This is true in research. We have won no really major victory, for example, against hardening of the arteries nor high blood pressure. We have won skirmishes and battles. We have not yet won the war. Thousands have been helped, but hundreds of thousands have not, and cannot be on the basis of today's knowledge. Many scientists feel, however, that there are so many research areas of opportunity today in hardening of the arteries that, given adequate manpower, facilities, and funds, the answer needed for victory can be uncovered.

In the field of education, both for the public and for research scientists, physicians, and health workers, much remains to be done. The area of training shows needs, for example, to increase research manpower and that of the health professions. Ways and means also need to be developed to improve the transmission of knowledge among scientists and to those who apply useful knowledge as it comes from research. Much more can be done in public education, too. The heart story has not yet been fully told to everyone.

The area of community services also provides challenging opportunities. Far more can be done in this field. Here alone lies more than sufficient evidence of the need for heart funds and new and increased activities. Services to patients in cooperation with their physicians, as in the provision of home care and home nursing programs, are an opportunity of great challenge and need.

As you take stock of the size and nature of the enemy, heart disease, then, and the needs and opportunities for progress against it, you will find solid ground for the conviction that you are embarking upon a most important endeavor for a truly worthwhile cause.

In closing, let me wish you every success and say again that I view the future as one bright with promise for progress. I could not hold this view without an equally strong feeling that the combined forces of the heart association, the medical and health professions, research institutions, and the official agencies will continue and grow as the essential partnership which will win victory over heart disease.

SENATE

THURSDAY, MARCH 15, 1962

(Legislative day of Wednesday, March 14, 1962)

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

Rev. Father J. Garvan Cavanagh, assistant priest, St. Francis Xavier Roman Catholic Cathedral, Alexandria, La., offered the following prayer:

Come, Holy Spirit, fill the hearts of Thy people and kindle in them the fire of Thy love. Send forth Thy spirit, and they shall be created and Thou shalt renew the face of the earth. O God, who by the light of the Holy Spirit didst instruct the hearts of Thy people, grant that by the same Spirit we may ever be truly wise and always rejoice in Thy consolations, through Jesus Christ, our Lord. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Journal of yesterday be considered as having been read.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none. Without objection, it is so ordered.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

REPORT ON U.S. PARTICIPATION IN THE UNITED NATIONS—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT (H. DOC. NO. 202)

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, which, with the accompanying report, was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

To the Congress of the United States:

Pursuant to the United Nations Participation Act, I transmit herewith the 15th annual report, covering U.S. participation in the United Nations during the year 1960.

These activities took place during the tenure of the previous administration. But U.S. support of the United Nations has never been and must never become a partisan matter. The aims of the United Nations—as expressed in the charter—are comparable to the aims of the United States as expressed in the Constitution. Both documents affirm ideals and principles which transcend partisanship.

When all nations adopt as their own—and conduct their affairs in accord with—the objectives of the United Nations Charter, our hopes and expectations for the world organization will be fulfilled.

Until then, the United Nations must serve as a forum for parliamentary diplomacy in which our Nation, in concert with others, can sustain these hopes and expectations. In a dangerous and disorderly world, the United States cannot conduct its foreign policy exclusively through the United Nations. We must—and we do—pursue national aims also through direct diplomacy and negotiations with individual countries and within associations more limited in size and purpose than the United Nations. While doing so, we can continue to demonstrate day by day in the United Nations that our objectives in the world are in broad harmony with those of the great majority of other nations.

This report and the record of 15 previous years prove that the United Nations now makes a major contribution to the maintenance of peace, the welcoming of new nations, the economic and social growth of large areas of the world, the validation of a civilized view of human rights, and the endless adjustments, accommodations, and agreements that are the daily business of a world community.

The degree to which members of the United Nations have adopted as their own the objectives of the charter can be assessed. Each national delegation, in the policies it pursues and the votes it casts, exposes to all its peaceful or aggressive intentions—its candor or its cynicism—its hopes or its fears—its maturity or its immaturity—its capacity for leadership or its weakness in action, and finally, the worth of its word. In the forum of the United Nations, each nation is put to the test; and each reveals its contribution—for good or evil—to human hopes and human expectations.

It is my firm purpose to see to it that in the United Nations, as elsewhere, the United States measures up to the principles of the charter.

JOHN F. KENNEDY.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *March 15, 1962.*

STRENGTHENING OF PROGRAMS FOR PROTECTION OF CONSUMER INTERESTS—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT (H. DOC. NO. 364)

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, which was referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare:

To the Congress of the United States:

Consumers, by definition, include us all. They are the largest economic group in the economy, affecting and affected by almost every public and private economic decision. Two-thirds of all spending in the economy is by consumers. But they are the only important group in the economy who are not effectively organized, whose views are often not heard.

The Federal Government—by nature the highest spokesman for all the people—has a special obligation to be alert to the consumer's needs and to advance the consumer's interests. Ever since legislation was enacted in 1872 to protect the consumer from frauds involving use of the U.S. mail, the Congress and executive branch have been increasingly aware of their responsibility to make certain that our Nation's economy fairly and adequately serves consumers' interests.

In the main, it has served them extremely well. Each succeeding generation has enjoyed both higher income and a greater variety of goods and services. As a result our standard of living is the highest in the world—and, in less than 20 years, it should rise an additional 50 percent.

Fortunate as we are, we nevertheless cannot afford waste in consumption any more than we can afford inefficiency in business or Government. If consumers are offered inferior products, if prices are exorbitant, if drugs are unsafe or worthless, if the consumer is unable to choose on an informed basis, then his dollar is wasted, his health and safety may be threatened, and the national interest suffers. On the other hand, increased efforts to make the best possible use of their incomes can contribute more

to the well-being of most families than equivalent efforts to raise their incomes.

The march of technology—affecting, for example, the foods we eat, the medicines we take, and the many appliances we use in our homes—has increased the difficulties of the consumer along with his opportunities; and it has outmoded many of the old laws and regulations and made new legislation necessary. The typical supermarket before World War II stocked about 1,500 separate food items—an impressive figure by any standard. But today it carries over 6,000. Ninety percent of the prescriptions written today are for drugs that were unknown 20 years ago. Many of the new products used every day in the home are highly complex. The housewife is called upon to be an amateur electrician, mechanic, chemist, toxicologist, dietitian, and mathematician—but she is rarely furnished the information she needs to perform these tasks proficiently.

Marketing is increasingly impersonal. Consumer choice is influenced by mass advertising utilizing highly developed arts of persuasion. The consumer typically cannot know whether drug preparations meet minimum standards of safety, quality, and efficacy. He usually does not know how much he pays for consumer credit; whether one prepared food has more nutritional value than another; whether the performance of a product will in fact meet his needs; or whether the "large economy size" is really a bargain.

Nearly all of the programs offered by this administration—e.g., the expansion of world trade, the improvement of medical care, the reduction of passenger taxes, the strengthening of mass transit, the development of conservation and recreation areas and low-cost power—are of direct or inherent importance to consumers. Additional legislative and administrative action is required, however, if the Federal Government is to meet its responsibility to consumers in the exercise of their rights. These rights include:

(1) The right to safety—to be protected against the marketing of goods which are hazardous to health or life.

(2) The right to be informed—to be protected against fraudulent, deceitful, or grossly misleading information, advertising, labeling, or other practices, and to be given the facts he needs to make an informed choice.

(3) The right to choose—to be assured, wherever possible, access to a variety of products and services at competitive prices; and in those industries in which competition is not workable and Government regulation is substituted, an assurance of satisfactory quality and service at fair prices.

(4) The right to be heard—to be assured that consumer interests will receive full and sympathetic consideration in the formulation of Government policy, and fair and expeditious treatment in its administrative tribunals.

To promote the fuller realization of these consumer rights, it is necessary that existing Government programs be strengthened, that Government organization be improved, and, in certain areas, that new legislation be enacted.

I. STRENGTHENING OF EXISTING PROGRAMS

This administration has sponsored a wide range of specific actions to strengthen existing programs. Major progress has already been achieved or is in prospect in several important areas. And the 1963 budget includes recommendations to improve the effectiveness of almost every major program of consumer protection.

(1) Food and drug protection. Thousands of common household items now available to consumers contain potentially harmful substances. Hundreds of new uses for such products as food additives, food colorings and pesticides are found every year, adding new potential hazards. To provide better protection and law enforcement in this vital area, I have recommended a 25-percent increase in staff for the Food and Drug Administration in the budget now pending before the Congress, the largest single increase in the agency's history. In addition, to assure more effective registration of pesticides, a new division has been established in the Department of Agriculture; and increased appropriations have been requested for pesticide regulation and for meat and poultry inspection activities.

(2) Safer transportation. As Americans make more use of highway and air transportation than any other nation, increased speed and congestion have required us to take special safety measures.

The Federal Aviation Agency has reexamined the Nation's air traffic control requirements and is designing an improved system to enhance the safety and efficiency of future air traffic.

The Secretary of Commerce has established an Office of Highway Safety in the Bureau of Public Roads to promote public support of highway safety standards, coordinate use of highway safety research findings, and encourage cooperation of State and local governments, industry, and allied groups—the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare is likewise strengthening its accident prevention work—and the Interstate Commerce Commission is strengthening its enforcement of safety requirements for motor carriers.

In addition, I am requesting the Departments of Commerce and of Health, Education, and Welfare, to review, with representatives of the automobile industry, those changes in automobile design and equipment which will help reduce the unconscionable toll of human life on the highways and the pollution of the air we breathe. Additional legislation does not appear required at this time in view of the automobile industry's action to incorporate in the new model design changes which will reduce air pollution.

(3) Financial protection. Important steps are being taken to help assure more adequate protection for the savings that prudent consumers lay aside for the future purchase of costly items, for the rainy day, for their children's education, or to meet their retirement needs.

Legislation enacted last year has strengthened the insurance program of the Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation.

The Securities and Exchange Commission has undertaken at the request of the Congress a major investigation of the securities market which should provide the basis for later legislation and administrative measures.

The Postmaster General and the Department of Justice have stepped up enforcement of the mail fraud statutes. Arrests for mail fraud last year set an alltime record; and convictions increased by 35 percent over the previous year.

(4) More effective regulation. The independent regulatory agencies also report increased emphasis on programs directly helpful to consumers.

The Interstate Commerce Commission has instituted proceedings designed to prevent excessive charges for moving household goods in interstate commerce.

The Civil Aeronautics Board has recently taken action to protect air travelers from abuses of overbooking.

The Federal Trade Commission has intensified its actions against deceptive trade practices and false advertising affecting a variety of goods, including refrigerators, house paint, sewing machines, vacuum cleaners, kitchen utensils, food wrapping, and carpets.

The Federal Power Commission is initiating a vigorous program to assure consumers of reasonable natural gas prices while assuring them of adequate supplies—revitalizing all of its regulatory programs in the electric power field—and undertaking a national power survey designed to identify ways of bringing down power costs in the decades ahead by making the best possible use of our capital and energy resources; and I recommend that the Congress enact legislation and make available funds to enable the Commission to provide for 34 million natural gas consumers the information similar to that now provided electrical consumers on typical bills in various areas, thus spotlighting abnormally high rates and stimulating better industry performance.

The Federal Communications Commission is actively reviewing the television network program selection process and encouraging the expanded development of educational television stations; and it will also step up in fiscal year 1963 its enforcement program to prevent interference with air navigation signals, distress calls, and other uses of radio important to public safety.

For all of the major regulatory agencies, I am recommending increased appropriations for 1963 to provide the increased staff necessary for more effective protection of the consumer and public interest.

Of the important changes in agency organizational procedure recommended last year to eliminate delays and strengthen decision making, the great majority have been authorized by reorganization plans or legislation and are being put into practice by agency heads; and, to permit similar improvements in the operations of the Securities and Exchange Commission and the Federal Power Commission through greater delegation of assignments, I recommend enactment this year of legislation along the lines of S. 2135 for the SEC and S. 1605 and H.R. 6956 for the FPC.

(5) Housing costs and quality. The largest purchase most consumers make in their lifetimes is a home. In the past year, significant steps have been taken to reduce the cost of financing housing and to improve housing quality. The level of interest rates and other charges on mortgage loans has been reduced by a variety of Federal actions. Under authority provided by the Housing Act of 1961, new programs have been started (a) to encourage experimental construction methods likely to develop better housing at lower cost, (b) to provide lower interest rates and longer maturities on loans for rehabilitation of existing housing, (c) to provide especially low cost rental housing for moderate income families, and (d) to provide housing for domestic farm labor. The same legislation also authorized demonstration grants to develop better methods of providing housing for low income families.

(6) Consumer information and research—and consumer representation in Government. Goverment can help consumers to help themselves by developing and making available reliable information.

The Housing and Home Finance Agency will undertake, under the budget proposed for fiscal 1963, new studies to discover ways of reducing monthly housing expenses, lowering the cost of land for homebuilding, and minimizing financing charges.

The Department of Agriculture is undertaking similar research designed to help raise rural housing standards and reduce costs.

The Food and Drug Administration will expand its Consumer Consultant Program which, together with the home demonstration program of the Agriculture Extension Service, now provides valuable information directly to consumers on product trends, food standards, and protection guides.

The Bureau of Labor Statistics is now conducting a nationwide survey of consumer expenditures, income, and savings, which will be used to update the widely used Consumer Price Index and to prepare model family budgets.

Too little has been done to make available to consumers the results of pertinent Government research. In addition to the types of studies mentioned above, many agencies are engaged—as aids to those principally concerned with their activities, in cooperation with industry or for Federal procurement purposes—in testing the performance of certain products, developing standards and specifications and assembling a wide range of related information which would be of immense use to consumers and consumer organizations. The beneficial results of these efforts—in the Departments of Agriculture, Commerce, Defense, and Health, Education, and Welfare, and in the General Services Administration and other agencies—should be more widely published. This is but one part of a wider problem: the failure of governmental machinery to assure specific consideration of the consumer's needs and point of view. With this in mind, I am directing:

First, that the Council of Economic Advisers create a Consumers' Advisory Council, to examine and provide advice to the Government on issues of broad economic policy, on governmental programs protecting consumer needs, and on needed improvements in the flow of consumer research material to the public; this Consumers' Council will also give interested individuals and organizations a voice in these matters;

Second, that the head of each Federal agency whose activities bear significantly on consumer welfare designate a special assistant in his office to advise and assist him in assuring adequate and effective attention to consumer interests in the work of the agency, to act as liaison with consumer and related organizations, and to place increased emphasis on preparing and making available pertinent research findings for consumers in clear and usable form; and

Third, that the Postmaster General undertake a pilot program by displaying, in at least 100 selected post offices, samples of publications useful to consumers and by providing facilities for the easier purchase of such publications.

II. NEW LEGISLATIVE AUTHORITY FOR ADDED CONSUMER PROTECTION

In addition to the foregoing measures, new legislative authority is also essential to advance and protect the consumer interest.

(A) Strengthen regulatory authority over foods and drugs. The successful development of more than 9,000 new drugs in the last 25 years has saved countless lives and relieved millions of victims of acute and chronic illnesses. However, new drugs are being placed on the market with no requirement that there be either advance proof that they will be effective in treating the diseases and conditions for which they are recommended or the prompt reporting of adverse reactions. These new drugs present greater hazards as well as greater potential benefits than ever before—for they are widely used, they are often very potent, and they are promoted by aggressive sales campaigns that may tend to overstate their merits and fail to indicate the risks involved in their use. For example, over 20 percent of the new drugs listed since 1956 in the publication New and Non-Official Drugs were found, upon being tested, to be incapable of sustaining one or more of their sponsor's claims regarding their therapeutic effect. There is no way of measuring the needless suffering, the money innocently squandered, and the protraction of illnesses resulting from the use of such ineffective drugs.

The physician and consumer should have the assurance, from an impartial scientific source, that any drug or therapeutic device on the market today is safe and effective for its intended use; that it has the strength and quality represented; and that the accompanying promotional material tells the full story—its bad effects as well as its good. They should be able to identify the drug by a simple, common name in order to avoid confusion and to enable the purchaser to buy the quality drugs he actually needs at the lowest competitive price.

Existing law gives no such assurance to the consumer—a fact highlighted by the thoroughgoing investigation led by Senator KEFAUVER. It is time to give American men, women and children the same protection we have been giving hogs, sheep and cattl since 1913, under an act forbidding the marketing of worthless serums and other drugs for the treatment of these animals.

There are other problems to meet in this area:

An extensive underground traffic exists in habit-forming barbiturates (sedatives) and amphetamines (stimulants). Because of inadequate supervision over distribution, these drugs are contributing to accidents, to juvenile delinquency and to crime.

Two billion dollars worth of cosmetics are marketed yearly, many without adequate safety testing. Thousands of women have suffered burns and other injuries to the eyes, skin and hair by untested or inadequately tested beauty aids.

Factory inspections now authorized by the pure food and drug laws are seriously hampered by the fact that the law does not clearly require the manufacturer to allow inspection of certain records. An uncooperative small minority of manufacturers can engage in a game of hide and seek with the Government in order to avoid adequate inspection. But protection of the public health is not a game. It is of vital importance to each and every citizen.

A fifth of all the meat slaughtered in the United States is not now inspected by the Department of Agriculture, because the coverage of the Meat Inspection Act is restricted to meat products moving across State lines. This incomplete coverage contributes to the diversion of unhealthy animals to processing channels where the products are uninspected and can, therefore, be a threat to human health.

In short, existing laws in the food, drug, and cosmetic area are inadequate to assure the necessary protection the American consumer deserves. To overcome these serious statutory gaps, I recommend:

(1) First, legislation to strengthen and broaden existing laws in the food and drug field to provide consumers with better, safer, and less expensive drugs, by authorizing the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare to:

(a) Require a showing that new drugs and therapeutic devices are effective for their intended use—as well as safe—before they are placed on the market;

(b) Withdraw approval of any such drug or device when there is substantial doubt as to its safety or efficacy, and require manufacturers to report any information bearing on its safety or efficacy;

(c) Require drug and therapeutic device manufacturers to maintain facilities and controls that will assure the reliability of their product;

(d) Require batch-by-batch testing and certification of all antibiotics;

(e) Assign simple common names to drugs;

(f) Establish an enforceable system of preventing the illicit distribution of habit-forming barbiturates and amphetamines;

(g) Require cosmetics to be tested and proved safe before they are marketed; and

(h) Institute more effective inspection to determine whether food, drug, cosmetics, and therapeutic devices are being manufactured and marketed in accordance with the law;

(2) Second, legislation to authorize the Federal Trade Commission to require that advertising of prescription drugs directed to physicians disclose the ingredients, the efficacy, and the adverse effects of such drugs; and

(3) Third, legislation to broaden the coverage of the Meat Inspection Act administered by the Department of Agriculture, to promote adequate inspection—in cooperation with the States and industry—of all meat slaughtered in the United States.

(B) Require "truth in lending." Consumer debt outstanding, including mortgage credit, has almost tripled in the last decade and now totals well over $200 billion. Its widespread availability has given consumers more flexibility in the timing of their purchases. But, in many instances, serious abuses have occurred. Under the chairmanship of Senator DOUGLAS, a subcommittee of the Senate Banking and Currency Committee has been conducting a detailed examination of such abuses. The testimony received shows a clear need for protection of consumers against charges of interest rates and fees far higher than apparent without any real knowledge on the part of the borrowers of the true amounts they are being charged. Purchasers of used cars in one study, for example, paid interest charges averaging 25 percent a year, and ranging well above this; yet very few were aware of how much they were actually paying for credit.

Excessive and untimely use of credit arising out of ignorance of its true cost is harmful both to the stability of the economy and to the welfare of the public. Legislation should therefore be enacted requiring lenders and vendors to disclose to borrowers in advance the actual amounts and rates which they will be paying for credit. Such legislation, similar in this sense to the truth-in-securities laws of 1933–34, would not control prices or charges. But it would require full disclosure to installment buyers and other prospective credit users, and thus permit consumers to make informed decisions before signing on the dotted line. Inasmuch as the specific credit practices which such a bill would be designed to correct are closely related to and often combined with other types of misleading trade practices which the Federal Trade Commission is already regulating, I recommend that enforcement of the new authority be assigned to the Commission. The Government agencies most concerned in this area have been cooperating with the subcommittee in developing the information necessary to prepare a workable and effective bill; and in view of the exhaustive hearings already held, I hope that the Congress can complete action on this important matter before it adjourns.

(C) Manufacture of all-channel television sets. Five out of six home television receivers today are equipped to receive programs on only the 12 very-high-frequency (VHF) channels. As a result, in most areas, stations desiring to operate on any of the 70 ultra-high-frequency (UHF) channels would usually have such small audiences that there is little incentive to make the substantial initial investment and continuing expenditures that effective broadcasting requires. The result is a sharply restricted choice for consumers.

After extensive study, the Federal Communications Commission has concluded that an effective and genuinely competitive nationwide television service, with adequate provision for local outlets and educational stations, is not possible within the narrow confines of 12 VHF channels. Legislation now before the Congress would authorize the Commission to prescribe the performance characteristics of all new television receivers shipped in interstate commerce to assure that they can receive both VHF and UHF signals. I strongly urge its passage as the most economical and practical method of broadening the range of programs available. This step, together with the Federal aid for construction of educational television stations which is nearing final passage by the Congress, will speed the full realization of television's great potential.

(D) Strengthen laws promoting competition and prohibiting monopoly. The most basic and longstanding protections for the right of consumers, to a choice at a competitive price, are the various laws designed to assure effective competition and to prevent monopoly. The Sherman Act of 1890, the Clayton Act of 1914, and many related laws are the strongest shields the consumer possesses against the growth of unchecked monopoly power. In addition to the measure now nearing final passage which would provide subpena powers for civil as well as criminal antitrust investigations, several other improvements are needed:

(1) The Federal Trade Commission should be empowered to issue temporary cease-and-desist orders against the continuance of unfair competitive practices while cases concerned with permanent relief from such practices are pending before the Commission. Under the present law, smaller competitors may be driven into bankruptcy or forced to accept merger on adverse terms long before present remedies become effective, thus reducing the competitive safeguards vital for the consumer. Similarly, deceptive trade practices in consumer goods may do their damage long before the Commission can "lock the barn door." I, therefore, reiterate my previous recommendation that the Congress give prompt consideration to effective legislation to accomplish this purpose.

(2) The consumer's right to a reasonable price can also be adversely affected by mergers of two business firms which substantially reduce effective competition. As in the case of unfair methods of competition, damage once done is often irreparable, and the Government, acting through the courts, cannot readily restore the degree of competition existing prior to the merger. Accordingly, I strongly recommend enactment of legislation to require reasonable advance notice to the Department of Justice and to the appropriate Commission or Board of any merger expected to result in a firm of substantial size. This will enable the businessman to obtain advice in advance, without litigation, as to whether a proposed merger would be regarded as contrary to the public interest. In addition, along with the recommended authority for the FTC to issue cease-and-desist orders, it is an essential safeguard against combinations which might cause unwarranted increases in consumer prices.

(3) In view of the potentially anticompetitive abuses to which the use of patents and trademarks are by nature subject, I recommend enactment of legislation requiring publication of the terms of all settlement agreements between different persons applying for patent rights on the same invention—for recent hearings have shown that such agreements may include features designed to weaken future competition at the expense of the consumer; and enactment of legislation authorizing the FTC to apply for the cancellation of any trademark which is, or becomes, the common descriptive name of an article and thus should be in the public domain. While a competitor has such a right today, it is important—if the FTC is to have clear authority to halt this kind of unfair commercial advantage—that the Senate insert this provision in its review of trademark legislation (H.R. 4333) already approved by the House.

(E) "Truth in packaging." Just as consumers have the right to know what is in their credit contract, so also do they have the right to know what is in the package they buy. Senator HART and his subcommittee are to be commended for the important investigation they are now conducting into packaging and labeling practices.

In our modern society good packaging meets many consumer needs, among them convenience, freshness, safety and attractive appearance. But often in recent years, as the hearings have demonstrated, these benefits have been accompanied by practices which frustrate the consumer's efforts to get the best value for his dollar. In many cases the label seems designed to conceal rather than to reveal the true contents of the package. Sometimes the consumer cannot readily ascertain the net amount of the product, or the ratio of solid contents to air. Frequently he cannot readily compute the comparative costs per unit of different brands packed in odd sizes, or of the same brand in large, giant, king size, or jumbo packages. And he may not realize that changes in the customary size or shape of the package may account for apparent bargains, or that "cents off" promotions are often not real savings.

Misleading, fraudulent or unhelpful practices such as these are clearly incompatible with the efficient and equitable functioning of our free competitive economy. Under our system, consumers

have a right to expect that packages will carry reliable and readily usable information about their contents. And those manufacturers whose products are sold in such packages have a right to expect that their competitors will be required to adhere to the same standards. Upon completion of our own survey of these packaging and labeling abuses, in full cooperation with the Senate subcommittee, I shall make recommendations as to the appropriate roles of private business and the Federal Government in improving packaging standards and achieving more specific disclosure of the quantity and ingredients of the product inside the package in a form convenient to and usable by the consumer.

As all of us are consumers, these actions and proposals in the interest of consumers are in the interest of us all. The budgetary investment required by these programs is very modest—but they can yield rich dividends in strengthening our free competitive economy, our standard of living and health and our traditionally high ethical patterns of business conduct. Fair competition aids both business and consumer.

It is my hope that this message, and the recommendations and requests it contains, can help alert every agency and branch of Government to the needs of our consumers. Their voice is not always as loudly heard in Washington as the voices of smaller and better-organized groups—nor is their point of view always defined and presented. But under our economic as well as our political form of democracy, we share an obligation to protect the common interest in every decision we make. I ask the Congress and every department and agency to help in the fulfillment of that obligation.

JOHN F. KENNEDY.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *March 15, 1962.*

EXECUTIVE MESSAGE REFERRED

As in executive session,

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a message from the President of the United States submitting the nomination of Ezra Glaser, of Falls Church, Va., to be an Assistant Commissioner of Patents, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Bartlett, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed a bill (H.R. 10607) to amend the Tariff Act of 1930 and certain related laws to provide for the restatement of the tariff classification provisions, and for other purposes, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

HOUSE BILL REFERRED

The bill (H.R. 10607) to amend the Tariff Act of 1930 and certain related laws to provide for the restatement of the tariff classification provisions, and for other purposes, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Finance.

ORDER FOR RECESS UNTIL NOON TOMORROW

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate concludes its business today, it stand in recess until tomorrow at 12 o'clock noon.

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

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

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

COMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING SENATE SESSION

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on Minerals, Materials, and Fuels of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs be permitted to meet during the session of the Senate today.

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

THE ALEXANDER HAMILTON NATIONAL MONUMENT

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the Chair will lay before the Senate the unfinished business.

The Senate resumed the consideration of the motion of the Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD] to proceed to the consideration of the joint resolution (S.J. Res. 29) providing for the establishing of the former dwelling house of Alexander Hamilton as a national monument.

Mr. HILL and Mr. HOLLAND addressed the Chair.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD] that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Senate Joint Resolution 29, providing for the establishment of the former dwelling house of Alexander Hamilton as a national monument.

TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS

By unanimous consent, the following routine business was transacted:

PENALTIES FOR CERTAIN OFFENSES COMMITTED IN CONNECTION WITH HIGHWAY CONSTRUCTION

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a letter from the Under Secretary of Commerce, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to provide penalties for certain offenses committed in connection with highway construction which, with the accompanying paper, was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

CONSTRUCTION OF PERRY RESERVOIR—RESOLUTION

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, the officers and directors of the Central Industrial District Association adopted a resolution urging Congress to appropriate necessary funds for planning and construction of the Perry Reservoir.

The central industrial district experienced a major flood in 1903 and a catastrophic flood in 1951. This reservoir, together with others in the Kansas River Basin, would serve as additional protection against further floods in this area.

I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be printed in the RECORD, and referred to the appropriate committee.

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

Whereas the flood control program of the Kaw Valley is of the utmost importance to the central industrial district; and

Whereas considerable progress has been made in the planning and construction of levee systems, reservoirs, and dams of which the giant Tuttle Creek project is a prime example; and

Whereas the proposed Perry project is also an integral part of the flood protection program and especially important to the Kansas City area because of its close proximity: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the board of directors of the Central Industrial District Association urges the Congress of the United States to appropriate the necessary funds for its planning, construction, and completion as soon as is practically possible.

Adopted at the meeting of the board of directors of the Central Industrial District Association on this 14th day of February 1962.

APPEARANCE OF CERTAIN WITNESSES AT TRIAL OF MACK S. TANE

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, from the Committee on Government Operations, I report an original resolution, and I ask unanimous consent for its present consideration.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolution will be read for the information of the Senate.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

Whereas in the case of *United States of America* v. *Mack S. Tane,* Criminal Action Numbered 61 Cr. 32, pending in the United States District Court for the Eastern District of New York, subpoenas ad testificandum and duces tecum were issued upon the application of the defendant, Mack S. Tane, and addressed as follows:

"To Ruth Watt, who is chief clerk of the Senate Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations of the Committee on Government Operations, directing her to appear as a witness before the said court on the 12th day of March 1962 at 10 o'clock antemeridian (which appearance has been continued by said court to the 19th day of March 1962 at 10 o'clock antemeridian), and to give testimony in the above entitled cause, and to bring with her:

"1. All records, correspondence, letters, memoranda, notes of communications, summaries, transcripts, and statements in the files of the Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations of the United States Senate Committee on Government Operations, in

connection with its investigation of the defendant Mack S. Tane, as regards information concerning Mack S. Tane obtained directly, indirectly, or derivatively by the staff of said subcommittee, from commissioners, officers, agents, or employees of the New York City Police Department, including the Criminal Intelligence Bureau and Squad of said Police Department, and the District Attorney of New York County, and the officers, chiefs, employees of his office, and the detectives assigned thereto;

"2. All records, correspondence, letters, memoranda, notes of communications, summaries, transcripts and statements in the files of the Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations of the United States Senate Committee on Government Operations, as above relates to Pase Motors, Inc. and Wesley Pase, and the latter's dealings with Local 239, International Brotherhood of Teamsters, its officers, agents and employees, concerning information obtained directly, indirectly or derivatively by the staff of said Subcommittee from commissioners, officers, agents or employees of the New York City Police Department, including the Criminal Intelligence Bureau and Squad of said Police Department, and the District Attorney of New York County, and the officers, chiefs, employees of his office and the detectives assigned thereto;

"3. An official transcript of the hearings before the Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations of the Committee on Government Operations, United States Senate, Eighty-Seventh Congress, January 10, 11, 12, 24 and 25, 1961, together with the following exhibits introduced in evidence, or otherwise employed at such hearings: Exhibits '1A', '1B', '2', '3', '4', '5', '5A', '6', '7A', '7B', '8', '9', '10A', '10B', '11A', '11B', '12', '13', '14', '15', '16', '17', '18', '19', '20', and '32';

"4. All records, recordings, transcripts, memoranda, notes, summaries and statements, of any kind and description, of any and all intercepted telephonic communications and wiretaps of the defendant Mack S. Tane with others, obtained by the Subcommittee, its staff, agents or employees, either through their own efforts or the efforts of others;

"5. All records, recordings, transcripts, memoranda, notes, summaries and statements, of any kind and description, of any and all intercepted communications, including wiretaps, room taps of conversations, obtained by the Subcommittee from the New York City Police Department, its agencies, or branches thereof, and/or the District Attorney of the County of New York, his agents, officers or employees, of the defendant herein, with others, of the officers, agents and employees of Local 239, Brotherhood of Teamsters, with Pase Motors, Inc., its agents, officers or employees and/or Wesley Pase or his then attorney Leo Guzik; and

"To Jerome S. Adlerman, who is general counsel of the Senate Permanent Subcommittee on Investigation of the Committee on Government Operations, directing him to appear as a witness before the said court on the 12th day of March 1962 at 10 o'clock antemeridian (which appearance has been continued by said court to the 19th day of March 1962 at 10 o'clock antemeridian), and to give testimony in the above entitled cause; and

"To Paul J. Tierney, who is assistant counsel of the Senate Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations of the Committee on Government Operations, directing him to appear as a witness before the said court on the 14th day of March 1962 at 10 o'clock antemeridian (which appearance has been continued by said court to the 19th day of March 1962 at 10 o'clock antemeridian), and to give testimony in the above entitled cause; and

"To Robert Dunne, who is assistant counsel for the Senate Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations of the Committee on Government Operations, directing him to appear as a witness before the said court on the 14th day of March 1962 (which appearance has been continued by said court to the 19th day of March 1962 at 10 o'clock antemeridian), and to give testimony in the above entitled cause; and

"To Paul Wilner, who is an employee of the United States General Accounting Office, and who was formerly assigned to duty with the Senate Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations of the Committee on Government Operations, directing him to appear as a witnesss before the said court and give testimony in the above entitled cause; and

"Attorney for the defendant states that he intends to address a subpoena ad testificandum to Carmine S. Bellino, former accountant-consultant to the Senate Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations of the Committee on Government Operations, directing him to appear as a witness before the said court and to give testimony in the above entitled case"; Therefore be it

Resolved, That by the privileges of the Senate of the United States no evidence under the control and in the possession of the Senate of the United States can, by the mandate of process of the ordinary courts of justice, be taken from such control or possession, but by its permission; be it further

Resolved, That by the privilege of the Senate and by Rule XXX thereof, no Member or Senate employee is authorized to produce Senate documents but by order of the Senate, and information secured by Senate staff employees pursuant to their official duties as employees of the Senate may not be revealed without the consent of the Senate; be it further

Resolved, That when it appears by the order of the court or of the judge thereof, or of any legal officer charged with the administration of the orders of such court or judge, that testimony of an employee of the Senate of the United States is needful for use in any court of justice or before any judge or such legal officer for the promotion of justice and, further, such testimony may involve documents, communications, conversations, and matters related thereto under the control of or in the possession of the Senate of the United States, the Senate of the United States will take such order thereon as will promote the ends of justice consistently with the privileges and rights of the Senate; be it further

Resolved, That Ruth Watt, Chief Clerk of the Senate Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations of the Committee on Government Operations, be authorized to appear at the place and before the court named in the subpoena duces tecum before mentioned, but shall not take with her any papers or documents on file in her office or under her control or in her possession as Chief Clerk of the Senate Permament Subcommittee on Investigations of the Committee on Government Operations; be it further

Resolved, That Jerome S. Adlerman, general counsel of the Senate Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations of the Committee on Government Operations, be authorized to appear at the place and before the court named in the subpoena ad testificandum before mentioned, but shall not take with him any papers or documents on file in his office or under his control or in his possession as general counsel of the Senate Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations of the Committee on Government Operations; be it further

Resolved, That Paul J. Tierney, assistant counsel of the Senate Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations of the Committee on Government Operations, be authorized to appear at the place and before the court named in the subpoena ad testificandum before mentioned, but shall not take with him any papers or documents on file in his office or under his control or in his possession as assistant counsel of the Senate Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations of the Committee on Government Operations; be it further

Resolved, That Robert Dunne, assistant counsel of the Senate Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations of the Committee on Government Operations, be authorized to appear at the place and before the court named in the subpoena ad testificandum before mentioned, but shall not take with him any papers or documents on file in his office or under his control or in his possession as assistant counsel of the Senate Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations of the Committee on Government Operations; be it further

Resolved, That Paul Wilner, an employee of the United States General Accounting Office, be authorized to appear at the place and before the court named in the subpoena ad testificandum before mentioned, but shall not take with him any papers or documents on file in his office or under his control or in his possession as a result of his having been assigned to duty with the Senate Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations of the Committee on Government Operations; be it further

Resolved, That in the event a subpena ad testificandum is addressed to Carmine S. Bellino, former accountant-consultant to the Senate Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations of the Committee on Government Operations, Mr. Bellino be authorized to appear at the place and before the court named in such subpoena before mentioned, but shall not take with him any papers or documents on file in his office or under his control or in his possession as a result of his having been accountant-consultant to the Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations of the Committee on Government Operations; be it further

Resolved, That when said court determines that any of the documents, papers, communications, and memorandums called for in the subpoena duces tecum have become part of the official transcripts of public proceedings of the Senate by virtue of their inclusion in the official minutes and official transcripts of such proceedings for dissemination to the public upon order of the Senate or pursuant to the rules of the Senate, and, further, that such documents, papers, communications, and memorandums are material and relevant to the issues pending before said court, then the said court, through any of its officers or agents, have full permission to attend with all proper parties at any place under the orders and control of the Senate, and take copies of such documents, papers, communications and memorandums in possession or control of the aforementioned Ruth Watt, or Jerome E. Adlerman, or Paul J. Tierney, or Robert Dunne, or Carmine S. Bellino, or Paul Wilner, which the court has found to be part of the official transcripts of public proceedings of the Senate by virtue of their inclusion in the official minutes and official transcripts of such proceedings for dissemination to the public upon order of the Senate or pursuant to the rules of the Senate, and which the court has found are material and relevant to the issues pending before said court, excepting any other documents, papers, communications and memorandums which the court or other proper officer thereof shall desire as such matters are within the privileges of the Senate; be it further

Resolved, That Ruth Watt, chief clerk of the Senate Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations of the Committee on Government Operations, in response to the aforementioned subpoena shall testify to any matter determined by the court to be material and relevant for the purposes of identification of any document or documents, provided said document or documents have

previously been made available to the general public, but said Ruth Watt shall respectfully decline to testify concerning any, and all matters that may be based on knowledge acquired by her in her official capacity either by reason of documents and papers appearing in the files of the said subcommittee or by virtue of conversations or communications with any person or persons; be it further

Resolved, That Jerome S. Adlerman, general counsel to the Senate Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations of the Committee on Government Operations, in response to the aforementioned subpoena shall testify to any matter determined by the court to be material and relevant for the purposes of identification of any document or documents, provided said document or documents have previously been made available to the general public, but said Jerome S. Adlerman shall respectfully decline to testify concerning any and all other matters that may be based on knowledge acquired by him in his official capacity either by reason of documents and papers appearing in the files of said subcommittee or by virtue of conversations or communications with any person or persons and he shall respectfully decline to testify concerning any matter or matters within the privilege of the attorney-client relationship existing between said Jerome S. Adlerman and the said subcommittee or any of its members; be it further

Resolved, That Paul J. Tierney, assistant counsel to the Senate Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations of the Committee on Government Operations, in response to the aforementioned subpoena shall testify to any matter determined by the court to be material and relevant for the purposes of identification of any document or documents, provided said document or documents have previously been made available to the general public, but said Paul J. Tierney shall respectfully decline to testify concerning any and all other matters that may be based on knowledge acquired by him in his official capacity either by reason of documents and papers appearing in the files of said subcommittee or by virtue of conversations or communications with any person or persons and he shall respectfully decline to testify concerning any matter or matters within the privilege of the attorney-client relationship existing between said Paul J. Tierney and the said subcommittee or any of its members; be it further

Resolved, That Robert Dunne, assistant counsel to the Senate Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations of the Committee on Government Operations, in response to the aforementioned subpoena, shall testify to any matter determined by the court to be material and relevant for the purposes of identification of any document or documents, provided said document or documents have previously been made available to the general public, but said Robert Dunne shall respectfully decline to testify concerning any and all other matters that may be based on knowledge acquired by him in his official capacity either by reason of documents and papers appearing in the files of said subcommittee or by virtue of conversations or communications with any person or persons and he shall respectfully decline to testify concerning any matter or matters within the privilege of the attorney-client relationship existing between said Robert Dunne and the said subcommittee or any of its members; be it further

Resolved, That Paul Wilner, who is an employee of the United States General Accounting Office, and who was formerly assigned to duty with the Senate Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations of the Committee on Government Operations, in response to the aforementioned subpoena shall testify to any matter determined by the court to be material and relevant for the purposes of identification of any document or documents, provided said document or documents have previously been made available to the general public, but said Paul Wilner shall respectfully decline to testify concerning any and all other matters that may be based on knowledge acquired by him in his official capacity either by reason of documents and papers appearing in the files of said subcommittee or by virtue of conversations or communications with any person or persons; be it further

Resolved, That in the event a subpoena is addressed to Carmine S. Bellino, former accountant-consultant to the Senate Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations of the Committee on Government Operations, said Carmine S. Bellino in response to such subpoena shall testify to any matter determined by the court to be material and relevant for the purposes of identification of any document or documents, provided said document or documents have previously been made available to the general public, but said Carmine S. Bellino shall respectfully decline to testify concerning any and all other matters that may be based on knowledge acquired by him in his former official capacity either by reason of documents, and papers appearing in the files of said subcommittee or by virtue of conversations or communications with any person or persons; be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be transmitted to said court as a respectful answer to the aforementioned subpoenas.

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

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I ask the Presiding Officer whether or not the resolution would displace the pending motion? If so, I would like to ask unanimous consent that it may not be so regarded.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, as the author of the resolution, I have no intention to undertake to displace the pending business except temporarily for the immediate consideration of the resolution.

Mr. HOLLAND. The resolution is one with which I am fully in accord and want to assist. I merely wished to be sure that it would not displace the pending business.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The ruling of the Chair is that consideration of the resolution by unanimous consent would not displace the pending motion. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, the resolution is one that would authorize employees of the Senate to testify in a criminal case. It involves subpenas that have been issued for the appearance in court of those employees. It would also require the production of certain records belonging to the Senate Committee on Investigations. It is in the usual form. I ask for its immediate adoption.

The resolution (S. Res. 316) was considered and agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

REPORT ENTITLED "ANTITRUST AND MONOPOLY ACTIVITIES, 1961"—INDIVIDUAL VIEWS (S. REPT. NO. 1304)

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, from the Committee on the Judiciary, I submit a report entitled "Antitrust and Monopoly Activities, 1961," pursuant to Senate Resolution 52, 87th Congress, 1st session, as extended, together with the individual views of the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY], and the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HRUSKA].

I ask unanimous consent that this report, together with the individual views be printed.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The report will be received and printed, as requested by the Senator from Tennessee.

REPORT ENTITLED "CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENTS"—INDIVIDUAL VIEWS (S. REPT. NO. 1305)

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, from the Committee on the Judiciary, I submit a report entitled "Constitutional Amendments," pursuant to Senate Resolution 59, 87th Congress, 1st session, as extended, together with the individual views of the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] and the Senator from New York [Mr. KEATING].

I ask unanimous consent that the report, together with the individual views be printed.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The report will be received and printed, as requested by the Senator from Tennessee.

REPORT ENTITLED "REFUGEES AND ESCAPEES" (S. REPT. NO. 1306)

Mr. HART, from the Committee on the Judiciary, pursuant to Senate Resolution 50, 87th Congress, 1st session, as extended, submitted a report entitled "Refugees and Escapees," which was ordered to be printed.

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF A COMMITTEE

As in executive session,

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

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

Adrian A. Spears, of Texas, to be U.S. district judge for the western district of Texas;

Sarah T. Hughes, of Texas, to be U.S. district judge for the northern district of Texas;

James L. Noel, Jr., of Texas, to be U.S. district judge for the southern district of Texas;

Marion Mathias Hale, of Texas, to be U.S. marshal for the southern district of Texas;

Robert I. Nash, of Texas, to be U.S. marshal for the northern district of Texas;

Leo Brewster, of Texas, to be U.S. district judge for the northern district of Texas; and

Tully Reynolds, of Texas, to be U.S. marshal for the eastern district of Texas.

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

George Rosling, of New York, to be U.S. district judge for the eastern district of New York;

Paul R. Hays, of New York, to be U.S. circuit judge, second circuit;

Dudley B. Bonsal, of New York, to be U.S. district judge for the southern district of New York; and

Wilfred Feinberg, of New York, to be U.S. district judge for the southern district of New York.

By Mr. LONG of Missouri, from the Committee on the Judiciary:

James H. Meredith, of Missouri, to be U.S. district judge for the eastern district of Missouri.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS INTRODUCED

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

By Mrs. NEUBERGER:

S. 2999. A bill for the relief of Kang Soon Yang; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BENNETT:

S. 3000. A bill for the relief of the widow and children of the late Lt. Cmdr. Douglas L. Barker, U.S. Navy; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HILL:

S. 3001. A bill to amend the definition of the term "telephone service" as used in title II of the Rural Electrification Act of 1936, as amended; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

By Mr. DODD:

S. 3002. A bill to amend section 201 of the Immigration and Nationality Act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

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

By Mr. CARLSON:

S. 3003. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide an additional income tax exemption of $1,000 for a taxpayer, spouse, or dependent who is a student at an institution of higher learning; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. ENGLE:

S. 3004. A bill to authorize the establishment of the Whiskeytown National Recreation Area in the State of California, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

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

By Mr. KEFAUVER:

S. 3005. A bill for the relief of Cathryn A. Glesener; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KEATING:

S.J. Res. 170. Joint resolution designating the month of June of each year as "Children's Music and Arts Festival Month"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

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

By Mr. JAVITS (for himself and Mr. KEATING):

S.J. Res. 171. Joint resolution providing for the establishing of the former dwelling house of Alexander Hamilton as a national memorial; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

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

RESOLUTIONS

APPEARANCE OF CERTAIN PERSONS IN TRIAL OF THE UNITED STATES AGAINST MACK S. TANE

Mr. McCLELLAN, from the Committee on Government Operations, reported an original resolution (S. Res. 316) concerning the appearance of certain persons and witnesses in the trial of the United States against Mack S. Tane in the U.S. District Court for the Eastern District of New York, which was considered and agreed to.

(See the above resolution printed in full when reported by Mr. McCLELLAN, which appears under a separate heading.)

TO PRINT, WITH ILLUSTRATIONS, COMMITTEE HEARINGS ENTITLED "ORBITAL FLIGHT OF JOHN H. GLENN, JR."

Mr. KERR submitted a resolution (S. Res. 317) to print, with illustrations, committee hearings entitled "Orbital Flight of John H. Glenn, Jr.," which was considered and agreed to.

(See the above resolution printed in full when submitted by Mr. KERR, which appears under a separate heading.)

PRINTING, WITH ILLUSTRATIONS, ADDITIONAL COPIES OF REPORT ENTITLED "A REPORT OF U.S. FOREIGN POLICY AND OPERATIONS"

Mr. MANSFIELD, from the Committee on Rules and Administration, reported an original resolution (S. Res. 318), which was considered and agreed to.

(See the above resolution printed in full when reported by Mr. MANSFIELD, which appears under a separate heading.)

AMENDMENT OF SECTION 201 OF THE IMMIGRATION AND NATIONALITY ACT

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to amend section 201 of the Immigration and Nationality Act—8 U.S.C. 1151.

The bill contains the following provisions:

First. A change from the 1920 census to the 1960 census as a more realistic and desirable basis for the allocation of immigration quotas.

Second. A method by which unfulfilled quotas can be used by those countries which have long waiting lists because of their filled quotas. The redistribution is to be made in the same proportion which the waiting list of any one country bears to the sum of all other waiting lists. To avoid excessive flooding from any single quota area, the bill limits the number of quota places which may be redistributed to any one country to the annual quota of that area, so that no country will have more than twice its regular quota in any given year.

Since 1920, when the original immigration bill was written, a great many changes have taken place in this country. We have grown to a nation of 183 million people, and we have learned that America has traditionally benefited from immigration to these shores. Nevertheless, the law governing the number of admissible immigrants is still based on the 1920 census, so that only 157,000 persons are permitted to immigrate into the United States each year under the various quotas.

A change to the 1960 census as a base for the total number of immigrants to be allowed would increase that figure to 300,000, not an excessive number in view of present-day needs.

The reallocation of unused immigration quotas provided by this bill is desirable for the simple reason that the number of present immigrants is far below even that foreseen by existing law. Because the quotas of some countries are exhausted while quotas of other countries are not filled, only 96,104 persons were admitted last year, instead of the 156,787 allowed under the existing system if all quotas were fully used. This is a clear indication that substantial quotas go to waste which are desperately sought after by the many prospective immigrants in countries whose quotas are oversubscribed.

Of the many thousands of people who wait for immigration, a substantial number consists of brothers, sisters, and married sons and daughters of U.S. citizens. Because they have to wait until there are vacant places in the three more privileged categories of immigrants provided by the present law, their chances of coming to the United States are almost nonexistent.

Immigration legislation is of necessity a matter of statistics, numbers, and quotas, but we must not let these drab statistics obscure the vital realities behind them.

This is a nation which was built by the immigrant. Part of the historical appeal of our country lay in the fact that until recent decades our doors were open to the homeless of the world, and distressed men and women the world over could come here to build a new life.

A liberalized immigration policy will reopen in some measure the door which has been closed to many. It will make possible the reuniting of thousands of families. It will open up to countless others new opportunity and new hope. And for our own country it will mean new strength, new vitality, new creativity, new skills, as we continue to draw from that vast reservoir which has nourished our land for three centuries.

Our entire history furnishes proof of the great benefits immigration has brought us. The present bill is intended to renew and increase these benefits, and is therefore recommended to the earnest attention of the Senate.

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

The bill (S. 3002) to amend section 201 of the Immigration and Nationality Act, introduced by Mr. DODD, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

WHISKEYTOWN NATIONAL RECREATION AREA

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. President, we are learning that manmade reservoirs in many cases can provide recreational opportunities as attractive as those of natural mountain lakes. A good case in point is Whiskeytown Reservoir, a new unit of the Trinity division of the Central Valley project, in the wooded hills of Shasta County, Calif.

I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to authorize the establishment of the Whiskeytown National Recreation

Area under the jurisdiction of the Secretary of the Interior. This proposal for a 37,000-acre recreation area has been studied by Shasta County and by the National Park Service. The study shows that Whiskeytown Reservoir, in combination with the picturesque mountain country, has great potential for diversified outdoor recreation including boating, swimming, hiking, camping, and horseback riding. The plan includes several marinas and boat-launching ramps, 150 picnic units and camp grounds, 7 scenic lookouts, 75 miles of riding trails with 3 horse corrals, several swimming beaches, 6 miles of access roads, and parking facilities for 400 cars and 200 boat trailers. Summer homesites and trailer parks would be permissible. The area also includes 6,000-foot Mount Bally southwest of the lake. From the mountain trails there are fine views of Mount Shasta, Mount Lassen, and the Trinity Alps.

The special advantage of Whiskeytown Reservoir for recreational use is that in the operation of the Central Valley project, it will be maintained at an almost constant top level, except perhaps in midwinter.

Whiskeytown Dam is under construction and scheduled to be completed in early 1963. The reservoir will cover a surface area of 3,500 acres and have a shoreline of 36 miles. The plan calls for recreational development not only of the shoreline of the lake but also the lands along Clear Creek below the dam, and Brandy Creek and Crystal Creek which would become fine trout streams.

Section 5 of my bill directs the preparation and implementation of a land- and water-use management plan including provision for the utilization of natural resources such as forage and forest products consistent with public use and enjoyment. Section 7 authorizes mining and mineral leasing in the area, and section 3(c) permits the retention in private ownership of mineral interests on private lands. Section 6 directs that hunting and fishing be permitted under State law. I recommend the establishment of the Whiskeytown National Recreation Area in the general pattern of similar national recreational areas now existing at Grand Coulee Dam, Lake Mead, Shadow Mountain, and Glen Canyon.

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

The bill (S. 3004) to authorize the establishment of the Whiskeytown National Recreation Area in the State of California, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. ENGLE, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

CHILDREN'S MUSIC AND ARTS FESTIVAL MONTH

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a joint resolution designating the month of June as Children's Music and Arts Festival Month.

For the past 2 years the Afro Arts Cultural Center in New York City, in cooperation with the New York City Department of Parks, the borough president of Manhattan's office, the board of education and the youth council of the police department's 28th precinct, has sponsored a children's music festival in New York City.

The Afro Arts Cultural Center is working to improve the cultural patterns of the people of New York City. The center has also endeavored to create a better understanding among all people of the world. In seeking to promote the theme that "the world belongs to children," the Afro Arts Cultural Center has had the support of many leading citizens of New York. It is hoped that the seed which this organization has planted in New York will spread to other States and to nations around the world. Through music and art the cultural spirits of all people can be united in an effort to promote better world understanding.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD the text of this joint resolution.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The joint resolution will be received and appropriately referred and, without objection, the joint resolution will be printed in the RECORD.

The joint resolution (S.J. Res. 170) designating the month of June of each year as "Children's Music and Arts Festival Month," introduced by Mr. KEATING, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the month of June of each year is hereby designated as "Children's Music and Arts Festival Month," and the President of the United States is authorized and requested to issue annually a proclamation calling on the people of the United States to observe such month, and urge the participation of all Americans without regard to race, creed, or national origin to participate in the observance of such month to the extent and by such means as they may deem appropriate.

ALEXANDER HAMILTON NATIONAL MEMORIAL

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, on behalf of myself and my distinguished colleague from New York [Mr. KEATING], a joint resolution to provide for the establishing of the former dwelling house of Alexander Hamilton as a national memorial.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The joint resolution will be received and appropriately referred.

The joint resolution (S.J. Res. 171) providing for the establishing of the former dwelling house of Alexander Hamilton as a national memorial, introduced by Mr. JAVITS (for himself and Mr. KEATING), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, this joint resolution is precisely in the form in which the Senate committee reported the measure which is to be the subject of whatever action the Senate shall take with respect to the poll tax. My colleague [Mr. KEATING] and I have every assurance that the national memorial of Alexander Hamilton's home will not be disadvantaged by what is now occurring, which is the using of the measure as a vehicle for the poll tax debate.

I have the gracious assurance of the majority leader that the introducing of the joint resolution is entirely unobjectionable to him, is agreeable to him, and every assurance was obtained yesterday by my colleague [Mr. KEATING] and myself that the joint resolution would be called up promptly.

I think all of us can agree upon a national shrine for this great Founding Father of our country. Whatever may be our differences and disputes with regard to the question of the poll tax, whatever may have been the reasons for choosing this measure as the poll tax vehicle, certainly we do not want—and I know this is especially a matter of some interest to the present occupant of the chair, the Vice President—to get into another Stella School case. The national memorial for Alexander Hamilton should be established. I have personally inspected the house. It is going to wrack and ruin. It needs to be dealt with and cared for.

I know we can depend absolutely upon the feelings of the majority leader.

A great speech was made to the Senate the other day by the Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON] bearing out the urgent desirability in the national interest for the establishing of the memorial, and other Senators have expressed their feelings in this regard.

My colleague and I are putting the measure back into the procedural stream, so that it will not be substantively disadvantaged by the situation which surrounds using it as the vehicle for the poll tax debate. We have every faith in the majority leader's assurances, and we believe the committee will adhere to its previous position in reporting the original measure.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, I wish to express my appreciation to the distinguished majority leader [Mr. MANSFIELD] and to the distinguished Senator from Nevada [Mr. BIBLE] who handled the Alexander Hamilton memorial joint resolution in the subcommittee of which he is chairman, for their assurances to us that if the joint resolution is used as the vehicle for proposed civil-rights legislation, prompt action will be taken to bring the same bill before us again. Sometimes a high price must be paid for the privilege of bringing civil-rights legislation before this body. In the last session it was the schoolchildren of the Stella School District who were parliamentary victims of a similar move. However, due to the assurances given to us, we can in turn assure those who are very much interested in the establishment of the memorial, which is a noteworthy project, that they will not suffer the fate of the Stella School District bill. Such a precedent, too, might be disastrous in the event that, at some future time in our history, the homes of certain Members of this body should be suggested as national monuments. In such happy and foreseeable circumstances, the intervention of legislation which

would have the effect of deterring such action might constitute a personal if not a national calamity. It would be a most heartening consequence if the Alexander Hamilton memorial joint resolution were the vehicle for establishing on our books further civil-rights legislation and at the same time serving to enshrine one of the most important historical sites in America.

TO PRINT AS A SENATE DOCUMENT, WITH ILLUSTRATIONS, COMMITTEE HEARINGS ON ORBITAL FLIGHT OF JOHN H. GLENN, JR. (S. DOC. NO. 79)

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, I submit a resolution, which I have cleared with the minority leader and the acting majority leader, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolution will be stated.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That the hearings conducted on February 23, 1962, by the Senate Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences entitled "Orbital Flight of John H. Glenn, Jr.", shall be printed with illustrations as a Senate document. There shall be printed nine thousand additional copies of such Senate document which shall be for the use of the Senate Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences.

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

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I make the same request that I made with relation to the previous resolution, that unanimous consent may be given that consideration of the resolution shall not displace the pending business.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair will make the identical ruling.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, the resolution would provide for the printing as a Senate document of the transcript of certain hearings of the Space Committee with reference to the appearance before it of the astronaut, with additional copies to be made available for the use of the Senate Space Committee.

There being no objection, the resolution (S. Res. 317) was considered and agreed to.

PROPOSED LEGISLATION RELATING TO REPORTS OF CIVIL RIGHTS COMMISSION—ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under authority of the order of the Senate of March 13, 1962, the names of Mr. HUMPHREY, Mr. LONG of Missouri, Mr. CASE of New Jersey, Mr. DIRKSEN, Mr. MORSE, Mr. BUSH, Mr. KUCHEL, Mr. PROXMIRE, and Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey were added as additional cosponsors of the following bills and resolutions:

S. 2979. A bill to further secure and protect the rights of citizens to vote in Federal and State elections; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 2980. A bill to establish a procedure for adoption and implementation of plans for the desegregation of public schools; to provide financial and technical assistance to facilitate desegregation of public schools; to restrict Federal financial aid for segregated public schools and institutions of higher education, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

S. 2981. A bill to establish a Commission on Equal Employment Opportunity to encourage and enforce a policy of equal employment opportunity in Federal employment, in employment under Government contracts, and in employment in programs supported or in facilities constructed by Federal grants-in-aid; to prohibit discrimination by labor organizations because of race, color, religion, or national origin, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

S. 2982. A bill to assure decent, safe, and sanitary housing to families displaced by construction of highways forming a part of the Interstate System; to the Committee on Public Works.

S. 2983. A bill to protect civil rights through providing criminal and civil remedies for unlawful official violence; authorizing suits by the Attorney General to prevent exclusion of members of minority groups from jury service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 2984. A bill to establish a matching grant program to be administered by the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare to improve the education, training, and recruitment of State and local police forces; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

S. Res. 311. Resolution concerning the establishment of congressional and State election districts;

S Res. 312. Resolution authorizing a study of the question of utilizing the full manpower resources of the Nation; and

S. Res. 313. Resolution concerning loans without discriminatory provisions on real estate by financial institutions.

MINORITY RIGHTS—ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF RESOLUTION

Under authority of the order of the Senate of March 8, 1962, the names of Senators BUSH, JAVITS, MILLER, ALLOTT, and BOGGS were added as additional cosponsors of the resolution (S. Res. 309) providing for minority rights, submitted by Mr. PROUTY on March 8, 1962.

NOTICE OF HEARING ON NOMINATION OF LOUIS ROSENBERG TO BE U.S. DISTRICT JUDGE, WESTERN DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, on behalf of the Committee on the Judiciary, I desire to give notice that a public hearing has been scheduled for Thursday, March 22, 1962, at 10:30 a.m., in room 2300, New Senate Office Building, on the nomination of Louis Rosenberg, of Pennsylvania, to be U.S. district judge, western district of Pennsylvania.

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

The subcommittee consists of the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON], the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HRUSKA], and myself, as chairman.

NOTICE OF HEARINGS ON NOMINATIONS BEFORE COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, on behalf of the Committee on the Judiciary, I desire to give notice that public hearings have been scheduled for Friday, March 23, 1962, at 10:30 a.m., in room 2300, New Senate Office Building, on the following nominations:

Wesley E. Brown, of Kansas, to be U.S. district judge, district of Kansas, vice Delmas C. Hill, elevated; and

Jesse E. Eschbach, of Indiana, to be U.S. district judge, northern district of Indiana, vice Luther M. Swygert, elevated.

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

The subcommittee consists of the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON], the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HRUSKA], and myself, as chairman.

NOTICE OF HEARING ON NOMINATION OF OSCAR H. DAVIS TO BE ASSOCIATE JUDGE, U.S. COURT OF CLAIMS

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, on behalf of the Committee on the Judiciary, I desire to give notice that a public hearing has been scheduled for Friday, March 23, 1962, at 10:30 a.m., in room 357, Senate Office Building, on the nomination of:

Oscar H. Davis, of New York, to be associate judge, U.S. Court of Claims, vice Joseph W. Madden, retired.

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

The subcommittee consists of the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON], and myself, as chairman.

NOTICE OF HEARINGS ON NOMINATIONS BEFORE COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, on behalf of the Committee on the Judiciary, I desire to give notice that public hearings have been scheduled for Tuesday, March 27, 1962, at 10:30 a.m., in room 2300 New Senate Office Building, on the following nominations:

James A. Coolahan, of New Jersey, to be U.S. district judge, district of New Jersey, vice Mendon Morrill, deceased; and

Ralph C. Body, of Pennsylvania, to be U.S. district judge, eastern district of Pennsylvania, vice Allan K. Grim, retired.

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

The subcommittee consists of the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON], the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HRUSKA], and myself, as chairman.

NOTICE OF HEARING ON NOMINATION OF SIDNEY W. BISHOP TO BE AN ASSISTANT POSTMASTER GENERAL

Mr. JOHNSTON. Mr. President, as chairman of the Post Office and Civil

Service Committee, I wish to announce that a public hearing on the nomination of Sidney W. Bishop to be an Assistant Postmaster General will be held Tuesday, March 20, 1962, at 10 a.m. in room 6202 of the New Senate Office Building.

The hearing will be open to the public and will be held before the full committee.

ADDRESSES, EDITORIALS, ARTICLES, ETC., PRINTED IN THE RECORD

On request, and by unanimous consent, addresses, editorials, articles, etc., were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

By Mr. CARROLL:

Statement of Senator CARROLL before the Senate Appropriations Committee on March 13, relating to Bent's Old Fort, Colo.

Statement of Senator CARROLL before the Senate Appropriations Committee on March 13, relating to fish pesticide lab for Fort Collins, Colo.

Statement of Senator CARROLL before the Senate Appropriations Committee on March 13, relating to cooperative fishery research unit for Colorado State University.

By Mr. MAGNUSON:

Remarks on the Nation's fisheries to be delivered before the N.F.I. convention.

FATHER JOHN GARVAN CAVANAGH

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, the opening prayer today was offered by a very unusual man, Father John Garvan Cavanagh, formerly of Norwalk, Conn., now located at Alexandria, La.

Father Cavanagh was ordained as a priest at the age of 53 after a distinguished and many-sided career in business, politics, and as a military officer.

It has been my privilege over the years to know Garvan Cavanagh and to have his friendship. He served as a member of the Connecticut General Assembly, as a member of the Connecticut State Park and Forest Commission, and, at the time he entered the priesthood, he was vice president of the Hat Corp. of America.

The story of Father Cavanagh is a significant one because it is a story of a man who gave up a life in which he had achieved eminent success in a number of fields in order to pursue a religious vocation.

Last month's issue of the Catholic Digest featured an excellent article about Father Cavanagh, and I ask unanimous consent that it be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

FATHER CAVANAGH AND HIS FATHER'S BUSINESS

(By James V. O'Gara)

In Rome back in March, a visitor entering the Basilica of St. John Lateran might have witnessed an unusual ordination. Among a group of 20 candidates at the altar before Luigi Cardinal Traglia, vice regent of the Eternal City, were six whose gray or balding heads and mature faces set them instantly apart.

The elder half dozen included an American, 53-year-old John Garvan Cavanagh, of Connecticut's famous Cavanagh hat family, onetime polo player, Army officer, politician, and businessman. He had surrendered a well-paid post as vice president of the Hat Corp. of America and its subsidiary, Cavanagh Hats, in 1957 to go on to Rome to study for the priesthood. In the fall of 1960 he had turned his back on a position in President Kennedy's administration to persevere in his late vocation.

"Next to the priesthood, politics is the greatest profession a man can have," said Father Cavanagh. "I have always been a Democrat and I was an early supporter of President Kennedy. I have many friends in the new administration. So it was natural that I should be told that I would be welcome in the Government. Every new administration needs men with business experience in a variety of posts."

When the Government offer reached him in the seminary, Father Cavanagh made a retreat with the Redemptorist Fathers "to have this thing out with myself."

"Later a Carmelite priest asked me, 'Can the President get along without you?'

"I said, 'If you put it that way, of course he can.'

"Then the priest said, 'There's only one thing for you to do—go ahead with your studies.' That clinched it."

Father Cavanagh traces his vocation to the Second World War. In a war, he said, "with the closeness of death, one's sense of values undergoes a change." He saw much of death, taking part in five major campaigns. As officer in charge of an ammunition supply detail on a troopship that was under a heavy bombing attack shortly after D-day, he won the Bronze Star with V (for valor). According to the official citation, he had "remained on an exposed portion of the bridge deck as he most efficiently directed his men in their work." Then, when a 3-inch naval gun was dangerously jammed by a fused projectile, he prevented the shell from exploding in the gun bore, thus saving many lives.

There was an additional element in his decision to become a priest. "I worked hard at my business for over 25 years," he said, "but I came to realize there was more to life than the pursuit of money."

News reports of Father Cavanagh's ordination described him as a "hat tycoon," "a millionaire," even as "one of the wealthiest men in the United States." He bridled a bit at the characterizations. "I am not a millionaire by any stretch of the imagination, nor even a quarter of a millionaire," he said emphatically. "Mr. Rockefeller, while sleeping, has made more money than I've ever seen."

The announcement of his ordination in March caught Father Cavanagh's friends and former business colleagues off guard. "When I entered the Beda (Pontificio Collegio Beda) in the fall of 1957," he explained, "I told only my brothers, Carroll and Lawrence, what I was doing." His reason was that he could not tell, at that time, if his vocation would persist.

Even the president of the Hat Corp. of America, Bernard Silesky, was "completely surprised" at his ordination. Mr. Silesky recalled recently that "Garvan and I were together part of nearly every business day for about 3 years" before he resigned.

"He seemed to be a religious man—more than once he left in the middle of a business meeting to go to mass—but I thought he'd wind up running for Governor of Connecticut or mayor of Norwalk," said Mr. Silesky. "Garvan had been in politics, he was widely known, a high-salaried executive, one of the best-dressed men I knew; a man who liked the luxurious things of life. He liked to be with people; he loved conversation."

Salesmen who worked under the future priest at the famed Cavanagh hat store on New York's Park Avenue ("the most exclusive hat store in the world," where $40 and even $100 headpieces are sold) were unprepared for the ordination news, too. None of them expected he would become a priest.

One remembered that the boss "always had a red convertible and once he accidentally ran it atop a huge sand pile." Another recalled him as "a clotheshorse who could wear a $35 suit and look terrific." This salesman added that Garvan Cavanagh was "a handsome man whose very presence added a feeling of graciousness to the store." A favorite recollection was that he got a kick out of working the siren on the official car of his friend, the fire commissioner of New York City.

Even his brother, Carroll Cavanagh, onetime New York Herald Tribune reporter, expressed some surprise. "He was real wild as a kid," he mused. "The grocers around here would ask mother not to bring him with her when she went shopping. Garvan would mix the dried peas and dried beans so that the guys couldn't sell either."

As a hatter, Father Cavanagh was always looking for new styles. Once, when a hatmakers' strike caused Hat Corp. sales to plummet, he turned up with a double-brimmed creation imported from France that helped stem the sales slide. He helped make a cap for Gen. Douglas MacArthur, the famous battered headpiece MacArthur wore out of Bataan. He designed a hunting hat and a polo helmet. The helmet was based on suggestions from such alltime polo greats as Stewart Iglehart, Raymond Guest, and Dunbar Bostwick. Father Cavanagh played with these polo immortals on two championship teams at Yale.

When John Garvan Cavanagh, who never married, turned up at St. Bede's, a unique major seminary, late in 1957, he had recently lost both his father, who was 94, and then his mother. "I was very close to my parents," said Father Cavanagh, "especially my mother." Her death "took away my only good reason for not pursuing my vocation." That reason, of course, was his obligation to look after her.

Before gaining admission to the seminary, he first had to find a bishop willing to accept a priest of his age. "Not every bishop wants to take on a man past 50," he explained. "Let's face it: a man of 25 is a better investment. However, in some parts of the country, where vocations are less plentiful than in the East, bishops will take on an older man if he has the qualifications, educational and otherwise.

"I met Bishop Charles P. Greco of Alexandria, La.," continued Father Cavanagh. "I was much impressed with him. Apparently he thought I was all right, and he agreed to have me."

The American seminarian found St. Bede's an unusual institution. It is in the south side of Rome, across the street from St. Paul's-Outside-the-Walls. It was established by Pope Leo XIII, who named it for the Venerable Bede. The Beda specializes in late vocations, and discourages applicants under 30. It has no top age limit, and there is always a waiting list. The Beda's candidates must have intelligence, some Latin, and the recommendation of a bishop.

According to its 75-year-old rector, Msgr. Charles L. H. Duchemin, a onetime lawyer who is himself a graduate of St. Bede's, the school is a combination of seminary, English university, and officers' mess. In fact, a number of retired British and former American Army officers have become priests there. One of them, ordained at 70, had difficulty finding an assignment but finally became the curate of an 81-year-old pastor.

Classes have included authors, clerks, pianists, auto mechanics, and teachers. Each class usually has a widower or two. One of these, a former newsdealer in Dubuque, Iowa, was the father of 14 children. Today he is a curate serving under one of his sons, who was ordained before him.

In its 64 years, the Beda has graduated about 1,000 priests. Its alumni include many bishops. The late Bernard Cardinal Griffin, Archbishop of Westminster, was a canon-law postgraduate student. Most of its students are English, but the United States this year is represented by five seminarians. Classes often include candidates from such faraway places as Australia, New Zealand, and China.

Ordained with Father Cavanagh were an Australian who had previously been a Protestant clergyman, and another American, Lisle Kennedy, a New Yorker who had worked in the office of the attorney general in Washington.

The Beda offers a 4-year course because older men are better gaited to a shorter-than-traditional period. Father Cavanagh took the fast, difficult work in stride. His ordination, he declares, was the happiest moment of his life.

John Garvan Cavanagh was born in East Norwalk, Conn., in 1908, the son of a master hatter who rose from the workbench to the presidency of the company that had employed him. His father, John J. Cavanagh, eventually merged Cavanagh-Dobbs with Knox to form the Hat Corp. of America.

The elder Cavanagh was mayor of South Norwalk and later mayor of Norwalk. Garvan's uncle, Francis P. Garvan, was assistant attorney general under President Woodrow Wilson, and his mother's sister, Genevieve, was the wife of William J. Macaulay, minister to the Vatican from the Irish Free State, now Eire.

Garvan graduated from Yale in 1932. He then spent 2 years studying scholastic philosophy at night at Fordham "under the late, great Father George Bull, S.J." After his 5 years in the Army, he won a degree of master of science in retailing at New York University.

Before the war, in 1940, he was elected to the Connecticut State Legislature. With the attack on Pearl Harbor, he and Mayor Robert Wagner, of New York City, who was then a New York State assemblyman, were the first legislators in the country to waive their military exemptions, resign their posts, and enter the service. During his legislative tenure, he had formed a friendship with Abraham Ribicoff, now Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, but then assistant minority leader of Connecticut's House of Representatives. It was Governor Ribicoff who named him to the State park and forest commission in the mid-1950's.

At the famed, luxurious Park Avenue hat store he managed, Garvan Cavanagh's customers included Henry Ford II, Francis Cardinal Spellman, Bing Crosby, the Duke of Windsor, Spencer Tracy, and Bishop Fulton J. Sheen. The store sells 37 hat styles in 10 different brim widths. All models are available in four ovals: regular, wide, long, and extra long. Sizes range from 6¾ to 8½, but the store will make others on request. It once created a size 6 for Edgar Bergen's wooden young friend, Charlie McCarthy.

Cardinal Spellman (wide oval), a lifelong friend of the Cavanagh family, "always insisted on having a Cavanagh label sewn into his zucchettos." When he was named a prince of the church he brought into the store several of these skullcaps which had belonged to the late Patrick Cardinal Hayes. The new cardinal wished them renovated for his own use on his trip to Rome. When the elder Cavanagh couldn't locate material of the correct color for new linings, he used silk from some of his own red ties.

For Fr. J. Garvan Cavanagh (a difficult-to-fit long oval) the hat business, politics, and polo are now but fond memories. "God certainly had me by the hand when I met Bishop Greco," he says, with some feeling. "I hope He'll be satisfied with His part of the bargain."

HARTFORD, CONN.—"ALL-AMERICA CITY"

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, the capital city of Connecticut, Hartford, was afforded a great distinction today. It was named an "All-America City" by a distinguished group of journalists and experts on municipal affairs. What is more, it is the second time in 12 years that Hartford was selected for this honor.

Today's award by the National Municipal League and Look magazine cited Hartford for "mobilizing citizen action behind a mammoth facelifting for the city." The awards are made to honor cities whose citizens have played an outstanding role in improving their communities. Twelve years ago, in 1950, Hartford began a downtown redevelopment job that today is considered a model the world over. And I might add that the redevelopment is continuing. It has been described by experts as a showcase. I wish you, my colleagues, could see the results of the efforts of the people of Hartford. They are not only beautiful, but sensible. Eyesores were eliminated and deteriorating property is being put back on the tax rolls. An area that once produced only $90,000 a year in tax revenue will soon produce over $1,300,000 a year.

Constitution Plaza would be the envy of any town. Beauty has been substituted for blight. Stifling transportation problems have been tackled. Crime-breeding slums have disappeared.

But most gratifying to me now, and through the years, has been the ability of the residents of Greater Hartford to pull together in a united effort to accomplish this great task. The leadership, the singleness of purpose, the relentless push to go ahead so traditional with the people of Connecticut has been a thing to see as this dream becomes a reality. I think there is a great lesson to be learned from it. Again we have the hardy stock of New Englanders adapting to meet the changing times, going forward as the occasion demands, as they have since the time of the earliest settlements. Their tradition of accomplishment continues.

The leaders in this project are strong of fiber and numerous. Many who were essential to the beginnings of the project are no longer with us, but must be remembered. Today a sense of accomplishment must be with men such as Mayor William E. Glynn; City Manager Carleton F. Sharpe; Judge Solomon Elsner, chairman of the redevelopment agency; Raymond A. Gibson, former chairman of the Committee for Hartford; Gladden W. Baker, chairman of Constitution Plaza, and to such organizations as the Greater Hartford Chamber of Commerce and the Hartford newspapers, all of whom have dedicated so much of their time and talent to this undertaking.

It is with a sense of pride that I pay tribute to such an accomplishment. It is a great honor to represent in the National Capitol people and projects such as these. I ask unanimous consent to have three articles from the Hartford Times inserted at this point in the RECORD.

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

HARTFORD SELECTED AS ALL-AMERICAN CITY FOR REDEVELOPMENT, ESPECIALLY PLAZA—ONE OF FEW TO WIN TWICE; AMONG TOP 11 IN COUNTRY

Several local celebrations are planned in honor of the award. An All-American Cities flag ceremony will be held at 12 noon Thursday on the steps of city hall, and the formal award presentation to Hartford will be made at a banquet April 25 at the Statler Hilton.

The flag will be presented to Mayor Glynn by John Flack, Connecticut representative of Look magazine. The Hartford High School Band will march from the Old State House to city hall down Main Street prior to the presentation, and it will play "America the Beautiful" as the flag is being raised over city hall. An honor guard of Hartford policemen and firemen will also take part.

Mayor Glynn will introduce members of the city council. Gladden W. Baker, chairman of the Committee for Hartford and chairman of Constitution Plaza, will give a short address.

Hartford, for the second time in the past dozen years, has been designated an All-America City.

The city was informed today by the National Municipal League and Look Magazine that it is among 11 cities designated as this year's All-America Cities.

Hartford received a similar designation in 1950. At that time it was cited for its progress after a shift from mayor-commission to city manager-city council government.

This year's award is for "mobilizing citizen action behind a mammoth facelifting for the city."

The national awards are made by the municipal league and the magazine to honor cities whose citizens have played an outstanding role in improving their communities.

Some 80 cities originally entered competition for this year's awards. This number was cut to 22 finalists. Then the 22 cities each made presentations before a panel of judges last November 30 and December 1 at Miami Beach, Fla.

Following the presentations, representatives of the league and Look visited the cities to make sure that claims were justified by facts.

Hartford's presentation at Miami seemed to attract the biggest interest from the panel of judges which was headed by Dr. George H. Gallup, director of the American Institute of Public Opinion.

The presentation was made by Richard B. Haskell, former president of the Greater Hartford Chamber of Commerce, and was greeted with spontaneous applause by business and civic leaders of other cities in the competition.

Hartford's entry in the all-America cities competition was predicated on the city's big renewal program and in particular Constitution Plaza.

In its announcement that the city was one of the winners today, the cosponsors cited local business and industrial leaders who joined with civic and other groups to save blighted downtown areas.

In 1956, voters rallied to the united campaign and approved the first renewal bond issue by a 5–1 vote. Today, four major projects are giving a brandnew look to downtown Hartford, while four more are underway elsewhere in the city. The striking new buildings rising in Constitution Plaza are expected to produce over $1,300,000 in tax revenue in an area that once produced $90,000. The city, too, is working with 26

surrounding towns on common plans for transportation and hospitals.

In addition to Hartford, other cities which today received the All-America designation were Anacortes, Wash.; Falls Church, Va.; Galveston, Tex.; Independence, Mo.; Lynwood, Calif.; Milton-Freewater, Oreg.; Rockville, Md.; Salisbury, N.C.; Sioux City, Iowa, and Wichita, Kans.

In receiving the designation today, Hartford became one of the few cities in the country to receive the award more than once. Rockville, Md., also became a second award recipient today. Philadelphia is the only city to have received three awards. Other cities which have won two awards previously are Phoenix, Ariz., Grand Rapids, Mich., De Soto, Mo., and Cincinnati, Ohio.

Judges for this year's competition in addition to Dr. Gallup included W. Scott Christopher, general manager of the Greater Tampa, Fla., Chamber of Commerce and president of American Chamber of Commerce Executives; Mark S. Matthews, former president of the U.S. Junior Chamber of Commerce; Willard V. Merrihue, manager of Community and Business Relations Service for General Electric Co., and chairman of the board of Effective Citizens Organization; Roy L. Miller, executive secretary of the Bureau of Municipal Research of Des Moines, Iowa.

Also: Vernon C. Myers, publisher of Look; Miss Katherine Peden, president of the National Federation of Business and Professional Women's Clubs; Mrs. Robert J. Phillips, president of the League of Women Voters of the United States; Paul Schweitzer, chairman of the board of Layne-Atlantic Co., and city councilman of Norfolk, Va.; Allen H. Seed, Jr., executive vice president of Keep American Beautiful, Inc.; Dr. Donald H. Webster, director of the Bureau of Governmental Research of the University of Washington; and Dr. Arnold S. Zander, international president of the American Federation of State, County, and Municipal Employees, AFL–CIO.

MANY HANDS JOINED TO BRING RENEWAL HONOR GIVEN CITY

Hartford's selection as an all-America city by the National Municipal League and Look magazine was the result of concerted efforts of Greater Hartford residents and organizations over the last decade.

From the beginning, the Hartford Times gave full coverage to renewal, and a special project in this area was the series of articles entitled "Go Ahead, Hartford," which alerted and informed the community of the problems of urban blight.

The articles and others that followed in the Times focused public attention on the urgent necessity of renewal and created an atmosphere in which civic and public leadership could be and was effective.

The Travelers Insurance Co. provided a tremendous boost to redevelopment in 1960 when the city's first major renewal project, Constitution Plaza, was faltering because of lack of financing. The insurance company announced it would stand behind the financing of the redevelopment. Constitution Plaza has been the city's renewal showcase since.

The basis of Hartford's award-winning entry emphasized the cooperative effort behind the mammoth face-lifting project that started as a reality in 1950 when the Federal Redevelopment Agency approved plans for clearing slums in the Front-Market Streets area.

Early last year, when a committee of business and civic leaders met at the Greater Hartford Chamber of Commerce to discuss submitting an entry from the city to the all-America cities competition, it was decided that Hartford's success could be attributed to the interest and support in redevelopment over the past dozen years.

It was also pointed out that since October 1960, when a rational redevelopment symposium was held here, the city has been cited by numerous newspaper and magazine writers as a "blueprint" for redevelopment. Inquiries about the local action in redevelopment have come from cities as far away as Sidney, Australia.

The presentation at the all-America cities competition at Miami showed the slum areas that existed before redevelopment, the new center rising at Constitution Plaza, and the hopes for other parts of the city through redevelopment.

The history of the Committee for Hartford, the citizens' action group that has guided the city's renewal program, was detailed. A booklet, "New City Going Up in Connecticut," was distributed to hundreds of persons attending the all-America cities session and allied conventions in Miami.

Edgar T. Sloan, president of the Greater Hartford Chamber of Commerce, today called Hartford's selection for an award "a meaningful step forward in the rebuilding of a dynamic new center in Hartford that will mean increased prosperity for all our people.

"It is further proof," Mr. Sloan said, "that Hartford has one of the most well-rounded and soundly conceived redevelopment plans in the country. Greater Hartford residents can join with pride in the flag-raising ceremony to be held Thursday noon at city hall."

OFFICIALS CONGRATULATE CITY, SAY VOTERS SHARE ITS TRIBUTE

State and local officials expressed elation today on Hartford's selection as one of this year's 11 all-American cities.

Among those paying tribute to the insurance city were Governor Dempsey; Mayor Glynn; City Manager Sharpe; Judge Solomon Elsner, chairman of the redevelopment agency; and Gladden W. Baker, chairman of the Committee for Hartford and chairman of the board of Constitution Plaza, Inc.

Governor Dempsey stated the announcement of the award "comes as most welcome news."

"This achievement of our capital city is typical of the growth and progress we are experiencing throughout Connecticut. It is significant that the Hartford redevelopment program, one of the many in progress in this State, played a major role in bringing the award to the city.

"I extend my heartiest congratulations to all the people of Hartford on this well-deserved honor," the chief executive added.

Mayor Glynn praised all those participating in the effort which brought about the award.

"There were many community leaders and representatives of the press, radio and TV who were instrumental in achieving the programs resulting in the honor which comes to the city today," he said.

"Most important, however, were the Hartford voters who have consistently supported these programs by authorizing the bond issues which made them a reality."

City Manager Sharpe hailed the award as a recognition of the good that can be done by the cooperation of the citizens and government.

"This is an honor which should be shared by all the people of Hartford," the city manager said. "It represents foresight in planning and sacrifices on the part of those who have contributed in many ways to earn this citation."

Mr. Baker said his committee, "along with other civic groups, is proud that Hartford has been named to the all-American team of 11 cities. Under the recent leadership of Raymond A. Gibson, the committee has helped greatly in making Hartford's redevelopment program outstanding in the country."

Judge Elsner, chairman of the Hartford Redevelopment Agency, hailed the award "as splendid recognition of what Hartford is trying to accomplish in the way of redevelopment.

"With such support as rendered by the Travelers Insurance Co. and the Phoenix Mutual Life Insurance Co., in the development of Constitution Plaza, Hartford will continue to grow and, I hope, merit the confidence expressed in this award."

WICHITA, KANS.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, on March 14, Look magazine named Wichita, Kans., one of 11 all-American cities for 1962. This is indeed a great honor for Wichitans and for all Kansas. No American city has had a more colorful history than Wichita, Kans., largest city in Kansas, first known to the world by the name of "Quivira," fabled city of the gilded man.

In 1867, the U.S. Government bought the site of Wichita and much of southern Kansas from the Osage Indians. The Osage and Wichita tribes then departed for Oklahoma.

The Wichita town company was organized in 1868. Among the original settlers who took claims in what is now the heart of Wichita, were William Greiffenstein, James R. Mead, N. A. English, Eli Waterman, and William Mathewson. Many of Wichita's streets and schools carry the names of these pioneers.

Douglas Avenue, the main street in Wichita, was made 114 feet wide at the suggestion of William Greiffenstein to coincide with width of the main street in Frankfort, Germany, where he was born.

With the building of the Santa Fe to Wichita in April 1872, Wichita became the cattle shipping point for Texas cattlemen, who brought their herds North to the railroad. In that first year 350,000 longhorn cattle were sold in Wichita for $2 million. Gradually, southern Kansas was settled by farmers, and Wichita began to be a wheat shipping and flour milling center. The first flour mill was built in 1874. Wichita is now the fifth leading flour milling city in the Nation.

The post office was established in 1868, with Milo B. Kellogg as postmaster. Wichita was incorporated as a village in 1870, as a city of the third class in 1871, a city of the second class in 1872, and a city of the first class in 1886. The city manager form of government was adopted in 1917.

In 1917 the first airplanes were built in Wichita. Ten years later Wichita was building more private planes than any other city in the world and today has headquarters plants of Beech Aircraft Corp. and Cessna Aircraft Co. Together, these two companies account for more than 60 percent of the world production and sales of personal and executive-type airplanes.

Wichita is the home of the swept-wing Boeing B–52's, powerful striking arm of the Strategic Air Command. McConnell Air Force Base is located in southeast

Wichita, with a $280 million industry that turns out topflight B–47 crews. Covering 2,540 acres of Sedgwick County land, McConnell has an estimated annual monetary impact on the city of Wichita of $31 million.

Long established keystones of Wichita's economy are:

Headquarters plants of the Coleman Co., whose trademark is known the world over as the largest manufacturer of gasoline lanterns and stoves, as well as for scores of other products manufactured for indoor comfort and outdoor recreation.

Bulging grain elevators with capacities exceeding 86 million bushels, including the world's largest single unit with a 43-million-bushel capacity, rank Wichita third in the storage of grain. Broom corn is produced in Wichita in volume unequaled anywhere in the world.

Wichita's industrial family numbers some 675 firms, with a diversity including: aircraft, chemicals, heating, and lighting equipment, air-conditioning equipment, oil field equipment, machinery, metal products, cloth and canvas products, petroleum products, home and office equipment, hotel and motel furnishings, and wood products.

Recent years have brought about a boom in the cold storage business, because of more favorable freight rates and transit privileges, thus permitting coastal fruit and vegetable firms to ship perishable products in bulk to Wichita for individual packaging, storage, and later shipment in accordance with consumer demands.

Two natural factors—central geographical location and moderate climate with four true seasons—are major contributing factors in Wichita's tremendous growth. Located just 149 miles southeast of the geographic center of the continental United States, Wichita is within a few hours' travel by air of any city in the Nation and overnight by rail to any city in the Middle West. Six major airlines and five railroads provide daily service. Also serving the city are two interstate highways, and the multimillion-dollar Kansas Turnpike.

Wichita's population in 1870 was only 50. Today, she boasts a metropolitan population of 343,231, almost double the 1950 census figures. To provide for this doubling of population, one-half of Wichita's homes have been built in the last 16 years, thus eliminating the slum areas that plague other metropolitan cities.

Wichita is the home of two noted universities: University of Wichita, a fully accredited, coeducational municipal university; and Friends University, a privately endowed Quaker institution. Her public school system comprises 81 elementary, 14 intermediate, and 5 fully accredited high schools. Supplementing its public school system are 16 parochial schools, including 13 elementary, and 3 high schools, as well as Sacred Heart College for Women.

Wichita is internationally known for its institute of logopedics, world's largest residential rehabilitation center for speech and hearing. Children and adults come from over the Nation and many foreign countries for specialized training that offers them hope for a new life in which they will be self-sufficient.

The citizens of this great city are deeply religious, as evidenced by its 360 religious organizations, housed in 345 edifices of 60 denominations.

In 1959, Wichitans founded the Civics Progress, Inc., and launched a successful campaign for passage of the sewage-treatment bonds at a special election. Civic groups formed a metropolitan area planning commission. In 1961, voters approved a $15 million bond issue for a civic center and new main library.

For a midwestern example of an all-American city, I give you Look magazine's choice for 1962, Wichita, Kans., center, United States of America.

DAIRY FARM INCOME SURE TO DROP UNLESS SENATE ACTS

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I today received a letter from Mr. James G. Patton, president of the National Farmers Union, supporting the President's request to Congress to pass a resolution maintaining dairy price supports at the present level.

In information attached to the letter, Mr. Patton points out that, unless the resolution is passed, farmers in the New York-New Jersey area will lose up to 30 cents a hundredweight, which means a drop of nearly 10 percent in their gross milk income.

In Iowa, prices would be reduced 30 cents a hundredweight.

In South Dakota, 30 cents a hundredweight.

In Delaware, it will be 20 to 30 cents a hundredweight.

In various areas of Texas, it will be between 17 and 30 cents a hundredweight.

In Arkansas, it will be 30 cents a hundredweight.

In Mississippi, apparently the loss will be 30 cents a hundredweight in virtually all sections.

In Florida the loss will be up to 30 cents a hundredweight.

In Pennsylvania, between 23 and 30 cents a hundredweight.

In Boston, up to 30 cents a hundredweight.

In Indianapolis, Ind., the Ohio Valley, 30 cents a hundredweight.

In Illinois and Missouri, 30 cents a hundredweight.

The reason why I call this matter to the attention of the Senate is that the resolution is extremely urgent at this time. It is under consideration by the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, and is before the subcommittee headed by the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON]. We hope to have action in the next day or so. Unless action is taken affirmatively and promptly, the loss to dairy farmers will be very serious.

I ask unanimous consent that the letter from Mr. Patton and the data attached thereto be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

NATIONAL FARMERS UNION,
Washington, D.C., March 14, 1962.

DEAR SENATOR PROXMIRE: I am taking this means of communicating with you about the problems which we face as a result of the House Committee disapproval of House Joint Resolution 613 to continue current support levels on milk through December 31 of this year.

The President's message was explicit in stating a return to the 75 percent of parity level ($3.10) if Congress did not act to extend the current level of $3.40 through the remainder of this year. The effect of this reduction will be to cut the income of dairy producers, regardless of whether they produce milk for manufacturing uses in States like Wisconsin and Minnesota, or whether they operate under a Federal marketing order.

Income of dairy producers nationally will be cut by about $250 million.

In manufacturing areas the price drop will be 30 cents per hundredweight and prices in all Federal order markets will drop significantly.

For each dollar that might be saved at the 75 percent of parity level, the net income of dairy producers will be reduced by twice that amount. This will create unnecessary hardships for dairy producers. Moreover, thousands of small businessmen in towns and cities all over the country where these producers do business will feel the effect.

I have said on many occasions that adjusting support prices downward does not result in any measurable adjustment in production. If we have learned anything from past experience, it is that unless prices go all the way down to a free market level, producers continue to produce and expand in order to meet their heavy production expenses and the personal needs of their families.

We face a serious problem of increasing carryovers of dairy products. This has been aggravated by a serious decline in consumption during the past year, but even if the support level had been at 75 percent of parity over this period, I do not believe that the decline in consumption would have been prevented and the problem would still be of serious proportions.

Secretary Freeman has no alternative under existing law, but to announce a support level of 75 percent of parity if Congress does not act to extend the $3.40 level.

As a farm leader, I see ahead some very serious implications for the friends of dairy farmers in the Congress unless a major effort is made to extend the current support level. Therefore, I urge you to introduce legislation to protect this support level through December 31, consistent with the language in Senate Joint Resolution 150, House Joint Resolution 613, and House Joint Resolution 614, introduced by Senators HUMPHREY and PROXMIRE and Congressmen COOLEY and JOHNSON, respectively. Moreover, I do not believe that the friends of dairy producers in Congress should go for a compromise of $3.22, the level that I understand may be supported by Dairy State Republicans in the Congress.

I believe that a major all-out effort should be made on the floors of both the Senate and House to protect Secretary Freeman and the administration in their action resulting in raising income of dairy producers by about $250 million since last April 1. Following up this congressional action, there should be an intensive effort made during the fall campaign to put the responsibility squarely on those Members of Congress who failed to

support at the outset the continuation of the current support level.

Kindest personal regards.

Sincerely,

JAMES G. PATTON,
President.

P.S.—Also enclosed is a statement showing price reductions for the various classes of milk in a cross section of dairy areas.

Assuming 1961 production and consumption levels, a 30-cent reduction in support prices would affect prices as follows:

New York-New Jersey:

Class I price: None.

Class II price: Down 30 cents per hundredweight.

Class III price: Down 30 cents per hundredweight.

Blend price to farmers: Down 15 cents per hundredweight.

If the recommended decision, tying the class I price directly to the midwestern condensery price, had been in effect in 1961, the effect would be as follows:

Class I price: Down 10 cents per hundredweight.

Class II price: Down 30 cents per hundredweight.

Class III price: Down 30 cents per hundredweight.

Blend price to farmers: Down 20 cents per hundredweight.

Cedar Rapids, Iowa City, Des Moines, Nebraska-western Iowa, north-central Iowa, Sioux City: All prices would be reduced 30 cents per hundredweight.

Black Hills, eastern South Dakota, and Sioux Falls-Mitchell, S. Dak.: All prices would be reduced 30 cents per hundredweight.

Louisville-Lexington, Ohio Valley, and Paducah: All prices would be reduced 30 cents per hundredweight.

Wilmington:

Class I price: Down 20 cents per hundredweight.

Class II price: Down 30 cents per hundredweight.

Blend price to farmers: Down 21 cents per hundredweight.

Calculations made for January–March 1962 quarter (which is at an annual level) on assumption that current supply-demand relationship will continue. New class I price levels would be written current ceiling of $2.60 over midwest condensery price, thus no immediate effect from price tie.

Northern Louisiana and New Orleans: All prices would be reduced 30 cents per hundredweight.

Austin-Waco, north Texas, Texas Panhandle, Red River Valley: All prices would be reduced 30 cents per hundredweight.

San Antonio:

Class I price: Down 30 cents per hundredweight.

Class II price: Down 30 cents per hundredweight.

Class II–A price: Down 17 cents per hundredweight.

Blend price to farmers: Down 30 cents per hundredweight.

Corpus Christi:

Class I price: Down 30 cents per hundredweight.

Class II price: Down 30 cents per hundredweight.

Class II–A price: Down 17 cents per hundredweight.

Blend price to farmers: Down 30 cents per hundredweight.

Class II–A price is based on 2 cents reduction in cheese support price. Class II–A milk is 2 percent of producer receipts.

Central west Texas:

Class I price: Down 30 cents per hundredweight.

Class II price: Down 30 cents per hundredweight.

Class II–A price: Down 17 cents per hundredweight.

Blend price to farmers: Down 28 cents per hundredweight.

Class II–A price is based on 2 cents reduction in cheese support price. Class II–A milk is 12 percent of total producer receipts.

Fort Smith, central Arkansas: All prices would be reduced 30 cents per hundredweight.

Washington, D.C.:

Class I price: Down 20 cents per hundredweight.

Class II price: Down 30 cents per hundredweight.

Blend price to farmers: Down 24 cents per hundredweight.

These results might not be immediate on April 1, but would likely occur by May this year.

Southeastern Florida:

Class I price: None.

Class II price: Down 30 cents per hundredweight.

Class III price: Down 30 cents per hundredweight.

Class IV price: Down 15 cents per hundredweight.

Blend price to farmers: Down 4 cents per hundredweight.

This is based on 11 percent of total producer receipts used in class II and class III milk and 4 percent in class IV.

Central Mississippi, Mississippi Delta, Mississippi gulf coast, and Memphis: All prices would be reduced 30 cents per hundredweight.

Duluth-Superior, southern Michigan, and upstate Michigan: All prices would be reduced 30 cents per hundredweight.

Cincinnati, north central Ohio, Youngstown-Warren, northeastern Ohio, Toledo, tri-State, Columbus, and Dayton-Springfield: All prices would be reduced 30 cents per hundredweight.

Michigan Upper Peninsula, Muskegon, southern Michigan, and upstate Michigan: All prices would be reduced 30 cents per hundredweight.

Duluth-Superior and Minneapolis-St. Paul: All prices would be reduced 30 cents per hundreweight.

North central Iowa, Des Moines, Cedar Rapids-Iowa City, Sioux City, Quad Cities-Dubuque: All prices would be reduced 30 cents per hundredweight.

Southwest Kansas, Wichita, Kansas City, Neosho Valley: All prices would be reduced 30 cents per hundredweight.

Oklahoma metropolitan, Red River Valley: All prices would be reduced 30 cents per hundredweight.

Philadelphia:

Class I price: Down 30 cents per hundredweight.

Class II price: Down 30 cents per hundredweight.

Blend price to farmers: Down 23 cents per hundredweight.

Calculations made for January–March 1962 quarter (which is at annual level) on assumption that current supply-demand relationship will continue. New class I price level would be within current "ceiling" of $2.60 over Midwest condensery price, thus no immediate effect from price tie.

Boston:

Class I price: None.

Class II price: Down 30 cents per hundredweight.

Blend price to farmers: Down 14 cents per hundredweight.

If the New York-New Jersey recommended decision were in effect, the 10 cents lower class I price in New York would be reflected also in the unbracketed Boston class I price and the effect would be as follows:

Class I price: Down 10 cents per hundredweight.

Class II price: Down 30 cents per hundredweight.

Blend price to farmers: Down 19 cents per hundredweight.

Inland Empire, Puget Sound: All prices would be reduced 30 cents per hundredweight.

Indianapolis, Fort Wayne, Ohio Valley, South Bend-LaPorte-Elkhart: All prices would be reduced 30 cents per hundredweight.

Chicago, Quad Cities-Dubuque, Rockford-Freeport, St. Louis, suburban St. Louis: All prices would be reduced 30 cents per hundredweight.

NBC DOCUMENTARY, "THE LAND," DESCRIBES FLIGHT OF AMERICAN FARMERS

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, many times I have argued that any farm program that passes Congress must, above all, increase farm income. On March 13 the National Broadcasting Co. presented a stirring hour-long documentary entitled "The Land," that dramatically demonstrates why this is so. Narrated by Mr. Chet Huntley, this program movingly described the grave human and social problems facing farm communities all over our Nation, and examined the economic factors which have caused them.

By brilliant use of the television camera's peering eye and intimate taped comments from farmers, the program provides a first-hand insight into the situation facing many American farmers. One farmer who talked to the camera was Lloyd Sellars, of Rice County, Kans. He described how he feels about farm programs, and why farm output tends to rise when prices fall. This farmer's investment in equipment is more than $40,000, in cattle $20,000, and his land is worth $150,000. He has one hired man. Yet, over the past 3 years, his net income has averaged only $7,500 per year. If one takes into account a modest return of 4 percent on this farmer's capital and land investment, his weekly pay for his highly efficient dawn-to-dusk labor is about $50 per week. And that makes no allowance for profits as a reward for initiative and risk.

Much of the land that this farmer now has in production comes from other farms whose owners have had to leave the land, driven away by low income to seek jobs in the city. As Mr. Huntley observes in his narration:

> The houses and barns rot in the sun but the land remains green, tilled by someone else. In the Dust Bowl days of the thirties, farmers fled because the land produced too little. Now they are forced out because it produces too much and drives crop prices down.

It is this kind of paradox which so often embitters farmers in their reactions to talk by those who would solve the farm problem in one full swoop. The pat explanation "There are too many farmers—get some of them off the farm, and the farm problem will be solved," ignores the fact that the land, livestock, and equipment remain available for use by other farmers who are getting more productive each year.

The paradox of supply and demand causes similar reactions. Farmers know

that falling prices often lead to increased production, as each farmer seeks to maintain his income by producing more at the lower prices.

In his perceptive conclusion to the program, Mr. Huntley ably summarizes why the farm problem is everyone's problem. In it he says:

We city people are selfishly maintaining a vast underappreciation of this fellow on the land, these 47 percent of our farmers who are providing us with the greatest cornucopia of plenty at the lowest prices in all history. We have him providing for us at an average rate of 80 cents an hour for his dawn-to-dusk effort.

It is not just charity or generosity or fairness that suggests we might do better for him or by him, but plain economic self-interest and commonsense.

A banker has said that there's still enough national investment in the land that a depression could start there again. Eighty cents an hour for a farmer's labor would appear to be flirting with it.

In addition to the investment we have observed that the farmer is the supreme consumer of everything we city people produce. He not only consumes in prodigious quantities the groceries, clothing, and gadgets which the rest of us produce but on top of that he is the buyer of farm machinery, fencing materials, lumber, paint, tools, and chemicals. If he goes under so do machinery companies, steel mills, truck manufacturers, and chemical plants; and so do we.

Before the turn of the century, American labor began solving its economic problems by collective bargaining. Collective marketing is a way out for the farmer. It has worked in the production of milk, fruits, and a few other commodities; but it has not yet been applied to grains and other farm products because it is complex and unwieldy and because the farmer himself is a rugged individualist * * * and a stubborn, contrary, suspicious, and sometimes untrusting nonconformist.

The only instrumentality thus far devised by the minds of men to represent the farmer, act as his counsel and agent, urge him to collective programs of production control or act as his own policeman, is the U.S. Department of Agriculture. The farmer frequently assails it. We taxpayers don't like it and the Government itself would like nothing better than to hear the last of all such expedient measures as soil banks, price supports, and surpluses. But thus far the farmer has been unable to bring himself to the final step: rationalization and firm control of his own production.

Nor have we city people been of too much help to him. We now control more power and influence in the Congress. A program which will save the farmer will probably originate there. When and if it does, we might bear in mind that he has been a good provider for us and we might understand that we're all in this together. If he is not prosperous, we're not going to be either, for very long.

This excellent NBC documentary program bears the title "The Land." Because of its deep sympathy for those who live on the land, it could well have been titled "The Land and the People." The program was written by Bill Hill and Chet Huntley. I ask unanimous consent that the script be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

"THE LAND"

HUNTLEY. On January 27, 1962, Nebraska tenant farmer George Powles gave up. Economically exhausted, he turned his back on the farm to seek his future in town.

This is a scene played out to its sad climax 170,000 times in this country last year—as elder farmers retired, as tenants were displaced by machines, or as young farmers simply gave up.

Most of these 170,000 times departure from the land contained a bitter admission of failure, and a host of shattered dreams of sparkling green fields, of a comfortable farm house, a magnificent barn. Most of these times it meant that a dream of plenty had been routed out by the reality of want.

This is Reed Point, Mont., where my parents now live. Its population totals 65. I first saw this town in 1923 when it had a population of about 400. The town's boom period began in 1913. It prospered until the late 1920's when highways and the depression spelled disaster. It sent its sons to war in the 1940's and declined throughout the 1950's.

As farmers leave the land the little towns suffer, contract and even disappear. Weed-choked empty lots are the cemeteries of prosperous yesterdays; and even the grave markers, the old foundations and basements. are filled in and overgrown.

Fifty years ago more than half of our people lived on the farm. Today only 1 in 8 remains. We have become a nation of city dwellers but we are reluctant to acknowledge it. There is something about country lanes and burgeoning fields and the scent of new hay and bucolic 160 acres which are a part of our folklore. By this dearly held mythology we are blinded to a vast agrarian upheaval as common to the South, the East, the Midwest, as it is to this little Montana town.

This is Lexington, Ga. In the decade from 1950 to 1960 its population dwindled from 514 to 376 while our national population increased by 28 million people.

In 1950, Graford, Tex., had a population of 655. Ten years later it was down to 448. In the same span the population of Texas mushroomed 24 percent.

In California, the town of Niland was cut down before it incorporated. It shrank in 10 years from 700 people to about 200 while the State's population exploded 48 percent.

Farmington, Wash., had 341 people 10 years ago. Now it has 176. These towns have this in common with thousands of others: they are small, they are agricultural, and they are dying.

This is Dunlap, Kans., not as it is today, but as it was around 1915 when the population was 650 and growing—the main street lined with buggies.

Today, the main street of Dunlap lies virtually deserted. The empty buildings stand there—dried-up relics of a past that slipped away so recently and so unobtrusively we can scarcely believe it is gone.

Dunlap is an agricultural ghost town. There are hundreds like it across the country. Here they built a city hall of stone for a future that never materialized. It was cut short—first by the automobile that carried farmers past Dunlap to bigger stores in larger towns, then by a gradual consolidation of farms that drained away the surrounding population. The city hall, robbed of its purpose, fell into disrepair and then into ruin.

In 1916, a 6-year-old boy posed with his sisters for a picture in front of their Dunlap home. Today, the house is empty but Fred Bernard, in middle age, remembers the neighborhood as it was.

BERNARD. The heyday of this street and these houses was probably 40 to 50 years ago, back around 1910–20. These houses were built before then by people who lived here to work in the various stores and industries in town; and were later taken over by retiring farmers as they moved to town after making their fortunes * * * which they almost always did. Now, most of the houses in Dunlap are empty.

Dunlap started going downhill as much as 40 years ago, but not noticeably. We always thought it was just a little slump, you know, in those days * * * wouldn't face the facts. And of course in the depression days. And of the Dirty Thirties, why all the young people that weren't well established, they came back to mom and dad's table. All the stores were lit up on a Saturday night and the streets were all filled with cars and children running around and playing hide-and-seek and so forth. But that didn't last long because the young people soon got out from underneath dad's table again and back on their feet. Since then it has been rather rapid.

At one time there were two banks in Dunlap. Now there are none. The Guaranty State Bank lasted until 1959 when it paid off its depositors and locked its doors, leaving behind a tableau of its final day.

HUNTLEY. Banker Charlie Haucke, who started out here in 1918, said, "If I made a mistake, it was settling in too small a town."

Farming today is big business. The small country bank, with its limited reserves, has been crowded out.

The bank is gone. So are a dozen other businesses. All that remain are a feedstore, a post office and a filling station on the edge of town.

Of the 134 people who remain in Dunlap, most are waiting out the inflexible arithmetic of mortality, and watching grass grow in the gutter of the city hall.

Coupled to the decline of the small agricultural community is the decline, and perhaps approaching extinction, of the small farmer.

We have cherished him since the days of Lexington and Concord as a national symbol of our virtue and our strength. Virtuous he still may be, but strong he is not.

In terms of cold statistics, the lower 53 percent of our farms account for only 8 percent of our total farm production. These farms, the small marginal farms, could disappear overnight without affecting our surpluses or the price of our groceries. The problem of the small farmer is not that of a production line in trouble, but of a human being in distress.

This is a small farm near Bushong, Kans. The crop is grain sorghum, a livestock feed many farmers call milo. The farm is run by Robert Whitaker and his wife, Velma.

R. WHITAKER. We have a 160-acre farm. Our principal crops are alfalfa, corn, milo, wheat, and sometimes we grow some oats. We grow about 20 acres of alfalfa, about 10 acres of wheat, about 10 of corn, about 25 of milo.

HUNTLEY. The Whitakers don't own a truck. They can't afford one. They bring milo from the field in a small trailer hooked to a car. The car belongs to Robert's father.

The father, 80-year-old Andrew Whitaker, is bothered by arthritis; but he helps with the harvest whenever he can.

When the milo is ripe, everyone drops what he is doing to help bring it in.

V. WHITAKER. Since our budget is quite limited, on the farm, I try to do my part by saving. I can every year on the average, I can about 150 quarts of fruit and around 70 to 80 quarts of vegetables and somewhere around 50 pints of jams, jellies, and pickles.

I help with bringing in the grain when harvest starts. And in the fall, I * * * uh * * * I help bring in the milo * * * help auger it off the trailer we use to haul it with * * * and help auger it back in the bin.

HUNTLEY. The family car, a 1948 model, also carries feed for the family's 50 cattle.

WHITAKER. Our main source of income comes from the sale of livestock. We have

a little from the sale of grain. We net about $1,700 a year. I think perhaps one year we made $2,200. It's been a few years back and I think perhaps that was one of our better years.

HUNTLEY. The Whitakers net $1,700 a year out of sales that gross about $3,700. Yet, even with a taxable income on only $1,700 the Whitakers are no worse off than 60 percent of the farmers in the country today.

On their $1,700 they must raise three children and help take care of Robert's aged parents. They do it, for the most part, by doing without.

This is Rodney Whitaker, 12 years old. He wants to follow in his father's footsteps. His chance of succeeding on this farm is almost nonexistent.

R. WHITAKER. We do not have the latest equipment nor the best. Some of it is just rather old. In fact, we have one old tractor my father bought in 1928 and we still use it a little. We have another tractor—it's about 12 years old—that we do most of our farm work with. And so our equipment isn't of the latest nor the best.

HUNTLEY. Over and over, in all possible variations, three basic factors lie at the root of the trouble for these 53 percent of our farmers who produce only 8 percent of the food and fiber: One, they are on marginal or wornout land; two, they have been unable to grasp or afford the new farm technology; three, falling farm prices.

Low farm prices have seriously threatened even the ideal farmer on good land. For the less than ideal farmer on less than ideal land, low prices have meant disaster.

Robert Whitaker scrimps, patches, does without. With luck, he may hang on.

In the Great Plains, March 1 is the customary date for new landlords and tenants to take over. So, beginning in January, the crisp air rings to the cry of the auctioneer while the neighbors gather, as much to visit as to bid.

This is the auction, 20 miles south of Lincoln, Nebr., of a man who gave up trying to make a living on 320 acres.

The farm machinery on sale here belongs to Lambert Termaat, a tenant farmer.

Termaat lived here 15 years. Last March a steel company in Lincoln taught him how to weld and gave him a job. Now he's leaving the farm to become a full-time welder.

These auctioneers have held 67 farm sales in the past 2 years. Of the 67 who sold out, 32 moved to town.

A farm sale is one of those emotionally charged dividing lines separating us from our past. But change is not necessarily tragic. Lambert Termaat may make more money in town. Yet there remains the nostalgia of remembered voices echoing across vacant yards and empty rooms.

Each year up to a million people leave the land and migrate to the city—20 million since 1940—almost half the farm population.

The houses and barns rot in the sun but the land remains green, tilled by someone else. In the Dust Bowl days of the thirties, farmers fled because the land produced too little. Now they are forced out because it produces too much and drives crop prices down.

MASKIL. Not very many years ago, in my lifetime, this county had 15,000 population. Now, then, it's down to 12,000. That's 3,000 people—3,000 people less. That's just as if the earth had opened up and swallowed a town of 3,000. And in this part of the country a town of 3,000 would be a pretty big town.

HUNTLEY. That was Oliver "Doc" Maskil, editor of the Westmoreland Recorder, a weekly paper in Westmoreland, Kans. The town started as a watering stop on the Oregon Trail. It grew into a farming community of 500 people.

In the past 10 years the average farm in this county grew from 300 to 390 acres, while the number of farms dropped from 1,600 to 1,200. But Westmoreland remained relatively stable.

MASKIL. There are several reasons for a town existing. It can be an industrial center. It can be a shipping center. Or, in the case of Westmoreland, it can be a county seat. Well, when you're a county seat that means a lot of things, particularly in this part of the country. It means that we have the courthouse and the courthouse payroll and we have the county shops and its payroll. Then, when people come in to these offices, when they come to the courthouse, when they come to the ASC office to see about their business, they go to the grocery store. They buy a few groceries. They stop in at the hardware store and get some nails. It * * * if it wasn't for being a county seat, Westmoreland just wouldn't be here at all.

HUNTLEY. Westmoreland has survived because it is the county seat of Pottawatomie County. But the people who live here are worried. To attract new residents they have applied for urban renewal. They have no sewers. Their gutters and sidewalks are falling apart.

But small town appeals for urban renewal get a mixed reception. Many sociologists feel small towns have outlived their function, that rescue should be directed toward larger rural units. Dwight Nesmith, an expert in rural area development at Kansas State University:

NESMITH. There are 530 small towns in Kansas, towns with less than 2,500 population. Now, if we assume we are going to save all these small towns, as some people apparently want us to do, let's take a look at the arithmetic we get involved in.

These small towns have a total population of about 300 thousand people and an average population of 570 people. This means we would have to add 2,120,000 people to Kansas * * * essentially double the population of the State of Kansas * * * to bring them up to the minimum of 4,000 population apiece, a minimum I feel is realistic if these towns are going to provide the goods and services that people have a right to expect from their community.

Now we can't do this, based on agricultural jobs. These are declining all the time. So we're going to have to depend on industrial development. Now, one manufacturing job will support about 3 people. So that means we need about 703,000 new manufacturing jobs in the State of Kansas, or about 6 times as many as we have at the present time.

To look at it another way, if we're going to put all our industrial efforts for a year into saving these small towns, it turns out that 100 plants with an assumed mortality rate of 50 percent, will be just about enough to save one city. Therefore, in 530 years the job will be done.

MASKIL. It's all very well and I suppose it is logical for these sociologists to say, "Well, let's consolidate these towns. There's no need for these small towns. Let's take up the people and move them to a larger town." But that just doesn't take into account the human factor.

People are living in Westmoreland because they want to live there. Now we don't have everything. Here, for example, we don't have a sewer system. There's other small towns around us that don't have a water system. But there's other things maybe that are needed and it's hard to put into words what they are. But people are living in these small towns because they want to. When they're gone there will be other people who prefer to live in those towns * * * these small towns. All we want for Westmoreland is to make it a nice place to live.

HUNTLEY. Westmoreland, Kans., and Reed Point, Mont., and all the other thousands of towns like them were once nice places to live. Some of them still are for the very few who can manage it.

What we have just seen is an example of the national social problem which happens to reside on the land. It is made up of the 53 percent of the American farmers who produce only 8 percent of the crop of food and fiber.

They represent a social problem for a combination of two basic causes. First: they are on land that should never have been tilled in the first place; or, second, they've been too slow in becoming the expert agricultural economist-technician which characterizes the successful farmer.

Nowhere else have science and technology been so intensively and extensively understood and applied as on the American farm. The successful American farmer is one of the supreme technical experts of all time. But even he is in trouble and is going under because of his technical skill in making things grow. Even he is driving himself off or being driven off the farm because he is producing too much, running too fast to stand still.

PART II

HUNTLEY. In 1870 the average American farmer produced enough to feed five people. In 1940 he fed 11. By 1960 the number of people fed by each farmer had jumped to 26.

In 1960 we produced 1,300 million bushels of wheat, 4,300 million bushels of corn, 14 million bales of cotton.

Production on the American farm has tripled since 1940. But the very productivity of this most efficient farming system in the world has left us floundering, like the sorcerer's apprentice, in a flood of plenty. The man who has suffered most from the overproduction of the farm is the farmer.

Forty-seven percent of our farms account for 92 percent of our farm production. These farms are large, mechanized, and efficient. Despite their growth, the vast majority remain family farms.

This is one of them: the 1,000-acre farm of Lloyd Sellers in Rice County, Kans. Sellers, with only one hired man, farms times as much land as his grandfather did under the Homestead Act, and in the winter feeds 300 cattle.

Over the past 20 years Rice County has lost about 40 farms a year. Most of those that go under are small. They are taken over by farmers like Lloyd Sellers.

SELLERS. In the acres that we now have in this farmstead that we farm, there used to be three other farmsteads. And over the years they have all been torn off. I helped tear down the buildings on two of the farmsteads, and my father tore down the buildings on one before I can remember.

On one corner of our home place there used to be a one-room school. In fact, us kids went to that one-room schoolhouse. But as the schools got bigger and consolidated and merged, then this school ceased to be used as a school. So we got one more acre under the plow than it used to be.

HUNTLEY. Farmers like Lloyd Sellers make the most of each acre, despite Government programs to control production.

SELLERS. A farmer living out on this land has to try to make a living. So, when his allotment is cut down to where he is not allowed to produce as many acres, then he tries everything he can think of to increase the production on the acres he is allowed to farm * * * so he can still make a living. So he'll farm better. He'll summer fallow more (summer fallowing will really increase production). And then he will probably use more fertilizer, buy more commercial fertilizer, which will help keep production up. In other words, keep about as many bushels as he was raising, anyhow.

HUNTLEY. Farmers do not boost production to be contrary. They feel they are driven by chronically low prices. There is little profit on one bushel of wheat or milo, so they try to grow enough to profit from sheer volume. This is in direct competition

with Government efforts to raise prices by reducing acreage. Because farmers can grow more on each acre, attempts to limit production this way have failed. Now the Government would like to control, instead, the bushels a farmer can market.

What farmers fear is a disastrous timelag between lower production and the day of higher prices.

This big plow is one reason Lloyd Sellers and his hired man can farm a thousand acres. The successful farm today is a big business: in acres, in machinery, and investment. Contrary to a carefully nurtured stereotype it usually is not a bottomless reservoir of Cadillacs.

A 5-bottom plow costs a thousand dollars. The tractor that pulls it costs $7,000. Sellers owns three tractors, three trucks, and a pickup, a $9,000 combine and much more. His investment in equipment is at least $40,000. This winter he is feeding cattle that cost $20,000. The land is worth at least $150,000. Yet, over the past 3 years, his net income has averaged only $7,500 a year. He lives comfortably but is not rich.

This kind of farming foreshadows the future and the ranks of economically qualified applicants are thinning out.

SELLERS. Actually, with the cost of machinery and equipment as it is today, if a young boy wanted to start in the farming business, and didn't have a father or some relative or somebody that would go with him and give him some land to start on and help, help him get started with equipment and stock, it would be impossible for him to start.

HUNTLEY. The most important single factor in the immense productivity of the American farm is the land grant college, a unique American institution. This is Kansas State University in Manhattan, Kans. It was founded just 100 years ago.

ROTC training, written into the land-grant law, is still a required course at Kansas State. But what was a college is now a university, complete with a cyclotron under construction.

A few hundred yards from the cyclotron is an experimental plot of hybrid milo. Out of fields like this came the basis for our agricultural revolution.

A current project is hybrid wheat. Tentative results, in the form of a few precious kernels, have already been passed around to interested researchers. Twenty-five grains of wheat went to the University of Nebraska.

At the University of Nebraska some research on hybrid wheat was already underway. Interest there quickened when the top expert at Kansas State was hired away by a commercial seed company. Space agencies are not the only victims of industry's technological piracy.

A hybrid plant is a cross between two varieties. They are crossbred to encourage the best qualities of both. Hybrid corn, which boosted production 25 percent, was the accidental result of basic genetic research.

Plant research consumes time. It can be accelerated by what are called growth chambers. A growing day, under artificial sunlight, is 18 hours, set on a timer. Here scientists can grow four crops of spring wheat a year.

It took farmers 20 years to realize the production advantages of hybrid corn. Now, most of our corn is hybrid. Hybrid milo, which you saw harvested on both the Whitaker and Sellers farms, was not introduced until 1957. Now, four crops later, it comprises 95 percent of the milo planted. Hybrid wheat, if it works, will catch on even faster.

At the present time scientists can make hybrid wheat but it will not reproduce itself. They are looking for some freak variety of grain that will lend itself to the development of reproduction. And they are certain it exists somewhere. Of course, hybrid wheat may be too expensive. It may not increase production. It may not have the adaptability researchers foresee. On the other hand it may. These few plants could foreshadow the bread of the next generation.

There is, at Hutchison, Kans., a grain elevator that stretches across the plain for half a mile. Each year we produce enough wheat surplus to fill it four times over. Year by year the unused surplus mounts, piling up storage charges. Surplus, the tarnished side of our agricultural miracle, is not a new problem. Since 1930, in every year we did not have a severe drought, a war, or a major war relief program, we have had surpluses.

In no one year do they amount to more than 5 percent of any one crop. Yet, added up, the cost of coping with them is $2½ billion a year, an annual charge about the same as the total spent on development of the atomic bomb under the Manhattan project.

Surpluses are even stored in military bases left over from World War II. They depress farm prices. They cost tax dollars. Perhaps worst of all, they represent the waste of unused food in a world where half the human race is undernourished.

The farmer is the target of constant exhortation, not all of it unselfish. Ambitious politicians, editors with axes to grind, urge the farmer, one day, to spurn the Federal farm programs and be a free farmer. The next day they scream at him to protest, to rise up, march on Washington about this or that phase of the Federal program. He is pushed and pulled, admonished, and harangued into schizophrenia, offered the best of two incompatible worlds—the no-redtape, no-document, no-affidavit kind of free-economy agriculture on the one hand; and the highest price supports, guaranteed-market, maximum-benefit kind of no-risk agriculture on the other.

This is Lyons, Kans., county seat of Rice County.

Lyons is one of those farming communities which has prospered in these years of sweeping agriculture change. It has a population of 4,000. It is the kind of town where people go when they bypass the Dunlaps and the Westmorelands. Arnold Fankhauser, who runs a clothing store, knows why.

FANKHAUSER. Really, we have about seven or eight towns that used to be competition here in a sense, and sold the same items we in turn sold here. While this town was a little larger, those towns actually did quite a bit of business.

And I don't mean to degrade them, they were more or less pickle-barrel type stores and they couldn't do any better because of their size. But actually, Lyons, Kans., was a little larger and I would say the pattern has changed this way: they like to shop in a little better town.

HUNTLEY. Lyons has better stores, more of them, and good roads leading in from the four points of the compass. Also, it has been the county seat since 1876.

Farmers, in the aggregate, are good consumers. Because of all their equipment they use more petroleum than any other industry in the country and comprise one of the biggest consumers of steel and rubber. This is reflected in the economy of Lyons.

Lyons has four grocery stores, two of them supermarkets. The car just pulling into the curb is driven by a farmer's wife. She drove 10 miles, bypassing two smaller towns closer to home, to shop here. Since fewer farmers grow a little of everything, their wives buy more food in the store, including meat, milk, and eggs. This farm wife's habits are changing and so are those of the store. Supermarkets have begun to compete with drugstores as purveyors of everything under the sun. Since these items go on the grocery bill, we tend to think of them as part of the cost of food. Often they are not. Since 1949 food has risen less than most other items on the cost of living index. And the farmer's share from the cost of food has gone down 12 percent.

We asked the shopper who had come 10 miles to let us read her grocery list. We found out two things: she spent more money than she meant to; and, 35 percent of what she spent was on nonfarm products.

Aluminum foil, which costs 35 cents, is a nonfarm product.

About one-fourth of the price of ice cream goes back to the farmer. He gets 3½ cents from a 25-cent loaf of bread.

The farmer gets back about half the money we spend for bacon, about 82 cents on a steak costing $1.41.

The return on butter is high—56 cents for a 79-cent pound of butter.

Soap powder is a nonfarm product. So are all the paper tissues we buy and most of the plastics.

Canned corn costs 45 cents. The farmer gets back a nickel.

Grocery stores now sell ping pong balls. No sale for the farmer.

The most expensive item of all: the impulse purchase of a longplaying record. Corny, perhaps, but not from the farm. Overall packaging and middleman costs are up * * * the farmers' share has gone down.

That is Lyons, Kans., a beneficiary of the agricultural revolution. Yet, even here, there is a shadow.

FANKHAUSER. Well, of course, the opportunity for the young people here is not nearly as great as it used to be for our farm population, you see, is decreasing quite rapidly. The larger farmer is taking over what used to be two or three or four farms. And the children that are coming, raised on a farm, they don't have an opportunity to go back on the farm. And in order to keep these people here at home, we must have industry here to attract them if we're wanting to keep up the population. Or, they don't have any choice after they get out of school but to go to some factory, or get a job elsewhere in some other part of the State or in some other part of the country.

HUNTLEY. One Lyons student who will return is Steven Sellers—you met his father. Steven, with a degree from Kansas State University, is coming back to farm. He wants most a farmer's independence.

SELLERS, JR. I'll be my own boss. I can do anything I want to, whenever I want to do it, however I want to do it. I can cover the whole half section with feed lots if I want to, or irrigate, raise swine, anything I want to.

It's going to take a lot of work and technology to make a go of farming today. If I were going to be an average farmer I don't think I'd go back because, actually, the average farmer has a rough row to hoe. But I believe with my training and hard work, I believe I can make a go of it. And that's what I love to do. So that's what I'm going to do.

HUNTLEY. Steven Sellers will return to his father's farm. In this he is more fortunate than most. The farm, by present standards, is large. The investment in expensive equipment has already been made.

Yet, a generation ago, this farm was sufficient to earn a man a good living. Now 160 acres will not bring Robert Whitaker enough income to justify the expense of efficient farming—which is the only kind with a chance of survival.

Steven Sellers will raise his children in this community. Now, Lyons is prosperous. It has taken over from the smaller villages that compass it.

But Dunlap, too, was once prosperous. Stores stayed open until 1 o'clock on Saturday night until the gasoline engine was harnessed to four wheels.

Steven Sellers is a college man. His chance of succeeding appears as good as that of any young farmer.

But the very college which educated him has unleashed the knowledge of which surpluses are made. And these surpluses may loom darkly across most of his adult life.

Change is constant and the pace is accelerating. All the Steven Sellers—the new generation of farmers—must live with it. The alternative is this.

We city people are selfishly maintaining a vast underappreciation of this fellow on the land, these 47 percent of our farmers who are providing us with the greatest cornucopia of plenty at the lowest prices in all history. We have him providing for us at an average rate of 80 cents an hour for his dawn to dusk effort.

It is not just charity or generosity or fairness that suggests we might do better for him or by him, but plain economic self-interest and commonsense.

A banker has said that there's still enough national investment in the land that a depression could start there again. Eighty cents an hour for a farmer's labor would appear to be flirting with it.

In addition to the investment we have observed that the farmer is the supreme consumer of everything we city people produce. He not only consumes in prodigious quantities the groceries, clothing, and gadgets which the rest of us produce but on top of that he is the buyer of farm machinery, fencing materials, lumber, paint, tools, and chemicals. If he goes under so do machinery companies, steel mills, truck manufacturers, and chemical plants and so do we.

Before the turn of the century, American labor began solving its economic problems by collective bargaining. Collective marketing is a way out for the farmer. It has worked in the production of milk, and a few other commodities; but it has not yet been applied to grains and other farm products because it's complex and unwieldy and because the farmer himself is a rugged individualist * * * and a stubborn, contrary, suspicious, and sometimes untrusting nonconformist.

The only instrumentality thus far devised by the minds of men to represent the farmer, act as his counsel and agent, urge him to collective programs of production control or act as his own policeman, is the United States Department of Agriculture. The farmer frequently assails it. We taxpayers don't like it and the Government itself would like nothing better than to hear the last of all such expedient measures as soil banks, price supports, and surpluses. But thus far the farmer has been unable to bring himself to the final step, rationalization and firm control of his own production.

Nor have we city people been of too much help to him. We now control more power and influence in the Congress. A program which will save the farmer will probably originate there. When and if it does, we might bear in mind that he has been a good provider for us and we might understand that we're all in this together. If he is not prosperous, we're not going to be either, for very long.

THE ALEXANDER HAMILTON NATIONAL MONUMENT

The Senate resumed the consideration of the motion of the Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD] to proceed to the consideration of the joint resolution (S.J. Res. 29) providing for the establishing of the former dwelling house of Alexander Hamilton as a national monument.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I have had some inquiries as to what is the text of the amendment which I shall propose in the event the Senate should vote to take up the joint resolution which is the subject of the pending motion.

I would propose to strike out everything after the enacting clause and put in the place thereof present Senate Joint Resolution 58, which has been introduced by 67 cosponsors.

I ask, however, rather than leave the matter upon that general basis, to send forward for printing, so it may be available on the table, the proposed amendments, which I shall, if given an opportunity at the appropriate time, ask to have substituted for the body of the joint resolution which is now pending.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendments will be received and printed, and will lie on the table.

Mr. JAVITS subsequently said: Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at the appropriate point in the RECORD the amendment by way of a statute with respect to the poll tax, to be offered by me and Senators DOUGLAS, KEATING, BUSH, HART, NEUBERGER, CASE of New Jersey, PASTORE, SCOTT, ALLOTT, MORSE, PROXMIRE, BEALL, WILLIAMS of New Jersey, and KUCHEL. I think the proper place in the RECORD would be following the constitutional amendment proposed by the Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND].

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from New York? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

The amendment, in the nature of a substitute, was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Strike out all after the resolving clause and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"That the Congress finds that the requirement that a poll tax or other tax be paid, or that any property qualification be met, as a prerequisite for voting or registering to vote at primaries or other elections for President, Vice President, electors for President or Vice President, or for Senator or Member of the House of Representatives, is not and shall not be deemed a qualification of voters or electors voting or registering to vote at primaries or other elections for said officers, within the meaning of the Constitution, but is and shall be deemed an interference with the manner of holding primaries and elections for said national officers, an abridgment of the rights and privileges of citizens of the United States, a tax on such rights and privileges, an obstruction of the operations of the Federal Government, and an impairment of the republican form of government.

"SEC. 2. It shall be unlawful for any State, municipality, or other governmental authority or any subdivision thereof, or for any person, whether or not acting on behalf of any State, municipality, other governmental authority or subdivision thereof, to levy, collect, or require the payment of any poll tax or other tax or to impose a property qualification as a prerequisite for registering to vote or voting in any primary or other election for President, Vice President, elector for President or Vice President, or Senator or Member of the House of Representatives, or otherwise to interfere with or prevent any person from registering to vote or voting in any such election by reason of such person's failure or refusal to pay or assume the obligation of paying any poll tax or other such tax or meeting any property qualification. Any such levy, collection or requirement, and any such tax or property qualification, shall be invalid and void insofar as it purports to disqualify any person otherwise qualified from voting at such primary or other election."

Amend the title so as to read: "Joint resolution to protect the right to vote in national elections by making unlawful the requirement that a poll tax be paid as a prerequisite to voting in such elections, and for other purposes."

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I wish to invite the attention of the Senate to the fact that the Attorney General of the United States, testifying this morning in the other body, made it clear that he sees no reason why this action cannot be taken by statute. Mr. President, of course I shall go into this in greater detail as we move along in the debate.

EXPANDING FOREST PRODUCTS LABORATORY AT MADISON, WIS.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, expansion of research in forestry, as in other fields, provides the key to progress.

For this reason, I am supporting efforts to provide adequate funds, not only for carrying forward the Forest Products Laboratory at Madison, Wis., but also for expanding its facilities.

Improving the outlook for the wood products industry, through research will, I believe, be tremendously significant to our citizens, individually, as well as to businesses and industries and the economy generally depending on such products.

According to expert computations, there is about a $70 return for each dollar invested in forest products research.

Although the Laboratory is a Federal institution, its operations demonstrate wonderfully how progress can be made by cooperating with, as well as creating benefits for, private industry in research.

Believing the proposal for expanding of the Laboratory deserves the consideration and approval not only of the Appropriations Committee, but of Congress, I ask unanimous consent to have the following items printed at this point in the RECORD:

First. A copy of my letter to Chairman HAYDEN of the Appropriations Committee, urging adequate funds for carrying forward and expanding the operations of the Laboratory.

Second. A series of representative letters from private industries reflecting the way in which the Laboratory is serving the overall interests of the Nation.

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

MARCH 14, 1962.

Hon. CARL HAYDEN,
Chairman, Appropriations Subcommittee on Department of Interior and Related Agencies, U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: I am writing to respectfully urge approval of:

1. The recommended $3,300,000 appropriation for operation of the Forest Products Laboratory at Madison, Wis., for fiscal year 1963; and

2. The recommendations for a first-year appropriation, amounting to $4 million—the first stage of a 3-year $10 million program for necessary expansion of its facilities.

As you are aware, the forest products industry is tremendously significant to the

whole U.S. economy. In 1960, for example—the latest year for which complete figures are available—the industry:

1. Provided jobs for about 1,136,000 people (a level of employment exceeded only by the machinery, food, transportation, equipment, and apparel industries); and

2. The manufacture of wood and paper products contribute about $10 billion to the Nation's income.

In Wisconsin—as in many other States—the forest products industry also ranked high in our economy, including (a) the creation of over 54,000 jobs; and (b) the output of products totaled around $1 billion.

I recognize, of course, that the requested appropriations for forest research represent a lot of money. According to expert computations, however, there is about a $70 return for each dollar invested in forest products research.

Consequently, this represents—in my judgment—a good investment.

For these reasons, then, I am respectfully urging approval of funds to carry forward—and to necessarily expand—the work of the Forest Products Laboratory at Madison, Wis.

If accompilshed—as I believe it should be—it will be of tremendous significance to:

Our forest and forest products industries;

The thousands of people employed;

The business and services dependent upon the buying power of workers in the industry; and

The vast number of people, including America's homeowners, as well as many other industries who benefit from the work of the Laboratory.

I am taking the liberty of forwarding copies of letters from private industry endorsing the need for expansion of the Forest Products Laboratory. Based upon past experience, these messages reflect the significance of expanded forest research to private enterprises and the needs of the American people.

I respectfully request, therefore, that these be included in the record of the hearings.

With appreciation for the consideration which I know you will give this matter, and with kindest regards, I remain

Sincerely yours,

ALEXANDER WILEY.

MOSINEE PAPER MILLS CO.,
Mosinee, Wis., February 28, 1962.

Senator ALEXANDER WILEY,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

HONORABLE SIR: Included in the U.S. Forest Service budget now being submitted, there is a request which I feel is of great importance to our country and which should be given high priority. This is the assignment of moneys (I think about $4,500,000) for the enlargement and improvement of the facilities at the Forest Products Laboratory at Madison, Wis.

The directors and staff of this Laboratory, ever since it was established, have made basic contribution to the paper and pulp industry and to all wood-using industries, and have been most valuable and important in the growth and service to our Nation. The scientific research and developments have definitely increased the usability and value of our forests.

New cooking processes were developed at the Laboratory which now makes it possible to make good pulps out of specie fibers that were formerly of little value. The usable yield per acre of our national timber resource has been increased by studies and results obtained at the Laboratory. Basic contributions through the work of this institution are continuing but are retarded and handicapped by limited facilities.

The support you have always given to the work of the Forest Products Laboratory is recognized and appreciated. A continuation of this support, I am sure, will come from you, Senator WILEY, by using your great influence to obtain the amount needed by the Laboratory from the Forest Service budget now up for consideration and adoption.

Respectfully and sincerely,

N. S. STONE,
Retired President.

CONSOLIDATED WATER POWER & PAPER CO.,
Wisconsin Rapids, Wis., March 6, 1962.

Senator ALEXANDER WILEY,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR WILEY: We have been advised that the Forest Products Laboratory in Madison, Wis., has a request in Congress for a $4 million construction item. They have added 12 acres of land and this new construction item will be primarily for new pulp and paper facilities.

We think the Forest Products Laboratory has done an excellent job in the past and that this new construction item is necessary and will result in considerable benefits both to the people of the State of Wisconsin and the people in the United States as a whole.

We would appreciate anything you can do to support this request.

Your very truly,

E. A. STARKS,
Assistant Treasurer.

WISCONSIN ALUMNI ASSOCIATION,
Madison, Wis., February 28, 1962.

Hon. ALEXANDER WILEY,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR WILEY: Wanted to apprise you of our keen interest in the activities of the Forest Products Laboratory.

For many years we in Madison have seen the outstanding contributions that this fine Government agency has rendered to our entire Nation.

You are to be complimented for your great interest in the Forest Products Laboratory and in the strong interest that you have shown in their budget.

Keep up the good work.

Sincerely,

ARLIE M. MUCKS, Jr.

ALGOMA PLYWOOD & VENEER CO.,
Algoma, Wis., March 8, 1962.

Hon. ALEXANDER WILEY,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR WILEY: The Senate Appropriations Subcommittee on Interior and Related Agencies will take under consideration on March 12, 1962, a proposal for a building program to modernize and make additions to the Forest Products Laboratory at Madison, Wis. Our company, as you know, operates a plant at Algoma and we have several warehouses throughout the State.

The Forest Products Laboratory in Wisconsin has rendered our company and our industry many technical services which we believe have helped to conserve the natural resources of our State and the United States. The Forest Products Laboratory has an extremely able staff and we know they are operating under a handicap due to the need for larger and more modern facilities.

We would like to strongly urge you to lend your good offices to supporting the request for a construction program for the Forest Products Laboratory. Senator CARL HAYDEN is the chairman of the subcommittee and we are confident a word from you to CARL HAYDEN would strengthen the position which we are advocating.

Thanking you for your assistance in this matter.

Sincerely,

RAY P. FULWILER,
President and General Manager.

HAMMERMILL PAPER CO.,
Erie, Pa., March 8, 1962.

Hon. ALEXANDER WILEY,
Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR WILEY: I was very much interested in reading your speech concerning the expansion of the Forest Products Laboratory at Madison as reported in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of February 20, 1962. You are to be complimented on your leadership in attempting to secure funds for the new facilities which are needed to meet the demands for increased research in the utilization of the products of our forests.

The Hammermill Paper Co. has worked very closely with the Forest Products Laboratory in the past and has directly benefited from the splendid research work which has bene done at the Laboratory. Previous commitments prevent our appearing before the Senate Subcommittee for the Department of the Interior and Related Agencies, which is now considering the request for funds to start construction of the proposed facilities at Madison. Perhaps you will find this letter of use to you in your efforts to secure favorable action on this matter by the subcommittee.

The Hammermill Paper Co. is one of the largest companies in the United States manufacturing fine papers—business, office, and printing papers. Paper manufacturing facilities are located in Pennsylvania, New York, Ohio, Massachusetts, Michigan, and Washington State with converting and merchandising facilities also located in a number of other States.

Hammermill, like almost all paper-manufacturing companies, depends on having an adequate supply of high-quality wood pulp made from available pulpwood at a competitive cost. The Forest Products Laboratory has made valuable contributions to the U.S. pulp and paper industry and we feel that the high position which our industry now occupies could not have been reached without the research and development work which has been carried out by Forest Products Laboratory in the past.

The development of the patented Hammermill neutracel process for the manufacture of high quality pulp from hardwoods, formerly considered unsuited for the purpose, was based upon excellent fundamental research work extending over many years by the Madison laboratory. It would not have been possible to perfect the method and design and install the commercial plant at Erie now making 250 tons of neutracel pulp per day as quickly, and possibly not at all, without the help of the Forest Products Laboratory.

As the result of the neutracel development Hammermill has been able to continue and expand its pulp manufacture in Erie and to create an important source of jobs and income for the farmers and small wood suppliers in the economically depressed areas of northern Pennsylvania and adjacent counties in New York. This means that over $2 million which formerly went to Canada for pulpwood purchases now is channeled into the economy of this region.

Other specific contributions could be cited as to the direct value to our industry of the research and technical contributions made by the Forest Products Laboratory but perhaps this example will suffice to illustrate the practical value of the work done at Madison.

It is hoped that you will be successful in your efforts to get the necessary approval so that construction of the much needed

section for pulp, paper, and wood chemistry research can be started this year.

Very truly yours,

DONALD T. JACKSON.

UNIT STRUCTURES, INC.,
Peshtigo, Wis., March 8, 1962.

Senator ALEXANDER WILEY,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR WILEY: We urge that you support the U.S. Forest Products Laboratory request for additional research funds to make more effective use of our timber resources.

The Department of the Interior and Related Agencies Subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations is being requested to include $4 million for fiscal 1963 to provide additional wood chemistry and pulp and paper research at Madison, Wis. This is part of a 3-year plan to assure $10 million of needed research facilities for increasing the serviceability of wood products, developing new uses for wood, and improving the usefulness and quality of all wood species.

This research is essential to the proper use of wood as a structural material as well as provide the processes and techniques to improve the productive potential of our forests for the paper and cellulose industries.

The personnel of this Laboratory have pioneered in the development of plywood, laminating, protection from fungi, insects, and fire, wood structural design criteria, and wood chemistry to change low-grade species into profitable products. Your support of their request for funds will be of tremendous importance to the State of Wisconsin and to the Nation in finding new uses for the products of its forests.

Yours very truly,

MAX J. HANISCH, Jr.,
President.

THE PEACE CORPS

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, most of us have been heartened at the successful year which the Peace Corps has had. This fine agency is doing a wonderful job in promoting good will for America abroad. Many of those who had expressed doubts about it are now its adherents.

I recently received a letter from Miss Carol Ann Byrnes, formerly of Pittsburgh, Pa., but who is presently with the Peace Corps in the Philippines, and who writes entertainingly and informatively about her experience there. She ends up her letter by saying:

Tell everyone at home we miss them, but wouldn't trade this experience for anything.

I ask unanimous consent that Miss Byrnes' letter may be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

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

FEBRUARY 18, 1962.

DEAR MR. CLARK: Greetings from the Philippine Islands. Are you surprised to be receiving a letter from a Peace Corps volunteer?

My main reason for writing is to thank you for your support of the Peace Corps. I'm sure without men like you pulling for us in the legislative branch of our Government, I probably wouldn't be here today. We do appreciate your support.

Perhaps you'd like to know a little of what life in the Peace Corps Philippines project is like. You'll excuse me for speaking personally, but it'll be easier to tell you what I, myself, am involved in, rather than the activities of all 180 volunteers.

Our training programs at the University of the Philippines lasted 7 weeks. We received instruction in Jagalog, the national language and also in Philippine history, education, culture, and social structure. Much of our time was spent in classes showing how to teach English and science. On December 1, we were sent to our respective assignments, after a graduation speech by Vice President Pelaez.

The island of Negros, where I'm assigned, is one of the world's leading exporters of sugar.

It's a beautiful place, and everywhere can be seen sugarcane fields, coconut trees, and rice harvests. Fishing is an important industry in Hinigaran and each morning the people come to the beach beside our house to buy fresh fish.

Our house is a cute, two-story frame structure with a nipa palm thatched roof. It's located just a few feet from the ocean, and when the tide is in, we can almost taste the salt water. We have almost all the comforts of home, including running water (when the pressure is great enough), shower, john, electricity between 6 p.m. and 6 a.m. and even an old upright piano.

The three volunteers with whom I live travel each day to barrio schools, while I have a 10 minute walk to the Hinigaran Central School. The school has over 1,800 students, and 56 teachers, so I'm kept quite busy. Most of my time is spent teaching English in grades three through six, although occasionally I teach a science class. Three times each week, I conduct a class for the teachers on teaching English as a second language. Once every week, I gather 25 or 30 of the best sixth grade students and give them extra help and work. Right now, I'm busy teaching some American dances (hokey pokey, skip to my Lou, etc.) for some kiddies to perform at Community Day next Friday.

The whole town gathers in the town plaza for a program. Even I'll be performing. Dressed in native costume, I'll dance a Filipino selection with the teachers.

Plans still in the offing are to organize a rythm band at school, using native materials like coconut shells, seeds, etc. I also would like to begin traveling to the rural areas with the public-health doctor and midwife to see how things are done.

One of the niceties of this project is that individual interests and skills can be utilized. For example, one of my housemates was a commercial artist who designed cards for Hallmark. Consequently, she's making place mats and paint brushes from native materials. Edmie has built a chicken coop and is raising poultry. Mary is kind of a linguist and made a speech in Ilongo (the local dialect) at a recent celebration.

Some of the Peace Corps groups are seeing tangible results of their work and can send pictures home of a bridge they've designed, a road they helped to construct, or a toilet they built. But who can photograph the mind of a child? One satisfaction comes in seeing a little round, tan face light up after it has pronounced "fish" correctly or learned to say "seat," instead of "sit."

We crave news about what is happening in the rest of the world and eagerly devour the Asiatic editions of Time and Newsweek. Voice of America helps a little, but it's not too good.

Tell everyone at home we miss them, but wouldn't trade this experience for anything.

Thanks again for your support.

Sincerely,

CAROL ANN BYRNES.
(Formerly of Pittsburgh).

CHAGRIN BEING FELT ON THE RIGHT

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, one of the controversies tending to divide the country today is the argument between the vast majority of our American citizens and what has been referred to as "the radical right," or, as my friend the senior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] refers to them, as the "Knights of Negativism."

A very interesting and sensible column appeared in Tuesday's Pittsburgh Post-Gazette under a byline of a well known columnist, Sidney Harris, entitled "Not Thunder but Chagrin Being Felt on the Right." I commend the column to my colleagues and to other readers of the RECORD, and I ask unanimous consent that it may be printed in the RECORD at this point.

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

NOT THUNDER BUT CHAGRIN BEING FELT ON THE RIGHT

(By Sidney Harris)

I was having lunch with an old friend of mine who happens to be a deep-dyed conservative. He was worried and upset about the radical rightwing movement in America.

"As you know," he said, "I sympathize with some of their aims and objectives. But if I go in with them, I'm immediately associated with a lot of crackpots and bigots and unsavory characters. And, naturally, I'd be tarred with the same brush."

"Naturally," I agreed, "and I'm glad to see that now the shoe is on the other foot. Pinches a bit, doesn't it?"

"What do you mean by that?" he asked sharply.

"I mean that has been the liberal's dilemma for the last 30 years. The minute he joined a group or worked for a cause that also had the Communists' support, he was immediately identified as a 'fellow traveler.'

"You conservatives," I went on, "have not hesitated to brand any liberal as some kind of 'pinko,' no matter how basically he may have disagreed with the Communists. As far as you were concerned, anybody who was for public housing or civil rights was a suspicious and probably subversive character."

"But the Communists did use a lot of naive liberals," he protested.

"Of course they did," I said, "and so will the rightwing extremists use a lot of respectable conservatives as fronts, if they can. It's in the nature of any fanatical group to try to take over wherever it can."

"What is a person to do, then?" he inquired.

"It seems to me," I said, "the first thing we can do is stop throwing dirty names around and calling everybody we oppose a 'pinko.' We have to learn to discriminate between people who believe in the orderly processes of government and those who really don't."

"Is that the basic difference?" he wanted to know.

"I think it is," I said. "Both the genuine liberal and the genuine conservative have faith in people as such. But the extremists on both sides really want to take over the government and run it for the benefit of some elite. The Communists and the rightwing radicals have a lot more in common than they realize.

PROPOSED UNITED NATIONS BOND ISSUE

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a column published in this morning's Washington Post and Times Herald, written by Walter Lippmann, which analyzes the issues as he sees them in respect to the current bond proposal for the United Nations.

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

THE REPUBLICANS AND THE U.N.

(By Walter Lippmann)

There is serious difficulty in Congress over the plan to finance the U.N. deficit by a bond issue. This plan was worked out by Americans, it is supported by the U.S. Government, and it has been approved by the General Assembly of the United Nations.

It now appears that there is danger that it may be defeated by a coalition of Republicans and southern Democrats who want to substitute for it an altogether different plan. Instead of our buying $100 million worth of bonds, to run for 25 years at 2-percent interest, Senators AIKEN and HICKENLOOPER want us to offer the U.N. a loan of $100 million, to run for 3 years at current rates of interest.

The supporters of this proposal, and notably its sponsors, Senators AIKEN and HICKENLOOPER have been, and profess still to be, friends of the United Nations. But it is no exaggeration to say that if they prevail, they will have struck a dangerous blow at the United Nations.

To understand why this is so, we must remember that the U.N. is in financial trouble solely because it is conducting two operations—the one on the frontier between Egypt and Israel, and the other in the Congo. Apart from them, the U.N. is solvent.

The deficit arising from Palestine and the Congo is caused by the fact that two of the great powers, the Soviet Union and France, and a number of the smaller powers, such as the Arab States, Portugal, South Africa, and some others, are refusing to pay their special assessments for either or both of these operations.

The basic issues before the U.N. and the country are whether all the members of the U.N. can be compelled to pay for these peacekeeping, operations and, if that fails, whether the U.N. must liquidate them and give up its actions, of which there have been eight, to enforce peace.

The crucial difference between the U.N. bond plan and the Aiken-Hickenlooper plan is that the bond plan would compel all members to pay their share of the costs of a peace-keeping operation authorized by the United Nations. The Aiken-Hickenlooper loan project cannot deal with this question of making every member pay for these special operations.

In the bond plan the interest and amortization charges would be covered in the regular budget, and a member who refused to pay its share for 2 years would be punishable by losing its right to vote. That ought to work to make the payment of these costs general throughout the membership.

Because the interest and amortization charges would be spread out over 25 years, the smaller, poorer members, though paying their share, would not have to pay large amounts. We cannot be sure that the big members, the Soviet Union, France, the Arab States and Belgium, would pay their share. But it would be a brazen defiance of the U.N. if they did not do so, and very embarrassing for them.

The Aiken-Hickenlooper loan plan would do none of these things. The fact is that the U.N. has no legal right to accept such a loan, and it is extremely improbable that a special session of the General Assembly, which would have to be called in order to accept a loan, would in fact approve it.

What is certain is that such a special session would reopen every crisis which was quieted down last autumn and the United States would find itself at the storm center of a new crisis. We would have to explain why the General Assembly should revoke its own decision of a few months ago, a decision we ourselves promoted, and why in order to please the Republican minority in Congress, the General Assembly should vote to overrule the recommendations of the President of the United States.

And if by some strange chance the U.N. accepted the loan, it would probably not be repaid. For the big nonpaying countries would surely stick to their position that special assessments are not binding, and the little nations would be unable to repay their share of the loan within 3 years.

It is in fact almost impossible to make any sense at all out of the Aiken-Hickenlooper amendment to the very much improved bill voted by the Senate Foreign Relations Committee. It is evident, however, that there are three elements at work in this confused raid on the bond plan.

One, unhappily, seems to be personal disgruntlement about which the less said the better. Another is a crude partisanship which is acting on the notion that to defeat what comes from Kennedy is somehow to win a victory. A third element, concealed but nonetheless at work, is old-fashioned isolationist hostility to the U.N. as such.

The Republican Party will not improve its famous image by playing politics with a plan which means so much to the stability of the world.

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, the crucial difference between the bond plan and the loan plan, as Mr. Lippmann correctly points out, is the matter of compelling a larger participation in the financing of the United Nations among the membership, and reducing the weight of the participation on the part of our own Government, in terms of its actual financial obligation.

FEAR AND FOREIGN AID

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the lead editorial in this morning's Washington Post and Times Herald, entitled "Fear and Foreign Aid," be printed in the RECORD.

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

FEAR AND FOREIGN AID

The President and his Agency for International Development Director, Fowler Hamilton, are handicapped in their presentation of this year's foreign-aid requests by their inability to show tangible results of their policies in the short time they have been in effect. Since the emphasis of the administration has been on programs of a long-range nature, this is not remarkable. Congress can hardly hold up new authorizations and appropriations until 10-year plans have produced the expected effect, so they will have to take informed forecasts of the outcome of the program as a basis for judgment.

In his message, the President did well to stress the bipartisan, longtime nature of foreign-aid policies, in saying:

"One of the brightest pages of the world's history has been the series of programs this Nation has devised, established, and implemented following the Second World War to help free peoples achieve economic development and the control of their own destinies."

The President and his foreign-aid administrator have tried to put the program on an affirmative basis, but have felt compelled, nonetheless, to place great emphasis on the negative reasons for the program, the usefulness of these loans and grants and aids in checking communism. Perhaps, like the Greek general who confessed he could not get his soldiers to fight until he had got them frightened, foreign-aid advocates think Congress will not vote unless it is frightened.

No doubt a country with a functioning economy in which there is at least the prospect of better days for the people is less likely to opt for communism than a bankrupt state. Still, relatively well-off countries have gone Communist and countries in which we have invested heavily have been infiltrated with communism. So great a stress has been put on this incidental purpose, over the years, that Americans have had few of the psychological satisfactions of unselfish aid to less fortunate people and less credit abroad for disinterested humanitarianism. The argument puts the blight of blind fear and sheer self-interest on vast expenditures which retain much of their support because of nobler considerations than sheer self-preservation.

Humanitarian impulse, to be sure, often is compatible with enlightened self-interest and is not less creditable for having in it that element. Long before there was a Communist menace, however, Americans, as private citizens and as members of great church groups, were sending aid abroad to people less fortunately situated. There is a great philanthropic drive in this land. There is a great current of generous impulse. There is a long tradition of disinterested humanitarianism. Its role in the foreign aid program needs to be emphasized and stressed without any shamefaced disavowals of sheer good will, brotherly feeling and honest affection for our fellowmen. Let us feed the starving because they are hungry and not just because they may get wrong ideas on an empty stomach. Let us clothe the naked because they are in need, not because they otherwise may become infected with communism. Let us send our aid and our technicians into underdeveloped lands under the inspiration of hope and not under the compulsion of fear.

The mainspring of our foreign aid program ought to be our love for the great world community of man and not our hatred for the communism of Karl Marx. We need more gods and fewer devils in our foreign aid religion.

Mr. McGEE. The burden of the editorial is that much of our focus and our motivation in the foreign aid program seems to have been on stopping communism, and we have tended to lose sight from time to time of what it is we are seeking with the program. I quote the concluding thought in the editorial:

The mainspring of our foreign aid program ought to be our love for the great world community of man and not our hatred for the communism of Karl Marx. We need more gods and fewer devils in our foreign aid religion.

FIRST ANNIVERSARY OF THE ALLIANCE FOR PROGRESS

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the second editorial from this morning's Washington Post and Times-Herald, entitled "The Alliance's Birthday," be printed in the RECORD.

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

THE ALLIANCE'S BIRTHDAY

There were some memorable statements in President Kennedy's speech Tuesday on the

occasion of the first anniversary of the Alliance for Progress. There is a need to make clear that the hemisphere program is more than a matter of commodity agreements and long-term credits—that it has political premises as well. Mr. Kennedy put it well in describing the meaning of the alliance as a doctrine of the freedom of man in the most spacious sense of that freedom.

The aim of the alliance is not simply to eliminate poverty; it is intended to broaden the range of choice of peoples who too often are consigned to a wasteland without exits. It is intended to free men from the bondage of want—without sacrificing basic democratic rights. This necessarily entails changes in the existing structure of Latin American societies. As Mr. Kennedy said: "Those who make peaceful revolution impossible will make violent revolution inevitable."

The President quite properly stressed the positive in his summary of the first year since Latin Americans were invited to join in an Alliance for Progress. Hemisphere meetings have been held and Latin American republics have agreed to support the help-for-self-help doctrine of the alliance. The administrative machinery has been created and funds are beginning to flow into Latin America. Whatever the short-term difficulties, the alliance is a reality and the generous vista it opens are bound to excite the imagination. "I look forward to the day," Mr. Kennedy concluded, "when the people of Latin America will take their place beside the United States and Western Europe as citizens of industrialized and growing and increasingly abundant societies. The United States, Europe and Latin America—almost a billion people—a bulwark of freedom and the values of Western civilization, invulnerable to the forces of despotism, lighting the path to liberty for all the peoples of the world."

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, this relates the substance of a series of remarks made by President Kennedy at a distinguished gathering at the White House yesterday, in observance of the first anniversary of the President's announcement of the Alliance for Progress program. Those of us who were privileged to hear his remarks were moved indeed by their appropriatness and the urgency of the tone of his comments.

The burden of the plea was, to those in Latin America, "Those who make peaceful revolution impossible will make violent revolution inevitable." With that keynote, the sense of urgency was sounded as to the Alliance for Progress getting more rapidly underway.

A CATHOLIC REPLY TO RADICAL RIGHT

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, in a column written by Marquis Childs there is "A Catholic Reply to Radical Right," which I believe merits the attention of this body, and I ask unanimous consent that it may be printed in the RECORD at this point.

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

A CATHOLIC REPLY TO RADICAL RIGHT

(By Marquis Childs)

In the growing debate over the role of the rightwing in American political life no document is likely to have wider circulation—and perhaps also greater influence—than the pamphlet by Father John F. Cronin, S.S., just published by the National Catholic Welfare Conference.

Issued last week the pamphlet, entitled "Communism: Threat to Freedom," made the front pages of many newspapers. The NCWC, which is the policy-formulating body of the Catholic Church in this country, plans to give it the widest possible dissemination.

Father Cronin's basic thesis is directly contrary to the position of most of the rightist organizations that have come into being in recent years. He writes that the danger from communism is not from within the country but from without. By indiscriminately using the tag of "Communist" or "Communist sympathizer" the extremists on the right are dividing America, the pamphlet warns, and the result is a net gain for the Communist movement.

He points to the danger in the line taken by those who accuse Government officials negotiating with the Communists of weakness or treason. The alternatives are not surrender or war, but a middle course between these extremes.

This last is also directly contrary to the position of the John Birch Society and others on the right. While the pamphlet does not mention the Birch Society or any other specific organization, the following applies to at least one or more of the groups that have attracted national attention:

"The Communists own the top. They have considerable strength in the middle. They are just now beginning to achieve an appreciable amount of direct control throughout the whole base. In other statements Presidents of the United States and Justices of our Supreme Court have been labeled 'Communists.' Our State Department is alleged to be thoroughly infiltrated by the party."

Father Cronin attacks another tactic of the rightists which is to equate liberalism with the welfare state, the welfare state with socialism and, since the Communists say they are Socialists, therefore liberalism equals communism. This logic, Father Cronin writes, would make the latest encyclical of Pope John, "Christianity and Social Progress," "a defense of communism."

The encyclical, which puts the liberal-welfare trends of recent years within the scope of the Christian conscience, has been widely hailed as one of the most important utterances from the Vatican in many years. It was attacked in the National Review, principal organ of the right, as "a venture in triviality." The editor of the Review is William F. Buckley, of a prominent and wealthy Catholic family.

Fifteen years ago Father Cronin published a pamphlet called "Communism, a World Menace." At that time he held that Communist subversion and infiltration was a danger to this country, with Communist influence substantial in the trade unions and in many areas of American life. Since 1950, according to the new pamphlet, Americans have been thoroughly alerted to the danger of communism, the Communist Party has withered away to a small splinter and Communist influence is comparatively negligible.

It is significant that today the church, through the National Catholic Welfare Conference, should consider that the threat of the extreme right merits this new publication. Extremist bigots have in some instances attacked the Catholic Church, going so far as to equate its methods with those of international communism. Robert Welch, head of the John Birch Society, who links a large part of the Protestant clergy to communism, has said that some Catholic priests are also soft on communism. Father Cronin in some detail refutes the charges against the Protestant churches.

This newest contribution to the debate over the right can hardly be expected to still the outcries of those who, whether from genuine fear and frustration or from a desire to exploit the present confusion for personal gain, are sounding the alarm. But it is the weightiest statement yet made and by one who can by no stretch of the most heated imagination be accused of being soft on communism.

As the debate continues, what appears to be happening is that the extreme right is becoming more and more isolated. Reports from Texas say that Gen. Edwin A. Walker is likely to run last in a field of six in the governorship race. Americans have a deep-seated aversion to extremes, and that fact seems in process of being demonstrated again.

AUTOPSY ON OPERATION ABOLITION

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, from the radio and television page of this morning's press I take a column written by Lawrence Laurent, the title of which is "'Autopsy' Could Set Up the Funeral for 'Operation Abolition.'" "Autopsy" is the title of a recently put together show.

Because of the impact of this analysis of a positive and more constructive television endeavor by a private group, to answer the uncertainties of those who are squeamish about traitors, Communists, and the like in our midst, I believe it should receive further attention, and I ask unanimous consent that it may be printed in the RECORD.

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

"AUTOPSY" COULD SET UP THE FUNERAL FOR "OPERATION ABOLITION"

(By Lawrence Laurent)

On television stations across the land and in private exhibitions in many cities, probably more people have seen some form of a film called "Operation Abolition" than any other documentary in history. This is a film about student riots in San Francisco in May 1960, that were in connection with hearings by the House Committee on Un-American Activities (HUAC).

First, the HUAC subpenaed about 2½ hours of newsreel footage, much of it repetitious, that had been shot by two San Francisco TV stations. This was turned over to Washington Video Productions, from which emerged a 45-minute film called "Operation Abolition." The narration is by Fulton (Buddy) Lewis III, son of the Mutual Broadcasting System commentator and formerly a staff member of HUAC.

Yesterday, an executive of Washington Video Productions said 1,456 copies of the film had been sold. The price: $100 per print.

Two months ago, an HUAC report estimated the film had been seen by 15 million persons, excluding television audiences.

This is only the beginning of the saga of this documentary film. Many charged it was filled with inaccuracies and a new narration was put on the sound track to create "Operation Correction." This came from the American Civil Liberties Union of Northern California, with narration by Ernest Besig, ACLU executive director.

In September 1961, Buddy Lewis said a new version of "Operation Abolition" was being shown, with changes made to meet some of the charges that the film's editing was distorted.

In two reports, issued in October 1961 and January 1962, the House Un-American Activities Committee defended the film. The most recent document dealt with 28 specific charges of distortion or unfairness that had been made against the film. (The film is an official part of the HUAC record, but Chairman FRANCIS E. WALTER, Democrat, of Pennsylvania, has said the committee

"had nothing to do with the preparation of the picture and nothing to do with the manufacturing and distribution of it."

A summation of the controversy over the film now has come from one of the Nation's largest publishers of Catholic educational aids. Impact Films of St. Paul, a department of the Catechetical Guild, has put together a dispassionate 60-minute film called "Autopsy on Operation Abolition."

The narrator, the Reverend Louis J. Twomey, of Loyola University in New Orleans, sets up the problem in terms of a coroner's inquest with the audience as the jury. Twelve persons are interviewed and the committee's hearings and the student riots are reviewed.

Those who favor the Un-American Activities Committee are given plenty of time to develop their charges that the riots were Communist inspired and that University of California students were "duped" by Communists. These include the Reverend Dr. Archer Weniger, pastor of the Foothill Boulevard Baptist Church in Oakland; Representative Edwin E. Willis, Democrat, of Louisiana, chairman of the HUAC at the time of the riots; and Francis J. McNamara, HUAC research director.

Official descriptions of the riots are given by San Francisco Mayor George Christopher and Sheriff Mathew C. Carberry. Both stick mainly to their actions as defenders of law and order in San Francisco. (Sixty-three demonstrators were arrested. Charges were dropped against all but one, Robert J. Meisenbach. He was acquitted in May 1961.)

Strongest defense of the students is given in an interview with the Reverend William Sullivan, Paulist chaplain at Newman Hall, University of California. Father Sullivan does not defend the students who participated in the riots, but he does say: "I insist that it has to be taken within the context of young students excited about ideals; concerned about freedom of speech; anxious to defend something in which they believe, and not out to destroy the United States at all."

Father Sullivan continues: "The strength of our young people's ideals—and I believe that freedom of speech is an ideal in which all of us must agree—the strength of these ideals is the strength of our country and I think also as a Catholic priest, the strength of these ideals, the belief in ideals which the American people hold dear, is also the strength of the Catholic Church."

Defense of the students is also voiced by Representative James Roosevelt, Democrat, of California; Prof. Henry Nash Smith (who says the film "is a deliberate falsification"); Dr. Cecil Thomas, a religious worker; Assemblyman John O'Connell; and the Reverend Richard Byfield, assistant executive to Bishop James A. Pike.

The "Autopsy on Operation Abolition" should result in a quiet funeral for a controversial documentary film.

CULTIVATION IN TV WASTELAND

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, there was published in the Sunday press an article describing the activities of the Chairman of the Federal Communications Commission, Mr. Newton Minow, and his assault on the wasteland of television. I ask unanimous consent that the article may be printed in the RECORD.

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

CULTIVATION IN TV WASTELAND—BIGGER CULTURAL YIELD IS MINOW'S AIM

The chap who's attempting to cultivate the wasteland of television—dynamic, 35-year-old Newton N. Minow, Chairman of the Federal Communications Commission—has won the plaudits of parents, poets, and a public hungry for more than cowboy pap and gangster gristle.

"I heartily approve of what Mr. Minow is doing for TV," said Carl Sandburg recently. "In my book he's more of a whale. I'd like to shake his hand."

The man who has the courage to buffet the broadcasters is of medium build, with a firm grip, cropped dark hair, gray eyes, and a seraglio of womenfolk which includes his pretty wife, three small daughters, and an English nurse.

"When I'm asked what I want next, I say a son-in-law," said Minow, as he sat in a blue and white living room adorned with antiques and modern paintings.

"I was raised in a home similar to this, comfortable middle class with three children," he continued, efficiently capsuling his life. He attended Milwaukee public schools, the University of Michigan, and Northwestern University, from which he obtained his law degree in 1950. He neglected to add that he stood first in his class. "In 1951 I became law clerk to Chief Justice Fred M. Vinson and in 1952 administrative assistant to Adlai Stevenson, then Governor of Illinois. I later became a partner of Stevenson's law firm and legal counsel to Encyclopedia Britannica Films, which produces educational TV films.

"I learned of my appointment to the FCC by picking up the morning paper. I couldn't believe it. I've been interested in communications since I was a sergeant in World War II, when my outfit strung the first telephone line between India and China. This is the one job in Government I've always wanted. The day I knew I had it was the most exciting of my life.

"Now, the first thing I do in the morning is turn on the television."

"That's true," confirmed Jo Minow, the pert brunet whom Newton Minow married as a law student. "His first words are 'Where's the remote?' The children call it 'the mote.' They pile onto our bed at 7 a.m., in time for the news. Newt has an early breakfast—orange juice and Metrecal, then down to the chaos. You know FCC stands for 'From Crisis to Crisis.'

"Newt wants TV to be more than a babysitter," said Jo. "The programs don't stretch the imagination. I'd like my children to learn more from TV than commercial jingles.

"The networks haven't been giving the public enough credit for intelligence and taste," continued FCC's livest wire. "One reason is that the public hasn't let them know when a thing is good. When Eisenhower spoke recently on TV, a survey showed that about 25 million viewers watched 'The Untouchables,' another 25 million watched 'Sing Along With Mitch' and 7.5 million watched Ike. 'That shows you public affairs programs are a failure,' say the networks. I say an audience of 7.5 million shouldn't be called a failure."

Last spring, Minow spoke out before the National Association of Broadcasters, deploring the wasteland of television. He was asked what the repercussions were.

"The FCC became known as 'The Seven Untouchables'; but not long ago, when I discussed reorganization before a congressional committee, I told them there'd been a shakeup: we are now 'Six Untouchables and One Unmentionable.' "

Mrs. Minow takes pride in her husband's work. "The other day I took a watch of Newt's to the jeweler's to replace the band. The clerk looked up when I gave my name and said 'Your husband's doing a great job.' I was so thrilled I had him put in a new crystal too."

WELCOMING THE AFRICANS TO WASHINGTON

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have an article from the Sunday Star magazine, on the reception of Africans in our Nation's Capital, printed in the RECORD.

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

WELCOMING THE AFRICANS TO WASHINGTON

"Washington is giving us a tremendous welcome—we had no idea that African ambassadors would receive such warmhearted hospitality from the American people."

This enthusiastic comment comes from Nigerian Ambassador J. M. Udochi, a leader among the 27 African ambassadors who are making a dramatic impact on the Washington social scene.

The smiling Nigerian diplomat, whose cheeks bear matching tribal scars, says he was surprised to find Americans such an idealistic, kindhearted people "because we had seen something completely different in Hollywood movies."

In appreciation for the pleasant life he has found since his arrival in December 1960, Ambassador Udochi named his son, born last October, "for two great Americans—John, for the President of the United States, and Franklin, after one of the Founding Fathers." The boy was also given a Nigerian name, Imoesi, meaning "I have a guardian angel."

Another leader in the African diplomatic corps, Ghanaian Ambassador W. M. Q. Halm, also expresses approval of the way he and other diplomats have been accepted. Like the Udochis, the Halms are seen often at dinners, receptions, and cocktail parties. Both couples are noted for their gracious hospitality in their own embassies and for the tasty African food prepared by the wives.

G. Mennen Williams, Assistant Secretary of State for African Affairs, and Mrs. Williams are the most frequent guests at functions given by the African diplomatic corps. However, Mrs. Dean Rusk, Chief of Protocol Angier Biddle Duke and his assistant, Pedro A. Sanjuan, Mrs. Chester Bowles, and many others in the top ranks of official social life are often guests of the Africans.

The interest now being focused on African diplomats started in 1960 when many new nations gained independence. Previously, there had been only a few oldtimers, such as the ambassadors of Liberia and Ethiopia, mingling in the diplomatic social life.

Then suddenly, the Africans, many dressed in their national costumes, appeared in large numbers at the parties of other embassies. Gradually, as they set up their own establishments, they returned the hospitality.

During the last year, many young nations entertained at gala independence day celebrations. Most of these larger parties, each attended by hundreds of guests, were held in hotels. However, one of the outstanding celebrations was in the new Nigerian Embassy on Woodland Drive NW.

"Last October 2 was really a big day for me—a double celebration," Ambassador Udochi recalls in his excellent English. "My son was born that morning and that night we had 800 guests. My wife had stayed up late, cooking African dishes before she went to the hospital. I handed out hundreds of cigars to celebrate the new boy. And, of course, we had a huge cake for our country's birthday anniversary."

Because peanuts are a staple food in many African countries, they often appear in soup and as a stew, called nkatee flau. Other dishes served frequently are fufu, which is pounded yam or potato; fried plantain, known as tataley, and baflar, which is a cooked green mixed with palm oil. There is also the West African chop made of ground chicken or other meat with palm oil and peanuts. Maize is prepared in different ways to serve as abolo, banku, and kenke.

African drummers have entertained at some embassy parties, and impromptu Afri-

can folksongs have enlivened others. Also, some embassies, including those of Liberia, Ivory Coast, and Morocco, have exhibited their own sculptures, paintings, and drawings.

"We don't think of their paintings as curiosities, but as a complex form of art that has to be known to be truly appreciated," says Assistant Chief of Protocol Sanjuan, who often goes to three or four receptions in one night. "These new nations have a wealth of music and art to bring forth for the enrichment of their guests, and I hope we'll have much more of it."

Mr. Sanjuan is a very busy man when heads of government visit Washington. The Office of Protocol sees that these distinguished visitors, including eight from Africa alone last year, are entertained in a manner appropriate to their office.

"The African leaders have certainly measured up well to the rules of protocol," he observes. "Most of them are well-educated, highly polished and urbane gentlemen who are comfortable at white-tie occasions and can converse well with President Kennedy as well as other guests.

He refers particularly to Leopold Sedar Senghor, President of the Republic of Senegal, whom he praises as "not only a statesman but a poet of renown—a man of letters who was the architect of his country's independence." President Senghor was Mr. Kennedy's honor guest at a White House luncheon at which a number of other noted poets and writers were entertained.

Another outstanding guest of state during the last year was William V. S. Tubman, President of Liberia since 1944. Like many Liberian leaders descended from American Negro slaves, he is the son of parents who emigrated to Africa from Georgia. Yet when he was greeted at the airport by President Kennedy, Mr. Tubman came through with flying colors in the demands of protocol.

A dapper dresser who is seldom seen without a long cigar and an ebony cane, President Tubman has a keen sense of drama in political life and loves spectacles of state. His inaugural celebrations have lasted 8 days. Gracious and jovial in private conversation, he assumed a manner of grave formality at official functions here.

Still another outstanding visitor was Ibrahim Abboud, President of the Supreme Council for the Armed Forces, Premier and Defense Minister of the Sudan. A man of striking military mien, President Abboud maintained great dignity on social occasions without seeming aloof or austere.

Descended from the fearsome Sudanese soldiers of the Hadendoa tribe immortalized by Rudyard Kipling in his poem, "Fuzzy-Wuzzy," President Abboud flashed his quick wit and ready smile as he made the Washington rounds. At the White House, he was honor guest at an elaborate dinner in the state dining room.

Later, he gave a dinner for President Kennedy at the Mayflower Hotel where the menu included "cream of Ful Sudani," a soup of beef, onions, and peanut butter made from a Sudanese recipe. A devout Moslem, he served fruit juices before the meal instead of cocktails.

The Moslem diplomats who do not drink have not found it difficult to make friends at cocktail parties, according to Mr. Sanjuan. He sticks to ginger ale, he says, "because I can remember names better—and after all, that's my job."

Language is a real problem for some African diplomats, however. About 18 of the 27 ambassadors speak only French, and for the most part their staffs have not yet learned English.

"The State Department is trying to help out in this problem," Mr. Sanjuan reports. "We have started arrangements for a specially tailored, speedup course in English for diplomats. Translators usually accompany the French-speaking ambassadors as interpreters, but we hope they will learn English so they can have more satisfactory communication with people in this country."

Mrs. Williams says the problem of teaching English to French-speaking wives of ambassadors is being approached on a more informal basis. A group known as the African-American Wives was organized last October to help the African women get settled in Washington and make friends among Americans. Miss Elizabeth Hitchcock, of the African-American Institute, is its director.

"At our monthly coffee parties in the homes of both African and American women," Mrs. Williams says, "we are teaching conversational English." Twenty-five American women, most of whom have been stationed with their husbands in Africa, form the nucleus of the group. Nearly all the wives of ambassadors are members.

"We help them with the problems in getting adjusted to life in America," Mrs. Williams explains. "For example, one volunteer puts out a monthly newsletter containing information for prospective mothers on how to buy baby clothes, places of interest to go as sightseers, and outstanding concerts and other amusements scheduled in Washington. The American women try to let the Africans know that they are real friends in this country that is new to them."

Mrs. Katie Louchheim, Deputy Assistant Secretary of State for Public Affairs, attends social events given by Africans and entertains many in her home. Fluent in French since childhood, she has no trouble communicating with those from French-speaking countries.

"I've learned so much from the African women," she says. "I hope some day to go to all their countries. Meanwhile, I can say that in my many years in Washington, I have never seen the equal in terms of interest and friendliness in the hospitality that is being extended to Africans."

THE ADMINISTRATION DISREGARDS ITS PROMISES ON LABOR SURPLUS AREAS

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I should like to discuss two analyses of trends in defense contracts awarded to New York State areas of substantial labor surplus, prepared by my office.

The experience of New York State, as brought out in these analyses, clearly shows that the promises of President Kennedy more than a year ago to channel more defense orders to areas of labor surplus are not being fulfilled.

The most intolerable situation revealed by this study concerns the Buffalo area. It is distressing to find that the July–December period represented a new low in defense contracts for Buffalo. Awards were 65 percent below the average for the same period over the previous 3 years. This loss pulled total defense contracts in Buffalo for the whole calendar year 1961 to 29 percent below the average for the preceding 3 years and made it the lowest year since the beginning of high unemployment in the area.

I am sending a letter to Defense Secretary McNamara today, requesting an explanation of the drastic decline in defense procurement in Buffalo.

The unfortunate fact that a large number of New York State areas have been suffering the hardships of severe unemployment for a long period of time enables us to assemble sufficient data for an accurate determination of trends.

One of the analyses compares contract awards during the October–December 1961 quarter with the average during the three previous October–December quarters. The second analysis deals with Buffalo, with the comparisons on a quarterly, semiannual, and annual basis for the full past 4 years.

The first study shows gains by one major labor surplus area—Utica-Rome—and four smaller areas of labor surplus—Amsterdam, Elmira, Jamestown-Dunkirk, and Newburgh-Middletown-Beacon. Three smaller areas show losses—Auburn, Gloversville, and Wellsville; and on the eight other smaller areas, no comparison is possible because they have not been listed as areas of labor surplus for the full period under study.

On February 2, 1961, President Kennedy ordered special consideration be given to areas of substantial labor surplus in the distribution of Government procurement contracts. He said in a message to Congress:

> I have today sent a directive to the Secretary of Defense, the Secretary of Labor, and the General Services Administration requesting prompt steps to improve the machinery by which Federal contracts can be channeled to firms located in labor surplus areas.

A year later, Buffalo is worse off than ever—a clear demonstration of the ineffectiveness of the administration's procurement policies.

Indeed, 6 months after the President's order, the real decline in procurement began for Buffalo, which at that time was already halfway into its fourth straight year of high unemployment, with joblessness running at an average rate of 10.4 percent since the beginning of the year.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the RECORD at this point the excerpt from the President's news conference of yesterday, showing that, 13 months after his directive of February 2, 1961, the matter is still only being discussed, and that the President seems entirely unaware of the situation in Buffalo.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from New York?

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

CHANNELING DEFENSE WORK

Question. Mr. President, sir, during your 1960 campaign, when you spoke of getting the country moving again, a lot of States and a lot of voters interpreted this to mean jobs for themselves, and now recently, States such as Ohio, Michigan, and Pennsylvania have been complaining that some of their defense contracts have been going elsewhere and the ones they had under the previous administration; that is, the level, has not stayed even as good as it was. Do you have any comment on this situation?

The PRESIDENT. No, I would have to—in my opinion, I don't think that in any of those three cases, even though this matter of contracts is a matter of continuing concern, defense contracts, we have particularly difficult problems in Detroit, which has been the subject of recent discussions, I don't think that the contracts in any of those

three States, and I would have to check it, are less than they were before.

The question is whether the distribution of the contracts is as equitable as it can be. The Defense Department, when manpower policy No. 4 was repealed in 1953, was given express indications by the Congress that they would not, except for the set-aside portion of the contract, that they were not supposed to attempt to steer contracts into areas where there might be unemployment.

I supported the defense manpower policy No. 4, but since that time the Defense Department has not been able to take that into consideration.

On the other hand, equity dictates that these contracts be assigned in areas which are not only efficient but where there is a work force which can be effectively used. But I will say that we have been considering the problem. Governor Lawrence discussed the problem of Scranton with me when he came to see me, and we talked about the problem of Detroit.

It is my judgment, and I would have to recheck it, that probably in these States the contracts are equal to or greater than they were the year before, but there is a concentration of contracts in a relatively few States which is historical.

I am concerned that in the case, as I say, of Detroit and two or three others where there is high unemployment, we do try to get some work to them, and it is a matter now which we are discussing.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, only strict adherence to the requirements of cold statistics prevents Buffalo from benefiting from the assistance program under the Area Redevelopment Act passed by the Congress in 1961. We all recognize the need for sticking to certain rules, even if Buffalo comes as close as any area in the country to just missing the minimum level of joblessness which permits the extension of assistance: The 10.8 and 9.3 percent of unemployment in 1958 and 1959 were well over the 50 percent above the national average which is required by the act. In 1961, however, Buffalo's 9.2-percent rate of unemployment was only 37 percent above the national average.

When hard statistics require the practice of human inequity—while at the same time showing clearly the extent of this inequity—it becomes necessary to redouble our efforts to alleviate this result. Nothing available now to the Government could have a more immediate and direct beneficial effect than an increase in defense procurement in an area which abounds with productive facilities and skilled manpower. Instead of such a natural step, we are confronted with a drastic reduction of procurement and an aggravation of suffering.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have the tables, prepared by my office, printed in the RECORD at this point.

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

Trends in prime defense contract awards of $10,000 or more in New York State areas of substantial labor surplus, October–December 1958–61

[In thousands of dollars]

Areas and contract awards	October–December—				Average: October–December quarters, 1958, 1959, 1960	October–December 1961 compared to average of previous 3 quarters
	1961	1960	1959	1958		
MAJOR						
Buffalo:						Percent
Total	14,261	10,770	30,087	34,901	25,253	−44
Pref	61	356	208	140	201	−70
Utica-Rome:						
Total	28,160	9,643	15,481	9,170	11,431	+146
Pref	141	143	37	137	106	+33
SMALLER						
Amsterdam: [1]						
Total	1,664	217	1,602	110	643	+159
Pref	264	0	0	0	0	X
Auburn: [1]						
Total	508	1,476	289	309	691	−26
Pref	328	0	62	11	24	+1,267
Batavia:						
Total	34					
Pref	13					
Corning-Hornell:						
Total	361					
Pref	0					
Elmira:						
Total	945	420	482	434	444	+113
Pref	0	0	0	36	12	X
Glens Falls-Hudson Falls:						
Total	71					
Pref	0					
Gloversville: [1]						
Total	218	42	384	346	244	−11
Pref	0	0	0	17	6	X
SMALLER—con.						
Jamestown-Dunkirk: [1]						Percent
Total	964	374	357	1,788	840	+15
Pref	30	0	14	50	21	+43
Newburgh-Middletown-Beacon:						
Total	1,798	784	1,155	464	801	+123
Pref	594	259	0	0	86	+591
Ogdensburg-Massena-Malone: [1]						
Total	163	13	[2] 11			
Pref	16	0	0			
Olean-Salamanca:						
Total	46					
Pref	0					
Oneonta: [1]						
Total	0					
Pref	0					
Plattsburgh: [1]						
Total	2,293	2,883	837			
Pref	88	0	0			
Watertown: [1]						
Total	370					
Pref	0					
Wellsville:						
Total	60	270	62	[2] 0	111	−46
Pref	0	0	0	0	0	X

[1] Areas of substantial and persistent labor surplus.

[2] Listed as an area of substantial labor surplus for only part of the period.

Special 4-year analysis of trends in prime defense contract awards of $10,000 or more and of unemployment in the Buffalo area, 1958–61

[In thousands of dollars]

	1961	1960	1959	1958	Averages: 1958, 1959, 1960	1961 compared to averages of 3 previous years
						Percent
October–December	14,261	10,770	30,087	34,901	25,253	−44
July–September	6,392	53,788	19,456	26,340	33,195	−81
6 months	20,653	64,558	49,543	61,241	58,448	−65
April–June	44,307	46,700	24,953	58,953	43,535	+2
January–March	25,028	25,118	29,738	[1] 17,291	24,049	+4
6 months	69,335	71,818	54,691	76,244	67,584	+3
12 months	89,988	136,376	104,234	137,485	126,032	−29
Percent unemployed:						
Buffalo	9.2	7.1	9.3	10.8		
United States	6.7	5.6	5.5	6.8		

[1] Listed as an area of substantial labor surplus for only part of the period.

DEFENSE CONTRACTS

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, yesterday, at his news conference, the President was asked about the defense contract situation in several States where defense contracts had declined. A number of States were mentioned, but New York State, where the decline over the first half of fiscal 1962 has been about 15 percent, compared with last fiscal year, was not even mentioned.

Furthermore, Mr. President, the President said:

> There is a concentration of contracts in a relatively few States which is historic.

I am very much disturbed by this remark, Mr. President. There is only one State in which there is a real concentration in defense work and that is California with 25 percent. New York is second with less than half as much.

Furthermore, the reason why New York has about 11 percent of the Nation's defense work is not historic, it is very much related to the present—to the existing capabilities of New York businesses and employees, and to the existing facilities in the State. New York has enjoyed these facilities for some time, but the reason for their existence lies in the progressive and competitive ideas of New York businessmen and the enlightened position of the State, not merely in history.

Also, Mr. President, let me add that New Yorkers pay nearly 20 percent of total Federal tax revenues. They receive barely half this much back in the form of Defense Department contracts and military work.

I understand the President has discussed the defense contract situation with the Governor of Pennsylvania and a number of other State representatives. Perhaps it would also be advisable for him to discuss it with the New York State congressional delegation and with the Governor of New York so that he can be made aware of the problem, not only as it exists in Ohio, Pennsylvania, and Michigan, but also as it now exists in the State of New York.

BIRTHDAY ANNIVERSARY OF SENATOR CARL T. CURTIS

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, birth anniversaries are always important. They are like high ground, because at those points one can stand and look back from whence he came. He can look around and survey the scene that exists at the moment. Then he can look forward on the high road and see where life still might take him.

So I would observe today that the distinguished Senator from Nebraska, the Honorable CARL CURTIS, observes his 57th anniversary. He is in his seventh year of service in the Senate. I would like to take note of his natal day and to extend to him congratulations.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, in the absence of the majority leader, who I know would want to appear of record on this subject, I wish to say that we on this side join in felicitations. We are sorry that some of us have reached the age when we do not care to have notice taken of our birthdays, but since our distinguished friend from Nebraska has not reached that stage we compliment him, congratulate him, and wish him many, many happy returns.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I wish to join in the good wishes and congratulations to our colleague, Senator CURTIS. In the words of Rip Van Winkle—May you all live long and prosper.

And may you have many more years of life, all of them rich in happiness and success.

THE PLIGHT OF MILITARY DEPENDENTS

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President, on the 9th of September last year the Secretary of Defense directed that the movement of military dependents to Europe be halted in 30 days. This ban is still in effect.

In the first 3 months of the suspension some 38,000 military dependents were thereby prevented from joining their sponsors in Europe. In consequence there has been an unfavorable effect on the motivation of military personnel, particularly those in the Army.

The problem inherent in this separation of our military men from their families for extended periods of time has been recognized by our military leadership. The Chief of Staff of the Army has stated it concisely:

> Ultimately, if the situation continues, it will have an adverse effect on the attraction and retention of the high caliber personnel the Army requires.

There are signs that this point already has been reached. The Congress recently was informed that a substantial number of Army people are apprehensive that if the suspension is continued indefinitely, they will serve 50 percent or more of their time in the service away from their families. Since the Army is now a married-man's Army the potential impact of this undesirable situation is clear.

That the problem is now upon us is shown by the current reenlistment rates in Europe. In September 1961, the month before the ban became effective, reenlistments within the U.S. Army Europe exceeded their goals in all categories. Reenlistments by first term Regular Army men, for example—and these are the very lifeblood of a professional army—were almost double the objective. By January of this year, however, all rates had dropped precipitantly. Further reductions occurred in February. In that month all categories of reenlistments were appreciably below their goals, the first term Regular Army rate having descended to only about half of the objective.

Based on these facts, the U.S. Army Europe has concluded that the sharp fall in its reenlistment rates is due in large measure to the ban on dependent travel. This is supported by the widespread cancellation of tour extensions that previously had been requested. The command is convinced that if the policy is continued there will be increased personnel turbulence and a further decline in reenlistment rates. General Clarke, the commander in chief of U.S. Army Europe, is understandably disturbed.

Our military people will accept Korea and southeast Asia and similar areas as places where they properly should not have their families. But in other places where they find a rather substantial number of noncombatants moving about freely, and yet they are unable to bring their own families, there is certain to be a question in their minds as to why they alone have been singled out for such a personal sacrifice.

This is not a problem unique to the Army. The Navy asked that it be exempted from the order and has said that it foresees the possibility of extremely adverse effects. The Marine Corps considers that an unhappy situation has been created in that service. The Air Force feels that the circumstances are a nightmare and has disclosed that around 5,000 Air Force families have gone to Europe as tourists and at their own expense in order to be with their husbands and fathers.

It is obvious that as long as hundreds of thousands of American tourists are unimpeded in their travels, as long as business can freely invest billions of American dollars in Europe, as long as governmental agencies other than the military are not restrained in the movement of their dependents abroad, there will continue to be a seriously detrimental effect on our men in uniform.

This suspension on the travel of military dependents no longer serves any useful purpose. Savings in our gold flow have been trifling. It begets undue strain and anxiety in family relationships. It is actually harmful to our military posture. It deserves to be rescinded promptly and positively.

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

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, with the understanding that I do not lose my right to the floor, I yield to the distinguished Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, I wish to commend the Senator from Alaska for raising this point. There are too many instances in which the Pentagon seems to be unaware of the fact that the military service in this period of the cold war is quite different from the service in a traditional or open war. The refusal of the Pentagon to let dependents of soldiers—families and wives and children—to accompany them or at least go to live with them in various countries, when they will in all probability be stationed over there for a long period of time, whether in Western Europe or elsewhere, is a serious matter.

I was somewhat—I do not know whether I should say shocked—certainly disturbed to note a press release to the effect that the Navy has asked its officers to make comments, as a basis of possible promotion or assignment abroad, with respect to the suitability of the wives of officers in relation to their accompanying their husbands on assignments abroad.

I protested this policy. It is a clear violation of the right to privacy of the family. I hope that it will be discontinued. It may very well be necessary for Congress to conduct a series of hearings on this general intrusion into a family's private life if these practices continue.

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

Mr. HILL. With the understanding that I do not lose my right to the floor, I yield to the distinguished Senator from Alaska.

Mr. BARTLETT. I appreciate the remarks of the Senator from Minnesota. As I have said, the Navy and the Marine Corps and the Air Force all feel that this is a very bad practice. The Air Force went so far as to say that these circumstances are a nightmare. So far as the Army is concerned, of course, they do not ask that their dependents be taken to Korea or to southeast Asia. However, they see no reason—and I do not see any either—why the families cannot go to Western Europe. After all—and I know the Senator from Minnesota will

agree with me on this point—the Army today is different from the Army of former times. It is a family army now. I imagine that a majority of the men serving in the Army are married. Certainly in these troubled times, it is likely that they will serve almost half of their time, or perhaps even more, of their service in the Army overseas. It is not right to ask them to serve under these conditions without the presence of their family.

SALUTE TO DR. JULES STEIN, OPHTHALMOLOGIST

Mrs. SMITH of Maine. Mr. President, one of the great leaders for medical research is Jules C. Stein, of Beverly Hills, Calif. Mr. Stein is a graduate ophthalmologist, but he turned to the field of music where he has enjoyed tremendous success financially. Although his professional activities have been in commercial music, he has never lost his deep interest in his first field of ophthalmology.

Instead he has remained dedicated to make every effort to promote the advance of ophthalmology. Without his support the great advances that have been made would not have been possible.

His latest contribution and achievement is the establishment of the Jules Stein Eye Institute at the Medical Center of the University of California at Los Angeles, which is being announced today.

I salute him, and I express gratitude to him on behalf of the American people. I ask unanimous consent that a statement with respect to the new Jules Stein Eye Institute be placed in the RECORD at this point, and I invite close reading of it.

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

Establishment of the Jules Stein Eye Institute at the Medical Center of the University of California at Los Angeles was announced today.

The institute will be one of the largest unified research centers in the world for the study of blinding eye diseases. The new institute, dedicated to the preservation of sight and the conquest of blindness, will be an integral part of the medical center located on the university campus in west Los Angeles, and designed to provide comprehensive facilities for ophthalmological education, research, and patient care.

"The need for research on the causes of eye diseases is imperative," Mr. Stein said. "More than 60 percent of all blindness results from diseases, the causes of which are unknown to science. In 1960, 365,000 Americans were classified as legally blind. Every year more than 30,000 Americans go blind, a rate steeper than the population rise. The problem now threatens our ability to cope with it."

"The new institute," said Chancellor Franklin D. Murphy, "will be constructed to meet the needs of a new era in eye research. The center will include the finest functional design ideas drawn from other top eye research centers the world over. It is hoped these new concepts will stimulate the maximum productivity of research scientists."

Mr. Stein said that recent research activity has resulted in a number of advances in the treatment of eye diseases. New drugs have proven helpful in the treatment of glaucoma, uveitis, herpes keratitis, retina blastoma, and trachoma.

Mr. Jules Stein, for whom the institute will be named, is founder and chairman of the board of MCA, Inc. (Music Corp. of America), and a former practicing ophthalmologist. He is also chairman of the Board of Research to Prevent Blindness, Inc. Mr. and Mrs. Stein have pledged more than $1 million for the construction and equipment of this new building. It is expected that contributions from other interested individuals, organizations, and public health agencies, when integrated with already approved university programs, will provide the balance of the more than $3,500,000 which will be required for construction and equipment.

The new institute will be a comprehensive multidisciplinary center devoted to research in the sciences related to vision, the care of patients with eye disease, and the dissemination of knowledge in the broad field of ophthalmology. The structure will contain complete and technical advanced facilities for the care of patients with eye disease, as well as special areas for research in vision, and newly developed equipment for the most effective forms of medical education.

TRIBUTE TO THE GIRL SCOUTS

Mrs. SMITH of Maine. Mr. President, one of the finest organizations in the United States is the Girl Scouts. That organization contributes tremendously to molding and building young women into future leaders and fine mothers. We owe much to it.

One of the best tributes that has been made to the Girl Scouts is the March 13, 1962, editorial of the Waterville, Maine, Morning Sentinel. I ask unanimous consent that this editorial be placed in the body of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and call attention of it to all Members.

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

ON MY HONOR

It was just 50 years ago Monday that Juliette Low organized the first troop of Girl Scouts in Georgia. In forming the organization she adapted the principles of scouting to the needs of girls in the United States.

In the five decades since then almost 18½ million girls and adults have enjoyed the benefits of girl scouting and communities like those in central Maine have been influenced by the impact of the principles of scouting.

The central ethic of the Girl Scouts is expressed in the Girl Scout promise:

"On my honor, I will try to do my duty to God and my country, to help other people at all times, to obey the Girl Scout laws."

The Girl Scout laws the Scouts promise to obey embody the best type of young citizenship, and adherence to them not only makes them better girls but prepares them for better citizenship.

In honoring the Girl Scouts on this, their 50th birthday, we would be remiss if we didn't pay special honor to the women who make the program possible.

Most girls are eager to participate in Girl Scout programs and absorb the principles set down many years ago by Juliette Low.

But the Girl Scout program wouldn't function and the girls wouldn't have the opportunity to participate if it were not for the women who provide the leadership.

Every good citizen should say a word of thanks to these women who provide the leadership. That they believe enough in America's future to give their time to help prepare girls for that future is deserving heartfelt thanks.

"Honor the past—serve the future" is the birthday theme of the Girl Scouts this week. Our congratulations to the girls and their leaders and our best wishes for the program's continued success.

FACING THE FUTURE—STATEMENT BY MARRINER S. AND GEORGE ECCLES

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, for many years, Mr. Marriner S. Eccles was Chairman of the Federal Reserve Board, and his brother, George, has headed the very important First Security Corp. When these two highly experienced and knowledgeable men make a statement, I think it is worth the attention of the Senate. For that reason, I ask unanimous consent that there may be printed in the RECORD a statement which is entitled "Facing the Future."

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

[From the Annual Report, First Security Corp.]

FACING THE FUTURE

The economic outlook for 1962 appears favorable with the highest level of production ever achieved. There is, however, some apprehension as to the probable extent and duration of this upward movement. Many of the underlying forces necessary for a strong and sustained recovery are not present. The current trend indicates that the administration is not willing to face the real problems.

Our economic and military leadership of the free world is dependent upon an adequate rate of economic growth, with a low level of unemployment and reasonable price stability.

In order to meet these objectives we must give adequate consideration and weight to the unstabilizing effects of the use of the monopolistic power of organized labor. It is unrealistic to gloss over the effects of its actions on prices, imports, exports, employment, profits, rate of growth and the deficiency in our international balance of payments. Wage and fringe benefits of union labor in this country are from two to five times that of other industrial countries. It draws from the economy benefits far in excess of increased productivity and it undermines our ability to compete in world as well as domestic markets.

Our high prices, together with the phenomenal recovery and increases in the productivity in industry of Western Europe and Japan, reduce our exports and increase our imports. We cannot continue both our huge foreign aid and foreign military expenditures and allow unlimited foreign investments. These conditions have created our most serious immediate economic problem—a continued large deficiency in our international balance of payments. The result is a weakness of our dollar in relation to other world currencies, a heavy loss of gold, and a lack of confidence in our economic stability and leadership. This situation is cumulative and of our own making; a continuation will result in a flight from the dollar.

In the light of the wage and price structure in this country it would appear that the dollar is overpriced in relation to other currencies. This is reflected by the disparity in price level brought about by our high wage scale without resulting in higher productivity, and our internal inflation brought about through continued Government budget deficits and unsound fiscal policies. If this condition persists the United States cannot continue as the reserve cur-

rency country and be world banker. This responsibility will have to be taken over by an international monetary organization where currency values can be adjusted upward or downward over the longer period as the basic need is determined.

Some of the necessary corrective steps for these conditions are: increased productivity and lower prices through a stable wage policy, greatly reduced foreign economic aid and foreign military expenditures; a curb on foreign travel and expenditures by U.S. citizens and restrictions on foreign investments by U.S. industry. Some of the alternatives would be devaluation of the dollar, embargo on gold, adoption of quotas and exchange control.

We are still confronted with the problem of public budgetary deficits in spite of our prosperous economy and a huge tax take, both national and local. This condition must be overcome by eliminating unnecessary and extravagant public programs. We must have a balanced budget brought about by reduced expenditures and not by higher taxes, which already siphon off so much of the national product that growth and expansion of our economy is being curtailed. An improvement in this internal situation would also help maintain the stability of the dollar.

We have grave doubts that the President's program to get the authority to reduce tariffs by 50 percent would help solve our international economic problems, and it would accentuate our internal problems. This program does not face up to the fact that a high wage and a high living standard country cannot compete with a lower wage and lower living standard country, unless productivity is equally low. This is not the case with the Outer Seven countries, the Common Market countries and Japan who can do business profitably. Tariff adjustments alone cannot correct this differential.

We in this country have not recognized our limitations. We have assumed too much of the free world defense, military and economic aid programs. Our Western Allies must share more of this financial responsibility.

We cannot expect to maintain an adequate rate of economic growth, a low level of unemployment and reasonable price stability unless we are willing to face up to the unpleasant economic facts and take necessary steps to correct them. Without doing this our present economic recovery cannot be sustained.

GEORGE S. ECCLES,
President.
MARRINER S. ECCLES,
Chairman of the Board.

HIGH HONOR PAID BERNARD G. SEGAL

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, the Golden Slipper Square Club of Philadelphia on the night of Tuesday, March 6, sponsored a large dinner meeting in Philadelphia, Pa., at which time high honor was paid to Bernard G. Segal, outstanding attorney of Philadelphia.

The presentation of the Law Achievement Award was made by the Honorable Robert F. Kennedy, Attorney General of the United States. A great many judges and leading citizens from many parts of the Nation came to Philadelphia to join in paying honor to Mr. Segal.

I have known Mr. Segal for many years. He is an outstandingly able and successful lawyer. But aside from his practice I know of no lawyer who has given more of his time and unusual ability to the welfare of the bar and the judiciary.

It will be recalled that he was chairman of the Standing Committee on Congressional Salaries in the 83d Congress.

I ask unanimous consent that the salute to Mr. Segal be printed at this point in the RECORD. I also ask unanimous consent that his address in response to the presentation of the Law Achievement Award by Attorney General Kennedy be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

BERNARD G. SEGAL

Distinguished lawyer and public servant, cited by two Presidents of the United States for your contributions to the administration of justice, you symbolize the highest traditions of our American bar.

Native of Gotham, you came to Philadelphia as a youth. At Central High School, you were valedictorian and won every major prize. Your classmates phophesied truly that you had "the heart to conceive, the understanding to direct, and the hand to execute."

After graduating with honors from the University of Pennsylvania, you entered its law school. At the age of 20, and while still a law student, you taught political science in the Wharton School and coached the university's debating teams. Yet you were able to serve as Case editor of the Law Review and to earn a Gowen fellowship.

While a Gowen fellow, you were selected as American reporter on contracts to the International Congress of Law at The Hague and as assistant to the reporter of the American Law Institute's restatement on conflict of laws. When you were 24, William A. Schnader, attorney general of Pennsylvania, appointed you as the youngest deputy attorney general. In that office, you authored the codification and revision of the State banking law, the first milk control law, and other major legislation, still in force today. You also wrote what remains a standard text in the banking field. You were chosen to argue important cases and early won a reputation for skill and advocacy.

Attorney General Schnader asked you to become the first associate in his new firm of Schnader & Lewis. In less than a year, you became a partner in what is now Schnader, Harrison, Segal & Lewis. Your clients know you as a devoted counselor who prepares himself thoroughly, applies himself assiduously, and spares himself not at all. The bar has given you the accolade achieved by few, and never consciously by any, that of "lawyer's lawyer." Judges have praised you as one of the outstanding advocates in the Nation, and have turned to you when they needed counsel of their own.

In 1953, you became the youngest chancellor in the history of the Philadelphia Bar Association. During your two terms of office, you revitalized the association and brought it to heights of achievement never before realized. You led and won the fight to maintain the sitting judge principle, and you took the initiative on such civil rights issues as providing adequate counsel to every defendant, no matter how unpopular his case.

In 1954 you were appointed by President Eisenhower as Chairman of the Commission on Judicial and Congressional Salaries created by the 83d Congress. Your masterful conduct of the hearings and skill in marshaling public opinion resulted in the enactment of a desperately needed law raising congressional and judicial salaries. For this boon to our public service and morale, you were publicly commended by the President of the United States.

Six years ago you became chairman of the standing committee on Federal judiciary of the American Bar Association. You brought to this high post an unswerving conviction that only the most qualified persons should be appointed to the Federal bench and a willingness to support that conviction with endless hours of effort. You established a unique rapport and confidential relationship with three Attorneys General of two administrations, who, for the first time in history, have sent the name of every potential nominee for the Federal bench to your committee for investigation and report. Fortune magazine recently reported that the American people owe more to you than they realize for the excellent quality of appointments to the Federal bench since you became chairman of the committee. For the high public service rendered by you and your committee, you have been commended by both President Eisenhower and President Kennedy.

On innumerable fronts, you have devoted your life and strength to the cause of justice. Chairman of the board of the American Judicature Society, treasurer and council member of the American Law Institute, member of the board of regents of the American College of Trial Lawyers—every organization cited in this salute to law has known your tireless labor and wise counsel. Recently you received signal recognition in your appointment by the Chief Justice of the United States to the permanent nine-man committee of judges and lawyers to conduct continuous studies and to make recommendations to the Supreme Court on the "Rules of Practice and Procedure in the Federal Courts."

You have served the community as trustee of the University of Pennsylvania, member of the board of governors and treasurer of Dropsie College, president and chairman of the board of the Allied Jewish Appeal, trustee of Medico, board member of the United Fund, the Greater Philadelphia Movement, the American Arbitration Association, and in manifold other positions. For your zealous devotion to the educational, philanthropic, and religious life of the community, you have been awarded the honorary degrees of doctor of laws and numerous other distinctions.

Justice Felix Frankfurter has said of you that you are "a lawyer for whom the great traditions of the bar are a lodestar for your own efforts." Truly a leading star in the legal firmament, salute to law proudly awards you its first Law Achievement Award.

RESPONSE OF BERNARD G. SEGAL TO PRESENTATION OF LAW ACHIEVEMENT AWARD BY HON. ROBERT F. KENNEDY, ATTORNEY GENERAL OF THE UNITED STATES, AT THE SALUTE TO LAW DINNER, GOLDEN SLIPPER SQUARE CLUB, MARCH 6, 1962

Mr. Chairman, Attorney General Kennedy, honored guests, members of the Golden Slipper Square Club, ladies and gentlemen, as I sat listening to the overgenerous citation and the very flattering comments by Senator KEFAUVER and Attorney General Kennedy, I was reminded of a story Al Smith once told when he found himself in a similar situation.

It seems that a farmer, a recent immigrant, was bringing a calf to market when the calf suddenly stopped and refused to cross the bridge over the creek. No amount of persuasion by the farmer could get the calf to move. Finally, a motorist drove up and sounded a loud blast on his horn. At that, the panic-stricken calf made a wild leap over the railing and was drowned. The philosophical farmer summed up the situation in one sentence: "Too bigga da honk for so smalla da calf."

Let me assure you that long ago I learned that flattery is like a delicate perfume—to be smelled but not swallowed.

But I should be less than frank if I were not to admit that even allowing for a very

large discount from what has been said, I am highly complimented by the mere fact that the words were spoken by Senator KEFAUVER and Attorney General Kennedy. Perhaps you may recall Cowley's couplet:

"Nothing so soon the drooping spirits can raise
As praises from the men whom all men praise."

There are occasions which are made to be remembered, and certainly tonight is one of them. For unless my research is faulty, I believe this is the first time anywhere that an important group of laymen have set aside an evening as a salute to law.

Your chairman has asked me to respond in behalf of all the recipients of your citations. I do so humbly and with reticence, for among the remarkably large and distinguished company of leaders of bench and bar whom you have gathered here this evening, there are any number who, from the important offices they occupy and from the talents they have so conspicuously demonstrated, might with much more propriety have been singled out for this acceptance. I am comforted, though, by the fact that your selection of a practicing lawyer, not because of any special office he may hold or distinction he may have achieved but in recognition of his work in behalf of the administration of justice through the organized bar, emphasizes this important truth of the life of the law in America today; namely, that except for service in the Government, it is only by his participation in the organized bar through all its various segments—national, State, local, general, and specialized—that the individual lawyer can make himself effective in the largest and most serious issues, public issues and professional issues, that concern his profession and his clients, and that affect the welfare and the progress of society as a whole.

This was not always so. For the first hundred years of our country's history, the lawyer carried on his activities primarily as an individual. At first, we did not have in America an organized bar of the kind which existed in England and in continental Europe. In his professional activities, in his public contributions, the lawyer acted alone. When Benjamin Franklin, at the beginning of our Government, said: "The legal profession is and has always been the right arm of liberty," he meant the individual lawyer. For the lawyer of that day had no group consciousness and the legal profession as a whole had no organizations.

But in our modern, complex society, the individual lawyer, acting alone, can no longer be effective in meeting the call of our generation on the legal profession. He must still provide the leadership, supply the stimulus and the inspiration, but it is only through the organized bar that he can make his full contribution to the urgent needs, the enlarging developments of his time, in the endless quest for the rule of law. Far vaster than he could ever achieve alone, are the dimensions a lawyer can achieve when he extends the reach of his voice and the cast of his mind through the organizations you are honoring this evening.

Now, I do not mean to say that the lawyer's individual practice is less important, or that his relationship to his client is less personal, than it ever was. The law is in its essence a service profession, and in his private capacity of ministering to the needs of his clients, the lawyer is performing a lofty function, and an intensely personal one. No organization can or should thrust itself into this relationship. The lawyer is, and must always remain, the independent, courageous counselor of his client, the dedicated advocate of his cause. But even here, the lawyer, through the organized bar, can effectively improve the environing circumstances in which he serves his client, the conditions under which he does his work, the public atmosphere and attitudes which bear upon his client's interests. Many of the programs of the organizations represented on this dais are specifically designed to improve the professional competence of the lawyer so that he may better represent his client.

However, in view of the emphasis you have given the evening by the nature of your award and the character of the organizations you have selected for citations, I shall talk primarily of the lawyer, not as he practices his craft and his calling, but rather as he assumes his traditional and rightful position of leadership in the movements for the improvement of our judicial system and the administration of justice.

And here there is a very great deal that needs to be done.

The citations you have heard, recite an immense record of effort and achievement, and, of course, there is much more that limitations of time prevented recounting. And yet the present need for reform in our substantive law and in our judicial machinery is critical and of immense proportions.

As President Kennedy was delivering his solemn and awesome address last Friday, announcing his decision on atomic testing, there ran through my mind the differences between the Communist world and our own. These are many, but, certainly, in no aspect is the difference more clearly distinguished than in our system of justice, conceived to protect the rights of the individual and dedicated to the preservation of ordered liberty under law. This is the very antithesis of the Communist system which enthrones the state and not the individual. On this difference rests our claim to moral leadership in the world community. But we cannot sustain that claim unless we can demonstrate the efficiency of our judicial system, the ultimate guardian of our basic freedoms. And the sobering fact is that under present conditions in many States, our courts cannot be efficient and they cannot render prompt justice.

While a fair number of States have initiated very crediable judicial reforms the situation in many others is appalling.

Despite the vast increase and complexity of litigation which modern conditions have brought, these States have made little or no change in their judicial structure. They struggle along with court systems evolved to meet the leisurely pace of bygone generations. For example, in Pennsylvania, our court system was established by a constitution, still in effect, which was adopted in 1873. The last amendment to the judicial article of that constitution was made more than half a century ago.

Conscientious judges in most of the States have adopted substantial measures to relieve the situation. The organized bar has worked assiduously with the courts in this common objective. But the simple fact is that the really basic changes which must be made require extensive constitutional revision and legislative enactment.

The grim results in such States are critical conditions of court congestion, huge case backlogs, and unconscionable delays in litigation. This certainly cannot be allowed to continue.

Where more judges are needed, they should be provided promptly.

Where judicial machinery requires overhauling, this should be done immediately.

These measures are not easy of achievement. But they have been attained, and they can be attained whenever and wherever the leaders of the organized bar join hands with the leaders of the lay groups of the community—organizations like yours—and resolve that they will not rest until prompt and efficient justice is administered in their courts.

In our Federal courts, the present Congress has afforded substantial prospects of relief by creating 73 new judgeships. We all hope that the 86 judges President Kennedy has already nominated, and the filling of the 42 existing vacancies on which the Attorney General and his staff are at this moment diligently working, will afford very large relief. Just how much, we shall have to wait and see.

The next subject which commands the attention of the organized bar is the selection of judges. For no judicial system can be any better than the judges who administer it.

On the Federal scene, great progress has been made in the past 10 years. Attorney General Kennedy and Deputy Attorney General Byron White on whom falls the primary responsibility of clearing names of individuals proposed for appointment to the Federal courts, have afforded to the American Bar Association every appropriate opportunity for cooperation and collaboration. We have come a long, long way when we can say with complete confidence, as I am sure we can, that today the Attorney General of the United States would not make a recommendation for a judicial appointment to a lifetime judgeship, and the President would not make the appointment, until after receiving and studying the American Bar Association committee's report on the candidate's qualifications. Of course, the Attorney General has other important sources of information, and that is as it should be, and, of course, the President must make the ultimate decision as to who shall be appointed, but all of us at the bar, and the public as well, are greatly in the debt of Attorney General Kennedy and Deputy Attorney General White for providing so ready and effective an instrument to receive the views of the professional community of judges and lawyers of the country in the difficult and serious matter of judicial appointments.

I wish that time allowed me to develop this whole subject of Federal judicial selection. As Attorney General Kennedy has just said, his Department and our committee have not always been in agreement, although I would add that the disagreements have been surprisingly few. I do recognize that there are elements in official determinations in the ultimate selection of a judge of which, in our unofficial capacity, our committee has no part. But in view of certain statements in the public press recently, there is one thing I should like to make very clear. It is this: Based on the many, many hours I have spent with Attorney General Kennedy and Deputy Attorney General White discussing judicial appointments, I can say with entire conviction that as to the quality of the judges they would like to see on the bench, Mr. Kennedy's and Mr. White's aspirations do not differ from my own or from those of the other members of our committee; and the overwhelming majority of the judges President Kennedy has appointed are reflections of these objectives.

In some States, Governors maintain the same close liaison with representatives of the organized bar in the selection of judges as does the President through the Attorney General. In others, however, the process is entirely political and the views of the bar associations, or of judges and lawyers generally, are neither sought nor regarded.

This fact serves to spotlight the evils of current methods of judicial selection in some States. There are still 17 States in the country in which judges are elected in the same way as candidates for executive and legislative office. Their names are included on the same political ballot in the primary elections, and they appear, by political party designation, on the same partisan ballot in the general election.

I am reminded of the poignant statement of Justice Fred L. Williams, formerly of the Supreme Court of Missouri, who, speaking of his own election before the adoption of the Missouri plan for nonpartisan selection, said:

"I was elected in 1916 because Woodrow Wilson kept us out of war. I was defeated in 1920 because Woodrow Wilson did not keep us out of war. In both of the elections, not more than 5 percent of the voters knew I was on the ticket."

It is sometimes said that the election of judges in this way is an attribute of democratic government. Of course, that is not so. It was not so in the majority of States in our country at the beginning of our Government. It is not so in two-thirds of them today.

It is an arresting fact that the only places in the world, outside our own country, where the judges are still elected by the people on a political ballot are Russia and its satellite nations. In no democratic nation, other than our own, is this elective system for judges still in force.

For years the American Bar Association has urged the adoption of a plan, in force in a few States, whereby the Governor would fill judicial vacancies by appointment from a panel nominated by a nonpartisan commission of judges, lawyers, and lay citizens. Each judge so appointed would serve a trial period, and thereafter would be voted upon in a general or local election in which he would be unopposed. The single question to the voters would be whether, on the basis of his record, the judge should be retained in office. This is the only system, outside of lifetime appointments, which can give our judges the freedom from political concerns which all of them should have.

The ultimate, austere objective of the organizations of bench and bar represented in this room is that only the best qualified lawyers or judges available shall be appointed to judicial posts, without regard to political affiliation. We recognize we are a long way from achieving this goal, but we shall continue to strive for it nevertheless, and in the meanwhile, we shall endeavor to improve in every way we can, the systems which are in effect.

The presence of Senator KEFAUVER and Attorney General Kennedy this evening give emphasis to another challenging assignment of the organized bar—the administration of the criminal laws.

The national crime figures compiled by the FBI indicate that there were over 1,860,000 serious crimes committed in the United States in 1960, an alltime high and over a quarter of a million more than in the preceding year. In 10 years, the number of serious crimes in our country has almost doubled and it continues to increase at a rate more than four times the increase in population.

In notable hearings a few years ago, which drew national attention and commendation, Senator KEFAUVER, as chairman of a subcommittee of the Senate Judiciary Committee, developed for the American people for the first time, a true picture of the staggering proportions organized crime has reached in this country. Since then, time and again, he has directed public attention to the continuing need for action.

When Attorney General Kennedy came into office, he made this problem one of the major subjects of attack. First, he presented to the Congress, and saw through to enactment, bills giving the Department of Justice and other law enforcement officials, new tools to combat syndicated and other interstate crime. Then, armed with these new laws, he instituted an all-out effort, through the Organized Crime and Racketeering Section of the Department of Justice, to coordinate the Government's crime-hunting agencies and facilities, and to integrate them with the activities of State and local enforcement officials. Conspicuous progress has already been made.

This work of Attorney General Kennedy and his Department deserves the unqualified support of the organized bar, and we are hard at work to help and to supplement these efforts.

The question of civil rights poses for the lawyers of America, grave problems. They are not questions of differing ideologies or sectional philosophies. This is a simple matter of obedience to the law of the land and the courts which administer it.

Here, too, the Attorney General has played a significant role. I like his present policy of evenhanded, lawyerlike enforcement of the civil rights laws, and I like also his determined efforts to avoid the long delays and great tensions of litigation by working with local groups and endeavoring to solve these difficult problems outside the courts. These procedures have the unqualified support of all enlightened Americans and the organized bar is hard at work implementing them.

The organized bar is engaged in a multitude of other projects.

We are determined that every person in need of legal advice shall have a lawyer, and that however unpopular may be his cause, he shall be adequately represented.

We know that we must fearlessly, and without favor, continue to discipline lawyers who fail to live up to the highest dictates of their profession, and to continue to establish and sternly maintain ever higher ethical standards for judges and for lawyers.

We recognize our obligation to the courts and to the judges who sit in them—to keep them independent and secure. We realize it is the duty of the organized bar to assure that the judges in our courts are given the machinery to work effectively, that their salaries, retirement, and survivorship benefits are fitting to their station and keep them free from concern, and that they are protected against unjust criticism and clamor.

We are cognizant, too, of our obligations to the legislative branch of our Government. It was the lawyers of America who spotlighted the problem of the inadequacy of the compensation of Members of the Congress. Realizing the difficult position of Members of Congress in exercising the constitutional mandate that they must determine the amount of their own salaries, it was the organized bar which first, ascertained the facts, and then secured the necessary public support for the sorely needed increases which were enacted in 1954.

These are a very few of the projects involving the administration of justice to which the organized bench and bar have dedicated themselves, and which presently command their diligent attention and unremitting effort. I may say, in summary, that no major issue of our time—international, national, State, local—is not presently challenging the attention and inspiring the action of one or another, or in many cases, several of the organizations you are honoring tonight.

Actors in the theaters speak of "the inside" and "the outside." Every profession knows this feeling. To be a professional man is to have an inside point of view, a professional attitude that is distinctive and separate. That is why it is so encouraging to those of us who work every day with the problems of the law, to see in this occasion a celebration of the professional work of the organized bar, by the "outside"—by laymen, the generality of citizens to whose interests the system of justice is directed. Certainly, every step forward envisioned by the organized bar, every reform, can be achieved only if it secures the support, the enthusiastic and expressed support, of an aroused citizenry. This has been the history of every major court reform, every major advance in the administration of justice.

Because of the fact that it is to organizations like yours to which we must look for support that is prerequisite to the achievement of our objectives, all of us on this dais are deeply appreciative of the way you have conceived this very original evening to honor our profession, and the administration of justice which is our highest goal. And we appreciate, too, the fact that Senator Kefauver, Senator Dodd, Attorney General Kennedy, Governor Lawrence, Mayor Tate, Members of Congress, judges, and representatives of the public at large have made the sacrifices implicit in their being here, and thereby have given this evening such distinction.

It is proper that we should respond to this generous attention by looking to those enduring principles that time has shaped for us in our heritage. We shall be certain that as the rule of law is the surest protection of the individual in an angry world grown small, so the steps by which the rule of law is enlarged and enriched are, each of them, steps that will lead us into a future when ordered liberty under the rule of law shall have been assured for all men.

DEATH OF FORMER SENATOR IRVING M. IVES OF NEW YORK

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, I feel a great personal loss in the passing of our former colleague, the Honorable Irving M. Ives, of New York. He was, to me, a very good friend, and I shall miss him.

The good works of Irving Ives will live long after him. His achievements in legislation which improved the lot of all Americans, and particularly those who comprise this Nation's great labor force, sprang from an abiding love for his fellow man and a deep conviction that discrimination contradicts the American tradition for fairplay and equal opportunity. Irving Ives was great in the same sense that other New Yorkers, such as Fiorello LaGuardia and Franklin Roosevelt, were great.

My wife, Nancy, joins me in extending our deepest sympathy to Marion Ives and to their son, George, in their great loss. The Nation's loss is also great.

DEATH OF FORMER REPRESENTATIVE J. RIDLEY MITCHELL, OF TENNESSEE

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, it was with great regret that I learned of the passing of the Honorable J. Ridley Mitchell, who represented the Fourth District of Tennessee in the House of Representatives in the 72d through the 75th Congresses. Former Representative Mitchell died February 26 at the age of 84 at his home in Crossville, Tenn.

Born in Livingston, Overton County, Tenn., on September 26, 1877, he was graduated from Peabody College in Nashville in 1896 and served as private secretary to the late Representative C. E. Snodgrass from 1899 to 1903. The following year he was graduated from the law department of Cumberland University, was admitted to the bar, and began the practice of law in Crossville.

Representative Mitchell served as assistant attorney general from 1908 to 1918, attorney general from 1918 to 1925, and judge of the fifth circuit of Tennessee from 1925 to 1931, when he entered Congress.

During his years in Congress he did fine work for Tennessee. He was popular with his fellow Members and always fought hard for programs for the betterment of Tennessee.

His public service did not end with his departure from Congress. From January 1943 to September 1945 he served as an attorney in the Office of the Alien Property Custodian, and from 1945 to 1951 was a special assistant to the U.S. Attorney General in the Antitrust Division of the Department of Justice.

He will be greatly missed.

THE ALEXANDER HAMILTON NATIONAL MONUMENT

The Senate resumed the consideration of the motion of the Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD] to proceed to the consideration of the joint resolution (S.J. Res. 29) providing for the establishing of the former dwelling house of Alexander Hamilton as a national monument.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, yesterday the distinguished Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] addressed himself to the proposal to substitute for the amendment offered by the Senator from Florida an amendment which proposes to amend the Constitution of the United States, to provide for the elimination of poll taxes in any States that might have such poll taxes.

I think the Senator was most thoughtful. He spoke about the fact that it is indeed most unusual and almost unprecedented to attempt to proceed in the fashion that is now proposed.

We have on the calendar of the Senate, Calendar No. 1196, Senate Joint Resolution 29, reported to the Senate by the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. The joint resolution provides for the establishment of the former dwelling house of Alexander Hamilton as a national monument.

It authorizes appropriations out of the Treasury. Of course, under the Constitution of the United States and the rules of the two Houses of Congress, the resolution would have to be passed by the Senate, then it would have to be passed by the House, and then it would have to be signed by the President of the United States.

As I have said, in his very able and thoughtful address yesterday the distinguished Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] called attention to what an unusual and extraordinary and almost unprecedented and I might say, preposterous proposal it was to take a joint resolution which provides for the establishment of the former dwelling home of Alexander Hamilton as a national monument and seek to use it as a vehicle to submit an amendment to change the Constitution of the United States.

As we know, the joint resolution for a memorial to Alexander Hamilton would have to be passed by the Senate, then it would have to be passed by the House, and then it would have to be signed by the President; whereas a proposal for amending the Constitution does not go to the President at all. If that proposal is passed by the Senate by a two-thirds vote and is likewise passed by the House by a two-thirds vote, it goes directly to the legislatures of the several States. It does not go to the President. So, as I have said, it is indeed a most unusual and extraordinary and, I think, unprecedented and preposterous course we are asked to follow in such a procedure as is now suggested.

This is an attempt to amend the Constitution, to take away from the States the rights which they have enjoyed from the very day the Constitution was written and became effective. It is an attempt to take away their rights to fix the qualifications of their electors. We oppose it because we are deeply moved by our concern and desire and our willingness to fight for the preservation of the cherished rights of our States to prescribe the qualifications of their electors.

I may say that these are rights which the Founding Fathers specifically preserved and secured to our States in the original Constitution.

They are rights which in the past have received great honor and respect.

Anyone who will read Mr. Madison's notes to the Constitutional Convention, the Convention which wrote the Constitution, and who will read the notes of the State conventions which ratified the Constitution, cannot escape the very definite and positive conclusion that if the provision of leaving to the States the power to prescribe the qualifications of their electors had not been written into the Federal Constitution, there would not have been any Federal Constitution and there would not have been any Federal Union.

Mr. Madison's notes of the Philadelphia Convention, where the Constitution was written, and the notes of the several State conventions where the Constitution was ratified, show how jealous the States were of this right—the right which insured to them the fixing of the qualifications of the electors in the several States. These notes confirm absolutely that there would have been no Constitution if that right had not been clearly, specifically, and absolutely preserved to the several States.

Mr. President, as we know, the poll tax is a diminishing phenomenon. Today it is levied in only 5 of the 50 States. The rates are extremely moderate. They range from $1 to $1.50. The influence of the tax on the size of the electorate is too insignificant for anyone even to attempt to measure.

I interpolate to say that the poll tax in my State of Alabama is only $1.50 a year, and it is not retroactive for more than 1 year. In other words, it would not be possible for anyone to owe more than $3; but the rate is $1.50 a year. Also, all persons who are 45 years of age or over are exempt from the payment of the poll tax. All war veterans—the veterans of World War I, World War II, and the Korean war—are exempt from the poll tax.

I emphasize further, based on a declaration by Judge Cooley, one of the greatest authorities on the Constitution in the whole history of our country, that there are certain prerequisites to voting. As we know, in some States registration is not permanent. In my State, once a person registers to vote, he does not have to reregister unless he sees fit to move out of the county in which he has been living. If he moves into another county, he must, in order to vote, reregister in the new county. But if he remains in the county in which he first registered, he need never reregister again.

I have registered once in my life, and that was when I became 21 years of age. I have never had to go to the trouble or to take any time to register again.

However, some States have different periods when the voters must register or reregister. We also know that to register, a person must go to a particular place where the registration is held. Persons do not register in their own homes; they must go to the courthouse or to some other place designated for that purpose.

Furthermore, in order to vote, a citizen must go to the polling place. He must transport himself to that place. When he gets there, sometimes he must stand in line before he may vote. It may take some time out of a very busy day for him to stand and wait his turn to exercise his right to the ballot and to vote. So, as Judge Cooley makes clear, there are certain prerequisites to voting, and this little tax is one of them.

Every dollar received from the poll tax in Alabama is devoted to educational purposes. It goes for the education of our youth. In Alabama, every dollar goes to the public schools of our State. Surely there is no Member of this body who does not experience the constant cry for more funds for the schools.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from Alabama yield?

Mr. HILL. I yield.

Mr. EASTLAND. Does the Senator know whether the poll tax in Alabama disqualifies anybody from voting?

Mr. HILL. I do not think the poll tax in Alabama disqualifies anybody from voting. I do not know of anyone in Alabama who does not have a dollar and a half that he cannot contribute to the education of the youth in Alabama in order to vote.

Mr. EASTLAND. Does not the Senator think that that is true in all the States which have the poll tax?

Mr. HILL. I think that is true in all those States. I think the Senator would say the same thing about his own State of Mississippi.

Mr. EASTLAND. Surely.

Mr. HILL. The poll tax does not prevent anyone from voting. Can it be that a citizen of a State does not have enough interest in the welfare and progress of his State to make the little contribution of a dollar or a dollar and a half to the education of the youth of his State, so that the citizen may vote?

Mr. EASTLAND. Does not the Senator from Alabama think that this is a very legitimate way to help to finance the school system of the State?

Mr. HILL. It has certainly proved to be that way in my State of Alabama.

Mr. EASTLAND. The distinguished Senator from Alabama knows, does he not, that our great Democratic President of the United States has taken the po-

sition with respect to the United Nations that any country which is a member of that organization and does not pay its dues should not be permitted to vote in that body?

Mr. HILL. That is correct.

Mr. EASTLAND. In fact, the representatives of the Department of State and of the other agencies of the U.S. Government who appeared before the committees of Congress took the same position. Is there any difference between that position and the requirement that a person must pay a nominal sum in order to vote in the primary and general elections of his State?

Mr. HILL. So far as the principle is concerned, they are absolutely on a par. The only difference is that the payment of which we are speaking, the poll tax, is such a minimal sum. It is not possible to pay any less than $1 or $1.50. However, so far as the principle is concerned, it is absolutely the same as the Senator from Mississippi has suggested. Furthermore, I do not know of any organization or association in which a person who participates does not pay his dues in order to help carry his part of the expense, so to speak.

Mr. EASTLAND. That is correct. Does not the distinguished Senator from Alabama think that when the U.S. Government took that position with respect to the United Nations, it thereby endorsed the principle of the poll tax?

Mr. HILL. It certainly endorsed the principle; and the Senator from Mississippi, just as I do, strongly believes in that principle.

Mr. EASTLAND. That is correct.

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

Mr. HILL. I yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. For how many years must a citizen in Alabama pay the poll tax in order to be qualified to vote? After a citizen becomes eligible to vote when he becomes 21 years of age?

Mr. HILL. He pays $1.50 a year; but no matter how many years he may have failed to pay his poll tax, he cannot be required to pay any more than $3. Three dollars is the maximum amount he would have to pay. In other words, if for 15 years a person has not paid a single cent poll tax, he must pay $1.50 for the current year and $1.50 for the past 15 years. The maximum amount anyone would have to pay would be $3.

Mr. HOLLAND. If the Senator will permit me to go further with my question, is it not true that a citizen between the ages of 22 and 45 must pay $3 or 2 years' poll tax in order to be qualified to vote?

Mr. HILL. If a person lets a year or more go by, or, as I said, if he lets as many as 15 years go by, or if he lets as many as 20 years go by, he never has to pay more than $3.

Mr. HOLLAND. But he does have to pay $3?

Mr. HILL. If he has not kept up his poll tax, the little tax of $1.50—every cent of which, as I have said, is devoted to the public schools of Alabama—if he has not kept that tax current and paid each year, the most he would have to pay would be $3.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from Alabama yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. I should like to complete my thought.

Mr. HILL. I yield to the Senator from Mississippi.

Mr. HOLLAND. Then I am happy to yield.

Mr. EASTLAND. Does not the Senator think that the $3 that a person must pay is quite puny and does not discommode anyone?

Mr. HILL. I thoroughly agree with the Senator from Mississippi. Certainly it does not discommode anybody. After all, what citizen is there, who has a proper interest in his State, who is concerned with the welfare, the progress, and the economic strength of his State, who is not perfectly willing to pay this small amount of $1.50?

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

Mr. HILL. I yield to the Senator from Florida.

Mr. HOLLAND. In other words, a man and his wife would have to pay $6 in order for both of them to be qualified to vote in a primary election or in a general election in Alabama, generally speaking, would they not?

Mr. HILL. No. The only time when they would have to pay $6 would be when they were in default. If they were current in the payment of that tax, they would have to pay only $1.50 a piece.

Mr. EASTLAND. The answer to the question of the Senator from Florida is that in the vast majority of cases he is wrong, is he not?

Mr. HILL. Yes.

Mr. EASTLAND. In 99 percent of the cases he is wrong, is he not?

Mr. HILL. Yes. He is undertaking to cite the most extreme case. He must be thinking about the people of his own State, not the people of Alabama.

Mr. HOLLAND. So far as the people of Florida are concerned, they have not had to pay a poll tax since 1937—which I think is a sound thing.

My second question is this: Does not the Senator from Alabama know that the amendment which I and 66 other Senators propose does not prohibit the imposition of a poll tax as a prerequisite to voting in State and local elections, but relates only to the election of President, Vice President, and Members of Congress?

Mr. HILL. Yes. But can the Senator from Florida think of anything which would be more confusing or would require more bookkeeping, redtape, and all that sort of thing, than to require the payment of a poll tax in order to make this contribution for the support of our schools, for the education of our youth, if one wishes to vote in elections for State and local officers, but then say, "But so far as national elections are concerned, the payment of a poll tax will not be required." I cannot think of anything that would be more divisive or confusing or would come nearer to undermining the system of obtaining, by means of the payment of this small amount of money, funds to be used for the education of our youth.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from Alabama yield further?

Mr. HILL. I yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. Then the Senator from Alabama thinks, does he, that citizens generally would not be willing to pay that small amount of money in order to qualify to vote in elections for their State, local, and county officials?

Mr. HILL. I think they are willing to pay now. Of course it is within their power to remove the poll tax. But to require the payment of a poll tax in order to vote for one set of officials, but not to require the payment of a poll tax in order to vote for another set of officials, would simply invite division and confusion.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from Alabama yield again to me?

Mr. HILL. I yield.

Mr. EASTLAND. Why should not a man pay a poll tax in order to be able to vote in an election for Members of Congress?

Mr. HILL. I know of no reason why he should not.

Mr. EASTLAND. What is the difference between paying a poll tax in order to be able to vote in an election for Members of Congress and paying a poll tax in order to be able to vote in an election for the Governor of the State?

Mr. HILL. There is no difference; and certainly there is no reason why a poll tax should not be paid in order to qualify to vote in all elections.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, if the Senator from Alabama will yield again to me, let me say in regard to the suggestion of the distinguished Senator that confusion would result, that I should like to ask him if it is not true that on the present registration rolls in the State of Alabama, places have to be left for exemptions for those who are veterans and for exemptions for those who are over a certain age, and for exemptions for other reasons; and is it not true that it has not proven to be difficult at all to have little stamped showings of exemptions appear on the same registration roll? That was the case in our State before the poll tax was knocked out.

Mr. HILL. But there has been no trouble at all about that.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from Alabama yield?

Mr. HILL. I yield.

Mr. EASTLAND. Does not the Senator from Alabama think the distinguished Senator from Florida has just now destroyed his own argument? In Alabama, one who is 45 years of age is exempt, is he not?

Mr. HILL. That is correct.

Mr. EASTLAND. And veterans are also exempt, are they not?

Mr. HILL. That is correct.

Mr. EASTLAND. When the Senator from Florida refers to a requirement to pay $3, he is picking out a few, little, puny cases here and there, is he not?

Mr. HILL. Yes.

Mr. EASTLAND. The requirement to pay $3 itself does not disenfranchise anyone, does it?

Mr. HILL. That is correct; there are only a few, little, puny cases.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from Alabama yield again to me?

Mr. HILL. I yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. Does not the Senator from Alabama know that a considerable number of States levy a poll tax, but do not require the payment of a poll tax as a prerequisite for voting, and obtain substantial amounts of revenue from that source, and find no difficulty in collecting it?

Mr. HILL. The truth is that the poll tax goes back to the very beginning of our Government, beginning with the very early days. In fact, in the early days some States not only required the payment of a poll tax, but also required that in order to be eligible to vote, one had to be a freeholder and had to pay other kinds of taxes; and one of the reasons why the States used the poll tax was in order to get away from the other little taxes, because the $1 or $1.50 poll tax could not be a burden on anyone.

Mr. HOLLAND. But does not the Senator from Alabama know that a number of States do levy and successfully collect poll taxes, but do not have any legal requirement that the payment of a poll tax is a prerequisite to voting or has anything to do with the right to vote?

Mr. HILL. There are some States in which that is the case; but if the people of Alabama and the people of Mississippi and the people of other States want to collect a poll tax in this way, that is their right, and it is guaranteed to them in the Constitution of the United States, and it is their right to get the funds for their schools in this way.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from Alabama yield again to me?

Mr. HILL. I yield

Mr. EASTLAND. And it is no business of the State of Florida, is it?

Mr. HILL. I agree 100 percent with the Senator from Mississippi.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from Alabama yield again to me?

Mr. HILL. I yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. Is it not true that every State which formerly imposed not only a poll tax—as was done by many States as a condition or requirement in order to be able to vote—but also property taxes and had property-ownership requirements of various kinds, have canceled those restrictions and limitations on the right to vote, except in the case of the five States which now have a poll tax?

Mr. HILL. In a few minutes I shall review the requirements of the various States at the time of the beginning of our Government. Some definite changes have been made; but I point out that those who are opposing this proposed constitutional amendment are fighting for the right of their States to make their own decision as to whether they want this small, minimal poll tax. That is our right; it is our right under the Constitution of the United States, and we are standing here and fighting to protect that right against the aggression of the Senator from Florida.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from Alabama yield again to me?

Mr. HILL. I yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. I recognized the fact that this is a constitutional matter; and for that reason I am proposing a constitutional amendment, rather than a statutory proposal, such as those which have been offered by a great many persons who, in my opinion, and in the opinion of many others, do not properly recognize the constitutional requirements.

I ask my friend, the Senator from Alabama, whether the Constitution has provided, since the day when it was adopted, that the regular way to go about changing fundamental law in any State or in all States is to proceed by way of the submission of a constitutional amendment, which requires the approval of three-fourths of the States before it can become operative; and is it not also true that that right existed long before Florida, Alabama, Mississippi, or any of the later admitted States came into the Union?

Mr. HILL. There is no question that that procedure is provided by the Constitution of the United States. But that procedure does not mean that it is an invitation to try to take away from the States the rights which have been guaranteed to them since the time when the Constitution of the United States was first written.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from Alabama yield again to me?

Mr. HILL. I yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. Does the Senator from Alabama recall that when women's suffrage had been tried in quite a number of States and had been found to be wholesome and sound, then a constitutional amendment was proposed, and was adopted by three-fourths of the States, and since that time the good women have participated in voting in all elections in our Government, and their participation has been wholesome; and does not the Senator realize that exactly the same procedure which was followed then is being followed now?

Mr. HILL. Of course.

Mr. HOLLAND. And, in fact, it had to be followed in order to require States which had not taken that action to allow their women to vote. That is correct, is it not?

Mr. HILL. Of course whenever the Constitution is amended, that is the procedure which is followed, and it is prescribed by the Constitution—except I point out that insofar as concerns the position which we fight to preserve, today, I point out that when the Constitution was amended in 1913, so as to provide for the direct election of U.S. Senators, rather than to have them elected by the State legislatures, as had theretofore been done, we reiterated, reestablished, reaffirmed, and ratified once again this right, which today we fight to preserve.

Mr. HOLLAND. The Senator from Alabama recognizes, does he not, that the other 45 States, which have considerable interest in the election of the President, the Vice President, and the Members of Congress, also have some rights, including the complete privilege and right, under the Constitution, to ask that this matter be submitted to the conscience of all 50 States? They have that right, do they not?

Mr. HILL. I would say that any American citizen has a right to ask for any change he may see fit to request. But the fact that he has a right to request such a change does not mean that the change he proposes is wise and should be made or is justified by any existing condition or any particular situation.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from Alabama yield again to me?

Mr. HILL. I yield.

Mr. EASTLAND. The distinguished Senator from Alabama knows that in connection with the Federal highway system, the vast amount of money is contributed by the Federal Government, is it not?

Mr. HILL. That is correct.

Mr. EASTLAND. Does the Senator from Alabama recall the exact percentage?

Mr. HILL. I think it goes as high as perhaps 90 percent.

Mr. EASTLAND. That is for the benefit of everyone; every American citizen has a right to use those highways, does he not?

Mr. HILL. That is correct; he does, indeed. It is interstate commerce.

Mr. EASTLAND. Does the Senator from Alabama know that the State of Maine collects a poll tax, and that a resident of Maine cannot obtain a driver's license until he pays that poll tax, and cannot drive on the Federal highways in the State of Maine until he pays that poll tax?

Mr. HILL. Yes. In other words, the payment of that poll tax is a prerequisite to driving on the Federal highways.

Mr. EASTLAND. Is not that situation similar to the one now confronting us?

Mr. HILL. Certainly, because the Federal Government has a very large, direct, and immediate pecuniary interest in that matter, having put up 90 percent of the funds for the construction of those highways.

Mr. EASTLAND. That is right.

Why does not the distinguished Senator from Florida try to correct that condition, instead of picking on several of his neighboring States in the South?

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

Mr. HILL. I yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. If I may be allowed to answer, in a patient way, the question that was raised by the Senator from Mississippi, the Senator from Florida hates to see people right across the line in Alabama, exactly like people in Florida, who can vote and do vote, deprived of their right of voting because they have either forgotten to pay the poll tax, or because they did not have the $6 to pay it, or they did not like the politics prevailing in the county.

The Senator from Florida has also regretted to see that the two great and

friendly States represented by the Senator from Alabama and the Senator from Mississippi show the smallest participation in elections of the qualified citizens of their States of any State in the Union. The Senator from Florida does not think that is a sound situation. He feels he has a complete right to move toward a sounder participation of all citizens, and makes no apology to anybody. He has stood arm in arm with his distinguished friends in opposition to other measures, but the Senator from Florida cannot for his life see how anybody can oppose something which is so basically American as to have this submission to the jury of States, which has been a part of our Constitution since it was founded.

Mr. EASTLAND. The Senator has said that the people have been deprived of the privilege of voting. I defy him to name one human being who has been denied the right to vote because of the poll tax. I defy him to find one. The Senator well knows that in our States the real test is in the primary elections, and not in the general elections, and we do have full participation in the primaries.

Mr. HILL. After the matter is settled in the primaries, the people know the result in the primaries is going to be the result in the general elections.

Mr. EASTLAND. To get back to the primary question, there is no proof that any more people will vote if the poll tax is removed. Does the poll tax disqualify them from voting?

Mr. HILL. It does not in Alabama. They do not vote in the general elections because the primary is the determining election. Whoever is nominated in the primaries, everyone knows, is going to be elected in the general elections.

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

Mr. HILL. I yield for a question.

Mr. HOLLAND. I have had some experience in this question. In my State, as soon as the poll tax was removed, at first the white people, and later the colored people, after the court threw out the white primaries, voted in greater numbers. I call attention to the list of States shown at page 475 of the printed hearings, which shows the following facts:

In Mississippi the number participating——

Mr. EASTLAND. Will the Senator state the authorities? He said the printed hearings. Who said that?

Mr. HOLLAND. The information is furnished by the American Heritage Foundation, the same figures were also found in the report of the Civil Rights Commission.

Mr. EASTLAND. The Senator is going very far when he takes the report of the Civil Rights Commission. If there ever was something loaded against decent people of this country, it is the Civil Rights Commission.

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

Mr. HILL. I have the floor. I did not think the Senator would deny us our rights based on such a report. The Senator from Florida has now become a working ally of the Civil Rights Commission.

Mr. HOLLAND. The Senator from Florida has taken the same position with respect to the creation of the Civil Rights Commission as the Senators from Alabama and Mississippi.

Mr. EASTLAND. We have not——

Mr. HOLLAND. Has the Senator yielded to me?

Mr. HILL. I yield to the Senator from Mississippi.

Mr. HOLLAND. I know the Senators do not want these facts in the RECORD.

Mr. EASTLAND. We are going to let the Senator put them in the RECORD, but we want the foundation for them.

Mr. HILL. We want the RECORD to be a true RECORD.

Mr. EASTLAND. The distinguished Senator has opposed the creation of that Commission. He has been against it. I would say the facts alleged by this Commission are absolutely unreliable, and I do not believe my friend would say they are reliable.

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

Mr. HILL. I yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. I stated these figures came originally from the American Heritage Foundation, but they were the same facts as set forth by the Civil Rights Commission.

If the Senators will take time to read page 475 of the hearings, they will see the sources are stated to be the American Heritage Foundation, the State election officials, and the U.S. Census Bureau. I do not know where the committee could have gone for more authoritative information than those three sources.

Mr. EASTLAND. But the Senator stated people were disqualified from voting.

Mr. HILL. There is nothing in there to show that people have been disqualified from voting because of the poll tax.

Mr. HOLLAND. The Senator from Florida thinks the people of Alabama and Mississippi are just as patriotic as are any other people. He thinks they would vote if there were not something in their way. When he sees these two great States, whose people are friendly to ours and ours are friendly to them, stand at the very bottom of the list of voter participation, the Senator from Florida regrets it and wishes to correct that condition. That is what he is trying to do.

Mr. HILL. We do not need any help from the Senator from Florida. Now that he is a working ally of the Civil Rights Commission, I would say the people of Alabama would certainly wish no help from the Senator from Florida.

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

Mr. HILL. I yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. I think the Senator has not heard the Senator from Florida state that the three sources for this information, as compiled and reported by the committee which is headed by my distinguished friend, the Senator from Mississippi, are the American Heritage Foundation, the State election officials, and the U.S. Census Bureau——

Mr. EASTLAND. Wait a minute. Let us be fair——

Mr. HILL. I yield to the Senator from Mississippi.

Mr. EASTLAND. The Senator from Florida is trying to impute that the Senator from Mississippi had something to do with these figures. It was testimony before the subcommittee. Why does not the Senator give the facts about it?

Mr. HOLLAND. The Senator from Florida is trying to.

Mr. EASTLAND. No. The Senator is trying to impute that the chairman of the committee had something to do with the authenticity of those figures.

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

Mr. HILL. I yield for a question.

Mr. HOLLAND. I was going to ask if the Senator will yield for a statement, without losing his right to the floor.

Mr. HILL. If it will be a brief statement.

Mr. HOLLAND. I know perfectly well the Senator from Mississippi had nothing to do with those figures. I know that for 14 years I have been trying to get this amendment out of the committee which has been headed, at least for the last 6 or 8 years, by the Senator from Mississippi. I know we have been able to get it out of the subcommittee. I think I know why we have not been able to get it out of the full committee. I certainly will not ascribe to my friend from Mississippi any interest in the production of this list or the production of these figures. I want the RECORD to show that.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, since the Senator from Florida has proposed his amendment so far as the recollection of the Senator from Alabama serves him, the Senator from Alabama has never had one single word, not one single line, not one single communication, by word of mouth or otherwise, about the proposal of the Senator from Florida. Knowing the people of Alabama and their desire to maintain their rights without outside interference, I know there is not one of them who today would wish the Senator from Florida to deny him his rights, which rights the people have had since the day the Constitution was founded.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, will he Senator yield?

Mr. HILL. I yield to the Senator from Mississippi.

Mr. EASTLAND. If the distinguished citizens of the State of Alabama thought there was the great problem which the proponents of these measures claim, would not the Senator from Alabama have received many communications from his own State?

Mr. HILL. Certainly.

Mr. EASTLAND. From people being hurt by the tax?

Mr. HILL. A Senator always knows that if people are hurting he will hear from them.

So far as the Senator from Alabama can recall, in all of the years during which the Senator from Florida has been proposing his amendment, the Senator from Alabama has not received one word, by word of mouth, by line, or by communication in any shape, fashion, or

form from a single Alabaman on behalf of the proposed amendment.

On the other hand, knowing the people of Alabama as I do, I know they are against the proposed amendment. I would say they even resent the proposed amendment.

Mr. EASTLAND. I say the same thing for the State of Mississippi. I have not received a single protest about the tax. In fact, every piece of mail I have received from Mississippi in this regard has been in opposition to this proposal.

Mr. HILL. I have received many communications and many letters, as the Senator from Mississippi has stated, in opposition to the proposal, but not a single one in favor of it.

Mr. President, as I said, the funds raised from this minimal, innocuous tax all go for educational purposes, yet at this most crucial time in the history of America and the free world we are asked to take the time of the Senate to consider proposals to deal with this so-called issue, which all the facts show is far more imaginary than real.

At this time poll taxes are so rare and so innocuous that it requires considerable imagination to claim that they serve as any barrier to the exercise of the franchise by anyone.

It will be recalled that in the early days, and for many years in the history of our country, many of our States required the payment of poll taxes as a prerequisite for voting. Practically all the States had some such qualifications. Some of the States had a much more stringent and burdensome qualification, namely, the ownership or the holding of property.

The poll tax came into being not to restrict suffrage, but as a measure to increase the number of eligible voters by substituting the poll tax for other onerous taxes and stringent requirements.

At the time the Constitution was being written in 1787, most of the States—at least 9 of the 13—had spoken, and had fixed, by their own constitutions, the qualifications of those who should vote for the members of their own legislatures.

What were those qualifications? I should like to sum up, briefly, the qualifications which the original States, which brought the Constitution into being, had themselves prescribed for their voting.

First let us look at the small but great State of New Hampshire, from which some of the minutemen, some of our bravest men in the War of the Revolution, came in the early days, the State which gave us Daniel Webster. Before this debate is concluded, I perhaps shall refer to some of Mr. Webster's great speeches on the Constitution.

The men from New Hampshire fought the battles of the Revolution in order that the Constitution might be born, that the rights of the States might be safeguarded, and most of all that the power might reside in the hands of the people, and not in a central, arbitrary government. This indeed, is what the minutemen died for—the brave and gallant boys from the hills and mountains of New Hampshire.

What were the qualifications in New Hampshire? A voter had to be a freeholder. He had to own property; he had to own real estate. But the qualifications in New Hampshire did not stop there. They went further. And what do Senators suppose a voter had to do? He had to pay a poll tax, the very tax we are discussing now. Voters in New Hampshire had to pay a poll tax at the time the Constitution of the United States was being written.

The next State in the list is the State of the granite hills, the beautiful little State of Vermont, a State whose sons also played a heroic part in the War of the Revolution. When the Constitution of the United States was being drafted, in order to vote in Vermont a man otherwise eligible to vote—in order to meet the prerequisite, had to be a freeholder. He had to own property.

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

Mr. HILL. I yield.

Mr. EASTLAND. Is that not all based on the premise that our Government, under the Constitution of the United States, regards voting as a privilege and not a right, and a privilege which can be restricted or denied?

Mr. HILL. Time and again emphasis is given to the fact that voting is a privilege.

I quoted a few moments ago from Judge Cooley, who I think is recognized as perhaps the greatest authority—certainly one of the greatest authorities—on the Constitution of the United States this country has ever known. He emphasized that very statement, that voting is a privilege. It is a privilege.

Mr. EASTLAND. The only limitation on it, of course, is the woman's suffrage amendment.

Mr. HILL. The Senator is correct.

Mr. EASTLAND. And the provision that no one shall be denied the right to vote because of race, color, or previous condition of servitude.

Mr. HILL. The Senator is absolutely correct.

Mr. EASTLAND. The poll tax applies to black and to white alike.

Mr. HILL. The Senator is correct. Whether a person is black, is white, is yellow, or is brown—whatever the color of the person may be—the poll tax applies to everyone on the same footing, on the same level, on the same basis.

Mr. President, if I may, I wish to advert now to the State of the distinguished Senator who is now the Presiding Officer of this body (Mr. SMITH of Massachusetts in the chair), a Senator whom we all greatly esteem and appreciate, for whom we have the greatest possible admiration. I, of course, now speak of the great Commonwealth of Massachusetts, the State of Samuel Adams, John Hancock, John Adams, John Quincy Adams, Dr. Warren, and other great heroes of the Revolution. In order to vote in Massachusetts the requirement was that one must own a freehold with an annual income of 3 pounds, or an estate of 60 pounds. One had to be a property owner in order to vote in Massachusetts. That State did not let one off with paying a poll tax of a dollar or a dollar and a half; a voter had to be a property owner.

In the great empire of the State of New York the voter had to be a freeholder of 20 pounds, paying rent of 40 shillings. He had to have a freehold of 100 pounds in order to vote for State senator. They seemed to prescribe a greater prerequisite for voting for State senator than for members of the most numerous branch of the legislature, which meant they prescribed a greater prerequisite for voting for State senator than was required for voting for a Member of the Federal Congress, because of course the qualification for voting for a Member of the Federal Congress was the qualification for voting for a Member of the most numerous branch of the legislature.

In New Jersey one had to own an estate of 50 pounds; he had to be a property owner.

In Pennsylvania the voter had to be a State or county taxpayer.

In Delaware the citizen in order to exercise the right to vote also had to be a State or county taxpayer.

In Maryland the voter had to be a freeholder of 50 acres, or have property worth 30 pounds.

In North Carolina the voter had to own a freehold of 50 acres in a county, and must have owned it for 6 months before the election. It was also a requirement that the voter had paid his public taxes. If the citizen had not paid his public taxes he could not vote. In other words, he not only had to own the property, but he had to pay all the taxes on the property, and if he was in any way delinquent in the paying of his taxes he could not vote.

In South Carolina the voter had to be a freeholder of 50 acres or a town lot, or he had to pay taxes equal to the tax on 50 acres. That is, if the voter did not own 50 acres, he must, as a requirement for voting, have paid a tax equal to the tax on 50 acres.

In Georgia the voter had to own property in an amount of 10 pounds, or have a trade as a mechanic, or be a taxpayer.

I am sure the trade of a mechanic would interest the distinguished Presiding Officer [Mr. SMITH of Massachusetts] as much as it does the Senator from Alabama.

At that time we had not moved into the scientific, mechanical, and technological age in which we live today, for even back in that time, in order to be a voter in Georgia, as I have said, one either had to own property in the amount of 10 pounds or have a trade as a mechanic. If one had a trade as a mechanic, he would qualify. The third alternative was to be a taxpayer in some other way.

The State of Kentucky was not one of the Thirteen Original States. It was one of the first States to be admitted into the Union, however, after the adoption of the Federal Constitution. It came into the Union in 1792, only 3 years after the formation of the Federal Government.

In order to be a voter in Kentucky, a citizen had to be a taxpayer.

In Tennessee, which was admitted shortly thereafter, a voter had to be a freeholder.

Mr. President, these were the qualifications of electors when Kentucky and Tennessee were admitted into the Union shortly after the adoption of the Constitution.

These were the qualifications the States prescribed respecting their electors when the Constitution was being drafted in Philadelphia, when the delegates from the States were busy writing that document at the Constitutional Convention.

Thus, in the debates at the Constitutional Convention, as reported by Elliott, which, as we know, is the authoritative work on the subject, we find James Madison, who had such a major part in writing the Constitution that we commonly refer to him as the father of the Constitution, suggesting that there be a definite statement of qualifications placed in the Constitution, and expressing the opinion that the freeholders of the country—landowners—would be the safest depository of republican liberty.

The delegates to the Constitutional Convention knew what the States, qualifications were, and therefore when they wrote into the Constitution that the qualifications for electors for Members of the House of Representatives should be the qualifications for the electors for the most numerous branch of the State legislatures, they knew exactly what they were doing.

They knew what those qualifications were in the Thirteen States. As we recall under the original Constitution Senators were elected by the members of the State legislatures. We also recall that when we provided in the 17th amendment, which was adopted in 1913, for the direct election of Senators, rather than their election by the State legislatures, there was written into the 17th amendment the same provision, namely, that the qualifications for electors for U.S. Senators should be the qualifications prescribed by the States for electors for the most numerous branch of the State legislatures.

We must recall that in 1787 when the Constitution was written the States were absolute sovereigns. They had joined in the Declaration of Independence. They had proclaimed their independence of the British Crown. They had fought through eight long, terrible, and bloody years to win their independence, and they stood absolutely independent and free from any other sovereignty on this earth. Their own sovereignty was full, complete, and absolute.

So they gathered in Philadelphia in their sovereign capacities, through their delegates, to write the Constitution of the United States. The question was, How much of their sovereignty would they yield to the Federal Government? The Federal Government was not in being; it had no existence; it had no sovereignty. The only sovereignty the Federal Government could have would be such sovereignty as was granted it by the sovereign States of that time.

Anyone who is at all familiar with the history of the writing of the Constitution, anyone who has taken the time to read Mr. Madison's notes on the Constitutional Convention and what transpired in that Convention when the Constitution was being written, knows how jealous were the several States of their sovereignty and how reluctant they were to yield much of that sovereignty to any federal government.

Mindful of their sovereignty, zestful and determined, insofar as possible to keep within their own hands as much of their sovereignty as they possibly could, and still have a federal government to meet the problems which had to be met by a central federal government, what did they do? They provided that every State should have two Senators—two Members in this body—no matter how large or how small the State might be, no matter what its industrial development might be, no matter what its financial development or its agricultural development might be. No matter what might be the status of a State in its power, its influence, its ability to influence other States and other persons in other States, every State in the United States should have equal representation in the Senate, it should have two Senators—its own two Senators. Then, as will be recalled, the delegates to the Convention went one further step, and provided that no State should have its representation in this body reduced or taken away from it without its consent. This meant that no matter how small a State might be, how weak, how ineffective, how uninfluential it might be, it would have equal representation in this body; it would have two Senators along with the two Senators of the most powerful, the wealthiest, and the greatest State of the Union.

It was in this spirit of jealous regard for their rights and determination to secure the primary authority of the States in the Government, that the question of qualifications of electors was considered and debated.

When we consult Madison's notes we find that there were three schools of thought in the Constitutional Convention with reference to the matter of qualifications of electors to vote for Members of Congress.

One school of thought felt that the qualifications should be prescribed in the Constitution itself.

The second school of thought felt that the qualifications should be left to Congress; that the Constitution should provide that the Congress should have the power to prescribe the qualifications.

The third school of thought, which, as we know so well, prevailed in the Constitutional Convention, was that the qualifications for the electors should be those fixed by the States for the most numerous branch of the State legislature.

That provision, as we know, is section 2, article I, of the Constitution of the United States.

We find in Mr. Madison's notes, as compiled by Mr. Jonathan Elliott, and published by J. B. Lippincott in Philadelphia in 1907, in volume V, page 385:

Mr. Gouverneur Morris, of Pennsylvania, moved to strike out the last member of the section, beginning with the words "qualifications of electors," in order that some other provision might be substituted which would restrain the right of suffrage to freeholders.

In other words, Gouverneur Morris not only wanted the Constitution to fix the qualifications for the electors but he wanted at least one of those qualifications to be that the elector should be a freeholder, that he should own property. So Gouverneur Morris moved to amend the proposal to write in the qualifications of freeholders.

Mr. Fitzsimons seconded the motion.

Mr. Williamson was opposed to the motion.

Mr. Wilson, who was also, incidentally, from the State of Pennsylvania, and was one of the ablest men, as we know, in the Convention, and one of the ablest of the Founding Fathers, then rose to speak.

Before I read what the different delegates said, I should like to call the attention of the Senate to the committee which proposed the provision in section 2, article I of the Constitution—the section to which I have just referred—which is the section dealing with the qualifications of voters. The committee was termed, in the language of the Constitutional Convention, "the committee of detail."

The committee of detail was composed of Mr. Rutledge, of South Carolina; Edmund Randolph, of Virginia; Nathaniel Gorham, of Massachusetts, who was Chairman of the Committee of the Whole; Oliver Ellsworth and James Wilson, of Pennsylvania. John Rutledge, as we recall, was offered a place on the first U.S. Supreme Court, and was afterward appointed Chief Justice of the United States. Edmund Randolph, we recall, was George Washington's first Attorney General. Later Oliver Ellsworth was Chief Justice of the United States, and James Wilson was a member of the President's Cabinet.

Where could there have been found at that time in all the world, or where could there be found today or at any other time in all the word, a committee of abler or more distinguished lawyers and students of government, or more capable political draftsmen than the men who constituted the committee which wrote section 2 of article I? Where could a more brilliant galaxy of stars in the field of statesmanship be found than these great lawyers, students of the philosophy of government, students of human nature, men of commonsense and wisdom, who constituted the committee which wrote section 2 of article I?

As I have stated Gouverneur Morris moved to amend the committee provision leaving to the States the fixing of the qualifications for electors of Members of Congress, so as to require that the electors be freeholders, or so as to make sure that they were property owners before they could vote for Members of the

House, Mr. Fitzsimons seconded the motion. Mr. Williamson opposed it. Then Mr. Wilson of Pennsylvania, one of the ablest men who sat in that convention, rose and made this observation, according to Madison's notes:

This part of the report was well considered by the committee, and he [Mr. Wilson] did not think it could be changed for the better. It was difficult to form any uniform rule of qualifications for all the States. Unnecessary innovations, he thought, too, should be avoided.

When I quote that language about unnecessary innovations, I come back to my statement of a few minutes ago; namely, that Mr. Wilson and the other delegates who had gathered to write the Constitution knew exactly what qualifications were fixed by their own State constitutions. So when Mr. Wilson was speaking about no innovations, he was, impliedly, at least, making a plea for the qualifications fixed in his own State of Pennsylvania and fixed by the constitutions of the other Original States.

Mr. Wilson went on to say:

It would be very hard and disagreeable for the same persons, at the same time, to vote for representatives in the State legislature and to be excluded from a vote for those in the National Legislature.

All of us have many times been in polling booths to vote. We know that the words spoken by Mr. Wilson not only were true in 1787, but they are just as true today. Can Senators imagine the disorder, the confusion, and the uncertainty that would be thrown around the exercise of a right which is the most sacred right, perhaps, possessed by any American citizen—the right to the ballot—if there were one set of qualifications for electors for Members of Congress, President, and Vice President, and if there were another set of qualifications for electors of State legislatures and State officers?

Mr. President, while I do not believe that the very practical question raised by Mr. Wilson was the controlling one in the drafting of article I, section 2, those men, being men of commonsense, men with a keen, profound knowledge of human nature and the ways of people and of events, were undoubtedly persuaded by the consideration of how impractical it would be to have varying qualifications for the different electors.

After Mr. Wilson made his statement, Gouverneur Morris, the author of the motion, rose. I read further from Madison's notes:

Such a hardship—

This is, being a freeholder or the owner of property, because that is what his motion provided as a qualification—

would be neither great nor novel. The people are accustomed to it, and not dissatisfied with it, in several of the States. In some, the qualifications are different for the choice of the Governor and of the Representatives; in others, for different houses of the legislature. Another objection against the clause as it stands is that it makes the qualifications of the National Legislature depend on the will of the States, which he thought not proper.

He was unwilling to recognize this right in the State. Mr. Morris was unwilling that this power should continue to be vested in the State. He wanted it in the Federal Government.

Then Mr. Ellsworth, of Massachusetts, rose and said that he thought the qualifications of electors stood on the most proper footing. Note this language:

The right of sovereignty was a tender point and strongly guarded by most of the State constitutions. The people will not readily subscribe to the National Constitution if it should subject them to be disfranchised.

He was arguing against Mr. Morris' motion to make the ownership of a freehold a qualification. Mr. Ellsworth added:

The States are the best judges of the circumstances and temper of their own people.

Note that language. The States—the people back home, the people who gather in the State capitals, the people who go to the ballot boxes back in the hamlets, the communities, and the crossroads—"are the best judges of the circumstances and temper of their own people." Would anyone dispute that today?

Mr. Butler, a delegate to the Constitutional Convention, made this significant statement:

There is no right of which the people are more jealous than that of suffrage.

Thus, emphasizing, fortifying, and reaffirming the idea that the determination of the qualifications of electors should remain in the hands of the people of the States.

After all, Madam President, it is only by means of the right of suffrage that the people are able to maintain their power, their authority, their sovereignty over their Government. If the people's right of suffrage were to be taken from them, no longer would there be government of the people, by the people, and for the people.

Madam President, I shall read from the statement of Mr. Dickinson. He was a gentleman of very conservative views; but I think we should have his views, since we are studying this whole subject. Mr. Dickinson had a very different idea with regard to the tendency toward vesting the right of suffrage in the freeholders of the country. He considered them as the best guardians of liberty, and the restriction of the right to them "as a necessary defense against the dangerous influence of those multitudes, without property, and without principle, with which our country, like all others, will in time abound." He very strongly favored the writing in of a qualification that electors must be property owners.

In reply to Mr. Dickinson, Mr. Ellsworth had this to say:

How shall the freehold be defined? Ought not every man who pays a tax vote for the representative who is to levy and dispose of his money? Shall the wealthy merchants and manufacturers who will bear full share of the public burden be not allowed a voice in the imposition of them? Taxation and representation ought to go together.

On the question as to whether a freehold or property ownership should be prescribed as a qualification, Mr. Madison, being a very wise and very practical man, expressed the view that that might well be determined upon the question as to how such a qualification would be received back in the States.

The men who sat in the Convention, who engaged in the debates in the Convention, who engaged in the actual drafting of the Constitution, knew best of all, knew far better than any who should come after them, what their intent and purposes were in writing the Constitution. We would never have had any Federal Constitution, we would never have had a Federal Government, if the view had not prevailed that the qualifications of the electors should be left to the several States; in other words, that section 1 of article 2 should be adopted and written into the Constitution just as it had been recommended by the committee and as it was adopted and written into the Constitution.

Mr. President, in the 60th Federalist paper, Mr. Hamilton defended the Federal Constitution against the charge that it favored the rich. That charge had been made against the Constitution. His remarks on this subject are very pertinent to the issue before us. I now quote from Mr. Hamilton.

The truth is—

He wrote—

that there is no method of securing to the rich the preference apprehended, but by prescribing qualifications of property either for those who may elect or be elected. But—

Went on Mr. Hamilton—

this forms no part of the power to be conferred upon the national Government.

Mr. Hamilton added:

Its authority would be expressly restricted to the regulation of the times, the places, the manner of elections. The qualifications of the persons who may choose or be chosen, as has been remarked upon other occasions, are defined and fixed in the Constitution, and are unalterable by the legislature.

Alexander Hamilton's words will be clear to anyone who takes the time to read them. He said that the Federal Government cannot invade that right; that it is a right left exclusively to the several States.

What happened? The Committee on Detail, on August 6, 1787—and, as I have stated, the Committee on Detail was the special committee for the drafting of the Constitution—recommended that:

The qualifications of the electors shall be the same, from time to time, as those of the electors of the several States, of the most numerous branch of their own legislatures.

This, of course, is the provision of section 2, article I, of the Constitution.

What happened? When that committee made the recommendation, a motion was made to prescribe in the Constitution the qualification of possessing a freehold; and that motion was voted down. What was the vote on that motion? The motion was rejected by a vote of 7 to 1. Only one State voted for the motion, and that was the little State of Delaware. Delaware voted "aye." New Hampshire, Massachusetts, Connecticut, Pennsylvania, Virginia, North Carolina, and South Carolina voted "no."

Madam President, the thinking of the men who wrote our Constitution is found not only in the debates held in the Constitutional Convention, but also in the writings of those who participated in it.

We know that Thomas Jefferson was not a member of the Constitutional Convention that wrote the Federal Constitution, because he was at that time our Minister to France; but although he was out of the country, he was in very close touch with the delegates to the Convention. We know that he had no closer ally or friend than James Madison, father of the Constitution.

We speak of Washington as the Father of our Country—which he was. I think we properly speak of James Madison as the father of the Constitution. I think we may well say that Thomas Jefferson was the great prophet of American democracy.

In Mr. Jefferson's draft of a proposed constitution for Virginia, which was written in June 1776, while Mr. Jefferson was serving as a Member of the Continental Congress in Philadelphia, Jefferson suggested in his draft:

> All male persons of full age and sane mind, having a freehold estate in (one-quarter of an acre) of land in any town or in (25) acres of land in the county, and all persons resident in the Colony who shall have paid scott and lot to Government the last (2 years) shall have right to give their vote for the election of their respective representatives.

He proposed this language for the Virginia constitution; but, on the other hand, when it came to the writing of the Federal Constitution, he opposed there being any provision of this sort prescribed in the Federal Constitution. He knew that the States should fix the qualifications for the voter.

I quoted a little while ago from Alexander Hamilton.

As we know, one of the greatest minds of that period, beginning with the War of the Revolution and coming on down through the Articles of Confederation, and the drafting of the Federal Constitution, and even in the administration of the Federal Government in the early days of George Washington, was the brilliant, profound, magnificent mind of Alexander Hamilton. It will be recalled that Hamilton was Secretary of the Treasury in President Washington's first Cabinet.

Perhaps this country has never known a more penetrating or more incisive mind than that of Alexander Hamilton. As we know, Hamilton was not a democrat, and I am using the word with a little "d." He did not believe in, he did not have faith in, the capacity of the people to govern themselves. He believed in a strong central government. He thought it was necessary to have central, arbitrary power concentrated in the government in Washington. He went so far that many speak of him as a monarchist. Certainly we know that in the plan which he submitted to the Constitutional Convention he provided for life tenure for the Chief Executive, the President of the United States. As I recall, he provided for certain hereditary rights—for many things that were to be found under the arbitrary, central power of the governments of the kings and the monarchies of the nations of Europe.

Mr. Hamilton in writing about the Constitution—and we must remember what his feelings and his views were—had this to say in chapter 52 of the Federalist:

> I shall begin with the House of Representatives * * * The first view to be taken of this part of the Government, related to the qualifications of the electors and the elected.

When he referred to "the qualifications of electors," he went straight to the very question we are discussing here today, because he knew what the whole question involved, so far as determining what our Government was, and what it would be down through the years. He knew it went to the whole question of our dual system of government, the whole question of the structure of our Government, of a divided authority between the Federal Government and the State governments. The brilliant Hamilton knew what he was talking about. He went on to say:

> Those of the former—

That is, of the House of Representatives—

> are to be the same—

That is, the qualifications are to be the same—

> with those of the electors of the most numerous branch of the State legislatures. The definition of the right of suffrage is very justly regarded as a fundamental article of Republican government. It was incumbent on the Convention, therefore, to define and establish this right in the Constitution.

In other words, the Constitution had to state what these qualifications were, and by whom they would be prescribed. Hamilton then continued:

> The provision made by the Convention—

That is the provision now written into section 2 of article I—

> appears, therefore, to be the best that lay within their option. It must be satisfactory to every State, because it is conformable to the standard already established or which may be established by the State itself.

Thus the leading Federalist, the outstanding Nationalist, in the days of the beginning of our Government proclaimed in his writings in the Federalist that this method must be satisfactory to the States, because under the Constitution as written it was left to the States.

Again, in the 87th Federalist, the question was asked. And Hamilton replied to his own question:

> Not the rich, more than the poor; nor the learned, more than the ignorant; or the haughty heirs of distinguished names, more than the humble sons of obscurity and unpropitious fortune. The electors are to be the great body of the people of the United States. They are to be the same who exercise the right in every State of electing the corresponding branch of the legislature of the State.

In the 59th Federalist we find this significant statement:

> Suppose an article had been introduced into the Constitution empowering the United States to regulate the elections for the particular States, would any man have hesitated to condemn it, both as an unwarrantable transposition of power and as a premeditated engine for the destruction of State governments?

In the 60th Federalist, Alexander Hamilton expressed fear that elections might be manipulated in the interest of the "rich and the well born." The only way in which this might be done, he wrote, would be by prescribing property qualifications either for those who may elect or for those who may be elected.

But, he added, this forms no part of the power to be conferred upon the National Government.

There were many different qualifications which the States in the exercise of their own sovereignty prescribed. There was not only this tremendous regard for the rights of the States and this excessive zeal and jealousy for the preservation of the sovereignty of the States in the Constitutional Convention in Philadelphia which brought forth the Constitution, but also, as we know, the Constitution to be effective, to come into being, had to be ratified by conventions in the several States.

If we turn to the conventions in the several States, we find that great battles raged in most of them over ratification of the Federal Constitution. What was the question? The question was whether the delegates in Philadelphia had given to the Federal Government too much power. The three most powerful States, the three most influential States at that time, were Virginia, New York, and Massachusetts. In their State conventions, because of the fear that the Federal Government might be given too much power, that the States might be lodging too much power in the Federal Government, only 53 percent of the votes in those conventions were cast for ratification. Since only 53 percent of the votes were cast for ratification, it will be realized that there was a rather close vote.

In the calling of the Virginia convention, in order to get as many delegates as possible, it was stated that all the members of the general assembly were eligible, and that delegates could be elected in addition to that number. Yet out of that group, which constituted nearly all of the political leaders of the State, the vote for ratification was only a majority of nine, and that was primarily due to the influence of George Washington.

Undoubtedly if it had not been for the tremendous confidence of the people of Virginia in General Washington, Virginia would not have ratified the Constitution.

Two of the greatest patriots of the Revolution—Patrick Henry, who sounded the tocsin of war and gave us the battle cry of the Revolution; and George Mason, who wrote the Virginia Bill of Rights—opposed ratification of the Constitution.

As Senators will recall, that great statesman of our time, Woodrow Wilson, said he would rather have been the author of the Virginia Bill of Rights than the author of any document ever penned

by the hand of man. That bill of rights is not only the Bill of Rights we find today in the Constitution of the United States, but it is the bill of rights we find in the constitutions of the States. It is the great guarantee of the rights of our people.

I have previously discussed the safeguards on which the delegates of the individual States insisted in order to protect their rights and to retain as much as possible of their State sovereignty. After the delegates representing the sovereign States had finished their work of writing the Constitution, putting in all the safeguards to insure the primary authority of the States, they closed the Constitution by writing into it the declaration that the Constitutional Convention acted "by the unanimous consent of the States" present. They wanted the people to know at that time, and wanted all succeeding generations to know, including the Senators sitting here in the year of our Lord 1962, some 175 years after the Constitution was drafted, that the sovereign States were the ones who had drafted and formulated the Constitution.

As I stated a moment ago, two of the foremost patriots of the Revolution, Patrick Henry and George Mason, who had done so much to win our independence from the British Crown, to win our freedom, opposed ratification of the Constitution. They felt, as did many of their compatriots, that there might be too great a surrender of sovereignty on the part of the States, that there might be too much yielding of power to the Federal Government.

I emphasize these points because the history of the ratification of the Constitution shows clearly that if the sovereignty of the States and the rights of the States had not been positively recognized in the Constitution, if all the safeguards and protections of their sovereignty and their rights had not been put into the Constitution, the Constitution would never have been ratified, and we never would have had a Federal Government.

We know, of course, that mankind has struggled through the centuries to break down arbitrary power. Sometimes it is difficult for us, living in free America, to realize the long struggle of mankind, century after century after century, to break arbitrary power. The high water mark of the struggle to break down arbitrary power, to bring about the distribution of power, and place it in the hands of the people, was reached when our ancestors fought the American Revolution and broke the powers of the British Crown over the people of the then Original Thirteen Colonies or States. The framers of the Constitution knew that the States, with their State governments, county governments, city governments, and town governments, were the citadels of local self-government. They knew that their concept of government by the people required full and plenary recognition of the rights and the sovereignty of the States. If the people were to hold and exercise the power of the government, there had to be recognition of the sovereignty and the rights of the States.

The people were fighting against centralized, arbitrary power at the seat of government. They were fighting to keep the wellsprings of our system of government in the hands of the people—as I have said, in the local communities, the crossroads, the hamlets, and the towns. What would it have availed the people to break the tyranny of the British Crown, had they, themselves, set up here in Washington a government with central arbitrary power? They were determined, after all the sacrifices they had made, and all their bitter sufferings, to reserve the power in their own hands. I repeat that in order to do this, they knew they had to maintain the sovereignty of the States, because within the States—and within the States alone—are the citadels of governmental power.

A few minutes ago we were speaking about the State conventions which met to ratify the Constitution. It is interesting to note that in those State conventions one of the first questions raised—and raised many times—was the very question we are discussing today, namely, the question as to section 2 of article I of the Constitution. In order to bring into being a Federal Union through the Constitution, the Constitution had to be ratified by at least nine of the States.

In the Massachusetts convention, there was a "doubting Thomas" by the name of Dr. John Taylor, from the town of Douglass, Mass. He wanted to be very sure about this new Constitution. He wanted to make certain. He was fearful that section 4 of article I, the section with reference to the times, places, and manner of holding elections—not the section with reference to qualifications—might give Congress the power to prescribe property qualification for voters in the sum, as he expressed it, of 100 pounds. He inquired of Rufus King—who, as we recall, was a member of the Constitutional Convention in Philadelphia, and was also a member of the Massachusetts State convention—whether under section 4, Congress could in any way go into the question of qualifications.

Mr. King, one of the leading members of the Philadelphia convention, had this to say:

> The idea of the honorable gentleman from Douglass transcends my understanding, for the power of control given by this section—

That is, section 4—

> extends to the manner of election, not to the qualifications of the electors.

Mr. King made this answer because he knew that the qualifications were prescribed in section 2, and were the qualifications which the States themselves would make.

In the Pennsylvania State convention, Mr. James Wilson—who, as will be recalled, had been one of the outstanding men in the Constitutional Convention in Philadelphia, in the writing of the Constitution—made this statement to the State convention:

> In order to know who are qualified to be electors of the House of Representatives—

That is, the Federal House of Representatives—

> we are to inquire who are qualified to be electors of the legislature of each State. If there be no legislature in the States there can be no electors of them. If there be no such electors, there is no criterion to know who are qualified to elect Members of the House of Representatives. By this short, plain deduction the existence of the State legislatures is proved to be essential to the existence of the general government.

In other words, there must be action by the State legislature in order to have a Representative in the Federal legislature.

As I read a few minutes ago, Mr. King, who had been in the Philadelphia Constitutional Convention, at the writing of the Federal Constitution, had this to say:

> The idea of the honorable gentleman from Douglass transcends my understanding—for the power of control given by this section extends to the manner of election, not to the qualifications of the electors.

I have noted earlier that the question arose in the Virginia convention; and Mr. Nicholas, one of the delegates, had something to say. As I recall, Mr. Nicholas was also a member of the Philadelphia Convention which wrote the Federal Constitution. Certainly he was a member of the State convention. This is what Mr. Nicholas said:

> If, therefore, by the proposed plan, it is left uncertain in whom the right of suffrage is to rest, or if it has placed that right in improper hands, I shall admit that it has a radical effect. But in his plan—

That is, in the Federal Constitution—

> there is a fixed rule for determining the qualification of electors, and that rule, the most judicious that could possibly have been devised, because it refers to a criterion which cannot be changed.

Mr. Nicholas went on to say:

> A qualification that gives a right to elect representatives for the State legislatures gives also, by this Constitution, a right to choose representatives for the General Government.

The yardstick was prescribed. The yardstick which was fixed by the States should be the yardstick for the election of representatives from the particular States. It was contemplated, as I have stated again and again, that it would be fixed in that way, not only because they thought it was the wisest and best way to do it, and not only because they knew that if they did not do it in that way, the Constitution would never be ratified and come into being, but also because they felt that, in doing it in that way, it would be fixed for all time to come, and could not, as Mr. Nicholas said, be changed.

I may add that in reading the notes of the convention, we see that Mr. Nicholas gave the members of the Richmond ratifying convention most positive assurance that the Federal Government could not and never would undertake to pass upon and fix the qualifications of voters.

In North Carolina, Mr. John Steele, who was a member of the ratification convention, wished to make this matter absolutely clear, so there could never be

any question in anyone's mind about what North Carolina was doing when it ratified the Constitution. Here is what Mr. Steele said:

Who are to vote for them?

By that is meant, of course, who are to vote for Members of the House of Representatives and for President and for Vice President? He then said:

Every man who has a right to vote for a representative to our legislature will ever have a right to vote for a Representative to the General Government.

By "General Government" he meant what we now refer to as the Federal Government.

Does it not expressly provide—

By the word "it" he means the Constitution, of course—

that the electors in each State shall have the qualifications requisite for the most numerous branch of the State legislature?

Mr. Steele went on to say:

The power over the manner of elections does not include that of saying who shall vote.

Of course, all of us should understand that. Section 2 of article I deals with the "who" of the electors. Section 4 of article I deals with the "how" of the elections.

Mr. Steele went on to say:

The Constitution—

Speaking of the Federal Constitution, of course—

expressly says that the qualifications are those which entitle a man to vote for a State representative. It is, then, clearly and indubitably fixed and determined who shall be the electors; and the power over the manner only enables them to determine how these electors shall elect—whether by ballot, or by vote, or by any other way.

The view expressed by Delegate John Steele, in the North Carolina convention, was confirmed by Delegate William R. Davis, who also had been a delegate to the Constitutional Convention in Philadelphia.

The meaning of section 2 of article I was so clear that the question was not even raised in the conventions of Rhode Island, New Jersey, Delaware, and Georgia; and, so far as the reports show, in New Hampshire, Connecticut, and Maryland no question was raised about the section. It was so clear that even a fourth grade school child on reading it would know what it meant.

Mr. President, with reference to the resolutions adopted by the several States in ratifying the Federal Constitution, we find that in none of those resolutions was any question raised about section 2 of article I. It was so clear that there was no question to be raised. It was ipse dixit; it spoke for itself.

However, it is interesting to note that, in referring to section 4 of article I, by which certain powers are given to the Congress with reference to the fixing of the times, places, and manner of holding elections, some of the ratifying resolutions did raise questions; and it is interesting to note that in each case where such questions were raised, those States in their resolutions ratifying the Constitution wished to make certain that Congress knew that they felt that Congress should never exercise the power given under section 4 of article I unless the States had failed to function in prescribing the times, places, and manner of holding elections.

South Carolina, in its resolution of May 27, 1788, declared:

And whereas it is essential to the preservation of the rights reserved to the several States and the freedom of the people under the operations of the General Government that the right of prescribing the manner, time, and places of holding elections to the Federal Legislature should be forever annexed to the sovereignty of the several States, this convention does declare that the same ought to remain, to all posterity, a perpetual and fundamental right in the local government, exclusive of the interference of the General Government—

That is, the Federal Government—

except in cases where the legislatures of the States shall refuse or neglect to perform and fulfill the same, according to the tenor of the said Constitution.

All this shows how jealous the States were, how jealous the people were to preserve to the States and to the people their rights.

In 1865 a congressional joint committee was created to draft the 14th amendment. The chairman of the committee, which was composed of 15 members, was Senator William Pitt Fessenden of Maine. Since Senator Fessenden was in ill health, Senator Jacob M. Howard of Michigan, the ranking member, frequently assumed the chairmanship.

Among members of the joint committee on the House side, were Roscoe Conkling, of New York; George M. Boutwell, of Massachusetts; Henry T. Blow, of Missouri; and John A. Bingham, of Ohio. Mr. Bingham, I believe, is credited with being the actual draftsman or author of the first section of the 14th amendment. Other members from the House were Justin S. Morrill, of Vermont, and E. B. Washburne, of Illinois. I believe the record discloses that Kentucky had representation in the person of Representative Grider.

In the Senate the first section was discussed by Senator Howard. On May 23, 1865, he had this to say:

The first section of the proposed amendment does not give to either of these classes the privilege of voting. The right of suffrage is not, in law, one of the privileges or immunities thus secured by the Constitution. It is merely the creature of law. It has always been regarded in this country as a result of positive local law.

In other words, where the section speaks of guaranteeing certain privileges and immunities, Senator Howard made it clear that those privileges and immunities did not apply to, had no reference to, and did not in any way include any right of suffrage.

This indicates that in 1865, when the Senate was considering the 14th amendment to the Constitution, the men who were its authors, proponents and advocates held fast to the same proposition in the matter of qualifications of electors which had been expressed and had been so stoutly proclaimed in 1787 by the framers and authors of the Constitution of the United States.

As to section 2, Senator Howard said—and I am reading now from page 2766 of the Congressional Globe:

This section does not recognize the authority of the United States over the question of suffrage in the several States at all. It leaves the right to regulate the elective franchise still with the States and does not meddle with that right.

In closing the debate, on June 8, and just before the joint resolution was passed upon by the Senate, Senator Howard said, at page 3039 of the Congressional Globe:

We know very well that the States retain the power which they have always possessed of regulating the right of suffrage.

Remember, Mr. President, I am quoting the words of the man who, on this floor, was charged with the responsibility of piloting through the Senate the 14th amendment. In speaking, he was not only speaking for himself, but for the entire committee of 15 members who had worked with him and had jointly with him drafted the 14th amendment.

He proceeded to say:

We know very well that the States retain the power which they have always possessed of regulating the right of suffrage. It is the theory of the Constitution,

Says Senator Howard, speaking for the committee:

That right—

That is, the right of suffrage—

has never been taken from them; no endeavor has ever been made to take it from them, and the theory of this whole amendment is to leave the power of regulating the suffrage with the people or legislatures of the States and not to assume to regulate it by any clause of the Constitution of the United States.

Could any language be stronger than these words I have quoted from Senator Howard, spoken some 77 years after our Government came into being?

On this committee of 15 there was one Democratic Senator who happened to be from the great State of Maryland, Senator Reverdy Johnson. He said:

I suppose that even the honorable Member from Massachusetts, Senator Sumner, will not deny that it was for Massachusetts to regulate her suffrage before 1789; and if it was, she has the power still unless she has agreed to part with it by devolving it upon the General Government. Is there a word in the Constitution that intimates such a purpose?

That is, the purpose of giving such a power to the Federal Government.

Who at that time, in 1787, denied that the State was clothed with the power of describing the qualifications for the most numerous branch of the State legislature? * * * The State and nobody else.

The right of choosing the allotted number in each State is to be exercised by such part of the inhabitants as the State itself may designate. Words could not have been adopted more obviously leading to the conclusion than in the opinion of the writers of the Federalist—

Here the Senator was quoting from the Federalist, as I should have said—

the States were to have the sole right of regulating the suffrage. There is nothing innate in the right of suffrage.

If we read the Federalist papers, that great document including papers written by James Madison, by Alexander Hamilton, by John Jay, we find that the Federalist papers confirmed all the statements which had been made. That document has this declaration:

> The States were to have the sole right of regulating the suffrage. There is nothing innate in the right of suffrage.

Earlier today the distinguished Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN] and his colleague the senior Senator from Alabama visited the office of the Vice President in the Capitol with a group of very fine young high school boys and girls. The Senator from Alabama told the story relating to the bust of the late former Senator Henry Wilson, of Massachusetts, who became Vice President of the United States during the second administration of President Ulysses S. Grant.

Vice President Wilson had this to say, speaking about the men who wrote the Constitution:

> The men who framed the Constitution made those State constitutions; they well knew what the qualifications were.

He added:

> Every State constitution provides for electors, prescribes the qualification for suffrage. The laws of the States provided for qualifications of electors. Every State, from the adoption of the State constitution to this hour, has claimed the authority and exercised it to settle the questions pertaining to suffrage. They never supposed that the Federal Government had the power to change it. They never gave that power, and they never intended to give that power.

The issue of voter qualification arose again in connection with the 17th amendment. It will be recalled that that amendment to the Constitution was adopted in 1913. That was 126 years after the ratification of the Constitution of the United States. After 126 years, when the people of the United States saw fit to change their method of electing U.S. Senators, when they desired to have their Senators elected not by the legislatures, as provided in the original Constitution, but directly by the people themselves, what did they provide? They provided, in the 17th amendment, as follows:

> The Senate of the United States shall be composed of two Senators from each State, elected by the people thereof, for 6 years; and each Senator shall have one vote.

Then there is this language:

> The electors in each State shall have the qualifications requisite for electors of the most numerous branch of the State legislatures.

The people adopted the same identical language for the qualification of electors for the U.S. Senate which was adopted for electors for Members of the House of Representatives at the very beginning. In other words, they ratified and reaffirmed the wisdom of the Founding Fathers and of the original States in providing that the qualifications of the electors for Members of the Congress should be the qualifications requisite for electors of the most numerous branch of the State legislatures. I think it can be said here that had the 17th amendment made any change in the fixing or determination of those qualifications, it would never have been ratified by the people of the United States. The people were determined that these qualifications should remain, to be fixed by the States.

One of the great court decisions concerning this matter was written by a great Justice of the Supreme Court, at whose feet I was privileged to sit as a student when I was attending law school at Columbia University. I refer, of course, of then Justice and later Chief Justice Harlan F. Stone, of the Supreme Court of the United States.

It is tragic indeed that Chief Justice Stone had to leave this world when he did.

In 1941, Mr. Justice Stone wrote, as a part of the Supreme Court's opinion in the case of *United States* v. *Classic*, 313 U.S. 299:

> Such right as is secured by the Constitution to qualified voters to choose Members of the House of Representatives is thus to be exercised in conformity with the requirements of State law, subject to the restrictions prescribed by section 2 and the authority conferred in Congress by section 4 to regulate the times, places, and manner of holding elections of Representatives.

The Justice then went on to say what was the natural thing and what was the logical thing, because the suit involved a citizen of Louisiana and came up from Louisiana:

> We look then to the statutes of Louisiana here involved to ascertain the nature of the right which under the constitutional mandate they define and confer on the voter.

The word "they" means the statutes of Louisiana.

Another case to which I invite attention is the case of *Minor* v. *Happersett*, 21 Wall. 162, decided on March 21, 1875. In that case the extent of the distinction between the rights of a citizen of the United States and the rights of a citizen of a State with regard to voting was laid down and explained.

Chief Justice Waite of the Supreme Court declared that the fact that the right to vote could not grow out of citizenship alone was clear when one considered who was a citizen of the United States. He said that everyone born here is a citizen of the United States; and therefore if voting depended on citizenship, every child, every pauper, every criminal, every person born here would have the right to vote.

The opinion in this case contained the summary statement:

> When the Federal Constitution was adopted, all the States, with the exception of Rhode Island and Connecticut, had constitutions of their own. These two continued to act under their charters from the Crown. Upon an examination of these constitutions we find that in no State were all citizens permitted to vote. Each State determined for itself who should have that power.

Again, in 1915 in the case of *Gwinn and Beal* v. *U.S.*, 238 U.S. 347, Chief Justice White made a statement about the effect of the 15th amendment on State power.

Incidentally, Chief Justice White served for many years in the Senate. He was a very distinguished Member of this body when he was appointed to the Supreme Court by Grover Cleveland, then President of the United States.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. HILL. I yield to the distinguished Senator from Mississippi.

Mr. EASTLAND. Would the Senator say that the present Chief Justice could learn some law from former Chief Justice White?

Mr. HILL. I would commend to him the writings of Chief Justice White, and I would also commend to him the writings of my old professor, for whom I have such great admiration, former Chief Justice Harlan F. Stone, and a number of other great Chief Justices of the Supreme Court.

Chief Justice White in his decision in the Gwinn and Beall against United States case said:

> Beyond doubt, the amendment does not take away from the State governments in a general sense the power over suffrage which had belonged to those governments from the beginning, and without the possession of which power the whole fabric upon which the division of State and National authority under the Constitution and the organization of both governments rest would be without support and both the authority of the Nation and the State would fall to the ground. In fact, the very command of the amendment recognizes the possession of the general power by the State, since the amendment seeks to regulate its exercise as to the particular subject with which it deals.

The limitation on the powers of the Federal Government was defined with clarity by the Supreme Court in the case of *Carter* v. *Carter Coal Co.*, 298 U.S. 238, in which the Court said:

> The general rule with regard to the respective powers of the National and State Governments under the Constitution is not in doubt. The States were before the Constitution; and, consequently, their legislative powers antedated the Constitution. Those who framed and those who adopted that instrument meant to carve from the general mass of legislative powers, then possessed by the States, only such portions as it was thought wise to confer upon the Federal Government; and in order that there should be no uncertainty in respect to what was taken and what was left the national powers of legislation were not aggregated but enumerated—

In other words, the powers were specifically enumerated so that there could be no claim of a grant of power by the Federal Government which the States themselves did not make to the Federal Government.

The Chief Justice added:

> with the result that what was not embraced by the enumeration remained vested in the States without change or impairment. Thus, "when it was found necessary to establish a national government for national purposes," this Court said in *Munn* v. *Illinois* (84 U.S. 113, 124), "a part of the powers of the States and the people of the States was granted to the United States and the people of the United States. This grant operated as a further limitation upon the powers of the States, so that now the governments of the States possess all the powers of the Parliament of England, except such as have been delegated to the United States or reserved by the people." While the States are not sover-

eign in the true sense of that term, but only quasi-sovereign, yet in respect of all powers reserved to them they are supreme—"as independent of the General Government as that Government within its sphere is independent of the States." And, since every addition to the legislative power to some extent detracts from or invades the power of the States it is of vital moment that, in order to preserve the fixed balance intended by the Constitution, the powers of the General Government be not so extended as to embrace any not within the express terms of the several grants or the implications necessary to be drawn therefrom.

The Court went on to say:

It is no longer open to question that the General Government, unlike the States, possesses no inherent power in respect of the internal affairs of the States and emphatically not with regard to legislation. The question in respect of the inherent power of that Government as to the external affairs of the Nation and in the field of international law is a wholly different matter which it is not necessary now to discuss.

But the Court emphasized that it is the internal affair of the States. The powers are all within the States, except as they might have been specifically granted to the Federal Government for some very definite and specific purpose.

Mr. President, I should now like to call the attention of the Senate to a few words to be found in Cooley's Constitutional Limitations, 8th edition, Carrington, volume 2.

As I have said before in this discussion, I do not think anyone in our history has been accepted as a greater authority on the Constitution of the United States than has Judge Cooley. I now quote from Judge Cooley:

Among the absolute, unqualified rights of the States is that of regulating the elective franchise; it is the foundation of State authority; the most important political function exercised by the people in their sovereign capacity. Whilst "the right of the people to participate in the legislature is the best security of liberty and foundation of all free government," yet it is subordinate to the higher power of regulating the qualifications of the electors and the elected. The original power of the people in their aggregate political capacity, is delegated in the form of suffrage to such persons as they deem proper for the safety of the commonwealth: Brightly Election cases (*Anderson* v. *Baker* (32, 33, 34, 23 Md. 531)).

Every constitution of government in these United States has assumed, as a fundamental principle, the right of the people of the State to alter, abolish, and modify the form of its own government according to the sovereign pleasure of the people. In fact, the people of each State have gone much further and settled a far more critical question by deciding who shall be the voters entitled to approve and reject the constitution framed by a delegated body under their direction (1 Story, Constitution, ch. 9, sec. 581).

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. HILL. I yield.

Mr. EASTLAND. Is not the very basis of a State's sovereignty the right and power to decide who shall exercise the franchise?

Mr. HILL. That is indeed the very basis of the right; and, as Judge Cooley said, it is the foundation of a State's sovereignty and authority. It is the foundation of the State itself.

Mr. EASTLAND. Of course, the Senator realizes that federalizing every function of government concentrates power in a vast national government. It is eating up and destroying the liberties of the people of this country. The joint resolution is a tremendous step in the federalization and centralization of the governmental structure of the United States and is the destruction of the liberties of the people of this country.

Mr. HILL. Yes; and the destruction of the most fundamental right of the State which, as the Senator has said, and which Judge Cooley has emphasized, is the very foundation of the State itself.

To quote further from Judge Cooley:

From this it will be seen how little, even in the most free of republican governments, any abstract right of suffrage, or any original and indefeasible privilege, has been recognized in practice (ibid.). In no two of these State constitutions will it be found that the qualifications of the voters are settled upon the same uniform basis, so that we have the most abundant proofs that among a free and enlightened people convened for the purpose of establishing their own forms of government and the rights of their own voters the question as to the due regulation of the qualifications has been deemed a matter of mere State policy, and varied to meet the wants, to suit the prejudices, and to foster the interests of the majority.

The exclusive right of the several States to regulate the exercise of the elective franchise and to prescribe the qualifications of voters was never questioned.

Mr. President, Judge Cooley continues:

The right to vote is not of necessity connected with citizenship. The rights of the citizens are rights, such as liberty of person and of conscience, the right to acquire and possess property, all of which are distinguishable from the political privilege of suffrage.

Senators will notice that Judge Cooley there departs from the use of the word right and uses the word privilege; not even conceding that there is any right to suffrage; that it is a privilege conferred by government, and under our federal system conferred by the States.

The history of the country shows that there is no foundation in fact for the view that the right of suffrage is one of the privileges or immunities of citizens.

Judge Cooley makes that very definite and very clear. As I have said before, in opposing the anti-poll-tax measure, we who oppose it are fighting for the protection of the rights of the States, for the protection of the foundation stones of the States, for the protection of the very basis upon which the States stand, as the Senator from Mississippi has so well said.

We are also fighting to save, as was indicated by the decision of the courts and the statement of Judge Cooley, to preserve our dual form of government, and to preserve the American Republic.

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

Mr. HILL. I yield.

Mr. EASTLAND. I am sure the Senator realizes that when Hitler took over Germany, before he could clamp his iron hand of dictatorship upon that country he had to destroy the federal system of Germany.

Mr. HILL. That is the first thing he did. He destroyed the federal system.

Mr. EASTLAND. That federal system was the protector of the liberties of the people of Germany, and it is the protector of the liberties of the people of this country.

Mr. HILL. Yes.

Mr. EASTLAND. The Senator realizes that what is proposed would be one more step down that road from which there is no return, to destroy the liberties of the people of this country; that is what is at issue. It is an attempt to destroy the rights of the people in their own community to determine their own affairs, which is the very basis of American liberty.

Mr. HILL. Once we destroy the federal system in this country, as Hitler destroyed the federal system in Germany, the next step, as lawyers say, a fortiori, is the destruction of the rights and liberties of the people.

Mr. EASTLAND. I am sure the Senator realizes that what we are asked to adopt here is a Hitler-type measure.

Mr. HILL. It is certainly a measure looking toward the destruction of our federal system. With the destruction of that system there would inevitably come the destruction of the rights and the liberties of the people of the United States.

In the very beginning, article 1, section 2, vested in the State governments the power over suffrage. Without the possession of this power in the States, the whole structure upon which the division of State and National authority under the Constitution and the organization of both governments rests would be without support, and the authority of both State and Nation would fall to the ground. Surely, after more than 170 years of the tried and proven wisdom, of the tried and proven effectiveness of this section, it is most unfortunate that now this question, which strikes at the very foundation stones of our dual system of government and which would tear down the very structure of our Government, should be injected into the Senate of the United States. The matter should be laid aside and no further consideration given to such a fundamental proposal striking at the very base of the temple of American rights and American freedom.

The poll tax is rapidly losing favor throughout the United States. Today only five States have such a tax.

I do not see any reason why Alabama or the other remaining States which have a poll tax should abolish it before the people of the States have come to the conclusion, without pressure or harassment, that the tax is undesirable or impractical. Meanwhile, I should like to remind my colleagues of the Senate that the poll tax has a long and quite respectable history, that it was supported by England's greatest liberal, John Stuart Mill, and that Judge Thomas M. Cooley, in his work on constitutional law, said:

Many of the States admit no one to the privilege of suffrage unless he is a taxpayer.

To require the payment of a capitation (poll) tax is no denial of suffrage; it is demanding only the preliminary performance of public duty, and may be classed, as may also presence at the polls, with registration, or the observance of any other preliminary to insure fairness and protect against fraud.

In fact, but for the fact that the poll tax provides some revenue for our schools, a revenue which is greatly needed today, the poll tax can really be regarded as academic. Whether we have it or do not have it cannot materially affect the economic situation of any State of the Union.

I suggest, Mr. President, that making this academic issue the subject of a measure constitutes yet another step in the headlong and heedless rush, as the Senator from Mississippi has said, to further diminish the sovereignty of the States.

In this connection let me recall to the Senate what Andrew Jackson, that indomitable character, that great tribune, said in his farewell address:

My experience in public concerns and the observations of a life somewhat advanced confirm opinions long since imbibed by me, that the destruction of our State governments or the annihilation of their control over the local concerns of the people would lead directly to revolution and anarchy and finally to despotism and military domination.

In discussing the necessity for the unity of the United States—and surely if there ever was a time in the history of our country when we needed unity, when we needed our people to be unified, it is today—Andrew Jackson had this to say:

But the Constitution cannot be maintained, nor the Union preserved, in opposition to public feeling, by the mere exertion of the coercive powers confided to the General Government. The foundations must be laid in the fraternal attachments which the citizens of the several States bear to one another, as members of one political family, mutually contributing to promote the happiness of each other.

Hence the citizens of every State should studiously avoid everything calculated to wound the sensibility or offend the just pride of the people of the other States. And they should frown upon any proceedings within their own borders likely to disturb the tranquillity of their political brethren in other portions of the Union. In a country so extensive as the United States, and with pursuits so varied, the internal regulations of the several States must frequently differ from one another in important particulars; and this difference is unavoidably increased by the varying principles upon which the American Colonies were originally planted; principles which had taken deep root in their social relations before the Revolution, and, therefore, of necessity, influencing their policy since they became free and independent States. But each State has the unquestionable right to regulate its own internal concerns according to its own pleasure; and while it does not interfere with the rights of the people of other States, or the rights of the Union, every State must be the sole judge of the measures proper to secure the safety of its citizens and promote their happiness and all efforts on the part of the people of other States to cast odium upon their institutions, and all measures calculated to disturb their rights of property, or put in jeopardy their peace and internal tranquillity, are in direct opposition to the spirit in which the Union was formed and must endanger its safety.

Motives of philanthropy may be assigned for this unwarrantable interference; and weak men may persuade themselves for a moment that they are laboring in the cause of humanity; and asserting the rights of the human race; but everyone, upon sober reflections, will see that nothing but mischief can come from these improper assaults upon the feelings and rights of others.

Rest assured that the men found busy in this work of discord are not worthy of your confidence and deserve your strongest reprobation.

It is well known that there have been those among us who wish to enlarge the powers of the General Government and experience would seem to indicate that there is a tendency on the part of this Government to overstep the boundaries marked out for it by the Constitution. Its legitimate authority is abundantly sufficient for all the purposes for which it was created, and its purposes and powers being expressly enumerated, there can be no justification for claiming anything beyond them.

Every attempt to exercise power beyond these limits should be promptly and firmly opposed. For one evil example will lead to other measures still more mischievous; and if the principle of constructive powers, or supposed advantage, or temporary circumstances shall ever be permitted to justify the assumption of a power not given by the Constitution, the General Government will before long absorb all the powers of legislation, and you will have in effect, but one consolidated Government.

From the extent of our country, its diversified interests, different pursuits and different habits, it is too obvious for argument that a single consolidated government would be wholly inadequate to watch over and protect its interests; and every friend of our free institutions should be always prepared to maintain unimpaired and in full vigor the rights and sovereignty of the States, and to confine the action of the General Government strictly to the sphere of its appropriate duties.

Mr. President, at this time let me point out to the Senate that a later President, a great scholar and teacher of our system of government, also expressed thoughts that we can ignore only at our peril. Woodrow Wilson said:

It is difficult to discuss so critical and fundamental a question calmly and without party heat or bias when it has come once more, as it has now, to an acute stage. Just because it lies at the heart of our constitutional system, to decide it wrongly is to alter the whole structure of our Government, for good or for evil, and one would wish never to see the passion of party touch it to distort it. A sobering sense of responsibility should fall upon everyone who handles it. No man should argue it this way or that for party advantage. Desire to bring the impartial truth to light must, in such a case, be the first dictate alike of true statesmanship and of true patriotism. Every man should seek to think of it and to speak of it in the true spirit of the founders of the Government and of all those who have spent their lives in the effort to confirm its just principles both in counsel and in action.

The principle of the division of powers between State and Federal Governments is a very simple one when stated in the most general terms. It is that the legislatures of the States shall have control of all the general subject matter of law, of private rights of every kind, of local interests, and of everything that directly concerns their people as communities—free choice wtih regard to all matters of local regulation and development.

Woodrow Wilson said we tend to think of our American political system as distinguished by its central structure—its President and Congress and courts set up by the Constitution—but "as a matter of fact, it is distinguished by its local structure, by the extreme vitality of its parts. It would be an impossibility without its division of powers."

He also said:

From the first America has been a nation in the making. It has come to maturity by the stimulation of no central force or guidance, but by the aboundingly helf-helping, self-sufficient energy in its parts, which severally brought themselves into existence and added themselves to the Union, pleasing first of all themselves in the framing of their laws and constitutions, not asking leave to exist and constitute themselves, but existing first and asking leave afterward, self-originated, self-constituted, self-confident, self-sustaining veritable communities, demanding only recognition. Communities develop not by external but by internal forces. Else they do not live at all. Our Commonwealths have not come into existence by invitation, like plants in a tended garden; they have sprung up of themselves, irrepressible, a sturdy, spontaneous product of the nature of men nurtured in a free air.

It is this spontaneity and variety, this independent and irrepressible life of its communities, that has given our system its extraordinary elasticity, which has preserved it from the paralysis which has sooner or later fallen upon every people who have looked to their Central Government to patronize and nurture them.

Let us also pay very close attention, Mr. President, to the following words of the late President Wilson:

The remedy for ill-considered legislation by the States, the remedy alike for neglect and mistake on the part of their several governments, lies not outside the States, but within them. The mistakes which they themselves correct will sink deeper into the consciousness of their people than the mistakes which Congress may rush in to correct for them, thrusting upon them what they have not learned to desire. They will either themselves learn their mistakes, by such intimate and domestic processes as will penetrate very deep and abide with them in convincing force, or else they will prove that what might have been a mistake for other States or regions of the country was no mistake for them, and the country will have been saved its wholesome variety. In no case will their failure to correct their own measures prove that the Federal Government might have forced wisdom upon them.

Wilson concluded his statement with this assertion:

We are certified by all political history of the fact that centralization is not vitalization. Moralization is by life, not by statute, by the interior impulse and experience of communities, not by fostering legislation which is merely the abstraction of an experience which may belong to a nation as a whole or to many parts of it without having yet touched the thought of the rest anywhere to the quick. The object of our federal system is to bring the understandings of constitutional government home to the people of every part of the Nation, to make them part of their consciousness as they go about their tasks. If we cannot successfully effect its adjustments by the nice local adaptations of our older practice, we have failed as constitutional statesmen.

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

Mr. HILL. I yield to the Senator from Mississippi.

Mr. EASTLAND. I congratulate the distinguished Senator from Alabama. I have been in the Senate for nearly 20 years. Every year or two a poll tax question has been under debate in the Senate. I have heard many speeches on the subject, and I think the distinguished Senator from Alabama has made the most logical, most profound, and most statesmanlike speech that I have ever heard on this question. He has gone to the very vitals of the issue, and I will say that he has made the best argument on this question that has ever been delivered on the floor of the Senate.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I wish to express my deep appreciation and heartfelt thanks to the Senator from Mississippi. Surely, if there is any one man who has given of himself, his time, his thoughts, and his efforts to protect our States on such measures as is now proposed against us, to protect the rights of our States, and to preserve the liberties of our people, it is the distinguished Senator from Mississippi. Surely no man could speak from greater devotion or with greater authority than does the Senator from Mississippi in the protection of our States in their rights and the protection of our people in their liberties.

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

Mr. HILL. I yield to the Senator from Mississippi.

Mr. EASTLAND. I thank the distinguished Senator from Alabama. I am very sincere in what I say about the Senator's speech. I think all Americans including all the people of the South, are indebted for the very fine and able speech which the distinguished Senator from Alabama has made today.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, may I again express my heartfelt appreciation to the Senator from Mississippi and tell him how grateful I am to him for his words.

I have been quoting from Andrew Jackson and Woodrow Wilson.

Still closer to our time, Franklin D. Roosevelt, while Governor of New York, had the following to say on the proper relationship between the States and the Federal Government:

> Fortunately for the stability of our Nation it was already apparent (when the Constitution was adopted) that the vastness of our territory presented wide geographical and climatic differences which gave to the States wide differences in the nature of their industry, their agriculture, and their commerce. * * * Thus, already, it was clear to the framers of our Constitution that the greatest possible liberty of self-government must be given to each State, and that any national administration attempting to make all laws for the whole Nation, such as was wholly practical in Great Britain, would inevitably result at some future time in a dissolution of the Union itself.
>
> The preservation of this home rule by the States is not a cry of jealous Commonwealths seeking their own aggrandizement at the expense of sister States. It is a fundamental necessity if we are to remain a truly united country.
>
> The whole success of our democracy has not been that it is a democracy wherein the will of a bare majority of the total inhabitants is imposed upon the minority, but because it has been a democracy where through a division of government into units called States the rights and interests of the minorities have been respected and have been given a voice in the control of our affairs.
>
> To bring about government by oligarchy masquerading as democracy it is fundamentally essential that practically all authority and control be centralized in our National Government. The individual sovereignty of our States must be destroyed, except in mere minor matters of legislation. We are safe from the danger of any such departure from the principles on which this country was founded just so long as the individual home rule of the States is scrupulously preserved and fought for whenever they seem in danger.

I have been quoting Franklin D. Roosevelt. After outlining the rights granted by the Constitution to the Federal Government, he said:

> As the individual is protected from possible oppression by his neighbors, so the smallest political unit—the town is in theory at least, allowed to manage its own affairs, secure from undue interference by the larger unit of the country, which in turn is protected from mischievous meddling by the State. The whole spirit and intent of the Constitution is to carry this great principle into the relations between the National Government and the governments of the States.
>
> Let us remember that from the very beginning, differences in climate, soil, conditions, habits and mode of living in States separated by thousands of miles rendered it necessary to give the fullest individual latitude to the individual States. Remembering that the mining States of the Rockies, the fertile savannas of the South, the prairies of the West, and the rocky soil of the New England States created many problems, introduced many factors in each locality, which have no existence in others, it is obvious that almost every new or old problem of government must be solved, if it is to be solved to the satisfaction of the people of the whole country, by each State in its own way.

As I have said, when the Founding Fathers gave up a portion of the sovereignty of the States to the Federal Government, they did so with a great deal of trepidation, and they did so only with the firm conviction that it was unity alone—unity of purpose, unity of resolve, and unity in their mutual dedication to human liberty, that unity about which Andrew Jackson spoke in his farewell address—that could enable the people of our country to long endure and abound in the joy of the priceless legacy which a heroic young Nation had won at the cost of much sacrifice and loss of life.

At this momentous hour in the history of America and of the world, the objective for which we must strive with all of our fervor and determination is unity.

Let us be done, Senators, with this measure before us, which can only distract and misguide our people, which separates and divides us, and which opens the way for the destruction of fundamental rights of the States and the fundamental rights of the people of all the United States.

Let us stand united, strong, and resolute in our unity; let us support squarely the rights of the people of the United States and the rights of the States of the United States, that our Government may be preserved. Let us stand squarely upon the Constitution of the United States—rock of freedom, ageless and enduring foundation of our rights, our hopes, and our democratic faith.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Bartlett, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 8723) to amend the Welfare and Pension Plans Disclosure Act with respect to the method of enforcement and to provide certain additional sanctions, and for other purposes.

WELFARE AND PENSION PLANS DISCLOSURE ACT—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. McNAMARA. Mr. President, I submit a report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill, H.R. 8723, to amend the Welfare and Pension Plans Disclosure Act with respect to the method of enforcement and to provide certain additional sanctions, and for other purposes. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the report.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The report will be read for the information of the Senate.

The legislative clerk read the report. (For conference report, see House proceedings of today.)

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the report?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the report.

Mr. McNAMARA. Mr. President, there were several substantive differences between the House and Senate versions of this bill. Of major importance was the differing coverage of the bills. Senators will recall that the Senate bill exempted small plans, those with 100 or less participants, from the annual reporting requirements. This Senate provision removed much of the administrative burden of this act from both the Department of Labor and the administrators of small plans. Fully 50 percent of the plans would be exempted from the annual paperwork required by this act—yet these plans covered only 8 percent of the employees.

The House version did not contain such a provision. I am happy to report to the Senate that the Senate version was adopted by the conferees.

Another major difference between the two bills related to bonding requirements. Under the Senate bill the Secretary was empowered by regulation to establish a schedule of bonds which required a minimum bond of 10 percent of the funds handled, with no ceiling established.

The House version provided for a self-enforcing bond of at least 10 percent of the funds handled, with a ceiling of $500,000. However, a proviso empowered the Secretary to raise that ceiling after

due notice and hearing. It was not clear whether any percentage ceiling applied to such larger bonds.

The Senate accepted the House language, with an amendment that placed a ceiling of 10 percent of the funds handled on bonds over $500,000. Thus the Secretary, by regulation, or on a case-by-case procedure, can require a bond larger than $500,000, but in no case shall it exceed 10 percent of the funds handled. A plan with assets of $10 million—under the flat rule of thumb of 10 percent—would be required to carry a $1 million bond. But the bill establishes a ceiling of $500,000, absent action by the Secretary. The conference report would permit the Secretary to set a bond for such a plan that could be in any amount between $500,000 and $1 million.

Both House and Senate versions permitted the Secretary to waive the bonding requirements of the act under certain conditions. The House bill would have permitted such a waiver when a plan administrator furnished evidence of financial responsibility adequate to assure protection of the beneficiaries and participants. The Senate provision permitted such a waiver only where other Federal or State bonding requirements were adequate for the protection of the participants and beneficiaries.

The compromise adopted by the conference permits the Secretary to waive the bonding requirements where an administrator offers adequate evidence of financial responsibility of the plan, or when the Secretary believes that other bonding arrangements provide adequate protection for the protection of beneficiaries.

This would enable the Secretary to accept bonding arrangements underwritten by a group of individual underwriters of good reputation admitted to provide such surety in a State of the United States—even though this group of individual underwriters is not certified by the Secretary of the Treasury pursuant to the act of July 30, 1947 (6 U.S.C. 6–13).

Under this new section 13(e), the Secretary would also be empowered to accept, in lieu of the bond requirements of section 13(a), irrevocable escrow arrangements which are most usually represented in commercial practice by the putting up of a cash bond.

There was one other major difference between the two versions. That related to the House provision which, in effect, barred Labor Department employees from participating in the enforcement and administration of this act if they were a member of a union which was affiliated with a parent federation which admitted other than Government employees to membership.

This provision was unacceptable to the Senate conferees for several reasons. First, it was a direct negation of the recent Presidential order which granted Federal employees the right to choose an employee organization. Second, the thrust of the provision would have been to favor an existing independent employees union over other unions which were affiliated with a parent group. Third, while the alleged purpose of the House provision was the prevention of a conflict of interest, there was nothing in the language of the House bill to guarantee that such a conflict of interest would not exist.

Since the majority of the conferees from both Houses agreed that the purpose of the House language was to prevent a conflict of interest and was not to favor one union over another, compromise language was adopted which, as section 15(b), reads as follows:

> No employee of the Department of Labor shall administer or enforce this act with respect to any employee organization of which he is a member or employer organization in which he has an interest.

This language makes clear that no employee can participate in the administration or enforcement of this act where it involves directly an employee organization of which he is a member or an employer organization in which he has an interest. However, it also makes clear that membership in any employee organization or any employer organization is not, per se, a conflict of interest that would bar employment. Certainly, a union member should not work on the plan which is submitted on behalf of members of that union, nor should a Department employee who has vested rights in a pension plan of a company be permitted to work on that plan.

The majority of conferees on both sides felt that the new language would provide the desired protection against a conflict of interest in the administration of the new act.

I move that the conference report be agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Michigan.

The motion was agreed to.

COSPONSOR OF SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 58

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I am happy to announce that the distinguished junior Senator from Arizona [Mr. GOLDWATER] has just asked that his name be added as one of the cosponsors of Senate Joint Resolution 58, which is the anti-poll-tax amendment, making 68 cosponsors. I ask that his request be shown of record, and also that his name be shown upon any reprints of the amendment that may be made.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

THE LIBERAL PAPERS

Mr. MORTON. Mr. President, I understand that tomorrow, March 16, Doubleday & Co. will publish a series of 12 essays on foreign policy, entitled "The Liberal Papers." With an introduction by Representative JAMES ROOSEVELT, the assays are part of a series prepared by consultants to the congressional Liberal project.

The Liberal project was formed in 1959 by a group of House Democrats. Active membership in the project centered around 12 Members of the House of Representatives. The active 12, as reported in the New York Times of May 23, 1960, were: Robert W. Kastenmeier, of Wisconsin, chairman; James Roosevelt, George A. Kasem, and George P. Miller, of California; Charles O. Porter, of Oregon; Frank Thompson, of New Jersey; Byron Johnson, of Colorado; Leonard G. Wolf, of Iowa; William S. Moorhead, of Pennsylvania; James G. O'Hare, of Michigan; William H. Meyer, of Vermont; and Henry S. Reuss, of Wisconsin.

The Liberal Papers suggest, however, that 23 other Democratic Members of the House of Representatives, including Chester Bowles, were close to the Liberal project, and constituted a group far to the left of well-known Democratic Senators such as HUMPHREY.

Of the 12 project members, 5 were defeated in 1960. Three of the five hold Government positions: Wolf, with the Agency for International Development—AID—as a food program officer in Rio de Janeiro; Johnson, with AID, as special assistant to the Assistant Administrator for the Bureau of Latin American Affairs; Meyer, as a consultant to the Department of the Interior. Kasem and Porter are seeking reelection to the House, and Meyer has entered the Vermont senatorial race.

Forty scholars, scientists, and foreign-policy experts were consultants to the Liberal project. The 12 selections in the book are papers prepared by some of the consultants. I list 13 quotations taken from 8 of the chapters of "The Liberal Papers":

Quotation 1:

> But as the cold war continues, it becomes increasingly difficult for decent Americans, humane enough to prefer peace to an egocentric national honor to be outspokenly and genuinely anti-Communist (p. 30).

Quotation 2:

> From the Western point of view, West Berlin is of no particular value, except that the West has incurred a moral liability to protect its 2,250,000 inhabitants from being overrun by communism. Strategically, the Western position is untenable. Economically, it is unprofitable (p. 66).

Quotation 3:

> We believe that the time has come when the United States should liberalize its restrictive trade policy vis-a-vis the Soviet Union (p. 75).

Quotation 4:

> Even if it is by no means certain that the Peking regime would welcome the establishment of diplomatic relations with the United States, this should not stand in the way of our making the attempt to open the channels of negotiation (p. 76).

Quotation 5:

> The United States should tackle directly with Peking the disputes over Taiwan (and the Pescadores) and over the Chinese offshore islands. The United States should begin by recognizing Peking's unquestionably valid claim to the offshore islands (perhaps subject to final determination by the International Court of Justice) in exchange for Peking's agreement to permit the unmolested evacuation of the Chinese Nationalist garrisons (p. 78).
>
> Taiwan and the Pescadores be placed for at least 5 years under U.N. administration (the People's Republic of China having previously become a member nation); the is-

lands be neutralized and demilitarized, the native population of Taiwan and the Pescadores be permitted to decide by plebiscite whether they wish to become part of mainland China (p. 78).

Quotation 6:

Our immediate recommendation to the Congress is that it abandon the present half-baked arrangement called civil defense, rather than go further into a program that would end in costing hundreds of billions, destroying liberty and failing in its purpose anyway (p. 148).

Quotation 7:

Atomic testing is not vital to American military security because it involves only a marginal addition to firepower and no addition at all to delivery capability (p. 152).

Quotation 8:

Most Americans are filled with the basically irrational conviction that the only way to avoid military conflict with the Communist world is to prepare for it. Everything becomes channeled into this one overwhelming polarity of good and evil—Cuba is seen as a Communist outpost (when there is probably nothing more Communist about Castro Cuba than there is democratic about Franco Spain) (p. 192).

Quotation 9:

The DEW line will be made bidirectional, and we invite the Soviets to plug in. If we have no intention of surprise attack, there is no reason why this shouldn't be done (p. 203).

Quotation 10:

Recognition of Communist China on our own initiative likewise would have psychological impact far beyond its military significance (p. 217).

Quotation 11:

Nor should we refuse aid to Communist countries, if aid is requested. We are already giving aid to Communist countries in Eastern Europe—Poland and Yugoslavia. The eventuality of undiluted Communist regimes is not at present anticipated in southeast Asia. However, the United States might make a powerful impression on countries in this area by declaring that it would be ready to give aid to Communist China, which now relies almost exclusively on financial and technological aid from the Soviet bloc, once Peiping has been admitted to represent China in the United Nations (pp. 261–262).

Question 12:

True, Chinese Communist troops killed Indian border guards and occupied portions of the Burmese frontier. But, qualitatively as well as quantitatively, these deserve the classical term of "incidents." In both cases the location of the frontier was in historic dispute. In both cases local threats to Chinese Communist security were not susceptible to control by the neighboring regime. Had Tibet not erupted in revolt, no shooting might have occurred between Indians and Chinese. Instead, Peiping probably would have continued to press quietly for its interpretation of the frontier (p. 298).

Question 13:

Recognition by the United States and admission to the United Nations of Communist China, both Germanys, both Koreas, and both Vietnams would seem necessary for effective armament inspection and for stabilization of international relations in Central Europe and the Far East. Self-determination for Taiwan and Berlin and incorporation in mainland China of the offshore islands of Matsu and Quemoy should be provided for, and the way should be left open for eventual union of the now divided states by negotiation between their governments (p. 328).

Mr. President, I am not concerned with the impact that this book may have on U.S. public opinion or on the direction or implementation of U.S. foreign policy. Those who wrote the papers, many of them scholars with nationwide academic reputations, have every right to publish their views. I am sure they are sincere and I do not question their motives. I personally disagree with most of the suggestions contained in "The Liberal Papers." I consider the suggestions naive in the extreme. "The Liberal Papers" might well be renamed "Our American Munich."

What does concern me is the impact that this book may have abroad because of its sponsorship by a group of prominent Democratic Congressmen. I am sure that the propaganda boys in Russia, in China, and in Cuba will quote from it very generously. They will certainly in each instance point to the sponsorship, and this in itself can increase our difficulties both with our own allies and at the conference table in Geneva and elsewhere. It could well cause many to question the intent and the purpose and the steadfastness of U.S. policy.

In many lands people do not fully understand our constitutional system with its separation of powers. When a Member of Congress in this country speaks out, it is often interpreted overseas as an indication of U.S. policy or intent. Now we have a group of Democratic Members of Congress in this time of a Democratic administration jointly sponsoring this series of essays.

I think it most unfortunate that this should happen at this particular time. It is bound to further complicate the difficulties that President Kennedy and Secretary Rusk face in Germany and Geneva, in Vietnam, in Cuba and in Africa and elsewhere. I hope, Mr. President, that we will let the world know that the content of "The Liberal Papers" does not represent the thinking of the vast majority of the Congress, Democrats or Republicans.

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

Mr. MORTON. I yield.

Mr. GOLDWATER. I would like to comment briefly on the remarks of my distinguished colleague from Kentucky concerning the publication tomorrow by Doubleday & Co. of a book entitled "The Liberal Papers."

I have not seen an advance copy of this publication. I have only seen excerpts. I understand the Senator from Kentucky has a copy. I did not know it was available.

I think the people who have published this book are to be thanked by freedom-loving Americans.

Those of us who are conservative in both parties have been maintaining for years that there is at work in this country a subversive force. I like to think of it not as a planned subversive force, but as a subversion that has been created by ignorance more than anything else, a subversion that is dedicated to innuendo, to half-truths, concerning what the United States should be doing.

I hope that every American will read this book, so that he can fully understand what we in Washington who are dedicated to victory for our way of life are confronted with today.

I shall not bore my colleagues from reading much from the report I have, but I am interested in what is called chapter 2, "A Reexamination of American Foreign Policy," by James Warburg. He says:

From the Western point of view, West Berlin is of no particular value, except that the West has incurred a moral liability to protect its 2,250,000 inhabitants from being overrun by communism.

Mr. President, if there is any force stronger than the moral force in this world, I have never heard of it. When a writer like Mr. James Warburg says the only liability we have is a moral liability, I do not know what could be a greater liability than a moral liability.

This is indicative of the thinking of some people in this town and elsewhere who are dedicated to the idea that somehow we can coexist with communism in this world. This is typical of statements I have found in the brief outline of the book I have had before me.

Mr. President, the distinguished Senator from Kentucky referred to these people as being naive. I hope that is all we wind up calling them—naive. I cannot understand this naivete which is willing to back the United States and its freedoms into a corner out of which we can escape only by an all-out nuclear war.

Mr. President, I suggest that there is only one way this world can enter the holocaust which many people fear, and that is by following the admonitions of these people who have prepared the Liberal Papers, who in effect keep saying, "Keep giving in. Keep yielding. Don't oppose the Communists. Don't make them angry."

Mr. President, all the patriotic people in this country who believe in winning, who believe in victory, who believe there is nothing wrong with telling the Communists in this world they are not going to bury us but that we are going to win over them, will not be destroyed. These patriotic people—even though some liberals in their naivete think they are not the majority—I can assure the Senate constitute the dominant majority of the American people. If the time comes that there is no action to save our freedom other than to instigate an all-out nuclear war, my feeling is that is the time when nuclear war will come.

I think we have been living, in the last month or month and a half, under an example of the so-called naivete. I refer to the investigation by the Subcommittee on Preparedness of the Committee on Armed Services of this body which has been investigating so-called censorship of the military. It is not the fact that censorship is going on which is the problem. I think all of us agree that written speeches should be carefully gone over to make sure that classified material is not inadvertently released.

The thing which concerns me—and I assure my colleagues it concerns the American people—is not the censoring

out of classified material but instead the absolute, complete consistency of striking out words which might be offensive to our enemy, communism; words like "communism," "Communist," "war," "victory," "winning." These are some words that have been stricken.

Mr. President, I think when we have an opportunity to read the new book, "The Liberal Papers," we will get part of the answer as to who these people are, as to who compose this clique which is able to control the decisions of the Defense Department and to control to a great extent the decisions of the President of the United States, to the end that we have yet to hear a public pronouncement that we are going to win over communism in this ideological world struggle in which we are engaged.

I am glad that Doubleday & Co. are publishing these papers. I hope every American will read them, so that all Americans can gain some understanding of what the people in this country must contend with. We are firmly convinced we can defeat communism, but we cannot do it quickly when we are confronted with a clique like this, obviously dedicated to living with an enemy which has announced its intention to destroy us.

PROPOSED UNITED NATIONS BOND ISSUE

Mr. AIKEN obtained the floor.

Mr. MORTON. Madam President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. AIKEN. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that I may yield to the Senator from Kentucky, so that he may suggest the absence of a quorum, without losing my right to the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mrs. NEUBERGER in the chair). Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Vermont? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. MORTON. Madam President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. AIKEN. Madam President, earlier today there was presented to the Senate for printing in the RECORD a column which appeared in the Washington Post, written by Walter Lippmann.

Ordinarily, I do not criticize the work of a columnist, even though it may contain errors of fact. I realize that the people who write daily columns are continually up against deadlines or are not in a position to ascertain the facts as they may appear from different viewpoints.

However, in this morning's Washington Post, there appears a column by Walter Lippmann which is so full of erroneous inferences and misstatements of fact that I feel it must be corrected here on the floor.

I would not undertake to do this except that Mr. Lippmann's close association with the White House may lead many people to believe that he is representing the President in his expression of views.

Incidentally, Mr. Lippmann, in contrast to several other writers, never made any effort to ascertain the reasons for the position I have taken.

Another reason why I feel that this column should be corrected is that it appears to be the start of a nationwide campaign, planned last week, to foist the United Nations bond issue upon the United States—whether it is the correct thing to do or not.

As I understand it, the plans consummated here in Washington, to be put into effect by professional operators, include the attempt to persuade writers, movie stars, and others to speak their views to Members of Congress, and to inaugurate a nationwide campaign on the Members of Congress. I would not object to the movie stars or others coming on the Hill and lobbying if they had been fully informed by the State Department. I would not object to a woman's club taking a position in favor of the bonds if it had been given full information by the administration, but apparently they are not in possession of full information.

Yesterday and today I received several virtually identical telegrams from different places urging the adoption of the bond proposal.

Members of Congress should be prepared for all kinds of professional pressure to be exerted upon them to secure approval of a proposal which clearly is not in the interest of the United States or the United Nations.

Now, I would like to take Mr. Lippmann's column point by point.

Point No. 1—with this point I can agree:

> This plan was worked out by Americans, it is supported by the U.S. Government, and it has been approved by the General Assembly of the United Nations.

This plan indeed was devised by Americans.

Mr. Klutznick, one of our representatives to the United Nations this year, told me 2 months ago that he was the proud father of the plan.

I see no reason for withholding his name inasmuch as Mr. Lippmann's statement might leave other innocent persons under suspicion.

Point No. 2:

> It now appears that there is danger that it (the bond issue) may be defeated by a coalition of Republicans and southern Democrats.

Southern Democrats are amply able to defend themselves against this charge.

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

Mr. AIKEN. I yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. On behalf of some of his friends from the South, I wish to thank the distinguished Senator from Vermont.

Mr. AIKEN. I have a little more to say.

I have referred before to President Kennedy's statement of January 30 that "failure to act (on the bond issue) would serve the interests of the Soviet Union."

I have voted against my southern colleagues many times but never once have I questioned their loyalty to the United States.

Point No. 3:

> Senators AIKEN and HICKENLOOPER, have been and profess still to be friends of the United Nations. But it is no exaggeration to say that if they prevail, they will have struck a dangerous blow at the United Nations.

This statement coincides with a statement of the President as reported in the Washington Post of March 14, 1962:

> The bond issue has become the symbol and substance of support of the United Nations by its members.

Any statements of this kind are absolutely false.

If the time has come when there can be no honest disagreement with the administration's plans without being branded as subversive, then it is time to ask what has become of our democracy.

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

Mr. AIKEN. I will not yield at this time. I wish to complete my statement; then I will be glad to yield.

Point No. 4:

> To understand why this is so, we must remember that the U.N. is in financial trouble solely because it is conducting two operations—the one on the frontier between Egypt and Israel, and the other in the Congo. Apart from them, the U.N. is solvent.
>
> The deficit arising from Palestine and the Congo is caused by the fact that two of the great powers, the Soviet Union and France, and a number of the smaller powers such as the Arab States, Portugal, South Africa, and some others are refusing to pay their special assessment for either or both of these operations.

In making this statement, Mr. Lippmann chooses to put the responsibility for United Nations financial difficulties on the Soviet Union, France, the Arab States, Portugal, South Africa, and some other unnamed members of the United Nations for failure to pay their assessments.

The fact is that the United Nations is short of cash because as of February 16, 1962, not just a few nations but 72 nations had failed to pay their assessments for the UNEF, or the Holy Land operations, and 74 nations had not paid their assessments toward the cost of the Congo.

Why should he attempt to put this responsibility on a few nations which apparently do not meet with his approval when 74 nations out of 99 that have been assessed have failed to make their payments?

Point No. 5:

> The crucial difference between the U.N. bond plan and the Aiken-Hickenlooper plan is that the bond plan would compel all members to pay their share of the costs of a peace-keeping operation authorized by the United Nations. The Aiken-Hickenlooper loan project cannot deal with this question of making every member pay for these special operations.

This statement is completely false.

The United Nations can make assessments for the purpose of paying off U.S.

loans just as legally as it can make assessments for servicing a bond issue.

Point No. 6:

In the bond plan the interest and amortization charges would be covered in the regular budget, and a member who refused to pay its share for 2 years would be punishable by losing its right to vote.

The fact is that while any member of the United Nations being in arrears 2 years on its dues is subject to loss of its vote, it is not subject to loss of membership in the General Assembly, and, if a permanent member of the Security Council, as are Russia and France, it is not subject to loss of its place on the Security Council and is not subject to loss of its veto power.

Furthermore, the General Assembly can permit a nonpaying member to vote even though it may be 2 years in arrears on its assessments.

With well over two-thirds of the membership failing to pay their assessments, is anyone so naive as to believe that the General Assembly would agree to deprive one of its members of the voting privilege when so many others are in the same boat?

Point No. 7:

Because the interest and amortization charges would be spread out over 25 years, the smaller, poorer members though paying their share, would not have to pay large amounts. We cannot be sure that the big members, the Soviet Union, France, the Arab States, and Belgium, would pay their share. But it would be a brazen defiance of the United Nations if they did not do so, and very embarrassing for them.

It has been my contention all along that if the International Court of Justice at The Hague finds assessments for the UNEF and Congo binding, these nations would pay and, if they pay, the arguments for a bond issue disappear.

Point No. 8:

The Aiken-Hickenlooper loan plan would do none of these things. The fact is that the U.N. has no legal right to accept such a loan, and it is extremely improbable that a special session of the General Assembly, which would have to be called in order to accept a loan, would in fact approve it.

Before our officials realized the weakness of their position in advocating bonds, they sat in my office across from my desk and assured me that the United Nations does have the right to accept loans, under a resolution approved in late 1960. It was only a week ago that they decided that they did not have this right.

However, if they now insist they do not have the right, it would be a matter of only a short time to reconvene the General Assembly, as virtually all members have permanent representatives that could be called on short notice.

This argument of Mr. Lippmann's is specious and is part and parcel of an effort to beat the United States into submission.

Point No. 9:

What is certain is that such a special session would reopen every crisis which was quieted down last autumn and the United States would find itself at the storm center of a new crisis.

No new crisis could be considered unless two-thirds of the membership of the General Assembly desired it. The General Assembly has already had one suspended session only last month.

There is no reason it cannot meet again, if necessary.

Point No. 10:

We would have to explain why the General Assembly should revoke its own decision of a few months ago, a decision we ourselves promoted, and why in order to please the Republican minority in Congress, the General Assembly should vote to overrule the recommendations of the President of the United States.

The United Nations General Assembly, in approving the issuance of $200 million worth of bonds, did not bind the United States to purchase the lion's share of this amount.

The U.S. representatives in the United Nations had no authority whatsoever to bind the United States to make these purchases.

At the time the President recommended that Congress approve these purchases, the State Department did not even have a financial statement from the United Nations, and it was not until January 31, 1962, that the Congress was able to get any kind of financial statement, and then one which was admittedly incorrect.

Point No. 11:

And if by some strange chance the U.N. accepted the loan, it would probably not be repaid.

This is a most disparaging statement about the United Nations.

I have more faith in the United Nations than Mr. Lippmann has, and I believe that if the United Nations should accept a temporary loan from the United States, or any other country, it would do so with the intention of repaying that loan, or at least renewing it if it could not be paid in full when due. This statement contradicts the earlier statement by Mr. Lippmann in the article, namely:

We cannot be sure that the big members, the Soviet Union, France, the Arab States and Belgium, would pay their share. But it would be a brazen defiance of the United Nations if they did not do so, and very embarrassing for them.

Evidently, Mr. Lippmann has little faith that the International Court of Justice will make a finding that assessments are compulsory, but he expresses the fact that these big countries under one condition would pay their assessments, but would not pay assessments for the purpose of meeting a temporary loan.

Point No. 12:

It is in fact almost impossible to make any sense at all out of the Aiken-Hickenlooper amendment to the very much improved bill voted by the Senate Foreign Relations Committee.

It is interesting to learn that Mr. Lippmann regards the committee amendments to the bond bill as greatly improving it.

These amendments provide that U.S. purchases above $25 million must be matched by other states and also that the United States should deduct from its payments to the U.N. each year the amount which would be due our country on the bonds themselves. I did not know that the administration would be pleased with such improvements.

Point No. 13:

It is evident, however, that there are three elements at work in this confused raid on the bond plan.

One, unhappily, seems to be personal disgruntlement about which the less said the better.

The columnist ought to say more about this. Who is personally disgruntled, and why?

Is it President Kennedy? Is it Dean Rusk? How is who disgruntled, and why is he disgruntled? Why does Mr. Lippmann put an intimation in his article that everyone who opposes this idea of mortgaging the United Nations for the next 25 years does so because he is disgruntled?

Mr. MANSFIELD. Madam President, will the Senator from Vermont yield?

Mr. AIKEN. I am about to conclude my statement.

Mr. MANSFIELD. But will the Senator yield?

Mr. AIKEN. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I do not feel that anyone who is opposed to the proposal advanced by the administration or the proposal reported by the Committee on Foreign Relations is either disgruntled, generally speaking, or is politically motivated in his opposition to these plans. I think all of these proposals have been advanced in good faith. I think they are entitled to serious consideration, and I think that that type of consideration has been given to them up to this time. I hope it will continue in the future.

But I, for one, have no idea that these proposals, such as the Aiken-Hickenlooper proposal and others, are advanced on the basis of disgruntlement or are advanced on the idea of achieving political influence or a political coup. I want the distinguished Senator from Vermont to know that so far as I am concerned—and I think I speak for practically every Senator on this side of the aisle—we do not look upon this proposal as being in any way politically motivated, inspired, or oriented; and certainly our views are not a sign of disgruntlement.

Mr. AIKEN. Everyone knows that the Senator from Montana would have nothing whatsoever to do with any unfair insinuations concerning proposals of a temporary loan to the United Nations, that the proponents of the temporary loan have been suggesting to them. We know that the Senator from Montana is a soul of honor; that he would not approve of any underhanded tactics. I only wish we could get this idea over to some of the people who are either in the State Department or are appointed by the State Department, so that they, too, might learn that statesmanship is not built on the questioning of motivation or to some of the pressure methods to which we are now being subjected.

Madam President, I continue to comment on the article:

Point No. 14:

Another is a crude partisanship which is acting on the notion that to defeat what comes from Kennedy is somehow to win a victory.

There, again, we see an effort to put this proposal on a partisan basis. God knows I have not been voting on issues in a partisan enough way to please the leadership of my own party, and I am not taking a position of partisanship at this time. But let me comment on the statement of Mr. Lippmann. I shall read it again:

> Another is a crude partisanship which is acting on the notion that to defeat what comes from Kennedy is somehow to win a victory.

It is my belief that any program which strengthens the United Nations, does away with the double standards which now prevail, and which will insure its continuation as an effective organization would be a victory.

It is also my opinion that for Uncle Sam to be whipped into submission either by representatives of our own Government or by the United Nations itself would be a humiliating disgrace and entirely unworthy of the ideals for which our country has always stood.

Point No. 15:

> A third element, concealed but nonetheless at work, is old-fashioned isolationist hostility to the U.N. as such.

I say to Mr. Lippmann: By making false statements and accusations, you and people who act like you are giving the old-fashioned isolationists the most potent ammunition they have had in the last two decades.

Furthermore, through prejudicial reporting, Mr. Lippmann is doing the conscientious news reports of this Nation a great disservice.

Let me say once more—and I have demonstrated this for 16 years—I believe thoroughly in an effective United Nations, wherein each member expecting and claiming maximum benefits is willing to assume at least a minimum of responsibility.

As I said the other day in the Senate, those members of the United Nations who wish to live under the law should be willing to live by the law. To live and to be effective, however, the United Nations must rid itself of double standards and establish fiscal responsibility in its operations.

Mr. President, I am an American.

I am proud of my country.

I cherish the ideals of freedom and opportunity for which it stands.

Regardless of any insinuations or false accusations that may be made, I will never forget that I am an American and so long as I am a Member of the Senate I will not be swerved from what I consider to be my duty to the United States.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Vermont yield?

Mr. AIKEN. I yield.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I thank the Senator from Vermont for yielding. Unfortunately, I have a commitment that I cannot avoid. I must leave the Chamber at 3 o'clock. I appreciate the Senator's indulgence. I do not wish to get the floor ahead of the Senator from New York, who asked for recognition a moment ago; but if I may be indulged for a moment, I wish to say one thing.

I congratulate the Senator from Vermont for discussing this column, which I read with utter amazement this morning. It was written by a columnist who has worked mightily throughout the years to create on behalf of himself the idea of omniscience, omnipotence, and political punditry, and who, whether he claims it openly or not, does not dodge from the idea that he is very close to the throne at the other end of the avenue, and probably is quite a spokesman for the White House.

I congratulate the Senator from Vermont for taking this article, which is specious in its complete context, and utterly demolishing, step by step, the unfounded and inaccurate allegations which are made in it.

I thoroughly agree with the statement of the Senator from Vermont. I am sure he will have more to say about it next week. I refer to the statement of my dear friend, the majority leader, who said, in response to my question on the floor of the Senate yesterday as to when this issue would come up in the Senate, "It will come up next week—maybe."

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator from Vermont yield briefly?

Mr. AIKEN. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Lest the Senator from Iowa have any idea that I have pulled a neat parliamentary coup, I call his attention to the fact that I had in mind what might happen relative to the poll tax proposal. I had an idea that the debate on it might perhaps last the rest of this week and continue into next week. So I wish to have the RECORD made clear.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. If the Senator from Vermont will yield further, I assure the majority leader that I made no other interpretation of his statement than that he was uncertain as to what the situation in the Senate would be. He thought perhaps the Senate might consider this proposal next week. I realize that other measures are to be considered in the meanwhile. In my experience, the majority leader has never attempted any so-called parliamentary coups or used unfair tactics, so far as either the majority or the minority is concerned. I would not make such a connotation or suggestion at all.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Vermont yield to me?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, as I previously stated, I must leave the Chamber almost immediately.

Mr. AIKEN. I yield to the Senator from Alabama.

Mr. SPARKMAN. If the Senator from Iowa will recall, last Saturday, at luncheon, he spoke to me about bringing up the United Nations bond issue, and told me that he wished I would get in touch with the Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD], the majority leader, because, so the Senator from Iowa said, he was going to have to be away from Washington on Thursday and Friday of this week; and he said the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART] would also have to be away at that time. I told him that I would see the majority leader; and the majority leader knows that I did speak to him and did tell him of that situation, and said that, by all means, before he scheduled this measure for consideration by the Senate, he should take these other matters into consideration.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I think there is some confusion about this matter. I am not objecting at all to bringing up this measure.

However, at this time I must leave, and I cannot pursue the matter further this afternoon. But I said that next week I would have more to say on the subject, and so will the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN], I am sure. If the subject does not come up then, perhaps we shall not have too much to say about it next week, of course.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Of course the Senator realizes that there is other business to be transacted by the Senate.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Of course, and certainly any measures of greater importance than the United Nations bond issue should receive prior consideration. So I shall be glad to cooperate and to go along with the transaction of the business of the Senate; and no roadblocks, either way, will be thrown up by me—not that I could do so if I wished to, but I assure my colleagues that no attempt to do so will be made by me.

Let me say that although I cannot pursue this matter further at this time, I should like to join in further amplification of the exposition of the complete, repeated, and consistent misstatements, miscalculations, and misinterpretations contained in the article by Walter Lippmann. However, I cannot pursue that matter further at this time. But, as I have said, next week or the week after, or whenever this matter comes up for consideration, perhaps we can discuss it in a little greater detail.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I see several Senators on their feet, seeking recognition, and about to ask me to yield to them. I hope their questions will be brief. I shall yield first to the Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS] then to the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] and then to the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] in that order, if I may have consent of the Senate to do so.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. PELL in the chair). Does the Senator from Vermont yield to the Senator from New York?

Mr. AIKEN. I yield.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I shall be brief.

Perhaps I am in a good position to speak in regard to this matter, because no one knows better than does the Senator from Vermont that I do not happen to share his view on this matter, and I do support the position taken by the committee. Therefore, I now state one critically important fact; namely, that in my view the Senator from Vermont is just as sincere in his support of the United Nations as I am or as any other Member of the Senate is; and I join with the Senator from Vermont in expressing great indignation at the entirely unwarranted implications as to his lack of good faith or—of even more importance—as to the lack of sincerity or lack

of depth of feeling on his part about the United Nations. I may differ completely with every one of his arguments as to the merits of the bond issue, but certainly there is no criticism of him in any way.

I am an admirer of Walter Lippmann, but in this area I think he has exceeded himself. I believe it most important for us to pay tribute to the good faith of the Senator from Vermont, for even though I may differ with his views, I realize that it is his duty to put the matter in proper focus, in accordance with his understanding and position.

I believe it would be most unfortunate if the judgment of the Senate in regard to this matter were to be affected—because of the high regard of all Senators for the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN], in which I join—by the critical comments in the article to which reference has been made. It would be most unfortunate if, as a result, the Members of the Senate felt that they were compelled to choose sides, either for or against the Senator from Vermont. Certainly I am for him, and certainly I pay tribute to the good faith and the great sincerity he has demonstrated in the positions he has taken for and in regard to the United Nations.

Finally, Mr. President, in my opinion among the critical issues confronting us are those in relation to the solid financial basis of the United Nations, the question of making reservations, the question of what the President has done in terms of U.S. foreign policy, and the question of obtaining contributions on the part of other nations. So I think the issues involved are quite different from those raised by means of the article to which reference has been made.

I believe it very important that today we assert the deep confidence of all persons like myself and those on the other side of the issue in the sincerity and integrity of the distinguished Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN], and the deep respect, confidence, and trust he holds for the United Nations; and I join in his remarks on that subject.

Mr. AIKEN. I thank the Senator from New York very much; and I join with him in expressing the hope that the decision in regard to whether the United States will purchase $100 million worth of the bonds of the United Nations will be based on the merits of the question, not on any narrow, partisan position. But I could not remain silent when it was asserted that those who oppose the United Nations bond issue are either opposing the United Nations or serving the cause of Russia. However, at this time we have been charged with both of those things.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President——

Mr. AIKEN. I yield to the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MORSE. I thank the Senator from Vermont.

Mr. President, the Senator from Vermont does not need any testimony from me as a character witness, but I welcome the opportunity to testify as a character witness in behalf of the Senator from Vermont.

I served for 3 years with the Senator from Vermont in the 15th General Assembly of the United Nations; and the Senator from Vermont served the United States with great distinction as our delegate on the 5th Committee of the United Nations. The Fifth Committee is the one which has jurisdiction over all the fiscal questions and fiscal problems of the United Nations.

I know of the great work the Senator from Vermont did on the financial problems of the United Nations. I know the great services he rendered our country as time and time again he answered the strategies of the Russians, who in the 15th General Assembly of the United Nations sought to do what they could to weaken the financial position and power of the United Nations. I wish to make this statement by way of preface to my very brief remarks in regard to the very able and, I think, deserved reply made by the Senator from Vermont to the article written by Mr. Lippmann.

Of course, it is not a new experience for me to find myself in somewhat the same position as that in which the Senator from Vermont finds himself today—although in regard to other columnists.

I wish to say that, like the Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS], I have not been convinced by the Senator from Vermont—or, at least, not as yet—in regard to the position he has taken in favor of the making of a loan, in preference to participation in the bond issue. But I certainly wish to say that the clear implications and in some instances, in my opinion, the unfortunate innuendoes left by Mr. Lippman's article, as regards the Senator from Vermont, are completely unwarranted.

I think Mr. Lippmann has only demonstrated by his article published this morning that he, too, possesses the same human frailties that the rest of us possess; and in his article published this morning he has demonstrated what I, myself, frequently demonstrate; namely, that when I make a mistake, it is a "blooper." Certainly he made a "blooper," in his article which was published this morning, as regards what I consider to be the very unfair implications and innuendoes in respect to my friend, the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN].

Let me say that I do not know of anyone in the Senate with whom I have served who has been more unpartisan—if I may put it that way—or nonpartisan, if one prefers that term, but who has been more insistent, as I have worked with him, in asking the question about the issue, "What are the facts?" and then seeking to ascertain where the facts lead, as he interprets those facts, as has been the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN].

May I say further that any possible interpretation of the Lippmann article—and it is possible to make the interpretation as the Senator from Vermont, who is directly affected and concerned, has made the interpretation—that he should be classified with an isolationist label or as aiding or abetting isolationists in this country is completely unjustified, because if we have ever had anyone in the Senate who has taken a more sound international approach with respect to American foreign policy in regard to the United Nations, I do not know who would be classed above the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] in that respect.

I only look upon the article as an unfortunate one in regard to its implications. I think an injustice is not done to the Senator from Vermont, but is done to Mr. Lippmann, because he has a very brilliant record in the field of writing on foreign policy. He is a man on whose viewpoint I place reliance on a great many issues. It saddens me to find myself in disagreement with an author and writer for whom I have such high respect and with whose views I find myself in agreement most of the time. But in this particular article he went awry.

I think this is one of those unfortunate instances. I know the Senator from Vermont is a very big man and a forgiving man. I think it was quite proper for him to set the record straight. I am also satisfied that, because a wrong has been done him, it will not color his point of view with respect to the foreign policy question that will confront the Senate.

I wanted to make these comments as a character witness for the Senator from Vermont because he deserves them. I still have open ears in regard to his position on the bond issue. I, too, will give careful weight to his argument because of my respect for him and for his great knowledge of the fiscal affairs of the Nation.

To date I have favored, and have so indicated in the committee, the bond issue. I favor it not on a partisan basis any more than the Senator from Vermont opposes it on a partisan basis. I favor it because the weight of evidence is on the side of the bond issue approach rather than the loan approach.

But that has nothing to do with the relationship which exists between the Senator from Vermont and the Senator from Oregon. I have simply risen as a character witness in his behalf, though he does not need it. I want him to know I am confident that, when the record is all in, the general opinion will be that the Senator from Vermont was not deserving of the innuendoes and implications contained in the Lippmann article as they related to him.

Mr. AIKEN. I thank the Senator from Oregon. I appreciate what he has said. I have worked with him at the United Nations and on many other occasions, and I have found him to be very fair and cooperative and to stick to his own positions when he thought those positions were right, the same as I do. I can assure him that when the bond issue comes before the Senate I shall attempt to convert the Senator from Oregon and the Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS]. I will undertake to do so on the basis of facts, and not on any other basis.

In order that no one may think that what I am saying today or the position I have taken in the last few weeks is something suddenly arrived at, I would like to point out that last February I wrote a special, short report on the

United Nations, attempting to point out the difficulties that we were leading up to. I ask unanimous consent to have printed at the end of this discussion the report which I submitted to the Congress last February. It is not a very long one.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 1.)

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

Mr. AIKEN. I yield to the Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. COOPER. The Senator from Vermont does not need to be defended by anyone. I will go further and say he does not need our praise or encomiums, because we know him as a man of honor and integrity, and one of high statesmanship.

I have probably voted with him on issues more consistently than with any other Member of the Senate. I have done so because I respect his honor and integrity, and because I respect his judgment and commonsense. And I may say as a Republican that he represents, in my view at least, republicanism at its best.

In January, after study, I made my decision that I would support the U.N. bond issue. I did it on the following grounds:

First, the U.N. is in a crisis in the Congo, and unless it is quickly financed, its operation will end—to be followed by continuing civil war, and the possibility of intervention by the Soviet Union.

Second, I believe the bond issue method will attract largest financial support, in volume, by members of the U.N.

Third, and I believe this is a point which has not been stressed enough, the bond issue is a means of securing the widest political support in the U.N. It is important that the largest possible number of members contribute to the U.N. operation in the Congo, so that it will be a true United Nations operation, rather than one supported by a few members, and chiefly by the United States.

That is my position, and when the bond issue question comes to the Senate floor, I shall be opposed to the proposal made by my dear friend from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] and by the distinguished Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER].

I would make this cautionary statement before I close: I have felt in recent weeks that this matter might become a party issue. I hope very much it will not, because it is important that the method of financing the U.N. operation be considered on its merits, as the Senator from Vermont and other Senators have said this afternoon.

I think it will be unfortunate indeed if the administration, or others, charge Members of the Senate who favor a mechanism, other than the bond issue, as opposing the United Nations. Certainly it is not true of such a man as the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN], or the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER]. If anything could do so, such charges might lead to a partisan issue. I hope the administration will not make this mistake.

I have no more to say. The Senator knows I have supported the bond issue for a long time. I support it for the reasons I have stated, and I will continue my support. I hope it will be approved by the Congress. But no man in this body enjoys greater respect than the Senator from Vermont. I applaud the reasons which led to his statement this afternoon.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Kentucky for his kind words. I know he and other Members of the Senate who support the bond issue do so because they really believe it is the best way to get the United Nations out of financial difficulties.

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

Mr. AIKEN. Before I yield to the Senator from New York, I wish to add that there seems to be an apprehension spread throughout the country that unless the United Nations can get a large sum of money very soon it is faced with imminent bankruptcy.

The facts are these, Mr. President: on the 31st of December 1961, the United Nations owed $114 million. It had due about $93 million in unpaid assessments. However, on the 1st of January there came due about $142 million more of assessments, part to be paid before July 1 and part to be paid during the year. It is an undoubted fact that some of those assessments will not be paid.

About $67 million is due to carry the Congo operations through to July 1. About $67 million is due under the regular assessments of the United Nations. Virtually every dollar of that amount will be paid. About $8 million is due on the UNEF operation. That makes a total of about $142 million.

It is safe to say $90 million of that will be collected within a reasonably short time. That should be sufficient to carry the United Nations past the time when an opinion will have been rendered by the International Court of Justice at the Hague, determining whether the $93 million of unpaid dues, by 74 members of the United Nations, are legal assessments and are binding or not.

I point out that the United Nations is presently not in the extremely difficult position in which it was, let us say, on December 31, statistically, because of the $140 million or more in assessments which are due. About $50 million is due from the United States. I am sure the United States will pay that in the near future.

I now yield to the junior Senator from New York.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, I think perhaps I am unique among those Senators who have asked the Senator to yield. I am also apart from the Senator from Vermont in the same respect. I at the moment have a completely open mind as to which method of financing would be best for the United Nations, or best for the United States. I intend to listen to all the arguments, and eventually I shall have to make my own decision.

I read the column of the distinguished journalist this morning. I have profited in the past many times from reading Walter Lippmann's columns. In the annals of his distinguished journalistic career, he has made many valuable contributions to this Nation's thinking. Yet I must say I read the column this morning with amazement at the inaccuracies, and with indignation at the motivations charged to those who might oppose the bond method of financing the United Nations.

I do not have nearly as much knowledge of the intricacies of this problem as has the Senator from Vermont or other members of the committee. But I immediately recognized inaccuracies in the statements of the distinguished journalist.

Certainly, if I should decide that the method advanced by the Senator from Vermont is the preferable method of financing, I would personally deeply resent any one of the three motives which the columnist said were behind the opposition to the United Nations bond plan.

The Senator from Vermont is certainly one of the most respected men, and perhaps the most respected man, in this Chamber. Many would agree with that statement.

I shall say no more as to the character of the Senator from Vermont, who does not need references from me.

On the subject of inaccuracies, I do not wish to get into a long, drawn-out discussion of the question, but I wish to make inquiry of the Senator from Vermont. If I am mistaken in my belief I should like to be set right, because I think it is an important matter.

If the United Nations bond issue does go into effect, and if the Soviet Union, let us say, which does not now pay its peace and security operations assessments, should decide, that it will not pay its assessed portion of these operations which will go into the general operating budget of the United Nations—yet would be a small fraction of the total Soviet assessment—am I correct in my understanding that the Soviet Union would not lose its right to vote until a period of many, many years had passed, because of the fact that the United Nations Charter provides a nation must be in arrears for 2 full years before it will lose the right to vote? It might be 10 or 20 or 30 years—I do not know the exact length of time involved—before the Soviet Union would lose its right to vote under those circumstances?

Have I correctly stated the situation, or am I in error?

Mr. AIKEN. The Senator is correct. How long it would take Russia to lose her voting rights is unknown. She probably would not lose them at all, with two-thirds of the other members of the United Nations in default, for the other nations would not be likely to let Russia lose her voting rights for the same reason.

I have the feeling, since Russia and Soviet bloc nations have been quite meticulous, or at least most of them—I think Poland is behind in payments—about paying assessments which they agree are legal, that once the International Court of Justice determines the assessments for the Congo and UNEF are legal, not only France and Belgium

but also the Soviet bloc nations will pay their legal dues.

At present Russia claims these assessments are illegal. There is a long story behind that. When the bill comes before the Senate, we shall probably tell the story on the floor, but it would take too long to do so now. We say that the assessments are legal. Russia says that they are not legal. The question has gone to the court.

Mr. KEATING. Furthermore, the column indicated that if any country did not pay its bond repayment assessment for 2 years it would be in arrears and would lose its right to vote, as I read the column.

Mr. AIKEN. That would not be correct.

Mr. KEATING. That would not be true?

Mr. AIKEN. The nation would not lose the right to vote, even if the other nations took advantage of, I believe, article 19 of the United Nations Charter. The nation would not lose the right to vote until it was behind the equivalent of the 2 preceding full years.

EXHIBIT 1

THE UNITED STATES IN THE UNITED NATIONS—SUPPLEMENTARY VIEWS OF SENATOR AIKEN

As a delegate to the 15th session of the U.N. General Assembly, I found the experience informative as well as somewhat frustrating.

At the end of the session in the early morning hours of December 21, I had come to these conclusions:

1. The United Nations now holds the principal, if not the only, hope of averting a widespread conflict with catastrophic results to much of the world's population. It also holds the best hope for the continued independence and progress of many smaller nations.

2. The future of the United Nations is uncertain and its continuance cannot be taken for granted. The policy of harassment by the Soviet bloc can probably be dealt with. More disturbing is the failure of so many other nations to acknowledge their responsibilities. If the United Nations flounders, this most likely will be due to the attitudes of those who need it most rather than to its enemies.

3. It cannot be expected that all nations could or should wear the same image. Attempts on the part of strong nations to impose their ideologies or their leadership on the newly independent countries simply create resentment and lessen the likelihood of world harmony in the future.

4. While the United State should continue to cooperate with the people of other countries, we and they must realize that our resources are not unlimited and that we cannot possibly help others to achieve in a few years those standards for which we ourselves required 170 years.

5. Until other countries able to meet their United Nations assessments are willing to do so, it will be advisable for the United States to continue its cooperative efforts largely on a bilateral basis. Even with bilateral programs, it is ridiculous to feel that every time Russia offers economic or technical assistance to another nation we should rush to outbid her.

6. It is high time that Russia did her part in helping the needy people of the world. The Soviets have a long record of promises unmatched by performance. If they are using promises simply to promote an ideology with no intentions of fulfilling these promises, then those nations who complain that the United States does not do enough for them might find out for themselves the difference between promises and deeds.

7. We should, however, be ready to contribute a greater amount to United Nations programs whenever other nations are willing to do their part. Particularly in the case of the African nations multilateral assistance provided by the United Nations offers the best chance of preventing that continent from becoming a continuing battleground in either a hot or cold war.

8. The procedures of the U.S. Government for making policy decisions regarding issues before the United Nations are exasperatingly slow and cumbersome. I strongly recommend to President Kennedy that he undertake to reconstruct the processes of our Government so that decisions can be made promptly and responsibility can be fixed for failure to make them.

9. A new situation has been brought about in the United Nations because of the shift in voting power from Western Europe and the Western Hemisphere to Africa and Asia. It was encouraging to note, however, that neither the new African nations nor the Asian group voted as a bloc. In spite of all the efforts to control them, these young nations showed a high degree of independence and an awareness of efforts made to use them. The only real bloc in the United Nations continues to be that of the Soviet which is always sure of 9 votes out of 99.

The bulk of this report is concerned with the work of the fifth committee, which was my special assignment and which deals with administrative and budgetary matters.

Senator MORSE, whom I was fortunate to have as my congressional colleague on the delegation, was assigned to the fourth committee dealing with colonies and mandated territories. He is reporting separately on the work of that committee, and I add here only that his representation of the United States was outstanding and that his tireless energy and sympathetic consideration made a very favorable impression on the delegates of other nations.

I should note also that the American delegation as a whole was one of the finest groups of people with which I have been privileged to work. The five delegates and five alternates were a hardworking and compatible group. I respected and admired them one and all.

Ambassador Wadsworth was an admirable and conscientious leader and possessed good judgment. Of course, the positions he expressed to the United Nations were officially formulated in Washington and were not necessarily the views of the U.S. delegation or the Ambassador.

I would also add a word of appreciation for the personnel of the U.S. mission. They tried to do their work well, though at times their individual capabilities and desires to do a good job seemed to suffer from the lack of full coordination with which our Government is frequently afflicted.

The job of the fifth committee basically was one of finding the money to pay the bills. Aside from the regular expenses of the United Nations amounting to a net of roughly $63 million—plus $19 million to meet the cost of UNEF (United Nations Emergency Force) in the Middle East, we were confronted with the cost of the Congo operation which totaled $60 million from the time of its inception last July until January 1, 1961—further the Cougo operation is expected to cost at least $8 million per month after January 1. The fifth committee did not consider the advisability of the Congo operation. That had already been determined by the Security Council and the General Assembly.

It was the position of the United States that this country would pay in contributions and assessments just under 50 percent of the cost of the Congo operation up to January 1, 1961. For costs to be incurred after that date, the Secretary General was authorized to incur expenditures up to $8 million a month for the first 3 months of the year.

In view of the fact that Russia has already announced her determination not to pay any of the cost except to forgive a charge for the Soviet airlift—and that many small nations have insisted on their inability to pay anything, it is apparent that the action taken will not suffice. The knotty problem of finding the cash will be up to the adjourned session of the United Nations in March.

Since the failure of several nations to pay their assessments had seriously impaired the working capital fund of the United Nations, it appeared necessary to authorize the Secretary General to borrow funds with which to carry on.

A resolution submitted to the fifth committee would have authorized the Secretary General to borrow from special funds available for programs sponsored by the United Nations, from member governments, or from other available sources, meaning commercial lending agencies.

The delegate from India moved to strike out the authority to borrow from private sources. He was supported by Russia and several other states. The motion was defeated in committee by a narrow margin. The General Assembly, however, sustained the Indian motion and as of now the Secretary General can only borrow from United Nations special funds at prevailing rates of interest and from member governments.

During the debate in the fifth committee, I pointed out that the United States does not have the authority to make loans to the United Nations whereupon one supporter of the Indian motion suggested that special legislation could be enacted for this purpose.

I would not look with favor upon congressional action to permit the U.S. Government to make loans to the United Nations to cover deficits caused by Russia's failure to meet just and equitable assessments. If we start on this course, we will find that not only Russia but possibly other countries will refuse to meet assessments secure in the knowledge that the United States will make up the deficit.

Furthermore, we would find that loans made on a temporary basis would soon lose their temporary status and become permanent and uncollectible.

It is possible that those governments which objected to commercial borrowings will be willing to make the necessary loans to the United Nations. If so, this would be a welcome solution but I would not like to see the United States start the practice of assuming responsibility for the arrearages of other nations, especially those countries which blandly announce that they do not intend to pay anyway.

One very discouraging feature of the United Nations session was the apparent feeling among so many have-not nations that it is the duty of the large countries and particularly the United States to bear the cost of bringing their social and economic standards up to a level with ours.

Too many of them seem to forget how long it took us to reach our present levels, and how we got where we are.

Too many of them also ignore the fact that every dollar we contribute to raising the standards of developing nations has to be earned or borrowed. The fact that we have gone so heavily in debt to help them does not seem to make much of an impression on some of them.

When we have reached the point where we do not have the means to help all people—and we are already there—I see no reason why we should not give preference

to those whose concept of government is more in line with our own and who are willing to make such reforms and to take such steps as will better their own condition.

Another of the more frustrating features of representing the United States at the United Nations was the difficulty in getting definite positions from the State Department.

In the matter of sharing the cost of the Congo operations a request for the position of the United States went unheeded for several weeks. In the meantime delegates from other nations were continually asking me for our position. It was rather embarrassing to have to admit that the U.S. Government was having difficulty in making up its mind and coordinating its action.

Finally, however, I did receive the position. It appeared in a New York newspaper, almost correct, on a Monday morning. The next day it was received from the State Department about 2 hours before I was to announce it officially.

Of course, no one was responsible for the messy situation. The poor position had been batted from conference to conference, to Secretary to Legal Adviser to Budget Director back to conference and so almost ad infinitum, until released to the world including the U.S. delegation by way of a leak.

Whether the ever-increasing practice of leaking news has become a policy of the State Department or whether it represents the desire of Government employees to gain favor with certain reporters, I am unable to say. It is apparent that there is some method in the practice, however, for the leaks appear most frequently in the press on Monday morning when greatest coverage can be obtained.

It is common knowledge that some governments use the leak system as a means of testing public sentiment without actually committing the government itself.

In Soviet Russia and Communist China, official government positions are accurately publicized through Pravda and Red Flag. At the United Nations there was a tendency on the part of some foreign delegates to quote from news stories in the American press as representing official positions even though the cumbersome machinery of the U.S. Government had not even ground out a decision.

The State Department today has plenty of competent, willing, and farsighted people—but getting effective action is about like taking parts of four different makes of automobiles and trying to assemble them into a smooth-running vehicle.

There remain more basic questions which can only be determined by the United Nations itself. Perhaps the most basic is whether the new members of the United Nations will match their power with responsibility. When the organization was created in 1946, there were 51 members. Now there are 99, with more in prospect.

Most of the new members are developing nations, many of them only receiving their independence during 1960. Some of them have a population less than that of Metropolitan Washington.

They have the power to vote extensive and expensive programs and to levy assessments which will require a few countries, principally the United States, to pay most of the cost.

Should this be done, it is doubtful that the people of the United States would sanction our continuing membership in the United Nations. We have already proven our willingness to do more than our share but we will not be imposed upon.

Since certain member nations are now over $31 million in arrears on their assessments not including costs of the Congo, it is clearly apparent that without the financial support of the United States, which now pays 32½ percent of the regular costs of the United Nations and approximately 40 percent of all costs including special programs, the United Nations could hardly function effectively as a world organization for peace and prosperity.

It was most distressing to see countries which otherwise share the same ideals of the United States, countries to whom we have furnished millions of dollars in aid, renege on their assessments of mere thousands of dollars for support of the Congo operation.

If we are all to avoid the unpleasant consequences of colonialism in reverse, the members of the United Nations must exercise proper restraint and meet the responsibility of paying for the programs they vote to carry out.

I confess that during all the early years of the organization I had believed in the efficacy of a United Nations police force comprised of units from the smaller nations.

My beliefs have now been reduced to hope, albeit a hope that will not die. I am even reconciled to the possibility that the world may not yet be ready for the maintenance of peace through force of arms.

The United Nations has now engaged in operations designed to restore and maintain peace in three areas.

In 1950, the attack by North Korean and Chinese Communists on the Government of Korea brought a swift response from the United Nations. In this action, the United States provided by far the major part of the men and material needed by the United Nations.

Was the operation successful?

Korea is today a divided country to the disadvantage of both its northern and southern areas. The actual fighting was stopped by an uneasy truce which still prevails.

The second police operation of the United Nations was in the Holy Land. This action did succeed in restoring order largely because all parties directly concerned were willing to accept it.

However, several years have passed and the United Nations still maintains a force of 4,500 men in that area. How long will it be necessary to maintain this force there? The cost is $19 million this year and the force has already become a built-in factor in the economy of the region. For the United Nations to furnish a permanent police force for any area is a rather farfetched arrangement.

The final effort toward policing troubled areas is the Congo. This is the acid test. From all I can learn the United Nations police action in the Congo is an inadequately supervised and controlled military operation, with internal dissension in the force. There is also a conflict of national purposes, which is causing many nations to consider withdrawing their troops. In this event the United States will doubtless be asked to transport them back to their own countries. There is no doubt but what the United Nations operation in the Congo is less costly than either a hot or cold war. If the action is not ultimately successful, however, it will be very difficult to convince the world of the efficacy of United Nations efforts to maintain the peace and independence of any nation by force.

These three efforts of the United Nations to operate an effective police force have not been decisive. They have indeed relieved the situations and possibly prevented greater wars.

Efforts to enforce peace, however, will not be decisive until the member nations both great and small are willing to support such efforts. According to Secretary General Hammarskjold's estimates, the current costs of world armament amount to $320 million a day. If each nation would contribute only 1 day's cost to an international police force each year, it is possible that all expenses in this field could be met.

It will take more than money alone to enforce peace in the world. It will take the desire for peace and the willingness to meet equitable demands and to accept the verdict. We are still far from reaching that goal. The road toward it is exasperating and frustrating, but we cannot give up.

MINUTEMAN: OUR ACE IN THE HOLE

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, an excellent article was published in the Air Force magazine for January 1962, describing the progress made in America's defense through development and testing of the Minuteman solid-fuel missile. The Boeing Co. of Seattle holds the prime contract on this weapon.

As the magazine noted in presenting the article written by Flint DuPre:

Here's a firsthand look at how Minuteman, our second generation ICBM now nearing operational readiness, grew from the study phase in 1955 to become today's new lean breed of nuclear weaponry.

I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

AMERICA'S STRATEGIC ACE IN THE HOLE

(By Flint DuPre)

The year 1961 was the year of truth for the Air Force's Minuteman intercontinental ballistic missile. Minuteman took giant steps toward the combat operational capability it is shortly scheduled to achieve. Retracing those steps makes it possible to place this new lean breed of nuclear weaponry in proper perspective in terms of what it will add to our strategic strength. The speed with which Minuteman has been developed—from a study phase of 1955 to a production decision in 1958 and the first successful launch in February 1961—is most reassuring.

For a firsthand look at just how all this was accomplished, you must travel from the sand and scrub of Florida's Cape Canaveral to the sprawling aerospace complex of Los Angeles, then up to Vandenberg Air Force Base, and on up the west coast to Sacramento and Seattle, across the top of the continent to Montana, down to the salt flats of Utah, and on across the Nation to the industrial East. Cover thousands of miles and still you won't see all the places and activities contributing to Minuteman. But you will get a fast look at the wonders of modern aerospace technology.

You'll see Minuteman's major components being made, the research and development test firings, the building of launch pads and silo holes for the training of combat crews, the construction of plant and assembly facilities, and site-activation construction for initial operational deployment.

The starting point is Cape Canaveral where the Air Force Missile Test Center and the Atlantic Missile Range, stretching more than 5,000 miles down into the South Atlantic, have become symbols of our Nation's strength in the rapidly advancing art of missilry.

The morning of last February 1 was bright with Florida sunshine. A pencil-slim Minuteman took the sun's rays on its launch pad as Col. (now brigadier general) Sam Phillips, director of the Minuteman program since its inception, sat before the launch

consoles in the nearby blockhouse to monitor a historic test.

Shortly after 9 a.m. the countdown hit zero, and the missile rose straight and true with a roar that heralded solid-propelled rocket power. The three-stage missile operated perfectly, the first time in our history that all stages and systems of a major missile had been tested in an initial launch. Minuteman went into free flight, successfully sending its reentry package to an impact point in the Atlantic, some 4,600 miles downrange.

"Minuteman will be the backbone of our ICBM force," Gen. Thomas D. White said on hearing the test results. "The successful firing of all three stages and the flawless operation of the guidance system the first time we launched the Minuteman is a long step toward the early attainment of this remarkable weapon," he added. The recently retired Chief of Staff's expression is significant since he, along with Gen. Curtis E. LeMay, the present Chief of Staff, and Gen. Bernard A. Schriever, Commander of the Air Force Systems Command, provided full support to the accelerated development of this missile in the face of some powerful detractors.

As that test was logged on Minuteman's permanent record, other pads at Cape Canaveral were being readied for additional tests, and holes were being dug for the below-ground silo testing so important to the missile, which is designed to be positioned underground permanently, launched from beneath the surface of the earth if the alarm ever goes off.

Other above-ground missiles were fired in May and July of 1961. Both were generally successful. By late August the first silo test was made. As the missile emerged from the ground, its second stage fired prematurely, causing the test vehicle to explode.

Then on November 17 Minuteman scored a perfect launch from a steel-and-concrete test hole at the cape. In a major milestone of the development program, the reentry vehicle raced more than 3,400 miles downrange. General Phillips called the launch from the 90-foot-deep silo totally successful.

Before the August malfunction, Minuteman had been tested eight times at Edwards AFB, Calif., in controlled and partially simulated launches from silos, but the November flight was the first successful below-ground, operational-type shot. The military-industry team responsible for Minuteman was heartened by performance data obtained from this silo launch. The missile was progressing handily as the second-generation followon to the liquid-fueled Atlas and Titan ICBM's, which are larger, more costly, and more complicated though they have the same 6,300-mile-plus range and general performance as Minuteman.

Moving from Florida to California, you find in the Los Angeles area, at Downey, a production line for the inertial-guidance and flight-control equipment in the Autonetics plant of North American Aviation. This associate prime contractor produces a system that guides and controls the missile during flight, yet remains operable while the ICBM is sealed in a silo for perhaps years. To accomplish this, Autonetics has had to develop transistors, resistors, diodes, and capacitors up to 100 times more reliable than any previously available.

About 165 miles north of Los Angeles is Vandenberg AFB where Strategic Air Command combat crews are beginning a training program. After learning to fire the missile in a number of test launches, they will be assigned to the base complexes where Minuteman will be deployed. Vandenberg is a combination training and operational missile base, located on ranch land once used by the U.S. Army but now converted to expensive missile facilities for use of the 1st Strategic Aerospace Missile Division. Launch pads jut along the shore line, with the Pacific and its attendant range providing the shooting gallery for the frequent launches. The below-ground launch facilities for Minuteman are under construction; 1962 should be a full year for the training of SAC crews at this base.

Continuing north to Sacramento, you see being made what it takes to send Minuteman from one part of the world to another. Here the second-stage rocket engine was developed and is being produced at the Aerojet-General Corporation's plant, a 20,000-acre site in the foothills of the Sierra Nevada range. More than 2,000 persons work on the problems of inert parts, propellants, and fabrication in facilities that include some of the largest cast and cure buildings in the free world. Test firing to perfect and improve the engine take place in rock and gravel trenches formed when the rugged land was dredged for gold.

On up the coast line to Seattle, Wash., are the extensive facilities that the Boeing Co. devotes to this project in its responsibility for the assembly and test of the complete weapon system. Located in a restricted area of the plant, in the heart of the city, is a simulated launcher network consisting of launch-support building, launch-control center, and a full-size silo with a missile in it. These facilities are used as models for similar structures in the field where Minuteman will be permanently stationed underground.

In this off-limits area a trim Texan, E. H. Boullioun, Boeing's installations project officer for Minuteman, takes authorized visitors into a building where a large tractor-trailer combination called a transporter-erector is being fitted with a full-scale test missile. Designed to travel over all types of roads—sometime this year it will face its severest test on the rugged terrain of Montana—the 63-foot-long combination, with a loaded weight of 108,000 pounds, will transport missiles from landing strips to their permanent launch sites. "The missiles will be airlifted by C–133 transports from the assembly point in Utah to the support bases," Mr. Boullioun says. "Then this baby takes over."

In another part of the vast Boeing plant are mockups and cutaways of Minuteman fixed facilities. Other company responsibilities include development of a major portion of the ground-support equipment in the launch site and launch-control center, the instrumentation systems, and the interstage structures connecting the engines and guidance system. Nearby are full-scale railway cars for the mobile Minuteman program, deferred last March in the interest of getting more fixed sites more rapidly. The mobile program was dropped in mid-December as Defense Secretary McNamara recommended funds for an increased number of Minutemen in silos.

From Seattle you go to Utah where you'll see some of the modern plants which produce the first- and third-stage engines, as well as the assembly and maintenance facility at Hill AFB, 6 miles south of Ogden, hub for the entire Minuteman program. Proudly calling itself the "Missile Center of the West," Hill is also the home of the Ogden Air Materiel Area and Air Procurement district.

There are three principal Air Force-industry plants in this area. One, Plant 77, located in the west area of Hill AFB, is a series of many buildings to be operated by Boeing for assembly of Minuteman, as well as for overhaul, repair, and maintenance when the ICBM becomes operational. The plant occupies 790 acres. The Air Force and Boeing are completing the conversion of more than 60 existing buildings once used as an Army ordnance depot. When the plant becomes fully operational sometime this year, the outlay will represent about $11 million.

About 60 miles north, past Brigham City, is Plant 78, the Thiokol Chemical Corp.'s facilities for test and production of the first-stage engine. Sprawling on an 11,000-acre tract in rugged, isolated land are dozens of new buildings and test facilities, colorful pastels to contrast with the bleak surroundings. This complex is for administration, production, and static test of engines, for the mixing of solid fuels, for nozzle mounting, and for curing ovens for the large engine cases. Near this center of modern technology—at Promontory, Utah—earlier history was made when in 1869 the golden spike was driven to join the Central Pacific and Union Pacific Railroads as the Nation's first transcontinental line.

For Minuteman, Thiokol began development of the first-stage engine in August 1958 and perfected the Nation's largest solid-propellant engine within the 27 months allotted under the contract.

About 50 miles south of Hill AFB and Ogden, near Bacchus, is Plant 81 being built for Hercules Powder Co. for assembly-line production of the third-stage engine, which was designed and developed at the companys' nearby Bacchus works.

All three stages are sent to the Boeing facility at Hill Air Force Base for final assembly.

"This is the business end of Minuteman," Col. Harry Goldsworthy will tell you when you reach Malmstrom Air Force Base in Montana, a few miles from the city of Great Falls. As site activation commander here, Colonel Goldsworthy directs construction for the complex of three squadrons of the first missile wing, designated the 341st. He stands before an unusual map on which varicolored lights burn and flicker. This relief map of the wing's area covers a plot larger than the State of Rhode Island.

Colonel Goldsworthy and his deputy, Col. Art Lahlum of the Army Corps of Engineers, use this map to check progress as the silos and control centers take form. The map is divided into three sections, one for each squadron comprising the wing. The squadrons are broken down into flights of 10 missiles each and control center. A Minuteman wing has 150 missiles and 15 control centers.

When a light goes out or flickers disturbingly, this means trouble. Within minutes one of the colonels or Clair Popejoy, Boeing manager on the spot, will likely board an on-alert helicopter and fly to the trouble spot. This close attention to detail goes far toward keeping the Malmstrom construction ahead of schedule. Late last year the Corps of Engineers had completed its work on the first flight, and Boeing began the assembly and checkout of equipment necessary to make Minuteman operational, with a target date before the end of this year for the first flight.

A visit to each of the 165 Malmstrom sites (silos and control centers) would take weeks by car, many days by helicopter. Traveling from one to another, and covering all locations, you would travel about 3,000 miles. The cabling being placed several feet underground to furnish communications between the control centers and the missile silos will total about 2,200 miles when completed. To link the sites it is necessary to tunnel the cable under about 30 river beds and 70 railroad and car roadbeds.

These cables will relay complex coded communications data necessary to launch the missiles. This feature of Minuteman construction has caused some writers to suggest that an animal might touch off a nuclear war by gnawing into the cable and causing a missile to fire. The men responsible for setting the cable and for its eventual operation say this simply could not happen. Air Force Secretary Eugene Zuckert recently pointed out that an accidental launching would be impossible because of a complicated system of mechanical and manual controls. If an animal should get its teeth into the buried cable, an alarm would go off, causing automatic shutdown of the system. The same would occur if a person tampered with the cable.

Because it is the first and most advanced of the four Minuteman support bases under construction, Malmstrom lends itself to close examination of what an operational Minuteman facility in the field will look like. The launch-control centers are the nerve centers of the missiles. Each is an underground command post, consisting of a launcher-support building and a concrete capsule, with a tunnel connecting them. Squadron personnel will man the control centers, which contain electronic monitoring equipment such as TV consoles as well as diesel engines, batteries, environmental equipment, and facilities to feed and shelter the men at the center.

Each center is at least 6 miles from the silos under its jurisdiction, and the missiles are dispersed from one another by at least that same distance. The silo hole is an 80-foot reinforced-concrete launch tube. A metal liner goes into the hole first. Then the missile is lowered into it. Each missile has its own underground support building, a prefabricated insulated-metal structure that rests on a concrete foundation, with the top flush with the ground. This building will contain electric generators and air-conditioning equipment for environmental control of the missile.

The launch tube will have a horizontal concrete-and-steel sliding cover. The area close to the tube will be paved and equipped with rail tracks so the transporter-erector can move the missile up to the opening for lowering into the silo. This operation can be repeated in reverse if it should be necessary to remove the missile from the silo for checkout or repair.

Each missile site will not only be hardened to withstand all but a direct hit but will also occupy a fenced-in three-acre plot of ground not easy to distinguish from the air.

There are three other Minuteman support bases besides Malmstrom. Construction for the wing near Ellsworth AFB, S. Dak., is well along. Ground has been broken for the third and fourth wings at Minot AFB, N. Dak., and Whiteman AFB, Mo., respectively. These four wings will have 600 Minuteman missiles underground by the mid-1960's.

Your Minuteman trip ends in the industrial East. Near Boston, AVCO is manufacturing the reentry vehicles, or nose cones, on an assembly line. In the same area the American Machine & Foundry Co. produces launch-site mechanisms. In New Jersey both Hercules and Curtiss-Wright Corp. are turning out cases for Minuteman engines.

The 54-foot Minuteman has many things in its favor. It represents a breakthrough in economy; it is a missile our country can afford to buy in quantity, giving the U.S.S.R. that many more targets to worry about.

The test program so far indicates good accuracy and reliability. Maintenance cost is low, as the missile will be on site in its hole unattended for long periods of time, yet can still be sent off in a matter of seconds.

Minuteman holds another distinction unique in the history of weapons. Although it can duplicate the speed—more than 16,000 miles per hour—and the intercontinental range of Atlas and Titan, it will cost only about one-third of the estimated $2-million-each price tag of the larger missiles. This is especially encouraging since historically new models of weapons usually cost more than their predecessors.

AFSC's General Schriever sums up the Minuteman weapon system this way: "It provides added depth to our national deterrent posture and imposes complications on our adversaries. Minuteman rates a degree of respect that cannot be matched by other modern weapon systems."

Which is one way of saying that Minuteman is indeed America's ace in the hole.

TRANSIT AIRCARGO

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, a truly important milestone in the movement of international airfreight is being marked today—the U.S. Bureau of Customs procedure called transit aircargo. This procedure, which is being put into effect today, permits international freight arriving at our airports of entry to be transferred from plane to plane and from airline to airline promptly upon arrival, for immediate takeoff to inland ports of entry. The significance of this procedure is that it enables our airlines to move international freight up to 72 hours faster. And this, of course, means improved service for U.S. business and industry and the promotion of foreign trade.

This new plan is an outstanding example of cooperation between the various U.S. inspection agencies and the airlines—individually and through their service and trade organization, the Air Transport Association of America. This new procedure was developed after painstaking planning and close coordination between Government and industry; for the primary objective had to be speed without forfeiting any of the safeguards provided by the Bureau of Customs and other U.S. inspection agencies.

This kind of airline-Government cooperation has succeeded in reducing border-crossing redtape along the world's airways by about one-third since World War II. The most important single step in facilitating travel to the United States has been the adoption of an airline plan known as "preclearance." This is a procedure whereby visitors clear U.S. Public Health, agriculture quarantine, immigration and customs at their points of departure, rather than upon arrival in the United States. The benefits to the traveler—the visitor from a foreign land—are numerous and important. Chiefly, it eliminates any possibility of delay or other inconvenience upon arrival in the United States.

Preclearance is in effect now in six cities in Canada, Bermuda, and Nassau. The stage is set for adoption of the plan in Mexico City; it awaits only action by the U.S. State Department and approval by Mexico.

The Congress has appropriated money to the U.S. Travel Office in an effort to stimulate tourism to America because of the many benefits it will bring, including the reduction of our balance-of-payments deficit. It is important, therefore, that anything that will help make it easier to travel to the United States should be done in the interest of promoting more tourism to our country. Thus it is hoped that the State Department will see fit to move quickly on this measure, because it will be one of the most significant steps we can take to promote reciprocal travel between this country and our neighbor to the south. Moreover, it will save passengers, the airline companies and both governments substantial time, money and procedural headaches.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD an article in the Traffic World of February 24 on this subject, together with an article entitled "Transport News: Air Customs Rule," published in the New York Times of February 18.

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

NEW CUSTOMS PROCEDURES OKAYED TO SPEED MOVEMENT OF INTERNATIONAL AIRCARGO

The Bureau of Customs has adopted new procedures designed to lessen delay and simplify custom control and documentation for international airfreight shipments moving both beyond ports of entry to inland U.S. cities and through the United States in transit to other countries.

Air transport spokesmen said the new procedures provided an alternative method of customs control for international airfreight which might be utilized in place of normal customs clearance procedures or so-called "in bond" procedures. Norman J. Philion, director of the office of international services of the Air Transport Association of America, said the new procedures would make it possible for international airfreight shipments to reach their destinations up to 72 hours faster.

EFFECTIVE MARCH 15

The new procedures, set forth in a lengthy addition to the Customs Bureau's air commerce regulations, were adopted February 6 for effectiveness March 15. The addition covers almost three pages of the Federal Register of February 13 and is identified as: "Part 6—Air Commerce Regulations—Alternate Procedures; Transportation in Bond of Aircargo."

Commenting in general terms on the new procedures, the Customs Bureau said:

"The increase in the volume of aircargo to be transported by aircraft beyond ports of the first arrival of aircraft or ports at which residue cargo procedures terminate, which cargo is not yet released by customs into the domestic commerce, has caused burdens to both airlines and customs by reason of presently required documentation of individual shipments.

"On September 12, 1961, a notice of proposed rulemaking was published in the Federal Register that alternate procedures for transportation of merchandise in bond were being considered for application to aircargo shipped subject to customs control to a port of destination in the United States, or shipped through the United States for exportation from another U.S. airport, or export directly from the port of arrival. These procedures to simplify controls over such shipments in order to lessen delays and documentation would be available when aircargo arrives in the United States on an aircraft of one airline for further transportation on aircraft of different airlines.

"These procedures also would be available when aircargo is to be transported beyond the port of first arrival on the aircraft bringing the goods to this country in the event such aircraft does not proceed under the residue cargo procedure.

"They would also be available when aircargo is transferred between aircraft of the same airline and the receiving aircraft does not proceed under the residue cargo procedure. These procedures for certain types of transportation of merchandise in bond would be in addition to existing procedures and would be for use by interested parties who elect to comply with the requirements."

Mr. Philion said the new procedures were suggested by the scheduled airline industry.

"The new procedure," he said, "will permit airlines to move international airfreight through U.S. airports of entry 24 hours a day, 7 days a week. It will enable the airlines to transfer freight from plane to plane and from airline to airline without interruption for immediate transportation to destination as soon as it arrives at a U.S. airport of entry.

"Customs control and supervision of airfreight will be maintained, but historic 'in bond entries and related paperwork, as well as special customs custody practices, heretofore required, will no longer be necessary.'

"BENEFITS FORESEEN

"The new procedure will be of tremendous benefit to shippers and to the general public in terms of service, speed, and reliability, and it will further add to the many advantages of shipping by air. It will stimulate the use of international airfreight generally, and encourage foreign shippers to route shipments via the United States and over the extensive and highly developed U.S. airline network.

"International airfreight can move today from practically any point in the world to another in a matter of hours but ground delays frequently exceed the total air transportation time. A substantial part of the ground delay is due to customs formalities and other related requirements. For example, international airfreight moving into this country has been subject to considerable delay at U.S. airports of entry because of customs procedures basically designed in an earlier age for other slower forms of transportation."

TRANSPORT NEWS: AIR CUSTOMS RULE—CHANGE TO EXPEDITE CARGO—U.S. ABIDES BY AID LAW

A change in customs procedure to speed airfreight moving through U.S. airports of entry to inland cities or on to foreign countries was announced last week by the Air Transport Association.

The new procedure, effective March 15, will do away with much of the paperwork and custody practices now required when shipments are transferred from an international to a domestic airline, it was said.

Import shipments will still be subject to full customs procedures at cities near their destination.

Spokesmen for the ATA said one advantage of the new customs procedure for transit aircargo, in addition to saving time and redtape, would be to erase a competitive edge over U.S. lines held by some foreign airlines flying to inland cities or crossing the country en route to another nation.

Airline spokesmen said that, with the new method of clearing, transit cargo shipments would reach their destinations up to 72 hours quicker. Delays of that length can result from unavailability of customs officers over holiday weekends and missed flights, they said.

Norman J. Philion, director of ATA's international services office, said the delays were due to "procedures basically designed in an earlier age for other, slower forms of transportation."

The procedure was suggested by the trade association and approved by the Bureau of Customs.

FEDERAL FLOOD INSURANCE ACT OF 1956 SHOULD BE IMPLEMENTED NOW

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, in 1956 the Congress of the United States passed the Federal Flood Insurance Act of 1956, a measure cosponsored by former Senator Lehman and then Senator Kennedy.

The Federal Flood Insurance Act of 1956 created a constituent agency within the Housing and Home Finance Agency to be known as the Federal Flood Insurance Administration, to be headed by a Commissioner, appointed by the President, subject to confirmation by the Senate.

Mr. President, there is now no Commissioner of Federal flood insurance.

Since Hurricane Carla raked the coast of Texas last fall, I have been advocating the implementation of the Federal Flood Insurance Act of 1956 and made a statement on the floor of the Senate, September 19, 1961, pleading for implementation of this law and have continued my efforts for it since.

Due to the failure of the Congress to appropriate funds to implement the law, this law has never been carried out.

Private insurance companies in the United States do not generally write casualty insurance to protect against the risk and danger caused to homeowners by rising water, which is ever present to the place of residence of scores of millions of American citizens, not merely along our ocean and gulf shores but in the great river valleys of America—the Mississippi, the Missouri, the Ohio, the Connecticut, and other river valleys.

Yesterday in his press conference, the President of the United States restated his support of the Federal Flood Insurance Act of 1956, and indicated the desirability of the law, and an appropriation to carry it out.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD the question asked and answer the President made concerning this act, which was made at the President's press conference, printed in the Washington Post of March 15, 1962:

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

FLOOD INSURANCE

Question. Mr. President, I believe as a Senator about 6 years ago you were a cosponsor of legislation passed by Congress entitled, "The Federal Flood Insurance Act of 1956," setting up a program of Federal insurance and coinsurance against the property losses by floods and other damage, water damage. That program never got off the ground because of lack of appropriations.

In view of the devastating northeaster on the east coast last week and the importance of some kind of insurance against the water damage, which is not provided by the insurance companies, in the rebuilding of these areas, would you consider requesting appropriations to get this Federal insurance program underway?

Answer. Yes. Well, I know that—why this has become a matter of—I must say that I think your experience indicates the desirability of legislation. The legislation is still on the books, the authorization, but the Senate passed the appropriation but the House did not. And so I would support it.

In fact, I will take another look at it and see whether we should recommend a supplemental appropriation in regard to the matter. But I do think the bill was useful and I think the experiences in the recent storm generally, on the coast, would indicate the desirability of the bill and the appropriation.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, I commend the President of the United States for his expressed approval of the Federal Flood Insurance Act of 1956, which he so ably coauthored and steered through while a U.S. Senator.

The recent damage on the Atlantic seaboard is added evidence, along with Hurricane Carla of last year, and the Missouri flood and the Connecticut flood of recent years and other similar instances of rising water, for the development of insurance programs to protect the scores and scores of millions of Americans who live in areas where their homes or their business property run the risk of damage by rising water.

I point out that since scores of millions of Americans live in such areas, the risk would be spread over a vast number of people, homes, and property, and the suggested activity would be feasible. If such a program were implemented, it would be sound from a business and economic standpoint.

As was the case with hail insurance nearly 30 years ago, the private insurance industry was too timid to furnish insurance until a Government-sponsored program proved that it was feasible, and now there is plenty of private insurance available for the insuring of crops against damage or loss from hailstorms.

If this Government implements the Federal Flood Insurance Act of 1956, I confidently predict that within 5 years there will be available ample opportunity to the homeowners of America to purchase casualty insurance from private companies on their homes and property at reasonable rates, to insure against the risks of loss and damage by rising waters.

In that connection I point out that recently a British-Swiss company started to sell by mail, from New Orleans, insurance for damage resulting from rising waters. Since it is a mail order business, buyers of the insurance do not have the protection they would have if the companies were licensed at home and had agents in the States where the insurance might be bought. But the fact that a British-Swiss company is willing to start selling such insurance by mail from New Orleans shows that at least one business institution thinks it is now economically sound.

The implementation of the Federal Insurance Act is long overdue. I am hopeful that at this session Congress will appropriate some money to implement it. The act is on the statute books.

The executive department has announced support of the measure. All that is needed is an appropriation from Congress to establish the Office of Federal Flood Insurance Commissioner under the Housing and Home Finance Agency so that studies may be made and reasonable casualty rates calculated in order to furnish the needed protection.

I see the distinguished junior Senator from Alabama in the Chamber. He is the father of more housing legislation than any other man in the history of the Congress. I mention the fact that FHA insurance loans on homes along the gulf and ocean coasts and in the river valleys are not protected for the Government in the event of damage to such homes by rising waters.

The action I have suggested is needed to protect homeowners from damage or loss of property by reason of rising waters, the U.S. Government, and others who might be insured.

I point out that people whose homes are destroyed sometimes have loans remaining that run from $6,000 to $8,000. The home is entirely gone. They have only a lot remaining. But, under the leadership of the distinguished junior Senator from Alabama, an emergency provision was placed in the law that would permit the homeowner or the lot owner in such a case to obtain a new loan and buy a new home. As I understand, the remnant of the old loan would be added to that amount. He must still pay off the old loan.

I ask the distinguished junior Senator from Alabama if what I have said is not correct.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, what the distinguished Senator from Texas has said is my understanding. Moreover, I doubt that any legislation was ever drafted with more care and deliberation than the particular legislation to which the Senator has referred. It was worked on during one session of the Congress, brought up at the next session, and worked on again. It was carefully drafted out on a nonpartisan basis. I believe it is good legislation and certainly ought to be implemented. The recent terrible damage, for which many homeowners can get no insurance, certainly ought to be an incentive for implementing such legislation.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, I thank the distinguished junior Senator from Alabama for his contribution to the discussion in pointing out the care with which the Federal Flood Insurance Act of 1956 was written. It was worked on very extensively during the 1955 session of Congress and finally passed in 1956 with a very comprehensive report that showed the variations in the law, which were reconciled so as to make it workable for its course through the two Houses of Congress. I thank the distinguished senior Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL] for yielding to me at this point. I ask unanimous consent that my remarks may be printed at the completion of his remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

WHAT FARMERS THINK ABOUT FARM PLANS

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, last month I addressed the Senate on the subject "Fairplay for Our Farmers." In those remarks I stated my conviction that the American farmer wishes to be free—free of Government domination and control of his operations, free of harassment from Washington rulemakers, and free of the threat of economic ruin by competition from huge Government-owned surplus stocks—stocks dumped on the market in an unannounced and ungoverned fashion by the Secretary of Agriculture.

In general, my position is that it will be necessary to have a gradual progression of farm operations from the present situation to a free and open market. This can be done by developing a long-range program, withdrawing more and more governmental regulations as the farmers adjust to the changing economy. During that transition period, the farmer should be assisted financially. Even more importantly, he must be supported with sensible programs of research which will find new uses for his products, new markets, and new methods to reduce the cost of doing business.

The approach toward the solution of our difficulty has already been pointed out. The steps include an effective land retirement program which will profit from the mistakes of the past and avoid them in the future; the elimination of the vicious competition between the farmer and the Government with its hoards of Commodity Credit Corporation stocks; an orderly cutoff of wheat allotments and marketing quotas; a relationship between the support price for wheat, corn, and other feed grains; a limitation of agricultural conservation payments; export payments in kind; support for the parity concept; and so on.

Mr. President, this morning I received a letter from Mr. Carroll P. Streeter, editor of the widely circulated and highly respected Farm Journal. In his letter, Mr. Streeter reports on the Farm Journal's poll as to what farmers themselves want in the way of a farm program, regardless of party or farm organization affiliation.

Mr. Streeter was a guest at the weekly Nebraska congressional breakfast a few weeks ago and reported to us on the preliminary results of the poll. Now there is available the result of 10,000 ballots—all the Farm Journal staff has had time to count so far.

Here is how farmers themselves voted on the three choices given them in the poll:

First, compulsory Government quotas on what could be sold, or how much land could be farmed; stiff penalties, support prices at, or above, present levels—all ingredients of the Kennedy-Freeman farm plan.

Only 4 percent of the 10,000 ballots cast favored that choice.

Second, expanded voluntary land retirement program to cut crop production; no compulsory quotas or allotments; with supports on crops at a level to stabilize markets, but not add to surpluses. This is the so-called "middle ground" approach. Forty-four percent of the 10,000 ballots cast declared in favor of that alternative.

The final choice was to have the Government completely out of the picture; there be no controls and no price supports. Fifty-two percent of the 10,000 ballots cast expressed their preference for this choice.

Even the editors of Farm Journal were surprised at the immediate response and the size of the vote. Farmers know what they want, and they are willing to tell anybody who will listen.

Mr. President, the results of the poll correlate quite closely with the mail received in my office from Nebraska farmers. It is to be hoped that Mr. Freeman will study the results of the Farm Journal poll because, as Mr. Streeter says in his letter:

> We've done farm-policy polls before, in 1959 and 1957. The thing that amazes us is how consistently farmers vote on somewhat similar questions each time. The conclusions can only be, after a while, that this is no fluke.

It occurs to me that the Congress would do well to take a cue from the Farm Journal poll. How much more sensible it would be if in this year's farm program, we offered the farmer, not the all-or-nothing choice now proposed, but to give him a third choice, a middle ground, as well.

This suggestion may not arouse the enthusiasm of the man in a chair behind a Department of Agriculture desk, but I am confident it will be welcomed by the man in the seat of a tractor in Nebraska.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the text of Mr. Streeter's letter to me; the article entitled, "How You Voted"; the Farm Journal editorial entitled "What Farmers Don't Want"; and the statistical analysis of the poll referred to.

There being no objection, the letter, article, editorial, and statistical analysis were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MARCH 14, 1962.

Hon. ROMAN L. HRUSKA,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: What do farmers themselves want in the way of a farm program—all farmers, regardless of party or farm-organization affiliation?

Farm Journal, the national farm news magazine, asked them in its March issue, and the volume and speed of response were amazing. Four days after the magazine came from the press we had 4,000 ballots back in Philadelphia (and some of this time was taken up by the mail in both directions). Within 6 days we had 11,000. At the end of 2 weeks we were all but buried in more than 50,000 and they're still coming.

Enclosed is the result on 10,000—all we've had time to count so far. We'll go on and count the rest, but we know the figures won't change significantly. We tabulate them by States, by region, by commodity, and by age. All of this will appear as a feature article in our April issue, accompanied by our edi-

torial opinion which you'll find on the back of the folder. All 3 million readers of Farm Journal will get this report next week; we thought you might like an advance look.

As we say in our editorial, polls, especially mail polls, can be faulted in many ways. However, the results of this one were so decisive that, even after they are discounted for this reason or that, they are still mighty eloquent. We've done farm policy polls before, in 1959 and 1957. The thing that amazes us is how consistently farmers vote on somewhat similar questions each time. The conclusion can only be, after awhile, that this is no fluke. Farm Journal itself doesn't agree with the group that says it wants the Government "clear out." This and the No. 2 choice both got a heavy vote. The result that we think is clearest is the emphatic "no" vote on No. 1.

Sincerely,

CARROLL P. STREETER,
Editor, Farm Journal.

HOW YOU VOTED

How does your choice compare with these 10,000 readers who voted on three different farm plans presented here last month?

If those Farm Journal readers who wrote us are typical, the Nation's farmers are overwhelmingly opposed to tighter controls and compulsory quotas on what they raise.

Only 4 percent—4 out of 100—who voted in Farm Journal's March poll favored a compulsory quota program (the main ingredient of the administration's farm plan).

Of our readers responding, 44 percent voted for an expanded voluntary land-retirement program. And 52 percent voted to get the Government clear out.

We were deluged with ballots—50,000 in the first 2 weeks; and still coming in. In order to get the results in time for this issue of Farm Journal, we could count only 10,000 ballots. We took these as they arrived, in proportion to the number of subscribers by States.

Altogether, 27 Farm Journal people spent 750 man-hours opening, sorting and counting these 10,000 ballots. One person, working alone, would need nearly 2 years to handle 50,000 ballots. We will put a crew on it and promptly open and count all ballots and read every letter.

The results from this poll check closely with previous polls by Farm Journal. In 1957 we offered four farm program choices; and in 1959, five. In 1957, 50 percent voted to get the Government out; in 1959, 55 percent voted that way; this year 52 percent.

The 4 percent return for compulsory quotas is the lowest vote for any of the choices over the 3 years.

Among the five Farm Journal editions, eastern readers gave the smallest vote to quotas, and the largest vote to getting the Government clear out. Quotas mustered a bit of support in parts of the western Corn Belt and in Kentucky.

The voluntary land-retirement program did best in the Central States (51 percent) and poorest in the East (32 percent).

Among commodity groups, the land-retirement program pulled the most votes among hog raisers—and got the smallest percentage from poultrymen and fruit and vegetable growers.

Poultrymen, who certainly have been in trouble, and for whom the Government is talking about national marketing orders, gave the highest vote for getting the Government out entirely—70 percent. Tobacco growers are least inclined—33 percent—to have the Government step out completely. They've had the most Government (compulsory quotas) of anybody.

Among States, Iowans gave the smallest vote—25 percent—to getting the Government out. This was also true in 1959 when 24 percent of the Iowans voted that way.

Young farmers are more opposed to compulsory quotas than older operators; otherwise, age didn't make much difference.

Age	Quotas	Land retirement	Government out
	Percent	*Percent*	*Percent*
29 and under	2	47	51
30 to 39	4	46	50
40 to 49	4	46	50
50 to 59	5	42	53
60 plus	4	41	55

Many took time to write letters explaining their choices. A large number who wrote were young farmers and "small" operators who objected to a quota system that would tie them to their present size.

"Quotas wouldn't give a starting farmer a chance; he'd have no prospects of expanding," says Robert Pfeil of South Dakota.

"The big operator would have more of a monopoly than he already has," thinks Noel Sorensen of Idaho.

Many dairymen complained bitterly about quotas. "I'm a young man who has been struggling along. Now that I have a young dairy started with my sons, they want to tell us we can't farm it because we didn't have a milk quota for 1961," says Donald Carey of New York.

Several of those who voted to get the Government out thought that if this were done the CCC shouldn't dump its surpluses on the market. Others admitted that it might be "rough" for a time. "I might be the first to go," wrote L. McGinnis, of Alabama, "but somewhere down the line we'd stabilize. I'm willing to bet a lifetime's work that I can knock heads with the hobby farmers and come out on top. I am eager for a try."

Many of those writing in support of compulsory quotas say that it's the only way to get rid of the surplus, and they agree with L. H. Kuhle, of Illinois, that farm programs won't work without controls. "What other business doesn't regiment its production to stay in line with demand?" asks Jay Triplett, of Texas.

WHAT FARMERS DON'T WANT—HERE'S A MESSAGE FROM THE COUNTRY

Farmers may disagree about what they do want in the way of a farm policy, but they're mighty clear about what they don't want. They don't want compulsory Government quotas. They don't want the Government running the farms of the country. They don't want the Secretary of Agriculture telling them how much, or how little, they can raise and sell without being whacked by a Government penalty. And they've just spoken in a way that should leave nobody in Washington in any doubt about it.

A mail poll, such as Farm Journal has just conducted, can be faulted in many ways. Some will say the choices weren't worded fairly, some that farmers voted without fully realizing the consequences of what they were voting for, some that the undecided were not represented in the voting. All of these things might be fairly argued. But discount the results as you will—they are still so decisive as to be eloquent.

Farm Journal makes no claim that such a poll shows anything with exactitude. We do say that it is a highly significant straw in the wind to show the direction of farm thinking. We believe it most certainly does that. Furthermore it cuts across all party and organizational lines. If we were a Congressman, a Senator, a Secretary of Agriculture or a President, we would pay serious attention to it.

The size and speed of the vote were astounding. In 1957, a similar poll eventually pulled 4,000 votes. In our 1959 poll we got about 11,000 ballots, over a 6-week period. This time the vote fairly blew the door down. Within 4 days after the magazine rolled off the presses, we had 4,000 ballots back. Within 6 days the total had swelled to over 10,000. At the end of 2 weeks we were swamped with approximately 50,000. Evidently many farmers felt strongly and welcomed the chance to tell the world where they stood.

Farm Journal doesn't happen to agree with the 52 percent who want the "Government clear out." We agree with Mr. Freeman that the Government has to help control supply, but disagree vigorously with him over method. We hold that any farmer who takes Government support has an obligation to help. But we believe all this can be done primarily by a voluntary land retirement program, which will cost little (if any) more than Government compulsion and which will leave farmers—not the Government—in control of farming.

We'll send the results of the poll to all of the people in Washington mentioned above. We wouldn't think they would have any difficulty in getting the message.

State	Compulsory quotas	Land retirement	Government clear out
	Percent	*Percent*	*Percent*
Eastern	2	32	66
Connecticut	0	16	84
Delaware	0	45	55
Maine	0	37	63
Maryland	2	35	63
Massachusetts	2	27	71
New Hampshire	0	41	59
New Jersey	6	29	65
New York	3	38	59
Pennsylvania	1	30	69
Rhode Island	11	11	78
Vermont	2	38	60
West Virginia	1	25	74
Central	4	51	45
Illinois	4	50	46
Indiana	1	48	51
Iowa	7	68	25
Kansas	2	47	51
Michigan	2	46	52
Minnesota	7	53	40
Missouri	3	54	43
Nebraska	6	57	37
North Dakota	9	55	36
Ohio	2	37	61
South Dakota	7	48	45
Wisconsin	6	48	46
Southeastern	6	48	46
Alabama	2	47	51
Florida	6	40	54
Georgia	6	50	44
Kentucky	11	59	30
Mississippi	0	52	48
North Carolina	8	46	46
South Carolina	6	47	47
Tennessee	6	51	43
Virginia	4	39	57
Southwestern	3	36	61
Arkansas	2	39	59
Louisiana	2	42	56
New Mexico	0	42	58
Oklahoma	1	40	59
Texas	5	31	64
Western	3	33	64
Arizona	3	8	89
California	3	26	71
Colorado	6	35	59
Idaho	2	43	55
Montana	4	35	61
Nevada	0	10	90
Oregon	2	41	57
Utah	2	49	49
Washington	2	34	64
Wyoming	3	28	69
U.S. total	4	44	52

What different commodity groups want

EASTERN

Kind of farmers [1]	Compulsory quotas		Land retirement		Government clear out	
	United States	Eastern	United States	Eastern	United States	Eastern
	Percent	*Percent*	*Percent*	*Percent*	*Percent*	*Percent*
Beef	4	0	42	27	54	73
Dairy	4	3	44	36	52	61
Feed grains	4	1	48	31	48	68
Fruit and vegetables	3	4	31	31	66	65
General	2	0	35	34	63	66
Hogs	4	0	52	25	44	75
Poultry	3	2	27	20	70	78
Sheep	3	0	36	41	61	59
Wheat	4	0	44	39	52	61

CENTRAL

Kind of farmers [1]	Compulsory quotas		Land retirement		Government clear out	
	United States	Central	United States	Central	United States	Central
	Percent	*Percent*	*Percent*	*Percent*	*Percent*	*Percent*
Beef	4	4	42	51	54	45
Dairy	4	4	44	48	52	48
Feed grains	4	5	48	52	48	43
Fruit and vegetables	3	4	31	43	66	53
General	2	3	35	48	63	49
Hogs	4	4	52	53	44	43
Poultry	3	3	27	46	70	51
Sheep	3	4	36	40	61	56
Wheat	4	4	44	48	52	48

SOUTHEASTERN

Kind of farmers [1]	Compulsory quotas		Land retirement		Government clear out	
	United States	Southeastern	United States	Southeastern	United States	Southeastern
	Percent	*Percent*	*Percent*	*Percent*	*Percent*	*Percent*
Beef	4	4	42	43	54	53
Cotton	5	6	51	57	44	37
Dairy	4	7	44	53	52	40
Feed grains	4	3	48	47	48	50
Fruit and vegetables	3	0	31	24	66	76
General	2	5	35	37	63	58

SOUTHEASTERN—Continued

Kind of farmers [1]	Compulsory quotas		Land retirement		Government clear out	
	United States	Southeastern	United States	Southeastern	United States	Southeastern
	Percent	*Percent*	*Percent*	*Percent*	*Percent*	*Percent*
Hogs	4	6	52	57	44	37
Peanuts	8	5	51	65	41	30
Poultry	3	9	27	31	70	60
Tobacco	13	15	54	56	33	29

SOUTHWESTERN

Kind of farmers [1]	Compulsory quotas		Land retirement		Government clear out	
	United States	Southwestern	United States	Southwestern	United States	Southwestern
	Percent	*Percent*	*Percent*	*Percent*	*Percent*	*Percent*
Beef	4	3	42	35	54	62
Cotton	5	4	51	49	44	47
Dairy	4	3	44	48	52	49
Feed grains	4	3	38	31	48	66
General	2	1	35	25	63	74
Hogs	4	2	52	31	44	67
Rice	7	7	33	32	60	61
Sheep	3	0	36	42	61	58
Wheat	4	0	44	40	52	60

WESTERN

Kind of farmers [1]	Compulsory quotas		Land retirement		Government clear out	
	United States	Western	United States	Western	United States	Western
	Percent	*Percent*	*Percent*	*Percent*	*Percent*	*Percent*
Beef	4	3	42	32	54	65
Cotton	5	6	51	39	44	55
Dairy	4	3	44	37	52	60
Feed grains	4	1	48	35	48	64
Fruit and vegetables	3	3	31	27	66	70
General	2	1	35	29	63	70
Hogs	4	0	52	27	44	73
Poultry	3	0	27	5	70	95
Sheep	3	0	36	25	61	75
Wheat	4	4	44	42	52	54

[1] Main crop or livestock.

THE HUNGARIAN REVOLUTION

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, March 15 represents the 114th anniversary of the Hungarian revolution—March 15, 1848—which will be celebrated by the Hungarians all over the world as a national holiday in commemoration of the freedom fighters of the Hungarian people against the oppressing Hapsburg dynasty. Today the people of Hungary are under the yoke of the Soviet Russian communistic power. However, it is difficult to refer to Hungarian freedom day without speaking of the courageous Hungarian freedom fighters who in 1956 desperately and hopefully attempted to free themselves and their children from the chains of Communist domination as they smashed through the Iron Curtain by sheer courage. The Communist-dominated Hungarian Army, some of whom defected against the cause of freedom and liberty, was brushed aside by these courageous freedom lovers. However, the Soviet Russia Communists, in order to show the world its brutal strength, sent masses of savage troops across the frontier led by tanks which systematically wiped out masses of men, boys, and even women who were armed only with rifles in an attempt to stem the tide. The world was shocked when 50,000 Hungarians were killed. Gaining the upper hand, the Communists unleashed vengeance and terror beyond the imagination of freedom-loving people throughout the world to comprehend such torturing of children, women, and men of Hungary.

Mr. President, the people behind the Iron Curtain still have hopes for freedom as do the other brave people both to the north and to the south, who are also behind the Iron Curtain. Since 1956 the United Nations General Assembly has adopted 12 resolutions condemning the Soviet Union in their brutalities of crushing the Hungarian revolution of 1956 and demanding that Soviet troops be withdrawn and that basic human rights and the right of self-determination be restored to the Hungarian people so that they could decide the form of government they want by free elections under international control.

Mr. President, by raising our voices in the Halls of Congress demanding that the Soviet Union give these people behind the Iron Curtain the right of self-determination and by urging the withdrawal of Russian troops, we are advising the peoples of the world that the failure of the Soviet Communists to do so proves they speak falsely when they speak as true spokesmen of self-determination and independence, and it will show to the new nations of Africa and Asia and to other nations throughout the world that they cannot depend upon the word of the Soviet Union with its many false promises of comfort and good life under the Communist ideologies.

Mr. President, it is my fervent hope and prayer that the day will come when all people will be free of governmental tyranny of all kinds and that they shall live as free men under God.

AVAILABILITY OF MEDICAL CARE TO QUALIFIED AGED CITIZENS OF ILLINOIS UNDER THE KERR-MILLS ACT OF 1960

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD a primer on medical care and the availability of such care to qualified aged citizens of Illinois and other citizens under the Kerr-Mills Act passed by Congress in 1960.

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

A PRIMER ON MEDICAL CARE AND THE AVAILABILITY OF SUCH CARE TO QUALIFIED AGED CITIZENS OF ILLINOIS UNDER THE KERR-MILLS ACT PASSED BY CONGRESS IN 1960

I. INTRODUCTION

There appears to be some impression that no medical care program for the aged exists.

That this impression is held by many persons may be derived from mail and inquiries to Members of Congress.

The fact that this impression exists has developed some confusion with respect to new plans now being offered.

Emphatically there is a medicare program for older people.

It has been on the Federal statute books since September 1960.

It requires action by the States to take advantage of the program.

Twenty-eight States have enacted legislation to do so, namely: Alabama, Arkansas, California, Connecticut, Georgia, Hawaii, Idaho, Illinois, Iowa, Kentucky, Louisiana, Maine, Maryland, Massachusetts, Michigan, New Hampshire, New Mexico, New York, North Dakota, Oklahoma, Oregon, Pennsylvania, South Carolina, Tennessee, Utah, Vermont, Washington, and West Virginia.

Legislatures of other States will doubtless act shortly.

This primer is designed to make available the background, the action, and the details of this program of health care for the aged.

II. BACKGROUND

Years of discussion within the Congress have been devoted to exploring methods for providing assistance to older people in need of medical care.

Many bills on this subject have been introduced in many Congresses.

There has been wide disagreement on what should be done.

There have been some areas of agreement on facts.

We know from census rolls the number of people age 65 and over.

We do not know with precision the number of people 65 and over who need medical care.

It is estimated that over one-half of all aged people now have some kind of health coverage.

The number of people over 65 covered by health insurance is increasing, apparently at a rapid rate.

Strangely enough, despite this progress, agitation in Congress continues for a new health program.

III. CONGRESSIONAL ACTION IN THIS FIELD

The Forand and Kennedy bills

In 1959 the Forand and Kennedy bills were introduced in the 86th Congress. They were named for Congressman Forand of Rhode Island and Senator Kennedy of Massachusetts.

Financing provisions of these bills called for a new social security tax on employer and employee of one-fourth percent each.

Benefits would have been available to all Social Security and Railroad Retirement Acts retirees over 65.

All others over 65 would be excluded.

Wealthy and poor alike could secure benefits if covered by social security. There would be no needs test.

Flat benefits would have consisted of 60 days hospitalization, 120 days of nursing home service (less hospital days) after transfer from a hospital, and nonelective surgery.

Those who pay the tax—workers—would be paying for an undetermined number of people who would not need these benefits.

Excluded from benefits would have been 4 million or more persons who have never been under social security.

The cost of these bills was estimated to be from $1½ to $2½ billion a year at the beginning of the program.

Additional Federal personnel needed to administer the program was estimated at 32,000. This figure might be doubled.

The Kerr-Mills bill

This bill was named after Senator KERR of Oklahoma and Congressman MILLS of Arkansas.

It was first developed in the Ways and Means Committee of the House of Representatives and then modified.

Its basic qualification provided that adequate medical services be made available to those persons, not on public assistance rolls, who need help in obtaining care.

No one would be excluded who met this qualification.

Administration of the program would be by the States.

The cost, including administrative expenses, would be shared by the State and Federal Governments.

The Anderson amendment

This amendment to the Kerr-Mills bill was offered in the Senate by Senator ANDERSON, of New Mexico, for whom it was named

It would have provided benefits similar to the Forand and Kennedy bills for retirees under social security.

Only such retirees, aged 68 and over, however, would have been eligible.

Senate action: The Anderson amendment was defeated August 23, 1960.

Final action on the Kerr-Mills bill

The Kerr-Mills bill, as modified in the Senate, passed the Senate August 23, 1960, by a vote of 91 to 2.

The bill went to conference committee to iron out differences between the House and Senate versions.

The conference report was adopted in the Senate August 29, 1960, by a vote of 74 to 11.

The Kerr-Mills Act was signed by President Eisenhower, September 13, 1960.

IV. THE PLAN

Each State is permitted to use the Federal funds available to it to provide any kind of medical care for persons over 65 who are unable to provide it for themselves, including those who are able to otherwise provide their own necessities.

No limit is placed on the benefits, but these benefits must include both institutional and noninstitutional care and may include:

(1) impatient hospital services;
(2) skilled nursing-home services;
(3) physicians' services;
(4) outpatient hospital or clinic services;
(5) home health care services;
(6) private duty nursing services;
(7) physical therapy and related services;
(8) dental services;
(9) laboratory and X-ray services;
(10) prescribed drugs, eyeglasses, dentures, and prosthetic devices;
(11) diagnostic, screening, and preventive services; and
(12) any other medical care or remedial care recognized under State law.

The Federal cost of this plan has been estimated at approximately $165 million per year, when fully in operation.

The State costs of this plan have been estimated at approximately $154 million per year.

V. PLAN IN OPERATION IN ILLINOIS

The plan was adopted by the State of Illinois August 1, 1961.

Appropriations of $18.3 million were made available to carry out the medical assistance for the aged program in Illinois through June 30, 1963.

One-half of this amount is provided from Federal funds under the Kerr-Mills Act.

The main feature of the plan, as adopted by the legislature, was authorization of a program embracing the complete range of federally recognized medical services.

It gave the Illinois Public Aid Commission responsibility, however, for determining which of these would be provided.

Current benefits now include necessary hospital inpatient care and physicians' services for 30 days after release from a hospital when not available from other sources.

Payment from public funds is limited to costs which (1) exceed 10 percent of a qualified applicant's income; and (2) are not payable by a health insurance policy.

Income requirements under the plan provide that an individual with income under $1,800 and a couple with income under $2,400 shall be eligible if other assets do not exceed stipulated amounts.

Assets which are excluded in determining eligibility are: (1) the homestead; (2) clothing, household effects and automobiles; (3) $1,000 life insurance; (4) personal property valued at under $1,000 and used in earning income; and (5) other liquid or marketable assets up to $1,800 for an individual and $2,400 for a couple.

Applications under the plan totaled 1,775 during the first 5 months of its operation, August 1 through December 1961.

Of these 694 were approved, 456 were pending, and 625 were denied as of February 1962.

Billings had been received and payments made, as of February 1, 1962, on 33 of these cases for a total of $19,718 or an average of $495 per case.

VI. SUMMARY

1. There is a Federal medical care plan for the aged which was signed into law by President Eisenhower September 13, 1960.

2. Along with other States there is a medical care plan in Illinois which is functioning and available to older persons of that State.

3. Any senior citizens of Illinois in need of such care can apply without delay through the Illinois Public Aid Commission.

4. The Illinois Public Aid Commission has offices in virtually every county of the State.

MEDICAL CARE NOW AVAILABLE FOR NEEDY AGED OVER 65

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, a department of the executive branch of Government has sent a folder to each Senator and Representative setting forth that items for congressional newsletters, briefings for constituents, interviews, speakers, radio and TV aid are now available to sell administration programs.

In this welter of propaganda, how strange that so little is done to tell our aged citizens over 65 that, since September 1960, a medical care program for the aged has been on the statute books.

Can it be that this is deliberately done to set the stage for the administration drive to replace this program with its own?

The fact is that the Eisenhower medical care program for the aged has been approved by 28 States and that other legislatures will act on it shortly.

The Kerr-Mills Act, as it is called, passed both branches of Congress by a whopping vote. It affords medicare for any of our needy aged over 65. The range of services is much wider than that provided by the new administration proposal and leaves it to the States to administer and determine what services may be included.

As an example, in the first 5 months of operations in Illinois, 1,775 applications were received, 694 were approved

and the first billings for services showed that they averaged $495 per case.

So there is a medical care program for the aged. And it is working. Why then is the administration so niggardly in telling our aged people about it? If facilities and officials are available to brief visitors to Washington on the U.N. $100 million bond plan or help Congressmen and Senators tell the story of $3 billion for Alianza para el Progresso or the new trade plan, surely some talent is available to better inform our own aged about the medical care program which Congress approved 18 months ago.

THE PROPOSED UNITED NATIONS BOND ISSUE

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, there is a danger that the debate on the United Nations bond bill will become sidetracked off toward a discussion of certain narrow financial matters and I hope that I do not contribute to that result by what I am about to do.

The senior Senator from Vermont has been using a table purporting to show the net cost to the United States of buying one-half of the $200 million worth of U.N. bonds. That table is included in the committee report on S. 2768. The validity of the table depends upon accepting certain assumptions which I am not willing to accept and I am afraid that the table may lead to misunderstanding if it is allowed to stand alone.

There are various ways to compute the cost of various methods of meeting the U.N. financial crisis. The answers that one gets vary greatly depending on the assumptions which one makes about such things as interest rates, the percentage share of the United States in making payments, and so forth.

For the benefit of my colleagues—and I hope not the further confusion of my colleagues—I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD at this point a series of tables comparing the net cost to the United States of participating in several possible methods of meeting the financial problems facing the United Nations.

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

Net cost to the United States of helping solve the U.N. financial crisis—comparison of various methods

[In millions]

A. Cash contributions of $200 million on same scale of assessments as in the past:	
Expenditures:	
U.S. assess contribution at 32.02 percent on $200 million	$64.0
Voluntary contribution needed based on past experience	31.0
Total	95.0
B. 25-year, 2-percent U.N. bonds in amount of $200 million, United States buying half:	
Expenditures:	
U.S. purchase	100.0
Repayments to U.N.:	
Of $200 million principal at 32.02 assessment	64.0
Of $55 million[1] interest at 32.02 assessment	17.6
Total U.S. expenditure	181.6

[1] Calculated on the basis of an average beginning time for interest.

Net cost to the United States of helping solve the U.N. financial crisis—comparison of various methods—Continued

[In millions]

B. 25-year, 2-percent U.N. bonds, etc.—Con.	
Receipts:	
Repayment of principal	$100.0
Payment of interest at 2 percent	27.5
Total U.S. receipts	127.5
Net U.S. cost	54.1
C. 3-year, 2.9-percent U.S. loan of $100 million and $100 million U.N. bonds purchased by others:[2]	
Expenditures:	
U.S. loan to U.N	100.0
Repayments to U.N.:	
On $100 million loan at 47½ percent[2]	47.5
On interest on loan of $8.7 million at 47½ percent	4.1
On $100 million bonds purchased by other nations at 32.02 percent	32.0
On $27.5 million interest on bonds purchased by other nations at 32.02 percent	8.8
Total U.S. expenditure	192.4
Receipts:	
Repayment of principal on U.S. 3-year loan	100.0
Repayment on interest on U.S. loan	8.7
Total U.S. receipts	108.7
Net U.S. cost	83.7
D. $200 million 3-year, 2.9-percent loan, with United States lending half:	
Expenditures:	
U.S. loan to U.N.:	
U.S. loan principal	100.0
Repayments to U.N.:	
On $100 million loan at 47½ percent[3]	47.5
On interest for loan of $8.7 million at 47½ percent	4.1
Total repayment of U.S. loan	51.6
Other nations loan to U.N.:	
Repayments to U.N.:	
On $100 million loan at 47½ percent	47.5
On interest for loan of $8.7 million at 47½ percent	4.1
Total repayment of other nations' loans	51.6
Total U.S. expenditures	203.2
Receipts:	
Repayment of principal on U.S. 3-year loan	100.0
Repayment of interest on U.S. 3-year loan	8.7
Total U.S. receipts	108.7
Net U.S. cost	94.5

[2] This table assumes that the U.S. loan will not be repaid in installments but in its entirety at the end of the 3-year period and that repayment will be by special assessment with the United States being obligated to pay the same percentage as we are now paying for the Congo operation through assessment plus voluntary contributions.

[3] It is assumed that the loan would be repaid in its entirety at the end of the 3-year period together with 2.9-percent interest and that the United States would have to pay 47½ percent.

KENNEDY ADMINISTRATION DEALS DEATH BLOW TO LEAD-ZINC INDUSTRY

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, yesterday a leading spokesman for the Kennedy administration said, in connection with direly needed legislation to raise lead and zinc tariffs:

> We have not considered nor have we taken action in regard to duties.

His declaration was so strong that the Wall Street Journal this morning in its headline said:

> Udall Kills Hopes of Rise in Lead and Zinc Tariffs.

Thus, the Kennedy administration, through Secretary of the Interior Stewart L. Udall, has dramatically demonstrated its total disregard and complete indifference to the welfare of the domestic lead-zinc industry. This indifference is so pronounced that the administration has "not seriously considered" an important bill, S. 2747, which is sponsored by Senator CLINTON ANDERSON, chairman of the Senate Interior and Insular Affairs Committee, together with 13 Democratic Senators and 7 Republican Senators. Apparently the administration does not think that a bill sponsored by 21 Senators and many Representatives is worthy of its consideration.

This cavalier statement by Secretary Udall will not be well received by the thousands of lead-zinc miners out of work in Utah and in the rest of the United States, nor will it be well received by mine operators who have had to go out of business or will soon have to do so if prompt remedial action is not taken by the Federal Government.

I was not always in agreement with the actions taken by the Eisenhower administration on lead and zinc problems, but the Udall statement and the attitude of the Kennedy administration make the Eisenhower administration look like the most helpful, the most sympathetic, and the most cooperative in history.

NO HELP OFFERED BY KENNEDY ADMINISTRATION

After dealing the death blow to the hopes of western miners, one might have expected Secretary Udall to offer at least a sop to them. But, instead, he indicated that the administration has virtually nothing whatever in mind to assist the domestic lead-zinc industry.

Both the Emergency Lead-Zinc Committee and I strongly support S. 2747, believing that a relatively low flexible tariff would make it possible for our mines to stay in operation. Our miners feel that they shcuid in fairness have about 50 percent of the domestic market, and believe that S. 2747 would accomplish this objective. But the Kennedy administration apparently prefers to shut down and bankrupt our western mining industry, as clearly shown both by the complete absence of a program and by its outright rejection of S. 2747.

ADMINISTRATION LEAD BARTER PROGRAM

The Kennedy administration has come up with only two programs which would supposedly assist the lead-zinc industry. The first is the so-called small producers

subsidy bill. All this bill will do, even if Congress provides the appropriations, is stimulate production by small operators in the Midwest and bankrupt many mines in the Rocky Mountain States.

The second program involves bartering with other countries. However, instead of bartering away the lead and zinc in our Government stockpiles, the Kennedy administration took the remarkable step of exchanging our wheat for Canadian and Australian lead to the tune of 100,000 tons. The wheat probably went to Communist China. I vigorously protested this unwise, unwarranted, and wasteful action last October. But the administration went right ahead. Thus. we now have another 100,000 tons of unneeded lead in our Federal stockpile.

Some months after my protest about the administration barter agreement, President Kennedy hinted darkly in a press conference that there was a record of past corruption in connection with the defense stockpiling program. His lieutenants said that the Government has four times more lead than it needs and would face a $70 million loss on disposal at present prices. Yet it was this same administration which added still another unneeded 100,000 tons of lead to the already bulging stockpile. Just where is the alleged corruption?

RESEARCH

On February 9, 1961, I introduced a bill, S. 828, which was designed to encourage and stimulate the production and conservation of lead and zinc in the United States through research and development by authorizing the Secretary of Interior to contract for lead and zinc research. This bill was prepared by Interior Department officials under the Eisenhower administration at my request. It was patterned after the so-called utilization coal research program. And how did the Kennedy administration respond to this approach? It rejected it, saying that the Department of Interior already had authority to accomplish some of the purposes of my bill, although not all. I then wrote the Secretary asking him to use this authority, but when the research program for the current fiscal year was announced, lead and zinc research was put on a starvation diet by the Department.

The people of the West have had just about enough of the highhanded and indifferent attitude of the Kennedy administration toward the mining industry. If this continues to be the approach of the Kennedy administration toward industries damaged by a flood of foreign imports, then I predict rough sledding for the President's trade program.

I ask unanimous consent that the Wall Street Journal article to which I referred be included in the RECORD, together with a copy of a letter which I directed to the President on June 21, 1961, and copies of a statement that I presented to the U.S. Tariff Commission on January 16, 1962, and a statement which I gave before the Senate Interior Committee on July 25, 1961. These statements show the grave situation that prevails in the lead-zinc mining industry.

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

UDALL KILLS HOPES OF RISE IN LEAD AND ZINC TARIFFS—HE INDICATES PRESIDENT STILL OPPOSES INCREASES, SEES TRADE ACT AIDING INDUSTRY—TALK GETS COOL RECEPTION

WASHINGTON.—Interior Secretary Udall dashed any hopes of the congressional mining bloc that President Kennedy might attempt to win their support for his trade program by raising lead and zinc tariffs.

Responding to questions from mining bloc members of the House Ways and Means Committee, Mr. Udall asserted: "We have not seriously considered nor have we taken action in regard to duties." In other words, the Kennedy administration is continuing its opposition to higher tariffs as a means of helping ailing concerns in the lead-zinc industry.

Instead, Mr. Udall's prepared testimony attempted to woo the mining State lawmakers for the Kennedy tariff-cutting trade program by arguing that it would aid the domestic mining industry. His reasoning: The new tariff reducing powers would open up the European Common Market to greater U.S. industrial exports so that U.S. manufacturers would need greater quantities of minerals to produce these exports.

As might be expected, there was no immediate acceptance of Mr. Udall's thesis. "I don't see where this bill offers any help" for the mining industry, asserted Representative ULLMAN, Democrat, of Oregon, usually a stanch administration supporter but also a champion of the western mining industries.

MAJOR STUMBLING BLOCK

The congressional mining bloc presents a major problem for the administration in trying to shepherd its trade bill through Congress. Some normally proadministration western Democrats declare privately they won't support the trade bill unless Mr. Kennedy either raises lead and zinc tariffs by Executive action or drops his opposition to a bill by Congres to accomplish the same thing. Administration spokesmen in the past have made it clear that Mr. Kennedy would veto such a bill, and Mr. Udall said nothing yesterday to change this impression.

When the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act was last renewed by Congress in 1958, former President Eisenhower won substantial support from western mining State lawmakers by proposing a far-reaching minerals subsidy program. The program passed the Senate but later was killed in the House. It had been expected that the Kennedy administration, which wants broad tariffcutting authority under a new version of the Trade Act that expires June 30, would also attempt to salve mining legislators—perhaps by raising lead and zinc tariffs.

The question of a tariff rise was put to Mr. Udall yesterday by Representative BAKER, Republican of Tennessee, regarded by the administration as a possible supporter of its trade program but whose mountainous eastern Tennessee district includes ailing lead-zinc producers. "Can you offer me any hope (for) effective action to restore that vital (lead-zinc) industry so that it can exist and put a lot of people back to work?" Mr. BAKER asked.

The best Mr. Udall could offer was a vague promise that the administration might do something about the present system of quotas on lead and zinc imports. This system was instituted by Mr. Eisenhower, but Mr. Udall conceded under questioning that it "hasn't been too successful."

Asked after the hearing to elaborate on his comments on quotas, Mr. Udall asserted the administration is not considering a reduction in the lead and zinc quotas. At some later date, he added, the administration might take another look at the flow of lead and zinc imports. This leaves the door open for one administration concession to the mining bloc, though it does not appear to be immediately in the offing or even probable in the future.

As for raising lead and zinc tariffs, Mr. Udall repeated the administration argument that this would hurt relations with such lead and zinc exporting nations as Canada, Mexico, Peru, and Australia—"our closest neighbors and closest friends."

In his prepared statement, the Interior Secretary had contended that "lower foreign tariffs on imports of American automobiles, machinery, and manufactures can only mean larger markets for crude materials. Furthermore, a reduction of tariff barriers to U.S. manufacturers may, in total, have a greater favorable impact on our crude mineral industry than direct U.S. tariff areas."

MINOR INFLUENCE FORECAST

Whatever tariff reductions on minerals that might result from the Kennedy trade program would have only a minor influence on the domestic mining industry's competitive situation, Mr. Udall contended. Moreover, he said the major part of U.S. mineral imports consists of commodities not available in the United States in commercial quantities—such as nickel, chrome, tin, quartz, manganese, asbestos, and mica.

Prior to Mr. Udall's appearance before the committee, Deputy Defense Secretary Gilpatric testified that passage of the Kennedy trade bill is regarded at the Pentagon "as a forward step designed to provide the cement of the free world alliance in which defense has already erected the framework of steel."

STATEMENT BY SENATOR WALLACE F. BENNETT GIVEN TO THE U.S. TARIFF COMMISSION

Mr. Chairman, I greatly appreciate the opportunity of appearing before the Tariff Commission this morning to discuss the ever more grave economic plight of the distressed lead-zinc mining industry of the United States. As a member of the Senate Finance Committee, I gave my full support to Senate Resolution 206, under the authority of which these hearings are being conducted today in order to update the economic data prepared by the Tariff Commission following the last lead-zinc proceedings. It is my hope that this hearing will dramatize the alarming situation which confronts our domestic lead-zinc mines, smelters, and mills, to the extent that it might push the administration to take long overdue steps to assist the industry. Thus far, nothing of consequence has been done.

As this Commission well knows, judging from its repeated findings of injury to the lead-zinc industry, lead and zinc miners throughout the entire United States are in serious trouble. In 1948, there were 1,346 mines. This number had dwindled to 625 by 1956, and in 1960 only 292 mines were open. In Utah, there were 81 mines in 1948, 41 in 1956, but there were only 15 mines open in 1960. However, only eight firms filed returns with the Utah State Tax Commission in 1960. Just since 1955, employment in Utah lead-zinc mines and mills has dropped from 1,677 to 900, while employment in smelters has dropped from 733 to 400.

These depressing statistics do not tell the full story, although what they show is bad enough. In 1955, the total net proceeds of lead-zinc operations in Utah was $2,997,000, but by 1960 this had dropped to $383,000. In determining net proceeds under Utah law, a mining company may not deduct certain expenses such as Federal income and social security taxes, salaries of corporate officers, interest, mining royalties, depletion, cost of insurance other than workmen's compensation, and several other important expenses.

Consequently, since 1958 virtually every lead-zinc mining operation in Utah has been operating at a loss.

The situation presently confronting the United Park City Mines Co. is typical of that facing other Utah operations. It has just completed its sixth consecutive year of deficit operations. The company does this in order to preserve its vast mineworkings and maintain a nucleus of its complex organization. Consequently, the number of employees dropped from 236 in 1955 to 154 in 1961. Moreover, United Park intended to close operations entirely, except for block leasing, on January 1, 1962. However, at the request of the local union and the company supervisors, it was agreed that the company would try to continue operations with 20 less employees. The company is now operating on a month-to-month basis, with the understanding that a full layoff will not take place as long as it can break even. This is regrettably typical of the other seven Utah lead-zinc mines.

This fall I visited Park City, which was once one of the great mining centers of America. In great part because the Federal Government has persisted in a policy of favoring and fostering foreign producers, this great area is but a skeleton of what it once was. If these misguided policies are continued, it will be a ghost town.

Before 1950 the Salt Lake-Tooele County area was the greatest nonferrous smelting center in the United States. Since that time, the American Smelting & Refining Co. smelters at Murray and the U.S. Smelting, Refining & Mining Co.'s smelter at Midvale have closed down. Only one smelter remains today—the International Smelting & Refining Co.'s plant at Tooele. The only remaining lead-zinc mill in the State is the U.S. Smelting's plant at Midvale. Unless the present administration bestirs itself to take more helpful action toward assisting the domestic lead-zinc industry than the ill-conceived and wholly inadequate small producers' subsidy bill, the proceedings today will be little more than a funeral. The subsidy bill will probaby do more harm to Utah miners than good, even assuming that Congress appropriates funds to implement it.

The present import quotas on lead and zinc are far too high. This is best demonstrated by the continuing depressing effects which imports have had on the domestic price. In 1961, lead sold at 3½ cents per pound less than during the base period of 1953–57 used in the quota determination. Meanwhile, consumption has decreased, while lead stocks have remained 50,000 to 100,000 tons higher than normal. At the same time, the price of zinc has fluctuated slightly above and below the low level of the base period. Only recently has it moved but one-quarter of a cent above the base. Similarly, zinc consumption has dropped since the base period.

All in all, it is a most forbidding picture. It is encouraging that the Tariff Commission has repeatedly recognized its seriousness, and if the Commission's recommendations to grant relief had been followed, I am confident that the problem would not now be so serious. I know that your findings of fact in the present hearings will fortify and show the wisdom of your previous recommendations. It is my sincere hope that these findings will have some persuasive effect and elicit a degree of sympathy from the present administration.

I ask that a table which I have had prepared, showing certain lead-zinc statistics for Utah from 1955 to 1961, together with a letter sent to me by S. K. Droubay, vice president and general manager of the United Park City Mines, be included in the Commission record for its study following my remarks.

STATEMENT BY SENATOR WALLACE F. BENNETT GIVEN BEFORE THE SENATE INTERIOR COMMITTEE

Mr. Chairman, and members of the committee, I greatly appreciate the opportunity of appearing before you this morning in support of S. 1747 of which I have had the honor to be a cosponsor with the chairmen of both the full committee and the subcommittee. This bill holds out the only hope for the economically depressed lead-zinc industry in our Western States, and specifically in Utah. Our lead-zinc miners and mine operators in the West are being drowned in a flood of lead-zinc imports from foreign countries. They have had little sympathy from any administration during the past three decades. The recent July 21 report of the Department of Interior flatly rejecting S. 1747, conclusively shows that the Kennedy administration is no exception and that it has all but written off the lead-zinc mining industry in the Western States. Unless Congress acts and acts soon, this hearing will be, at best, a wake for the industry and we can proceed from here to dedicate the grave.

WESTERN MINERS HAVE SUFFERED THE GREATEST LOSS

Our western miners and mine operators have had to bear almost the total loss of markets caused by the great increase in imports from abroad. This discrimination must cease. Comparing the average domestic production of lead-zinc of the 1947–49 period with the domestic production of 1960, the loss of production in areas other than the Western States was just 51,080 tons, or 15 percent of the total loss. But the loss of production of the Western States was a shocking 85 percent, or 287,666 tons. This means a direct loss to western miners of $46 million in 1960 alone.

UTAH'S DEPRESSED LEAD-ZINC INDUSTRY

Where domestic lead-zinc mines and mills had 24,777 employees in 1952, there were only 9,769 in 1959 and fewer now, a decrease of 61 percent. In Utah, the number of employees in our lead-zinc mines has dropped from 3,118 in 1948 to less than 1,000 today. Where Utah had over 100 mines operating in 1948, there are only 6 today, and 3 of them are small mines combined under one management. Our Utah lead-zinc industry is an island of depression in a sea of national prosperity.

TARIFF COMMISSION UNANIMOUSLY FINDS INJURY

The Tariff Commission unanimously found in May 1954, in April 1958, and again in March 1960, that the lead-zinc industry is suffering serious injury because of excessive imports. I think all of our people recognize that we must import lead and zinc to meet our needs but not in the vast quantities now permitted to reach our shores, since it is having the effect of depressing the price of lead-zinc in domestic markets. It is particularly unfair that western miners should bear almost the full burden of this impact. It is imperative for us to preserve a stable domestic lead-zinc industry in the interest of our national security.

We must have a reliable source of supply and it seems only fair and reasonable to permit our domestic industry to have 50 percent of the American market. Yet, at the present time, imports of lead exceed domestic production by 110,000 tons. Imports of zinc in 1960 exceeded domestic mine production by 70,000 tons. This flood of imports has caused a sharp drop in prices which makes it impossible for our Utah miners and mining operations to make a profit.

KENNEDY ADMINISTRATION'S PROGRAM—A RETURN TO FAILURE

Against this serious backdrop of depression in the lead-zinc industry, I think the Utah miners and mine operators may be forgiven for believing that what purports to be a program offered by the Kennedy administration is worth virtually nothing at all. First of all, the administration rejects S. 1747, which would give domestic miners a price of 13½ cents per pound for lead and 14½ cents per pound for zinc. This combined price is the minimum which must be received by the western lead-zinc mine operators if they are to have a successful economic operation. Contrast these prices, however, with the price which has prevailed for several months of 11 cents for lead and 11½ cents for zinc. These prices under the bill would be achieved by a permanent tariff on lead and zinc of 2 cents per pound, compared with the present rate of 1.0625 cents for lead and 0.7 cent for zinc. In addition, should the domestic price for either metal go below 13½ cents an additional 2 cents flexible tariff would be applied, to be removed when the domestic price rises above 14½ cents per pound.

The administration offers as a substitute for S. 1747 a four-point program:

1. Temporary continuation of the present quantitative import quota program.

2. A barter arrangement under which the United States would exchange surplus agriculture products for lead stocks held outside the United States.

3. A temporary program of limited subsidies to small producers.

4. Creation of a special task force to gather data.

The barter and import quota programs constitute a return to programs that have been tried and failed. The quotas are set so high that our shores are being flooded with imports of lead-zinc. In Utah alone, there has been a decline of over 13 percent in lead-zinc metal production since quotas were imposed on October 1, 1958. Employment has dropped over 13 percent in the same period, with resulting hardship to miners and their families. In the last 2 years, two custom lead-zinc mills were closed and a lead smelter and custom ore sampler have been dismantled. Where Utah 10 years ago had three custom lead smelters, three custom lead-zinc mills and one independent custom ore sampler, we now have only one lead smelter, one lead-zinc mill and no ore samplers.

The barter program was completely discredited when it was applied in 1955–56. All that barter accomplished then was to stimulate foreign production. As a result, imports reached an all-time high in the years 1956 through 1958, amassing commercial surpluses which have never been liquidated. Such a program would add 300,000 tons of lead-zinc to the huge supply already in the Federal stockpile. In all, it would waste $60 million of Federal funds. Any temporary benefit which might result would not reach the miners who are the ones who need help. On the contrary, the benefits would go to the two or three large producers who hold excess stocks. The end result of barter would be merely a subsidy to foreign producers.

The third point in the administration's program calls for temporary subsidies to small producers. This would be of virtually no use to the lead-zinc mining operations in the State of Utah. None of the few remaining existing producers would qualify for assistance, with one exception, under the so-called Edmondson subsidy bill endorsed by the President.

The subsidy recommendation by the administration is most curious. On the first

page of the administration report, the use of subsidies is vigorously criticized. The report correctly points out that this would bring on the market substantial additional tonnages and would stimulate production of marginal mines. Let me say in all candor that I agree with the administration.

But then on the third page, the administration recommends the adoption of a program of the very substitutes it earlier attacked. This is surprising to say the least.

Let me make it clear that I as one Senator will not support any limited subsidy program to small producers unless the flexible tariff provisions of S. 1747 are enacted.

As for a task force to study mining problems, our mining industry has been studied to death. We need affirmative action—not more paper work.

If this disastrous trend is allowed to continue it will not be long before the United States will be totally dependent upon foreign imports. Likewise our lead-zinc industry in the Western States will be dead. Therefore I urge early favorable action by this committee to approve S. 1747 which is the only real hope for the survival of the lead-zinc industry.

I hereby request that the committee include in the hearing record the attached statement prepared by S. K. Droubay, vice president and general manager of the United Park City Mines Co., Salt Lake City, Utah, who is unable to be here this morning. Mr. Droubay is also president of the Utah Mining Association and fully endorses S. 1747.

JUNE 21, 1961.

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

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: If the economically distressed lead-zinc mining industry of America is compelled to wait many more weeks for agreement on an administration program, there will soon be no lead-zinc industry, particularly in the West.

I am greatly concerned that your administration was unable to present a program before the House Interior Committee lead-zinc hearings originally scheduled for June 16. I sincerely hope that you will be prepared to offer an affirmative program in the immediate future and specifically that you will support S. 1747 which I have the privilege of cosponsoring with Senator ANDERSON. An identical bill, H.R. 4316, has been introduced by Congressman ASPINALL. These bills hold out the only real hope for the survival of the lead-zinc industry, particularly of the West.

Our western miners and mine operators have had to bear almost the total loss of markets caused by the great increase in imports from abroad. This discrimination must cease. Comparing the average domestic production of lead-zinc of the 1947–49 period with the domestic production of 1960, the loss of production in areas other than the Western States was just 51,080 tons, or 15 percent of the total loss. But the loss of production of the Western States was a shocking 85 percent, or 287,666 tons. This means a direct loss to western miners of $46 million in 1950 alone.

Where domestic lead-zinc mines and mills had 24,777 employees in 1952, there were only 9,769 in 1959 and fewer now, a decrease of 61 percent. In Utah, the number of employees in our lead-zinc mines has dropped from 3,118 in 1948 to less than 1,000 today.

Where Utah had many mines operating in 1948, there are only six today, and three of them are small mines combined under one management. Our Utah lead-zinc industry is an island of depression in a sea of national prosperity.

The situation in Utah is growing increasingly grave. Various remedies have been tried including stockpile purchases and barter, but they proved to be nothing but temporary palliatives. At the present time, the Federal Government has an import quota system which is not doing the job. The quotas on foreign imports are far too high. In Utah alone, there has been a decline of over 13 percent in lead-zinc metal production since quotas were imposed on October 1, 1958. Employment has dropped over 13 percent in the same period, with resulting hardship to miners and their families. In the last 2 years, two custom lead-zinc mills were closed and a lead smelter and custom ore sampler have been dismantled. Where Utah 10 years ago had three custom lead smelters, three custom lead-zinc mills and one independent custom ore sampler, we now have only one lead smelter, one lead-zinc mill and no ore samplers.

The conclusion is obvious: the quotas as applied have not benefited Utah or any western mines. Foreign imports continue to depress the domestic price to a point where none of our Utah mines can operate at a profit. They only continue to operate because shutdown expenses would be greater than their present annual operating losses. The companies, to keep losses down, have been forced to drastically cut exploration and development work and to high-grade their ore. At best this can only be a holding operation. Our patience and survival capacity are rapidly dwindling.

The Tariff Commission unanimously found in November 1963, 1957, January 1960, and September 1960, that the lead-zinc industry is suffering serious injury because of excessive imports. I think all of our people recognize that we must import lead and zinc to meet our needs but not in the vast quantities now permitted to reach our shores, since it is having the effect of depressing the price of lead-zinc in domestic markets. It is particularly unfair that western miners should bear almost the full burden of this impact.

It is imperative for us to preserve a stable domestic lead-zinc industry in the interest of our national security.

We must have a reliable source of supply and it seems only fair and reasonable to permit our domestic industry to have 50 percent of the American market. Yet, at the present time, imports of lead exceed domestic production by 110,000 tons. Imports of zinc in 1960 exceeded domestic mine production by 70,000 tons. This flood of imports has caused a sharp drop in prices which makes it impossible for the Utah miners and mining operations to make a profit.

The situation facing our lead-zinc miners, therefore, is acute and I respectfully urge that you take immediate action in support of S. 1747. It would guarantee for domestic production a price of 13½ cents for lead and 14½ cents for zinc. This will be accomplished by a permanent tariff on lead and zinc of 2 cents per pound, compared with the present rate of 1.0625 cents for lead and 0.7 cents for zinc. In addition, should the domesitc price for either metal go below 13½ an additional 2 cents flexible tariff would be applied, to be removed when the domestic price rises above 14½ cents per pound.

Let me emphasize that the Edmondson bill, which would provide a subsidy for small lead-zinc miners, would be of virtually no use to the lead-zinc industry of Utah. Secondly, the barter program recently proposed by our State Department would be of doubtful value to our domestic miners. All it would do is use American taxpayers' money to buy up the surplus lead and zinc for our stockpile, a surplus created by excessive imports from abroad. Barters can only be of temporary help.

If this disastrous trend is allowed to continue, it will not be long before the United States will be totally dependent upon foreign imports. Immediate favorable action by the administration is imperative.

With kindest personal regards.

Sincerely,

WALLACE F. BENNETT.

AUTHORIZATION FOR VICE PRESIDENT AND PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE TO SIGN ENROLLED BILLS DURING RECESS OF SENATE

During the delivery of Mr. HILL's speech,

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator from Alabama yield to me briefly, without losing his right to the floor?

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I yield to the Senator from Montana, with the understanding that I do not lose my right to the floor, and with the further understanding that the remarks of the Senator from Montana may appear at the end of my speech, because I would not want the remarks of the Senator to interfere in any way with this magnificent, commanding statement by Andrew Jackson.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Far be it from me to interfere in any way with the speech of the Senator from Alabama, except in certain fields.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the President of the Senate and the President pro tempore may be given the privilege of signing bills, resolutions, and related matters during the recess of the Senate.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, does the Senator from Montana plan to have the Senate recess until Monday?

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I think the Senator from Alabama should have made a parliamentary inquiry at that point.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I have no objection to the request of the Senator from Montana.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

PRINTING OF ADDITIONAL COPIES OF REPORT ENTITLED "A REPORT OF UNITED STATES FOREIGN POLICY AND OPERATIONS"

During the delivery of Mr. HILL's speech,

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, from the Committee on Rules and Administration, I report an original resolution and ask for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution will be stated.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That there be printed, with illustrations, one thousand additional copies of a report submitted by Senator ELLENDER to the Committee on Appropriations entitled "A Report of United States Foreign Policy and Operations."

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

There being no objection, the resolution (S. Res. 318) was considered and agreed to.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I thank the distinguished Senator from Alabama. I look forward to his continuation of that magnificent speech by President Andrew Jackson.

EQUAL RIGHTS FOR THE CONSUMER

During the delivery of Mr. HILL's speech,

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may be permitted to yield to the distinguished Senator from Oregon without losing my right to the floor, and that her remarks appear at the conclusion of mine.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mrs. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, when two ranchers in eastern Oregon come together to buy and sell a horse, they generally meet on equal terms. The buyer is more likely than not to know as much about horses as the seller. Despite *this* equality, the common law has, for hundreds of years, protected even this buyer from the seller's deception and misrepresentation and, sometimes, from the buyer's own mistakes.

The Portland housewife who shops for her family does not meet on equal terms the industries who produce and sell to her. She knows less about the contents of a box of crackers than the firm that produced and packaged the crackers. She knows far less about the therapeutic value or undesirable side effects of the miracle drug than the firm that developed and marketed the drug. She may have no comprehension of the true cost of credit that the finance company sells her. And, as if these deficiencies of knowledge were not handicap enough, industries spend millions of dollars to induce her to buy their products, informing her of the facts she needs to know only as it suits their purpose. Yet, the Government has often failed to provide the consumer with even the horse trader's minimal protection against deception, misrepresentation, and mistake.

However, this administration has moved with remarkable speed and vigor to place the consumer on a parity with the sellers of products and goods. The administration has sternly policed deception and misrepresentation within the existing framework of legislation and has acted to educate the consumer to avoid mistake.

The President's consumer message delivered to Congress today is an extraordinary document. It illuminates the entire spectrum of consumer needs, from the need to be informed so as to be capable of choosing wisely, to the need to be protected from hazards to life itself.

A few particular points in the President's message are worth commenting on, aside from comments on the message in its entirety.

I now read from the President's message:

> If consumers are offered inferior products, if prices are exorbitant, if drugs are unsafe or worthless, if the consumer is unable to choose on an informed basis, then his dollar is wasted, his health and safety may be threatened, and the national interest suffers.

At another point in his very fine message the President stated:

> The consumer typically cannot know whether drug preparations meet minimum standards of safety, quality, and efficacy. He usually does not know how much he pays for consumer credit; whether one prepared food has more nutritional value than another; whether the performance of a product will in fact meet his needs; or whether the "large economy size" is really a bargain.

I was especially interested in the President's outlining of four rights that consumers can expect of their Government. I do not know whether the President was thinking of the Four Freedoms, but these four points rather parallel them:

> (1) The right to safety—to be protected against the marketing of goods which are hazardous to health or life.
>
> (2) The right to be informed—to be protected against fraudulent, deceitful, or grossly misleading information, advertising, labeling, or other practices, and to be given the facts he needs to make an informed choice.
>
> (3) The right to choose—to be assured, wherever possible, access to a variety of products and services at competitive prices; and in those industries in which competition is not workable and Government regulation is substituted, an assurance of satisfactory quality and service at fair prices.
>
> (4) The right to be heard—to be assured that consumer interests will receive full and sympathetic consideration in the formulation of Government policy, and fair and expeditious treatment in its administrative tribunals.

Mr. President, I commend the President's support of Senator DOUGLAS' truth in lending bill, Senator KEFAUVER's drug bill, and Senator HART's efforts to abolish deception in packaging and labeling; and I note with particular gratitude the President's decision to create a Consumers Advisory Council to provide, as I have long sought, a voice for the consumer in the councils of government.

Many of my colleagues in the Senate are justly famed as horse traders, and a few as cattlemen; but I doubt that even they can meet on equal terms the producers and sellers of mid-20th century goods in the mid-20th century marketplace. Moreover, I urge them, when evaluating the need for the President's program, to think not in terms of themselves, but in terms of the millions of consumers, like myself, who without the aid of government to redress the inequality of the marketplace, will continue to be the victims of deception, misrepresentation, and uninformed mistake.

WEST-EAST TRADE IS BOON TO CANADIAN SEAPORT

Mrs. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, news that the port of Vancouver, in British Columbia, is setting records as the busiest harbor on the west coast of North America is not likely to be greeted by applause in my home city of Portland, Oreg. It is not that we would deny prosperity and trade activity to our northern neighbors on the Pacific coast. Quite the contrary. Expansion of commerce is of benefit to an entire western region with interconnected economic ties.

However, in coastal areas of the Pacific Northwest there is grave concern over U.S. policies which have thrust our British Columbia friends into a position of trade dominance. The factors were cited in a brief news item which appeared in the New York Times of Sunday, March 11, 1962. I quote from the article:

> The big oceangoing freighters, flying the flags of scores of nations, anchor under steam waiting for berths. Vancouver has always been a major shipper of goods around the world, but grain for Communist China is now putting it over the top.

Flags of foreign vessels are also seen in the great port of Portland, Oreg., the harbor which taps the great inland empire of the Pacific Northwest. But, unlike many of the foreign ships in Vancouver, these in Portland are not engaged in transporting lumber to Atlantic seaboard markets. Canada does not have a Jones Act which prohibits the coastal and intercoastal shipment of goods in foreign-owned vessels. We do. One result has been to enhance the Atlantic coast market for lumber produced in British Columbia. In 1961, British Columbia lumber shipments to eastern U.S. ports topped Washington-Oregon-California movements by about 200 million board feet. The British Columbia shipments were reported up 17 percent from those in 1960. Sales from west coast mills sagged by more than one-fourth.

British Columbia's gains result mostly from an estimated $7 to $12 advantage per thousand board feet on water shipments. U.S. lumber going by water to any U.S. port must move in American ships, under terms of the Jones Act, and under charges that are much higher than those when shipped in foreign bottoms. The practical effect of the Jones Act is that it causes American commodity shippers to subsidize, through higher rates, the American merchant marine in the coastal and intercoastal trade. Considering the decline in American intercoastal steamship operations, perhaps the time has come to review any continuing need for the Jones Act.

Another factor in Vancouver's surging trade is the Canadian policy for shipment of wheat to Communist China. It is my understanding that the Canadian Government and the People's Republic of China concluded a transaction by which China will receive some 6 million tons of wheat, barley, and flour before the end of 1963. Canada will receive payment in sterling for the shipments, said to be valued at $362 million.

For various reasons, it appears unlikely that our own policy with respect to the export embargo on our surplus wheat to Red China will change, regardless of whether the Peiping Government were in a position to pay us in dollars or in currency convertible into dollars. Thus, the port of Vancouver has prospects for continued prosperity and activity in supplying the Red China wheat market. Until steps are taken to offset the shipping-cost advantage caused by the Jones Act, the British Columbia port will also

benefit from heavy lumber traffic to the Atlantic seaboard of the United States.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, along with my remarks, an article entitled "Vancouver Sets Records as Port," which appeared in the New York Times of March 11, 1962.

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

VANCOUVER SETS RECORD AS PORT

VANCOUVER, B.C., March 10.—A seemingly endless formation of deep-sea ships is humming a busy dollar-cargo chanty for the port of Vancouver.

It's one that spells out records as the busiest harbor on the west coast of North America and probably the world's greatest grain-shipping center—for the present at least.

The big oceangoing freighters, flying the flags of scores of nations, anchor under steam waiting for berths. Port officials estimate that each leaves an average of $10,000 in fuel, food, berthage, and other fees in the average 3½-day stay here.

Vancouver has always been a major shipper of goods around the world, but grain for Communist China now is putting it over the top.

A record total of 77 ships—the average is 150 a month—cleared Vancouver in February. They carried away a record total of 18,764,878 bushels of grain, and more than 25 of the shiploads went to China in fulfillment of that country's multimillion-bushels orders for Canadian grain.

Port officials expect Vancouver's 58 berths in the 20-mile-long natural harbor to be going at capacity in a record 1962.

The port handled a record of 14,040,346 tons of general cargo in 1961, of which 4,750,588 tons was grain. This compared with a total of 12,380,431 tons in 1960.

In terms of total dry cargo, officials say Vancouver handles almost as much as 11 of the U.S. Pacific ports put together.

TRIBUTE TO SENATOR SMITH OF MASSACHUSETTS

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, let me make a brief statement regarding one of our most distinguished and outstanding colleagues, the junior Senator from Massachusetts, BENJAMIN A. SMITH II, who has served so ably as a Senator of the United States since December 27, 1960.

Our colleague—who, by the way, is only 46 years of age—has concluded not to seek reelection this year, and will voluntarily leave this body late in the present year.

It has been my good fortune to meet with him in conferences on legislative proposals, and to sit close to him in the Senate Chamber, and also to participate in proceedings in this Chamber on many occasions when our colleague from Massachusetts, Senator SMITH, has been presiding over the deliberations of the Senate, at the request of the Vice President.

I know I voice the views of my colleagues on both sides of the aisle—Senators of the majority and the minority that BEN SMITH has earned the respect and admiration of all of us. Citizens of Massachusetts have every reason to be proud of the manner in which Senator SMITH has represented their great and historic commonwealth, following the time he was appointed to complete the unexpired term of Senator John F. Kennedy, now our Chief Executive.

BEN A. SMITH II has a fine background for important public service in any capacity. He attended Governor Dummer Academy following his graduation from Gloucester public schools and attended and graduated from Harvard University with a degree of bachelor of science. He has been a successful manufacturer. He is married. He and his wife, Barbara, have five children.

In addition to his fine service for his country as a dedicated public servant in the Senate of the United States, he entered the U.S. Navy in 1941 and served throughout World War II. Later, the citizens of his native city, Gloucester elected him mayor.

While it is not given to me to see into the future, nor do I have a prescient eye to observe what may occur in Massachusetts and the Nation throughout the next 10, 20, or 30 years, I feel certain that our colleague, who has demonstrated such great ability and industry, will be called upon for important public service in the future; and knowing him as I do, I feel he will respond to this call regardless of any financial or personal sacrifice that might entail.

May I express not only my fervent hope, but the hopes and wishes of all of us, that BENJAMIN A. SMITH may have many healthy, happy, and successful years in all things and in whatever endeavor he pursues following the time he leaves the Senate.

MIGRANT WORKERS

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, it is a disgrace that the richest Nation in the world has permitted perhaps 2 million of its citizens to live and work under conditions of virtual peonage. I refer to our migrant farm laborers, who are among the forgotten Americans of our time.

These Americans work for a shockingly low wage, averaging less than $1,000 a year. They cannot qualify for local public health and welfare services. They rarely see a doctor, and their children seldom are received in local schools. Despite laws to protect them, their children too often are worked long hours under searing sun. In some cases even 6- and 7-year olds work in the fields to help their parents eke out an existence, or their days are spent sitting in the fields watching their parents toil from dawn to dark. Home to them is one bleak decrepit shack after another.

The distinguished junior Senator from New Jersey [Mr. WILLIAMS] deserves the commendation of all Americans for the magnificent work he has done and is doing in bringing this problem to the attention of the public and in taking action to remedy it. Five bills to help alleviate these shocking conditions were reported out of the subcommittee of which he is chairman and passed by the Senate during the last session. They are now pending before the House of Representatives.

State and local governments and organizations have in many instances acted to aid these people. However, in many localities, there is no responsible State or local force at work to render this needful public service. Anyway, this is a national problem concerning all Americans, and we cannot bury our heads in the sand and pretend it does not exist. We must go further in aiding these underprivileged, undernourished, underpaid, overworked fellow citizens, and their children.

To this end, the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. WILLIAMS] has introduced legislation to expand and stabilize employment in agriculture, and to provide for these migratory workers minimum wage levels, housing loans, collective bargaining rights, and day-care centers for their children. Incidentally, their infant mortality rate is twice that of the rest of our population, and few migrant children are immunized against disease.

This legislative program should be acted upon during this session of Congress. With each month that goes by without our doing so, thousands of children of migratory workers are denied the right to a better life while their parents continue to toil under deplorable conditions.

Action must be taken by Congress immediately to bring these people and their children into the 20th century. It is true that they are a comparatively small minority in a nation of 180 million persons; nevertheless they are significant beyond their numbers. If we believe in economic and social justice for all Americans, it must include these 2 million people.

President Kennedy pointed the way in his agricultural message this year when he said, "We seek to end rural poverty." In the words of the President's Committee on Migratory Labor, we must—

accomplish in agriculture what we, as a nation, have already accomplished in most other sectors of our economy—the restoration of respect and dignity, based on good wages, good working conditions, steady employment, educational opportunities, and the extension of public health and welfare services to the men, women, and children who labor for hire in American agriculture.

In doing these things, Americans will prove to the world that ours is a nation where no one is forgotten, where the young have faith and their elders have hope, and where all working men and women may have every reason to trust and love their government and be trusted by it.

JAY N. "DING" DARLING

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, on February 12, Iowa lost one of her famous sons. I refer to Jay N. "Ding" Darling, of Des Moines, long-time cartoonist for the Des Moines Register and a 1924 and 1943 winner of the Pulitzer Prize. During his 85 years, "Ding" contributed much to the Nation's thinking, particularly in the area of his greatest interest—conservation. The last letter I received from him, dated December 16, 1961, echoed one of his favorite programs:

I still think it would be grand to have a national park in this Missouri River Valley

where the Army Engineers are establishing reservoirs and lakes, or better yet clear along the Lewis and Clark trail.

In the February 13 edition of the Des Moines Register, there appeared a lead editorial which pays fitting tribute to this beloved Iowan, and I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed in the RECORD.

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

JAY DARLING

Although 12 years have passed since Jay Darling retired as the Register's cartoonist, he continued to come frequently to his studio in our building, and he never lost his buoyant interest in people and causes.

So to many of us who had worked with him he still seemed a member of the staff when he died Monday morning.

It is tempting to speak of him now in eulogistic terms, but few things would have embarrassed him more than a eulogy. And nothing we could say now would add to the prestige and stature of an artist who had been recognized for decades as a leading American cartoonist, who had twice been awarded the Pulitzer Prize, and whose position was established, long before his death, in the tradition of the great cartoonists and satirists reaching back from Thomas Nast to Daumier.

It seems, therefore, a more appropriate tribute to try to identify some of the characteristics of "Ding's" achievement.

Those who worked close to "Ding" were always impressed first by how hard he worked. Everyone knew he had a great talent—talent that few men are privileged to have. Only those who observed him knew that his working habits, his intense concentration, the exacting standards he set for himself, were as much responsible for his success as his talent.

Several times during his career, Ding used as a theme the thought that the American Continent was not developed with a 40-hour week. He did not mean that he wanted to turn back the clock to the 12-hour day or the 7-day week. It was his way of stating vividly a deep conviction that there can be no creative production without a respect for work and a satisfaction in the performance of it.

No one had to work close to Ding to know that he had integrity, strong convictions, and the courage to express his views. He once said, "My convictions may not be worth much to the world, but they are my own, and if I am going to go through life expressing anybody's convictions, they are going to be mine."

It was this quality which gave force and vigor and originality to his work and made him a major influence in the life of his era. Whether readers agreed with him or not, they found him provocative.

Along with forthrightness and courage Ding brought to his drawing board the supporting virtues of humor, tolerance and perspective.

His satire could be sharp. He could puncture a pompous figure with a few strokes. He could quickly ridicule a silly idea. But he rarely drew in anger. He once said that he had made it a practice to stay away from the drawing board when he was angry.

Justice Oliver Wendell Holmes once wrote, "It is required of a man that he should take part in the actions and passions of his time, at the peril of being judged not to have lived."

No journalist has more vigorously, skillfully, and joyously taken part in the actions and passions of his time than Jay Darling.

Above everything else, Ding had a wonderful zest for living, a love for people, a delight with the world. It was characteristic of him that he could not think of leaving without a final, warm goodbye which we print in his old place on the front page this morning.

It is never possible to measure the influence of an articulate man who speaks his views forcefully, and we will never be able to measure the influence of Jay Darling. All we know is that because of him millions of people have looked at the problems of our times from a fresh point of view, with a sharper perspective, a new insight. And we know that influence of this type does not stop when today's paper is discarded. It goes on and on subtly into the future, its origin perhaps forgotten but its force forever effective.

FARM JOURNAL READER POLL

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, today I received a letter from Carroll P. Streeter, editor of the Farm Journal, dated March 14, 1962, enclosing a reprint of an article which will appear in the April 1962 edition of the Farm Journal, covering the results of a poll taken by the editors of the Farm Journal regarding the agricultural programs.

Mr. President, I think it is highly significant that although the poll has not been completed the first 10,000 answers seem to indicate an overwhelming reaction on the part of farmers throughout the entire United States against a compulsory quota program such as that set forth in the Freeman program, recently introduced in the Congress.

I ask unanimous consent that the letter from Mr. Streeter and the article be printed in the RECORD.

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

FARM JOURNAL,
Philadelphia, Pa., March 14, 1962.

Hon. JACK R. MILLER,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: What do farmers themselves want in the way of a farm program—all farmers, regardless of party or farm-organization affiliation?

Farm Journal, the national farm news magazine, asked them in its March issue, and the volume and speed of response were amazing. Four days after the magazine came from the press we had 4,000 ballots back in Philadelphia (and some of this time was taken up by the mail in both directions). Within 6 days we had 11,000. At the end of 2 weeks we were all but buried in more than 50,000 and they're still coming.

Enclosed is the result on 10,000—all we've had time to count so far. We'll go on and count the rest, but we know the figures won't change significantly. We tabulate them by States, by region, by commodity and by age. All of this will appear as a feature article in our April issue, accompanied by our editorial opinion which you'll find on the back of the folder. All 3 million readers of Farm Journal will get this report next week; we thought you might like an advance look.

As we say in our editorial, polls, especially mail polls, can be faulted in many ways. However, the results of this one were so decisive that even after they are discounted for this reason or that they are still mighty eloquent. We've done farm-policy polls before, in 1959 and 1957. The thing that amazes us is how consistently farmers vote on somewhat similar questions each time. The conclusion can only be, after awhile, that this is no fluke. Farm Journal itself doesn't agree with the group that says it wants the Government clear out. This and the No. 2 choice both got a heavy vote. The result that we think is clearest is the emphatic "no" vote on No. 1.

Sincerely,

CARROLL P. STREETER,
Editor.

HOW YOU VOTED

How does your choice compare with these 10,000 readers who voted on 3 different farm plans presented here last month?

If those Farm Journal readers who wrote us are typical, the Nation's farmers are overwhelmingly opposed to tighter controls and compulsory quotas on what they raise.

Only 4 percent—4 out of 100—who voted in Farm Journal's March poll favored a compulsory quota program (the main ingredient of the administration's farm plan).

Of our readers responding, 44 percent voted for an expanded voluntary land retirement program. And 52 percent voted to get the Government clear out.

We were deluged with ballots—50,000 in the first 2 weeks; and still coming. In order to get the results in time for this issue of Farm Journal, we could count only 10,000 ballots. We took these as they arrived, in proportion to the number of subscribers by States.

How the United States voted on the three choices:

1. Compulsory Government quotas on what I could sell, or how much land I could farm; stiff penalties, support prices at, or above, present levels, 4 percent.

2. Expanded voluntary land retirement program to cut crop production; no compulsory quotas or allotments; with supports on crops at a level to stabilize markets but not add to surpluses, 44 percent.

3. Get the Government clear out—no controls, no price supports, 52 percent.

Altogether, 27 Farm Journal people spent 750 man-hours opening, sorting, and counting these 10,000 ballots. One person, working alone, would need nearly 2 years to handle 50,000 ballots. We will put a crew on it and promptly open and count all ballots and read every letter.

State	Compulsory quotas	Land retirement	Government clear out
	Percent	*Percent*	*Percent*
Eastern	2	32	66
Connecticut	0	16	84
Delaware	0	45	55
Maine	0	37	63
Maryland	2	35	63
Massachusetts	2	27	71
New Hampshire	0	41	59
New Jersey	6	29	65
New York	3	38	59
Pennsylvania	1	30	69
Rhode Island	11	11	78
Vermont	2	38	60
West Virginia	1	25	74
Central	4	51	45
Illinois	4	50	46
Indiana	1	48	51
Iowa	7	68	25
Kansas	2	47	51
Michigan	2	46	52
Minnesota	7	53	40
Missouri	3	54	43
Nebraska	6	57	37
North Dakota	9	55	36
Ohio	2	37	61
South Dakota	7	48	45
Wisconsin	6	48	46
Southeastern	6	48	46
Alabama	2	47	51
Florida	6	40	54
Georgia	6	50	44
Kentucky	11	59	30
Mississippi	0	52	48

State	Compulsory quotas	Land retirement	Government clear out
Southeastern—Con.	*Percent*	*Percent*	*Percent*
North Carolina	8	46	46
South Carolina	6	47	47
Tennessee	6	51	43
Virginia	4	39	57
Southwestern	3	36	61
Arkansas	2	39	59
Louisiana	2	42	56
New Mexico	0	42	58
Oklahoma	1	40	59
Texas	5	31	64
Western	3	33	64
Arizona	3	8	89
California	3	26	71
Colorado	6	35	59
Idaho	2	43	55
Montana	4	35	61
Nevada	0	10	90
Oregon	2	41	57
Utah	2	49	49
Washington	2	34	64
Wyoming	3	28	69
U.S. total	4	44	52

The results from this poll check closely with previous polls by Farm Journal. In 1957 we offered four farm program choices, and in 1959, five. In 1957, 50 percent voted to get the Government out; in 1959, 55 percent voted that way; this year 52 percent.

The 4-percent return for compulsory quotas is the lowest vote for any of the choices over the 3 years.

Among the five Farm Journal editions, eastern readers gave the smallest vote to quotas, and the largest vote to getting the Government clear out. Quotas mustered a bit of support in parts of the western Corn Belt and in Kentucky.

The voluntary land-retirement program did best in the Central States (51 percent) and poorest in the East (32 percent).

Among commodity groups, the land-retirement program pulled the most votes among hog raisers—and got the smallest percentage from poultrymen and fruit and vegetable growers.

Poultrymen, who certainly have been in trouble, and for whom the Government is talking about national marketing orders, gave the highest vote for getting the Government out entirely—70 percent. Tobacco growers are least inclined—33 percent—to have the Government step out completely. They've had the most Government (compulsory quotas) of anybody.

Among States, Iowans gave the smallest vote—25 percent—to getting the Government out. This was also true in 1959 when 24 percent of the Iowans voted that way.

Young farmers are more opposed to compulsory quotas than older operators; otherwise, age didn't make much difference

Age	Quotas	Land retirement	Government out
	Percent	*Percent*	*Percent*
29 and under	2	47	51
30 to 39	4	46	50
40 to 49	4	46	50
50 to 59	5	42	53
60 plus	4	41	55

Many took time to write letters explaining their choices. A large number who wrote were young farmers and small operators who objected to a quota system that would tie them to their present size.

"Quotas wouldn't give a starting farmer a chance; he'd have no prospects of expanding," says Robert Pfeil, of South Dakota.

"The big operator would have more of a monopoly than he already has," thinks Noel Sorenson, of Idaho.

Many dairymen complained bitterly about quotas. "I'm a young man who has been struggling along. Now that I have a young dairy started with my sons, they want to tell us we can't farm it because we didn't have a milk quota for 1961," says Donald Carey, of New York.

Several of those who voted to get the Government out thought that if this were done the CCC shouldn't dump its surpluses on the market. Others admitted that it might be rough for a time. "I might be the first to go," wrote L. McGinnis, of Alabama, "but somewhere down the line we'd stabilize. I'm willing to bet a lifetime's work that I can knock heads with the hobby farmers and come out on top. I am eager for a try."

Many of those writing in support of compulsory quotas say that it's the only way to get rid of the surplus, and they agree with L. H. Kuhle, of Illinois, that farm programs won't work without controls. "What other business doesn't regiment its production to stay in line with demand?" asks Jay Triplett, of Texas.

What different commodity groups want

EASTERN

Kind of farmers [1]	Compulsory quotas		Land retirement		Government clear out	
	United States	Eastern	United States	Eastern	United States	Eastern
	Percent	*Percent*	*Percent*	*Percent*	*Percent*	*Percent*
Beef	4	0	42	27	54	73
Dairy	4	3	44	36	52	61
Feed grains	4	1	48	31	48	68
Fruit and vegetables	3	4	31	31	66	65
General	2	0	35	34	63	66
Hogs	4	0	52	25	44	75
Poultry	3	2	27	20	70	78
Sheep	3	0	36	41	61	59
Wheat	4	0	44	39	52	61

CENTRAL

Kind of farmers [1]	Compulsory quotas		Land retirement		Government clear out	
	United States	Central	United States	Central	United States	Central
	Percent	*Percent*	*Percent*	*Percent*	*Percent*	*Percent*
Beef	4	4	42	51	54	45
Dairy	4	4	44	48	52	48
Feed grains	4	5	48	52	48	43
Fruit and vegetables	3	4	31	43	66	53
General	2	3	35	48	63	49
Hogs	4	4	52	53	44	43
Poultry	3	3	27	46	70	51
Sheep	3	4	36	40	61	56
Wheat	4	4	44	48	52	48

SOUTHEASTERN

Kind of farmers [1]	Compulsory quotas		Land retirement		Government clear out	
	United States	Southeastern	United States	Southeastern	United States	Southeastern
	Percent	*Percent*	*Percent*	*Percent*	*Percent*	*Percent*
Beef	4	4	42	43	54	53
Cotton	5	6	51	57	44	37
Dairy	4	7	44	53	52	40
Feed grains	4	3	48	47	48	50
Fruit and vegetables	3	0	31	24	66	76
General	2	5	35	37	63	58

SOUTHEASTERN—Continued

Kind of farmers [1]	Compulsory quotas		Land retirement		Government clear out	
	United States	Southeastern	United States	Southeastern	United States	Southeastern
	Percent	*Percent*	*Percent*	*Percent*	*Percent*	*Percent*
Hogs	4	6	52	57	44	37
Peanuts	8	5	51	65	41	30
Poultry	3	9	27	31	70	60
Tobacco	13	15	54	56	33	29

SOUTHWESTERN

Kind of farmers [1]	Compulsory quotas		Land retirement		Government clear out	
	United States	Southwestern	United States	Southwestern	United States	Southwestern
	Percent	*Percent*	*Percent*	*Percent*	*Percent*	*Percent*
Beef	4	3	42	35	54	62
Cotton	5	4	51	49	44	47
Dairy	4	3	44	48	52	49
Feed grains	4	3	48	31	48	66
General	2	1	35	25	63	74
Hogs	4	2	52	31	44	67
Rice	7	7	33	32	60	61
Sheep	3	0	36	42	61	58
Wheat	4	0	44	40	52	60

WESTERN

Kind of farmers [1]	Compulsory quotas		Land retirement		Government clear out	
	United States	Western	United States	Western	United States	Western
	Percent	*Percent*	*Percent*	*Percent*	*Percent*	*Percent*
Beef	4	3	42	32	54	65
Cotton	5	6	51	39	44	55
Dairy	4	3	44	37	52	60
Feed grains	4	1	48	35	48	64
Fruit and vegetables	3	3	31	27	66	70
General	2	1	35	29	63	70
Hogs	4	0	52	27	44	73
Poultry	3	0	27	5	70	95
Sheep	3	0	36	25	61	75
Wheat	4	4	44	42	52	54

[1] Main crop or livestock.

WHAT FARMERS DON'T WANT

Farmers may disagree about what they do want in the way of a farm policy, but they're mighty clear about what they don't want. They don't want compulsory Government quotas. They don't want the Government running the farms of the country. They don't want the Secretary of Agriculture telling them how much, or how little, they can raise and sell without being whacked by a Government penalty. And they've just spoken in a way that should leave nobody in Washington in any doubt about it.

A mail poll, such as Farm Journal has just conducted, can be faulted in many ways. Some will say the choices weren't worded fairly, some that farmers voted without fully realizing the consequences of what they were voting for, some that the undecided were not represented in the voting. All of these things might be fairly argued. But discount the results as you will—they are still so decisive as to be eloquent.

Farm Journal makes no claim that such a poll shows anything with exactitude. We do say that it is a highly significant straw in the wind to show the direction of farm thinking. We believe it most certainly does that. Furthermore it cuts across all party and organizational lines. If we were a Congressman, a Senator, a Secretary of Agriculture or a President, we would pay serious attention to it.

The size and speed of the vote were astounding. In 1957, a similar poll eventually pulled 4,000 votes. In our 1959 poll we got about 11,000 ballots, over a 6-week period. This time the vote fairly blew the door down. Within 4 days after the magazine rolled off the presses, we had 4,000 ballots back. Within 6 days the total had swelled to over 10,000. At the end of 2 weeks we were swamped with approximately 50,000. Evidently many farmers felt strongly and welcomed the chance to tell the world where they stood.

Farm Journal doesn't happen to agree with the 52 percent who want the "Government to clear out." We agree with Mr. Freeman that the Government has to help control supply, but disagree vigorously with him over method. We hold that any farmer who takes Government support has an obligation to help. But we believe all this can be done primarily by a voluntary land retirement program, which will cost little (if any) more than Government compulsion and which will leave farmers—not the Government—in control of farming.

We'll send the results of the poll to all of the people in Washington mentioned above. We wouldn't think they would have any difficulty in getting the message.

THE MANDATORY DEATH PENALTY

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, in this morning's Washington Post and Times Herald there appeared an editorial entitled "Reasoned Punishment," and I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed in the RECORD.

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

REASONED PUNISHMENT

The Senate's action yesterday in voting to abandon the mandatory death penalty for first-degree murder in the District brings it into harmony with the House and will constitute, when it becomes law, an important reform in the administration of justice here. The sentencing of those convicted of this terrible crime will be determined henceforth by reason, and in conformity with a judicial appraisal of the culprit and of the circumstances surrounding what he did. This is far more consistent with justice than an inflexible penalty.

Although we share Senator MORSE's opposition to capital punishment as a matter of principle, we are unreservedly glad that the Senate on this occasion chose to take a modest step forward rather than a giant stride. To have sent the bill back to committee for further hearings, as Mr. MORSE desired, would have produced an indefinite delay and in the end, perhaps, passage by the Senate of a measure wholly at variance with the bill approved in the House.

Now that the mandatory death penalty has been repealed, however, we think it time to begin efforts to bring about abandonment of the death penalty altogether. Senator MORSE is quite right in urging that the District Committees hear testimony from eminent criminologists and from others who have reflected on the terrible implications of capital punishment. The community cannot promote respect for the sanctity of human life by an official snuffing out of life—or by treating even the most outrageous of criminals as wholly beyond redemption and beyond the limits of a divine purpose.

Mr. MORSE. It is a very interesting editorial, Mr. President. Part of it reads as follows:

Although we share Senator MORSE's opposition to capital punishment as a matter of principle, we are unreservedly glad that the Senate on this occasion chose to take a modest step forward rather than a giant stride.

That reminds me of the story about one politician receiving the favorable words and the other fellow getting the votes. That is pretty much the situation in which I find myself on this capital punishment issue.

I am always interested in journalistic rationalizations. This is an interesting rationalization on the part of the Washington Post and Times Herald editors. When it is said that they agree with me on principle, "but."

The "but" clause is the rationalization so characteristic of journalistic expediency. It becolors so much of the editorial policy of the Washington Post and Times Herald. Nevertheless I want the editors to know how grateful I am that they are with me on principle. I think that is wonderful. I shall give them an opportunity to be with me on principle some more.

I say to my "good friends of the editorial department of the Washington Post" I am going to introduce a bill which will seek to abolish capital punishment in all Federal jurisdictions. I hope that they will give me a little better editorial support. I hope they will exercise their great influence on the Hill—and they have great influence, except with me or for me—and that they will help me to get an early hearing on my bill. After the experts testify the Senate can consider the bill. I assure everyone I shall urge that the criminologists and penologists be called in to testify on my bill, as well as the prosecutors and the judges. I hope, after the hearings are completed, the Washington Post and Times Herald will go all out in support of my bill to abolish capital punishment, consistent with the many editorials of that newspaper of the past in opposition to capital punishment, which I had printed in the RECORD the other day.

I am always grateful for little things. May I facetiously say, that is about all I ever get, so far as journalistic support is concerned. I shall appreciate whatever little or large support the Washington Post and Times Herald can give me editorially on the Morse anti-capital-punishment bill, which will be introduced next Monday, to abolish capital punishment in all Federal jurisdictions.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. MORSE. I yield to my friend from New York.

Mr. KEATING. I rose to congratulate my friend from Oregon for the recognition which he received in the editorial, a recognition which the Washington Post and Times Herald did not see fit to accord to the author of the measure which was passed. I say to the Senator, since his name was spelled correctly, I think he really should not have any objection to the editorial at all.

Mr. MORSE. I have already expressed with tongue in cheek my great appreciation for the editorial.

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

Mr. MORSE. I yield to my friend, the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I respectfully suggest a letter to the editor, saying, "Next time 'but me no buts'," in the manner of the great poet of long ago.

Mr. MORSE. I would appreciate it if the Senator from Illinois would write that letter to the editor on my behalf. I have long since given up hope of educating editors of newspapers by writing letters to the editor.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. EASTLAND obtained the floor.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may yield to the distinguished Senator from Minnesota, with the understanding that at the conclusion of his remarks I shall have the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate convenes tomorrow, I be granted the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

GEORGE WASHINGTON'S FAITH IN US

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that an address by Secretary of the Air Force Eugene M. Zuckert, delivered at the George Washington winter commencement on February 22, 1962, entitled "George Washington's Faith in Us," be inserted at this point in the RECORD.

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

GEORGE WASHINGTON'S FAITH IN US

(By Eugene M. Zuckert, Secretary of the Air Force)

President Carroll, faculty members, trustees, graduates, and students of the George Washington University, it is difficult for me to express my feelings on being honored by the George Washington University.

The character of this great institution, its place in our national community, and its demonstrated faith in America's tomorrow, give a special quality to a degree from the George Washington University. It is a quality which deepens my appreciation of this new bond with those who contribute so much through education to our Nation's strength.

My association with the university has been one of the more rewarding activities of my life. Not only have I seen and felt, from official posts, the constructive work of this school, but it has also been my pleasure and satisfaction to work personally in furtherance of your high goals.

The George Washington University has trained, and is training for their management responsibility, many of the leaders, and the leaders to be, of the U.S. Air Force.

It was my good fortune to have a role in planning the development of the resources which are now being applied to meet the Nation's needs through the school of government, business, and international affairs.

The satisfaction of useful work and the stimulation of working with this faculty have been enriched by the friendship of President Thomas Carroll, who was both classmate and faculty associate at Harvard. As a man, and as the head of an institution of higher education, his are the standards by which Americans can live and by which our Nation will grow.

The community of the George Washington University—its president, faculty, trustees, and students—is the special beneficiary of the faith which George Washington had in the future of his country.

Our link with him here tonight is direct. Among the evidences of his faith in his country's future was his vision of a university at the Nation's Capital.

His faith in us was so great that his expression of it was almost casual, and always characteristically modest. It was never more simply and straightforwardly stated than in a letter to his nephew urging adoption of our Constitution. He was confident that any imperfections could be remedied. He said, "I do not think we are more inspired, have more wisdom, or possess more virtue, than those who will come after us."

In the hope of finding guidance for today's problems, I have tried to define the essentials of Washington's faith. This faith was the real sustaining power of the founders of the Nation. It seems to me the essentials are: First, an unshakable belief of the rightness of the cause; second, a full appreciation of the resources available; third, a continuing plan by which to exploit these resources; and fourth, the will to stay with it, to carry through.

The Nation still has these qualities. They are the elements of our national strength. They are dynamic. They grow and become stronger as they are exercised and applied to the problems which confront us as a Nation.

These four elements of faith bear directly on today's problems, but they do not produce quick and easy solutions. Just remember that the simple answers didn't always suffice in George Washington's day either. For example, when word came to the illegal assembly in the Tavern at Williamsburg of the King's punitive measures against Boston, Washington had a quick solution himself. His contribution to the indignant debate was, "I will gladly enlist of my own expense 1,000 men and march to the relief of Boston." He didn't know it would take 8 years of suffering and sacrifice to accomplish the objectives.

There was more at stake than relief of Boston. The longing of the colonists was not to be satisfied so easily. Nor will it be easy to satisfy today's longing for an end to the threat of tyranny which alarms the free world today in the same way that George the Third's policies alarmed his subjects in America.

To say that it will not be easy to overcome today's monstrous threat to freedom is not just to chide the voluble extremists, who have never been more active nor drawn so much attention, with their apparently easy solution to the world's problems. It is slight comfort to say that theirs is seldom the voice of responsible authority and too often their words have the sound of escape. The cacophony of their advice sometimes contains notes of despair, despair which must have roots in frustrations the origins of which are all too clear. But escapism, despair and carping are not our way.

There is a massive and silent current to the momentum of the American people. It is an essential element of national self-confidence. It is demonstrated in the very great trust and confidence placed in the national leadership once our people have made their selection.

This is necessarily a two-way confidence. It is increased and deepened by the confidence which our leaders place in the faith, commonsense, and determination of the American people—their readiness, in President Kennedy's words, to "go forth and meet new risks and tests of our ability."

To be sure, our courage is under test. Certainly the alarms and excursions of the day are enough to discourage those without faith. No one needs access to classified information to suffer a daily depression. The newspaper and electronic press continuously pour forth details of the array of frustrations and difficulties which plague our world.

Sometimes, it would seem the world has gone mad. Our close neighbor, Cuba, given independence by New World standards of freedom now has a dictator who scorns both freedom and the New World; a growing and great neutralist power solves an old problem by quick aggressive action; secretly prepared and arrogantly brandished Soviet nuclear tests seem hardly to disturb the bitterest opponents of testing; countries newly liberated engage in civil war; and a once great capital city of Europe is cruelly cut in two by a concrete wall.

The shackles of czardom were thrown off a half century ago in Russia by revolutionists who now put a stop even to peaceful revolution within a continent-sized barbed wire prison. And China, ancient home of culture and learning, preaches destruction, denies in a mad tragedy its own great intellectual heritage, and is kept outside the council of nations.

But in some ways, the world has always been mad. The struggle for freedom and justice and for sensible relations among the nations has gone on for centuries, and will continue. The point is, we are making progress, and we are going to keep on making progress. We are gaining ground in terms of closer cooperation among all the free nations, particularly within the Atlantic community. Our investment in the Alliance for Progress and in the United Nations are part of the building job toward a free world structure stronger than the Communist pyramid of regimentation.

The President has said this period of history is freedom's hour of maximum danger, and that America has been granted the role of being its great defender. This means also the hour of greatest demand on our national strength.

For us to be discouraged now would be a tragedy of miserable irony and unworthy of everything for which our Nation's builders have worked for more than two centuries.

This is a great, strong, beautiful, spiritually motivated country. We cannot let its strength be lessened and its will eroded by the dripping repetition of external difficulties which seem to place ever greater burdens upon us.

We should not worry so much as to whether we are loved by everyone. In our dealings with other peoples throughout the world, we should seek a constructive and lasting respect and affection, but of a very special quality. It must be built on our constancy of worthy purpose, on the demonstrated strength and will to defend freedom, and on the wisdom of help others grow in their own stature to a freedom we can share with them and they with us.

We can be proud of our idealism and our generosity, but we must be realistic, and tough where necessary. We must be guided by what we think is right and practical. And we must not trim the high sails of our ideals to the foreshortened goals of critics and calamity howlers at home or abroad.

We must never take comfort from but take always the full measure of the weaknesses in the monolithic barrier erected across the path of freedom. We must not touch any wooden horses, but we can be sure that contacts between free and fenced people—in the arts, in athletics, in science, in the parliament of sovereign States—can nourish seeds productive of freedom and peace.

We can dramatize our strengths. Why should we be shy or hesitant about exploiting a peace-loving friendliness and generosity which is ours to enjoy but decried by the Marxists? Remember what we have done—and think of the possibilities. Here are a few examples:

The Marshall plan cradled Europe's recovery and the power of our NATO allies.

The *Hope* ship, a gleaming white teaching hospital sent to southeast Pacific, is an example of private enterprise in action. It is also an example of the partnership between Government and private enterprise. It won many friends for America through service to suffering people and as a symbol of friendship and compassion, as well as of America's great medical resources.

The President's visits to Europe and Latin America, Vice President JOHNSON'S visit to southeast Asia and the recent visit of the Attorney General to the Far East revealed and strengthened the old friendships and inspired new ones.

Fulbright scholars weave friendships in both directions.

The Peace Corps, so basically American in concept, is a fresh approach to problems at the level where they exist.

The United Nations technical assistance programs, most heavily supported by this country, are building and strengthening the foundations of the kind of world in which we want to live.

The food-for-peace program employs our prodigal food producing capacity to help people where communism lurks with hunger and despair. It is a program worthy of the American people, is constructive of peace, and furthermore, it is doable.

Every element of our great national strength in production, in science, in conservation and reclamation of our lands, in education, medicine, agriculture, communication and the arts, can be turned to constructive use in the struggle for freedom, whose leaders we are, in the words of President Kennedy "by both strength and conviction."

But these resources can be exploited constructively and for peace only if we are strong enough militarily to deter the use of aggressive force against us.

Our total defense posture must be adapted to the full range of conflict available to an aggressor who may move for a variety of reasons. He may strike out of a false confidence that he can quickly and decisively win. Or, he may strike out of desperation that his chances are waning. He may strike on a limited scale at selected points in order to try to gain his ends piecemeal. Or he may only pose to strike, armed with intention to bully and blackmail.

Our strength to meet these contingencies must be maintained in step with the swift march of science and technology. The first requirement is the basic strategic superiority necessary to deter all-out war. But we must also have the military capability to respond to situations of lesser magnitude, wherever and however our true interests are threatened by aggressive action. In other words, our deterrence must cover all the choices open to an aggressor.

We must build, and keep modern, the forces necessary to overcome the total military threat to the security of the free world. This is now the pattern of our national defense—across-the-board deterrence.

This pattern provides the standard which we must apply to the measurement of our military spending. We must not measure against doubts as to the strength of our economy, nor against fears of provocation of the Soviets, nor out of resentment of the extraordinary burden of leadership of the free world.

We can look forward to a sharing of that burden with the strong NATO partner, which has grown, with our wise help, in Western Europe. It is not too soon, because, unquestionably, the warmaking power of the Soviets is growing.

But one Soviet goal has been moved farther away. Because of its outstanding strength the United States has been the yardstick against which the Soviets have measured their own technological and economic attainment. Today, the growing union of Western States means the emergence of still another power of comparable technological and productive capability.

We are bound to this third power—the NATO nations—by heritage, culture, and economic ties, and by common ideals of freedom and a common danger. But we must keep open channels of trade and adjust our economic relationships to the end that the power of the two major elements of the free world face the Sino-Soviet bloc in a posture of maximum economic strength.

Anything less is unthinkable. Our failure to seek trade arrangements, which would open to us the production and consuming power of Europe's Common Market, would be dissipation of part of freedom's resoruces and evidence of a lack of faith in our cause.

I have not tried to catalog all our resources. But neither have I sought to avoid the difficulties we face. I have tried to strike enough of a balance between our resources and our difficulties to show that there is reason for confidence. There is strong reason for confidence, and there is very great strength behind our determination.

We are in this struggle for a long time. It will cost lives. It will involve operations in many parts of the world. It will call for continuing heavy expenditures, and the investment of national resources.

We will continue to seek peace by every honorable means, but we will not forfeit the means to fight for freedom. We will strive for effective control of armaments of all kinds, but only as a way to maintain freedom and peace together.

Because we share George Washington's faith in the rightness of our cause, we have the national determination to carry on for so long as is necessary. We have the resources, and we will stay with it until there is no more a threat to freedom in peace.

Freedom can never be looked upon as secure. That eternal vigilance which is the price of liberty is at the same time the price of national survival.

We will carry on, not just until, but beyond—and on beyond—the time when collapse or change in today's Communist conspiracy shall remove this threat to the preservation and extension of freedom.

THE PRESERVATION OF OUTDOOR RECREATION AREAS

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, this past week it was my privilege to address the American Camping Association at its annual convention which was held in New York City.

In this address I spelled out what I consider as necessary and desirable steps to preserve outdoor recreation areas for this and future generations.

I emphasized the need to establish new parks and seashores as well as the need to preserve the wilderness areas which remain in this country. I also called attention to the need for a Youth Conservation Corps, as proposed in S. 404, which it was my privilege to sponsor here in the Senate and is now pending on the Senate Calendar. A Youth Conservation Corps of young men could do a tremendous amount of work in our Federal and State parks and forests developing recreational facilities and areas.

What an opportunity to put to work presently idle young men who can use their energies in a positive way to help build a better country. It will certainly be unfortunate if this Congress adjourns without having acted on this proposal.

I ask unanimous consent that my address be inserted in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

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

ADDRESS BY SENATOR HUBERT H. HUMPHREY

Ladies and gentleman, it is a very great honor and a magnificent opportunity to be asked to sound the keynote for the 1962 convention of the American Camping Association.

Your assembly comes at a most fortunate moment in the course of the year's events. We have been called to action in the cause of outdoor America. I know you are as eager to respond to this call as am I.

Two important messages—the report of the Outdoor Recreation Resources Review Commission at the end of January, and the President's special message on conservation of last Thursday—have sounded a common theme. On the back cover of its report the Commission has set forth the challenge so beautifully that I want to quote it to you in full:

"The outdoors lies deep in American tradition. It has had immeasurable impact on the Nation's character and on those who made its history. When an American looks for the meaning of his past, he seeks it not in ancient ruins, but more likely in mountains and forests, by a river, or at the edge of the sea. Today's challenge is to assure all Americans permanent access to their outdoor heritage."

The President and the Commission have proposed a number of steps which should be taken now to meet that challenge. You may want to add to their recommendations. I, too, have a few pet suggestions of my own to make.

But, the time for talk has passed. The time to act has come.

Two fundamental principles run through the report and the special message: First, we must act now to set aside those lands which will make good parks and recreation areas. The need is especially acute in the Northern and Eastern States where population density is greatest. Second, we must make sure that every public agency, Federal, State, and local, which administers land or natural resources does all it can, consistent with its primary goals, to provide and preserve outdoor recreational opportunities and to protect fish and wildlife values.

Let us first examine what must be done to set aside and preserve recreation lands.

We must establish new national parks and seashores. Areas of truly national significance must be chosen to advance the National Park System plan to preserve for us all the Nation's great scenic wonders; our outstanding examples of plants, animals, and rock and land formations; and the scenes of significant historical events. The President urged creation of three new national parks, four new national seashores, one national monument, and one historic site. We in the Congress are pushing action on these and other proposals. Your support can help make them a reality this year.

Next, we must preserve the wilderness which remains in Federal hands. As you know, I have long been a keen advocate of wilderness preservation and introduced the first bill in 1956. Last year the Senate passed S. 174, a bill introduced by Senator ANDERSON, which would set up a wilderness system. Both the President and the Outdoor Recreation Commission have urged such legislation.

We need, in addition, provision for a new system of national recreation areas to meet the growing demand for opportunities to camp, picnic, hike, fish, swim, and enjoy the forests and wildlife. Such areas could take advantage of opportunities to develop outdoor recreation facilities near centers of population, regardless of their significance in rounding out our National Park System. For example, a magnificent national recretion area can be provided on the reservoir of the proposed Tocks Island Dam on the Delaware River. It will be within easy reach of 30 million Americans and could be one of our greatest national recreation assets. Another such opportunity is afforded by the construction of Barkley Dam on the Cumberland River. A narrow belt of land there divides the Tennessee River from the Cumberland. Nearby, on the Tennessee River, a great lake has long since been created by the Kentucky dam. The area between the two manmade lakes offers one of the most outstanding bases for fresh water recreation on earth. We should actively seek other such opportunities, even on lands which may continue to be used in part for purposes other than recreation, so that our heritage of the outdoors may be available wherever we may live.

A fourth way to set aside and preserve recreation lands is to use to their full advantage most of the lakes created by our multiple-purpose dams. Wonderful opportunities for water-based fun have been opened to people who live far from nature's lakes. Last year 175 million visits—more than half of all the recreation visits recorded on Federal lands—were at the reservoirs built by the Corps of Engineers, the Bureau of Reclamation, and the Tennessee Valley Authority. The TVA perhaps has shown us best what can be done. It has turned the Tennessee River into a summer playland for all of America. Forty-two million recreation visits were recorded on that one river last year.

Let me also take this occasion to offer special praise to the Corps of Engineers and the Bureau of Reclamation. On February 23, 1962, less than 2 weeks ago, these two agen-

cies announced joint agreement on a new policy for land acquisition for recreational purposes at all their projects. Henceforth, at both old dams and new, each agency will buy lands needed to provide public access to the reservoir, to protect fish and wildlife, and to provide sites for outdoor recreation developments such as camp grounds, picnic areas, swimming beaches and boat ramps. I am delighted by this action and intend to support both agencies fully in these efforts to serve all our people.

The national forests also could afford us still greater opportunities for recreation. The Forest Service should be empowered to acquire small quantities of land which would open to public use now inaccessible public forests. New camp sites, new trails, and new scenery could be opened at relatively little cost.

These, then, are the steps we can take to set aside needed recreation lands: We can create new parks and seashores; we can preserve the wilderness; we can establish a new system of recreation areas; we can open up our multiple-purpose reservoir projects; we can permit the Forest Service to acquire lands which will provide access to new forest recreation areas.

All this is easier said than done. Many of these proposals mean that the Federal Government must buy land which private individuals now own. For 185 years, our National Government has been disposing of land—giving it away, selling it at bargain basement rates, and exchanging it for other lands which no one wanted. Now we must change direction and begin to bring back to the people a few key beauty spots which should be preserved for us all, generation after generation.

How to go about getting the new lands has been of concern to many of us in the Congress.

In many Western States, where the Federal Government already holds large acreages, the best policy probably will be to build park and recreation areas by using existing Federal lands and by exchanging suitable Federal lands for lands in private hands. For every dollar's worth of land thus removed from the tax rolls, a dollar's worth would be replaced, and perhaps more acres would actually be put in private ownership than returned to the Government.

But in the East, where the Government owns little land, new parks and recreation areas must be created principally by buying the acres. Because land costs are rising constantly, the part of wisdom is to acquire the lands now, as rapidly as possible, and to develop appropriate facilities on them later, as we can afford them.

To provide funds for land acquisition, the President in his conservation message proposed creation of a land conservation fund. Initially, he proposes that the Treasury advance $500 million for the fund. The money would be repaid by earmarked revenues derived largely from charges made to those using recreational facilities. He also proposes that the fund benefit from a user tax on boats, the unclaimed refundable taxes paid on gasoline used in motorboats, and receipts from the sale of surplus Federal nonmilitary lands.

The user-fee proposal, of course, raises the basic question of whether our out-of-doors ought to remain free for everyone. The Outdoor Recreation Resources Review Commission distinguished between outdoor activities which were made possible by Government development and maintenance of facilities, and activities which require no special investment. The Commission felt that for the use of developed facilities, reasonable charges should be made which would "not prevent or curtail the possible use and enjoyment of basic outdoor recreation opportunities."

The President has adopted the position recommended by the Commission. I support him. Fees are now charged at some 30 percent of the public outdoor recreation areas. It certainly seems reasonable to suggest that all agencies should follow the same policy. It also seems reasonable to expect that those who wish to use developed facilities should contribute to the building of such facilities.

In this connection, perhaps we should recall that hunting and fishing have not been free for many years. The license fees which hunters and fishermen pay have supplied the backbone of State fish and game preservation and development programs, which have made possible the continued enjoyment of those sports.

An excellent example is the Federal Duck Stamp, which is providing the funds to set aside the remaining wetlands for migratory waterfowl.

In some instances, fees collected from fishermen and hunters have been diverted to emergency protection of park and scenic objectives. Sportsmen have given sympathetic support to such aid, but have understandably felt that fees for hunting and fishing should not become an ordinary source of support for general recreational objectives.

The President did not specify what user fees and what methods of collection he would recommend. However, Secretary of the Interior Stewart Udall is considering an automobile sticker which would have to be displayed to enter any Federal recreation area.

Although some have voiced concern that user fees would restrict recreational use, fees need not be large to provide significant aid. Even 10 cents per visit last year would have returned $34 million.

I know that you who camp and hike want to be sure that scenic spots will be preserved for public use and that adequate facilities will be available for you and your families and their families in the years to come. I suspect that most of you would be willing to buy an automobile sticker and even to pay reasonable fees for the use of developed facilities, especially if you could be sure that all of the money collected would be used to make it possibe for you to enjoy the out of doors.

The Congress will have to decide these matters in the coming weeks. I, therefore, earnestly solicit your advice on the matter.

State and local governments also must play a major role in providing outdoor recreational opportunities. Indeed, facilities which a great many camping families will use must be provided by the States. Many States are displaying wisdom and foresight in meeting the needs of their people. New York, New Jersey, and Wisconsin have approved outstanding programs for the acquisition and development of park lands and recreation areas. Pennsylvania will lay "Project 70," a comprehensive statewide outdoor recreation plan, before its voters next November.

West Virginia is exploring ways to take advantage of the recent study by the National Park Service of its recreation potential. The importance of such an effort for a State which is suffering severely from the effects of technological dislocation is obvious. Their courage and determination set an example for us all.

Other States are developing comprehensive recreation programs. We must make every effort to encourage and support them.

To assist the States, the President has offered two immediate measures. He has recommended "that the Federal Surplus Property Disposal Act be amended to permit States and local government to acquire surplus Federal lands for parks, recreation, or wildlife users on more liberal terms." He also has proposed that the Congress provide matching grants to the States for planning the purchase and use of outdoor recreation lands.

I favor such planning grants to the States. I also would like to see grants of financial aid for the purchase of recreation lands. Planning is an important part of the jobs. But the States also need to know that we stand prepared to help them carry out their plans. If the States can set aside suitable recreation lands in the next few years they can be counted on to develop them rapidly in the years thereafter.

Local governments likewise deserve direct aid. They have received a notable beginning in the enactment of the Housing Act of 1961, which provided $50 million in grants to cities for the planning and acquisition of open space. The President has recommended that the authorization be doubled to meet the requests which have flooded into the Housing and Home Finance Agency. I am confident that the Congress will respond to that call.

Now let me turn to my second major theme—doing a better job for recreation by using the agencies and lands we already have.

Recreation should be regarded as a participating partner in Federal resource programs.

The Bureau of Land Management has charge of 180 million acres of reserved public domain lands, largely in the Western States. An even larger acreage is in Alaska.

Although many uses must be made of these lands, including lumbering, grazing, mining, and watershed control, many areas could provide excellent recreational opportunities.

Yet the Bureau has no program to develop and maintain facilities such as campsites on most of its land. Even so, an estimated 11 million visitors used the undeveloped sites last year, often risking serious fire hazard and dangers to public health. It is urgent that funds for adequate facilities be made available.

The Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife manages 277 wildlife refuges covering nearly 18 million acres. Last year 10 million visitors entered the refuges.

Yet the Bureau has no authority to construct and maintain facilities, even picnic tables, although they could be appropriately provided in many places. Such authority should be granted.

Recreational opportunities could be greatly improved on Indian lands if a program were instituted by the Bureau of Indian Affairs to provide loans to interested Indian tribes to assist in the development of public recreation facilities.

The Forest Service could improve its recreational services if it were authorized to designate areas of special beauty and suitability as forest recreation areas, so that outdoor recreation could be the primary purpose for which they are managed.

The Soil Conservation Service also provides many promising opportunities for local recreational development through its small watershed program. It should be authorized to include recreation as well as fish and wildlife purposes in its projects.

Recreation generally could be better provided by improved coordination among Federal agencies which manage our land resources. To that end the President has approved the Outdoor Recreation Commission's suggestion that he create an Outdoor Recreation Advisory Council, made up of the heads of departments and agencies concerned with recreation. He has also approved establishment of a Bureau of Outdoor Recreation in the Department of the Interior.

One of my special projects—a Youth Conservation Corps—would greatly assist achievement of all these objectives. The President made clear his enthusiasm for establishment of the corps by making it the first item of business in his special conservation message.

Much of the work to be done in developing recreation facilities, in preserving our forests, in reseeding our ranges, in protecting our watersheds, and in conserving our soil requires the devoted labor of healthy young men. The service to the public of the Civilian Conservation Corps in the 1930's still is meeting many needs. A Youth Conservation Corps would aid the young men themselves to build healthy bodies and minds. They would gain useful skills and knowledge of the protection and use of natural resources. And they will have the joy of working out of doors.

There is a huge backlog of conservation work to be done in almost every State—work for which it is frequently impossible to hire regular workers. The corps would give many men work and would displace no man from his job. As you know, I have been a very active sponsor of the bill now before Congress. I look forward confidently to its enactment this year.

Two other significant Federal programs are going to affect the quantity and quality of outdoor recreational opportunities. I have a deep interest in them both.

First, my fellow Minnesotan, Orville Freeman, Secretary of Agriculture, has recently announced a program to adjust farm production by converting 50 million acres of cropland to other productive uses. Among the uses will be recreation. Some land would be converted directly into parks and recreation areas. More importantly, the Extension Service will give farmers tips on how to add to their income by providing opportunities for city dwellers to swim, picnic, fish, hike, camp, and even hunt on their land. In aiding farmers to help meet the recreational needs of their city cousins, and at the same time to help themselves, we can also build better understanding and greater respect among our people.

Second, the Water Pollution Control Act of 1961 will enable us to protect and improve our lakes and streams for public enjoyment. For the first time, the Public Health Service has real authority to reduce overpollution by requiring release of water from Federal reservoirs during periods of low streamflow and to enforce control measures against polluters of all navigable waters. In addition, the program of matching grants to local governments for the construction of municipal sewage disposal plants was increased at a rate which will double assistance by 1964. The immediate result this year has been a new high of $430 million in municipal investment in waste treatment facilities, a very good start toward reaching the necessary level of $600 million each year required to meet national needs.

Thus by many avenues can the cause of outdoor America be served:

The call to action sounded by the President and the Outdoor Recreation Resources Review Commission can be met if we will set aside new lands for recreation in parks, wilderness, recreational areas, and forests. It can be met if we aid the States and local governments to acquire parks and open space now for their future needs.

It can be met if we authorize our executive agencies to protect for recreational use our public domain, our refuge, our Indian lands, our forests, and even our soil conservation projects.

It can be met by a new Youth Conservation Corps, by a sound farm policy, by effective control of pollution, and by improvements in administrative organization.

But, in the larger sense, it can be met by every sound measure to promote the conservation of all our natural resources. For, important though outdoor recreation is to the restoration of our tranquillity, to the building of healthy bodies, and to the enhancement of our knowledge, recreation must remain but one of the many demands we place upon our natural resources.

As President Kennedy reported, much has been accomplished this last year to move the Nation forward in a comprehensive conservation program. A new program for the national forests has been prepared and presented to Congress. A new system of classification has been undertaken to guide the wise conservation and use of the remaining public domain. I could cite many more.

Yet much remains to be done. The President has offered many recommendations and will forward more to us. The States, the local governments, organizations like your own, all must contribute to the stream of ideas and support necessary to the conservation of our natural resources.

In a sense, all such conservation efforts contribute to the goals of those of us who enjoy the out of doors, for recreation depends on the lakes and rivers, the forests, and the land. In the same sense, all of us can contribute to conservation by support for sound public programs, by considerate public conduct, and by the enthusiasm we bring to the use of our heritage.

But it takes action to get action. Outdoor-minded citizens must actively support the objectives they seek. The American Camping Association can play a vital role in achieving a dynamic recreation program as part of sound resource conservation if you will make your voices heard in Washington and in your State capitals. Resolutions are not enough. You must write, call upon and impress both legislators and administrators with the importance of your cause and with the determination which moves you.

Now, let me close with two brief thoughts:

First, an invitation. We in Minnesota are especially proud of our natural vacation land and of our conservation program to preserve it for us all. So, when you're camping this year, let me invite you to our land of 10,000 lakes—to the Lake of the Woods, or perhaps to our Quetico-Superior canoe area—to share them with us and to see what we have done.

Second, a brief quotation from Wallace Stegner's description of "The Wilderness Idea"—for it applies to all we seek:

"We need wilderness preserved—as much of it as is still left, and as many kinds—because it was the challenge against which our character as a people was formed. The reminder and the reassurance that it is still there is good for our spiritual health even if we never once in 10 years set foot in it. It is good for us when we are young, because of the incomparable sanity it can bring briefly, as vacation and rest. It is important to us when we are old simply because it is there—important, that is, simply as idea."

Thank you very much for this opportunity to share with you my enthusiasm for the objectives we seek.

BENNY GOODMAN TO TOUR SOVIET UNION

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I was most delighted at the announcement last week of the agreement between the United States and the Soviet Union under our cultural exchange program to permit Benny Goodman and his jazz ensemble to perform in the Soviet Union.

Mr. Goodman, popularly known as the King of Swing, will prove, I know, to be a most effective ambassador of good will. Good music has no national boundaries and the people of the Soviet Union cannot help but be impressed by this great musician and leading exponent of American jazz. It has been my privilege to hear Mr. Goodman on several occasions, the last time being when he performed this past fall in Santiago, Chile, to a large and enthusiastic audience. I can tell Senators that his performance won the hearts of these people and improved their image of Americans.

I wish Mr. Goodman and his group the very best wishes for a most successful trip. We can be proud of him representing us in the Soviet Union.

Mr. President, I mention this particular matter relating to Mr. Goodman because while I was visiting with him I found that the arrangements for Mr. Goodman's visit to the Soviet Union had somehow or other become stalemated; no action was taking place. It was my privilege to contact the State Department and urge that this matter be expedited and that a decision one way or another be arrived at. Of course, I was hopeful that the decision would be as it finally was made, namely, that this type of cultural exchange would be undertaken.

I commend the Department of State for its action in this matter and, indeed, commend Mr. Goodman for his willingness to undertake the trip. I know that it will have a very good effect.

I ask unanimous consent that an article from the New York Times on Mr. Goodman's trip to the Soviet Union, including a biographical sketch of this great American, be inserted at this point in the RECORD.

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

THE KING OF SWING: BENJAMIN DAVID GOODMAN

If music is the real bridge to international understanding, then Benny Goodman must be one of the master toll keepers.

A king is flattered when the tailor's son from Chicago consents to a melodic twosome; concert hall audiences are delighted when he takes up his clarinet, and the less classical-minded sink into happy comas over different sounds from that same instrument; and now the Russians will join the vast personal following of the "King of Swing," who will make a tour of the Soviet Union beginning in May.

Mr. Goodman earned his "King of Swing" title in the 1930's when he assembled a large band and began to play special arrangements in a style that made cheering listeners out of dancers. Youngsters stampeded into such places as the Paramount Theater and Madison Square Garden when his band appeared there, and police had to be called in to restore order.

Riding the tide of his popularity, Mr. Goodman was able to take jazz into the concert halls. He was also one of the first to integrate Negro musicians into a white band.

PRAISED AS PIONEER

According to Lionel Hampton, "what he did in 1937 made it possible for Negroes to have their chance in baseball and other fields. He was a real pioneer and he didn't grandstand about it."

Another factor that has set Mr. Goodman apart is his interest in "long-hair" music. He has played Mozart and Brahms with the Budapest String Quartet. He gave the first New York performance of a Hindemith clarinet concerto with the "Symphony of the Air" under Leonard Bernstein and he commissioned a clarinet concerto from Aaron Copland.

Outside of jam sessions, he likes nothing better than to assemble some long-hair friends for private sessions of classical chamber music at his home in Stamford, Conn.

When he was 40 years old, he went back to studying the clarinet, this time with one of the most distinguished players of the instrument, Reginald Kell.

EIGHTH OF ELEVEN CHILDREN

Benny Goodman was born in one of the major jazz centers, Chicago, on May 30, 1909. He was the eighth of 11 children of an impoverished tailor. He was named Benjamin David.

At Jane Addams' famous Hull House he was able to get lessons on a clarinet that he had bought by mail order, and he played in a boys' band organized by a synagogue.

After gaining experience in Chicago dance bands, Mr. Goodman freelanced in New York, playing with radio and musical comedy orchestras and such popular ensembles as that led by Red Nichols.

The first band he organized, in 1934, did not win immediate popularity. After 2 years, however, his swing style became the vogue and gave a name to an era.

It has been said that between 1936 and 1942 he must have been the most popular musician in the world.

After the war, the enthusiasm for big bands died out. This, and bouts of illness, plagued Mr. Goodman's career from time to time, although he was never out of the public eye. He taught at the Juilliard School of Music and at Boston University.

He kept up his appearances in concerts of classical music, and is still in demand at major summer series, such as those at Lewisohn Stadium in New York and Tanglewood in Lenox, Mass. He has been a steady performer on television.

MET KING OF THAILAND

In the winter of 1956–57 he made a 6-week tour of the Far East, under State Department sponsorship. It was on this trip that he made fast friends with King Phumiphal Adulet of Thailand, an inveterate jazz player himself.

When the King came to this country in the summer of 1960, he joined Mr. Goodman and others in jam sessions at the Goodman New York home and at the Rockefeller estate in Pocantico Hills, N.Y.

Only a year ago, Benny Goodman and a 10-piece band were to be heard at Basin Street East in New York City, back in a swinging groove and being happily discovered by a new generation.

One member of that generation is his daughter, Rachel. In the summer of 1959, when she was 16, she made her concert debut as pianist in a trio with her father and David Dawson, violist. And like father, like daughter: Rachel is as partial to jazz as she is to chamber music.

This is not the first time that Mr. Goodman has gone abroad as a representative of American culture, and his reputation is worldwide. His arrangement of the Burmese national anthem has been adopted as the official version by that Asian country.

When the United States was fighting a cultural cold war with the Russians at the Brussels World's Fair in 1958, it was Benny Goodman and his band that scored the first success for the American side.

INTERNATIONAL TEACHER DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I am sure all of us remember the occasion a few weeks ago when President Kennedy received a group of foreign teachers and educators in the White House. Among other things he told them that during their stay in the United States they had given as well as they had received. We had learned from them as much or more as they had learned from us.

These foreign teachers were over here under the international teacher development program, which is part of the educational exchange program administered under contract by the Office of Education. Each year this program affords more than 500 foreign teachers a chance to visit the United States for 6 months. Grants, totaling approximately $3,000 per teacher, are appropriated by the Department of State. The grantees have a remarkable orientation course in Washington followed by special seminars in U.S. colleges and universities. During part of their stay they live as individuals with American families in American communities, and they travel in the United States. It seems to me that this type of cultural exchange program produces the maximum good or the maximum impact.

Mr. President, I have received a letter from Mr. Stuart A. Blackorby, superintendent of Independent School District No. 690 in Warroad, Minn., who was good enough to tell me about his community's experience with a teacher from northern Rhodesia—Mr. Grenson Lukwesa. I ask unanimous consent to have Mr. Blackorby's letter printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

INDEPENDENT SCHOOL DISTRICT No. 690,
Warroad, Minn., February 8, 1962.

Senator H. HUMPHREY,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR HUMPHREY: Since January 8 we have had Mr. Grenson Lukwesa, of Northern Rhodesia, as our guest under the international teacher development program. I can assure you this has been a tremendous experience for our school and community, and there is every indication that it has been an equally tremendous experience for Mr. Lukwesa.

Mr. Lukwesa has been in many of our schools, not only in Warroad but our neighbors as well, such as Roseau, Thief River Falls, Warren, and Stephen. He has had the experience of visiting most if not all of the rural schools in Roseau County. In addition he has spoken to civic groups, PTA's, service clubs, and church groups.

We feel this program is one of the greatest things for understanding between peoples. Mr. Lukwesa has had happy experiences and he has been able to understand how our system works. I'm sure that when he returns to Northern Rhodesia he will do much to create a favorable impression of Americans as human beings as well as a country which is worthwhile imitating.

Mr. Lukwesa is much impressed with the philosophy of our schools whereby students have the opportunity and when they do drop out of school they do not drop out because school officials have weeded them out by arbitrary examinations but drop out because of their own decisions to drop out. In other words, personal and individual responsibility.

We heartily endorse the continuation of this program. I'm sure I speak not only for myself and my faculty but also for the public. We have had many commendable expressions from lay people.

Again I would urge continuation of this program.

Very truly yours,
STUART A. BLACKORBY,
Superintendent.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, the letter demonstrates that the international teacher development program is performing a unique service in fostering international understanding. The program is fulfilling its twin objectives: First, foreign teachers are learning at first hand the operation of our educational system, its methods and philosophy; second, they are getting to know representative Americans, and Americans are getting to know them.

As I see it, the only trouble with the program is that it does not go far enough. For instance, I am informed that the annual program includes only some 30 teachers from Africa, despite the fact that a large number of Africans apply for grants each year. I am also informed that the Africans who come here, like Mr. Lukwesa, make truly outstanding records. Also, the program is very limited with respect to the number of teachers who come to the United States from Latin America. Surely we need to stimulate a greater exchange with Latin America. These teachers learn; they make lasting friends; they carry away a sympathy and an understanding for America.

Mr. President, when so many Africans are pounding on our doors for knowledge, for a chance to see us and our way of life, would we lose anything by opening these doors a little wider? I think not. If the underdeveloped countries need anything, they need trained, experienced educators. Education is the key to their ambitions for national development and collective dignity. Indeed the underdeveloped countries are so conscious of their needs that they frequently send top government officials to take part in the international teacher development program. The least we can do is to give them all the encouragement we can. We should not send them into the arms of Friendship University in Moscow.

Mr. President, I was interested to learn today that the number of Latin Americans who have been invited to the so-called Friendship University in Moscow has increased threefold in the past year. I believe something over 300 were in attendance there in 1960 and more than 1,200 in 1961. I remind the Senate that the international teacher development program for the United States provides for the reception of 500 students from all over the world. The Soviet Union now has more than 1,200 students from Latin America alone in attendance at Friendship University in Moscow. Indeed, the Soviet Union is making every possible effort to influence the thinking and the attitudes of those who will teach the young.

The letter I have referred to is a moving one. Not only is it a compliment to the teacher who visited from Northern Rhodesia—Mr. Lukwesa; it is also a compliment to the superintendent of schools at Warroad, Minn., who has had the vision and the understanding that this letter so fully reveals.

A CAMPAIGN FOR SANITY IN MEETING THE COMMUNIST THREAT

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, earlier this month the National Catholic Welfare Conference published a booklet entitled "Communism: Threat to Freedom," written by the Reverend John F. Cronin. I commend Father Cronin and

the National Catholic Welfare Conference for this extremely timely and valuable publication.

As Senators know, Father Cronin has a well-deserved reputation as one of America's leading scholars in the field of communism. Therefore, what he says deserves the careful attention and consideration of all the American people.

The basic theme of Father Cronin's book is that the basic threat of communism is external not internal, and that anti-Communist extremists are misdirecting their energies by concentrating on internal subversion.

Father Cronin writes:

Speakers and writers for such groups are vigorously fighting problems that were mostly solved in 1950, and neglecting the far greater dangers of Communist subversion in Asia, Africa, and Latin America and the general world Communist offensive.

On the question of what the average citizen can do to fight communism, here is what Father Cronin says:

For the average citizen who asks: What can I do to fight communism? The answer might well be: Devote all your strength and energy, in concert with your fellow Americans, to build national unity and moral strength. Practice your religion, and make it a vital force in your community. Even in dealing with moral evils, concentrate less on denunciation and more on giving leadership and example. Be a man of integrity in your work. Make your family outstanding by the quality of parental love and discipline you show. Unite with your neighbors for a high moral standard in your community. Work for racial justice and harmony. Do your part to make this a better and stronger Nation, and we shall not fear what the Communists plot and scheme against us.

Above all, we must have a broader vision of world needs.

Mr. President, we are indebted to Father Cronin for this excellent booklet. I certainly hope it is one which will be widely distributed and read by all who are concerned about the threat of communism—and it is a very real threat. In dealing with it, we must act in a mature and not an emotional fashion. That is what this distinguished priest so well spells out in this booklet.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that an article relating to Father Cronin's booklet, published in the New York Times of March 2, together with excerpts from the booklet which appeared in the same issue of the New York Times, be printed at this point in the RECORD.

Their being no objection, the article and excerpts were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CATHOLIC BISHOPS ASSAIL RIGHTISTS—CHURCH OPENS DRIVE AGAINST EXTREMISTS—BOOKLET ON ANTICOMMUNISM ISSUED

(By John D. Morris)

WASHINGTON, March 1.—The Roman Catholic Church began a national campaign today to discourage participation in extreme anti-Communist movements such as the John Birch Society.

The drive got under way with publication by the National Catholic Welfare Conference of an 80-page booklet attacking extremists of the right for fomenting a virulent form of disunity that is dangerously weakening the Nation.

The National Catholic Welfare Conference is the central administrative organ of the country's Catholic bishops.

The Reverend John F. Cronin, author of the booklet, said at a news conference that its publication signaled the start of a campaign for sanity in meeting the Communist threat. Father Cronin, a nationally recognized expert on the Communist movement for 20 years, is assistant director of the social action department of the National Catholic Welfare Conference.

For the citizen who asks, "What can I do to fight communism?" Father Cronin suggests in his booklet:

"Devote all your strength and energy, in concert with your fellow Americans, to building national unity and moral strength. Practice your religion, and make it a vital force in your community.

"Even in dealing with moral evils, concentrate less on denunciation and more on giving leadership and example. Be a man of integrity in your work. Make your family outstanding by the quality of parental love and discipline you show.

"Unite with your neighbors for racial justice and harmony. Do your part to make this a better and stronger Nation, and we shall not fear what the Communists plot and scheme against us.

"Above all, we must have a broader vision of world needs."

The conference is distributing 100,000 copies of the booklet to Catholic dioceses throughout the country for use by parish study clubs, parochial school teachers and church publications. Issuance of the booklet was expected to be front-page news in most diocesan newspapers in their weekly editions today and tomorrow. Many of them are expected to serialize its text and base editorials on it. Pastors are expected to use it as a basis for sermons.

BOOKLET'S SIGNIFICANCE

Ultimately, Father Cronin said, from 500,000 to 1 million copies are to be printed and distributed by the conference and the booklet's copublisher, the Paulist Press of New York.

The campaign is regarded as particularly significant in view of the fact that some priests and nuns and many Catholic laymen have been identified with the militantly rightwing anti-Communist movement now brought under attack by their church.

Robert H. W. Welch, Jr., leader of the semisecret John Birch Society, has said that about 40 percent of the members of his organization are Catholics. Father Cronin said that he believed this to be an exaggeration but he conceded that quite a few Catholics belonged to the society.

Altogether, about 50 sizable organizations constitute the extremist forces at which the booklet is aimed, Father Cronin told reporters.

The leadership and membership of most of the others that he named are predominantly non-Catholic. They include the Christian Anti-Communist Crusade, headed by Dr. Fred C. Schwarz of Los Angeles; the Christian Crusade, led by the Reverend Billy James Hargis of Tulsa; the Circuit Riders, Inc., of Cincinnati, and the American Council of Christian Churches, directed by Edgar C. Bundy.

None of the organizations is mentioned by name in the booklet, but it was clear that the John Birch Society was the main target.

The central theme of the Cronin booklet is that "the basic threat of communism is external, not internal" and that anti-Communist extremists are misdirecting their energies by concentrating on internal subversion.

MANY SEEN BEWILDERED

"Speakers and writers for such groups," Father Cronin writes, "are vigorously fighting problems that were mostly solved by 1950, and neglecting the far greater dangers of Communist subversion in Asia, Africa, and Latin America and the general world Communist offensive."

"In many parts of the country," he declares, "hysteria and suspicion are becoming increasingly evident. A virulent form of disunity is weakening us in the world struggle against communism and performing this disservice in the name of militant anticommunism. Many Americans are confused and bewildered by the whole trend."

Father Cronin accuses some anti-Communist extremists of identifying communism with "whatever ideas they happen to dislike," inciting racial and religious prejudice under the guise of fighting subversion and seeking to discredit reputable individuals and institutions with the taint of communism.

He is emphatic in challenging Mr. Welch's contention that 7,000 Protestant clergymen are identified with the Communist movement. He says that Communist influence among the Protestant clergy "is virtually nonexistent."

He attributes the spread of anti-Communist extremism largely to the frustration of impatient Americans who want to do something about communism but who do not realize that the main threat to the United States no longer is subversion here.

He advises citizens to leave the task of combating subversion to experts in the Federal Government who have the training and authority to do the job.

EXCERPTS FROM CATHOLIC BOOKLET ON THE RIGHT WING

WASHINGTON, March 1.—Following are excerpts from the booklet "Communism: Threat to Freedom" by the Reverend John F. Cronin, which was published today by the National Catholic Welfare Conference:

"The Communist Party in the United States dates from 1919. During the 43 years of its existence here, it has varied in strength and effectiveness. For 15 years, 1935–1950, it prospered both in terms of numbers and influence. After 1950, a sharp decline set in. By the 1960's, it reached its lowest ebb in terms of membership, finances, and influence on American opinion and policy.

"The Communists that remain are by no means inactive. But compared with their activities and influence 20 years ago, Communists today are weak and impotent. Yet, in the 1960's strong reaction against domestic communism is sweeping the land. Well-financed and attended crusades, which would have been manna from heaven in 1946, are increasingly evident. Speakers and writers for such groups are vigorously fighting problems that were mostly solved by 1950, and neglecting the far greater dangers of Communist subversion in Asia, Africa, and Latin America, and the general world Communist offensive.

"In many parts of the country, hysteria and suspicion are becoming increasingly evident. A virulent form of disunity is weakening us in the world struggle against communism, and performing this disservice in the name of militant anticommunism. Many Americans are confused and bewildered by the whole trend.

"FALSE PROPHETS MISLEAD

"It is easy to dismiss such events by name-calling. But such an approach is unfair to millions of Americans who desperately want to do something about communism. They have been misled by false prophets, but these ordinary Americans are not extremists or crackpots.

"Their basic problem is frustration and even fear. They have seen the Soviet Union apparently gaining in its struggle to communize the world. Those who would have Americans concentrate on a minor threat of domestic subversion and ignore subversion and Communist pressures in Europe, Asia, Africa, and Latin America are misleading the American people. Whatever their motives, they are effectively aiding the Communist cause.

"They are most effective when they can quote 'experts' to bolster their cause.

"There are three types of experts whose credentials should be scrutinized with care. They are former agents of the FBI (Federal Bureau of Investigation) former informants for the FBI, and persons who have had first-hand contact with the Communist Party, either as members or victims.

"Many of the more vocal anti-Communist groups have connected communism with social philosophies they find unpopular. Many, for example, use the argument expressed by a former high Government official in late 1961. It runs this way: Liberalism (or the Fair Deal or the New Frontier) is the same as the welfare state. The welfare state is socialism. And the Communists say that they are Socialists. Hence, liberalism is communism."

BAD LOGIC IS DISCERNED

"Actually this statement is bad logic and worse history. As logic, it would make the encyclical of Pope John XXIII, 'Mater et Magistra' (Christianity and social progress), a defense of communism. The encyclical advocates or does not reprove many specific items rejected by extremist groups (the use of the income tax to equalize burdens, and to undeveloped natives, Government action to smooth out economic change, social insurance, and to agriculture, housing subsidies, etc.).

"The violent and bitter struggle for racial equality in the United States has often prompted charges that Communists were behind these activities.

"Actually, it is an amazing fact that the Communists have had such little success among the Negroes.

"In fact, Negro leaders and the overwhelming majority of Negro people have rejected Communist influence and have insisted that they are true Americans. Whenever Communist influence is detected by the NAACP (National Association for Advancement of Colored People) or CORE, it is promptly removed.

"Protestant churches, especially the National Council of Churches, have also been a target for attack. Behind these attacks one usually finds opposition to the social Gospel or to alleged modernist trends in organized Protestantism."

PROTESTANT CLERGY DEFENDED

"Communist influence among the Protestant clergy today is virtually nonexistent.

"Some anti-Communist sources are also anti-Semitic. These groups are small and have little influence except among bigots. The organized Jewish community in the United States is strongly opposed to communism.

"Groups opposed to the United Nations often use alleged Communist infiltration or even control as a weapon in attacking this organization.

"Some of these opponents are basically isolationist and use the Communist charge as a handy weapon. Catholics who deny our international responsibilities do so in the face of repeated papal assertions of our moral obligation to seek world order, world prosperity, and world peace.

"The labor movement, and certain labor leaders, have also been the targets of special pleaders. Yet the CIO, Congress of Industrial Organizations wing of the labor movement, expelled its Communist unions well before the general public became excited about the problem. Both wings have been working for years to fight for free labor unions, and against Communist unions, in Europe, Asia, Africa, and Latin America.

"DISTORTIONS ARE OUTLINED

"Offenses charged to Communist infiltration also include fluoridation of water, promoting mental health, and organized peddling of smut. Yet our organized dental profession supports fluoridation of water. The medical profession endorses sound mental health programs. And organized pornography is a commercial venture, with no proven link to the Communist party.

"The menace of communism is much too real and much too worldwide for the American people to tolerate and support the distortions outlined above. Simple honesty and respect for truth should be adequate reasons for avoiding these efforts. But they are more than dishonest, they are also divisive. They show distrust in our Nation at a time when national unity is imperative. They weaken our democracy by spreading suspicions of treason in Government and asking Americans to use Communist tactics against fellow Americans. If carried far enough, these movements would paralyze American diplomacy. When every discussion with the Communist powers is considered a sign of weakness or even treason, then we are left with only two stark alternatives: surrender or war. Surely our commonsense should tell us that we should seek some middle course between these extremes.

"A mature and strong people has the inner strength to live with occasional frustration and failure. It does not cry disloyalty every time its will is thwarted. When honest mistakes of judgment are made, it seeks to correct them through the democratic process. Temper tantrums resulting from frustrations are not welcomed even in young children. In adults, they are signs of serious immaturity. There is much to be done to combat the menace of world communism. It is time for Americans to close ranks and to fight the real enemy on the real battleground with real weapons. If we fail in this, we shall be so weakened internally that Communist conquest will be inevitable.

"For the average citizen who asks: What can I do to fight communism? The answer might well be: Devote all your strength and energy, in concert with your fellow Americans, to build national unity and moral strength. Practice your religion, and make it a vital force in your community. Even in dealing with moral evils, concentrate less on denunciation and more on giving leadership and example. Be a man of integrity in your work. Make your family outstanding by the quality of parental love and discipline you show. Unite with your neighbors for a high moral standard in your community. Work for racial justice and harmony. Do your part to make this a better and stronger Nation, and we shall not fear what the Communists plot and scheme against us.

"Above all, we must have a broader vision of world needs."

APPOINTMENTS BY THE VICE PRESIDENT

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. PELL in the chair) announced that pursuant to Public Law 380 of the 86th Congress, the Vice President reappointed Senator SAM J. ERVIN, JR., of North Carolina, Senator KARL E. MUNDT, of South Dakota, and Senator EDMUND S. MUSKIE, of Maine, as members of the Commission on Intergovernmental Relations.

Also, pursuant to Senate Resolution 33 of the 87th Congress, the Vice President appointed Senator WINSTON L. PROUTY, of Vermont, vice Senator NORRIS COTTON, of New Hampshire, as a member of the Special Committee on Aging.

THE ALEXANDER HAMILTON NATIONAL MONUMENT

The Senate resumed the consideration of the joint resolution (S.J. Res. 29) providing for the establishing of the former dwelling house of Alexander Hamilton as a national monument.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, the distinguished Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] gave notice that he would make a point of order with respect to an amendment to Senate Joint Resolution 29, concerning which a motion to consider has been made. I shall support that point of order.

Mr. President, the pending business before the Senate is the consideration of Senate Joint Resolution 29, which would provide for the establishing of the former dwelling house of Alexander Hamilton as a national monument. Section 3 of this proposal provides:

> There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this joint resolution. This joint resolution requires the signature of the President of the United States in the identical manner and fashion as is required of legislative vehicles commonly denominated as "bills."

Thus, Senate Joint Resolution 29 is a legislative vehicle to further the constitutional process of lawmaking as provided for in article I, section 7, clause 2, of the U.S. Constitution. This clause provides in part:

> Every bill which shall have passed the House of Representatives and the Senate, shall, before it becomes a law, be presented to the President of the United States; if he approves he shall sign it, but if not he shall return it, with his objections to that House in which it shall have originated, who shall enter the objections it reached on their journal and proceed to reconsider it.

The bill and Senate joint resolution herein described is the legislative process by which the laws of the United States as incorporated in the statutes at large are enacted. Senate Joint Resolution 29 in its present form is consonant with this constitutional and legislative process.

The senior Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND] has now proposed an amendment to Senate Joint Resolution 29 in the nature of a substitute.

The proposed substitute would strike out all of the language after the enacting clause of Senate Joint Resolution 29 and insert in lieu thereof the identical language now contained in Senate Joint Resolution 58. Senate Joint Resolution 58 was introduced on February 28, 1961, and proposed an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to the qualifications of electors. This resolution is now pending in the Constitutional Amendments Subcommittee of the Committee on the Judiciary.

In other words, the resolution is now being studied in a subcommittee of the Committee on the Judiciary, of which the distinguished senior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER] is the chairman. The Senator from Tennessee is a diligent Senator. I know he is studying and working on this question in a careful manner. I certainly think the Senate should not proceed to circumvent his efforts in this field.

The senior Senator from Florida now proposes to be an alchemist, one who would transfer base metals into gold, or a magician so adept that he can drop a

rabbit in a hat and pull out a polecat. His proposal confronts a constitutional barrier that is insurmountable.

Senate Joint Resolution 58 and the language of the amendment now proposed in the nature of a substitute follow the language and procedure required by article 5 of the Constitution, providing for the amendatory process. This amendatory process is not achieved by the enactment of a law described in article I, but is achieved by the mode of amendment set forth in article 5. Article 5 describes the machinery by which amendments to the Constitution are achieved. It is removed and divorced from the legislative machinery of every kind and character that is described in article I, section 7. This fact is pinpointed when we consider that the Supreme Court of the United States as early as 1798, in the case of *Hollingsworth* v. *the United States*, 3 Dall. 378, declared that resolutions of Congress proposing amendments to the Constitution need not be submitted to the President, but can be referred directly to the States for their approval.

Mr. President, this procedure is in violation of the Constitution of the United States; and when the Senator from Georgia makes his point of order, it certainly should be sustained by the Senate.

The interpretation by the Supreme Court in the Hollingsworth case conclusively demonstrates that the legislative machinery to be utilized in implementing article 5 of the U.S. Constitution was completely divorced and entirely apart from the type and character of legislative process described in article I, section 7, of the Constitution.

Neither by the rules of the Senate, the rules of the House of Representatives, nor by any possible statute law, can a vehicle designed as legislation requiring the signature of the President be converted into a proposal for a constitutional amendment which must be submitted to the States without recourse to the President. The cart cannot be put before the horse. If the subject of this proposed amendment in the nature of a substitute is to be put before this Senate for consideration, Senate Joint Resolution 29, by number, must be obliterated from the calendar, and a proper constitutional vehicle to achieve the purpose must be substituted in its place.

Mr. President, 2 years ago, as I recall, when the Senate passed this identical resolution, it was substituted for another amendment—a resolution amending the Constitution—which then was pending on the Senate Calendar.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Mississippi yield?

Mr. EASTLAND. I yield.

Mr. HILL. It is a fact, is it not, that it was a resolution to amend the Constitution of the United States?

Mr. EASTLAND. That is correct.

Mr. HILL. And it was added to the resolution to amend the Constitution?

Mr. EASTLAND. Yes.

Mr. HILL. In other words, both propositions—in fact, before the resolution was passed, there were three propositions in it, but all three of them were amendments to the Constitution of the United States—were amendments to the Constitution; not one of the three was legislation. All three were proposed amendments of the Constitution of the United States, were they not?

Mr. EASTLAND. Yes. It was recognized that the only way the Senate can proceed to amend the Constitution of the United States is by means of a joint resolution, which does not have to go to the President of the United States. In fact, we would violate the Constitution of the United States if we tried to proceed to amend the Constitution through legislation. However, that is what is being attempted in this case.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Mississippi yield again?

Mr. EASTLAND. I yield.

Mr. HILL. And of course any proposal to amend the Constitution of the United States must be passed by two-thirds votes in both Houses of Congress, whereas a legislative proposal requires only majority votes.

Mr. EASTLAND. That is correct; and the measure which is the subject of the motion to call up, to which it is proposed to hitch the proposed constitutional amendment, requires only a majority vote for passage.

In searching the history of legislative procedures in regard to basic changes in forms of legislative proposals, the only compilation of cited authorities that I have been able to find is contained in Watkins' and Riddick's definitive book on Senate procedure. At page 101 of the 1958 edition it is stated:

> The form of legislative proposals, by unanimous consent or without objection, have been changed after their introduction.

So far as I can determine, the language that opens this paragraph is correct and conclusive. All the citations of actions taken by either the House or the Senate, in regard to a change in the form of legislative proposals, show that they have been achieved by unanimous consent or without objection. And throughout the entire history of the Senate, when constitutional amendments have been subsituted or when a legislative proposal has been amended by striking out all after the enacting clause and inserting, in lieu thereof, a proposal to amend the Constitution of the United States, that has been done by unanimous consent of the Senate; and that is the only proper way and the only legal way in which it can be done.

Therefore, I now give notice that under no conditions can unanimous consent be obtained, because I and other Senators will object.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Mississippi yield?

Mr. EASTLAND. I yield.

Mr. HILL. The reason why unanimous consent is required is that it is contrary to the rules and in violation of them to proceed in the way described.

Mr. EASTLAND. That is correct.

Mr. HILL. So unanimous consent is required, in order to proceed contrary to the rules.

Mr. EASTLAND. That is correct. Unanimous consent is required; and that is the way it has been done throughout the history of this body.

So, Mr. President, I, for one, do not give unanimous consent; and I emphatically object to having the present amendment in the nature of a substitute attached to Senate Joint Resolution 29. I further register my objections to this procedure on the basis of the point of order, which should be unanimously sustained by the Members of this body.

Since 1791, when the first 10 amendments to the Constitution were ratified, only 12 additional amendments have been added thereto—an average of 1 new amendment for each 14 and a fraction years. Proposed abolition of the poll tax by one form of legislative or constitutional action or another has been a perennial matter for discussion and consideration by the U.S. Congress. The number of poll tax States has diminished to five. Where are the necessity and the urgency for adopting the presently proposed unique and unheard-of procedure to achieve a constitutional amendment? While I am one of those who have always believed that the poll tax was a legitimate prerequisite to exercise of the franchise, and that it was unwise to adopt any constitutional amendments which would deny to a State the right to levy a poll tax if it so chose, I do admit that over a long period of years a great number of persons have disagreed with my personal views in this regard. It is now heartening to see that the pendulum is swinging back to my point of view. No less person than the President of the United States, in a recent message to Congress, wholeheartedly endorsed the principle involved in the poll tax. He said, on January 30, 1962, in a message transmitting to Congress the proposal to appropriate up to $100 million for the purchase of United Nations bonds that:

> It is the opinion of the United States that special assessments voted by a two-thirds majority of the General Assembly are obligatory. We anticipate a decision by early summer of this year. If our view, which is shared by most of the members of the United Nations, is confirmed by the Court (the International Court of Justice), then all members will have to pay their dues or lose their right to vote in the General Assembly. It is only fair that members that participate in the privileges of membership should participate also in its obligations.

The President here is not only stating his opinion, but he purports to speak for the United States. If the United States believes that a nation which does not pay its assessments should be denied the right to vote in the General Assembly of the United Nations, then where is the consistency in saying that a sovereign State cannot require a small per capita or head tax as a prerequisite for its citizens to exercise the privilege of suffrage? Unlike some assessments against member nations in the United Nations, no existing poll tax in any of the States where it exists is onerous or oppressive. They are all modest contributions to help supply the funds necessary to the operations of the State Government. In my State the entire amount of the poll tax—$2—goes to the support of public schools.

The President's opinion as to the United States attitude toward voting

rights in the United Nations was buttressed by the testimony of the Secretary of State, our Ambassador to the United Nations, and practically every individual or organization that appeared before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee testifying in behalf of the United Nations bond issue appropriation. Is there any reason or justification that a separate standard of conduct should be imposed on nations than that which is required of the individuals who make up any sovereignty, be it a State or a nation?

It is the policy of the American Government that no member State of the United Nations that does not pay its dues shall vote in that body. Here it is proposed to tell a sovereign State that it cannot levy a puny $2 or $1.50 poll tax as a requirement for voting. The President of the United States, the Secretary of State of the United States, the Ambassador of the United States to the United Nations have in principle endorsed the theory of the poll tax and have made it the official policy of the United States Government.

While I am one of those who do not feel that either the United States or any State thereof is bound legally by any decision that might be rendered by the International Court of Justice, certainly before any further consideration is given to the domestic matter of a poll tax, it would not be inappropriate to ask that the decision be deferred until such time as we might have the benefit of the decision of the International Court of Justice on the principle involved. At least, whatever the decision is, there is a possibility that the inconsistency inherent in the position taken by the United States in international affairs and the urgency for this proposed constitutional amendment in domestic affairs might be resolved if the Court held that payment of assessments could not be required as a prerequisite for a nation voting in the General Assembly of the United Nations. Personally, I think it would be very appropriate for the Court to hold that a nation should be required to pay its assessments as a prerequisite to voting, and, by the same token, I hold that my State should have the fundamental right to continue to make such a requirement.

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

Mr. EASTLAND. I yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. I point out to him that I see no similarity between the situation in the United Nations to which he has referred and the situation relative to the poll tax. In the United Nations the charter itself provides that a nation which is in default for a certain period of time in the payment of regular annual assessments may not vote. The question being presented to the International Court of Justice, as I understand it, is whether or not these arrearages would be classified as falling within the purview of regular assessments or whether they would be classified as coming under some other category. I see no similarity, no comparison at all, between that situation and the poll tax.

To repeat, the Charter of the United Nations itself, by which every nation who is a member is bound, provides conclusively that a nation which does not pay its regular annual assessment for a fixed period of time—as I remember, 2 years—cannot vote; and this bond issue is not a normal sort of procedure. The question now pending before the International Court of Justice, as I understand, is whether, in the opinion of that Court, the assessments in arrears shall be held to fall within the purview of the regular annual assessment.

Mr. EASTLAND. I am certainly sorry the distinguished Senator from Florida does not see this. It is very similar. It is very plain. Yes, the Charter of the United Nations provides that a nation has to keep up its assessments in order to vote. That assessment can be onerous to a country. It is identically the same principle contained in the State Constitution, that one has to pay a poll tax in order to vote; but that poll tax is not onerous. It is exactly the same principle.

What strikes me is that only in the past few weeks the U.S. Government, has endorsed that principle in the United Nations. It is a policy of the U.S. Government in international affairs.

Mr. HOLLAND. I am afraid that my distinguished friend has not studied the question very carefully, because if he had I think he would find the situation there is not similar to this. The Soviets and the behind-the-Iron-Curtain satellites have been very careful to pay their annual assessments, in order to keep their voting rights, but they have not paid special assessments for operations in the Congo. The U.N. bond issue is supposed to take the place of and take care of the special assessments.

My understanding of the issue before the Court is whether these special assessments are something that fall within the purview of regular assessments.

I notice the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. MORTON] on his feet. He has made a study of the question. I venture only a horseback opinion. That is my understanding. I hope the Senator from Mississippi will yield to the Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. EASTLAND. Certainly.

Mr. MORTON. I think the issue before the World Court has really nothing to do with the bond issue. The issue went to the World Court before the question of the bond issue was passed upon by the General Assembly. The issue before the World Court involves three categories of assessment on members of the United Nations. One is called a general assessment, which goes to the regular operating functions of the United Nations. The second assessment is to take care of the expenses of the security force in the Gaza strip, which went there in 1957 and which has been continued there by the United Nations. The third assessment is to take care of the Congo operations.

The question is, Does article 14 apply to special assessments as it does to regular assessments? If, as anticipated, the Court holds that it does, then I think that makes the Aiken-Hickenlooper proposal a very proper proposal and gives the United Nations 3 years in which to straighten out its fiscal dilemma.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may yield to the distinguished Senator from Kentucky provided that I do not lose my right to the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. EASTLAND. I had only yielded for a question.

Mr. MORTON. I certainly would want the Senator to retain his right to the floor.

Mr. EASTLAND. Proceed, please.

Mr. MORTON. I merely wished to straighten out one point. I think the Senator from Mississippi has made an interesting point. I trust that someone speaking for the administration, if not this evening, at least tomorrow, will answer as to whether or not the President of the United States is against the poll tax.

Mr. EASTLAND. There is no answer to it. That is the proposal. We have the testimony of the Secretary of State. We have the testimony of the Ambassador to the United Nations. They say, "You cannot vote unless you pay your assessment"; and it can be an onerous assessment.

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

Mr. EASTLAND. I yield for a question.

Mr. HOLLAND. I trust that the Senator will yield for a short statement.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may yield to the Senator from Florida without losing my right to the floor.

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

Mr. HOLLAND. Replying to the suggestion made by my distinguished friend from Kentucky, I invite his attention to the fact that the record of the hearings in this particular matter shows that the Assistant Attorney General, Mr. Katzenbach, who appeared to testify on various pending constitutional amendments, made it very clear that on this particular amendment he was authorized to speak for the President in these words, as shown on page 388:

> I am authorized on this to speak for the administration and for the President.

That comes after the time he said:

> The Justice Department supports the proposed amendment as a realistic technique which seeks the early demise of the poll tax.

Those statements appear in several other forms during the course of the statement, that the President had given specific support to this and to this alone, of the various proceedings.

Mr. EASTLAND. Will the Senator tell us from what he is quoting?

Mr. HOLLAND. From the printed record of hearings before the Subcommittee on Constitutional Amendments of the Committee on the Judiciary of the U.S. Senate.

The Senator from Mississippi is, of course, the chairman of the full Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. EASTLAND. Yes.

Mr. HOLLAND. This is a print from one of the subcommittees of his committee. There is no question about it.

In addition to that, Mr. President, further evidence will be offered during the course of the argument.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. HOLLAND. The Senator from Mississippi has control of the floor.

Mr. EASTLAND. I yielded to the Senator from Florida, under unanimous consent.

Mr. HOLLAND. I am glad to yield.

Mr. EASTLAND. Does the Senator not know that the Attorney General testified today in favor of abolishing the poll tax by legislation?

Mr. HOLLAND. I had not heard that, but I know what the President wants; and that is not in accord with his wishes, and it is not in accord with the position of the Justice Department, as stated by Mr. Katzenbach. I think we shall be able to show that conclusively.

Mr. EASTLAND. I believe the testimony today was on the literacy test, by legislation, but of course that involves the same principle.

Mr. HOLLAND. If the Senator will yield further, for some reason unknown to me the Justice Department has taken the position that the literacy test is in a different category from the poll tax question. I do not know why.

I certainly do not give the rubber stamp of complete approval to everything coming from the Justice Department, but I say that the Justice Department and the President are both clearly on record before the subcommittee on Constitutional Amendments of the Senator's own committee as supporting the amendment which is proposed, and the feeling that that is the practical and constitutional way to go after the poll tax.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, there is no question that they so testified, but what does that have to do with what I said? Of course they testified to that, but what I said is that the policy of the U.S. Government has endorsed the principle of the poll tax in international affairs, because we say that no nation shall vote in the United Nations unless it pays its assessments, even though they be onerous.

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

Mr. EASTLAND. I yield for a question.

Mr. HOLLAND. The reason for that statement is that the charter, to which we are bound by treaty, so provides.

Mr. EASTLAND. The State constitutions so provide.

Mr. HOLLAND. The Federal Constitution does not so provide, however, and the Federal Constitution is changeable, and changeable in the method we are seeking to follow. The submission to the jury of the States is a method which existed before the Senator's State and mine came into the Union.

Mr. EASTLAND. Of course it can be submitted properly to the jury of the States, but that does not change the fact that the U.S. Government in international affairs has adopted the principle of the poll tax. The Senator cannot explain it away. The Senator cannot laugh it away. The Senator cannot brush it away. It is there.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield further, I am laughing it away, because I see no possible comparison between the two.

The United States and the other governments are able to pay their assessments. The thing we protest against is the fact that people oppressed by penury and poverty are not always able to pay them, and have not paid them.

Mr. EASTLAND. I defy the Senator to name one individual in my State or in the State of Alabama whom the poll tax has disqualified.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I do not care to go into that subject.

Mr. EASTLAND. I defy the Senator to name an individual.

Mr. HOLLAND. I merely invite attention to the fact that the Senator would not let me put in the RECORD this morning—but I am stating it now, with his indulgence—the fact that the 2 States so ably represented by the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND] and the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL], both of whom are on the floor, are at the very bottom of the 50 States in respect to participation of their citizens in elections. There must be some good reason for that.

Mr. EASTLAND. Now the Senator has gone far afield. He is quoting from the Civil Rights Commission, and he knows it is not worthy of belief. He has been opposed to it.

Mr. HOLLAND. I am not quoting from the Civil Rights Commission; I am quoting from the Senator's own record, from his own committee, which is based on the report of the Census Bureau, the State officials, and the American Heritage Foundation.

Mr. EASTLAND. The Senator knows that in the South, where we do not have an effective two-party system, the Democratic primary really is the election.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Bartlett, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had agreed to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 5143) to amend section 801 of the act entitled "An act to establish a code of law for the District of Columbia," approved March 3, 1901.

RECESS

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, I move, pursuant to the order previously entered, that the Senate take a recess until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 6 o'clock and 26 minutes p.m.) the Senate took a recess, pursuant to the order previously entered, until tomorrow, Friday, March 16, 1962, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATION

Executive nomination received by the Senate March 15 (legislative day of March 14), 1962:

U.S. PATENT OFFICE

Ezra Glaser, of Virginia, to be an Assistant Commissioner of Patents.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

THURSDAY, MARCH 15, 1962

The House met at 11 o'clock a.m.

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

I John 2: 17: *He that doeth the will of God abideth forever.*

O Thou who hast given unto us this Lenten season may we diligently examine our minds and hearts to see what kind of a spirit dwells there.

May we hear and heed Thy voice calling humanity to something far higher and nobler than the aimless, indolent, self-centered, and frivolous epicurean way of life.

Show us the insecurity and the vanity of any life that is not founded upon a strong faith in Thee but we penitently confess that we often hold our faith so lightly and loosely.

Grant that we may make a determined and disciplined effort to be crusaders and conquerors in the great adventure of doing Thy will and gaining for ourselves and all mankind a well-ordered inner life, one that is radiant and serene.

Hear us in the name of the Prince of Peace. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

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

SUNDRY MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Sundry messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the House by Mr. Ratchford, one of his secretaries.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. McGown, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed, with an amendment in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 5143. An act to amend section 801 of the act entitled "An act to establish a code of law for the District of Columbia," approved March 3, 1901.

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATION BILL, 1963

Mr. KIRWAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Appropriations may have until midnight tomorrow night to file a privileged report on the Department of the Interior