the tax burden, and keep your own taxes lower than they otherwise would be.

Low-cost power brings industrial growth that makes new payrolls and profits to be taxed. The industries attracted to Oregon and Washington and western Montana by low-cost Bonneville power generally are the biggest single taxpayers in their respective counties. Low-cost power creates the wealth that pays the taxes.

Now, as I have said, Madam Speaker, if we are going to get our share, two things must be done. First, we must get the Bonneville Power Administration's

service area extended to include all of Idaho. Senator CHURCH, the gentleman from Idaho, Congressman HARDING, and I have asked that this be done. Secretary Udall, who has the authority to extend BPA service into all of Idaho, has directed BPA to make a feasibility study in cooperation with the Bureau of Reclamation. That study is now well underway, and we hope it will be favorable. If it is favorable, and if the people of Idaho indicate they want Bonneville service, the Secretary will issue the necessary marketing order.

Second, the House of Representatives must pass my regional preference bill which assures the Northwest of first call on all Federal power produced in the Northwest. The Senate has already passed a companion measure. At present, any power in excess of the needs of the Northwest could be sold elsewhere. Right now Bonneville's marketing area includes all of Washington, most of Oregon, western Montana, and the panhandle of Idaho. All those areas will be protected by this legislation. If southern Idaho is included in the BPA marketing area, the legislation would extend the same protection to southern Idaho.

Advances in technology make this legislation absolutely necessary. Until very recently you could not transmit electric power, economically, more than 400 miles. There was no way for Northwest power to leave the Northwest. But today we can transmit electricity up to 1,000 miles, or even 2,000 miles, economically.

Further, existing law says Bonneville Power Administration shall sell its power anywhere within economic transmission distance, and give preference to public agencies. There are any number of public agencies within transmission distance who would like to have our power. If transmission lines are built, without regional preference legislation to protect us, these agencies could demand Northwest Federal power ahead of our industries, ahead of our private utilities, and on par with our own public utilities—municipalities, REA's, and so on.

Bonneville does not want to sell firm power elsewhere at the expense of Northwest customers. But Bonneville is willing and even anxious to sell its surplus secondary power to other areas. Unlike firm power, which is based on the lowest streamflows of record, secondary power cannot be guaranteed for delivery day in and day out, year in and year out because it is produced during high water periods.

As a result, there is practically no market for this kind of power in the Northwest. But there is a market for it in California as a cheaper substitute for electricity produced in steamplants that burn coal, oil, or gas. When low-cost northwest secondary power is available, these plants can be shut down, and fuel can be saved. When it is not available, these plants can be fired up again and electric service can be continued without interruption. California is willing to take our surplus power on that basis.

Bonneville is faced with the problem of either selling this secondary power wherever it can be sold, in order to help preserve its low rates, or to let it go to

waste and raise rates. And rates are very important to us in the Northwest. It is not just an ample power supply, but an ample supply of low-cost power that attracts industries and makes jobs and builds our region.

As you may know, all Bonneville revenues go to the Federal Treasury to repay, with interest, the Federal Government's investment in Northwest power dams. Every year for its first 20 years, Bonneville always was ahead of schedule in repaying the Treasury. Five years ago BPA was, cumulatively, \$78 million ahead of schedule. But 5 straight deficit years have cut BPA's surplus to \$20 million. More annual deficits are threatened unless BPA can sell its secondary power. Ironically, in every deficit year BPA has had more unsold secondary power than the amount of the deficit. This secondary power could mean an extra \$15 million in revenue each year.

The danger is this: if Bonneville builds the lines or otherwise makes arrangements to sell this secondary power in California without regional preference legislation being enacted first, California public agencies—under existing laws—can demand not only the Northwest's surplus secondary power, but firm power as well—power that is desperately needed here.

This is true whether the transmission lines be Federal or private.

Let us make one more point clear: This pending regional preference legislation does not authorize an intertie. BPA already has authority to sell anywhere within transmission distance. As a matter of fact, 3 years ago BPA was all set to hook up with a California private utility, and would have if the Senate Interior Committee, at the insistence of Senators MAGNUSON and JACKSON and CHURCH, had not stopped them. These and other northwest Senators demanded that regional preference legislation be passed first, so the people of the Northwest would continue to have first call on northwest Federal power.

What this really gets down to is a case of protecting one of the Northwest's most valuable resources—its low-cost Federal power—rather than putting it in danger of export to California on a permanent and irrevocable basis. A vote against this legislation is a vote to risk the permanent sale of Northwest resources to other States. A vote for this legislation is a vote to protect our northwest resources and our people. That's why seven of the eight northwest Senators voted for regional preference legislation. I regret that our new Republican Senator from Idaho was the only northwest Senator who did not vote for this measure.

I have been fighting for it in the House of Representatives, along with most northwest Democrats in the House and most if not all the House Republicans from the Northwest.

We must keep BPA rates low. We must retain first call on Northwest Federal power. And we must get Bonneville power into all of Idaho. This is the way to build our State. This is the way to make more business opportunities and more jobs for Idaho people—the way to

make a future for our children and keep them in Idaho. This is the way to lower our electric bills. This is the way every Idahoan can add \$60, \$90, \$120 a year to his income by savings on his electric bills. This is the way to broaden our tax base.

This is the way the farmer, the homeowner, the worker, the businessman and, yes, even the Idaho Power Co. can profit and prosper in a healthy, vigorous, and growing Idaho economy.

THE 87TH CONGRESS—PROGRESSIVE AND IMPRESSIVE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. STAGGERS] is recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Speaker, the record of the 2d session of the 87th Congress has indeed been both progressive and impressive. Legislative and administrative action has emerged which means so much to us nationally, internationally—and specifically to the citizens of the Second District of West Virginia, whom I have had the honor to represent for the past 14 years.

American leadership of the free world has been asserted—admitted by the slave world. Personal income is up some \$28 billion. Inflation has been halted, making the gain a real gain. Corporate earnings have increased almost \$10 billion, providing incentive to enterprise. Depreciation allowances are up approximately \$30 billion, making available funds for industrial expansion and modernization.

In this age of outer space projects, nuclear energy utilization, communications satellites, and such—and considering the vast speed in which the whole world is moving—we must keep progressing. There are those, and many, who would like to stand still or look back. I sincerely believe we must keep stepping ahead, we must keep our vision forward, and continue working and striving to strengthen our Nation and make it a better place in which to live and rear your children and mine.

Space projects for exploration, for scientific research, for communication, and, if necessary, for military uses—are all "go." Military might has been increased; the Minuteman alone is described as the missile which closed the gap. We can take the offensive, if, and when, and where we choose.

I am proud to say we have been maneuvered into no hasty or imprudent action repugnant to good sense and national purposes, despite the efforts of our enemies and a few fanatics.

Uncle Sam seems to be in pretty good shape today.

No one can say that the 87th has been an idle or unproductive Congress. During the second session, from January to September 20, 1962, both Houses passed and the President signed no less than 65 major measures. As of that date, 17 additional ones had passed both Houses, and most of these bills were in conference. The total will be larger before adjournment, of course. Still more have been widely and vigorously discussed,

with action delayed until the legislation can be put in more perfect form.

Each and every one of these legislative items enacted is important to some one or more segments of national life. I take the liberty of listing a few which I consider significant to the people of the 17 counties of West Virginia which constitute the Second Congressional District. Without classifying them in specific categories, they are:

Authorization for executive department reorganizations. This makes possible easier contact with executives.

Defense procurement contracts placed on a competitive basis—not negotiated. This action gives better opportunities for small business contracts.

Peace Corps expanded: With this expansion is shown foreign approval of our efforts for peace.

President authorized to restrict imports of foreign agricultural products. The fruit industries in the eastern panhandle of West Virginia and other States should be benefited.

President authorized to restrict exports of strategic and critical materials. By this authorization, no help can be given any enemies.

The amount of \$12.97 billion for procurement of missiles and naval vessels; \$1.45 billion for construction and improvement of military bases and installations; \$3.81 billion for planetary and lunar exploration; \$167.4 million for Atomic Energy Commission, all involving more contracts and uses for coal; \$900 million for construction of needed public works, including roads, water and sewer systems, airports, and others.

Communications satellite system established, operated and controlled jointly by the Federal Government and private industry.

Rail and bus fare tax repealed; the air fare tax was cut in half.

Small Business Administration loan authorization increased by \$1.109 billion.

Renegotiation Act extended to provide for recovery of excessive profits on defense contracts.

Small hydraulic electrical projects exempted from the Federal Power Act.

Secretary of Labor given additional power to enforce Welfare and Pensions Plan Disclosure Act of 1958.

Works programs established for the needy, making possible the means for reducing public assistance rolls.

The amount of \$2.6 billion provided for construction and improvement loans to colleges and universities over a 5-year period.

The amount of \$1 million to any State for educational television.

Armed Forces members permitted to accept scholarships, fellowships and grants for specific purposes.

Veterans' Administration hospital and medical care extended to peacetime veterans who have noncompensable service-connected disabilities—and an increase of 9.4 percent in rates of compensation for service-connected disabilities paid to 1.9 million veterans.

Not since the early days of our Nation has there been such full discussion of public questions and proposals as has characterized the 87th Congress. Every man, in and out of the Congress, has

been free to do that which was right in his own eyes. No one is master—no subservience has been exacted or tendered. Nor has the integrity of any man's convictions been questioned.

The most dangerous issue throughout the world today is communism. I feel the greatest menace to our Nation and to free men everywhere is this deadly poisonous attitude of the Communists. It is certainly the most demoralizing and debasing influence on earth.

In talking with representatives of the Federal Bureau of Investigation they have given assurance that communism within the United States is on a downward trend. This is indeed good news. However, we must be on guard always—we cannot let down. We must face realistically that communism could ultimately prevail—this godless "ism" which is so insidious and destroys freedom and righteousness. All of us must never cease our efforts to eliminate and destroy its influence.

The prayer of each of us must be that Almighty God, in His infinite wisdom and glory, give us the strength and unity and foresight to work as a united people against this relentless foe.

We, individually and as a nation, must work together. We must believe in and practice loyalty to our country, to our God, and to the high ideals in which our Nation had its being.

The 87th Congress has indeed been a Congress in the true spirit of the Constitution as it was framed by its originators. With a record of achievement and stern devotion to responsibility, service to the people, faithfulness to duty, and loyalty to God and to country—we rest our case with the electors.

STATE AND MUNICIPAL EMPLOYEES

Mr. STAGGERS. Madam Speaker, one of my first acts after coming to Congress in 1949 was to contact all members of the Ways and Means Committee of the House of Representatives, urging the passage of legislation helpful to our deserving State and municipal employees. A bill accomplishing that end was passed that year.

I am proud of the part I have had in enacting legislation which permitted State roadworkers, State employees, municipal workers and schoolteachers to come under the provisions of the Social Security Act.

The strengthening and liberalization of this humanitarian act has meant so much to thousands in my home State of West Virginia. State and municipal retirees are receiving benefits under social security and are thereby having some measure of security in these years when they are no longer able to be gainfully employed.

The Congress has been helpful since the existence of the social security program in improving its benefits, and I believe there is still room for further improvement.

Many of the retired State and city employees who are receiving some social security today say the benefits are not sufficient, considering the cost of living at present. Personally, I agree with

them. Thousands of these citizens are receiving the bare minimum allowed under the existing law because of the fact that this is based on the low wages they received at the time they were working and the short period of time they had paid into the fund under the coverage amendment.

I sincerely believe one of the first acts of the 88th Congress when it convenes in January 1963, the Good Lord willing, should be to review the social security program and increase the benefits to those deserving retired State and municipal employees who are on retirement at this time and those who will retire in the future.

In recent years, some consideration has been extended almost all other segments of our society. Certainly, with such a strong and rich and powerful Nation as ours, we surely should have consideration for those worthy and deserving persons who were so helpful in building our great United States.

RETIREMENT OF HON. GORDON H. SCHERER

Mr. LANGEN. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. CLANCY] have permission to address the House on Thursday, October 11, for 30 minutes, to honor the retirement of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. SCHERER]; and that all Members have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks on this subject matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

AN UNCONSCIONABLE DEFICIT

Mr. LANGEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HARSHA] 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 Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. HARSHA. Mr. Speaker, I feel it imperative that I bring to the attention of this body information which I have received from reliable sources concerning the U.S. deficit.

An estimate of the U.S. deficit for fiscal 1963 is at least \$6 billion and the deficit may be as much as \$10 billion.

The U.S. Treasury reports show a deficit for the first quarter of 1963 of approximately \$2.25 billion; at this rate the deficit could run well over \$6 billion.

If the recommendations of the New Frontier budget makers are followed for fiscal 1964, reliable estimates are that the deficit may run from \$12 to \$16 billion. And now the President is barnstorming the country asking for a rubberstamp Congress, "a Kennedy Congress," to put these proposals into effect.

Mr. Speaker, I do not think the American people can afford a \$12 to \$16 billion deficit or a rubberstamp Congress. It is my strong belief that the American people should be cognizant of this wasteful extravaganza which depletes the value of their hard earned dollars.

MR. HOEVEN'S VOTE ON H.R. 7927

Mr. LANGEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. JENSEN] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, my colleague from Iowa [Mr. HOEVEN] was unavoidably absent from the House on October 5, 1962, during rollcall No. 279, the conference report on H.R. 7927, the Postal Revision Act of 1962. If present the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HOEVEN] would have voted "aye."

REPORT TO THE PEOPLE OF WESTERN WESTCHESTER AND PUTNAM COUNTIES, N.Y.

Mr. LANGEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. BARRY] 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 Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. BARRY. Mr. Speaker, I am deeply grateful for those Westchester and Putnam County constituents who helped make representative government function more effectively by participating in the questionnaire on domestic and foreign issues which my office sent them earlier this year. The questionnaire reached approximately 225,000 voters in the 25th Congressional District of New York, with some 38,500, or 17 percent, participating. Returns were broken down according to locations in the district; answers were tabulated and computed percentage-wise; final results were compiled in report form; and, where indicated, participants were added to my mailing list. This final phase was just recently completed.

I would like to take this opportunity, through the medium of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD to report to my constituents the following: First, the results of the questionnaire; second, the status of relative legislation; and, third, how their Congressman represented them in these matters of great national concern.

RESULTS OF QUESTIONNAIRE DOMESTIC ISSUES

First. Shelter construction: In answer to the question "Should the United States build and supply extensive fallout shelters?" 64 percent of those polled answered in the negative; 18 percent in the affirmative, and 18 percent were not sure.

The President in his opening address to the 2d session of the 87th Congress urged us to give priority consideration to legislation involving the expenditure of huge sums for the construction and supply of public fallout shelters. I thought it only appropriate, therefore, that the people of the 25th District be afforded the opportunity to censor this demand on their tax dollars, and I was pleased with the deliberation and foresight that obviously went into their response.

Ironically, it was in November 1961, that the Secretary of Defense embarked on a shelter survey program, and it was presumed that the results of the survey together with other data would serve as a basis for the Secretary's recommendations to the President. Apparently, the President felt that he did not have to wait for the results—as it was just 2 months later that he made his request to Congress for authority and funds to proceed with a large-scale shelter construction program. The survey has recently approached the halfway mark and Congress was prevailed upon to appropriate \$38 million for its completion.

Neither the Senate nor the House Armed Services Committees have taken any action with respect to the administration's bill for shelter construction, for the very obvious reason that the proposal of the President is equally unappealing elsewhere in the United States as it is in Westchester and Putnam Counties.

Second. Medical aid for the aged: The people of the 25th District demonstrated a preference for a voluntary program of medical aid for the aged as opposed to the President's proposal for compulsory hospital care under social security. Of those polled, 57 percent were against the administration's compulsory plan, while 63 percent favored expanding the voluntary Kerr-Mills program, and 59 percent approved of the Blue Cross proposal based on income level.

We all know that the administration's proposal was defeated in the Senate and prior to this action the House Ways and Means Committee voted not to report the bill. The views of my constituents therefore reflected the mood of the Nation and of the Congress with respect to the administration's limited and compulsory payroll tax proposal which completely disregards the needs of approximately 4 million senior citizens.

Shortly after the questionnaire results were tabulated, I introduced, on behalf of the people of the 25th Congressional District, a bill that overcomes many of the shortcomings of the administration's proposal and offers what I feel is a most constructive solution to the medical problems of our senior citizens.

My bill, H.R. 11466, proposes a program of medical assistance to the aged which: First, is voluntary with the individual; second, provides a choice of insurance plans; third, offers broader and more inclusive protection; fourth, keeps the Federal Government out of the administrative aspects of the program, appropriately reserving these to the insurance industry; and fifth, is available to all people over age 65.

This bill permits a tax credit of \$125 per year on behalf of every American 65 years of age and over, provided that the money is used to purchase his choice of the prescribed insurance plans. For those who pay no income tax—and, because of the special tax exemptions they already enjoy, they are in the majority—the bill authorizes the issuance by the Treasury Department of a medical care insurance certificate which the individual can use to pay premiums on a medical care policy. These certificates will be redeemed by the Treasury

when presented by the insurance carrier.

I am pleased to report that this proposal has 32 cosponsors in the House and that it is steadily gaining congressional, organizational and, most important of all, popular support. I am hopeful that it will receive early and favorable consideration in the 88th Congress.

Third. Drug controls: Even before the thalidomide calamity became headlines, the people of the 25th District favored a drug law with teeth in it. The results of my poll reflected that 67 percent felt the present laws inadequate to insure quality control of drug manufacturing.

Had the thalidomide tragedy not occurred this year, there probably would not have been drug legislation enacted during the 87th Congress, as major drug bills in the House and Senate were bottled up in committee. Ironically, therefore, some good did come about as a result of this terrible tragedy.

The Congress has approved, and I was privileged to support, a bill which reinforces the law with respect to the control, certification, marketing, and effectiveness of drugs for sale to the American public. The legislation—S. 1552—adds to the present law new provisions on: first, quality manufacturing controls; second, factory inspection; third, new drug effectiveness and safety; fourth, new drug testing and reports; fifth, new drug clearance procedure; sixth, antibiotic certification; seventh, use of official names, ingredients, quantities, side effects, and so forth, in descriptive printed matter on drugs.

This bill, which received bipartisan support in the House and Senate, is designed to close loopholes in the present law without frustrating research and development of drugs which have greatly contributed to our world leadership in medicine and public health.

Fourth. Aid to education—colleges and universities: A majority of voters—51 percent—of the congressional district indicated that they favor Federal aid in loans and grants to colleges and universities. By a greater majority—66 percent—they demonstrated a preference for indirect aid by an income tax credit for tuition costs.

Unfortunately, the major education bill of the 87th Congress, H.R. 8900—College Academic Facilities Act—which authorized grants and loans to public and private colleges for construction of classrooms, libraries, science and engineering buildings, has never cleared the final legislative hurdle. Originally passed by the House with my support in January 1962, the bill was amended by the Senate in February and was tied up in conference until September 19. The conference committee had more than sufficient time to resolve outstanding differences between House and Senate versions. However, as it later turned out the House conferees too willingly yielded to the Senate, accepting almost entirely its version including a controversial provision which would have established an entirely new program of scholarship assistance. This was done

in the knowledge that there is never an opportunity to amend a conference report and that there was no real possibility of House acceptance of the scholarship provision, which would wastefully duplicate assistance already available under the National Defense Education Act. The NDEA itself was extended by Congress in 1961.

The Democratic chairmen of the Senate and House conference committees thus succeeded in blocking for possibly another year the passage of a higher education bill—and attempted to use the House as their scapegoat in this unwarranted parliamentary scheme. Members of the House remonstrated against the purely political maneuverings of the chairmen by rejecting the conference report at which time they made it clear that they—the chairmen—would be held solely responsible for the failure of the 87th Congress to legislate a higher education bill.

My bill, H.R. 5589, which allows a tax credit for income spent on education by any taxpayer either for his own tuition or for anyone he may wish to help educate is pending before the House Ways and Means Committee. Executive reports from the Treasury and the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare have been requested. As of this date there are before the committee a total of 67 bills that provide tax relief for the costs of tuition, and there is a good possibility that this approach will be considered when the committee undertakes tax reform in the 88th Congress.

Elementary and secondary education: Of those responding to the poll, 61 percent favor Federal aid through loans and grants to public school districts, while 62 percent favor indirect aid by an income tax credit for local school taxes. Thus, the people of the 25th District indicated a desire for an extension of Federal assistance to the public school system. But, just as the results disclose an almost even division among the people on the two methods of aid cited, so is the Congress divided on vehicles rather than goals.

At the close of the 1st session of the 87th Congress, the House refuted an attempt to bring up the administration's bill which authorized grants of Federal funds for the construction of elementary and secondary school classrooms or improvement of teachers' salaries. Main points of opposition to the administration's bill were: First, threat of Federal control over public school system; second, major shift of responsibility for local education to the Federal Government; third, decline in classroom shortage; fourth, Federal control over teachers' salaries; and fifth, the "equalization formula" under which New Yorkers would pay \$312 million in Federal taxes to get \$116 million in Federal aid. New York State would suffer a net loss of \$196 million over a 3-year period were the administration's bill enacted into law. The House later extended the program of assistance to federally impacted school districts which I supported.

Still pending before the Congress is a proposal which I support providing that every taxpayer who pays a school tax

on his real property or as a part of his real estate tax shall be permitted to subtract from the Federal income tax which he owes, the full amount of such school property tax, or such proportion of it as will result in an additional tax benefit. Under the present Federal income tax law, State and local school taxes are deductible from gross income but the amount actually saved by the taxpayer depends on his Federal income tax bracket. The tax credit would be available to real property school taxpayers whether they itemize their Federal income tax returns or take the standard deduction. This proposal would eliminate the dangers inherent in the administration's lower education bill, and would return to the local level tax resources for educational and other community needs.

My own aid to education bill is becoming law: In order to encourage a closer relationship between school district leaders and parents, and at the same time correct a grave inequity in the postal rate structure, I introduced a bill, H.R. 4975, to grant second-class mailing privileges to elementary and secondary schools. Under present law religious organizations, fraternal orders, many colleges and universities enjoy second-class mailing privileges, but our public school system does not. I am pleased to report that my bill was incorporated into H.R. 7927 which was finally approved by the Congress on October 5, 1962. It awaits the President's signature as this report is being made.

Fifth. Federal income tax rates: Months before the administration announced that there would be a "top to bottom reduction in the rates on income tax," people of the 25th Congressional District indicated that they would welcome rate reductions in all income brackets as follows: high—56 percent yes, 35 percent no; middle—73 percent yes, 19 percent no; and low—72 percent yes, 20 percent no.

Although my constituents expressed overwhelming support for income tax reductions, many of them qualified their answers with comments such as "only if conditions permit," and "welcome but not necessary," and so forth. There was a definite pattern in the answers—one that revealed a desirability for long overdue tax relief, but with a note of caution against taking such a step at the wrong time, which could prove disastrous. I am privileged to represent people who put the welfare of their country above personal gain.

The type of hasty tax reform that the administration was considering earlier this year did not get a good reception in the Westchester-Putnam area. People were outraged that the administration would contemplate making such a critical move for what they regarded as purely partisan reasons. Our people reflected the mood of the Nation and of the Congress once again, and consequently the President's so-called emergency tax cut was short lived. Instead the next Congress will undertake an orderly, and, what I hope, will be a thorough investigation of all economic factors before legislating a major tax re-

form. Key economic considerations such as employment and unemployment, industrial production, retail sales, personal income, construction rate, and gross national product, will have to be carefully studied in order to determine whether or not a tax reduction is in the long-term interest of the economic health of the Nation.

Sixth. Tax incentive for business: In accord with the views of my constituents the 87th Congress legislated an investment tax credit for business. The people of the 25th District favored tax incentive for business by 79 percent for as opposed to 11 percent against. As sent to the President, H.R. 10650 permits an investment credit against tax liability of up to 7 percent of investments in new and used tangible personal and real property; a maximum 3 percent credit—7 percent for gas pipelines—for utility companies that are subject to governmental regulation; 7 percent credit on tax liability up to \$25,000 and on 25 percent of the liability above that level; a 3-year carryback and a 5-year carry-forward of unused investment credits resulting when the dollar limitations on eligible tax liability prevented the taxpayer from taking the full credit to which otherwise entitled.

Many of my constituents were opposed to the provision dealing with the withholding of taxes on dividends and interest which was contained in the original House version of H.R. 10650. I am pleased to report that this provision was later substituted by the requirement that corporations and financial institutions report to the taxpayer and to the Government any dividend or interest payment of \$10 or more per person per year, thus avoiding the many disadvantages of interest and dividend withholding.

Seventh. Fiscal responsibility: Reduction of Federal spending and the national debt, as well as adoption of a balanced budget, find strong support among the people of New York's 25th Congressional District. Of these polled, 76 percent favored cutting nondefense Federal spending and 86 percent advocated a balanced budget and a reduction in the national debt.

My constituents have left no doubt as to their feelings on matters of fiscal integrity and a sound economy, and I would like to make it clear that I am in complete agreement with their sentiments.

In 1940 the total cost of operating the Federal Government was a fraction over \$9 billion which is less than our Government now spends just for interest on the national debt. Debt interest in 1962 will approximate \$9½ billion.

In the last fiscal year the Federal Government spent \$8.3 billion more than its income. The deficit for this year is already \$6.3 billion and will probably exceed \$8 billion by the time the fiscal year comes to a close.

It is high time for the administration to implement the same spirit of sacrifice which it repeatedly asks of our countrymen—by sacrificing its politically expedient policies of nonessential spending for the common good of the country as a whole.

Eighth. Civil Rights Commission: In answer to the question, "Should Congress make the Commission on Civil Rights a permanent agency of the Government?" residents of Westchester-Putnam replied 43 percent in the affirmative, 36 percent in the negative, and 21 percent unsure. To date the Civil Rights Commission has conducted valuable studies in the fields of voting, education, employment, housing, and the administration of justice, which are of considerable help to the Congress. Unfortunately, the work of the Commission often goes unnoticed by the general public which may account for the extremely large "undecided" vote on this question.

The Commission, established by Congress in 1957, is headed by six non-salaried Commissioners and a staff Director, all appointed by the President and confirmed by the Senate. Its main function is to investigate complaints that voting rights or equal protection under the law have been denied by reason of color, race, religion, or national origin.

In the 87th Congress approximately a dozen bills were introduced that called for the establishment of the Civil Rights Commission on a permanent basis, including my own bill, H.R. 12597, which is awaiting action by the House Judiciary Committee. In the meantime, I supported Public Law 87-264 which extended the life of the Commission until September 30, 1963.

In the field of civil rights I supported a constitutional amendment barring the requirement of a poll tax as a qualification for voting in Federal elections and primaries. If ratified by three-fourths of the States within 7 years, Senate Joint Resolution 29 will become the 24th amendment to the Constitution. Unfortunately, many States have used means such as poll taxes and literacy tests to arbitrarily deny Federal voting rights which has forced the Federal Government to try to establish uniform standards for voting in Federal elections. The abolishment of the poll tax requirement for voting in Federal elections was an initial step in the right direction. However, the so-called literacy test is also used by some States as a means to arbitrarily deny Federal voting privileges. To remedy this situation I have sponsored a bill, H.R. 11465, by which the Federal Government would establish uniform testing standards to determine voter qualification in Federal elections. Such legislation was killed in the Senate following a lengthy filibuster led by southern Democrats. The House Judiciary Committee held hearings in this area, but postponed any further action.

Ninth. Manpower retraining: A majority, or 54 percent, of Westchester-Putnam constituents said they favored Federal programs to retrain those whose skills are no longer required due to technological progress. This question evoked a large—14 percent—undecided vote indicating that there was a lack of public information available on this issue. The 87th Congress legislated and I supported a 3-year program of vocational training and on-the-job training for unemployed

workers with obsolete and insufficient skills. There was strong bipartisan support for the manpower retraining program which is aimed at hard-core joblessness caused by structural changes in the economy. Interestingly, such a plan was sponsored by Republicans long before the administration included it as part of the legislative program.

The Manpower Retraining Act—Public Law 87-415—requires the Federal Government to appraise the Nation's manpower requirements and resources and to develop and apply information and methods of dealing with unemployment. Under the act the Secretary of Labor is required to promote the development of training programs to qualify persons for employment who could not reasonably be expected to secure full time employment without such training.

In addition the act sets requirements for the Secretaries of Labor and Health, Education, and Welfare in apportioning benefits to the States, prohibits use of the act to assist in relocating establishments from one area to another, and bars consideration of a trainee's membership or nonmembership in a union as a criterion for selection for placement under the act, and authorizes appropriations for planning and starting programs under the act. Because of the similarity of purpose between manpower retraining, and youth employment opportunities programs, provision was made in Public Law 87-415 for training of unemployed youth.

Since this law was recently enacted, it is too early yet to judge the effectiveness of the manpower retraining program. Its success to a large extent depends on administrative policies of the Federal and State Governments in implementing the law.

Tenth. Farm program: Even before the Billie Sol Estes scandal came to light, people of the 25th District indicated they were sick and tired of a federally controlled farm program of waste and corruption. In answer to the question, "Do you favor a farm program of fewer controls and subsidies?" 80 percent answered affirmatively, with only 9 percent responding negatively, and 11 percent undecided.

I am concerned with the farm question; first, because of the manner in which it affects the pocketbook of the consumer-taxpayer, and second, because of the failure of massive Government controls and spending to solve the country's agriculture dilemma. It is ironic that one of the biggest problems in the United States is overabundance of food, while so many of our foreign neighbors are suffering and dying of malnutrition and other terrible diseases associated with the lack of an adequate diet, and while the Soviet Union and its satellites are plagued with failure in producing food enough to meet their barest needs.

The Eisenhower administration inherited the farm program that was spawned during World War II by a Democrat administration. Time and again President Eisenhower sent to Congress sane proposals which called for an end to unrealistic price fixing, less Government in farming, emphasis on markets, increased efficiency, and com-

petitive selling. The Democrat-controlled Congress, failing to act upon any constructive program, further involved us in what Ezra Taft Benson termed the "most costly, irrational, hodgepodge program ever patched together."

Two farm bills came before us during the 87th Congress. One, the Kennedy administration bill, had it passed, would have imposed strict and unworkable acreage allotments and marketing quotas on feed grains; depressed the income of feed grain farmers; placed new controls on the wheat farmer; and discriminated against the small farmer in several different ways. President Charles B. Schuman, of the American Farm Bureau Federation, largest U.S. farm organization, called rejection of the bill "a victory for farmers, consumers, and taxpayers." "The only losers," continued Mr. Schuman, "are the political empire builders in Washington."

As a result of this defeat, a substitute farm bill was introduced even though its supporters characterized it as "the lesser of two evils." I opposed this bill because of the excessive cost to the taxpayer—Secretary of Agriculture Freeman himself put the estimate at \$2.4 billion. The bill constituted a further danger to the dairy industry because of a provision which could well be the beginning of supply management and compulsory milk quotas for all dairy farmers. Up to this time dairy farmers have entered into agreements among themselves to limit their production, and I feel that this type of voluntary control should be maintained and encouraged.

As I shall later outline under the section dealing with foreign issues, I voted to support the Trade Expansion Act, section 252 of which particularly affects the farm community—and empowers the President to use retaliatory action against any country discriminating against U.S. products, and specifically agriculture commodities. An expanded export market for our agriculture products will do much to help our surplus food problem, and may eventually pave the way for the elimination of Government controls so that a free agriculture market can play its role in bringing about an adjustment of world supply to world demand.

FOREIGN AFFAIRS

As the only Republican member from the State of New York on either the Senate or the House committee having primarily to do with foreign affairs, I feel an especially heavy responsibility not only to know and interpret the facts of our foreign policy correctly but also to appraise in their proper perspective the events of the present in order to formulate judgments about the future.

Cuba: All of us have been concerned over the weakening of our position in Cuba. As far back as January, Westchester and Putnam shared this concern, when 80 percent favored sending U.S. troops into Latin America if this were the only way to prevent a Communist takeover. The stand taken by the people of Westchester-Putnam has since been endorsed by the majority of Americans everywhere who called upon their representatives in Congress to take firm

measures against the Russian threat to Cuba. Compelled by a sense of urgency I participated as a member of the Foreign Affairs Committee in the drafting of a strongly worded resolution overwhelmingly approved by the Congress which reaffirms the principles of the Monroe Doctrine and officially reiterates our position in the Western Hemisphere.

Berlin: Since assuming the role of spokesman and interpreter for a large number of people concerned over our international relations, I have been living almost constantly with the Berlin crisis. On several occasions I have visited that monument to injustice, the Berlin wall, and have conferred with Mayor Willy Brandt and Gen. Lucius Clay about the Communist pressures in Berlin and about the ultimate Western goal of a free and unified Germany.

Significantly, in the poll taken early this year a large majority anticipated the intensified campaign of the Soviets to remove the Western allies from Berlin and favored refusal of the West to negotiate until the artificially created pressure ceased as opposed to beginning negotiations at once. It was interesting to me that 14 percent of those polled did not consider the two alternatives mutually exclusive and, therefore, favored both refusal to negotiate until Communist pressures ceased and also immediate negotiation. A poll taken at the present time very likely would reflect less overlapping of views as a result of the stepped-up campaign of atrocities committed by the Communists.

Trade expansion: On the general subject of trade I posed the question to the people of my district as to whether or not they believed the United States should protect her \$20 billion export market through mutual tariff and quota reductions in keeping with the steps being taken by the European Common Market even where such reductions could result in growth in certain industries but contraction in others. Sixty-seven percent voted in the affirmative, 13 percent voted against tariff reductions, and 20 percent stated they were unsure. This is a large percentage to be unsure on such an important issue. However, it may well be interpreted that at that time many were uncertain as to the success of the still young Common Market experiment but yet did not want to close the door through a negative vote to a change in our trade policy.

Since this poll was taken we in the Congress passed into law the Trade Expansion Act after extensive debate which was accorded wide publicity. I believe it would be a safe assumption that most of the questions in the minds of the uncertain 20 percent were resolved by the information forthcoming from both proponents and opponents of the program.

SEATO: The voters of Westchester and Putnam share with me a concern over the weaknesses of the Southeast Asia Treaty Organization and the existing veto provision whereby one abstaining vote could void the will of every other participating nation. Eighty-one percent of those polled expressed the opinion that the SEATO Charter should be amended to eliminate this provision,

and in the event such a change could not be effected 80 percent favored establishing a new southeast Asian alliance patterned after NATO.

I have experienced grave misgivings over the weakening of our position in southeast Asia and as a consequence journeyed there to study a way to strengthen our SEATO pact. This study has included many conferences with Departments of State and Defense officials and commanders of our Pacific forces, all of which led to certain recommendations that the administration adopted—the most important being to send military forces into southeast Asia and to accelerate helicopter operations.

Aid to Poland and Yugoslavia: One of the thorniest problems facing us has been the decision whether or not to continue aid to Poland and Yugoslavia. In order to satisfy my own questions and judge for myself rather than wade through the mass of conflicting advice on the subject of these two countries, I spent last Easter in Poland traveling for miles around the countryside with our American Ambassador to inspect farms, villages and to visit the churches.

So disturbed have I been over the injustices perpetrated upon the captive peoples of Europe whose countries are now satellites of the Soviet Union that I have made a special study of their problems through my membership in the Foreign Affairs Subcommittee on Europe. I have broadcast over Radio Free Europe and the Voice of America which daily beam messages of hope behind the Iron Curtain. I have added my statements in committee and on the floor of the House in the cause of freedom for these beleaguered souls.

The Congo: I have been greatly distressed over the United Nations mishandling of the Congo's problems in the effort to achieve unity. In this I have been joined by many of the people of Westchester and Putnam Counties. In fact, people from all over the country have written to express their bewilderment, indignation, and despair over the chaos in the Congo. The Foreign Affairs Committee is holding the State Department strictly to account for its position at the United Nations with respect to Congo operations. We are hopeful that our demands will bring about a better day for the Congo.

India and Goa: Nehru's seizure of Goa reflects the contradictions that are rampant in the international behavior of other countries. On the one hand, all former colonial powers are subject to the cry "imperialist" at any action of theirs which displeases some of the newer nations, not to mention the Soviet Union and her hapless satellites. However, the world dare not give breath to a protest over the aggressive actions of a nation should it happen to be what we term "neutralist" or "uncommitted." It is unfortunate that such a nation can appoint herself the critic and judge of all her sister nations and yet permit herself to operate without the bounds of international law and justice when such action redounds to her own personal benefit. It is a sad commentary on our

times that such a double standard does exist.

Military alliances: I have a consuming interest in strengthening our regional alliances and international organizations in order that we may arrive more fully at the goal of peaceful settlement of disputes rather than resort to strife and bloodshed. To this end I have several times served as delegate to the NATO Parliament in Paris and have had many conferences with our NATO military commanders. These deliberations have given me opportunity to prepare important resolutions adopted by that body, all of them designed to toughen the posture of the free world.

Long hours have been spent over the Mutual Security Act in an effort to determine the quality and quantity of military aid necessary to maintain the strength of our allies. In dozens of sessions of the Foreign Affairs Committee I have carefully studied our foreign assistance program for the purpose of improving its administration and effectiveness and to make reductions wherever possible in the interest of economy and efficiency.

Having occasion to confer with Prime Minister Ikeda, of Japan, I strongly urged that Japan assume a greater share of the burden of economic development in southeast Asia. That country in recognition of her responsibilities has since enlarged her foreign assistance program.

Bipartisanship in foreign affairs: On the question of whether the minority party in the United States should maintain a bipartisan approach in the field of foreign affairs or be outspoken in its criticism, 75 percent favored the former and 57 percent the latter. Here again, a very large percentage of those replying did not consider that one position could possibly rule out the other. Another interpretation is that a minority party can be constructively critical of the party in power and yet maintain bipartisanship on important international issues.

Throughout my efforts to maintain a bipartisan approach in the field of foreign affairs I have relied on personal meetings with many ambassadors, chiefs of state, foreign secretaries, active cabinet officers, diplomats and retired statesmen like General MacArthur and General Eisenhower.

In each attempt that I have made to better our foreign relations I have received the consideration of the executive branch. In a true spirit of bipartisanship on foreign policy I recently received a letter on behalf of Dean Rusk which stated:

As the present session of Congress approaches adjournment, I want to express my appreciation and respect for the thought and time you have given to the Department of State and to the conduct of this country's foreign affairs. The role of Congress is essential to a clear definition of our foreign policy, and I think the past 9 months proves the validity of this principle.

REPRESENTATIVE GOVERNMENT AT ITS BEST

When a Member of Congress can reflect the views of his people—without sacrificing his own personal convictions as I have been able to do—this is representative government in its best form.

The compatibility that I have enjoyed with the people of western Westchester and Putnam Counties over the past 4 years has made my job a truly rare and rewarding experience.

U.S. HOSPITAL FOR DELINQUENTS

Mr. LANGEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. HALL] 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 Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, on Sunday p.m., October 7, 1962, I returned from the Seventh Congressional District of Missouri, wherein in the city of Springfield is located the U.S. Federal Hospital for Defective Delinquents. It is a part of our Federal Prison System of the Department of Justice and is administered by the Attorney General, and jointly staffed by Department of Justice and U.S. Public Health Service personnel. For example, the warden, Russell O. Settle, M.D., is also a U.S. Public Health Service physician of great competency. He has an excellent staff of trained doctors, including specialists in psychiatry, and we are proud of the institution, as well as the professional ranking of the medical staff, the Department of Justice staff, and the civilian consultants in and around the city of Springfield, Mo. It should be clear that it cares for many chronic diseases, and performs much rehabilitation medicine and surgery in addition to caring for the U.S. prisoners of unsound mind—or defective delinquents. All informed members of this House are familiar with one of its most recent and famous "inmates," Mr. Edwin T. Walker, of Texas.

While in the district, in line with my official duties, I paid a call on the warden, assistant warden, and chiefs of medical staff of this hospital, as well as Mr. Edwin Walker. You will recall that this former Army officer has voluntarily retired and given up all his rights and privileges as a former major general of the U.S. Army. He recently ran in the primaries for Governor of the great State of Texas. Although a physician myself, with 2 years of internship and residency training at St. Elizabeths Hospital in Washington, D.C., in the mid 1930's—largely in neuropsychiatric training—before that institution forwarded most of its defective delinquent patients to the then newly opened U.S. Federal Medical Center in Springfield, Mo., I do not speak today as a physician.

I am not in the least interested in the Federal charges against Mr. Walker, insofar as inciting rebellion, leading an affray, or influencing insurrection against the law of the United States as interpreted by our Supreme Court is concerned. Furthermore, Mr. Speaker, I am not interested in pronouncing professional judgment as to Mr. Walker's competency, or soundness of mind based on a short interview at a time he was finding himself in a strange place, under harassing circumstances, and contrary

to the norm—with the wheels of justice moving swiftly.

I am concerned with the due process given any prisoner of the U.S. Department of Justice regardless of the cause, and his constitutional and Bill of Rights privileges under articles 4 and 6 of the latter. I am convinced that Mr. Walker, on the morning of Tuesday, the 2d of October, was mentally competent to understand the proceedings against him, and properly assist in his own defense. He personally stated to me that he was understandably—due to military usage, and so forth—not able to make a telephone call outside of the city of Oxford, Miss., in the 2 hours allowed before he was placed on a plane and started to Springfield, Mo., per telegraphic orders of the Director of Prisons, Mr. James V. Bennett, of the Department of Justice, Bureau of Prisons. He stated he was not aware of his destination until he was airborne. It is also my understanding that he was not given the advantage of legal counsel in the hearings, under the 18th United States Code, section 4244.

Mr. Speaker, you will recall that the next morning, on Wednesday, October 3 at the direction of the Department of Justice in Washington, a request for examination to prove mental competency, or not, was granted through the Federal court in or near Tupelo, Miss. This, and the warden's own statement, were admission of lack of authority to retain in a mental institution, any person, be he political prisoner or not, without employing section 4244. There is no other section allowing for such expeditious transfer or assignment of any patient or detainee to a mental institution prior to due process, prior to determination of competency and soundness of mind, and finally, prior to a day in court.

There has been much concern on the part of responsible legislators in recent months, as well as many of our citizens—as witnessed the number of telephone calls I received in Springfield, Mo., on the mornings of October 2, 3, and 4. This stems in part perhaps from recent unfortunate publicity, and perhaps partial truths concerning the incarceration in St. Elizabeths Hospital—the Government hospital for the insane—in Washington, D.C., of a lady in the Department of Agriculture this city who had to do with the exposé in the Billie Sol Estes case, now famous to us all.

As I have previously said, I do not propose, as a physician, to pass judgment or to aline myself with the groups that find witches behind every shadow, but I am aware of the need for good legislation protecting the individual and civil rights of our people under the Constitution; and thereunto a perfection of our commitment laws to avoid interstate failure of legislation, and to allow crossing of State lines in the case of Federal prisoners.

It is indeed a paradox that Mr. Walker was erroneously directed on the basis of a so-called expert in the employ of the Government, admittedly not on personal examination but based on news releases and magazine articles only; to a Federal prison in Missouri where the Supreme Court has ruled along with Connecticut, Alaska and California, that commitment

procedures now in existence represent a dangerous departure from Constitutional protection of individual rights.

Whenever an individual as a so-called proposed patient can be seized by any police or peace officer in his home or on the street and transported against his will and without due process to a mental hospital, where he can be forcibly examined and subjected to any type of therapy including drugs and narcotics, involving practices of modern psychiatry including hypnotism, shock therapy, or even lobotomy of the brain, we are approaching a very dark future unless such person has due process and protection of law, not men. My remarks are completely nonpartisan in this important area, and I actually feel this could never happen with the excellent professional staff that I know we have at the Federal Hospital for Defective Delinquents in Springfield, Mo., because they keep their honor above directive, and their professional integrity above reproach.

However, there is much ado throughout the land about these possibilities of producing mental robots for political purposes, and I submit this is no time to have faulty or inadequate legislation covering these points. It is to the credit of the Attorney General that he ordered the bail cut in half and the prisoner freed on stipulation that he would undergo psychiatric examination by a private clinician agreed upon jointly by the astute lawyers for the defendant and the Attorney General. On the other hand, there was little else they could do, as the Attorney General had not one leg upon which to stand.

Inasmuch as this delicate question involves not only our Federal statutes but those of the various States of the Union and our territorial governments, and even the United Nations and World Court; I think it is time that this body joined with recommendations for an investigation, as well as proper legislation, and indeed I intend to submit the latter with the convening of the next Congress. I have sought long-experienced and expert advice in this preparation.

In closing, since it is the commitment procedure which allows dangerous practice versus the constitutional protection of individual rights, I would like to summarize the United States-Missouri situation:

First. First of all, you will recall that the present Federal law provides that no one shall suffer commitment to an asylum unless and until he or she is found to be insane. Now, "insanity" is a fairly well defined, but legal term.

Second. But free and easy commitment procedures, and the substitution of what is tantamount to a mock trial before a kangaroo court for the traditional and accepted legal mental hearings, are of infinitely greater import and significance than are the portions of the bill which were responsible for the great popular outcry and clamor against it. Unless the individual can be guaranteed by due process of law against railroad-ing and the disregard of his rights under any pretext whatsoever, regardless of how pontifically high sounding and ostensibly humanitarian that pretext

may be alleged to be, then it would seem all but hopeless to waste time in considering what might be done to the patient after he is illegally so confined.

On June 14, 1954, the supreme court of Missouri, in the case of State ex rel. Fuller against Mullinax, found the commitment procedures as specified in the Draft Act and exhibited in the Missouri statute unconstitutional.

Third. Original proceeding in mandamus to compel admission of a mentally ill patient as a patient in a State mental hospital. Superintendent of hospital refused admission for reason that he had been informed that act whereunder patient had been committed was unconstitutional and void. The Supreme Court, Leedy, J., held that provisions for confinement upon application and certification or upon suspicion of mental illness, without notice or hearing in advance of commitment, were in violation of requirement of due process, notwithstanding provision for hearing upon demand after commitment.

Fourth. This is particularly pertinent since it goes right to the root of the whole controversy upon whether or not a patient may be confined upon application and certification or upon suspicion of mental illness without notice or hearing in advance of commitment.

Fifth. Moreover the doctrine of later relief by habeas corpus as effectuating due process has been expressly repudiated. In State ex rel. Kowats v. Arnold, 345 Mo. 661, 673, 204, S.W. 2d 254, 260, it was said:

The exercise of the power (to hold insanity inquisitions and issue commitments thereunder) may deprive the subject of precious constitutional rights, liberty and the enjoyment of property, which cannot be done without due process of law.

And, it will not do to say in such a case that relief can be obtained afterward by habeas corpus.

It would appear that Missouri is the first of the States to adopt the model act, although some of its features, in varying forms and degrees, can be identified as having been taken from statutes of other States.

It is my intention to see that proper and needed Federal law is constitutional and within our Bill of Rights in permitting the right to a speedy and public trial, the right to be informed of the nature of the charge preferred against a patient, prisoner, or detainee—or first of kin if truly defective—and the right to be represented by an attorney at all stages of the proceedings, as well as the right to trial by an impartial jury, the right to be confronted by witnesses against him, and the right to subpoena witnesses in his own behalf and for his own defense, as well as the right to bail under all but most necessarily protected circumstances. This will obviate the present condition which permits no examination under Federal indictment, and verbal directives for admission to mental hospitals with all the stigma attached thereunto, as well as no statement of cause needing to be filed in order to support the issuance of a warrant or arrest for apprehension, and no judge or magistrate needing issue a warrant for such arrest.

It will further correct the lack of examination, per the patient's desires or that of his own physician, no trial by judge or jury, and will preclude his being held in custody without bail for an undue length of time. Certainly it will protect writ of habeas corpus proceedings and the U.S. courts are to be congratulated in the cited case for ordering the warden to show cause within a lesser amount of time than the existing faulty law allowed.

Mr. Speaker, I sincerely hope our colleagues will join me in correcting this evil situation, and thereby allaying our citizens' fears of a police state, and future incarceration thereby.

SUPREME COURT'S INTEGRATION "LAW"

Mr. HAGAN of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. WAGGONNER] 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 Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. WAGGONNER. Mr. Speaker, since 1954 and the Supreme Court's making of the integration law, volumes have been written on the subject. Few statements, if any, have impressed me with their calm and clear logic, to the degree a statement published recently by the Honorable Wade O. Martin, Jr., secretary of state of Louisiana. Secretary Martin has served our State under seven State administrations and four Presidents. Few men are held in higher esteem in Louisiana than he is. I think his statement is worthy of attention by every Member of the Congress and I include it here in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for all to read and ponder.

STATEMENT BY HON. WADE O. MARTIN, JR.

Those of us who have deep-rooted love for our Nation and our States have been greatly concerned over the lack of understanding that the Federal courts, the Attorney General, the NAACP, and now you, our President, have been displaying in the matter of forcing integration of the Negro and white races in this country.

Individually and collectively, you are on the verge of being responsible for spilling the blood—not of criminals—but of loyal, dedicated, cultured, and respectable taxpaying Americans—with American guns in the hands of Americans under your control either directly or indirectly.

It is regrettable that there is not a forum for debating the matter at issue, but there is none, because even the President, in a statement via television, implied, if not directly stated, that this is a closed issue and not subject to debate.

NO ALTERNATIVE

So, following the lead of the President and the Court, there is no alternative but to utilize the press and other media of information, in order to make an urgent plea in the interest of the United States.

All of you to whom this letter is addressed realize that you have many marshals, many Federal soldiers, under your command. But quite obviously there are, have been and will be many State soldiers and civilians ready to repel your advances with guns of their own.

Before you fire any further shots or strike any additional blows, you should take one final look at your position. This may well be your last opportunity to save this Nation from the suicide which is so imminent.

In examining your position, you must resolve all doubts in favor of peace and tranquility among all Americans and a united front against our known enemies from without.

As one who is experienced in law, politics, and government, I offer these thoughts on the position of each of you.

The world will probably never know whether your position is right or wrong. But I maintain that the final answer in the years to come would be of little comfort to the American people if, in the interim, we destroy ourselves over our differences of opinion; if, in the interim, we become a nation without a Constitution and without courts—a nation in which Negroes and whites, Catholics, Protestants, Jews, and all the people are reduced to slavery much worse than that which existed before the Civil War.

Yes, whether you are right or wrong, each side should consider the sincerity of the other, and go slow on the trigger.

As we listened to your telecast, Mr. President, it occurred to many of us that you were hitting below the belt when you listed the names of the judges who were hearing the case involving Governor Barnett, of Mississippi. You pointedly named several judges from Southern States, but, Mr. President, were you not hiding behind the true facts?

FAIRER

Would it not have been better and fairer had you said that the orders in this case were inevitable, irrespective of which district lower judges were sitting, because under the Constitution they had no alternative but to follow not the dictates of southern judges as such, but the dictates of the U.S. Supreme Court, whose members are not elected, as you well know, but most of them were appointed by Franklin D. Roosevelt, Harry S. Truman, Dwight D. Eisenhower, and you, Mr. President? The people of the United States have never had the opportunity to elect these Justices of the Supreme Court, and they are the ones who wrote this so-called law.

Now, true enough, courts can, and have always, interpreted law, and this is the function of the courts. As simply stated as it can be, that is the position taken by the Supreme Court as I understand it.

Some outstanding constitutional lawyers believe the decision to be wrong in that it repudiated the Constitution of the United States in favor of adopting Communist writings on psychology.

But there is another side to this proposition—one that the Supreme Court and all of you should consider. While the average American is not too well versed in the niceties of the law, the average American believes that the adoption or passage of a law, or the change of a law—particularly one which would affect his very life—is a matter for the lawmakers, the Congress and the legislators, that they, the people, elect and whom they can censure and recall if they so desire.

And if the law in question happens to be a provision of the Constitution, the average American has always felt, and does indeed now feel, that he should have the opportunity to see that amendment proposed by the Congress, the lawmakers of the Nation. Then he should have the opportunity to elect not only the Congressmen who propose it, but the Members of the legislature who ratify or reject it in the various States.

And if there was ever a travesty on American democracy, it was in the effective amendment of a provision of the Constitution that had been ratified and affirmed, for over a 100 years, by nine men appointed by the Presidents of the United States who could not be reached with a ballot.

So, when the people's homeland, their property, their families, are all placed in jeopardy, in danger of being injured or destroyed by a new or a changed law, which never had a hearing before their lawmakers with Congress or in their States, there is naturally a great resentment, untold frustration, and a consequent disrespect for the law and for those who promulgate and seek to enforce it.

DESTRUCTION

Need you be reminded, all of you, that the destruction of an American's property, the changing of his environment, the destruction of his culture and that of his community, are no less acceptable to him when imposed by the Federal Supreme Court, the President, the Attorney General, or the NAACP, than when imposed or threatened by outside enemies.

So, whether you are right or wrong about the ultimate effects of complete integration, these innumerable worthy Americans, who believe it is bad for the Nation and bad for them, will fight all of you almost as quickly as they would fight outside invaders of their country.

Besides having been deprived of the opportunity to vote for or against the lawmakers (they were all appointed by Presidents) in the integration law change, and besides having been deprived of the opportunity to be heard in committees of Congress and committees of the State legislatures on proposals to change the Constitution, as is usually the case in a democracy, those who oppose this so-called law are finding other strange and undemocratic practices.

This court-made law is applicable in some places, and not in others, and it is enforced only as fast as people are ready to accept it.

Even stranger and more deplorable is the fact that new laws (court orders by individual judges) are being written from day to day, naming by name who shall be entitled to the privileges of the law, and indirectly saying that its provisions are unavailable to others.

And possibly, most undemocratic of all is the fact that the citizens have no advance knowledge of the penalty for violating these so-called laws. A usual criminal law without specific penalty is unenforceable. And when a law enacted by legislators is cruel and unjust, it is always subject to review by the courts.

But in this case, judges, having written the law, are rewriting it from day to day, and they pick penalties out of the air. The death penalty? \$10,000 a day? \$100,000 a day? Who will decide whether a penalty is cruel and unjust when the penalty is written by the judge? What is imposed apparently depends on the whim or the mood of the Department of Justice, and the mood of the judge from day to day in each case. And apparently there is no recourse.

The courts, the President, the Attorney General, and the NAACP should recognize the un-American aspects of their actions, and should not press too hard for perpetuating this undemocratic procedure with bullets and bayonets. They could be wrong.

What is the alternative to bullets and bayonets and helicopters, and the use of the State National Guard to carry arms against the people of the States in which they were organized?

Here again as the President stood behind the names of district judges who were carrying out the Supreme Court's orders, we must wonder whether his actions in calling out the Mississippi National Guard were to enable him, in the event of violence, to say that killings in Mississippi were justified because they were done by the National Guard of Mississippi.

What is the alternative to the use of bullets and bayonets and helicopters and tear gas, and perhaps even atomic missiles by Americans against American people in this issue?

Three of the most vociferous outsiders advocating the use of force as the only alternative are former President Dwight D. Eisenhower, Martin Luther King of the NAACP, and presumably Khrushchev for the Communists. Each of them may be entitled to his opinion and his objectives, but to some of us it seems that with the Nation on the verge of a shooting war, General Eisenhower, who knows the strategy of military science, should follow it, and stop backbiting the President who now has command. He didn't settle the issue with troops at Little Rock when he was in command.

It would seem also that the NAACP, were its members interested in this Nation and the welfare of our people, could have selected a less crucial place than the University of Mississippi to insist upon this buildup, and the use of military might by Americans against Americans at the same time that Russia is building up military might in Cuba.

FIGHTING

Khrushchev has only one real concern—our national strength; and anything we do to fight among ourselves is precisely what he wants.

So, when we fight each other at Ole Miss—or elsewhere—at the insistence of the President or a former President or the NAACP or Khrushchev, or the courts, or the so-called integrationists or anyone else, the cost of this operation and the lives lost will, in the showdown which must soon come, reduce our ability to fight off our enemies from without.

The extent to which we will be weakened will depend upon how far the President, the Attorney General, the NAACP, and the courts pursue their present course of using military might to integrate.

Even the forced capitulation of one Governor, even the winning of the battle of Ole Miss in the face of the military might of the United States, will not be the end of this internal war. Little Rock did not prevent the New Orleans school integration crisis; the New Orleans crisis did not prevent the Ole Miss crisis; and none of these will prevent other integration emergency situations within the United States, as long as the President, the Attorney General, the NAACP, and the Federal courts continue their present practices.

We should now be engaged in the effort to cope with the crises of Berlin, Cuba, Laos and Katanga, and stop creating crises among ourselves because of a so-called law that was adopted, and is sought to be enforced, outside the normal democratic processes.

We cannot continue to allow local hot spots to sap our time, energy, and talents, to damage our image abroad, and to weaken our national strength.

It seems the height of folly for us to undertake to achieve, with bayonets against our own people, the sudden abolition of segregation of the Negro and white races—something which occurs throughout the world.

When can a nation hope to resume internal peace and tranquility, if it is to be accomplished only when children of one race are to be transported away from their home environment, solely for the purpose of mixing them with children of another race and environment, and when every Negro or white person is to insist upon going to a particular school.

ROOM TO IMPROVE

Doubtless there is room for improvement of the lot of both the whites and blacks of our country, but the important thing is that both have more of everything here than they are afforded in any other country of the world. But if we continue to fight amongst ourselves before we defeat our ominous enemies from without, we will all be reduced to slavery.

Of course, the question will be asked, What about changing the attitudes of those on the other side of this controversy?

During my years in public office, I have observed that the seven State administrations with which I have served have provided more education, more welfare, health, and medical services for the Negro than have been provided for him in any other area of the world.

We want to help Negroes as well as whites; nevertheless human nature cannot be changed overnight. Most of the white people of Mississippi, Louisiana, New York, Michigan—in fact, not only in this Nation, but all over the world, will not live in Negro communities, under Negro cultures, in Negro environments, and under Negro leadership. This has been proven time and again in history, and more recently in Harlem and in the Nation's Capitol at Washington.

As soon as the Supreme Court, the President, the Attorney General, and the NAACP forced extensive integration in Washington, they effectively seized and confiscated from many white people their schools, residences, and places of business. Washington is no longer the white metropolitan area it once was. The integration program has removed most of the white children from its schools and a majority of the residents are now Negroes.

Many of the whites in the Nation's Capital did not own their homes and their businesses, but were renting. Washington was an area of displaced persons in the first instance, many of them having come from various nations of the world and States of the Union. So it was disturbing them little when they fled from Washington to Virginia and Maryland, a short distance away where they moved into white communities and commuted back and forth to work.

BLOW TO WHITES

In Washington, integration, therefore, was a blow to the whites, but nothing like it would be in Mississippi. Since most whites will not live in a Negro community for an extended period of time, when you send helicopters and marshals, and muster the National Guard to force integration in Mississippi, you are not forcing one Negro into the University of Mississippi, you are taking the first step which corresponds to what Castro did in Cuba. He took Cuba for the Communists, and when all the chips are down, it will in the final analysis probably make little difference to the people of Mississippi whether their State is seized by outside invaders, or whether President Kennedy, the Supreme Court, the NAACP, and the Attorney General take Mississippi and give it to the Negroes. Insofar as they are concerned, they will have lost their homelands, their communities. They will not live in the Negro community, which Mississippi will become if your present program of integration in both private business and educational institutions is successful. When you succeed in forcing complete integration in Mississippi and other areas where the Negro population outnumbers the white, those areas will be abandoned by most white people just as Washington, D.C., was virtually abandoned. This condition may change in the future, but we are dealing with the present, and these are the facts as of now.

When extreme violence is threatened, the national commentators ask the question repeatedly. How can everyone save face? I am not nearly as concerned about anyone saving face as I am about saving this great Nation, and I tell you without equivocation that there is only one way to save this great Nation from the suicide which is impending. This is not Mississippi, Louisiana, North or South Carolina—it is the Nation as a whole. The only way you can save it is to revert back to the democratic processes that were provided in our Constitution. Realize once and for all that education and the matters under consideration are matters that were not granted to the Federal Government under the original Constitution, but reserved to the States.

Let each State take care of its own business, as you are letting each of the small new African nations take care of their own.

As long as we remain free, let the States reserve to themselves the powers that the people did not give to the Federal Government.

If you feel that it is essential in this day and age to have complete integration of the white and Negro races through the means of a law, then have that law enacted as any major law is enacted. Bring it back into the Congress.

CEASE FIRE

First, cease firing, and let the democratic processes come into being. Let Congress propose, consider, and enact, if the majority of the people want it, the kind of an integration law that the Supreme Court of the United States enacted. If they do enact it, then let Congress prescribe the penalties, and after that is done, then let the various States in their legislatures vote on the adoption or rejection of the amendment.

Let the people of this country be heard in Congress, and in their State legislatures. Until this is done, we can only go on and on with another crisis, and another, and then more bloodshed.

Let's take Ole Miss and all cases like it off the front page, and return Cuba to page 1 where it belongs.

THE HONORABLE BRENT SPENCE

Mr. HAGAN of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. MULTER] 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 Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, this House has been graced by many great personalities. During my service here, which goes back to 1947, it has been my privilege and pleasure to meet many of the greatest.

One of those with whom I have had the honor to be most closely associated is certainly at the top of the list by any and all standards. My first committee assignment was with the effective and very influential Banking and Currency Committee. When I arrived there in the 80th Congress the ranking minority member was the gentleman from Kentucky, the Honorable BRENT SPENCE. He had already made his mark as chairman of that committee during Democratic Congresses and of course returned to that important post in the 81st Congress.

This fine man was able, diligent, effective, and, most important of all, he was friendly and kindly. The uppermost thought in his mind at all times was, "How can I help?"

He made my work immeasurably easier and certainly more pleasant, as he did for all of our colleagues.

We will miss his wise counsel.

I wish him good health and all of the best things in life when his voluntary retirement comes at the close of this session.

ADOLPH EICHMANN TRIAL

Mr. HAGAN of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. LANE]

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 Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, on February 12, 1961, I delivered my views on the essential fairness and basic right in the State of Israel to bring Adolph Eichmann before its bar of justice to stand trial for offenses so heinous as to stagger the conscience of man.

Since then the trial was held. I am proud that justice ran its course unobstructed and unhindered. I noted in the September 1962, issue of the American Bar Association an article entitled "The Eichmann Trial and the Role of Law" which closely parallels my remarks published in CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of February 20, 1961.

I then noted that Eichmann will be safer before an Israeli court which is determined to do impartial justice, and stand forever on its record, rather than before a temporary body convened to dispose of him and then disbanded. I noted that the full glare of publicity will permit no deviation from fairness both to the defendant and to the people whom he offended.

The American Bar Association Journal reports that—

The conduct of the trial was exemplary; dignity and decorum were maintained throughout, continuously brought comments of respect from lawyers and journalists alike (p. 820).

In February 1961 I refuted the argument that the State of Israel had no jurisdiction in the Eichmann case on the premises that the State of Israel never ceased being a State. All through the ages Palestine was merely a possession of different temporary conquerors who held the land, but not the people. The people of Israel never surrendered. They were exiled from it but never surrendered their claim to it. Furthermore, I contended, Hitler waged war against Jews not as French Jews, or Dutch Jews or Polish Jews but simply as Jews, without recognizing them as citizens of the countries he invaded. He recognized them only as a people separate, distinct and apart from all other nations. Hitler himself, therefore, laid the ground rules for Eichmann's trial in Israel.

The article in the American Bar Association Journal confirmed the foregoing conclusions. The Israeli tribunal is cited as stating that "The connection between the State of Israel and the Jewish people needs no explanation" and that the annihilation of European Jews had no relation to the countries in which they resided, but had as its only basis their historical and ancestral relationship with the Holy Land. And the land of Israel has endured for thousands of years; there has been but a change of governments.

I stated that the crime of murder is so reprehensible as to be violative of that unwritten law commonly recognized as natural law. The American Bar Journal confirmed that statement by citing Prof.

Robert Woetzel, of Fordham University; the "Trial Judgment"—page 27—"There is not any taint of ex post factoism in the law of murder"; and Hugo Grotius—that the apprehending state had not only a right to try one charged with violating "in extreme form" the law of nature or the law of nations, no matter where committed, but as well had a moral duty to other nations to do so. A fortiori with genocide.

I observed that there was no international tribunal to try that man. The International Court of Justice has no jurisdiction over the trial of individuals. The Nuremberg tribunal was no longer in existence. At best it was an imperfect court. What court is there to handle this case? Another imperfect international tribunal?

The American Bar Journal, in the aforesaid September issue, confirms my views. It states:

There was not available any international tribunal for such a trial and the creation of an ad hoc international court free of cold-war politics and propaganda was highly unlikely. The World Court's jurisdiction does not extend to the trial of criminal cases, and the United Nations has on several occasions attempted without success to establish a permanent international criminal court of justice.

I concluded with the observation that if new law is to be written, on the principles of natural law, then it is fitting that it be written in Israel inasmuch as the prophet Isaiah said, "From out of Zion shall go forth law."

The American Bar Journal concludes in much the same vein:

We have seen how long it required for many of the principles once laid down in the Holy Land to become written into the domestic statutes of most nations and accepted as binding upon all.

But law in the modern age must go further than its traditional role of following the mores of the people it serves. It must undertake the role of leadership, and its jurists must continually stress and teach the rules of conduct to which the leaders of nations and all men must bind themselves for the survival of mankind.

The American Bar Association Journal article is commended to my colleagues, as follows:

THE EICHMANN TRIAL AND THE ROLE OF LAW
(By Zad Leavy, of the California Bar,
Beverly Hills)

(NOTE.—In the interest of saving space, the author has deleted many citations of authority, both to the official record of *Attorney General v. Eichmann* and to outside sources. Interested readers will find most of these in the footnotes to Leavy, "The Eichmann Trial, Report from Jerusalem" (37 Calif. B.J. 243 (1962).)

The circumstances in which Adolf Eichmann was tried give rise to serious questions which some have seen as a possible challenge to the legality of the trial under the commonly accepted rules of international law and criminal law. Eichmann was kidnapped from another sovereign state and tried under a retroactive law for crimes committed outside the jurisdiction of Israel. There is no clear rule of international law which would have prevented Israel from trying Eichmann in the face of such facts, concludes Mr. Leavy. The result of the trial may be to strengthen the principle that the responsibility for crimes against humanity should lie with

those who commit the crimes. If this is true, asserts the author, then the trial may have been a positive good, even if the kidnapping detracted from world law.

A sense of history swept over the hundreds of correspondents sitting in the huge courtroom as the Attorney General of Israel, using the language of the Old Testament, began his long and moving opening address to the Jerusalem district court:

"As I stand before you, judges of Israel, in this court to accuse Adolf Eichmann, I stand not alone. Here with me at this moment are 6 million accusers."¹

Many of us recalled that not far from this courtroom were the chambers of the 71 ancient judges of Israel who comprised the Sanhedrin, or supreme court, which administered the law of the land from the time of Moses until beyond the destruction of the Jewish state, and that much of the law laid down and used by that court found its way through universal usage and acceptance into modern jurisprudence to guide orderly conduct among men.

Again here in Jerusalem, Holy City to three great religions of the world, we watched another eminent court of law proclaim and reaffirm the lofty precepts which offer hope to mankind in a turbulent age ahead.

THE TRIAL

Israel's primary motive, that of recording a tragic story of her people never before fully told, was reflected in the broad scope of the indictment and in the determination of the prosecution, in the face of the obvious impatience of both newsmen and the court, doggedly to place on the record every stark fact pertinent to the Nazis' final solution of the Jewish problem.²

¹ Transcript 17.4.61 session 6 C1, *Attorney General v. Eichmann*, crim. case 40/61, Jerusalem District Court [hereinafter cited as "transcript"].

² Eichmann was tried before the court of general jurisdiction in Israel, a district court, impaneled with three judges as in capital or other serious felony cases, with one of them a supreme court justice appointed by the president of the supreme court to preside over the tribunal. Since the acts charged to Eichmann were not committed in any part of Israel, venue lay in the central or Jerusalem district.

In furtherance of the tradition under Ottoman and British rule, there are no juries in Israel. The criminal law is essentially English, with 13 years of Israeli case law strongly influenced by decisions in the United States.

Eichmann was captured in Argentina on May 11, 1960, and taken to Israel. Action was initiated shortly thereafter by Argentina against Israel in the U.N. Security Council, and after Israel's apology the matter was declared closed in a joint communique issued by the two nations on August 3, 1960.

The trial commenced on April 11, 1961, and final arguments were completed on August 14, 1961. Prosecution witnesses totaled 111 and the court admitted 1,434 prosecution exhibits, many of them individually voluminous. Only Eichmann testified in court for the defense, but statements of other defense witnesses were taken in foreign courts; 109 defense exhibits were admitted. Final judgment was handed down throughout the week of December 11, 1961. The accused was found guilty of all 15 counts in the indictment, but was acquitted of several allegations not proved beyond a reasonable doubt, and he was sentenced to die.

Execution of the death penalty in Israel is by hanging. There is no death penalty except for the crimes attributed to Eichmann and treason in wartime. Eichmann's execution was the first in the new state's short history.

The conduct of the trial was exemplary; dignity and decorum were maintained throughout. The television facilities hardly affected the proceedings. The constant presence of a large crowd provided no more diversion than the audience in any criminal courtroom in the United States. The firm attitude with which Supreme Court Justice Moshe Landau, presiding, constantly maintained a near-absolute silence in the large auditorium, as it were, continuously brought comments of respect from lawyers and journalists alike.

Hearsay evidence tending to prove the corpus delicti for the most part came in without objection. Indeed, the defense admitted the bulk of the corpus, the holocaust itself, but disputed Eichmann's criminal responsibility. Defense counsel seldom cross-examined most witnesses, except when their testimony tended to link the accused to the corpus.

Evidence of questionable reliability, and hearsay tending to prove Eichmann's intent and connection with the crimes alleged, e.g., previous statements of other Nazis under oath and not under oath, were on occasion admitted under a special rule adopted at Nuremberg and codified in the statute under which Eichmann was tried, but the court in its judgment weighed such evidence with care and relied upon it only when corroborated by other more trustworthy proof.

The eyewitness evidence was unbelievable. There were not enough words nor adjectives adequately to describe what we saw and heard in the courtroom, and the correspondents' frustration was clearly evident. In the words of the Supreme Court of Israel:

"No human pen, no human tongue would ever succeed to describe the merest outline of the suffering of the millions who were killed, massacred and burned in the extermination camps and gas chambers through the murderous tools invented and improved by the 'fertile' brain and perverse fantasy of Nazi excretion. Before the rise of Hitler's regime in the thirties of the 20th century, no one has envisaged any such spectacle."³

THE DEFENSE AND THE ANSWER

Eichmann's contention that he merely followed and transmitted orders from above and exercised no initiative whatsoever, was pleaded both to the indictment and in mitigation of penalty, and was overwhelmingly disproved by the evidence, much of it from the accused himself. He was shown to have exerted great initiative and enthusiasm on the top levels of command which planned and directed the "final solution."

"My honor is loyalty," he testified.⁴ "I regard the violation of an oath of loyalty as the greatest crime a man can commit. The question of conscience is a matter for the head of state, not for me." But Eichmann admitted he knew from the inception of the "final solution" that it was contrary to law.

Only in recent generations has the law of nations come firmly to reject the plea of superior orders when the orders were manifestly unlawful, and in cases of high ranking officers who could have reflected upon the legality of the orders and had available the moral choice not to obey. In this and other postwar trials, an ideology of blind obedience was on trial and was soundly condemned.

Eichmann's counsel argued that only the sovereign should be held liable for the acts of its nationals in carrying out state policy on behalf of the state. He pragmatically stressed the plight of such an individual enmeshed in the mission of his country.

³ Appeal judgment III 2, par. 1, *Adolf Eichmann, appellant v. Attorney General, respondent*, Crim. Appeal 336/61 in the Supreme Court of Israel sitting as a court of criminal appeal [hereinafter cited as appeal judgment].

⁴ Transcript 13.7.61 session 95 S1. Transcript 7.7.61, session 88 II.

"The basic principle of every state is," said Dr. Robert Servatius, "loyalty to and confidence in the leadership. The deed is dumb and obedience is blind. These are the virtues on which alone a state can build its foundations."⁵

The trial court recognized that this may be true in a totalitarian regime based upon denial of law, as in Hitler's Germany, and that in such a system the criminal is not amenable to justice until the regime falls—

"But such arguments are not to be voiced in any state in the world which bases itself on the rule of law. The attempt to turn an order for the extermination of millions of innocent people into a political act with the aim of thus exempting from their personal criminal responsibility those who gave and those who carried out the order, is of no avail. And do not let counsel for the defense console us with the promise of world government to come, when such 'acts of state' will become a thing of the past. We do not have to wait for such a radical change in the relations between nations in order to bring a criminal to judgment, according to his own personal responsibility for his acts, which is the basis of criminal judgment all over the world."⁶

Both the district court and the supreme court expressed their final answer through the penalty, and the judges of Israel declared they had but little choice in the matter. They explained that in the light of the evidence before them, they could do no less than express through the power of the court the greatest possible condemnation of the Nazi ideology and its doctrine of blind obedience, and of genocide, the most horrendous crime yet devised by man, not only as it was perpetrated in World War II but as well in the form it will assume in future holocausts. The trial court ruled:

"For the due punishment of the accused and for the deterrence of others, the maximum penalty laid down by the law has to be imposed in this case.

"Even had we found that the accused acted out of blind obedience, as he alleges, yet we would have said that one who had participated in crimes of such dimensions for years on end has to undergo the greatest punishment known to the law, and no order given to him could be a ground even for mitigating his punishment."⁷

THE APPEAL

Eichmann appealed⁸ from both the conviction and the sentence, and raised basically the same jurisdictional issues and defense

⁵ Trial Judgment, passage 216, *Attorney General v. Adolf Eichmann*, Crim. Case 40/61, Jerusalem district court [hereinafter cited as trial judgment, with passage number following].

⁶ Trial judgment 216.

⁷ Transcript 15.12.61, session 121 A2.

⁸ The appeal from the district court's decisions was filed with the highest court in the land, the Supreme Court of Israel. There is no intermediate court. Unlike in the United States and England, an appeal lies both from the verdict and the sentence. The court sits with three justices, or in important cases with five or more of the total of nine justices; five in the Eichmann appeal. The justice who presided at the trial did not sit in judgment at the appellate stage. Further evidence may be taken if the court chooses not to rely solely on the record, or it may retry the case upon application of the accused or the attorney general. Judges in Israel are appointed for life, and are guaranteed their independence by a statute which provides that they are subject only to the law.

Argument before the supreme court commenced March 22, 1962, and continued for about 1 week. The court's affirmation of the verdict and sentence was announced May 29,

pleas that were brought up at the trial. His counsel also requested permission to present further evidence; but after he made his offers of proof the supreme court denied his request and set out its reasons therefor, the final one being that such evidence could not have altered the outcome.

The supreme court fully concurred "without hesitation or reserve" in all the conclusions and reasons of the district court, "because they are fully supported by copious judicial precedents that were cited in the judgment and by substantial proof culled and abstracted out of the monumental mass of evidence produced to the court."⁹ Nevertheless, the appellate court disposed of each defense contention by either citing the pertinent portion of the district court judgment or by setting out its own answer at length.

JURISDICTION

Most interesting to lawyers was probably the question of the legal right of an Israel court to try Eichmann, but it is often difficult to disentangle the legal issues from the thorny question of what Israel should or should not have done as a matter of national policy. The wisdom of Israel's actions, aside from the jurisdictional issues, is itself a lively subject of debate in the light of the effect of these actions upon obedience to the rule of law in the future.

First it must be understood that actually there lay no challenge to jurisdiction, for courts in Israel by and large follow British procedure and precedent and have no power of judicial review as we know it in the United States. The legislature is supreme, and its clear edict providing a trial for one charged under the statute pertaining to the prosecution of Nazis must be obeyed by the courts. Should there arise a conflict between such an edict and the international law, said the district and supreme courts, under the English system the law of the forum must prevail. Nonetheless, both courts attempted further to justify their position by seeking to demonstrate that the Nazis and Nazi collaborators (punishment) law of Israel and its present application "conforms to the best traditions of the law of nations."¹⁰

CONTROVERSY OVER KIPNAPING

The forcible abduction of Adolf Eichmann was clearly a violation of positive international law, but was technically cured by action in the United Nations. Eichmann as an individual had no right to speak in international law, and all nations which had some right to demand his body waived such rights, thus leaving Israel free to pursue the conduct of its own choice within its own territory and within the framework of its own law. Once a prisoner is within the physical control of a particular court and properly charged, according to the law of almost every nation, he may be tried by that court regardless of the manner by which he was brought before it.

There are those who argue that the abduction was justified by the nature and extent of the crimes charged and by the impossibility of extradition of Nazis from Argentina; that in some extreme situations the positive law must yield to the natural and moral law.¹¹ This is akin to the natural law of self-defense. But this question is as diffi-

1962, and Eichmann immediately petitioned the President of Israel for clemency. Clemency was denied and shortly thereafter, at 11:58 p.m. on May 30, 1962, Adolf Eichmann was hanged. Within hours his body had been cremated, pursuant to his own request, and his ashes spread upon the Mediterranean.

⁹ Appeal judgment I 2, par. 5.

¹⁰ Trial judgment 11.

¹¹ Among the most eloquent: Silving, *In re Eichmann: A Dilemma of Law and Morality*, 55. *Am. J. Intl. L.* 307 (1961).

cult to resolve as it is difficult to determine in advance just when and to what extent the positive law shall yield, so as to constitute a reasonably workable rule.

Israel had strong motives in her national interest to obtain Eichmann and have him tried before none but a Jewish court, and clandestine abduction was apparently the only way of obtaining him. Although kidnapping is and has been common practice among nations as the alternative to ineffective or nonexistent channels of extradition, this was a blow to the rule of law aggravated somewhat by the fact that the violating nation has been traditionally a champion of obedience of law, a nation which now seeks to be the bastion of democracy in the Middle East and whose people have advocated "strict adherence to law for thousands of years.

Whatever sympathy lies with Israel for the crimes committed against her people and whatever moral justification there may have been, to those who firmly believe that the future of the world depends upon the ability of men and nations to lay down and follow positive rules for peaceful conduct among themselves, the bad taste of kidnapping, of achieving justice through an unlawful act, still remains.

LEGALITY VERSUS POLICY

In addition to the question of forcible abduction, the objections to the court's jurisdiction revolved primarily around indictment under the retroactive Israel statute, the Nazis and Nazi collaborators (punishment) law of 1950,¹² and the extra-territorial application of this law.

Though neither the district court nor the supreme court, under existing precedent could strike down and disregard the jurisdiction conferred by the Israel Parliament, argument to this question was heard before Eichmann pleaded to the indictment and again on appeal. As discussed *infra*, both courts declared there to be no violation of the law of nations by Israel's assumption of jurisdiction and subsequent trial.

Indeed, this seems to be so.¹³ The case is *sui generis* and the relevant rules are far from settled and in a state of change. Although there was no rule or precedent directly in point which would allow the trial, neither was there a direct prohibition, and broadly speaking, unless there is a clear rule of international law forbidding a state from pursuing a particular line of conduct, it may exercise jurisdiction within its own territory even in cases involving acts committed abroad.¹⁴

Whether Israel should have gone ahead with the trial is again a question divorced from that of jurisdiction. There was not available any international tribunal for such a trial and the creation of an *ad hoc* international court free of cold war politics and propaganda was highly unlikely. The World Court's jurisdiction does not extend to the trial of criminal cases, and the United Nations has on several occasions attempted without success to establish a permanent international criminal court of justice.

It is doubtful, moreover, that Israel under any circumstances would have given up her power to have Eichmann tried before a Jewish court sitting in the Holy Land.

RETROACTIVE LAW

Israeli courts acknowledge that the Nazis law of 1950 is both retroactive and extra-territorial in nature, but the Eichmann trial court said:

"The Israel Legislature embodied into domestic law what have long been crimes under

the laws of all civilized nations, including the German people, before and after the Nazi regime, while the law and criminal decrees of Hitler and his regime are no laws and have been set aside with retroactive effect even by the German courts themselves. It cannot be said that the perpetrators of the crimes defined in the law in question "could not have had a mens rea because they did not and could not know that what they were doing was a criminal act." On the contrary, the extensive measures taken by the Nazis to efface the traces of their crimes, such as the disinterment of the dead bodies of the murdered and their cremation into ashes, and the destruction of the Gestapo archives before the collapse of the Reich, clearly prove that the Nazis knew well the criminal character of their enormities."¹⁵

The 300-page Eichmann judgment traced the origin of the Nazis' law. It contains nearly verbatim the same description of murder, plunder, prevention of birth, uprooting of peoples, and other atrocities as found in the international law definitions of genocide and "crimes against humanity."

The court also indicated that in the development of law following World War II, several nations affected by the aggression and atrocities of the Third Reich enacted statutes similar to Israel's Nazis law.

The Hebrew maxim, "No one may be punished unless he was forewarned," and its Western counterparts, *nullum crimen sine lege* and the rule against *ex post facto* laws, constitute a generally accepted principle intended to guard against abuses of justice through retroactive legislation. It is seldom expressed as a rule of positive law, however, and is not considered a limitation upon a nation's sovereignty, but a general principle designed to prevent injustice. If no injustice is worked, then there is no violation of the principle.

"Whether or not an injustice is worked would depend on a variety of circumstances," according to Prof. Robert Woetzel, of Fordham University, in his recent "The Nuremberg Trials in International Law."¹⁶

"If the act was a heinous violation of international law; if it was recognizable as such to the individual; if he could reasonably be expected to know that it was punishable; and if he intended to do the thing he did which was in violation of his duties and obligations under international law. If all these conditions are met in a particular case, then it would not only be just to hold the individual criminally responsible for his misdeed, it would be an injustice not to do so. There could be no violation of the maxim *nullum crimen, nulla poena in such a case.*"

"There is (not) any taint of *ex post facto* in the law of murder," said the Jerusalem District Court.¹⁷

The supreme court pointed to the absence of a positive rule of international law banning criminal legislation with retroactive effect, and maintained there was no moral justification for preventing the application of such legislation to the offenses charged to Eichmann. The ethical import of the *nulla poena maxim*, ruled the high court, was not violated in this case.¹⁸

TWO SOURCES OF JURISDICTION

The State of Israel's right to try and punish Adolf Eichmann derives from two cumulative sources, according to the district court, and affirmed by the supreme court:

"A universal source (pertaining to the whole of mankind) which vests the right to prosecute and punish crimes of this order in every State within the family of nations; and a specific or national source which gives

the victim nation the right to try any who assault their existence."¹⁹

The trial court noted the World Court's advisory opinion in 1951 that the right to try an individual for a crime against humanity was universal, and could be exercised by any nation in whose custody rested an accused. Universality by its very nature, moreover, implies the extraterritorial application of penal law. The territorial principle, i.e., trial where the acts were committed, is by no means the only basis of jurisdiction; it is but a compulsory minimum.

Citing Coke, Blackstone, and precedent from the Middle Ages, the Jerusalem court described the most frequent application of the universality of a pirate by any nation which apprehended him, on the ground that he was *hostes generis humani*, an enemy of the human race. Furthermore, according to the early scholar of international law, Hugo Grotius, the apprehending state had not only a right to try one charged with violating "in extreme form" the law of nature or the law of nations, no matter where committed, but as well had a moral duty to other nations to do so. *A fortiori* with genocide.

Turning to the national source of jurisdiction, the court relied heavily upon an elementary principle expounded in 1625 by Grotius in his "De Jure Belli ac Pacis," the basic right of the victim to punish his assailant. It is a matter of historical fact, the tribunal said, that the vital interests of Israel, both before and after it achieved its sovereignty, were seriously and adversely affected by the Nazis' attempt to destroy the Jewish people, and there was without question the "linking point" between prosecutor and crime, as required by Grotius.

When defense counsel argued the absence of a linking point between the crimes and Israel, that territoriality was the only true basis of jurisdiction, and that jurisdiction lay only in the countries of Europe where the acts were committed, the trial court in reply began to use stronger and more emotional language, and indicated annoyed impatience with anyone who might fail to see the connection between Israel and the holocaust:

"In other words, 18 nations do have the right to punish the accused for the murder of Jews who reside in their territories, but the nation of those who were murdered has no right to inflict such punishment because those persons were not exterminated on its territory."²⁰

"The connection between the State of Israel and the Jewish people needs no explanation," the court said.²¹ The annihilation of European Jews had no relation to the countries in which they resided, but had as its only basis their historical and ancestral relationship with the Holy Land. And the Land of Israel has endured for thousands of years; there has been but a change of governments.

"The people is one and the crime is one. * * * To argue that there is no connection is like cutting away a tree root and branch and saying to its trunk: 'I have not hurt you.'"²²

Thus, the district court inadvertently announced one of the subtle but compelling motives of the government for holding the trial in Israel, that of asserting a sort of sovereignty, as it were, on behalf of all the Jewish people. Again citing Grotius, the court declared:

"The very existence of a people who can be murdered with impunity is in danger, to say nothing of the danger to its honor and authority. This has been the curse of dispersion and the want of sovereignty of the people of Israel, upon whom any criminal

¹² 4 Israel Laws 154 (5710-1949/50).

¹³ Leavy, "The Eichmann Trial, Report from Jerusalem," 37 Calif. B. J. 243, 257, authorities cited at note 75.

¹⁴ The Lotus Case. P.C.I.J. ser. A. No. 10, p. 18 (*France v. Turkey*, 1927).

¹⁵ Trial judgment 7.

¹⁶ Pp. 115, 116 (1960).

¹⁷ Trial judgment 27.

¹⁸ Appeal judgment I 4, 5, par. 8.

¹⁹ Trial judgment 30.

²⁰ Trial judgment 34.

²¹ *Ibid.*

²² Trial judgment 35.

could commit his outrages without fear of being punished by the people outraged."²³

DETERIORATION OF LAW

At least as interesting as the question of jurisdiction, and far more startling to me as a lawyer, was the evidence which showed the clear, consistent pattern of deterioration of legal systems and principles in each country occupied by the Nazis, commencing with Germany itself.

First was the enactment of discriminatory laws which arbitrarily deprived certain groups of basic human and property rights, and the ruthless execution of those laws as Government policy. Then came the acquiescence and capitulation of the judiciary, which by and large had prostituted itself to the Government's wishes. Members of the bar who would not then cooperate with the new order were disposed of, for there was but small need for attorneys in such a system.

The demise of court-administered justice and an established, orderly legal system signaled the rise of police power, and the pattern was set most clearly in Nazi Germany. Minister of Justice Hugh Bormann reported to Hitler in 1942 that the courts were not handling the "volume of criminals" with sufficient speed and he urged that "the police should be given free rein and thus achieve better results."²⁴

The inattention of lawyers to the criminal courts and to the administration of constitutional law gave needed encouragement to the regime in power. The first encroachments by the Government brought not an avalanche of protest from the legal profession, as we would expect in the United States, but instead hardly a trickle.

To a lawyer sitting in the Jerusalem courtroom, having been schooled in the traditions of Anglo-American constitutional law, this evidence and its implications registered with pounding force.

THE LAW MUST TEACH

Perhaps, though Eichmann's abduction at present detracted from world law, the trial itself may have been a noteworthy step toward acceptance of principles which someday may be the basis of peace and order among nations. The Eichmann court, in a major case some 16 years after the heat of war and its attendant passions have substantially subsided, reaffirmed that personal responsibility will lie with those who commit war crimes and crimes against humanity under blind obedience and as political acts in the name of national security.

Many quarrel with the soundness of this doctrine in the light of current world affairs. As with most precepts, it is not a perfect rule. It may be misused by the wrong victor. It cannot be applied against the criminal who has a powerful armed force to protect himself from apprehension; to him and his followers the principle of personal responsibility may presently be no deterrent at all.

It will never be binding upon the minds of all men, to prevent resort to force, until all men accept it as such. This indeed will take a great deal of time, much yielding of sovereignty in the interest of law and order, and constant usage of the doctrine until it is universally accepted as a matter of course.

Sovereign nations are most often reluctant to forgo their own interests in order to strengthen the rule of law, except under pressure of great world opinion, economic sanctions, or the threat of outright force. Achieving stability in law is a painfully long-term process of gradually increasing usage and acceptance. We have seen how long it required for many of the principles once laid down in the Holy Land to become written into the domestic statutes of

most nations and accepted as binding upon all.

But law in the modern age must go further than its traditional role of following the mores of the people it serves. It must undertake the role of leadership, and its jurist must continually stress and teach the rules of conduct to which the leaders of nations and all men must bind themselves for the survival of mankind.

Oliver Wendell Holmes said in 1881, "The life of the law has not been logic: it has been experience."²⁵ But the world can ill afford to await experience before accepting as binding the principles laid down at Nuremberg. It is utterly frightening to contemplate that what required Hitler several years of the bloodiest and most intense methods may now be accomplished on an even greater scale in a matter of minutes and in a most simple and unfettered manner—in fact, even by accident.

Nuclear weapons have already been used upon human beings, though probably not with specific intent to destroy an entire people, and genocide by such means in the future is far from just a remote possibility. Who knows but that it is already upon us, with the effects of radioactive fallout to be registered in future generations—but of course, lacking the element of specific intent.

Israel, as with several other nations, accepted into her domestic law the principle of personal responsibility and the injunction against genocide. It used these in a trial of great import to the world. The concepts were again tested in the Supreme Court of Israel on appeal by judges schooled in the highest standards of Anglo-American law. And we hope it will not end there; perhaps responsible courts throughout the world will follow suit in other cases which arise over the decades, thus developing more firmly into law and upon the consciences of all men the principles which offer hope to the future of man. Said the Jerusalem District Court:

"Perhaps it is not a vain hope that the more this conviction becomes rooted in the minds of men, the more they will refrain from following criminal leaders, and the rule of law and order in the relations between nations will be strengthened accordingly."²⁶

RECORD OF ACCOMPLISHMENTS OF THE 87TH CONGRESS

Mr. HAGAN of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. FINNEGAN] 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 Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. FINNEGAN. Mr. Speaker, because I know of the continued interest of the constituents of my district in all of the accomplishments of Congress, I take this opportunity of reporting to them.

From the time that I raised my right hand and repeated the oath of office as given to me by the late beloved Speaker, Sam Rayburn, I have conscientiously tried to discharge my duties in the national interest and in the interest of my constituents.

Of necessity the itemization by public laws is fragmentary. No attempt is made here to set out in detail all of the elements and provisions in each piece of legislation. However, my office, as always, holds itself available to provide

any reasonable requests for the laws or explanations of them. We welcome your interest and will try to fill all demands, if at all possible.

NATIONAL ECONOMY

The 87th Congress was a memorable one. We gathered in Washington on January 3, 1961, when the country was in the midst of a recession. Unemployment was high and the economy was stagnant. The voters of the United States had just elected a vigorous young man who had promised to get this country moving again. Almost 2 years later we are adjourning with a record of accomplishments that is very indicative of the temper of the times. In some areas we have made great advances with progressive legislation, in other areas a conservative mood is predominant.

In both sessions of the 87th Congress many steps were taken to stimulate the economy. Not only was it necessary to bring it back from the recession depths of January 1961, but in the last weeks of the second session additional measures were asked for by the President to forestall another downturn.

Some major legislation enacted dealing with these problems were:

Public Law 87-6: Authorized \$928 million temporary program to provide 13 weeks additional unemployment compensation up to June 30, 1962, for jobless whose payments expire.

Public Law 87-7: Applied similar benefits to unemployed railroad workers under the Railroad Unemployment Insurance Act.

Public Law 87-27: Established Area Redevelopment Administration in Department of Commerce; authorized \$300 million loans and \$94 million grants for industrial plants and public facilities in areas of economic distress, provides for technical assistance, vocational rehabilitation, and subsistence grants for persons undergoing retraining, the program ending June 30, 1965.

Public Law 87-30: Increased \$1 minimum wage to \$1.25 an hour, extended coverage to 3.5 million additional workers by gradual wage step-ups, and amended Fair Labor Standards Act.

Public Law 87-31: Authorized temporary grants to States to finance inclusion of dependent children of unemployed under Federal-State assistance program for 15 months to June 1, 1962.

Public Law 87-61: Authorized additional \$11.5 billion for completion of Interstate and Defense Highway System as scheduled by 1972, and to bring Federal apportionments for primary, secondary and urban programs, from \$925 million to \$1 billion annually; fixed Federal gas and diesel tax at 4 cents per gallon, raised levies on tires, tubes, retread rubber and on heavy trucks and buses.

Public Law 87-196: Directed Securities and Exchange Commission to investigate adequacy of rules and regulations of stock exchanges.

Public Law 87-255: Extended construction aid under the Airport Act for 3 years to June 30, 1964; authorized \$225 million for grants on a matching basis at the rate of \$75 million a year.

Public Law 87-415: Authorized \$435 million, 3-year program of training of unemployed in vocational schools, or on-

²³ Ibid.

²⁴ Transcript 28.4.61, session W1.

²⁵ The Common Law, p. 1.

²⁶ Trial judgment 220.

the-job retraining, to develop new skills, the first 2 years' cost to be paid by the Federal Government, the third year 50-50 with the States.

Public Law 87-624: Authorized creation of a commercial corporation, owned 50-50 by the public and the communication industry to establish and operate a communications satellite system under regulation of the FCC, in cooperation with NASA; three members of the board of directors to be appointed by the President.

Public Law 87-658: Was designed to combat the persistent high level of unemployment in those areas bypassed by general economic recovery and to stimulate the economy through the construction of needed public works. It authorized the appropriation of \$900 million to undertake and accelerate Federal public works and for matching grants for local projects.

H.R. 10650: Amended the Internal Revenue Code to provide a tax credit for investment in new equipment; reduced deductions for business expenses and increased taxes on income earned by American wholly owned subsidiaries abroad.

INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS

In this field of international relations some noteworthy legislation was passed:

Public Law 87-794: The Trade Expansion Act of 1962, empowers the President, subject to safeguard provisions, to cut duties on imports by agreements with other nations over a 5-year period by 50 percent, and gives him special authority to reduce tariffs up to 100 percent on those items in which the United States and the European Common Market together account for 80 percent of the free world trade.

The act is of particular importance to Illinois as our growth in exports has made us the leading State in the Union in this category. Expanded world trade will help favorably the more than 600 companies in Illinois, most of them in the Chicago area, whose exports exceed \$25,000 per year and who employ 450,000 of a total of approximately 1,140,000 manufacturing workers in the State.

Public Law 87-297: Established a U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency to operate under guidance of the President and the Secretary of State—a good move toward turning the arms race into a "peace race."

Public Law 87-293 and Public Law 87-442: Established and expanded the Peace Corps as an independent agency subject to policy guidance by the State Department.

Public Law 87-731: Authorized loans up to total of \$100 million by the United States to the U.N. based on matching combined subscriptions of all other countries.

Public Law 87-195: Authorized \$4.2 billion for 1962 program of loans and grants for foreign economic aid and development, military assistance and support, and contributions to international programs; provided for 5-year programming of development loans.

Public Law 87-565: Authorized \$4.6 billion foreign assistance program for 1963, including military support funds, development loans and grants, and pro-

grams for Latin America at \$600 million a year through 1966.

Public Law 87-92: Extended indefinitely the President's authority to use surplus farm products to aid the people and economy of underdeveloped nations and permits broadened programs.

Public Law 87-256: Consolidated and broadened programs of educational and cultural exchange of persons between the United States and other countries.

Public Law 87-132: Reduced from \$500 to \$100 value of goods returning Americans may bring back duty free from abroad.

Public Law 87-63: Established a U.S. Travel Service in the Department of Commerce to promote and encourage travel from abroad.

House Concurrent Resolution 226: Expressed the sense of Congress that the OAS reevaluate the role of Cuba in inter-American affairs and take such steps as it deems necessary toward imposition of sanctions under the Inter-American Treaty of Reciprocal Assistance.

SOCIAL SECURITY, HEALTH AND WELFARE

Public Law 87-64 and Public Law 87-285: Raised minimum monthly old-age insurance payments under Social Security Act from \$33 to \$40, increased benefits to widows and provided male workers may draw reduced benefits upon retirement at age 62, liberalized disability provisions while increasing tax for workers and employers by one-eighth of 1 percent each.

Public Law 87-543: Amended Social Security Act so as to reduce public assistance rolls, by providing grants to States that establish work programs for needy, increasing U.S. share of administrative costs, extending for 5 years payments to families of unemployed fathers and other needy children, and raising by \$4 per month the ceiling on Federal matching grants for aged, blind, and disabled.

Public Law 87-420: Amended Welfare and Pension Plans Disclosure Act of 1958 by providing Secretary of Labor with powers of enforcement, to establish regulations and interpret the statute.

S. 1552: Provided for stricter regulation of drug industry and of the distribution of new drugs.

H.R. 10541: Authorized 3-year, \$36 million program of grants to aid States and communities in carrying out mass vaccination programs against polio, diphtheria, whooping cough, and tetanus.

H.R. 11665: Revised formula for apportioning cash assistance funds among the States under the National School Lunch Act.

Public Law 87-22: Extended for 4 years to June 30, 1965, \$5 million a year program for grants and scholarships for the training of practical nurses under Vocational Education Act of 1946.

Public Law 87-529: Amended the Federal Communications Act to give FCC authority to require all newly manufactured TV sets to be equipped to receive all UHF and VHF channels.

Public Law 87-447: Authorized matching Federal grants up to \$1 million for any State to purchase TV transmission equipment for educational purposes, providing the State or sponsoring agency

furnish the land, buildings, and guarantee to operate and maintain the channel.

GENERAL LEGISLATION

Public Law 87-36: Created 63 additional U.S. district court judgeships and 10 in circuit courts to meet increasing caseloads.

Public Law 87-368: Authorized FBI to pursue across State lines any fugitive accused of an offense punishable by more than 1 year in prison.

Public Law 87-216: Prohibited and fixed the penalty for interstate transportation of wagering paraphernalia.

Public Law 87-228: Prohibited and fixed the penalty for interstate and foreign travel, or use of the mails, for the purpose of unlawful activity.

House Document 372: Reorganization Plan No. 2, 1962. Established Office of Science and Technology in the Executive Office of the President to coordinate all Federal functions in this field.

Senate Joint Resolution 29: Proposed a constitutional amendment to prohibit poll taxes.

Public Law 87-264: Extended the life of the President's Civil Rights Commission for 2 years to September 30, 1963.

Public Law 87-128: Cut wheat acreage 10 percent for the 1961-62 crop year, offered payment for additional reductions and price support averaging \$2 per bushel, continued present program of voluntary acreage cuts for feed grains, including barley, and fixed minimum price support at 65 percent while extending surplus disposal program.

H.R. 12391: Extended through the 1963 crop year a 10-percent cut in wheat acreage, offering payments for additional voluntary reductions; continued optional cuts and price support for corn, grain sorghums, and barley; and provided payments for dairy farmers who cut milk production.

Public Law 87-5: Provided for a 1-year voluntary cut in acreage and crops of feed grains; increased price-support payments to participants for corn, grain sorghums, and other feed grains and soybeans.

Public Law 87-28: Authorized the disposal of additional \$2 billion in surplus commodities under provisions of the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act.

Public Law 87-127: Authorized the distribution of feed at reduced price to livestock farmers suffering hardship from drought.

Public Law 87-198: Increased temporarily by \$20 million, to \$595 million, the amount available to Small Business Administration for regular business loans.

Public Law 87-305: Increased by \$105 million, to \$1.1 billion, the total borrowing authority of Small Business Administration, including \$725 million for regular business loans.

Public Law 87-341: Raised the limit on amounts Small Business Administration may lend small business investment corporations and on latter's investments in individual enterprises.

Public Law 87-550: Increased the lending authority of Small Business Administration for business loans and disaster loans to a combined total of \$1.09

billion, investment company loans from \$325 million to \$341 million, authorized loans to firms in need of assistance under Trade Expansion Act.

VETERANS AND SERVICEMEN

Public Law 87-84, H.R. 5723: Extended direct and guaranteed home loan programs for World War II veterans to July 26, 1967, and for Korean conflict veterans to February 1, 1975; authorized \$1.2 billion for direct loan program through fiscal year 1965.

Public Law 87-233, H.R. 4539: Authorized the payment of \$60 million special dividend to eligible policyholders of national service life insurance.

Public Law 87-268, H.R. 6969: Increased payments to veterans' widows.

Public Law 87-138, H.R. 845: Increased to \$100 per month special pensions to holders of Congressional Medal of Honor.

Public Law 87-3, S. 1173: Restored rank of General of the Army (five stars) to former President Eisenhower.

Public Law 87-583, S. 3109: Authorized VA hospital and medical care for peacetime veterans for noncompensable service-connected disabilities.

Public Law 87-645, H.R. 10743: Increased by average of 9.4 percent rates of compensation for service-connected disability paid to 1.9 million veterans.

Public Law 87-531, H.R. 11221: Increased basic allowance for living quarters for members of Armed Forces.

H.R. 852: Provided for review by independent medical experts of disputed disability or death claims of veterans. Passed both Houses.

COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY

As a member of the Banking and Currency Committee and the Subcommittee on Housing, I have particular interest in legislation that has proceeded through our committee and been enacted into law. Since the House of Representatives is so large and cumbersome most of the important work is done within the committees of the House where proposed legislation receives open hearings and can be more thoroughly studied and debated than before the full House. For this reason, I am more intimately connected with the drafting and enacting of the following measures which originated in my committees.

Public Law 87-311: Authorized the Export-Import Bank to guarantee and insure U.S. exporters and importers against political and credit risks of loss in foreign countries.

Public Law 87-490: Authorized United States to lend up to \$2 billion to International Monetary Fund as part of a \$6 billion program by 10 nations to strengthen world currencies and uphold the dollar.

Public Law 87-506: Extended for 2 years to June 30, 1964, authority of Federal Reserve Board to buy up to \$5 billion in U.S. securities directly from the Treasury.

Public Law 87-588: Authorized the Federal Reserve Board to permit foreign branches of American national banks to adopt practices of country where bank is located.

Public Law 87-717: Increased to 70 percent of deposits amount national banks may lend on real estate; extended maturity of construction loans.

Public Law 87-185: Approved an amendment to the agreement of the International Finance Corporation authorizing it to invest in common stocks.

Public Law 87-42: Authorized the President to award posthumously a medal to Dr. Thomas A. Dooley for his humanitarian services abroad.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON HOUSING

Public Law 87-70: Authorized 4 to 5 years \$4.9 billion housing programs for: Low and moderate income families on liberalized terms; urban renewal; open spaces development in cities; college dormitory construction loans; 100,000 new units of public housing; community facilities. Extended farm housing program, increased funds for housing for the aged, and provided for loans to cities to acquire mass transportation facilities.

Public Law 87-38: Provided interim \$1 billion increase in Federal Housing Administration mortgage insurance authority.

Public Law 87-395: Expanded and extended programs of Federal grants to States and communities for: Construction of nursing homes, training of public health personnel, and studies to improve services for aged outside hospitals.

Public Law 87-723: Provided for low and moderate cost housing for elderly in urban and rural areas; authorized \$200 million for loan funds for new construction and other programs.

This listing of many of the most important measures that received congressional approval is by no means complete, but I hope it will give you an idea of the wide variety of legislation dealt with by this Congress and how it directly affects you and your family.

Of course, there were many more bills enacted into law that were of equal importance to many persons. These include the hundreds of minor bills and private bills that affect specific situations or individuals.

It has been my privilege to introduce many such bills, the greater majority concerning immigration matters. Because our early immigration laws have followed the restrictive national-origins theory they have been discriminatory in many instances. We have managed to liberalize some of these restrictive policies in this Congress, and I hope we shall do much more next year. We have enacted Public Law 87-301, which established permanent authority for admission of alien orphans to the United States for the purpose of adoption; and provides for judicial review of deportation orders and otherwise amends the Immigration and Nationality Act, and we have removed from the waiting lists and permitted entry as nonquota those who have been registered in countries abroad for a period of 10 years.

All in all, Mr. Speaker, the legislative record of the 87th Congress is a good one, a progressive one, and one in which I am proud to have taken part. As I look over the past 2 years what is perhaps of more personal satisfaction to

me are the individual services I have been able to perform for my constituents and friends back home. We have received and answered inquiries, requests, and correspondence numbering in the thousands. We have given individual attention to those with problems relating to such Federal matters as social security, veteran and military cases, post office matters and many others. We inaugurated a questionnaire to better determine the feelings of our constituents on important legislative matters before the Congress. We issue periodic newsletters and reports to a mailing list now composed of over 75,000 registered voters, and we are most fortunate to act as hosts to the hundreds of visitors who annually visit our Washington office and take advantage of the facilities available to them.

This is the record on which I go to the people on November 6; and I hope it meets with their approval.

ACTION NEEDED TO REGAIN INITIATIVE IN WESTERN HEMISPHERE

Mr. HAGAN of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. SELDEN] 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 Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. SELDEN. Mr. Speaker, on Monday evening, October 8, 1962, I had the privilege of addressing the Florida Retail Federation at its annual meeting which was held at the Lago Mar Hotel in Fort Lauderdale, Fla. The text of my address, which follows, deals with the continuing Cuban crisis:

In a few days the 87th Congress will be history. Some will remember this Congress for its legislative accomplishments, others for its legislative shortcomings. In my own case, as chairman of the House Inter-American Affairs Subcommittee, I will look back on the 87th Congress as the Congress which recognized and warned the American people of the growing Communist threat to our hemisphere.

Whatever the final assessment of this past Congress—at the polls in November or at the hands of future historians—let the record speak clearly on that one point: its Members have been alert to the menace of Fidel Castro's Cuba and they have reflected the American people's rising concern over the establishment of a Communist fortress 90 miles from our shores.

The able Congressman from this district, my colleague, PAUL ROGERS, has been a leading spokesman on this subject as has his neighbor to the south, Congressman DANTE FASCELL. As an example, only last week, in the final days of the session, Congressman ROGERS took the lead in a successful effort to keep vessels which carry military cargoes to Cuba from using U.S. ports. On almost every occasion that I have spoken on this subject on the floor of the House of Representatives these two able Members have given me unqualified support. As a matter of fact, your entire Florida delegation has worked tirelessly to intensify this country's efforts to eliminate communism from our hemisphere.

But Congress, as we know, has neither the ultimate power nor the final responsibility for the conduct of foreign policy. That power

and responsibility lies with the executive branch of Government. Congress can warn—Congress can implore—Congress can make its feelings and the feelings of its constituents known—but the final direction of American foreign policy lies with the President of the United States.

As an American and as a Member of Congress—not as a political partisan—I was critical of the Eisenhower administration's seeming complacency about the Castro menace to Latin America. During the 87th Congress, which convened in January 1961, I have been no less critical of our Democratic administration for its mistakes in Latin American policy.

To be sure, neither political party is free to cast stones over our present dilemma in Cuba and throughout Latin America.

Republicans who criticize the Kennedy administration's record on Castro would do well to remember that the Castro regime is an unwanted legacy from the Eisenhower administration and that the critical Latin American area was virtually ignored during the 8 years President Eisenhower was in office.

At the same time, Democrats who in 1960 criticized the Eisenhower administration's record on Castro might well consider the failure of the Kennedy administration thus far to remove the threat of Castro and communism from the hemisphere.

But partisanship—unfortunate as it may be when concerned with foreign policy—is not the fundamental source of our difficulties in Latin America. No one doubts that Democrats and Republicans alike would come together in mutual praise of a President who eliminated the threat of communism from our hemisphere.

The recent resolution passed by the Congress, in the wake of Soviet shipments of arms and military personnel to Cuba, demonstrates the essential unity of the country on this point. In brief, that resolution expressed congressional support of the President in whatever action he takes to meet this latest Soviet challenge to our hemispheric security.

No, if we have faltered in Latin America, let no one say that national disunity is the cause. On the basic point that communism must not be allowed a foothold in the Western Hemisphere, all Americans agree.

But although the country is united against the Communist threat to our hemisphere, we continue to lose ground in Latin America. This grim state of affairs frustrates our own people, and it mystifies our friends.

We are a rich nation, the richest in the world. We are a powerful nation, the most powerful in the world. And where Latin America is concerned, we are confronting our Communist adversaries on a cold war battlefield we know and understand through years of cultural and political ties.

Why then does the United States—rich, powerful, and determined to oppose communism in its own hemisphere—fail in this mission?

I submit that the erosion of U.S. power and prestige in Latin America is not the result of an inevitable historical tide, as the Communists would have the world believe.

I submit that we can cleanse our hemisphere of the cancer of Castro and communism if we first clear our minds of the cobwebs of illusion. For the bitter truth is that Khrushchev's success in Cuba has been possible only because of our own failure to see clearly our national and hemispheric responsibilities.

What steps can be taken to reverse the ominous trend of recent events in our hemisphere? First, we must examine the myths and illusions which form the basis of policy toward the Castro regime.

Illusion No. 1, of course, is that the threat posed by Castro's Cuba is minor. That this

illusion serves as a foundation for our Latin American policy is pointed up by a recent statement of Under Secretary of State George Ball.

"Our policy toward Cuba," declared Mr. Ball, "is based upon the assessment that it does not today constitute a military threat to the United States."

That is one illusion on which our policy toward Castro's Cuba has been based. Now hear this conclusion from a report of a special subcommittee of the House Armed Services Committee:

"In addition we must now concede an in-flight refueling capability for long-range Soviet aircraft, with reasonable assurance that Cuba, as well as some other possible areas to the south, would be available as staging areas for in-flight refueling of Soviet bombers.

"No one can now successfully contend," continues the committee report, "that the sole threat of Soviet attack by aircraft or air-breathing missiles is limited to the northern approach.

"The threat is now total and our defensive capability must be adjusted to meet it."

So much for the contention that a hostile Cuba, occupied by Soviet military personnel and possessing Soviet military hardware, does not constitute a threat to our security. Yet this contention forms the basis for present U.S. policy and planning regarding Cuba—according to no less an authority than the Under Secretary of State.

Illusion No. 2 is that the Castro regime, if economically isolated in the hemisphere, will collapse of its own weight. This illusion served as the fundamental thesis of U.S. Cuban policy in the period preceding recent Soviet shipments to the island.

It should be clear to all that the Kremlin views its Cuban satellite as an invaluable cold war base, both militarily and politically. The Castro regime is now being supported and maintained by its Soviet masters—and the Kremlin will invest whatever is needed to keep this Communist foothold in the Americas.

Khrushchev can be expected to reinforce the Castro regime's iron grip on the Cuban people with some amount of economic aid—and with an ever-increasing amount of military aid. The Castro government cannot fall of its own weight because it is not standing on its own feet. The source of its power lies not with the people of Cuba, but with the weapons supplied by the Soviet Union.

This leads directly to illusion No. 3: We are asked to believe that because Cuban military weaponry is quote—defensive—unquote, Castro poses no revolutionary threat to other Latin American nations.

But neither Fidel Castro nor his Kremlin advisors are foolish enough to attempt to export communism in the Americas by means of overt military aggression. Their chief hope of exporting communism throughout the hemisphere is not military aggression, but political subversion.

Cuba today serves as a base for possible future military operations against the United States—and as a base for current subversive operations against other governments in the hemisphere. The training of agents and the establishment of subversive networks to foment revolution throughout Latin America is a primary aim of the Castro regime.

Yet a fourth illusion leading to our present hemispheric crisis relates to our economic programs to raise the living standards of the hemisphere. The long-range purpose of the most extensive of these programs—the Alliance for Progress—is to remove the basic economic cause for the cancer of communism.

Let me be clear on this point. The Alliance for Progress is real and it offers our best hope for the prosperity and security of our hemisphere in the years ahead. But the

illusion fostered by some policy planners is that the Alliance is an adequate answer to the immediate threat of Castro's aggressive, subversive activities in the Americas.

The fact is that so long as the Castro regime operates in Cuba, it will serve to thwart and block the success of the Alliance for Progress. We cannot cure the cancer without first eliminating its primary source. If the Alliance is to be provided a fair opportunity to operate, Castro's immediate threat to hemispheric security must be eradicated.

Our aspirations are long range—but the enemy's threat is immediate. Economic aid alone cannot withstand the insidious assault of communism in Latin America today. But economic aid coupled with a firm military policy can and will defeat the Khrushchev-Castro plans for our hemisphere.

So much for the greater illusions upon which our Latin American policy has been launched—and has foundered—in recent years. Each and all of these myths, you will observe, argue the same conclusion: That the best, if not the only course for the United States regarding Cuba is—to do nothing at all.

Once again, shocked though the American people have been by the physical presence of Russian military personnel in our own Caribbean, we are asked to drift and wait. Wait and see. This is the sum and substance of the policies nurtured by the illusions of our policy planners.

But now there are indications that our people are not content to sit back and await the next shock—the fall of another Latin American government to Castroism or the alliance of Castro Cuba to the Warsaw Pact. Indeed, as the President himself and Secretary Rusk have warned the Soviets in times past, our patience is not inexhaustible.

The patience of the American people has in fact been exhausted. It only remains for their leaders to understand and appreciate the meaning of the rising clamor for action—and action now—to regain the initiative in our own hemisphere.

We then return to the question, What kind of action is needed to reverse the ominous trend of recent events in our hemisphere?

To begin, let me express the opinion that we cannot expect to bring down the Castro regime by the sheer weight of the various proclamations, declarations, and resolutions approved by the Congress, the Organization of American States, and our own Department of State. Words alone cannot free Cuba from the Communist grip.

At the same time, we cannot completely discount the strength of political and economic pressure when it is exerted by the various nations of the hemisphere. As a member of the congressional delegation which attended the inter-American Foreign Ministers meeting early this year, I can state that the unified political and economic pressure brought to bear at Punta del Este has taken its toll of Castro's strength in Cuba.

Further, let us not overlook the fact that the significant inter-American agreements, notably the Declaration of Rio, the Bogotá Pact, and the policy agreement at Punta del Este, form a legal and juridical basis for whatever action is needed to bring down the Castro government.

The hemisphere's political and economic pressure against Castro's Cuba must be maintained. Yet we are far enough down the road to recognize that the ultimate burden for action against Castro is upon the shoulders of the United States. We welcome the moral and material assistance of other freedom-loving countries of the hemisphere—but in the final analysis, we must be prepared to move unilaterally if necessary to defend our own national security.

The day may come when our country must take upon itself the sole responsibility for maintaining our hemisphere's integrity.

But we may continue to hope for an alternative solution and for unified inter-American action against Communist encroachment.

In this regard, we may be encouraged by the new-found unanimity of opinion regarding the threat of Castroism which was displayed last week at the inter-American Foreign Ministers' meeting in Washington.

What then are our choices? First, let me make it clear that I do not consider our choices limited to either sending in U.S. troops or doing nothing at all to dislodge communism from its Cuban base.

No; there are alternative solutions and they are obvious enough if our policy planners will but open their eyes to see them. Let us consider our greatest potential resource in the battle to free Cuba—the Cuban people themselves. Obviously they cannot do the job alone and must depend on a major effort on our part to assist them. But the ultimate liberation of Cuba can be greatly accelerated if freedom-loving Cubans are provided the means and the support necessary to strike at their oppressors.

The time is long overdue for this country to provide active support and recognition to a government of free Cuba. The recent Soviet actions in Cuba only strengthen the argument that the Castro government no longer is a legitimate instrument of the Cuban peoples' will, but is in fact only an instrument of Soviet policy.

Let us then recognize a Cuban government-in-exile, whatever the difficulties involved, as the first step toward regaining the initiative in the battle against communism in our hemisphere. And let us then make clear our intention and purpose to aid, support, and equip such a government in its own battle against communism in its homeland.

By all means, let us have an end to the policy of hampering and discouraging the Cuban people and freedom-loving peoples throughout the hemisphere in their efforts to combat the Castro regime.

Indeed, this country does have a neutrality act. But let there be no misunderstanding that in any struggle between the forces of freedom and the forces of tyranny in the Western Hemisphere the United States will sit on its hands.

Encouraging, organizing, and equipping the forces of free Cuba is only one step toward regaining the initiative in our hemisphere, however. We must also act boldly and firmly to draw a line against the presence of Soviet personnel in Cuba.

Let the warning be given to Khrushchev that we are supporting a free Cuban government and that he risks the loss of Soviet lives by maintaining military personnel on the island. And let there be no hesitation on our part out of fear that the Kremlin's strategists will use our action to justify a move against Berlin or any other free world base in Europe or the Middle East.

Anyone familiar with the history of the cold war must certainly know by now that if the Soviets were ready and able to move against Berlin or any other outpost of the free world, they would not need or await an excuse to take aggressive action.

Conceded there are risks involved in such a course of action but we must realize that the world we live in is one where risks cannot be avoided if we are to extend or even maintain the boundaries of freedom. Recent history demonstrated that the greater risk lies in doing nothing at all.

This Nation is committed irrevocably to the cause of freedom in the Americas. This Nation is committed irrevocably to the struggle against tyranny in the Americas. Recognition and support of a free Cuban government and the barring of Soviet military forces from Cuba are but the beginnings of a policy of action aimed at honoring our commitments.

Fidel Castro knows—as do his Soviet mentors, that once the people of the United States determine to make such a beginning, there can be but one ending. And that ending is the final liberation of Cuba from the yoke of Communist tyranny.

DEDICATED SENATE SERVICE OF BENJAMIN A. SMITH II, OF MASSACHUSETTS

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, I do not think it proper for the 87th Congress to adjourn sine die without my taking the floor to pay tribute to my good friend and colleague in the Massachusetts delegation in Congress, Senator BENJAMIN A. SMITH II, who has served the Commonwealth with dignity and distinction and followed in the footsteps of another great Senator from our State, our own President John F. Kennedy.

Senator BEN SMITH has made innumerable contributions to the welfare of his people, his country, and his beloved State during the 87th Congress. Only a man possessing his remarkable ability, astuteness, and acuity could enter that august Senate Chamber as a junior Member and demonstrate so quickly such an amazing mental grasp of how that body does its work, illustrate such profound understanding of the legislative work to be done, and show such initiative in helping to get this work underway.

Those of us who have worked closely with Senator BEN SMITH, and his Senate colleagues, can attest to the quality of his contribution to the gigantic task of studying and formulating new legislation, and of persuading fellow Members of its value. He served on three extremely busy Senate committees, those of Labor and Public Welfare, the Committee on Public Works, and the District of Columbia Committee. His work on these committees was notable.

BEN SMITH, the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts, will always be remembered as cosponsor of one of the most important pieces of New Frontier legislation in the 87th Congress—the Area Redevelopment Act. Not only did he drop the bill into the hopper, but he worked actively in the Halls of Congress giving life to a piece of legislation that he eventually saw signed into law by his longtime personal friend, President Kennedy. Senator SMITH's statesmanship was displayed in his championship of this act, which exemplifies the kind of assistance the Federal Government ought to offer, when necessary, to private enterprise and to municipalities.

The junior Senator from Massachusetts was also an active and articulate proponent of the new minimum wage law, and was, as a member of the Labor and Public Welfare Committee, a member of the conference with the House which determined the final form of the bill.

Mr. Speaker, I was particularly proud to have Senator SMITH join with me, and with Senator LEVERETT SALTONSTALL, in cosponsoring the Cape Cod National Seashore Park bill. I had first sponsored this bill jointly with my colleague, Congressman THOMAS P. O'NEILL, of Massa-

chusetts, back in May of 1958, and we were later joined on the Senate side by both Senator SALTONSTALL and the then Senator John F. Kennedy. Following his appointment to the Senate from Massachusetts to succeed President Kennedy in that seat, Senator SMITH immediately conferred with me and the distinguished Congressman representing the Cape Cod area, the Honorable HASTINGS KEITH, and joined in cosponsoring the legislation which led to the establishment of this great national seashore park so that the natural beauty of Cape Cod can be preserved in perpetuity for all Americans.

Senator BEN SMITH's service to the United States, to Massachusetts, and to the legislative branch of Government deserves our recognition. He is a dedicated U.S. Senator. He is not with us today on Capitol Hill, because President Kennedy has sent him on a special mission, with the rank of ambassador, as the special representative of the President, to the celebration of the independence of Uganda as a Republic in East Africa. But I believe I speak for all of the members of the Massachusetts delegation and his friends here on the House side when I express the hope that the country will continue to have the benefit of BEN SMITH's intelligence and devotion in the future, as we have in the past with his outstanding Senate service.

Mr. Speaker, I think that my colleagues will be interested in reading an excellent article on Senator SMITH which appeared in the Springfield Daily News last Monday, October 8, and, under unanimous consent, I include it with my remarks:

FOR SERVICES RENDERED—RETIRING SENATOR BEN SMITH READY FOR NEW CAREER—SPECIAL AMBASSADOR TO UGANDA INDEPENDENCE CELEBRATION CAN CHOOSE HIS OWN JOB

WASHINGTON, D.C.—When Senator BENJAMIN A. SMITH 2d, Democrat, of Massachusetts, walked from his office on Friday, he was closing out one public career, beginning another, and had prospects of still a third in the future.

The boyish-looking junior Senator from the Bay State was ringing down the curtain on his brief but successful career in the U.S. Senate.

REPRESENTS J.F.K.

And he was on his way as the personal representative of the President, with the rank of ambassador, to the celebration observing the independence of Uganda as a republic of Africa.

"I feel honored to carry the best wishes of President Kennedy to this new nation," said SMITH. "Of course I will add my own for the success and good fortune for the people of Uganda."

GOOD WILL AMBASSADOR

SMITH will take on some of the duties of a general good will Ambassador at Large on the trip. As he and Mrs. Smith and State Department attachés flew out of Washington Friday night, their schedule called for an initial stopover at Rome on Saturday and the flight to Uganda yesterday.

He will meet with the Duke and Duchess of Kent at the 3-day independence celebration and deliver special gifts from the United States.

President Kennedy has sent an engraved desk set to Prime Minister Milton Obote. Already arrived are four mobile gifts from the United States—veterinary, library, and audiovisual units, and a combination library

and audiovisual unit. Following the public ceremonies, SMITH and the American delegation are to spend several days in the scenic national parks of Uganda.

TO BE ROYAL ESCORT

On the way home next weekend, they are to stop at Tripoli where they will escort Hasan al-Rida al-Sanusi, Libyan Crown Prince, to Washington on an official state visit.

Almost the forgotten man in the Eddie-Teddy battle and in the current Kennedy-Lodge contest for the Senate seat he will vacate, SMITH was considered a natural choice to represent the United States at Uganda.

"He carries the image of youthful government leaders both here and in Africa," said one Senate colleague. "He had the vigor of the New Frontier in his Senate activities."

JOB WAITING FOR HIM

Now just 46, SMITH says he has no plans to cut down on this vigor for public activities. For the record, he said he plans to return to private business in Gloucester, but unofficially reports circulating in the Capital are that President Kennedy will find ample use for him in his administration.

One news magazine has reported that SMITH may have a blank check to choose his own job with the Government.

"I personally feel good about my 2 years in the Senate," he said.

HAS FOND MEMORIES

Most outstanding in his memory are the conferences he arranged and attended for city and county officials of Massachusetts with Government officers.

"They seem to have drawn the cities, State, and Federal governments closer together. We now understand each other's problems and can work toward solving them."

Like most fellow Democrats in the House and Senate, SMITH, too, looks upon the administration's trade bill and Peace Corps as two milestones in the country's legislative history.

Biggest disappointment were the defeats of medicare and the aid-to-education bills.

"They are matters that Congress must still face up to someday," he said.

"There is still much work to be done for the fisheries and boatmen of Massachusetts," SMITH said, "but I think we're on the way toward getting organized."

Leaving his fourth-floor office in the Old Senate Office Building, SMITH for the moment was walking out on a bit of New England transplanted to Washington.

Walls of the office were splashed with colorful posters of Nantucket, Cape Cod, and other scenic sites of the Commonwealth. The mantel over the fireplace in his office was decorated with a model of a Gloucester fishing schooner, two fishermen's lights and models of the nuclear powered destroyer *Long Beach* built at the Fall River yard.

Off in a corner, almost hidden, was something not expected in an outpost of the New Frontier. It was a single golf putter—a prominent symbol of the former Republican administration.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. DOYLE (at the request of Mr. DANIELS), for the balance of the session on account of official business.

Mr. WILLIAMS, for today, on account of illness in the family.

Mrs. RILEY (at the request of Mr. McMILLAN), for an indefinite period, on account of official business (for Committee on Science and Astronautics).

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. LIBONATI, for 1 hour, today, to revise and extend his remarks and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. CRAMER, for one-half hour, today.

Mr. VANIK, for 10 minutes, on tomorrow.

Mr. ASHBROOK, for 60 minutes, today.

Mrs. POST, for 30 minutes, today.

Mr. STAGGERS, for 10 minutes, on each of two subjects, today, and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mrs. ST. GEORGE, for 30 minutes, tomorrow, Thursday, October 11, 1962.

Mrs. BOLTON, for 30 minutes, tomorrow.

Mr. LANGEN, for 30 minutes, on October 11.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mr. BENNETT of Florida and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. ZABLOCKI and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. DEROUNIAN and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. HOSMER and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. DENT.
(The following Members (at the request of Mr. LANGEN) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. AVERY in two instances.

Mr. LINDSAY.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. HAGAN of Georgia) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. MORRIS.

Mr. EVINS in two instances.

Mr. SHELLEY.

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.J. Res. 712. Joint resolution to direct the Franklin Delano Roosevelt Commission to consider possible changes in the winning design for the proposed memorial or the selection of a new design for such memorial;

H.R. 7283. An act to amend the War Claims Act of 1948, as amended, to provide compensation for certain World War II losses;

H.R. 8938. An act to provide a more definitive tariff classification description for lightweight bicycles;

H.R. 10650. An act to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide a credit for investment in certain depreciable property, to eliminate certain defects and inequities, and for other purposes; and

H.R. 13175. An act making appropriations for foreign aid and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1963, and for other purposes.

BILLS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. BURLESON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee did on October 9, 1962, present to the President, for his approval, bills of the House of the following titles:

H.R. 10931. An act to revise and codify the general and permanent laws relating to and in force in the Canal Zone and to enact the Canal Zone Code, and for other purposes;

H.R. 11970. An act 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; and

H.R. 13241. An act to amend section 309 of the Food and Agriculture Act of 1962.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. HAGAN of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 7 o'clock and 24 minutes p.m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, October 11, 1962, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

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

2622. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, U.S. Department of Justice, transmitting copies of orders entered in cases where the authority contained in section 212(d)(3) of the Immigration and Nationality Act was exercised in behalf of such aliens, pursuant to the Immigration and Nationality Act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2623. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on the review of the cranberry indemnity payment program administered by the Agricultural Marketing Service, Department of Agriculture; 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. SMITH of Virginia: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 832. Resolution taking H.R. 13278 from the Speaker's table and sending it to conference; without amendment (Rept. No. 2547). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. NATCHER: Committee of conference. H.R. 12276. A bill making appropriations for the government of the District of Columbia and other activities chargeable in whole or in part against the revenues of said District for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1963, and for other purposes without amendment (Rept. No. 2548). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. FALLON: Committee of conference. H.R. 12135. A bill to authorize appropriations for the fiscal years 1964 and 1965 for the construction of certain highways in accordance with title 23 of the United States Code, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 2549). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. DOWDY: Committee of conference. S. 1447. A bill to amend the District of

Columbia Teachers' Salary Act of 1955, as amended (Rept. No. 2550). Ordered to be printed.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mr. BOGGS:

H.R. 13383. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to exchange certain lands at the Southern Regional Research Laboratory with the city of New Orleans, La., for certain other lands adjacent to such laboratory; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. CURTIS of Missouri:

H.R. 13384. A bill to amend section 132 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 to provide for the adjournment of the Congress not later than the last day in the month of July except in time of war or national emergency hereafter proclaimed by the President; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. DOWDY:

H.R. 13385. A bill to amend the District of Columbia Charitable Solicitation Act to require certain findings before the issuance of a solicitation permit thereunder, and for

other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. HEBERT:

H.R. 13386. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to exchange certain lands at the Southern Regional Research Laboratory with the city of New Orleans, La., for certain other lands adjacent to such laboratory; to the Committee on Agriculture.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mr. BROYHILL:

H.R. 13387. A bill for the relief of Capt. Ted R. Sturm; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BROYHILL (by request):

H.R. 13388. A bill for relief of Lem Hong, Mrs. May Hong, and Rose Marie Hong; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FINNEGAN:

H.R. 13389. A bill for the relief of Ioannis Filopoulos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GONZALEZ:

H.R. 13390. A bill for the relief of Ely Sabidales; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KEOGH:

H.R. 13391. A bill for the relief of Filippa Fucarino; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 13392. A bill for the relief of Paraskevi Stamadianou; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. POWELL:

H.R. 13393. A bill for the relief of Panagiotis Vatalidis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ST. GERMAIN:

H.R. 13394. A bill for relief of Jan Cyganowski; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 13395. A bill for the relief of Gabriel da Silva Lopes and Mrs. Maria da Trindade Lopes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII,

414. Mr. FOUNTAIN presented a petition of Jesse M. Seaver of Margarettsville, N.C., on behalf of the Carolina Christian Union, condemning the recent decision of the U.S. Supreme Court, outlawing the New York regent's prescribed prayer in public schools, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Bonneville Rate Schedule Manipulations—A Warning to Taxpayers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CRAIG HOSMER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 10, 1962

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, for the information of the Congress and as a warning to the public I have asked that the following letter to Secretary Udall be spread upon this RECORD:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., October 8, 1962.

Re Bonneville Project Administration: Repayment schedules/power rates.

HON. STEWART L. UDALL,
Secretary of the Interior,
Department of the Interior,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: It has come to my attention that the BPA Regional Advisory Council has made a recommendation for changing the manner in which repayment schedules are computed for Columbia River dams and power facilities under cognizance of the Bonneville Power Administration.

The new scheme would lump all Federal projects in the system together and the payout for the whole system would be figured from the date of the newest dam in the system. In effect, this would mean pooling of revenues and costs for the 20-dam power system for the purpose of delaying repayment of the various dams from their present individual dates to fiscal year 2019, which is 50 years after the scheduled initial operation of John Day Dam, the last of the 20 dams existing or under construction at the present time.

The net effect of this scheme would amount to a reduction of as much as \$7.5 million a year in annual repayment charges by BPA to the U.S. Treasury. Presumably, the principle would apply to stall further the payout schedules if dams subsequent to John

Day are constructed and, thereby, further reduce Treasury repayments.

It also has come to my attention that even this rollback of payout schedules fails to satisfy the greed of Pacific Northwest public power adherents for subsidized below-cost power at the expense of the general taxpayers of the United States. BPA Administrator Charles F. Luce is reported to have up his sleeve follow-on plans for an additional raid on the pocketbooks of taxpaying Americans. They involve calculating a very generous overall service life for the BPA system—probably in the range of 75 to 100 years—then further lowering the annual payback charges on the basis of this fantasy.

In my opinion, these proposals constitute unconscionable machinations for withholding public moneys under spurious pretenses, and their acceptance would amount to a fraud on the taxpayers.

Capital outlays for BPA in each instance were obtained under the stipulation they would be paid back over an already overly generous payback period. The law under which BPA operates requires the fixing of its rates to meet these payback schedules. The history of authorization and appropriations on each of the 20 dams of the BPA system is replete with assurances that repayments would be made over a fixed period following each capital investment. Less than 2 weeks ago Administrator Luce testified before the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy in connection with the Hanford project that rates based on these payback schedules would, if necessary, be adjusted upward to meet any possible losses on the Hanford arrangements.

Now, with Bonneville's wholesale power rates coming up for regular 5-year review for the period 1964-69, and with BPA having operated at a deficit for the last 5 years, an inner circle of something-for-nothing zealots seemingly has concocted what, to my mind, appears to be a double-barreled, faith-breaking hoax to victimize the U.S. Treasury on the installment plan.

I call upon you, Mr. Secretary, to direct those charged with the establishment of Bonneville rates to carry out their duties to the public in a straightforward manner and get on with the necessary business of rais-

ing Bonneville's wholesale power rates as may be required to meet established commitments for refund of public moneys.

Very truly yours,

CRAIG HOSMER,
Member of Congress.

Speech by Senator Frank Carlson at Dedication Ceremony, Lawrence, Kans., October 6, 1962

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM H. AVERY

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 10, 1962

Mr. AVERY. Mr. Speaker, on Wednesday, October 6, I was honored to be invited to the dedication of a nuclear reactor and environmental health center on the campus of the University of Kansas at Lawrence. The principal dedicatory address was delivered by the senior Senator from Kansas, the Honorable FRANK CARLSON.

It has been my observation that speakers on such an occasion tend to assume the role of an expert in sometimes unfamiliar fields. For example, it is quite common for a scientist to become a politician and conversely for a politician to become a scientist.

The remarks of Senator CARLSON at this occasion, however, were the very honest and simple observations of a man who has witnessed the transition from the elementary theories of physics into the electronic mysteries identified with the space age. Because of the very honest and simple logic of his remarks, yet reflecting such a great depth of thought and understanding, I am asking