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

AUTHENTICATED U.S. GOVERNMENT INFORMATION GPO

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

and related agencies appropriation bill for 1963.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. FENTON reserved all points of order on the bill.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The clerk called the roll and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 36]

Alford	Grant	Norrell
Andersen, Minn.	Gray	Rains
Andrews	Hagan, Ga.	Roberts, Ala.
Blitch	Haley	St. Germain
Breeding	Hoffman, Mich.	Shelley
Celler	Huddleston	Shriver
Coad	Jensen	Smith, Miss.
Cooley	Jones, Ala.	Spence
Davis, Tenn.	Karth	Tupper
Feighan	Kitchin	Weaver
Flynt	Lesinski	Willis
Glenn	Macdonald	
	Moulder	

The SPEAKER. On this rollcall, 397 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

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

WELFARE AND PENSION PLANS DISCLOSURE ACT AMENDMENTS OF 1962

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on 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, and ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers on the part of the House be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

The conference report and statement are as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT (H. REPT. No. 1417)

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, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert the following: "That this Act may be cited as the 'Welfare and Pension Plans Disclosure Act Amendments of 1962'.

"SEC. 2. The first line of section 3 of the Welfare and Pension Plans Disclosure Act is amended by striking out '(a)'.

"SEC. 3. Paragraph (1) of section 3 of such Act is amended by striking out the word 'to' after the word 'communicated'.

"SEC. 4. Paragraph (9) of section 3 of such Act is amended to read as follows:

"'(9) The term "State" includes any State of the United States, the District of Columbia, Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands, American Samoa, Guam, Wake Island, the Canal Zone, and Outer Continental Shelf lands defined in the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act (43 U.S.C. 1331–1343).'

"SEC. 5. Section 3 of such Act is further amended by striking out paragraph (11) and adding the following new paragraphs (11), (12), and (13):

"'(11) The term "industry or activity affecting commerce" means any activity, business, or industry in commerce or in which a labor dispute would hinder or obstruct commerce or the free flow of commerce and includes any activity or industry "affecting commerce" within the meaning of the Labor-Management Relations Act, 1947, as amended, or the Railway Labor Act, as amended.

"'(12) The term "Secretary" means the Secretary of Labor.

"'(13) The term "party in interest" means any administrator, officer, trustee, custodian, counsel, or employee of any employee welfare benefit plan or employee pension benefit plan, or a person providing benefit plan services to any such plan, or an employer any of whose employees are covered by such a plan or officer or employee or agent of such employer, or an officer or agent or employee of an employee organization having members covered by such plan.'

"SEC. 6. Paragraphs (3) and (4) of subsection (b) of section 4 of such Act are amended to read as follows:

"'(3) such plan is administered by an organization which is exempt from taxation under the provisions of section 501(a) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 and is administered as a corollary to membership in a fraternal benefit society described in section 501(c)(8) of such Code or by organizations described in sections 501(c)(3) and 501(c)(4) of such Code: *Provided*, That the provisions of this paragraph shall not exempt any plan administered by a fraternal benefit society or organization which represents its members for purposes of collective bargaining; or

"'(4) such plan covers not more than twenty-five participants.'

"SEC. 7. Subsection (a) of section 5 of such Act is amended by striking out the last sentence thereof and inserting in lieu thereof the following: 'Such description and such report shall contain the information required by sections 6 and 7 of this Act in such form and detail as the Secretary shall by regulations prescribe and copies thereof shall be executed, published, and filed in accordance with the provisions of this Act and the Secretary's regulations thereunder. No regulation shall be issued under the preceding sentence which relieves any administrator of the obligation to include in such description or report any information relative to his plan which is required by section 6 or 7. Notwithstanding the foregoing, if the Secretary finds, on the record after giving interested persons an opportunity to be heard, that specific information on plans of certain kinds or on any class or classes of benefits described in section 3 (1) and (2) which are provided by such plans cannot, in the normal method of operation of such plans, be practicably ascertained or made available for publication in the manner or for the period prescribed in any provision of this Act, or that the information if published in such manner or for such period would be duplicative or uninformative, the Secretary may by regulations prescribe such other manner or such other period for the publication of such information as he may determine to be necessary and appropriate to carry out the purposes of this Act.'

"SEC. 8. Subsection (b) of section 6 of such Act is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new sentence: 'Any change in the information required by this subsection shall be reported to the Secretary within sixty days after the change has been effectuated.'

"SEC. 9. (a) Section 7(a) of such Act is amended by inserting after the word 'plan' the second time it appears the following: 'if it covers one hundred or more participants. However, the Secretary, after investigation, may require the administrator of any plan otherwise covered by the Act to publish such report when necessary and appropriate to carry out the purposes of the Act', and by striking out 'twenty' both times it appears and inserting in lieu thereof 'fifty'.

"(b) Section 7(b) of such Act is amended by striking out the first sentence of the second paragraph and inserting in lieu thereof the following: 'The amount contributed by each employer; the amount contributed by the employees; the amount of benefits paid or otherwise furnished; the number of employees covered; a statement of assets specifying the total amount in each of the following types of assets: cash, Government bonds, non-Government bonds and debentures, common stocks, preferred stocks, common trust funds, real estate loans and mortgages, operated real estate, other real estate, and other assets; a statement of liabilities, receipts, and disbursements of the plan; a detailed statement of the salaries and fees and commissions charged to the plan, to whom paid, in what amount, and for what purposes. The Secretary, when he has determined that an investigation is necessary in accordance with section 9(d) of this Act, may require the filing of supporting schedules of assets and liabilities.'

"(c) Section 7(b) is further amended by adding at the end thereof the following new sentence: 'In the case of reports sworn to, but not certified, the Secretary, when he determines that it may be necessary to investigate the plan in accordance with section 9(d) of this Act, shall, prior to investigation by the Department of Labor, require certification of the report by an independent certified or licensed public accountant.'

"SEC. 10. Subparagraph (B) of paragraph (1) of subsection (f) of section 7 of such Act is amended by striking out 'summary' and by striking out 'broken down by types, such as cash investments in governmental obligations, investments in nongovernmental bonds, and investments in corporate stocks' and inserting in lieu thereof the following: 'as required by section 7(b)'.

"SEC. 11. Subparagraph (C) of paragraph (1) of subsection (f) of section 7 of such Act is amended by striking out 'total fund' and inserting 'total funds', by striking out 'by reason of being an officer, trustee, or employee of such fund', and by striking out 'listed at their aggregate cost or present value, whichever is lower' and inserting in lieu thereof 'valued as provided in subparagraph (B)'.

"SEC. 12. Subparagraph (D) of paragraph (1) of subsection (f) of section 7 of such Act is amended by striking out the words 'by reason of being an officer, trustee, or employee of such fund'.

"SEC. 13. Section 7 of such Act is amended by adding thereto the following new subsections (g) and (h):

"'(g) If some or all of the benefits under the plan are provided by an insurance carrier or service or other organization, such carrier or organization shall certify to the administrator of such plan, within one hundred and twenty days after the end of each calendar, policy, and other fiscal year, as the case may be, such reasonable information determined by the Secretary to be necessary to enable such administrator to comply with the requirements of this Act.

"'(h) The Secretary shall prescribe by general rule simplified reports for plans which he finds that by virtue of their size or otherwise a detailed report would be unduly burdensome, but the Secretary may revoke such provisions for simplified forms for any plan if the purposes of the Act would be served thereby.'

"SEC. 14. Section 8(a)(2) of such Act is amended by striking out 'a summary' and inserting in lieu thereof 'an adequate summary'.

"SEC. 15. (a) Section 9(a) of such Act is amended by striking out 'of sections 5 or 8' and inserting before the period the words ', or both'.

"(b) Section 9 of such Act is amended by striking out subsections (d) and (e) and inserting in lieu thereof the following new subsections:

"'(d) The Secretary may, after first requiring certification in accordance with section 7(b), upon complaint of violation not satisfied by such certification, or on his own motion, when he continues to have reasonable cause to believe investigation may disclose violations of this Act, make such investigations as he deems necessary, and may require or permit any person to file with him a statement in writing, under oath or otherwise, as to all the facts and circumstances concerning the matter to be investigated.

"'(e) For the purposes of any investigation provided for in this Act, the provisions of sections 9 and 10 (relating to the attendance of witnesses and the production of books, records, and documents) of the Federal Trade Commission Act of September 16, 1914, as amended (15 U.S.C. 49, 50), are hereby made applicable to the jurisdiction, powers, and duties of the Secretary or any officers designated by him.

"'(f) Whenever it shall appear to the Secretary that any person is engaged in any violation of the provisions of this Act, he may in his discretion bring an action in the proper district court of the United States or United States court of any place subject to the jurisdiction of the United States, to enjoin such acts or practices, and upon a proper showing a permanent or temporary injunction or restraining order shall be granted.

"'(g) The United States district courts and the United States courts of any place subject to the jurisdiction of the United States shall have jurisdiction, for cause shown, to restrain violations of this Act.

"'(h) Nothing contained in this Act shall be so construed or applied as to authorize the Secretary to regulate, or interfere in the management of, any employee welfare or pension benefit plan, except that the Secretary may inquire into the existence and amount of investments, actuarial assumptions, or accounting practices only when it has been determined that investigation is required in accordance with section 9(d) of this Act.

"'(i) The Secretary shall immediately forward to the Attorney General or his representative any information coming to his attention in the course of the administration of this Act which may warrant consideration for criminal prosecution under the provisions of this Act or other Federal law.'

"SEC. 16. (a) Such Act is further amended by renumbering sections 10, 11, and 12 as sections 16, 17, and 18, respectively, and by adding the following new sections to the Act:

"'REPORTS MADE PUBLIC INFORMATION

"'SEC. 10. The contents of the descriptions and regular annual reports filed with the Secretary pursuant to this Act shall be public information, and the Secretary, where to do so would protect the interests of participants or beneficiaries of a plan, may publish any such information and data. The Secretary may use the information and data for statistical and research purposes, and compile and publish such studies, analyses, reports, and surveys based thereon as he may deem appropriate.

"'RETENTION OF RECORDS

"'SEC. 11. Every person required to file any description or report or to certify any information therefor under this Act shall maintain records on the matters of which disclosure is required which will provide in sufficient detail the necessary basic information and data from which the documents thus required may be verified, explained, or clarified, and checked for accuracy and completeness, and shall include vouchers, worksheets, receipts, and applicable resolutions, and shall keep such records available for examination for a period of not less than five years after the filing of the documents based on the information which they contain.

"'RELIANCE ON ADMINISTRATIVE INTERPRETATIONS AND FORMS

"'SEC. 12. In any action or proceeding based on any act or omission in alleged violation of this Act, no person shall be subject to any liability or punishment for or on account of the failure of such person to (1) comply with any provision of this Act if he pleads and proves that the act or omission complained of was in good faith, in conformity with, and in reliance on any written interpretation or opinion of the Secretary, or (2) publish and file any information required by any provision of this Act if he pleads and proves that he published and filed such information in good faith, on the description and annual report forms prepared by the Secretary and in conformity with the instructions of the Secretary issued under this Act regarding the filing of such forms. Such a defense, if established, shall be a bar to the action or proceeding, notwithstanding that (A) after such act or omission, such interpretation or opinion is modified or rescinded or is determined by judicial authority to be invalid or of no legal effect, or (B) after publishing or filing the description and annual reports, such publication or filing is determined by judicial authority not to be in conformity with the requirements of this Act.

"'BONDING

"'SEC. 13. (a) Every administrator, officer and employee of any employee welfare benefit plan or of any employee pension benefit plan subject to this Act who handles funds or other property of such plan shall be bonded as herein provided; except that, where such plan is one under which the only assets from which benefits are paid are the general assets of a union or of an employer, the administrator, officers and employees of such plan shall be exempt from the bonding requirements of this section. The amount of such bond shall be fixed at the beginning of each calendar, policy, or other fiscal year, as the case may be, which constitutes the reporting year of such plan. Such amount shall be not less than 10 per centum of the amount of funds handled, determined as herein provided, except that any such bond shall be in at least the amount of $1,000 and no such bond shall be required in an amount in excess of $500,000: *Provided*, That the Secretary, after due notice and opportunity for hearing to all interested parties, and after consideration of the record, may prescribe an amount in excess of $500,000, which in no event shall exceed 10 per centum of the funds handled. For purposes of fixing the amount of such bond, the amount of funds handled shall be determined by the funds handled by the person, group, or class to be covered by such bond and by their predecessor or predecessors, if any, during the preceding reporting year, or if the plan has no preceding reporting year, the amount of funds to be handled during the current reporting year by such person, group, or class, estimated as provided in regulations of the Secretary. Such bond shall provide protection to the plan against loss by reason of acts of fraud or dishonesty on the part of such administrator, officer, or employee, directly or through connivance with others. Any bond shall have as surety thereon a corporate surety company which is an acceptable surety on Federal bonds under authority granted by the Secretary of the Treasury pursuant to the Act of July 30, 1947 (6 U.S.C. 6–13). Any bond shall be in a form or of a type approved by the Secretary, including individual bonds or schedule or blanket forms of bonds which cover a group or class.

"'(b) It shall be unlawful for any administrator, officer, or employee to whom subsection (a) applies, to receive, handle, disburse, or otherwise exercise custody or control of any of the funds or other property of any employee welfare benefit plan or employee pension benefit plan, without being bonded as required by subsection (a) and it shall be unlawful for any administrator, officer, or employee of such plan, or any other person having authority to direct the performance of such functions, to permit such functions, or any of them, to be performed by any such person, with respect to whom the requirements of subsection (a) have not been met.

"'(c) It shall be unlawful for any person to procure any bond required by subsection (a) from any surety or other company or through any agent or broker in whose business operations such plan or any party in interest in such plan has any significant control or financial interest, direct or indirect.

"'(d) Nothing in any other provision of law shall require any person, required to be bonded as provided in subsection (a) because he handles funds or other property of an employee welfare benefit plan or of an employee pension benefit plan, to be bonded insofar as the handling by such person of the funds or other property of such plan is concerned.

"'(e) The Secretary shall from time to time issue such regulations as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this section. When, in the opinion of the Secretary, the administrator of a plan offers adequate evidence of the financial responsibility of the plan, or that other bonding arrangements would provide adequate protection of the beneficiaries and participants, he may exempt such plan from the requirements of this section.

"'ADVISORY COUNCIL

"'SEC. 14. (a) There is hereby established an Advisory Council on Employee Welfare and Pension Benefit Plans (hereinafter referred to as the "Council") which shall consist of thirteen members to be appointed in the following manner: One from the insurance field, one from the corporate trust field, two from management, four from labor, and two from other interested groups, all appointed by the Secretary from among persons recommended by organizations in the respective groups; and three representatives of the general public appointed by the Secretary.

"'(b) It shall be the duty of the Council to advise the Secretary with respect to the carrying out of his functions under this Act, and to submit to the Secretary recommendations with respect thereto. The Council shall meet at least twice each year and at such other times as the Secretary requests. At the beginning of each regular session of the Congress, the Secretary shall transmit to the Senate and House of Representatives each recommendation which he has received from the Council during the preceding calendar year and a report covering his activities under the Act for such preceding calendar year, including full information as to the number of plans and their size, the results of any studies he may have made of such plans and the Act's operation and such other information and data as he may deem desirable in connection with employee welfare and pension benefit plans.

"'(c) The Secretary shall furnish to the Council an executive secretary and such secretarial, clerical, and other services as are deemed necessary to the conduct of its business. The Secretary may call upon other agencies of the Government for statistical data, reports, and other information which will assist the Council in the performance of its duties.

"'(d) Appointed members of the Council shall be paid compensation at the rate of $50 per diem when engaged in the work of the Council, including travel time, and shall be allowed travel expenses and per diem in lieu of subsistence as authorized by law (5 U.S.C. 73b-2) for persons in the Government service employed intermittently and receiving compensation on a per diem, when actually employed, basis.

"'(e)(1) Any member of the Council is hereby exempted with respect to such appointment, from the operation of sections 281, 283, and 1914 of title 18 of the United States Code, and section 190 of the Revised Statutes (5 U.S.C. 99), except as otherwise specified in paragraph (2) of this subsection.

"'(2) The exemption granted by paragraph (1) of this subsection shall not extend—

"'(A) to the receipt or payment of salary in connection with the appointee's Government service from any source other than the private employer of the appointee at the time of his appointment, or

"'(B) during the period of such appointment, to the prosecution or participation in the prosecution, by any person so appointed, of any claim against the Government involving any matter with which such person, during such period, is or was directly connected by reason of such appointment.

"'ADMINISTRATION

"'SEC. 15. (a) The provisions of the Administrative Procedure Act shall be applicable to this Act.

"'(b) 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.

"'(c) No more than 260 employees shall be employed by the Department of Labor to administer or enforce this Act for the first two years after the enactment of the Welfare and Pension Plans Disclosure Act Amendments of 1962.

"'(d) Not more than two million two hundred thousand dollars per year is authorized to be appropriated for the administration and enforcement of this Act, for the first two years after the enactment of the Welfare and Pension Plans Disclosure Act Amendments of 1962.'

"(b) Subsection (b) of the section renumbered as section 16 by this Act, is amended by inserting after 'of this section' the following: 'and section 13'.

"(c) The table of contents of the first section of such Act is amended by striking out the last three lines and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

"'Sec. 10. Reports made public information.
"'Sec. 11. Retention of records.
"'Sec. 12. Reliance on administrative interpretations and forms.
"'Sec. 13. Bonding.
"'Sec. 14. Advisory Council.
"'Sec. 15. Administration.
"'Sec. 16. Effect of other laws.
"'Sec. 17. Separability of provisions.
"'Sec. 18. Effective date.'

"SEC. 17. (a) Chapter 31 of title 18, United States Code, as amended, is amended by adding a new section captioned and reading as follows:

"'§ 664. Theft or embezzlement from employee benefit plan

"'Any person who embezzles, steals, or unlawfully and willfully abstracts or converts to his own use or to the use of another, any of the moneys, funds, securities, premiums, credits, property, or other assets of any employee welfare benefit plan or employee pension benefit plan, or of any fund connected therewith, shall be fined not more than $10,000, or imprisoned not more than five years, or both.

"'As used in this section, the term "any employee welfare benefit plan or employee pension benefit plan" means any such plan subject to the provisions of the Welfare and Pension Plans Disclosure Act.'

"(b) The analysis of chapter 31, title 18, United States Code, immediately preceding section 641 thereof, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new item:

"'664. Theft or embezzlement from employee benefit plan.'

"(c) Chapter 47 of title 18, United States Code, as amended, is amended by adding a new section captioned and reading as follows:

"'§ 1027. False statements and concealment of facts in relation to documents required by the Welfare and Pension Plans Disclosure Act

"'Whoever, in any document required by the Welfare and Pension Plans Disclosure Act (as amended from time to time) to be published, or kept as part of the records of any employee welfare benefit plan or employee pension benefit plan, or certified to the administrator of any such plan, makes any false statement or representation of fact, knowing it to be false, or knowingly conceals, covers up, or fails to disclose any fact the disclosure of which is required by such Act or is necessary to verify, explain, clarify or check for accuracy and completeness any report required by such Act to be published or any information required by such Act to be certified, shall be fined not more than $10,000, or imprisoned not more than five years, or both.'

"(d) The analysis of chapter 47, title 18, United States Code, immediately preceding section 1001, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new item:

"'1027. False statements and concealment of facts in relation to documents required by the Welfare and Pension Plans Disclosure Act.'

"(e) Chapter 95 of title 18, United States Code, as amended, is amended by adding a new section captioned and reading as follows:

"'§ 1954. Offer, acceptance, or solicitation to influence operations of employee benefit plan

"'(a) Whoever being—

"'(1) an administrator, officer, trustee, custodian, counsel, agent, or employee of any employee welfare benefit plan or employee pension benefit plan; or

"'an officer, counsel, agent, or employee of an employer or an employer any of whose employees are covered by such plan; or

"'(3) an officer, counsel, agent, or employee of an employee organization any of whose members are covered by such plan; or

"'(4) a person who, or an officer, counsel, agent, or employee of an organization which, provides benefit plan services to such plan receives or agrees to receive or solicits any fee, kickback, commission, gift, loan, money, or thing of value because of or with intent to be influenced with respect to, any of his actions, decisions, or other duties relating to any question or matter concerning such plan or any person who directly or indirectly gives or offers, or promises to give or offer, any fee, kickback, commission, gift, loan, money, or thing of value prohibited by this section, shall be fined not more than $10,000 or imprisoned not more than three years, or both: *Provided*, That this section shall not prohibit the payment to or acceptance by any person of bona fide salary, compensation, or other payments made for goods or facilities actually furnished or for services actually performed in the regular course of his duties as such person, administrator, officer, trustee, custodian, counsel, agent, or employee of such plan, employer, employee organization, or organization providing benefit plan services to such plan.

"'As used in this section, the term (a) "any employee welfare benefit plan" or "employee pension benefit plan" means any such plan subject to the provisions of the Welfare and Pension Plans Disclosure Act, as amended, and (b) "employee organization" and "administrator" as defined respectively in sections 3(3) and 5(b) (1) and (2) of the Welfare and Pension Plans Disclosure Act, as amended.

"'(b) Whenever in the judgment of a United States attorney the testimony of any witness, or the production of books, papers, or other evidence by any witness, in any case or proceeding before any grand jury or court of the United States involving any violation of this section, or any conspiracy to violate such section, is necessary to the public interest, he, upon the approval of the Attorney General, shall make application to the court that the witness shall be instructed to testify or produce evidence subject to the provisions of this subsection, and upon order of the court such witness shall not be excused from testifying or from producing books, papers, or other evidence on the ground that the testimony or evidence required of him may tend to incriminate him or subject him to a penalty or forfeiture. But no such witness shall be prosecuted or subjected to any penalty or forfeiture for or on account of any transaction, matter, or thing concerning which he is compelled, after having claimed his privilege against self-incrimination, to testify or produce evidence, nor shall testimony so compelled be used as evidence in any criminal proceeding (except prosecution described in the next sentence) against him in any court. No witness shall be exempt under this subsection from prosecution for perjury or contempt committed while giving testimony or producing evidence under compulsion as provided in this subsection.'

"(f) The analysis of chapter 95, title 18, United States Code, immediately preceding section 1951 thereof, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new item:

"'1954. Offer, acceptance, or solicitation to influence operations of employee benefit plan.'

"SEC. 18. The Welfare and Pension Plans Disclosure Act is further amended by substituting the term 'Secretary' for the term 'Secretary of Labor' wherever the latter term appears in such Act.

"SEC. 19. The amendments made by this Act shall take effect ninety days after the enactment of this Act, except that section

13 of the Welfare and Pension Plans Disclosure Act shall take effect one hundred eighty days after such date of enactment.

"And the Senate agree to the same."

ADAM C. POWELL,
JAMES ROOSEVELT,
JOHN H. DENT,
NEAL SMITH,
Managers on the Part of the House.

PAT MCNAMARA,
WAYNE MORSE,
J. RANDOLPH,
BEN A. SMITH,
CLAIBORNE PELL,
Q. BURDICK,
WINSTON L. PROUTY,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the 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, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon by the conferees and recommended in the accompanying conference report:

The Senate amendment struck out all of the House bill after the enacting clause and inserted a new text. The House recedes from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate, with an amendment which is a substitute for both the House bill and the Senate amendment. The differences between the House bill and the substitute agreed upon in conference are described in this statement, except for incidental, minor, and clarifying changes.

Section 8 of the House bill provided that changes in the information required to be contained in the description of a plan must be reported to the Secretary within 60 days after the effective date of the change. The Senate amendment contained the same provision, except that it required such a change to be reported within 60 days after the change has been effectuated. The conference substitute adopts the Senate provision so that the 60-day period will run from the actual date such a change is made where the change is given a retroactive effective date.

Section 9(a) of the Senate amendment amended section 7(a) of the act to provide that annual reports with respect to employee welfare or pension benefit plans need not be published where they cover fewer than 100, but the amendment gave the Secretary of Labor power, after investigation, to require administrators of plans which would otherwise be covered to publish such reports when necessary and appropriate to carry out the purposes of the act. The House bill contained no comparable provision, so that employee welfare or pension benefit plans are subject to the requirements of the act if they cover more than 25 participants. The conference substitute adopts this provision of the Senate amendment.

The House bill, in section 16(a), added a new section 10 of the act providing that the contents of descriptions and annual reports filed under the act will be public information, and that the Secretary could, where it would protect the interests of participants or beneficiaries to do so, publish any information and data which he obtains pursuant to the act. The Senate amendment also provided that descriptions and regular annual reports would be public information but permitted the Secretary to publish only information and data contained in such descriptions and reports. The conference substitute makes the contents of descriptions and regular annual reports public information and permits the Secretary to publish any information and data derived from such descriptions and regular annual reports where to do so would protect the interests of participants or beneficiaries.

Both the House bill and the Senate amendment added a new section 13 to the act requiring the bonding of administrators, officers, and employees of employee welfare or pension benefit plans. In this section the House bill provided that no bond would be required in an amount in excess of $500,000. However, the bill permitted the Secretary, after due notice and opportunity of hearing to all interested parties and after consideration of the record, to prescribe an amount in excess of $500,000. The conference substitute on this point is the same as the House bill except that the authority of the Secretary to prescribe bonds in the amount of $500,000 is so limited as to insure that he will not be permitted to require a bond in excess of 10 percent of the amount of funds handled. It should be made clear that it is the intent of Congress that the Secretary of Labor, in exercising this authority to require a bond in excess of $500,000, may do so by regulation prior to the effective date of the bonding requirements or on a case-by-case basis after the bonding provision becomes effective. That is, the Secretary may, by regulation, establish a schedule of bond amounts for large plans prior to the effective date of the bonding provisions, and he may modify his regulations for any individual plan after such date.

The House bill, in the new section 13(e), permitted the Secretary to exempt any administrator, officer, or employee of a plan from the new bonding requirements when, in his opinion, the plan administrator furnished evidence of financial responsibility adequate to assure protection of the beneficiaries and participants. The comparable provision of the Senate amendment permitted such an exemption only where there were other bonding arrangements required by Federal or State law covering such persons which were adequate for the protection of the participants and beneficiaries. The conference substitute adopts the provisions of the House bill, with the additional provision that the plan could be exempted from the bonding requirements, not only when the administrator offers adequate evidence of financial responsibility but also when he is of the opinion that other bonding arrangements would provide adequate protection for the participants and beneficiaries. That intent is that the Secretary of Labor will, by regulation or by a case-by-case procedure, be empowered to accept other forms of surety to protect welfare and pension funds. He will be empowered to accept bonding arrangements underwritten by a group of individual underwriters of good reputation admitted to provide such arrangements in a State of the United States. He will also be empowered to accept irrevocable escrow arrangements that will provide the same degree of protection offered by other bonds. Thus, the commercial practice of guaranteeing an obligation through a cash bond can be accepted by the Secretary in lieu of other bonds.

The House bill added a new section 15(b) to the act which provided that Labor Department employees whose duties involve the administration or enforcement of this act could not be members of an employee organization if such organization admits to membership, or is affiliated directly or indirectly with an organization which admits to membership, employees other than employees of the Federal Government. The Senate amendment contained no comparable provision. The substitute agreed upon in conference provides that no Labor Department employee may administer and enforce this act with respect to an employee organization of which he is a member or employer organization in which he has an interest. This provision was adopted to insure that the administration and enforcement of the act would be free from any conflict of interest. This language is intended to provide guidelines for individual Labor Department employee participation in the administration and enforcement of the act. It was the intent of the conferees representing both Houses that no member of a labor union or employer organization should work on the plan or report submitted by that union or employer organization. It must be made clear that this language is not intended to bar employees of the Department from belonging to an organization which is affiliated with a parent federation. Thus, an employee of the Department, even though a member of a labor union which is affiliated with a parent federation, would not be barred from working on plans or reports other than those submitted by his local or international union. Similarly, a member of a trade association would not be barred from working on the plans or reports submitted by members of that trade association other than those submitted by the particular employer organization in which he has an interest.

The House bill added a new section 15(c) to the act providing that not more than 260 employees could be employed by the Labor Department to enforce or administer the act. The Senate amendment contained no comparable provision. The conference substitute adopts this provision of the House bill, except that it is made applicable for only the first 2 years after the enactment of these amendments.

The House bill, in section 17(a), added a section to chapter 11 of title 18 of the United States Code making it a crime to give or receive anything of value for influencing the actions, decisions, or duties of persons connected with employee benefit plans. The Senate amendment makes a very similar amendment to chapter 31 of title 18. In addition to differences in location, the Senate amendment differs from the House bill by (1) including agents of plans in the section, (2) officers, counsels, agents, and employees of organizations providing benefit plan services are included, (3) counsels of employers and employee organizations are included, (4) solicitations are expressly included, (5) fees, kickbacks, commissions, gifts, and loans are expressly included, and (6) certain definitions are incorporated by reference. The conference substitute is like the Senate amendment.

The House bill provided that the amendments made by the act would come into effect on January 1, 1963, except that the new bonding requirements would take effect on July 1, 1963. The Senate amendment would provide that the amendments would take effect 90 days after the enactment of this act, except that the bonding provisions would take effect 180 days after the date of enactment. The substitute agreed upon in conference provides for the adoption of the provisions of the Senate amendment in this respect.

ADAM C. POWELL,
JAMES ROOSEVELT,
JOHN H. DENT,
NEAL SMITH,
Managers on the Part of the House.

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, in September of last year, in the closing days of the first session, our committee brought H.R. 8723, amendments to the Welfare and Pension Plans Disclosure Act, to the floor under suspension of rules. The vast majority of the Members, 245 in number, voted to pass this measure, but we were 12 short of the necessary two-thirds vote. In February of this year, we again brought this bill to the floor and a full debate on its merits was had.

By a better than 2-to-1 vote, the House again voiced its support for these amendments.

We all realized that H.R. 8723 answered a long overdue need to assure the 100 million men and women who are direct and indirect beneficiaries of the welfare and pension plans that their moneys are safeguarded and that the trustees of these funds recognize their fiduciary responsibilities. I believe that the bill which we passed will go a long way toward doing that job. The counterpart bill in the other body was also an effective proposal containing almost identical provisions.

We are now presenting to the House the results of our conference. I believe that we have taken the best of both bills and therefore bring to you now even better legislation than either original proposal. The conference report before you is not greatly different from the bill which passed this House last month.

In the 2 days of conference which were held, all the provisions of H.R. 8723 and S. 2520 were carefully examined. On all but one issue, I can safely say that those conferees from both sides of the House who favored this measure were in agreement that the changes made by the conferees were beneficial. The conferees of the other body receded on more issues than did the House. The House only receded when it was felt that the Senate or compromise language proposed was even more expressive of the House's intent. In this respect, I wish to compliment the conferees of both parties for their willingness, in a spirit of compromise and with constructive effort, to work out a mutually acceptable conference report. Mr. ROOSEVELT will explain to you the changes which were made by the conference.

I would like to conclude by saying that I believe that the Members of this body gave overwhelming support to this measure because they believe, as I do, that it is fundamental in a democracy that the rights of the individual are secured by law—and until this conference report becomes the law of the land the rights of millions of Americans to full disclosure of the operations of their welfare and pension plans are not so secured.

One final word—as I said a few moments ago, there was only one provision of this report on which all our House managers did not agree—although all the Senate conferees who were recorded did vote with the majority—the so-called Ashbrook amendment which was adopted in the House by a teller vote when we debated this bill. A majority of the conferees, from both Houses, believed that this amendment was not only inequitable but would also have harmful, although perhaps unintentional ramifications. We spent a great amount of time on this matter in conference. A member of the minority party, from the other body, proved to be the "Great Compromiser." He suggested a substitute amendment as well as a clarifying statement for use in the statement of managers. These were adopted verbatim and are before you at this time. A majority of the House managers believe that this substitute amendment contained in the conference report will prevent any possibility of conflict of interest in the administration of this act. At the same time, the partiality of the Ashbrook amendment is avoided and rights to join unions of their own choosing that Government workers have enjoyed since 1912 are preserved. Your vote to approve the conference report is requested.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. GOODELL].

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. Speaker, may I ask if the gentleman from New York [Mr. POWELL] would yield us half the time, and let us allocate that?

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, under the rules it is possible to yield half the time to the other side?

The SPEAKER. The practice is that whoever is in charge of the conference report has control of the time, and he yields the time to others. The gentleman from New York [Mr. GOODELL] has been yielded 5 minutes. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. Speaker, I come to you today as a conferee who favors the purpose of the Welfare and Pension Disclosure Act. I spoke to you as vigorously as I was capable of doing when this first came to the floor, in favor of the provisions which came from the committee.

In the conference we had one difference of opinion that involved the so-called Ashbrook amendment. The Ashbrook amendment, simply put, said that no employee of the Department of Labor who is enforcing this act shall be a member of an employee organization or affiliated with an employee organization that admits to membership individuals other than employees of the Federal Government. We fought for this, the conferees on our side, throughout the conference, and we lost. We refused to sign the conference report on that ground alone.

This issue was first raised, may I say, by our esteemed colleague, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. LANDRUM] when he testified in the Committee on Rules on the Welfare and Pension Bill. He pointed out the possible conflict of interest that existed with employees of the Labor Department enforcing this act with respect to unions. Actually the Ashbrook amendment will affect 260 specific employees in the Labor Department.

I pay tribute to the experience and background of both the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. LANDRUM], and the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. GRIFFIN]. The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. GRIFFIN] also feels very strongly that in this issue there is a matter of principle involved. I would say to you that I favor the Ashbrook amendment and there will be a motion to recommit this conference report, with instructions to our conferees to insist upon the Ashbrook amendment. I shall favor the motion to recommit.

If we had a situation here where an executive of the Chrysler Corp. had some involvement in the enforcement of an act affecting the Chrysler Corp., I do not think you would have any doubt about there being a conflict of interest. If we had a situation here where a member of the National Association of Manufacturers was enforcing an act affecting prominent and strong members of that organization, I think also that there would be less doubt on the part of some of the people who now oppose the Ashbrook amendment. We are, with the Ashbrook amendment, attempting to clear these employees of exceptional pressures, of the possibility of improper influence being brought to bear upon them, or the possibility of their being subjected to the torsion of divided loyalties. Federal employees will have a difficult job to enforce this act fairly and we should help them be in a sense as pure as Caesar's wife.

There are many opportunities in this act for leaks which will do great harm, immeasurable harm to the parties involved with these welfare and pension plans. No situation of divided loyalty should be permitted to encourage further leaks.

I had one reservation about the Ashbrook amendment and in conference I expressed that reservation and offered a compromise. I felt there was a legitimate question of conflict of interest here but that we should not apply it just to employee organizations, that we should also bar conflict of interest as to those who might be affiliated with employer organizations. I offered this compromise in conference to cover all parties who might have a conflict of interest involving the supervision of these acts. It was summarily rejected.

Mention has been made of the compromise, so-called, that was offered from the other body. That compromise will have virtually no effect upon the enforcement of this act, in my opinion. We all fear the granting of great discretion to administrators downtown, to the so-called bureaucrats. Last week we had an example of it, right after the manpower bill had passed this House. In defiance of our expressed will on this floor, decision was made in the Labor Department to do precisely the opposite of what we intended with reimbursement under the unemployment compensation system. This decision was called to my attention midweek. We called together both Democrats and Republicans in the House and got to work and reversed their decision downtown.

But we have to watch these people constantly. They have great authority and can be influenced to expand that authority beyond the actual intent of Congress. Certainly it is not fair to these employees to be put in the position of having divided loyalties, of having pressures upon them and influences upon them from sources that have nothing to do with the fair and impartial administration of this act.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. Speaker, would the gentleman from New York yield me more time?

Mr. POWELL. At the expense of other Members who are opposed to this, I yield the gentleman 1 minute.

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

Mr. GOODELL. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. LINDSAY. I would like to know whether the conferees took into consideration the conflict of interest bill that was passed by the House of Representatives in the last session. That was a very carefully drafted bill and it will cover this problem if it becomes law. It is along the lines of the Prouty amendment. This was something that the House worked on quite considerably. Did the conferees take this into consideration?

Mr. GOODELL. I considered this personally, but we did not discuss it in detail in conference because the compromise which I offered was rather summarily rejected. I feel, the conflict of interest amendment, which did pass this House was stronger and more effective than the so-called Prouty amendment here. We did not feel we could in this bill properly go into the whole complicated question of conflicts of interest involving monetary gains and things of that sort, but the possibility of behind the scenes pressures or invocation of loyalties in conflict with an administrator's charged duty troubled us greatly with reference to the welfare and pension plans. The Prouty amendment was an attempt to deal with this situation. I much prefer a stronger provision than the Prouty amendment.

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

Mr. GOODELL. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. POWELL. Under the terms of the Ashbrook amendment, is every single labor organization in this country exempted?

Mr. GOODELL. Is every single labor organization exempted?

Mr. POWELL. Is every single labor organization in this country forbidden to organize?

Mr. GOODELL. Oh, no. Under the terms of the Ashbrook amendment, Government employees may join an employee organization but if that employee organization is affiliated with another employee organization which has members who are not Government employees, that is the way it is phrased, then such Government employees cannot enforce this act. The basis for it is that affiliation with nongovernment employee organizations might tend to put them in an awkward position where there might be pressures or influences brought to bear. I felt in my compromise, we would bar the same types of influences and pressure from the employer organizations.

Mr. POWELL. How many such labor organizations are there that you are referring to?

Mr. GOODELL. Well, as a practical matter, what it amounts to is that in the original Ashbrook amendment, it is my understanding that if a government employee union is associated or affiliated with the AFL–CIO, then nobody who is in that union could be involved in the enforcement of this act. They may join an independent union without any problem.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has again expired.

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman from New York 1 additional minute.

How many such organizations are there in existence now?

Mr. GOODELL. Which organizations are you referring to?

Mr. POWELL. Would the independent unions be allowed to organize under the Ashbrook amendment?

Mr. GOODELL. Yes. Independent unions would not be barred by the Ashbrook amendment.

Mr. POWELL. How about the Teamsters?

Mr. GOODELL. No, government employees could not belong to the Teamsters. The Teamsters admit nongovernment employees to membership.

Mr. POWELL. Is it not true that there is only one union that is favoring the Ashbrook amendment, and is it not true that that union has been the National Federation of Federal Employees?

Mr. GOODELL. There is one major independent union of government employees which favors the Ashbrook amendment.

Mr. POWELL. I thank my colleague.

Mr. GOODELL. I agree with the gentleman on that point.

Mr. POWELL. I thank the gentleman.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has again expired.

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. LANDRUM], a distinguished member of our committee.

Mr. LANDRUM. Mr. Speaker, I was a member of the subcommittee which originally developed this Pension Welfare Reporting and Disclosure Act. I favored its terms. I did not favor the amendments which were before the committee and which came out of the committee this year. But I bow to the majority in what was done in reporting out these amendments and adopting them here with this provision, and that is that the Ashbrook amendment is absolutely essential to avoid a definite conflict of interest that not only can but very likely will develop if we allow this conference report to be adopted without the inclusion of the amendment.

Why do I say that? The executive department issued an order on January 17 providing that all Government employees may become members of labor unions. The Executive order allowed until July of this year for the various departments or cabinet heads to promulgate rules and regulations under which the Government employees could become members of a labor union. The Secretary of Labor, Mr. Goldberg, had his rules and regulations ready the next day. I want to call to the attention of the House what he says, to show the possibility of that conflict of interest. Section 6b of the Secretary's order promulgating these rules says this:

> Union membership: Each employee of the Department has, and shall be protected in the exercise of, the right to form, join, and assist any employee organization or to refrain from any such activity. In the exercise of this right, he shall be free from coercion, restraint, discrimination, or reprisal.

According to this, the Government employees can affiliate with any craft organization, any international union, whether it be the Teamsters, an independent union, or the A.F. of L., if the majority of them want to do so.

To show you that they expect the majority of the members of the Labor Department to become union members, let me quote from an AFL letter contained in the AFL–CIO News of January 27, 1962. Reporting a speech by Secretary of Labor Goldberg before an AFL–CIO affiliate, the article stated:

> Goldberg spoke at the American Federation of Government Employes banquet marking the 79th anniversary of the Civil Service Act. He announced that he has already extended formal recognition to the AFGE lodge at the Labor Department, to which more than one-third of the Department's employees belong.
>
> The lodge has announced that it soon hopes to petition for exclusive bargaining rights by representing more than 50 percent of the employees. This would give it the right to negotiate a written contract, and the obligation to represent all employees in grievance procedures.

Now, this is Mr. Goldberg:

> He told the AFGE that as their union grows and achieves exclusive bargaining rights, they will have to face up to possible "conflicts of interest" which might arise when supervisory officials serve as union officers.

What we are asked to do is to amend the Reporting and Disclosure Act, the administration of which must be done by employees of the Labor Department so that in the face of these events this year, members of the Labor Department will be also members of an international labor union whose constitutions require certain fealty and loyalty to the unions. That Government employee, paid by the taxpayers of America, has to choose between loyalty or fidelity to a union and loyalty to the taxpayers who are his employers.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BOGGS). The time of the gentleman from Georgia has expired.

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman 2 additional minutes.

Mr. LANDRUM. Mr. Speaker, in conclusion, therefore, let me urge the membership of this House in acting upon this conference report to take into consideration whether you want to put an employee of the Federal Government under the responsibility of having to choose between being loyal to a union with which he is affiliated or being loyal to the Federal Government and the taxpayers of America to which he owes his every duty and responsibility for both his job and for the salvation of freedom.

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

Mr. LANDRUM. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. POWELL. How is the gentleman from Georgia recorded on this bill when we passed it out of the full committee?

Mr. LANDRUM. I have stated in my opening remarks that I was opposed to the amendments proposed to the bill al-

though I favored the original bill. I do not oppose it now. I oppose the amendments to the bill because I think it allows enforcement we did not intend originally, and I think we are going into some private funds we have no business to go into.

Mr. POWELL. The gentleman from Georgia is in favor of the National Federation of Federal Employees having the sole right to organize?

Mr. LANDRUM. Will the gentleman repeat that?

Mr. POWELL. Is the gentleman from Georgia in favor of the National Federation of Federal Employees having the sole right to organize?

Mr. LANDRUM. The gentleman from Georgia is opposed to any Government employee belonging to a union which advocates the right to strike against the people.

Mr. POWELL. This amendment applies to the only existing union in the United States of America that organizes only Federal Government employees.

Mr. LANDRUM. I do not agree with that conclusion of the gentleman.

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

Mr. LANDRUM. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. GRIFFIN. Is the chairman indicating that under this amendment there could be only one union that could represent employees in this particular unit of the Labor Department?

Mr. POWELL. At the present time there is only one such union. A new one could be formed today or tomorrow.

Mr. GRIFFIN. That is correct, and that is a very important point.

Mr. POWELL. Right now there is only one.

Mr. LANDRUM. In answer to the gentleman's question, may we say we are not opposing their right under the Executive order to organize. All we are saying is if they do organize they cannot administer this law that applies to a union they belong to.

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to a distinguished member of the committee from Michigan [Mr. GRIFFIN].

Mr. GRIFFIN. Mr. Speaker, as the gentleman from Georgia pointed out earlier, the need for this amendment was created when the President promulgated his Executive order of January 17, 1962.

It is interesting to note that the President, himself, recognized the principle involved in this Ashbrook amendment when he exempted such agencies as the Federal Bureau of Investigation from his Executive order. He went further than the Ashbrook amendment because, under his order, the Government would not recognize or bargain with any union representing employees in the Federal Bureau of Investigation.

Why did the President exempt the Federal Bureau of Investigation? Obviously, it was because the Federal Bureau of Investigation is an investigating, policing agency of the Government.

I would point out that the conferees recognized the principle involved in the Ashbrook amendment when they accepted a substitute. It is a meaningless and watered-down substitute, but it is interesting to note that the conferees went through the motions of adopting the substitute rather than deleting all reference to this matter.

I would like to go further and remind the House that in the Taft-Hartley Act, Congress previously recognized the principle involved in the Ashbrook amendment.

Section 9 of the Taft-Hartley Act provides, in part, as follows:

> No labor organization shall be certified as the representative of employees in a bargaining unit of guards if such organization admits to membership, or is affiliated directly or indirectly with an organization which admits to membership, employees other than guards.

The language is similar and the principle is the same as the Ashbrook amendment. When the Taft-Hartley Act was enacted, plant protection guards, in many instances, belonged to the same union which represented the production workers, whom the guards were supposed to police.

What happened after Taft-Hartley was adopted? The guards thereafter organized themselves into independent unions which were not affiliated with the unions representing production workers.

At the present time, there are a number of independent unions which represent guards or plant protection personnel. This experience should indicate what could, and probably would, happen under the Ashbrook amendment.

Now, this principle is also recognized as far as policemen in local communities are concerned. Local policemen who belong to unions usually belong to the Fraternal Order of Police or to such an independent labor organization not affiliated with the AFL–CIO, United Mine Workers, or the Teamsters Union. Why? Because if that were not the case, they might be called upon next week to enforce the law against brother union members or union officials, and organizational control and discipline could pose serious conflict-of-interest problems. If policemen want to be represented by a union, then it should be an independent union. This principle is sound and in the public interest.

Why did we pass the Welfare and Pension Plans Disclosure Act? Why do we want it enacted into law? It is because we want to protect rank-and-file union members. Against what? Against having their funds diverted. By whom? Now, are you going to allow the very people against whom this act is directed to look over the shoulder of the policing personnel in the Labor Department who are supposed to administer and enforce this act? That is the question. These people in the Labor Department should be independent. They should not be subject to any discipline or any control from the very people we are trying to regulate.

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. ASHBROOK].

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, on February 7, this House adopted the so-called Ashbrook amendment which would prevent a conflict of interest in the administration of the Welfare and Pension Plan Disclosure Act. In conference, language was substituted which, for all intents and purposes, is meaningless. Why do I say this? Let us look at the facts.

The language inserted in this bill by the conferees which replaced the House amendment 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 any employer organization in which he has an interest.

Note in the first instance that the restraint as far as an employee organization is concerned relates to "membership" but the corresponding restraint regarding an employer organization relates to one "in which he has an interest." Why this difference? Is this a tacit admission that an employee would in effect have "an interest" in an affiliated organization and thus we delimit this by using the word "membership?"

Let us take a look at how this conference committee amendment will operate. On January 20, 1962, in hailing the signing of Executive Order No. 10988, Secretary of Labor Arthur J. Goldberg, speaking before the American Federation of Government Employees, noted that provision was made in the Executive order for "including exclusive recognition comparable in most respects to exclusive recognition in the private sphere of the economy."

He went on to say:

> In this connection, I would like you to know that yesterday I issued an order setting forth the basic policies, principles, and standards to implement the Executive order in the Department of Labor. And this morning, I granted formal, Departmentwide recognition to Lodge 12 of the American Federation of Government Employees, which I am pleased to say is the largest lodge of your union.

Mr. Adrian Roberts, president of Labor Lodge 12, AFGE, issued a statement of January 19 in which he noted:

> We intend to move forward from this point rapidly to recruit many more members into Labor Lodge 12 and expect soon to petition for the holding of an election to designate Labor Lodge 12 as the exclusive bargaining representative of the employees of the Department in Washington.

Now, I think it is fair to assume that this organization will become the exclusive bargaining agent for Department of of Labor employees. Under this circumstance, what effect would the substitute amendment have? It would merely say that these employees shall not administer or enforce this act with respect to their own organization. Welfare and pension plans administered by Federal, State, county, or municipal governments are exempt from the requirements of the present act so, in effect, you are adopting no meaningful conflict of interest amendment whatsoever. Should the International Association of Machinists be certified as the exclusive bargaining agent it is not clear whether the restriction would apply only to the administration of the welfare and pension plans of the employee's local organization or the entire IAM.

Am I saying that the employees of Lodge 12 will consciously endeavor to thwart the intent of the law? Absolutely not. I am saying that good legislating requires us to contemplate situations where conflict of interest appears and this is certainly one. The Congress wisely applied this theory in the Taft-Hartley law to guards because there well could be a conflict of loyalties if the guards whose duty it is to enforce plant rules had to enforce these rules against a fellow union member. In his speech of January 20, Secretary Goldberg noted that conflict of interest could arise in other areas such as having union officials as officers of the local bargaining with themselves and said:

> In the future, however, when union officials will be negotiating written agreements on personnel matters of the first importance with the responsible management officials, it is simply contrary to the public interest for the union to be on both sides of the bargaining table.

It seems to me it is equally not in the public interest to have employees who are affiliated with a non-Federal Government employees organization to be, in effect, on both sides—representing the public on the one hand and affiliated with those whom they are checking.

The application form of the American Federation of Government Employees contains a symbol with the inscription, "Work together, think together, act together." It also contains the clasped hands symbol of the AFL–CIO. Maybe it is entirely possible to work together, think together, and act together and be impartial at the same time but I think the public interest demands that those employees who administer these important funds are not subject to any pressures, direct or indirect, which would almost certainly result from having close, filial ties with employees outside of the Government service.

I will offer a motion to recommit with instructions to the managers on the part of the House to insist on the language of section 15(o) of the House bill, known as the Ashbrook amendment. I urge your support of this motion.

In a release to the Members of the House this week, the AFL–CIO has charged that the amendment which the House accepted on February 7 was "a direct attempt to undermine the right of Government employees to form or join unions of their own choosing as set forth in President Kennedy's Executive Order No. 10988 on employee unions in the Federal service." This is absolutely not the case.

The National Federation of Federal Employees, through its president, Mr. Vaux Owen, has gone on record as saying that the House amendment is in the public interest and should be retained in the bill.

The debate on this conference report today proves most interesting from many standpoints. The majority of the organizations and the Members who have rallied against the so-called Ashbrook amendment were leading the chorus chanting "conflict of interest" when in the past they were calling for Cabinet members and other appointees to divest themselves of stocks, directorships, law firm connections, and anything else which might remotely tie them into some relationship with an organization doing business with the Government. Where is their protest today when we are talking about conflict of interest of another type?

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

Mr. ASHBROOK. I gladly yield to the distinguished minority leader, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK].

Mr. HALLECK. I do not want to detain the House any undue length, but I would like, however, to say that I did support the gentleman's amendment when it was proposed here in the House.

I thought then that it would promote the better operation of this proposition that we are now undertaking to write into the law. I still support it. I trust that the gentleman's motion to recommit, when it is offered, will be adopted by the House here today.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to say this: I agree with the arguments that have been made here for the gentleman's amendment on the merits. I would like to say this further thing: Possibly it is because sometimes we are accused of being in the lower body, but I think when we adopt by a decisive vote here in the House of Representatives an amendment such as this, too many times we apparently give up the House position pretty quickly and lose what we have undertaken to write into the bill. This is no criticism of the conferees. I understand that in any conference compromise is a necessity, but sometimes, as I say, it does seem to me that our compromises, as far as we are concerned, undertake to go too far. So I think, besides making this legislation better, the adoption of this motion to recommit would possibly serve to strengthen our position in the months to come, as we go to conference with legislation that is important to the country.

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, I thank the distinguished minority leader for his statement.

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, at this time I would like to yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. ROOSEVELT].

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

Mr. ROOSEVELT. I will be very happy to yield to the distinguished majority leader, Mr. ALBERT, of Oklahoma.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I would like to inquire of the gentleman from California if this is not the situation: The Ashbrook amendment was adopted when this bill was before the House. The Senate bill contained no provision in this area at all. The conferees accepted a compromise which was written in during the conference, as is generally done in situations of this kind. Is that not correct?

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, I would say to the gentleman from Oklahoma that he has accurately stated the situation.

Mr. ALBERT. If the gentleman will yield further, in this situation is it not true that the language in the conference report applies both to employer organizations and employee organizations, and that the complaint about which the gentleman from New York [Mr. LINDSAY] spoke, has to that extent been provided for in the conference report? Is that not true?

Mr. ROOSEVELT. The gentleman is absolutely correct.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield further, then is it not the view of the gentleman from California, and does not the gentleman believe that in adopting this conference report we are following the usual procedure when there is a difference between bills passed by the two bodies and that we should proceed now to vote down the motion to recommit, adopt the conference report, and get on with the business of the House?

Mr. ROOSEVELT. I would agree with the gentleman and I would say in this instance the House conferees were successful in achieving a majority of what the House wanted. If we ever establish the rule that the House is never going to try to reach a compromise on any bill, then I can see no reason to have a conference committee. Therefore I hope that this House will understand that on this question a great deal of time and thought was put into it. The Senate had no such provision as the House had, as the majority leader has well stated, and a proper compromise was worked out.

I know no other way and if we should go back into the conference with the kind of instructions which we have been told will be offered, there would be absolutely no legislation. It would mean the complete abandonment of the very basic principles which both administrations, the past one and this one, have recognized as being necessary.

I think that this House, however, should also understand that there is a complete agreement amongst all the conferees on all the other aspects of this bill. On this one point, what my friends on the other side of the aisle are saying is that any union of government employees shall not become affiliated with the AFL–CIO. It is as plain as that. It is an antilabor move straight down the line with the hope that it will be a precedent for other actions in the future.

I must say in all candor that I agree with my distinguished friend from Georgia when he quoted the Secretary of Labor as saying, that there might be a conflict of interest where the employee had a direct membership in a union that he belonged to and a plan that was being considered by him was managed by that union. Under such a situation he should not have any part in consideration of such a plan. And that is exactly what we have written into this bill.

On the other hand, you are being asked by my friends on the other side of the aisle to set up a straw man, that there is a conflict of interest simply because a man has belonged to a union that is affiliated with the AFL–CIO. There has been no evidence of such conflict of interest presented at any time.

One of my friends once said to me that he had heard of such a conflict of inter-

est, but there is no evidence at any point, anywhere, of the existence of such a round-the-corner kind of conflict of this kind.

I can only say to my colleagues that if you should vote this kind of instructions, it would be by implication inferred that every man who was affiliated with the AFL–CIO was dishonest. I do not think you want to do that. I hope you do not want to do that. But we have covered the direct conflict-of-interest situation which might arise. And I must say in all candor that I cannot believe that this House would doubt that the Committee on Education and Labor and particularly the subcommittee of which I have the honor to be chairman would pass over for a moment any case which was presented to it showing that a conflict of interest had occurred. No such presentation has ever been made to us in the manner that is envisioned by the Ashbrook amendment. And lacking that, Mr. Speaker, does it not seem obvious what the amendment is really aimed at?

I sincerely hope that all of the work which has gone into this bill, all of the work which my friends on the other side of the aisle agree has made this a better bill to safeguard the billions of dollars that are involved in the interest of the working men and women of this country, should not be obliterated by the one hope that maybe here we can strike a blow at the AFL–CIO.

I would say to my friend that I am in agreement with the gentleman from New York [Mr. LINDSAY] when he said that if there are wholesale areas of conflict of interest, this House has a committee, the Judiciary Committee, which has acted on this proposition. And if the Congress feels that it wants to write a broader conflict-of-interest law then I suggest that it present it to this House for consideration. Why tack it onto a bill that has nothing to do with the broad aspects of conflict of interest, but does have in the bill a very careful provision, incidentally introduced by a good Republican in the other body, which takes care of any specific matter which might come under the provisions of this particular Pension and Welfare Disclosure Act?

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

Mr. ROOSEVELT. I did not interrupt your side, but I am afraid I must yield to my good friend, the gentleman from New York.

Mr. GOODELL. I thank the gentleman from California. He is very gracious. The gentleman will agree, I have worked very hard with him in trying to improve this legislation, and that I am in favor of the legislation and so spoke on the floor of this House of Representatives.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. And I would not like to see you sabotage all the good work that you did.

Mr. GOODELL. Of course, we have a sincere difference of opinion on this point. That is why I asked the gentleman to yield. I would like to point out to my friend the great difference of opinion is as to what effect this amendment would have on the ultimate passage of the legislation. I was sorry to hear the gentleman say, in effect, he would abandon all efforts to pass this legislaton, if these conferees were instructed.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. No, the gentleman did not say that. What the gentleman said was that in view of the absolute irreconcilable opposition of the other body to the so-called Ashbrook amendment, we would have a stalemate and we could not reach any agreement. I did not say I would abandon doing anything that would help in passing this legislation.

Mr. GOODELL. You would agree that the other body never passed on the Ashbrook amendment and that we have never seen this irreconcilability to the Ashbrook amendment particularly. And you will also agree I did offer a compromise in conference to make this apply not only to employee affiliated organizations but employer affiliated organizations.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. I agree with that, and the gentleman will recognize, I am sure, that our other body conferees very clearly said, under no circumstances would they consider the gentleman's suggestion and only then did we work on this compromise provision.

Mr. GOODELL. Well, they did, I agree with the gentleman, reject it summarily. They said absolutely, no, but the gentleman will agree that my compromise was directed to employer affiliated organizations as well as employee affiliated organizations. In that sense, it was my very sincere effort not to make this even by implication an antilabor measure. I disagree with the gentleman when he says that it is an antilabor measure. I believe this amendment is proworkingman. It is to make this law easier to enforce without any possibility of a conflict of interest among those who are charged with the responsibility of enforcing it.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. We refer to the employers as well as the employees. So, unfortunately, what the gentleman is talking about, the essence here, is not a conflict of employers, but it is an inferred conflict that has to do with those who belong to the AFL–CIO by indirection because they are affiliated with it. Therefore, it must be and logically has to be only aimed at the AFL–CIO. And, may I point out to my friend, the facts of life are that there is only one independent Government employee association. You probably have all received a letter from them urging the adoption of the Ashbrook amendment because this is the only hope, of course, that they have of staying alive under the so-called Executive order. So, Mr. Speaker, I urge with all my heart that the conference report be adopted.

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. O'HARA], a distinguished member of the committee.

Mr. O'HARA of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I think it bears repeating that the conference committee report before the House today does include a conflict-of-interest provision. It is a well-known conflict-of-interest provision proposed by a minority conferee from the other body. It states that:

> No employees 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 is a clear, concise and effective conflict-of-interest provision. The Ashbrook amendment, on the other hand, does not contain any language whatsoever with regard to conflicts of interest. Rather, the Ashbrook amendment contains a simple prohibition against AFL–CIO membership by a person working in a part of the Labor Department that handles welfare and pension plan disclosure reports.

The Ashbrook amendment ignores the real conflict-of-interest issue. The Ashbrook amendment also disregards the possibility of employer conflict of interest.

The intention of this bill, Mr. Speaker, is to tighten enforcement of the Welfare and Pension Plans Disclosure Act of 1958. It was requestd by the Secretary of Labor in the Eisenhower administration, and by the Secretary of Labor in this administration. An attempt is being made by a number of organizations outside this House to defeat efforts to tighten up the Welfare and Pension Plans Disclosure Act by raising a totally extraneous issue. What the policy of this Congress shall be toward membership in labor organizations by Government employees is an issue that does not belong in this bill. I think we must direct our attention to the main objective of the bills, which is to enforce the Welfare and Pension Plans Disclosure Act policy of the Congress of 1958. When we concentrate on this objective, I think it is clear that the conference report should be adopted.

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. JOELSON].

Mr. JOELSON. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the committee report, and I wish we would turn back now to the main business before us, which is the protection of 100 million Americans who have interests in pension and welfare funds. I think we should remember that some $60 billion is now in these funds, and it will probably grow to $100 billion before too many years. These funds need protection and safeguarding. That is the purpose of this bill. Here we are talking about improvements, but you know and I know that if this bill is recommitted to conference on this relatively minor matter, it will stay there and very likely die of improvements.

I think we are laboring under a misapprehension as to the management of these funds. Less than 10 percent is administered by the unions; 90 percent is administered by management, or combined groups of management and labor. So the union conflict-of-interest issue is really a very, very weak one, I would think.

Let me say this as gingerly and delicately as I know how, but I am very touched by this concern with conflict of

interest in this body, because we constantly turn our back on it when it comes to ourselves. However, when it comes to labor unions we are very, very zealous about conflict of interest.

This is a good bill; it is a bill that can be enforced. I say to you that if a man is a member of the AFL–CIO, he is a member of a very loose confederation. Unfortunately, the various internationals within the AFL–CIO are not always at peace among themselves. So I do not see how membership by a Labor Department employee in the AFL–CIO could in any way interfere with the enforcement of this act. In fact, it might increase the zeal on the part of those administering the act to see that the best possible pension and welfare system was maintained for members of the various plans.

So I very strongly urge that we support the committee and defeat the motion to recommit this bill to conference.

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DENT].

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, I support and urge the Congress to support the conference report on H.R. 724, the Welfare and Pension Plans Disclosure Act.

As one of the conferees, I can assure you that the conferees worked toward strengthening rather than allowing any weakening features to be added to the House version.

It is unfortunate that in reporting the prior actions on this legislation the erroneous statement was made that both the chamber of commerce and the Brotherhood of Teamsters opposed this legislation.—Business Week, February 17, 1962. The article follows:

CLOSER TABS ON PENSION PLANS—BOTH THE HOUSE AND SENATE HAVE PASSED MEASURES THAT WOULD TIGHTEN THE REPORTING REQUIREMENTS FOR OFFICIALS ADMINISTERING EMPLOYEE WELFARE AND PENSION FUNDS

Stricter regulation of the country's swiftly growing employee welfare and pension plans—now estimated to hold $50 billion in assets—became a certainty last week when the House and Senate passed slightly differing versions of a new bill.

The legislation, which has the administration's backing, amends the Welfare and Pension Plans Disclosure Act of 1958 to give Labor Secretary Arthur J. Goldberg new power over some 200,000 plans, involving benefits for some 80 million persons. Assets of the funds are growing at about $4 billion to $5 billion a year, and at that rate would reach $100 billion in another 10 years.

The present law—which the Eisenhower administration sought and got, but found unsatisfactory—merely requires that summary reports on welfare and pension plans be filed with the Labor Department. But beyond making the Department a place for filing such reports, it gives the Secretary little power to force reporting or to investigate reports or plans he suspects are not in compliance with the law.

The new law: The new legislation would make somewhat more detailed reports mandatory, authorize the Labor Department to follow up on inadequate reporting, and provide a staff of accountants and investigators to ferret out complaints about mismanagement or fraud. In 1958, a Senate investigation spotlighted some pension and welfare scandals involving high commissions, excessive administrative fees, high insurance rates, embezzlement, and unscrupulous practices of one kind or another—"shocking * * * cases of dishonesty and fund looting," the report said.

These revelations led to the passage of the original law.

According to the Labor Department, the new reports would call for no more information than is required in any normal audit of welfare funds. All fund officials will use the same forms for reporting that 90 percent of them use right now, Department spokesmen said.

Essentially, the new legislation requires the same kind of reporting that unions provide under the Landrum-Griffin law's provisions on disclosure of union funds, Goldberg said.

Opposition to the measure—from the chamber of commerce and the International Brotherhood of Teamsters, among others—was based on the fear that it would expand the Labor Department's regulatory powers unduly.

Proponents of the new legislation pointed out that there is nothing in it that gives the Government a voice in the actual management of the funds, or the right to pass judgment on the wisdom of their management.

An earlier attempt to amend the 1958 act was made during the Eisenhower administration. Former Labor Secretary James P. Mitchell attacked the law as not worth keeping on the books in its original form and President Eisenhower called for amendments. But the move ran into strong conservative opposition in Congress.

Wide coverage. Of those plans reporting under present law, the welfare plans (those based on Blue Cross, Blue Shield, and similar plans) have an estimated $1.7 billion in assets and cover directly about 25 million employees. The pension plans have about $27.4 billion in assets and cover directly about 17 million employees.

These figures fall short of the actual totals involved. For one thing, many plans also cover employees' families. For another, many plans have never reported to the Labor Department as a result of the law's loose phrasing and enforcement.

About 90 percent of the plans were administered by employers, the remainder either jointly by labor and management or by labor alone.

Budget boost sought. At this stage, the Labor Department hasn't determined exactly how much more staff it will need for the new job, but Goldberg gave the House Labor Committee a preliminary estimate of 117 additional employees. At present, 80 work on the program. The budget would be brought up to more than $2 million from its present $564,000.

As far back as June 1, 1961, the legislative counsel of the International Brotherhood of Teamsters, Sidney Zagri, appeared before the subcommittee on which I served under the chairmanship of the Honorable JAMES ROOSEVELT, in support of this legislation.

His statement contained the following endorsements:

My name is Sidney Zagri. I appear in my capacity as legislative counsel for the International Brotherhood of Teamsters. I appreciate the opportunity of appearing before this subcommittee to present our views regarding H.R. 7234.

First I would like to establish the basis of our interest in the proposed legislation. The Teamsters Union has pioneered in the establishment of health, welfare, and pension funds through collective bargaining.

The Central States southeast and southwest areas health and welfare fund was established by a trust agreement approved by employer and union representatives in March 1950.

The 1,700,000 members of the Teamsters Union, their wives and children, totaling over 5 million individuals are for the most part beneficiaries of over 1,000 health, welfare and pension programs.

These funds range from individual plans covering the membership of a single local union to large multistate programs such as the Central States health, welfare, and pension fund, which covers 118,000 members and over 350,000 wives and children residing in 23 States.

It is to be noted that this fund, as is the case with most other funds, is subject to the following reporting and disclosure regulations by the States and Federal Government.

1. The various States regulate insurance companies which underwrite welfare and pension plans.

2. The States of Connecticut, Massachusetts, New York, Washington, and Wisconsin have enacted State disclosure laws which are comparable to the Federal Welfare and Pension Plans Disclosure Act.

3. The Internal Revenue Service requires the filing of appropriate financial data by pension funds which meet the requirements of sections 401(a) and 501(a) of the Internal Revenue Code.

In addition to the aforementioned supervision and regulation by State law, the operations of the Central States southeast and southwest areas health and welfare fund were thoroughly investigated by the Douglas committee of the U.S. Senate.

The fund was given a clean bill of health by the committee and its operations are described as follows:

"The fund operates from Chicago, Ill., where it maintains a complete bookkeeping system and a visual record card system on each employer and employee. The office has 55 employees. All employer contributions go directly to a bank and no money is handled by the fund office. Monthly and yearly audits are made by separate accounting firms. The fund is completely self-administered with the exception of payment of claims. Administrative expenses run about 2.4 percent of the fund's income. Trustees receive no compensation other than travel expenses and per diem allowance in connection with quarterly meetings. The salaries of the executive secretary of the fund and his assistant are paid by the union, the Central States Drivers Council."[1]

It is clear from the foregoing that the Teamsters Union and its membership have a great stake in this proposed legislation.

At the outset, let me make it perfectly clear that we favor the purposes and objectives of H.R. 7234 for the following reasons:

1. We subscribe to the concept that health and welfare and pension funds are, for the most part, deferred wages, and as such, should receive similar protection afforded other funds of a quasi-public nature. This is particularly true since over 100 million people in America are affected and pension funds alone exceed $40 billion.

2. We favor a Federal reporting and disclosure law as the only sound approach to the problem of multiple filing requirements by the several States of funds covering employees or employers in more than one State.

3. We favor and support implementation of these objectives.

At this point, I want to make it clear that the AFL–CIO also supported the legislation all the way from its introduc-

[1] The Douglas committee's final report on welfare and pension plans investigation, p. 129.

tion, through the hearings and are at present supporting the conference report.

There was opposition from the chamber of commerce on certain features of the bill and I presume they are still opposed.

However, in fairness to the House and Senate conferees, the main objectives were aimed—during hearings—at the features which appeared to give the Secretary of Labor unwarranted power to actually interfere in the management of funds and welfare plans.

You will note that the conference report specifically states:

> Nothing contained in this act shall be so construed or applied as to authorize the Secretary to regulate, or interfere in the management of any employee welfare or pension benefit plan.

It appears to me that this should clear away any misunderstanding and the Congress can support this legislation without reservations.

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. SMITH].

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, the alleged purpose of this amendment is conflict of interest. It is alleged that an employee who belongs to an employee organization affiliated with the AFL–CIO should not administer those funds that are administered by an employee organization which is affiliated with the AFL–CIO.

What are we talking about? We are talking about 2 percent of the funds in the United States. There are $55 billion in these funds and we are talking about only the $1 billion or a little bit more that are administered by unions.

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

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. I would like to point out that in the conference we adopted the amendment which eliminated all plans unless they had 100 employees or more; therefore, the number of employees that are managed by labor has gone down to below 1 percent.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. I thank the gentleman. That is a very good point. Actually there is less than $1 billion affected by the amendment. The Ashbrook amendment is very ineffective because it exempts from the conflict of interest principle $50 billion, or more, out of $55 billion in these funds.

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

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. GOODELL. I would like to point out, in view of what has been said, that this group that was exempted has to make the initial report and the Secretary may in his discretion compel them to report annually. They are not completely exempt. If there is any reason for the Secretary to compel reports which he can justify on a reasonable basis, he may do so.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Even to that extent, we are only talking about $1 billion in the fund. We have dealt with that in this compromise amendment submitted by a minority Member of the other body. The substitute provided that if one is a member of a union, he cannot work on funds administered by that union. At the same time, we have covered situations which the Ashbrook amendment does not cover. There are people who are interested in employee groups working down there in the Department. Why they do not want to cover those people too, I do not know. Fifty billion dollars of these funds out of $55 billion are administered by employer organizations, yet the Ashbrook amendment would not prohibit a member of the employer organization from working in the Department on the investigation of the funds administered by that employer organization. The Ashbrook amendment is one that is totally ineffective. I say the committee amendment is the effective amendment in this case. Even though it was submitted by a Republican Member of the other body, House Members on both sides generally should agree that it is the best amendment, and this amendment as a substitute should be adopted.

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. HIESTAND].

Mr. HIESTAND. Mr. Speaker, the conference's refusal to accept the House-passed amendment protecting workers from conflict of interest in the supervision and administration of their welfare and pension funds is very serious, enough to condemn this bill.

I oppose the bill as a whole on the grounds:

First. That the need for it has not been shown. In fact, cannot be shown. It is an imaginary need.

Second. It would mean an immense increase of power to the Federal Government, the executive branch, and to the Department of Labor. It would set up another vast bureau and cost more money.

Third. It would infringe upon State legislation. There are adequate laws against embezzlement in all States.

Fourth. It would ignore the provisions of the Internal Revenue Code which now provides effective indirect control of abuses of pension welfare funds.

Fifth. It would disregard the rules of conduct and standards prescribed in the Taft-Hartley Act for jointly administered pension and welfare funds.

These points, together with the fatal weakness of the lack of conflict-of-interest amendment are sufficient to condemn the conference report in my eyes.

The temptation to conflict of interest and the effects of such conflict are even more insidious and more serious under this statute than in many situations where conflict of interest may arise. In many situations, the chief result of a conflict of interest is an unlawful and unethical gain to the Government employee who yields to that temptation. Under the present statute, however, the result in every case would be frustration of the very purposes of the statute.

The purpose is to regulate employee welfare and pension plans for the protection and benefit of employees. All it would take to defeat that purpose with respect to any particular plan would be a decision by the person or persons in appropriate positions of authority that a report on the plan should be accepted and filed without further investigation. It is unlikely that attention would ever be focused later on any single decision among the thousands made. Even if it were, such decision could generally be explained and justified as an exercise of discretion.

Moreover, under the proposed bill, the statute would lend itself peculiarly to temptation to conflict of interest because it would give the Department authority to grant immunity through "any written interpretation or opinion" or any "instructions." Section 12 of the bill, entitled "Reliance on Administrative Interpretations and Forms" would make good faith reliance on any written interpretation or opinion of the Secretary or any forms or instructions a complete defense to any civil or criminal proceedings under the act. This would be true even if such interpretation, opinion, forms or instructions are determined by the courts "to be invalid or of no legal effect, or not to be in conformity with the requirements of this act."

Thus not only could reports be pigeonholed and forgotten after they are filed but also immunity could be granted even before they are filed. If Congress is really concerned about the rights of employees under welfare and pension plans it should not permit enforcement of this act to be carried on in an atmosphere fraught with possibilities and temptations of conflict of interest which would defeat the whole purpose of the act.

While the act speaks of administration by the Secretary of Labor, everyone knows that the thousands of reports, interpretations, opinions, instructions, and other matters cannot be handled personally by the Secretary of Labor and that the administration will necessarily be conducted by staff employees who will be exposed to the conflict of interest inherent in the bill unless the amendment is reinstated.

I oppose the bill as a whole and shall support the instructed vote to recommit.

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

Mr. HIESTAND. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. GRIFFIN. The speaker who proceeded the gentleman now in the well defended, or tried to defend, the substitute language in the conference report. Others on the floor may really believe that the substitute would provide some meaningful protection. But let me make it clear that the substitute language does not guard against conflict of interest. In effect, it provides that an employee of the Department of Labor shall not be allowed to police the welfare and pension plans of his own union. All right, but let's consider what that means. Are there any welfare and pension plans covering Labor Department employees that come under this act? Of course not. Their pension programs come under the Civil Service Retirement Act. So, it seems to me that the substitute is meaningless language. But, those who seek to defend it as meaningful are at least recognizing, it seems to me, that there is

a problem and possible conflicts of interests.

It seems clear that those who vote against the Ashbrook amendment today would also vote to repeal that provision in the Taft-Hartley Act which applies the same principle to guards at a plant, and it would seem that they would also allow local policemen to be represented by affiliated, international unions—rather than independent unions.

Some have said that no conflict of interest has yet been shown with respect to this act. Of course not. We are just passing the act. This is new legislation that will go into effect when the President signs it. But the basic conflict of interest principle is just as sound and just as applicable to this act as in the Taft-Hartley Act.

Mr. HIESTAND. I thank the gentleman for his contribution. The fact of the matter is, in my judgment, the substitute wording of the Senate language which has been well described as forbidding a member of a union to have supervision and administration over his own union welfare funds would be a conflict of interest. We had a letter from the Secretary of Labor stating that such a man certainly would be disqualified, anyway, if, indeed, they did not disqualify themselves.

Mr. GRIFFIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. HIESTAND. I yield.

Mr. GRIFFIN. One of the Members earlier in debate tried to argue that a vote for the Ashbrook amendment would constitute an antilabor vote. I want to say as emphatically as I can that a vote for the Ashbrook amendment will not be antilabor—it will be a vote for the rank and file union member. Consider the situation of a rank and file union member who has reason to suspect or believe that money in his union's welfare and pension fund is being diverted. Ten years from now that union pension program, to which he is contributing, will be all important to him. Suppose he thinks that something is wrong with the administration of the pension fund at higher echelons of the union. Suppose he has the courage to go down to the Department of Labor to file a complaint and request an investigation. I think it might be just a bit discouraging for him to look at the coat lapel of the fellow in the Labor Department and find him wearing the same union button as the union leader against whom the complaint would be filed. I don't think that is the kind of protection that rank and file union members want.

Mr. HIESTAND. Mr. Speaker, I urge the acceptance of the motion to recommit.

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of the time.

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

Mr. POWELL. I yield to the gentleman from California [Mr. ROOSEVELT].

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, may I just emphasize that what the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. GRIFFIN] said is not quite accurate. The man who filed or felt he had to file a complaint about his plan would not find the button of his union on the individual that is looking at it, because that is absolutely taken care of and prohibited by the amendment proposed by a minority conferee of the other body and appearing in the language in the conference report.

Second, Mr. Speaker, the report states that not only does this proposed amendment apply to the particular union that the man might belong to, but to the international unions also. So, this covers a much broader area of possible conflict than the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. GRIFFIN], I am afraid, gave the impression.

Mr. POWELL. The gentleman from California is exactly correct.

Mr. Speaker, in these remaining few minutes I would like to clear up some of the cloud of misunderstanding and perhaps even ignorance concerning the conference report. I am sure that the vast majority of our colleagues have not read the conference report. Let us look at the picture.

In the first place, when we went to conference there was no language in the legislation as passed by the other body that covered conflicts of interest at all; none. In the second place, when we went to conference we went to conference with the Ashbrook amendment which covered conflicts of interest only with the AFL–CIO and international organizations. It did not cover conflicts of interest with employer organizations, and allowed one union only in this entire Nation, the National Federation of Federal Employees, to have free rein, thereby monopolizing this entire situation.

Mr. Speaker, we come back to the House with language that covers conflicts of interest in unions—independent unions, AFL–CIO unions, and employer organizations. I will read that to the Members of the House. It is very brief:

> 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.

Then, the statement of the managers, which is tantamount to legislation, begins as follows:

> The substitute language in section 15(b) was adopted to insure that the administration and enforcement of this act would be free from any conflict of interest.

Mr. Speaker, that is plain and simple English, and it will be law. If we pass it today, conflict of interest will be covered far more than we would cover it with the Ashbrook amendment.

It will cover conflict of interest with employer organizations, and independent unions as well.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to say that we are casting aspersions and criticism on the integrity of our Government employees if we insist upon this Ashbrook amendment. Or, would we adopt this philosophy and apply it to other legislation such as when we pass legislation concerning the Internal Revenue Service? Would we have conflict-of-interest legislation with reference to the Internal Revenue Service to the effect that no agent in the Internal Revenue Service shall ever look at the income tax returns of another agent? Of course we would not.

Mr. Speaker, when we pass legislation concerning the Armed Forces, would we say that the Army cannot police the Army? Of course we would not. So, we are picking out one area and casting aspersions on the integrity of one department of our Government. I think as Americans we ought to be ashamed of any type of attitude of this nature.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to point out that the gentleman from California [Mr. HIESTAND], who preceded me, and the eminent gentleman from Georgia [Mr. LANDRUM], that these are two of the gentlemen in our committee who opposed this legislation every step of the way—every single step of the way—in subcommittee, full committee, and on the floor of the House.

Mr. Speaker, if we do not accept this conference report, what is going to happen? In the first place, I believe we are going to have a deadlock. I know the temper of the gentleman with whom we dealt in conference for a period of 2 days. That means that we are going to throw into probably one of the worst scandals the pension plans and welfare plans of 100 million American people, the working people in your district. Their plans are going to be in danger.

Mr. Speaker, there is nothing on the statute books today to control any form of corruption that may break out tomorrow and today, as did break out in Pennsylvania just a few weeks ago. It means that you have a callous disregard of the laboring class of this Nation, and you are failing your responsibility as elected Members of this House.

Mr. Speaker, this amendment is not important to the full purpose of this bill. The full purpose of the legislation before us is to guarantee that the 100 million workers of this Nation shall have their $75 billion of pension and welfare funds policed and protected.

Mr. Speaker, on that basis, therefore, I ask for your confidence and your vote in favor of the conference report.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from New York [Mr. POWELL] has expired. All time has expired.

Mr. KEARNS. Mr. Speaker, as I indicated during the debate on the Pension and Welfare Act amendments, one of the key provisions which we were considering was the provision which dealt with the union membership of the Labor Department employees who would be entrusted with the administration and enforcement of the act. At that time I noted that I would support H.R. 8723 only if this provision was included. I am as convinced now as I was then that this provision, now known as the Ashbrook amendment, is absolutely essential. If we permit this provision to be drastically limited in its application, as has been done by the wording of the compromise provision, we will be performing a terrible disservice to the thousands of employees who must look to this act for help and protection. Moreover, we will be permitting a situation to exist wherein the objectiveness of the Labor Department employees may be questioned. I contend that this result is unnecessary.

I recall that during the debate on H.R. 8723 it was insisted by my colleagues across the aisle that this legislation was absolutely essential for without it thousands of employee pension and welfare plans would be in jeopardy and an untold number of dishonest acts which would adversely affect these plans would go undetected. Now, these same Members are ready to jeopardize this legislation with all of its protective features for the employees of America simply because the Ashbrook amendment would prohibit 260 Labor Department employees from belonging to a labor organization which in turn is affiliated with another labor organization which these employees may be called upon to investigate. Is the sense of urgency now less great?

Certainly it is in order to inquire as to the basic purpose of this legislation. Are we being called upon to pass legislation which will provide ample protection to the thousands of employee pension and welfare plans, or are we primarily interested in the right of a particular union to represent 260 Labor Department employees even when such representation may create an embarrassing conflict of interests and may cause the very people who must look to the act for protection to view its enforcement with suspicion and distrust?

I would like to point out that all of these unfortunate results can be avoided simply by reaffirming the Ashbrook amendment and instructing our conferees to this effect. If we do this, I am confident that the Senate conferees will recede and will accept this amendment. By so doing we are not denying the 260 Labor Department employees the right to belong to a union or to have such a union represent them. We are merely assuring that such membership shall not create a possible conflict of interest or cast an unfair reflection on these dedicated Government employees.

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the conference report.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on adoption of the conference report.

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER. Is the gentleman opposed to the conference report?

Mr. ASHBROOK. I am, Mr. Speaker.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. ASHBROOK moves to recommit the conference report on the bill (H.R. 8723) to the committee of conference with instructions to the managers on the part of the House to insist on the language of section 15(b) of the House bill, known as the "Ashbrook amendment," which reads as follows:

"(b) No employee of the Department of Labor whose duties involve the administration or enforcement of this Act shall be a member of an employee organization if such organization admits to membership, or is affiliated directly or indirectly with an organization which admits to membership, employees other than employees of the Federal Government."

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion to recommit.

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 182, nays 218, not voting 36, as follows:

[Roll No. 37]

YEAS—182

Abbitt	Ford	Michel
Abernethy	Forrester	Miller, N.Y.
Adair	Fountain	Minshall
Alexander	Fulton	Moore
Alger	Garland	Moorehead, Ohio
Anderson, Ill.	Gary	Mosher
Arends	Gathings	Murray
Ashbrook	Gavin	Nelsen
Ashmore	Goodell	Nygaard
Auchincloss	Goodling	Passman
Avery	Griffin	Pilcher
Ayres	Gross	Pillion
Bailey	Gubser	Pirnie
Barry	Hagan, Ga.	Poff
Bass, N.H.	Hall	Quie
Bates	Halleck	Ray
Battin	Hardy	Reece
Becker	Harrison, Wyo.	Reifel
Beckworth	Harsha	Rhodes, Ariz.
Beermann	Harvey, Ind.	Rivers, S.C.
Belcher	Harvey, Mich.	Robison
Bell	Hébert	Rogers, Fla.
Berry	Hemphill	Rogers, Tex.
Betts	Henderson	Roudebush
Bolton	Herlong	Rousselot
Bonner	Hiestand	St. George
Bow	Hoeven	Schadeberg
Bromwell	Hoffman, Ill.	Schenck
Broomfield	Horan	Scherer
Brown	Hosmer	Schneebeli
Bruce	Jarman	Schwengel
Burleson	Johansen	Scott
Byrnes, Wis.	Jonas	Selden
Casey	Judd	Short
Cederberg	Kearns	Sikes
Chamberlain	Keith	Siler
Chenoweth	Kilburn	Smith, Calif.
Chiperfield	Kilgore	Smith, Va.
Church	King, N.Y.	Springer
Clancy	Knox	Stephens
Collier	Kornegay	Taber
Colmer	Kyl	Taylor
Cramer	Laird	Teague, Calif.
Curtis, Mass.	Landrum	Teague, Tex.
Curtis, Mo.	Langen	Thomson, Wis.
Dague	Latta	Tuck
Davis, James C.	Lennon	Utt
Davis, John W.	Lipscomb	Van Pelt
Derounian	McCulloch	Vinson
Derwinski	McDonough	Waggonner
Devine	McIntire	Westland
Dole	McMillan	Wharton
Dominick	McSween	Whitener
Dooley	McVey	Whitten
Dorn	MacGregor	Williams
Dowdy	Mahon	Wilson, Calif.
Downing	Martin, Mass.	Wilson, Ind.
Durno	Martin, Nebr.	Winstead
Everett	Mason	Younger
Findley	Matthews	
Fisher	May	
	Meader	

NAYS—218

Addabbo	Coad	Fogarty
Addonizio	Cohelan	Frazier
Albert	Conte	Frelinghuysen
Ashley	Cook	Friedel
Aspinall	Corbett	Gallagher
Baker	Corman	Garmatz
Baldwin	Cunningham	Giaimo
Baring	Curtin	Gilbert
Barrett	Daddario	Gonzalez
Bass, Tenn.	Daniels	Granahan
Bennett, Fla.	Delaney	Gray
Bennett, Mich.	Dent	Green, Oreg.
Blatnik	Denton	Green, Pa.
Boggs	Diggs	Griffiths
Boland	Dingell	Hagen, Calif.
Bolling	Donohue	Halpern
Brademas	Doyle	Hansen
Bray	Dulski	Harding
Brewster	Dwyer	Harris
Brooks	Edmondson	Hays
Broyhill	Elliott	Healey
Buckley	Ellsworth	Hechler
Burke, Ky.	Evins	Holifield
Burke, Mass.	Fallon	Holland
Byrne, Pa.	Farbstein	Hull
Cahill	Fascell	Ichord, Mo.
Cannon	Feighan	Inouye
Carey	Fenton	Jennings
Celler	Finnegan	Joelson
Chelf	Fino	Johnson, Calif.
Clark	Flood	Johnson, Md.
Johnson, Wis.	Natcher	Santangelo
Jones, Mo.	Nedzi	Saund
Karsten	Nix	Saylor
Kastenmeier	Norblad	Schweiker
Kee	O'Brien, Ill.	Scranton
Kelly	O'Brien, N.Y.	Seely-Brown
Keogh	O'Hara, Ill.	Shipley
King, Calif.	O'Hara, Mich.	Sibal
King, Utah	O'Konski	Sisk
Kirwan	Olsen	Slack
Kluczynski	O'Neill	Smith, Iowa
Kowalski	Osmers	Smith, Miss.
Kunkel	Ostertag	Stafford
Lankford	Patman	Staggers
Lesinski	Pelly	Steed
Libonati	Perkins	Stratton
Lindsay	Peterson	Stubblefield
Loser	Pfost	Sullivan
McDowell	Philbin	Thomas
McFall	Pike	Thompson, N.J.
Mack	Poage	Thompson, Tex.
Madden	Powell	Thornberry
Magnuson	Price	Toll
Mailliard	Pucinski	Tollefson
Marshall	Purcell	Trimble
Mathias	Randall	Tupper
Merrow	Reuss	Udall, Morris K.
Miller, Clem	Rhodes, Pa.	Ullman
Miller, George P.	Riehlman	Vanik
Milliken	Rivers, Alaska	Van Zandt
Mills	Roberts, Tex.	Wallhauser
Moeller	Rodino	Walter
Monagan	Rogers, Colo.	Watts
Montoya	Rooney	Weis
Moorhead, Pa.	Roosevelt	Whalley
Morgan	Rosenthal	Wickersham
Morris	Rostenkowski	Widnall
Morse	Roush	Wright
Moss	Rutherford	Yates
Multer	Ryan, Mich.	Young
Murphy	Ryan, N.Y.	Zablocki
	St. Germain	Zelenko

NOT VOTING—36

Alford	Glenn	Morrison
Andersen, Minn.	Grant	Moulder
	Haley	Norrell
Andrews	Harrison, Va.	Rains
Anfuso	Hoffman, Mich.	Roberts, Ala.
Blitch	Huddleston	Shelley
Boykin	Jensen	Sheppard
Breeding	Jones, Ala.	Shriver
Cooley	Karth	Spence
Davis, Tenn.	Kitchin	Thompson, La.
Dawson	Lane	Weaver
Flynt	Macdonald	Willis

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Weaver for, with Mr. Macdonald against.
Mr. Cooley for, with Mr. Breeding against.
Mrs. Blitch for, with Mr. Alford against.
Mr. Haley for, with Mr. Shelley against.
Mr. Harrison of Virginia for, with Mr. Sheppard against.
Mr. Willis for, with Mr. Anfuso against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Spence with Mr. Jensen.
Mr. Karth with Mr. Glenn.
Mr. Morrison with Mr. Andersen of Minnesota.
Mr. Thompson of Louisiana with Mr. Hoffman of Michigan.
Mr. Lane with Mr. Shriver.

Mrs. KEE, Mr. STAGGERS, and Mr. LESINSKI changed their votes from "yea" to "nay."

Mr. SPRINGER changed his vote from "nay" to "yea."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The doors were opened.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the adoption of the conference report.

The question was taken; and the Speaker announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 284, nays, 108, not voting 45, as follows:

[Roll No. 38]

YEAS—284

Adair	Gonzalez	O'Brien, N.Y.
Addabbo	Goodell	O'Hara, Ill.
Addonizio	Goodling	O'Hara, Mich.
Albert	Granahan	O'Konski
Ashley	Gray	Olsen
Aspinall	Green, Oreg.	O'Neill
Auchincloss	Green, Pa.	Osmers
Avery	Griffiths	Ostertag
Ayres	Gubser	Patman
Baker	Hagen, Calif.	Pelly
Baldwin	Halpern	Perkins
Baring	Hansen	Peterson
Barrett	Harding	Pfost
Barry	Harris	Philbin
Bass, Tenn.	Harrison, Wyo.	Pike
Bates	Harsha	Pillion
Battin	Hays	Pirnie
Becker	Healey	Poage
Beckworth	Hechler	Powell
Bell	Herlong	Price
Bennett, Fla.	Hoeven	Pucinski
Bennett, Mich.	Holifield	Purcell
Blatnik	Holland	Quie
Boggs	Hosmer	Randall
Boland	Hull	Reuss
Bolling	Inouye	Rhodes, Ariz.
Bolton	Jarman	Rhodes, Pa.
Brademas	Jennings	Riehlman
Brewster	Joelson	Rivers, Alaska
Bromwell	Johnson, Calif.	Roberts, Tex.
Brooks	Johnson, Md.	Robison
Broomfield	Johnson, Wis.	Rodino
Broyhill	Jones, Mo.	Rogers, Colo.
Buckley	Judd	Rooney
Burke, Ky.	Karsten	Roosevelt
Burke, Mass.	Kastenmeier	Rosenthal
Byrne, Pa.	Keith	Rostenkowski
Cahill	Kelly	Roush
Cannon	Keogh	Rutherford
Carey	Kilgore	Ryan, Mich.
Celler	King, Calif.	Ryan, N.Y.
Chamberlain	King, Utah	St. Germain
Chelf	Kirwan	Santangelo
Clark	Kluczynski	Saund
Coad	Knox	Schenck
Cohelan	Kowalski	Schneebeli
Conte	Kunkel	Schweiker
Cook	Kyl	Scranton
Corbett	Langen	Seely-Brown
Corman	Lankford	Selden
Cramer	Lesinski	Shipley
Cunningham	Libonati	Short
Curtin	Lindsay	Sibal
Curtis, Mass.	Loser	Sikes
Daddario	McCulloch	Siler
Dague	McDonough	Sisk
Daniels	McDowell	Slack
Dawson	McFall	Smith, Iowa
Delaney	McIntire	Smith, Miss.
Dent	MacGregor	Springer
Denton	Mack	Stafford
Derounian	Madden	Stratton
Diggs	Magnuson	Stubblefield
Dingell	Mailliard	Sullivan
Donohue	Marshall	Thomas
Dooley	Martin, Mass.	Thompson, N.J.
Doyle	Mathias	Thompson, Tex.
Dulski	Matthews	Thomson, Wis.
Durno	May	Thornberry
Dwyer	Meader	Toll
Edmondson	Merrow	Tollefson
Elliott	Miller, Clem	Trimble
Ellsworth	Miller, George P.	Tupper
Everett	Miller, N.Y.	Udall, Morris K.
Evins	Milliken	Ullman
Fallon	Mills	Vanik
Farbstein	Moeller	Van Pelt
Fascell	Monagan	Van Zandt
Feighan	Montoya	Vinson
Fenton	Moorhead, Pa.	Wallhauser
Finnegan	Morgan	Walter
Fino	Morris	Watts
Flood	Morse	Weis
Fogarty	Mosher	Westland
Ford	Moss	Whalley
Frazier	Multer	Wickersham
Frelinghuysen	Murphy	Widnall
Friedel	Natcher	Willis
Fulton	Nedzi	Wilson, Ind.
Gallagher	Nelsen	Wright
Garland	Nix	Yates
Garmatz	Norblad	Young
Gavin	Nygaard	Younger
Giaimo	O'Brien, Ill.	Zablocki
Gilbert		Zelenko

NAYS—108

Abbitt	Alger	Ashbrook
Abernethy	Anderson, Ill.	Ashmore
Alexander	Arends	Bailey
Bass, N.H.	Gathings	Murray
Beermann	Gross	Passman
Belcher	Hagan, Ga.	Pilcher
Berry	Hall	Poff
Betts	Halleck	Ray
Bonner	Hardy	Reece
Bray	Harvey, Ind.	Reifel
Brown	Harvey, Mich.	Rivers, S.C.
Bruce	Hébert	Rogers, Fla.
Burleson	Hemphill	Rogers, Tex.
Byrnes, Wis.	Henderson	Roudebush
Casey	Hiestand	Rousselot
Chenoweth	Hoffman, Ill.	St. George
Chiperfield	Horan	Saylor
Church	Ichord, Mo.	Schadeberg
Clancy	Johansen	Scherer
Collier	Jonas	Scott
Colmer	Kearns	Smith, Calif.
Curtis, Mo.	Kilburn	Smith, Va.
Davis, James C.	King, N.Y.	Staggers
Davis, John W.	Kornegay	Stephens
Derwinski	Laird	Taber
Devine	Landrum	Taylor
Dole	Latta	Teague, Calif.
Dominick	Lennon	Teague, Tex.
Dorn	Lipscomb	Tuck
Dowdy	McMillan	Utt
Downing	McSween	Waggonner
Findley	McVey	Wharton
Fisher	Mahon	Whitener
Forrester	Martin, Nebr.	Williams
Fountain	Michel	Winstead
Gary	Minshall	
	Moore	

NOT VOTING—45

Alford	Griffin	Morrison
Andersen, Minn.	Haley	Moulder
Andrews	Harrison, Va.	Norrell
Anfuso	Hoffman, Mich.	Rains
Blitch	Huddleston	Roberts, Ala.
Bow	Jensen	Schwengel
Boykin	Jones, Ala.	Shelley
Breeding	Karth	Sheppard
Cederberg	Kee	Shriver
Cooley	Kitchin	Spence
Davis, Tenn.	Lane	Steed
Flynt	Macdonald	Thompson, La.
Glenn	Mason	Weaver
Grant	Moorehead, Ohio	Whitten
		Wilson, Calif.

So the conference report was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Anfuso for, with Mrs. Blitch against.

Mr. Karth for, with Mr. Cooley against.

Mr. Lane for, with Mr. Harrison of Virginia against.

Mr. Spence for, with Mr. Weaver against.

Mr. Sheppard for, with Mr. Cederberg against.

Mr. Macdonald for, with Mr. Mason against.

Mr. Shelley for, with Mr. Bow against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Morrison with Mr. Glenn.

Mr. Thompson of Louisiana with Mr. Shriver.

Mr. Haley with Mr. Andersen of Minnesota.

Mr. Whitten with Mr. Hoffman of Michigan.

Mr. Kitchin with Mr. Jensen.

Mr. Breeding with Mr. Griffin.

Mr. Alford with Mr. Moorehead of Ohio.

Mr. Moulder with Mr. Schwengel.

Mr. Davis of Tennessee with Mr. Wilson of California.

Mr. LAIRD changed his vote from "yea" to "nay."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks on the conference report just adopted.

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

There was no objection.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, I entered the Chamber after my name had been called on the passage of the conference report. If I had been present, I would have voted "nay."

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, when the vote was taken on the passage of the conference report, I was unavoidably absent on official business. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea."

Mr. WILSON of California. Mr. Speaker, I was not here when my name was called on the passage of the conference report, so I do not qualify. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea."

MENOMINEE INDIAN TRIBE OF WISCONSIN

Mr. ASPINALL submitted a conference report and statement on the bill (H.R. 4130) to lessen the impact of the termination of Federal services to the Menominee Indian Tribe of Wisconsin.

PUBLIC WELFARE AMENDMENTS OF 1962

Mr. SISK. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 563 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill H.R. 10606 to extend and improve the public assistance and child welfare services programs of the Social Security Act, and for other purposes, and all points of order against said bill are hereby waived. That after general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and continue not to exceed four hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Ways and Means, the bill shall be considered as having been read for amendment. No amendment shall be in order to said bill except amendments offered by direction of the Committee on Ways and Means. Amendments offered by direction of the Committee on Ways and Means may be offered to any section of the bill at the conclusion of the general debate, but said amendments shall not be subject to amendment. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion, except one motion to recommit, with or without instructions.

Mr. SISK. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROWN] and pending that, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 563 provides for the consideration of H.R. 10606, a bill to extend and improve the public assistance and child welfare serv-

ices programs of the Social Security Act, and for other purposes. The resolution provides for a closed rule, waiving points of order, with 4 hours of general debate.

The proposals embodied in H.R. 10606 are designed to improve, redirect, and tighten up the Federal-State cooperative public welfare programs. The bill involves a new, constructive approach which, by taking account of changing conditions and the existence of new rehabilitative skills, will assist the States in meeting their responsibility for the development and administration of realistic and sound public welfare programs, provide the States with much greater flexibility in the development and administration of such programs in the light of their particular needs and conditions. The bill, therefore, provides much broader authority to the States to permit them to take constructive legislative and administrative action in the light of changed conditions so as to correct and prevent abuses.

The new approach embodied in the bill places emphasis on the provision of services to help families become self-supporting rather than dependent upon welfare checks. The bill would make it possible for the States to provide incentives to the recipients of public assistance to improve their condition so as to render continued public assistance for such persons unnecessary. This approach accords due recognition to rehabilitation of recipients so as to restore them as useful productive individuals, and assist them to become self-supporting, independent, and able to care for themselves. This approach also places emphasis on training so as to increase the supply of adequately equipped public welfare personnel. Experience has shown that adequately trained personnel can be one of the largest factors in reducing, ultimately, the cost of the public assistance programs.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the adoption of House Resolution 563.

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

Mr. Speaker, as the gentleman from California, my colleague on the Rules Committee, Mr. SISK, has explained, this rule makes in order the consideration, H.R. 10606, under 4 hours of general debate and under the closed, or gag rule, which prohibits the offering or consideration of any amendments except those which may be submitted by the Ways and Means Committee itself, from which the bill originates, after waiving points of order.

Mr. Speaker, this bill is designed presumably to improve, redirect and tighten up Federal-State cooperative public welfare programs. It contains quite a number of important provisions and sections. In fact, the bill itself is 81 pages in length.

A great deal of the bill, in my opinion, carries very good legislation and will provide greater authority to the States to control their own welfare program than has existed in the past, something that in my opinion has been badly needed.

However, at the same time this bill would increase the Federal payments to the States under certain circumstances at a cost, I believe, of about $325 million more than at the present time. Certainly there are two sections in the bill that add increased costs without any real reason, in my opinion therefor, of some $140 million annually, which would consist of outright gifts or grants to the States.

If I may, I would like to call your attention now to the good qualities of the bill, because the first part of the measure does carry very helpful and very needed changes in present law that should be approved by the Congress.

However, there are two changes, made by this bill in the present law, that, in my opinion, are not well founded and are actually dangerous and injurious, in view of the situation which confronts us when we have a national debt of about $300 billion, and are running a deficit of somewhere around $9 billion in the present fiscal year; and when we are having difficulties in borrowing money to run the Federal Government, I notice that our Treasury has now again resorted to issuing $1.8 billion worth of tax anticipation bills. These securities will carry interest, up to September 21, which simply means that the taxpayers of the country will be paid this interest if they will pay their Federal taxes in advance by from 3 to 6 months.

These are the two sections to which I wish to call your attention and to which I understand an amendment will be offered in a motion to recommit. In other words, there will be an attempt made to amend and to change this bill by a motion to recommit.

I should pause to say the Rules Committee, by a tie vote, failed to report a special rule which would have made in order the offering, by members of the Ways and Means Committee, the minority members, perhaps, to amend these two sections of this bill, and to consider them separately, so as to give the House an opportunity to work its will.

The first proposed amendment we discussed in the Rules Committee is to section 101. This section would change the Federal contribution to the States, for the cost of preventive and rehabilitation services, from 50 percent, under existing law, to 75 percent.

Then the second cost increase would come in the change provided in the contribution the Federal Government makes to the States for public assistance payments. These payments would be increased from the present rate of $24.80 out of the first $31 of such public assistance, under existing law, to $29 out of the first $35. In other words, the Federal Government would be required to pay $29 out of $35 instead of $24.80 out of $31. There is no provision whatsoever in this bill that would require this additional contribution of $5.20 to each State to go to needy recipients, or to the aged persons, or other persons entitled to help under this provision. But, instead this extra Federal money could be used by the State in any way it might desire, without limitation.

I understand the motion to recommit will deal only with this one section, something the States have not asked for, and something not justified in the hearings before the Committee on Ways and Means according to the information I have received; something which is just an outright gift to the States to use as they see fit and not to be used exclusively for the beneficiaries we are trying to take care of in this bill.

I would like to conclude by saying to you, in my opinion, the general purpose of this bill is very good, and provides turning over to the States the control of their welfare programs, something they have never enjoyed before. Many of us in our own States have had situations where the local or State officials, who have attempted to have persons receiving benefits under these welfare laws do some kind of constructive work which they were able to do. That is public work for the public good, and not to work for private industry. In such cases we have had the Federal officials actually say, and serve notice, "You cannot do that. You just have to give them the money but you cannot require them to do anything that could be of public service."

I remember just a few years ago, when in one of the counties in my district, State and local officials decreed recipients of these welfare benefits should, where they are able to, and where they could pass a physical examination, the men should go into the courthouse and clean the books and records there, and wash down the walls and do certain other helpful work that the taxpayers otherwise would have had to pay for, with such men being given a regular credit, or full pay, for the work they would do, to be charged, of course, against their benefits. These officials also said that women receiving these welfare benefits, are able to do so, should go to the children's home or to the county infirmary and help prepare for winter by canning certain foods, and by repairing bed linens and wearing apparel of the children or elderly inmates. The Federal official promptly served notice—"You will not do that at all. These people do not have to make any such contribution of labor or service. Just give them the money or the Federal Government will not give you anything."

This bill, as I understand it, would correct such situations, and would permit the States and local communities, under State direction, through its welfare department, wherever it is possible for these recipients to make some contribution to the common good, that they do so.

From that angle, this bill is very, very good. From the angle of giving a free gift of $140 million and, perhaps, a little more, to the States, many of whom have not asked for this. In fact, I have had officials from my home State say to me, over the telephone yesterday, they did not approve of the bill as it is, and did not ask for this extra money, for our State was able to meet its own requirements, under the present law, and would do so.

So, it seems to me, that while this bill in part, is a good bill, it would be a much better one if the motion to recommit is adopted.

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

Mr. BROWN. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. What reason was given for the consideration of a bill of this sweeping nature under a gag rule? What reason was given for this kind of procedure?

Mr. BROWN. I wil say to the gentleman, I did not vote for the gag rule. I voted for a rule that would permit the offering of these amendments to various sections, as recommended by the minority members of the Ways and Means Committee. So I cannot answer except to say that we did not have enough votes to have my proposed rule adopted.

Mr. GROSS. It is claimed there is not time to consider the bill under an open rule?

Mr. BROWN. Let me answer the gentleman this way: The statement was made by some of the supporters of the closed or gag rule that if we had a completely open rule this bill would be saddled with all sorts of amendments and all sorts of welfare projects, from medical under social security, up or down. They stated that for that reason they were for a closed rule.

I do think I need state to the gentleman that despite my opposition to closed or gag rules—and I have opposed them many times on this floor—that most bills of this type dealing with welfare services, and bills dealing with the tax matters have been considered under gag rules, and many gag rules have been voted in this body over my opposition. I am rather used to being kicked around, but I did attempt, and made the motion personally, to open up this bill for the offering of amendments.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. BROWN. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. GROSS. Is there an implication in this gag rule that the House is either irresponsible or not capable of full consideration of legislation of this type?

Mr. BROWN. The gentleman from Iowa has heard the gentleman from Ohio go into detail many times as to the reason for his opposition to gag rules. I have long been of the opinion that the House of Representatives is just as able to work out a bill as some other legislative body I will not mention at this time. Nevertheless, the House proceeded many, many times over my opposition to vote closed or gag rules.

I can give no further answer to the gentleman concerning the present situation.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SISK. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH] chairman of the Committee on Rules, 5 minutes.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I think there is much good in this bill. It is the first break we seem to have had to exercise some discretion in the way of stopping abuses in the social security program. I hope those features in the bill will be passed.

I would like to say that I was in favor of the whole bill, and that is what I wanted to say a few words to you about. I think most of us do not like gag rules—I certainly do not like them—but so far as tax bills are concerned and bills of this type, gag rules are what we might term a necessary evil. If we were to turn a tax bill loose here, a bill dealing with the whole tax structure, we just would never get anywhere. To deal with a tax bill satisfactorily we have to adopt a rule like this, but I think we are up against a different situation in this particular case. Here is the situation: I came in while the gentleman from Ohio was speaking, and I did not hear all of his argument, but there was quite some discussion of the bill in the Rules Committee, and I just want to tell you what happened.

We were told by some witnesses that there were two items in the bill for which there was just no excuse. They were not asked for by the administration, and they were not included in the budget. They amount to a burden directly upon the Treasury of $140 million a year. They come about because of two changes, one in the proportion of contributions between the States and the Federal Government, and the second in the matter of the direct contribution by the Federal Government.

I do not think we would violate the necessary part of the closed rule if we would permit in the House a vote on a specific proposition, such as the one I am telling you about.

Here is an item not requested by the administration, not included in the budget, involving a charge of $140 million a year from now on from the Treasury of the United States. Some of us think that is not a good thing to do. Some evidently think it is a good thing to do because the Ways and Means Committee has reported it.

What harm could it do to the logic of the closed rule theory if the House were permitted to say on the one proposition, "We want it" or "We do not want it"? There is no way under our present method of procedure by which that specific proposition can be decided by the House unless the House debates it and expresses its will. I do not think that is logical, and I think that sooner or later the House is going to revolt on the closed rule proposition. In my opinion, the closed rule in certain instances is a very essential part of our procedure, rough as it may be at times.

I am sorry that the Committee on Ways and Means does not agree with me about that because I fear that sooner or later the House may say, "Let us get rid of the gag rule altogether."

I had hoped we would be able to try that procedure out on this bill, but the Committee on Ways and Means and the Committee on Rules did not agree with me. So I take this occasion to lay the matter before the House, because we are going to have a tax bill up for consideration next week. I had hoped that this tax bill was going to involve something which would get some more money for the Treasury to meet the appropriations we are providing every year which are far in excess of the revenues we receive. I thought we were going to tighten up and replenish the Treasury, to a moderate extent anyway. But I find that there is in the bill a matter which is called "tax credits." There is a feature in this bill that instead of raising money for the Treasury will be an outright gift to industry of something in the neighborhood, as estimated now, of $2 billion. The result of that one clause in the bill is going to be to wipe out the gains you make by deducting from people's dividends and deducting from their interest and making them pay in advance. These are features which I am prepared to go along with, hard as it is, in order to raise money for our depleted Treasury. We cannot keep on in this way. We are going to be told, "No, you cannot give the House the opportunity to say whether it wants to give industry a $2 billion gift."

I do not see the logic of it. I do not know that it is going to be discussed in the Rules Committee when the tax bill comes up. But I do mention this as an illustration of the kind of things that we are doing. I do not belileve the House believes in it. I think the House should be permitted to work its will. I have always gone along, but I think we are going to sooner or later have to modify things a little bit to meet the logic and the necessity of the situation, instead of gagging the Members of the House unnecessarily.

I wish I could convince some of my friends, but I do not think I can. I just do not think there is any reason in the world for doing that. There would be no trouble at all in letting the House do that in this one specific instance in connection with the present bill, let the House say, "We are in favor of giving them this $140 million that is not budgeted" or "We are not in favor of it."

Now, what is the matter with that? I would like somebody to take the time and answer that question.

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

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

Mr. GROSS. I just wanted to ask the gentleman if he thought that any great harm would be done if and when the tax bill comes before the House if we had 4 or 5 days to debate and amend it. What would be wrong with that?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Well, I think it would perhaps interfere with some of the extracurricular activities of some of the Members.

Mr. GROSS. Yes, I am sure the gentleman is right.

Mr. SISK. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE

Mr. SISK. Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. HARRIS], I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce may sit during general debate today.

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

There was no objection.

CONSUMER INTERESTS—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 364)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read and, together with the acompanying papers, referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union and ordered to be printed:

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 diffculties 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—for example, 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

all-time 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 decisionmaking, 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. Government 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 protection 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 cattle 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 long-standing 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.*

ENDORSEMENT OF MAJOR PROVISIONS OF H.R. 1235 TO STRENGTHEN FOOD, DRUG, AND COSMETIC ACT

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

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, the President's message today on consumer interest issues is an excellent outline of some of the vital problems facing the consumer—and I use vital in the literal sense as meaning problems on which life itself depends. I am gratified that he has described the consumer issues before the Congress in such eloquent and persuasive terms; more, I am personally delighted to have his strong endorsement of proposals which constitute the major provisions of my omnibus bill to rewrite the Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act of 1938, the bill H.R. 1235.

Every proposal suggested by the President dealing with the Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act is already covered in H.R. 1235. For instance, the bill provides for pretesting of cosmetics for safety of use before marketing; it provides for pretesting of therapeutic devices for safety before they can be sold; it provides for proof of efficacy of new drugs and of therapeutic devices before they can be approved; it provides for tighter factory inspection laws in food, drug, and cosmetic manufacturing and warehousing and distribution; it provides for removal from the market of any previously approved drug or therapeutic device if subsequent information casts reasonable doubt on its safety; it requires drug and therapeutic device manufacturers to maintain facilities and controls that will assure the reliability of their product; it requires batch-by-batch testing and certification of all antibiotics instead of the few now designated in the basic law; it assigns simple common names to drugs; it establishes an enforcible system of preventing the illicit distribution of habit-forming barbiturates and amphetamines—the so-called "pep pills"—and it also gets at the problem the President mentioned but has not as yet suggested a solution for—that of assuring the consumer the kind of informative labels which will tell him what is in the food packages in the stores, and how much, so that the consumer can do some comparison shopping and cost computations in the packaging jungle of supermarket shelves.

All of these provisions, and more—many more—are included in H.R. 1235, which has been pending on the calendar of the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce since January 3, 1961. As a good Democrat and as a strong supporter of the Kennedy administration, I think I can now say, without being accused of "blasting" the President or attacking his aids, that I have been waiting patiently for more than a year for the official report from the administration to the House committee on H.R. 1235. I discussed with the chairman of the committee, Congressman HARRIS, last year, the matter of scheduling hearings on my bill, and I suggested, and it was agreed between us, that we should wait until the administration filed its report on the far-reaching bill. I did not realize it would take so long—or that it would have to wait for a Presidential message which included so many other unrelated aspects of consumer problems.

But the delays are over and done with now, I hope, so that we should schedule early hearings on H.R. 1235, the only omnibus bill introduced in this Congress to rewrite the Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act along the comprehensive lines recommended in the President's message today.

Meat inspection does not come under the Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act, nor does it come before the Interstate Commerce Committee, so my bill does not apply to that section of the Presidential message. Also, recommendations for strengthening the antitrust laws to prevent monopolistic pricing practices in drugs or other products are similarly not within the jurisdiction of the Interstate Commerce Committee or under the Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act. But since

everything else in the President's message dealing with foods, drugs, or cosmetics can be considered in relation to H.R. 1235—or is already included in it—I hope we can now proceed with this bill expeditiously.

I stated that the President urged adoption of some but not all of the provisions of H.R. 1235. Following are some provisions included in the bill which the President did not refer to in the message, but which I hope the administration will nevertheless support:

First. In addition to pretesting of cosmetics for safety, including an anticancer clause, a requirement that the major ingredients of cosmetics be listed clearly on the label for the protection of consumers allergic to many of the now mysterious contents of cosmetic products.

Second. In addition to stronger inspection laws for factories in this country, a provision that foreign firms exporting large quantities of foods, drugs, or cosmetics into the United States must permit U.S. inspectors the right to conduct the same kind of plant inspections as are carried on in the United States, or lose the right to sell their product in the United States.

Third. Removal of the special exemption for soap in the 1938 act so that the chemicals and color additives used in face and complexion soap can be regulated just as the ingredients in any other cosmetic would be controlled as to safety.

Fourth. Protection of consumers against victimization by high-priced special dietary foods featuring exotic ingredients having no usefulness for the special purposes claimed.

Fifth. Stronger legal weapons to use in the battle to curb fake cancer remedies.

Sixth. Assignment to the Food and Drug Administration of power to subpena information under certain circumstances for administrative hearings on establishment of standards of identity of processed foods.

Mr. Speaker, last May, when the appropriation bill was before us for the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, I reported to the House that Administration officials had testified in the hearings that there were serious loopholes in the Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act—loopholes which should be closed. Secretary Ribicoff and Commissioner Larrick in their testimony last year cited all of the loopholes mentioned today in the food, drug, and cosmetic section of the President's message. I feel we have wasted a precious year in consideration of these problems. I do not think action on this matter of Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act reform should have had to wait until the administration also decided on whether to have a consumer representative in the White House or a Consumers' Advisory Council in the Council of Economic Advisers, or whether television sets should be required to be built to receive all the UHF as well as VHF channels. Fine as these recommendations are—and fine as all the other recommendations in the message are—I think we could have gotten started long before this on the vital issues of this message—those dealing with life-and-death in the manufacture and sale of foods, drugs, and cosmetics.

As the President so well stated, "Thousands of women have suffered burns and other injuries to the eyes, skin and hair by untested or inadequately tested beauty aids," among the $2 billion of cosmetics marketed in this country annually. I know of numerous such cases which have been called to my attention and which I, in turn, have forwarded to FDA. Can we now close these glaring loopholes in our law, which allows our Government to remove dangerous cosmetics from the market only after there is proof of their danger, which means after people have already been burned, scarred, scalped, de-nailed or otherwise maimed or hurt?

The dangerous situation for cosmetic users is by no means the only dangerous consumer problem resulting from glaring inadequacies in the Food, Drug and Cosmetic Act of 1938. Fortunately, they can be corrected.

UNITED NATIONS PARTICIPATION ACT—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 202)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read, referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and ordered to be printed with illustrations:

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.*

PUBLIC WELFARE AMENDMENTS OF 1962

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill—H.R. 10606—to extend and improve the public assistance and child welfare services programs of the Social Security Act, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Arkansas.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill H.R. 10606, with Mr. LANDRUM in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. MILLS] will be recognized for 2 hours, and the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. BYRNES] will be recognized for 2 hours.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. MILLS].

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 15 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, the proposals contained in H.R. 10606, as reported by the Committee on Ways and Means, are designed to improve, redirect, and tighten up the Federal-State cooperative public welfare programs. The committee is well aware of the increasing number of comments which are critical of the public assistance program. It realizes that solutions to the problems in this area are not easy and involve delicate relationships. It is convinced, however, that

the Federal Government must grant some latitude to the States to deal with them, particularly as to abuses in the aid to dependent children program. Along with this increased flexibility to deal with misuse of Federal and State funds, the States must have help in providing services in all programs which will cover people on the assistance rolls. In the past the public assistance programs have been too much concerned with the mere dispatching of monthly checks. We believe that it is high time that some concerted effort be made to get people off the rolls who can sustain themselves. It is realized that this process will not be an overnight affair. The provision of really effective rehabilitative services calls for well-trained personnel and concentrated and individualized case effort.

This bill, Mr. Chairman, grew out of discussions in the conference committee last year between the Secretary of HEW and the members of that conference committee. In December and January the Secretary took what administrative action he could under existing law in providing for a more effective method of locating deserting parents, reducing fraud and emphasizing the provision of more effective casework in the difficult aid to dependent children cases, where there was illegitimacy, desertion, and home situations which were rapidly becoming unsuitable. It was acknowledged at that time, however, that further legislative authority would have to be sought as to the public-assistance provisions if they are going to solve the welfare problems of this decade.

Permit me to digress somewhat at this point to comment upon the manner in which the current incumbent in the office of Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, the Honorable Abraham Ribicoff, has so effectively discharged his duties since his appointment to that position. Those of us who served with him in the House of Representatives and who have followed his career were, of course, aware of his outstanding legislative and administrative ability, and we were pleased at his selection by President Kennedy to head the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. I think this was a particularly able and fortunate appointment because in the short space that he has served as Secretary of that Department he has, in my judgment, accomplished a great deal in developing a program which should help remedy, in fact, go a long way toward remedying, many of the abuses in the welfare field which in the past several years have become the subject of increasing criticism from citizens, the press, and on the floor of this House. Secretary Ribicoff has, indeed, as he has stated on several occasions, approached these matters with a "hard head and a compassionate heart."

Secretary Ribicoff is to be highly commended, in my judgment, for the manner in which he has dug into these welfare problems, and brought forward suggestions which, in my opinion, are constructive and will be productive of results. These programs are vast in size and they are costly. I think the administration's recommendations which are embodied in this committee bill will assist in reducing ultimately the cost of these programs.

Almost all parties concerned recognized that there should be substantial modifications of the public assistance law which was enacted in 1935 under wholly different conditions. The committee bill will also help needy people who are legitimately on the public assistance rolls. They should have payments which provide them an austere but decent existence.

The bill would increase the Federal matching for the needy aged, blind, and disabled, so that their payments will more closely reflect this purpose. Payments for the aid-to-dependent-children program will be increased. Now I want you to get this: It will be increased through the matching for both parents in disability and in unemployment cases. Without this provision to which I have just referred, for the benefit of those under the old-age, the blind, and the disabled programs, there would be nothing in here that would in any way give greater guarantee to their austere but meager existence.

The bill would provide various methods, short of denying assistance to the child, that the State could use to see that aid-to-dependent-children payments are used in the best interests of the child. Two provisions are introduced for the first time in the aid-to-dependent-children program to carry out the committee's objectives. The first adds a new provision specifying that without loss of Federal funds the State may, in instances of assistance not being spent in the best interests of the child, give extensive counseling service to the recipients to encourage more acceptable behavior. If that fails, the provisions permit the State to advise the recipient of the possibility of making a protected payment, which I shall describe later, or to notify him that the welfare agency will seek the appointment of a guardian or a legal representative as provided elsewhere in this statute.

In addition, the provision permits the State beyond this to take any other action authorized under State law, which is in the interest of the child, without losing the right to Federal grants. Thus a State could pass legislation authorizing voucher payments in lieu of cash payments, as one State has already tried to do, but was turned down as being not in compliance or in conformity, in those cases where it is determined by the State that the welfare of the child was actually in jeopardy.

The committee recognized that this gives the States broad discretion, or broader discretion than they have had in all of the years of the operation of this program. But the committee did subject this provision to certain general limitations. They said that assistance with respect to the child may not be denied as long as the child is in the home of a relative. The action to be taken by the State must be specifically provided for in the State law and the action taken finally must be in the best interests of the child.

The second provision sets up a new type of payment for needy children whose parents or other relatives are not spending the money in the child's welfare or behalf. The new concept is that of a protective payment; that is, a payment to a person other than the relative with whom the child is living, who has an interest in the welfare of the child.

Under the committee bill the State may choose to provide such payments and if it does so a series of safeguarding provisions must be followed.

Moreover, such payments could not comprise more than 5 percent of all aid to dependent children payments in the State. This provision would be in effect for 5 years, after which a State-by-State study of its operations would be made and the Congress could then determine whether it wanted it continued or not.

The bill would extend for a 5-year period the temporary provision enacted in 1961 which would provide for matching funds to families where the children are in need because of unemployment of the father or of the parent. Prior to May 1961, Federal matching was limited to families in which the children were deprived of financial support by reason of the death, incapacity, or absence of the parent. The committee believed that this experience we have had under this 1-year program justifies the extension, and in view of the testimony that some States had not adopted the program because of the short duration of the temporary provision, the committee bill would extend it for 5 years until June 30, 1967.

The committee believed that the children of unemployed parents who are in need and who are hungry deserve the same treatment as do the children where the father is no longer in the home. This provision is also amended by the bill so as to deny assistance to an unemployed parent if, and as long as, he refused without good cause to undergo retraining. In other words, if he is going to be under this program, and an agency wants him to be retrained, he cannot refuse to take that training except for good cause. This is particularly appropriate in view of the recently enacted and the pending legislation providing training and retraining programs.

In this connection, the committee has in this bill established, beginning on October 1, 1962, and for a period of 5 years, that Federal matching funds will be available in cases where payments are made under work programs which are a part of the ADC program and meet certain standards. This is a recognition of the problem that became known nationwide as in the Newburgh case. Under interpretation of existing law, there can be no matching as to payments made for work by a welfare agency, and such payments are wholly by State and local funds. The amendment treating the children of unemployed parents under the aid to dependent children program introduces for the first time an identifiable group of employable people into the federally aided public assistance program.

The committee is satisfied as to the desirability of aiding the children of un-

employed, but recognizes that provisions must be made to deal with the problem of useful work for the unemployed parent.

Mr. Chairman, comment has already been made about the action of the committee in providing for an increase in Federal matching funds in connection with rehabilitation services and training in the public assistance programs to prevent or reduce the dependency and to promote self-sufficiency.

Mr. Chairman, it may not be generally recognized, but the State under existing law—and at its option—can provide services toward this end. Under all the public assistance programs except medical assistance for the aged, the Federal Government at the moment matches these expenditures on a 50–50 basis, under the provisions of existing law. Here we are saying to the State in this bill, that this problem or this matter is no longer left to the option of the State. We are not going to leave it to your discretion as to whether or not you adopt these vocational training and rehabilitation programs within your State and subject these people to these programs—we are telling you that you must, in order to have any part with the public assistance program, be in conformity. In the process of saying that, we are not doing as the minority report suggests and I quote:

The minority report states:

> The proposed increase in the percentage of the Federal contribution to the States for preventive and rehabilitative services results in a windfall of $40 million to the States. There is nothing to prevent the States from using this increase to reduce their budget for these services by one-half—the equivalent of the increase in the Federal contribution. This provision assures neither increased emphasis on preventive and rehabilitative services, nor improvement of these services.

What is the answer? Under existing law, rehabilitative services are completely optional with the State. It varies, moreover, between the States. Very little has been done to provide them in some other States. Under the 50–50 matching some, however, have done an outstandingly good job; and what has been the result? A great number of people as a result of this training have been removed from the rolls as being sufficiently capable of self-care in those States where they have had these services programs.

It is said here that we are for this requirement of public assistance, that we want that, but we are not willing to raise from 50 to 75 percent the Federal contribution for this purpose.

Let me ask you this question: Do you think it is fair for us to require the States by mandate of this Congress to pursue a new course of action that they have not voluntarily assumed to this date, and say to them that we will only match them on a 50–50 basis of the cost of carrying out this program? I have the greatest amount of reluctance to tell the States by Federal law what they have to do. I certainly am not going to subject my State to what we want done here in the way of a vocational training rehabilitation program, and tell them they have got to do the job by putting up 50 percent of the cost. Let me tell you what this bill states: That the State will have to provide at least the minimum services. How can it be said that this provision provides nothing as to increased emphasis on preventive or rehabilitative services or any improvement of these services? How can it be said that under this bill the States receive 50 percent more for this purpose? The States under this provision will have to put up 25 percent of the cost of these special services. In the great majority of States this will be far more than what they are now spending for such service. Clearly those States will have to put up more money. It is argued that the States will be burdened with this increased cost by our own action here, not by action of the States, but we say we will only give you 50–50 matching as under existing law.

I do not think it is fair to impose upon the States these additional burdens without our recognizing that we are bringing them about and recognizing that we are justified in bringing them about. I recognize that we are justified in assuming some greater share of the cost.

Now, Mr. Chairman, let me pass hurriedly on. In this bill there is a provision that was not asked for by the administration. There is in it a provision referred to earlier in the debate, a change in the matching formula for effective participation with the States in developing the program of the Federal Government of old-age assistance, the aid to the blind program, and the disabled program. Under the provisions of existing law $1 of that formula expires on June 30 of this year.

Under the provisions of existing law, including that $1, we say we will match the States in the first $31 of their expenditures for these three categories on the basis of four-fifths Federal money and one-fifth State money.

What we are doing here in this bill is changing that formula so that the Federal Government will match the States on that first $35 for purposes of the three categories on the basis of twenty-nine thirty-fifths Federal money. In other words, $29 Federal, $6 State.

Mr. Chairman, this has been with us for a long time. In 1946 another body adopted an amendment. That body adopted an amendment for a $5 provision by change in this first step of the formula I am talking about. We agreed in conference. In October 1948 another body adopted a $5 provision. We agreed to it in conference. In October 1952 another body adopted a $5 provision. We agreed to it in conference. In each instance the House, without a murmur, took the conference reports. In October 1956 the conferees on the part of the House accepted another Senate amendment modifying this formula to the extent of $3 of Federal money. In October 1958 the Senate adopted another amendment. The conferees accepted it, and the House took it, increasing this formula so as to provide on an average $4.73 of additional Federal money.

Mr. Chairman, we are dealing now with a group of people who are determined by the States to be in "need," not by our own terms of need. We are dealing with a group of people determined to be in need by a State agency. In the process here we are saying, "We will use Federal funds to match the welfare of these people up to a total of $70." That is all we are talking about—up to $70 total. "If you want to go above that, no Federal funds will be involved. Do it on your own."

Mr. Chairman, during the last decade we have increased by only $19 the average payment of people on old-age assistance. Is it too much if we add $4 more? Can it be argued that is too much?

What is the position of a person now, with all of the increase in the cost of living that has occurred? We go up to $70. Does that raise him, in fact, above that austere type of livelihood we are talking about that we intended in this program? I do not think so.

Mr. Chairman, if this amendment is stricken, these people will not have anything in the way of an increase in this bill. But bear in mind that there will remain an increase in the bill for aid to the dependent children program for the reasons I pointed out earlier.

I always try to be fair between the groups and the four categories.

I thought it was necessary for this to be added in order to maintain fairness in our treatment between the people in these categories. They say it does not have to go to this purpose; that it can be used for other purposes. It cannot be used for anything except in the welfare care of these folks.

Now, what is the history of it? Every time in the past when this has happened, have the States taken the money and put it in another pocket and not passed it on? They have not. They have passed it on either in benefits to those on the rolls or by putting other people on the rolls or by increasing their medical care. Do you realize that this money is going to be used for these purposes? It can be used for these purposes. If it happens to release $1 of State money, that dollar of State money is not going to be taken out of this program. It could be, I will admit, but the history of it is that it is not. What might they do with that dollar if they do not want to increase all these benefits? They might add just a little bit more to their package of medical care for the benefit of these people who are economically at the lowest rung of the ladder.

Mr. Chairman, I hope that the House will defeat a motion to recommit which would deprive these people of this meager increase in their subsistence.

Mr. FOUNTAIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLS. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. FOUNTAIN. I just have a question as to legislative intent. It is my understanding that the term "remedial care" wherever it appears in the bill is intended to include optometric services; is that correct?

Mr. MILLS. The intention of the committee with respect to that expression is to maintain, in the event that

there is a consolidation of these programs into one program under title 16, the same treatment which provides at the moment under title 1 or title 10 with respect to this group. We are not providing that the State cannot include them. We are not saying to the State that they must include them. We are leaving the situation exactly as it is at the moment. If the State wants them included in this term, the State can include them in this term.

Mr. FOUNTAIN. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. CHELF. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLS. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. CHELF. The gentleman has made a very clear and wonderful statement on this subject matter. There is one question that occurred to me as he spoke, and that was that the welfare, the best interests of the child was involved. Who would make that decision as to which would be the best interest of the child, the State or on a Federal level?

Mr. MILLS. The State. You understand, of course, if it is determined that it is in the best interest of the child to take it out of the home, that the State court would be involved in tha' instance, but if there is a protective payment or voucher payment or something of that sort, the decision would have to be made by the State welfare department.

Mr. CHELF. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. FOUNTAIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for one further question?

Mr. MILLS. I yield.

Mr. FOUNTAIN. With reference to my earlier question, is it not true that many States have included optometric services under this term?

Mr. MILLS. Yes, many States have and they could still do so under this new provision.

Mr. FOUNTAIN. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CURTIS].

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to this bill. Of course, I am for improved welfare programs in our society, and that is the reason that I am in opposition the way the bill is presently written, because, in my judgment, it would actually overall harm and hurt the welfare programs.

There are features in this bill that are good. In fact, there are three specific features in this bill that are good. I want to explain why they are good.

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Arkansas has emphasized the features in the bill that are good: On page 4 of the committee report, under item 1, "Additional authority to States to prevent abuses in aid to dependent children payments," then item 5, "Payments to children removed by court order into foster care," and then just one little part of item 2 under the next clause on page 5, section E, "Other improvements in public assistance programs."

Mr. Chairman, why are these three proposals out of the many proposals in this bill in our judgment desirable? It is because they liberalize the programs from the standpoint of what the States can do in this field. In fact, our welfare program in these three areas has been badly damaged because of the Federal standards imposed by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare on the flexibility and the manner in which the States could operate their own programs, particularly in the area of aid to dependent children. Two of these items refer to that.

Mr. Chairman, we are all well aware of some of the abuses that have come to the attention of the public through the publicity media in this field of aid to dependent children. I was very happy that the Secretary of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare recognized this problem and that the primary concern should be the welfare of the child, and not the particular mother who might have borne that child. If the child were being brought up in a home that was immoral or unsuitable that there should be an ability or an opportunity to put that child in a proper and good environment.

Mr. Chairman, why is it that the States that wanted to do this have been deterred from so doing by the Federal Government? It is because any State that dared to set up a program to try to relate this matter to the well-being of the child was told that "Your State will be in noncompliance of the Federal regulations, and you will lose all matching funds from the Federal Government."

Mr. Chairman, I am so pleased that in this bill we removed that restriction and now States are permitted to set up their own programs along this line without having the Federal Government refusing them the opportunity of doing so.

Many of us were here in the House a few years ago when we had the problem come up in regard to opening up for inspection, and not to publicize as we said at the time, the welfare rolls in Indiana—not for publicizing them, but for inspecting them by proper people, including, I might say, the press, or anyone who had an open interest in who might be on the welfare rolls. However, we found the Federal Government saying "If you do such a thing, you are cut off from Federal funds."

The State of Indiana had the courage to say "Well, we will be cut off from Federal funds, then." They came down to the Congress and fought their battle here. We permitted the State of Indiana to do this. Incidentally, the record shows that the welfare rolls were cut almost in half merely by having them open to inspection. I am trying to recount what happens when you turn this great power in the welfare field over to the Federal Government, in a way not to help programs, but to restrict them and to conform them in the way of Federal standards.

Mr. Chairman, the third good feature of the bill relates to the treatment of the blind. It happens that the States of Pennsylvania and Missouri, my own State, had developed programs for the blind over a period of many years long before the Federal Government ever thought of getting into the field of welfare. These programs were directed toward rehabilitation of the blind. Yet, when the Federal Government entered the field, and aid to the blind is one of the sections, of course, of this social security bill, those States that did not conform to the concept of the Federal Government as to a correct program for the treatment of the blind, or aid to the blind, could not qualify and could not get Federal money. To the credit of both the State of Missouri and the State of Pennsylvania, they resisted that because they said "Our programs show to be much better programs." Here is why: Because it does relate to rehabilitation. The Federal Government said "No."

The Federal Government said no; and each year ever since I have been in the Congress the Representatives from the State of Pennsylvania and the Representatives from the State of Missouri have had to get through special bills to permit Missouri and Pennsylvania to continue their programs.

I am happy to say that in this bill that exception for the State of Missouri and for the State of Pennsylvania is made permanent. But what I had requested and what is not here is this: Any State that thought it would like to emulate Missouri or Pennsylvania or develop their own kind of program for aid to the blind, which they thought was better or superior, should be permitted to do so. That has not been granted; no. This is just to let Missouri and Pennsylvania continue, even though I think the evidence shows that these are better programs.

Now, Mr. Chairman, let me get back to the bill in its entirety because, if I could take out these three liberalizing clauses which would improve and do improve the welfare programs of our society——

Mrs. CHURCH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. I yield to the gentlewoman from Illinois.

Mrs. CHURCH. I wonder if the gentleman would be good enough to tell us the reasoning behind the committee refusal to grant this permission to the other States.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. The reason behind it is the same reason that the Department, regardless of which administration was in power—these are the same people—is the same reason. These are the same people, these are good, sincere people, in my judgment, but they think they know better what is the best way to take care of the blind people and others. And they do not want the States to experiment or change their own programs.

Mrs. CHURCH. Although I congratulate the gentleman from Missouri and also the Representatives from that State and from Pennsylvania on getting this exception for their States, it seems to me that if the bill were open to amendment this privilege might be extended to other States.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. I could not agree more with the gentlewoman from Illinois. I wish this bill were open. I think my views on closed rules are pretty well known. I see no revenue

features involved in this kind of bill. Why the great Committee on Ways and Means cannot come to the floor of the House and defend its bills and present its reasons why these are good measures, I do not understand. Yes, I would pause if there were revenue features involved because of the peculiarities of those bills, but certainly open up a bill of this kind to amendment so that the House may consider amendments if they were desirable.

Mr. JENNINGS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. JENNINGS. With reference to the question asked by the gentlewoman from Illinois [Mrs. CHURCH] has any State other than Missouri and Pennsylvania asked for the privilege of changing its program for the blind?

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. No, but I will say this: Other States had their own programs but bowed down to the restrictions imposed by the Department and changed their programs to conform. It is a very difficult thing for them to dare to move ahead under their own program in the face of the loss of funds. Take the history that I referred to of the State of Indiana. It created, as the gentleman I am sure can imagine, a real political problem; that is, when you turn down hundreds of millions of dollars of Federal money and impose that burden on your own taxpayers.

Mr. JENNINGS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. I yield.

Mr. JENNINGS. Would it not follow, then, that if some of these States have a better program, and if they in turn make application, this would set a precedent so that they could in turn set up their own programs in the future?

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. I hope so; I certainly do hope so. You can see how regressive this is.

This does not permit the States nor encourage them to do any experimentation in this field. And they are the ones closest to the welfare programs and they know more about it, I submit, and would be more careful of the funds and be more really sympathetic to the human beings involved than somebody down here in Washington in a Washington agency who never does see the real human misery that goes with this.

Mr. JENNINGS. Would the gentleman not agree that this is a step in the right direction even though it is just one step?

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Oh, yes. I was pointing out three features of the bill that I thought were steps in the right direction. Take this problem of aid to dependent children. If these bureaucrats here in Washington, and again I say they are fine people, had to experience the actual situations of children even four or five in a family, illegitimate, and being kept in unsanitary and immoral conditions, and when State or municipal authorities want to do something about it, they are threatened with being taken off the Federal payments, if they dare to try to move forward. That is what happens when you move this program here through Federal control.

Mr. LINDSAY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. LINDSAY. I thank my colleague for yielding. I do not want to dwell too much on this one point and I do not want to ask the gentleman to occupy all of his time on this one point, but I am interested in getting a little more specifically what it was that the State of Missouri was trying to do. What was the nature of the situation there?

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. The Missouri program is simply this, that the blind got a pension which they did not lose when they went out and got jobs. In other words, when you tie the amount that the blind person receives to their actual earnings, there is a discouragement and I think anyone in the field of rehabilitation recognizes that. There is not the incentive for blind persons to actually get on their own feet. But, if they know they can count on this as a sort of base, and then go out and build on that, that is what they do in Missouri. We have gotten to the point where many of our blind people have gotten themselves to the point where they have jobs and have not only taken themselves completely off of the rolls as a matter of pride and have returned the pensions that they received, but they are taxpayers themselves. It is this unusual human trait of incentive involved in this area that is being shut out by the Federal program.

As to the features of the bill that the chairman of the committee has referred to as liberalizing or helping the program—my colleagues, everyone of them puts further power in the hands of the Federal Government. We cannot do anything otherwise when we increase the share that the Federal Government takes in financing these programs because we have an obligation to our constituents to see that Federal tax money is spent in accordance with certain standards, and when you increase these programs from a 50-percent formula to a 75-percent formula, and I just suggest that you read through the features of the bill and you will see each time, although it is couched in unusual language, or rather I mean very clever language, what it really means is that the Federal Government is going to restrict.

Let me illustrate. On page 10, and this is just one of many things of this kind that could be cited, the language is as follows:

> Your committee's bill encourages the States to provide such services by increasing the Federal share of at least the minimum content of these services, and by setting forth an obligation on the States to provide services at least to applicants and recipients of assistance.

Throughout the bill there are further restrictions on what the States may do in this regard.

Mr. JENNINGS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. JENNINGS. As I understand the portion of this bill, which the gentleman is referring to, it is financed not from the social security trust fund, but from the general appropriation funds.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. That is correct.

Mr. JENNINGS. And, therefore, any portion that is increased here, which has not been asked for and which is not in the budget, would then, in effect, throw the budget out of balance by that amount; is that not correct?

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. There is no question about it.

In fact, that, incidentally, is the question involved on the recommittal vote, this extra $140 million. Of course, I know the gentleman from Virginia fully realizes that we all share the same concern. But, this administration did not ask for this amount, and it was just put in gratuitously without any study, I might say, on the part of the committee, and being unbudgeted, it does throw out the budget by $140 million. But it is not the $140 million alone that worries me in this bill. It is the imposition of further Federal standards in this program.

Mr. LINDSAY. If it was not requested by this administration and was put in without any real study, why was it done?

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. I do not know. I think President Kennedy has always said that he has compassion and has requested all his press writers to be sure that they say that is so. When he proposed this bill without the $140 million I assume, of course, he was doing it with compassion.

Mr. BERRY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. I yield.

Mr. BERRY. Is not the gentleman from Missouri concerned about the provision in this and other bills which expand and extend the section providing that the parents of unemployed children shall be eligible for aid?

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Certainly, and I was coming to that particular point presently. I personally think that that has been presented in a way that will rob the Congress of a full understanding. As it was, we extended unemployment insurance temporarily last year and included aid to dependent children. It is not an issue of whether these children are going to go without funds at all, it is whether they are going to get funds given through the ADC program or given through the welfare program. The amounts are the same, except in those States—and mine is one of them I regret to say—where we have a provision of our welfare laws that say that if there is an employable person in the family then they cannot get welfare. I certainly regret that Missouri has that provision, but that is no reason for imposing this burden on other States which have done such a splendid job with their welfare programs.

Mr. BERRY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. I yield.

Mr. BERRY. To me it seems that this is the nucleus of eroding away the foundation of this Republic.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. I feel that government closer to home in the welfare field is the best government; and that is the issue here.

The concluding remark I want to make is this: The program of the federalist is always, "Well, the States cannot get enough to take care of these programs." We get into a very interesting discussion as to whether the real estate property tax is not a more progressive tax, a more efficient and sounder form of tax than the Federal income tax. I submit that a real objective analysis of the two taxes demonstrates quite clearly that the real estate property tax which does finance these programs is close to home and is by far the more practicable and reliable tax, and has stood up beautifully since World War II in providing the funds to finance the programs at the local and State levels. We are talking about financing education, community facilities, sewers, as well as welfare.

Mr. GROSS. If the gentleman will yield, it goes beyond tax, up to the responsibility of the citizen.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Of course it does, and there we get to the private sector.

Mr. HERLONG. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. KEOGH].

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Chairman, I want at the outset to commend the capable Secretary of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare for coming to us with these proposals which, in my opinion, provide an efficient and realistic approach in this area.

You have heard and will undoubtedly hear more about the meritorious aspects of the pending bill, but there are two provisions which are particularly praiseworthy in my estimation.

ADC BECAUSE OF UNEMPLOYMENT

The first is the continuation, for an additional 5-year period, of the temporary—1-year—provision which, since May 1961 has allowed States to give aid to dependent children payments to those families which are in need because the breadwinner is unemployed. Prior to our legislation in 1961 authorizing such payments, aid to dependent children had been only available where the father was dead, incapacitated, or had deserted. It seemed to us last year, before the provision was first added, that the Congress was saying to the unemployed father:

> If you stay with your family and try to hold it together during this critical period we can offer you no Federal assistance, but if you happen to desert them, your family will be fully eligible for aid to dependent children.

This seemed then, and it seems to us now, an anomalous and indefensible situation. Moreover, there is evidence which indicates that this new program has already had the effect, in some cases, of returning fathers to their families. A study conducted by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare for the first 7 months of the program's operation—May to November 1961—shows that of the 66,100 applications allowed at that time 2,900 families which had been receiving aid to dependent children for reasons other than unemployment, became eligible under the new program, usually because an absent father had returned to the home.

Experience with the entire program during the 1-year trial period, I believe, has demonstrated its success and indicates that the program should be extended for the 5-year period as provided in H.R. 10606. By January, 15 States had programs in effect. In December 1961, 220,000 recipients, the great majority children, were receiving payments under this program. In my State of New York, some 54,000 recipients—44,000 of whom were children—were receiving payments which averaged $35 per recipient in December.

I might add that the validity of this provision is also strengthened by the addition of the community work and training programs in the aid to dependent children plan, which allows Federal matching for projects complying with certain health and work standards specified in the bill. Currently States and localities must provide all money if they set up such work projects. Bringing the children of unemployed parents under the aid to dependent children program, introduced for the first time an identifiable group of employable people into the federally aided public assistance program. The community work programs written into this legislation are an effective method of dealing with the problem of providing useful work and training for the unemployed parent so that and until he can reenter the regular labor force.

I have said that experience under the program has already shown its potentials. A review of the aid to dependent children unemployed parent program in effect in 13 States in October 1961, showed that the following general groups of parents were benefiting from this program.

First. Those parents who remained jobless only for short periods. These were fathers under 45, ready to work and with stable work records, who had been unemployed less than 3 months. In some cases, such fathers obtained work before the agency had acted on their assistance applications. Roughly one-fourth of the caseload fell into this group.

Second. Those parents whose chances for returning to work depended upon training or retraining, and other special services. Often these were younger workers, some recently discharged from military service, with limited education and talents. Some older men, 30 to 55 years of age, with large families and education below the eighth grade level, were also in the group. About half of the caseload in the 13 States were believed to be in this category.

One argument advanced for the legislation at the time it was adopted is that it provides protection for the families of workers in hard-core areas of unemployment who have exhausted their unemployment insurance benefits. The experience of one State beset with this problem may suggest the importance of this program for other areas in similar situations. For example, in West Virginia, in December 1961, approximately one-third of the families on the aid to dependent children rolls—10,745 out of 31,037—were families with an unemployed father. Some 34,873 children, who could not otherwise have qualified, were made eligible.

DAY CARE

The second major step forward contained in the bill, in my opinion, is the specific authorization of Federal child-welfare funds for day-care facilities. Under the bill, up to $5 million of the child-welfare funds appropriated above the present $25 million ceiling, would be earmarked for day care in fiscal 1963, and up to $10 million would be allocated in subsequent years. The need for this legislation was succinctly pointed out to the committee by Mrs. Randolph Guggenheimer, president of the National Committee for Day Care of Children, Inc., who said:

> During the last 5 years, there has been an increase in both the number of preschool and school-age children whose mothers work full time. The rate of increase is larger in the school-age group, which indicates that too many young children are joining the so-called latch-key group. These are the children who wander our city streets, or return home to an empty house. Supervision is needed for this highly vulnerable group during their out-of-school hours. Certainly supervision is needed for the preschool children, too many of whom were recorded in a study made in 1958 as being left without any care during the day.
>
> Kindergarten or short-day nursery schools are not the answer. They provide a valuable service but the children who have no one at home to care for them all day long must have not only a full-day program but a special kind of program that compensates for the loss of family life.
>
> Unless Federal aid is available to stimulate day-care programs, we know from experience that such programs will not come into existence—and that child day-care service with damaging and dangerous standards will persist. Other countries throughout the world have made this discovery.

As the report on the bill points out, a study made by the Bureau of the Census, at the request of the Children's Bureau in 1958, showed that 400,000 children under 12, whose mothers were working full time, were caring for themselves without any planned supervision.

To insure that this program will be oriented to State and local needs, and provide a well-rounded approach which reflects the views of public and private agencies in this area, the committee bill would require, as conditions of State plan approval, with respect to day care:

> 1. For such safeguards as may be necessary that the care is provided only in cases in which it is in the best interest of the child and the mother and the need for such care exists under criteria established by the State; and
>
> 2. For giving priority, in determining the existence of the need for such day care, to members of low income or other groups and to geographical areas which have the greatest relative need for extending such care; and
>
> 3. For cooperative arrangements with the State health authority and the State agency primarily responsible for State supervision of public schools to assure maximum utilization of such agencies in the provision of health services and education for the children receiving day care; and

4. For an advisory committee, to advise the State public welfare agency on the general policy involved in the provision of day care under the State plan. This committee must include, among its members, representatives of other State agencies concerned with day care or services related thereto and persons representative of professional or civic or other public or nonprofit private agencies, organizations, or groups concerned with the provision of day care.

These are but two of the provisions in this important bill which modernizes our welfare programs. The public assistance and child-welfare programs—which were established in the Social Security Act of 1935—must be given the flexibility to deal with changing social conditions if they are to be the effective legislation they have been in the past.

Mr. Chairman, I urge the support and the passage of the bill. If I may join my distinguished and capable chairman, I urge that a motion to recommit, if one is offered, should be rejected.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I yield 20 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. ALGER].

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Chairman, this particular issue is one that has troubled me considerably because so frequently those of us who oppose particular Federal legislation are accused of being against people and their needs. I can assure my colleagues in this instance that those who are conservative in their leanings also want to take care of the needy. Because others will be presenting specific details of this bill, I would like to present something a little different as background material. As a member of the Ways and Means Committee might be expected to do, who for the first time in 3 years is confronted with a program that directs its interest to the blind, the aged, the disabled, and the people that all of us would want to help, I would like to present in a pro-and-con fashion nine arguments, the presumptions and rationalizations that I have heard over and over for this particular program. This may give the Members of the House some thoughts concerning public assistance's original concept, and why we should or should not now expand it. I submit this in good conscience to my colleagues to think about, in order to see if there might not be reason to actually question not only this bill but the original basis of the program itself, and the reasons for it.

Mr. Chairman, first of all, in presenting the policies and the rationalizations that underlie public assistance and the proposed changes, I would like to present the pro arguments. Then I would say let us study these each in turn. First of all, this is what the proponents on not only this particular section of social security, but the whole field of social insurance, say to us over and over again: "Social insurance should be strengthened and should be the first line of defense against income loss through any of the commonly shared hazards of life, unemployment, old age, death, or disability. Individuals receive benefits as a matter of right and the social insurances are a bulwark against common risk to financial insecurity." In other words, it is a matter of right that our citizens have these benefits whether it be under the contributory part of social security or, indeed, under this section of social security to which we are putting our attention today.

Now, Mr. Chairman, let us look at that from the other side, this way: Social insurance is not insurance legally. It is a gratuity, and has been so ruled by the Supreme Court.

As insurance it would be unconstitutional. Further, any program within the framework of social security is no stronger than the basic program. And at this point, therefore, I come to this particular part of social security which we call public assistance. Since the basic program of social security is actuarially unsound—and at this point I shall ask permission in the House to submit to you the minority report from last year's social security amendments to show you in what a precarious situation the entire social security program is; and I shall cite in that several examples that show its financial insecurity. The program is unsound.

MINORITY VIEWS

We believe in a soundly financed and equitably conceived system of social security that properly seeks to provide a basic floor of retirement and survivorship protection for the American people on a nondiscriminatory basis. The existing old-age, survivors, and disability insurance program falls considerably short of meeting these requirements.

We are opposed to a system of so-called social insurance that (1) discourages individual productivity, (2) impairs individual ability to achieve self-sufficiency, (3) illogically and arbitrarily differentiates among citizens in regard to benefit eligibility and amount, and (4) spends currently the savings of the present generation so that the commitments of the system to one generation will inevitably fall on succeeding generations in increasing magnitude. The present old-age, survivors, and disability insurance program tragically possesses these shortcomings on every count and with seemingly unshakable firmness persists in their retention.

We are opposed to the enactment of H.R. 6027 because it seeks to enact a combination of illy conceived or inadequate modifications in a social security structure that urgently requires much more basic and sweeping reform to be acceptable and workable. There seems to us little merit or future in adding another room to a house built on sand.

We associate ourselves fully with the criticisms in the supplemental views by our Republican colleagues with respect to the proposal to reduce the possible retirement age for men to 62 years. We also tend to support the recommendations of our Republican colleagues to liberalize the retirement test and to end the present unconscionable discrimination against those present aged who through no fault of their own are precluded from a benefit entitlement even though their need is the greatest and even though they may have contributed as much to the OASI trust fund as many present beneficiaries. With respect to the proposed increase in certain dependents' benefits, we can see no reason or rationale for saying to a widow that she can have only 75 percent or 82½ percent or any other percent less than 100 percent of the amount paid to a retired man. We would support a proposal to equate the benefit entitlement between these two classes of beneficiaries.

We should frankly recognize that the present social security system is not insurance and we should end the cruel pretense of maintaining on the basis of an insurance concept that some citizens are deserving of higher benefits than others and some citizens are deserving of no benefits. It serves no useful purpose to characterize as "insurance" what is merely a statutory mechanism combining welfare and insurance characteristics which emerge as a hybrid that is not insurance and that provides welfare only on a hit-or-miss basis. This mechanism is essentially a device for taking the productivity of one group of our citizens to provide for the welfare of another group and these groups may or may not be of the same generation.

We support the portion of the supplemental views of our Republican colleagues expressed in regard to the tax schedule in existing law and proposed in this legislation necessary to finance the OASDI program. In commenting on the tax burden we stress the fact that the OASDI system has not met the critical test of time. We are told that the system will not mature until well into the 21st century. In the interim it is entirely possible that experience will prove the present tax schedule inadequate. We are perhaps not justified in assuming that future generations will acquiesce in tax burdens to which we are now so willing to commit them.

We also join in the supplemental views of our Republican colleagues with respect to concern over the willingness of the administration to utilize the OASDI program for pump-priming purposes. The fact that the administration did not recommend any comparable liberalization of the public assistance programs under the Social Security Act reveals a dangerous inclination to use the OASDI trust funds for fiscal policy purposes to pursue an objective that, if it is to be done at all, should be done through the Treasury general fund route.

Our reservations with respect to the existing social security program and the amendments proposed in H.R. 6027, aside from considerations of equity and fairness are primarily directed to our serious doubts over the financial ability of the program to sustain itself in perpetuity. The assumptions on which the system is pronounced sound are inescapably predicated almost completely on economic and population forecasting. There is less reason to question the actuarial conclusions if the assumed economic and population forecasts are correct. Our concern is that these forecasts may prove to be at substantial variance with experience, with the result that the tremendous obligations already accumulated under the OASDI system will prove an intolerable burden.

The existing system is established on the principle that taxes will be imposed on future earned income of future workers to pay benefits obligations that have been previously incurred. The magnitude of these obligations can be demonstrated by an examination of certain actuarial data:

First, an employee with maximum taxable earnings since the program began in 1937 would have contributed through December 31, 1960, a total of $1,290, so that the combined employer-employee taxes are $2,580. If such an individual reached age 65 on January 1, 1961, and had a wife the same age, the average total amount of benefits that would be paid out in this case would be about $31,200.

Secondly, a similar individual who qualifies for the minimum benefit could have contributed as little as $6.50 (by obtaining 13 quarters of coverage at the minimum rate of $50 of wages per quarter during the period 1937–49, when the contribution rate was 1 percent); in such case, the combined employer-employee taxes would be $13. The total amount of benefits that would be paid out, on the average, in such case (considering that the widow would receive the full

minimum benefit under present law of $33) would be about $9,100.

Third, the total contributions that have been collected by the OASDI system since the inception of the program through 1960 amount to approximately $81.6 billion. The present value of future benefit obligations incurred with respect to existing beneficiaries is estimated at about $95 billion. This latter figure does not take into account the benefit obligations currently being developed for persons who have not as yet reached retirement age or died, or the total benefits paid since the inception of the program through 1960, amounting to $62.9 billion. The combined OASDI trust funds at the end of 1960 amounted to only $22.6 billion.

And, fourth, the present unfunded obligations of the OASDI system are estimated to be approximately $300 billion on the assumption that no new workers enter the system but that only presently covered persons and their employers make contributions and acquire benefit rights.

These actuarial data give some meaning to the magnitude of the future obligations that have already been incurred under the social security program and suggest the compelling reasons why care must be exercised in the evaluation of the existing program and any proposed liberalizations thereof.

We favor a program that is sound in principle and in its financing features. We are opposed to imposing on future generations the obligations that we should be meeting for ourselves. For these reasons we are constrained to express our opposition to the favorable consideration of H.R. 6027.

NOAH M. MASON.
JAMES B. UTT.
BRUCE ALGER.

Admitting that, as a political gratuity subject to vote, it does not need to be sound, does not lessen the danger that a $300 billion deficit poses to the health of the entire program, including this section.

Contributions are not related, therefore, as a matter of right. Congress can vote this entire program out of existence. There is no binding contract as there is in insurance. And it is compulsory, it is not voluntary.

This first pro and con is directed to the basic review of social security, including the contributory section. This bill today, of course, is not a part of the contributory section. And I call your attention also to the minority views of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CURTIS] of last year.

Let us go on to the second presumption. Here is the argument for: The Federal-State public assistance programs need to be expanded with new formulas applied, providing a larger Federal share to help more States presumably less able to provide for their people.

Now, let us look at the other side. The bland assumption by Federal authorities that State programs are inadequate by Federal standards does not make them so, even though today's family budgets, diets, and living standards have not been specified by Federal authorities. Certainly, therefore, there is a question whether increasing Federal control is necessary. It is axiomatic that if more money is offered to the States the States will, in effect, be bribed into taking it, because they know that their residents have paid in this Federal tax money to the Government.

It is also true the Federal Government will and must lay down the formulas, regulations, and controls to safeguard the expenditures. Here, then, the States are coerced with bribes and bonuses, even as we tried to have a residence requirement this year forced on the States, and which we knocked out of the bill. The States thus lose administrative control, which the gentleman from Missouri pointed out was the case in all but two or three of the liberalized provisions of the bill.

Now as to presumption No. 3. Here is the pro side: Localities are taxwise the weakest of any level of government. States should bear a greater portion of the cost. But even here, with so many other State programs, States are hard pressed for funds, so the Federal share in the participation should be increased.

Mr. Chairman, I now quote, as I shall do several times, from a statement made by the other body, shown in Document No. 93, January 1960, entitled "Public Assistance." Not having the printed hearings and report of this bill at the time I did my detailed study and homework. This was my source as to the basic premises underlying social security. This is what this study says about this tax matter.

We believe the National Government should assume that share of assistance cost which demonstrably State and local governments and private sources cannot meet.

And again:

Many States are burdened today by heavy fiscal responsibilities.

And further:

We do not find the Federal share of public assistance programs unduly high in relation to the Federal share of other Federal-State programs.

Now let us look at this tax matter on the con side. The Federal share traditionally in Government programs always increases. It is politically expedient and the human thing as politicians for us to do. So much is this true that the Federal participation in highway expenditures went up to 90 percent, much to our present sorrow. This disproves that when you increase the percentage you are always improving the program. Yes, we can increase the Federal percentage but to do this because the States and localities are hard pressed for funds begs the question.

But the Federal Government is much worse off, having no funds, being hundreds of billions of dollars in debt, and with only the taxing power to provide funds which in advance are overcommitted. To compare this participation with other Federal-State programs is hardly enlightening since it might well be that "two wrongs do not make a right."

Next, as to the presumption that national concern over State inadequacies and inequities, must take precedence I quote again from the study of the other body:

Despite our firm conviction that within broad limits the States should have the freedom to define and administer their public assistance programs as they see fit, for this is in line with the value Americans place on experimentation and diversification, we consider inadequacies and inequities in public assistance a matter for national concern.

Let us look at the other side of that. The differences in State programs will exist so long as there are checks and balances of the Federal-State constitutional relationship. We can by Federal coercion change that at any time we see fit—nonconstitutional, of course, it would be. There are those who would see State differences as a healthy diversification and a competitive situation from which State residents take authorship and pride thinking their way is best.

At this point I might dare to disagree with the Federal coercion and planners. State leaders and residents might also feel this might make a stronger United States than the affirmative federally imposed pattern.

Now as to rationalization number 5. Public assistance spending is and should be "open end," with no limit to the number of local applicants nor to the amount to be spent. The amount of the Federal appropriation should remain "open end." That is, the amount should be the total necessary to match State local expenditures under the formula specified for Federal financial participation, with no limiting predetermination of what the total shall be.

This, too, is taken from the study by the other body, on the nature of public assistance.

Let us look at the other side of that.

Federal spending has always been open-end, since the Federal Government has no limitation on its power to tax, spend and borrow. It may be that this in itself explains why there is not and will not ever be fiscal responsibility at the Federal level and why in Federal spending too often the do good side of human beings runs away with the need for reason and fiscal prudence.

Sixth to go to the next rationalization underlying public assistance.

Implicit, though not often directly stated, is the conviction throughout that misuse of or dereliction in the programs percentagewise is small and inconsequential.

My answer to that on the "con" side of the argument is this: The percentage of dereliction and misuse in giveaway programs is open to dispute since few if any studies are really made to determine and to uncover freeloading and goldbricks. Lack of such studies does not prevent such dereliction and misuse and becomes greater as Federal participation and money control increases.

Seventh. The next rationalization. Implicit also is the belief that people need more than money in Government aid. The people coming to the assistance agencies need more than money. The extreme view was presented of this by Mr. R. E. Bondy, director, National Social Welfare Assembly, this year who said:

Social services should not be restricted to persons in economic need.

My answer to that is this: Social services not related to economic need are even less the province of the Federal

Government. There is grave doubt in my mind if Federal participation even in cases of need is constitutional by the traditional standards laid down by our forefathers.

Eighth. The next rationalization is this:

> Private agencies are to be used and coordinated with Government agencies. Voluntary efforts by families, churches, and privately supported social agencies meet great areas of need. Federal Government should exercise greater leadership. The Federal Government should encourage each State to utilize services of voluntary organizations and develop coordinated programs.

This year in our testimony, Mr. Mintener of the National Council of Churches said:

> There are 4,000 church related health and welfare agencies in the United States under Protestant and Eastern Orthodox auspices. A number may be in a position to sell service to their State or county. There is general agreement that church related agencies may accept per diem payments on a case-by-case basis for services purchased by Government for individuals.

Monsignor Gallagher, secretary of the National Conference of Catholic Charities, admitted under cross-examination that the church agencies are already accepting Federal-State-local money for charity work, and saw little conflict of church and government—though I suspect he was troubled about this.

My answer to this matter of private agencies and churches getting into Federal subsidy is this:

Church related agencies selling their services is unconstitutional. This violates the separation of church and state. Federal funds must have regulations, controls, and dictation. Followed to its logical conclusion, church agencies, and then the church, indeed, would lose their identity.

More importantly is the loss of the private concept of charity which has marked the course of the Judeo-Christian heritage which underlies Western civilization. Continued and increased contribution by the Federal Government can only change private charity into public charity and this means that in time private charity will be eliminated entirely. I must say that in this bill the churches purportedly are eliminated except for some slight assistance to certain groups, and I suspect that in the other body there will be some increase in the role of the church receiving Federal funds.

Ninth. The final presumption is this:

> The number and qualifications of welfare workers must be increased. One hundred percent Federal funds should be provided for this including graduate schoolwork. Further, public assistance workers should increase public knowledge of public welfare programs since public opinion is a potent force. Citizens of a democracy, in order to be intelligently effective, must be well informed. Too many citizens are ignorant of our vast public assistance programs or have mistaken ideas about them and welfare workers must inform them.

Increasing welfare workers, training them with 100 percent Federal funds will insure Federal indoctrination. Then teaching the public about the vast public assistance programs will complete the total brainwash of our people and elimination of all private, church and charitable efforts in assistance. Such an event will also be a major step in destroying the independence of our people.

Mr. Chairman, now let us look further into the problem, the principles involved and how to solve this ageless problem of caring for human needs.

The needy have been with us always. Hardship and insecurity accompany life. U.S. society will and does provide for the disabled, the blind, the aged and others that genuinely are in need. Demagogs would confuse the issue—saying some are for helping the needy—that others are not. This is not the issue. I assume and now repeat my belief that the needy must be provided for, have been and will be. So what is the question and the controversy? Simply this: How best to do the job in conformity with our fundamental principles which simply stated are twofold and overlapping: First, the Judeo-Christian heritage, and second, the companion form of society, the American plan of a constitutional republic in a democracy, a society of free people.

Is the job done best by expanded help of the Federal Government? Many of the presumptions here previously outlined accompanying public assistance violate these basic American concepts.

Charity is personal, a spiritual dedication of human being aiding human being. The giver is not sanctimonious. The receiver is not debased. The church is the heart of the effort, and private agencies are the administrative means, distributing private contributions.

This definition of charity is the Judeo-Christian heritage. Federal Government compulsory taxes—failure to comply punishable by fines and jail—plus Federal bureaucratic regulations and regimentation violates and distorts both this religious heritage and the role of the Constitutional Republic—at the sacrifice of the freedom of those composing a free society. There are no empty generalities. The intangible needs of human being are no less real than the tangible needs, such as food, clothing, shelter, and necessities. The unseen strength of American people is their freedom—spiritual and material. Traditionaly, the church has been at the center of man's vicissitudes and griefs to strengthen a religious-based code of conduct and the strength, through prayer to our God, to face the stark realities of daily life. These realities cannot be dodged or passed to others through additional voted Federal aid.

Now we are reminded in public assistance that the Federal Government can through the broadly based compulsory tax device replace charity by stressing that our people have a Federal right to life's necessities. In this proposed effort the church is asking Federal aid, completely abrogating its independent and primary position in succoring man. Indeed, the bill seeks to coordinate public, Government, private, and church agencies.

Citizens not even students of government know government must dominate and control any public-private cooperation and government will grow from no matter how small a federal part until complete domination. Thus church and private charity will be eliminated, replaced by the materialistic state socialism of federal government regimentation. There can be no other end to this path we travel.

The alternative, the sensible course to follow, will stress church and private agencies with less, not more, Federal participation. It is not too late to make this critical decision. Local efforts are the answer, with the State helping only when necessary. Ideally, we should return entirely to private control without Government funds.

Realistically, we can prevent further centralization and domination of Federal Government at the expense of private and church agencies. To do this we must reduce, not increase, Federal participation, yet at the same time stressing State responsibilities and administrative flexibility. Basic mistakes, inherent in this program, are many. Worthiness of intention in helping the needy is not reason enough further to take money from the taxpayers. The stressing of democracy, the people, belittles our real form of government, a Republic wherein we do not play up expediency for political gain to the needs of the people, but rather as representatives of the people we Members of Congress exercise that self-restraint and self-discipline that goes with fiscal responsibility, a balanced budget and frugality with taxpayers' money. Most important we must remember there is no Federal Government right for people to be federally clothed, housed, employed or provided the basic necessities. This is not the constitutional role of Federal Government. Society can provide help for needy without embracing a form of federal domination which will violate our most sacred beliefs of church and government. The needy can be provided for without the Federal Government.

Mr. Chairman, I am opposed to this bill, and I shall include as a part of my remarks the remarks I made last year on social security, and I ask that the Members take a look, and think about these items whether agreeing or disagreeing. Of course we are all in favor of aid to dependent children; of course we are for aiding the blind and disabled, and unemployed that, and we are going to help them, but we cannot move the Federal Government in without doing more damage than help.

Mr. HERLONG. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 15 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, perhaps there are not very many bills that come before the House of Representatives of any significance that some of us would not like to vote two-thirds "yes" and one-third "no," or something like that. Maybe sometime a resolution ought to be presented to change our rules, to divide the votes up into tenths and perhaps 3 or 4 days after the vote was taken we may find out how it came out.

Seriously, this is a situation where I find myself in favor of a good portion of

a bill. Some of the sections I do not like. I realize under a closed rule you have to vote for or against the package; but, then, that is no argument in this particular case in favor of an open rule, because I find myself frequently, after a bill has been amended under an open rule, in a situation where I still do not like every section of it and I would like to vote two-thirds "yes" and one-third "no," or something like that. This today is a situation where we have to look at the overall accomplishments or objectives that we are seeking in this bill.

What we are attempting to do is to provide an incentive to get people off the welfare roll.

I want to speak with reference to one or two sections of this program, sections that I think are particularly good and should be added to the law, so good in fact that it would compel me to vote for the entire bill, in spite of the fact there are some sections I would not be enthusiastic about.

Mr. Chairman, what we are trying to do in this bill is to take a long-range look at these welfare programs and reduce, ultimately, their cost, by providing incentives to get people off the welfare rolls.

I would like to mention, in particular, several features of the bill which are especially meritorious.

1. AVOIDING ABUSES IN THE ADC PROGRAM

The first relates to granting States additional authority to prevent abuses which have arisen in payments for dependent children. The second provision would allow the State to make "protective payments," that is, payments on a child's behalf to a person other than the relative with whom the child is living, in cases where the relatives are not using such payments in the child's best interests. We are all aware of the many complaints which have arisen concerning abuses by recipients of aid to dependent children. It has been reported, for example, that in some cases an irresponsible parent or relative caring for the child has used the monthly welfare check to pursue his own interests rather than meeting the needs of the child.

This problem raises the difficult question of how to deal with these instances of abuse of funds without endangering the general principle adopted when the Social Security Act was first passed in 1935 that public assistance recipients should be free to provide for themselves with the assistance they receive in the form of money payments. It also does involve the question of Federal-State relationships, where a large share of the funds is Federal money. The States are now free, in instances of abuse of public assistance payments, to make nonmoney payments; but if they do so, their expenditures are not matched by Federal funds and must be supported wholly from State and local funds. The provisions of the bill recognize that the States should be allowed to use various types of nonmoney payments when this is in the interest of dependent children without being penalized.

The first of the amendments which I mentioned—section 107 of the bill—allows the States to take certain action without losing Federal funds. The States may, in instances where assistance is not used in the best interest of the child, give extensive counseling services to the parent or relative caring for the child to encourage and assist them in providing more adequately for the family's needs. If this fails, the amendment permits the States to advise the recipient of the possibility that direct payments to him will be stopped and that "protective payments"—which I shall describe in a moment—will be made for the family to a third party. The States may also caution the recipient that the welfare agency may seek the appointment of a guardian or representative for the purpose of receiving payments on the child's behalf. The amendment in addition permits the States to take other actions authorized under State law which are in the interest of the child without losing Federal grants. These could include voucher payments under which a recipient would be furnished with a voucher or certificate which enables him to obtain particular goods or services. The recipient could be limited to procuring goods and services for specific purposes, for instance, groceries and rent, instead of receiving a cash payment which would be used for items completely unrelated to the welfare of the child. This expanded authority which the bill would give to the States is subject to three general limitations: first, assistance with respect to the child may not be denied as long as the child is still in the home of the relative; second, the action to be taken by the State must be specifically provided for in State law; and third, the action taken must be in the child's best interest.

The second amendment which I mentioned—section 108 of the bill—sets up a new type of payment for needy children whose parents or other relatives receiving the payments are not spending them on the child's behalf. These are "protective payments," which would be made to a person who has an interest in the welfare of the child other than the relative with whom the child is living. The bill provides that if these payments are used, a number of safeguarding provisions must be followed, including periodic review by the State agency to determine whether the "protective payment" in a given case should be continued. The bill also limits the number of recipients for whom "protective payments" may be made, to 5 percent of all other recipients of aid to dependent children in the State.

These provisions, I am sure, will allow the States wide latitude to take action in protecting the best interests of dependent children, and will at the same time prevent State and Federal welfare payments from being diverted to unnecessary and improper purposes.

2. COMMUNITY WORK AND TRAINING PROJECTS

The bill carries another provision which should be emphasized. This is the section—section 105—which authorizes Federal participation in community work and training programs for relatives with whom dependent children are living. This amendment is particularly reasonable and pertinent in view of the amendment adopted last year and extended by this bill, authorizing payments to children who are dependent because of the unemployment of a parent. When the aid to dependent children program was expanded to include the children of unemployed parents in 1961, federally aided public assistance took in an entire new group of employable persons. It is eminently illogical, it seems to me, to allow the States to make money payments to these persons, but to withhold Federal support if the State or locality chooses to employ them for useful purposes. This is precisely what the Federal law provides. At the present time, work projects for employable persons are conducted under welfare programs financed solely from State and local funds. The bill would recognize that community work and training programs have legitimate application to able-bodied adults who are recipients of payments under the aid to dependent children program. Federal participation will be conditioned upon proof that the work will serve a useful community or public purpose, will not displace regular employees, will not impair prevailing wages and working conditions, and will be accompanied by certain basic health and safety protections. Moreover, the bill would authorize a State to withhold assistance payments to a relative if he refuses without good cause to participate in the work project.

3. REHABILITATIVE SERVICES

Finally, I should like to state that it is my hope and belief that the provisions contained in the bill—section 101—designed to encourage the providing of more and better rehabilitative services to public assistance recipients will bring about savings so far as public assistance money payments are concerned. We hope these services to millions will help many families break the chain of chronic dependency. This dependency in too many cases is perpetuated by the habit of waiting for the monthly welfare check. In place of this dependency the bill provides a road for the relief recipient back into productive work. If he travels this road successfully, we will have one less welfare recipient and one more taxpayer.

I urge adoption of the bill as reported from the Committee on Ways and Means.

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HERLONG. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. KEOGH. Would the gentleman not agree with me that in these provisions to which the gentleman has addressed himself there is an obvious and significant shift of emphasis to the dependent child in what is best for it?

Mr. HERLONG. I would certainly agree with the gentleman. This is something that in the past we have not paid strict enough attention to. I know of instances that were brought out in the committee hearings by our distinguished chairman where he showed that there were proposed provisions which would have permitted payments to people that

were not for the benefit of the child, which instances were not noticed by all members of the committee. However, our diligent chairman detected them and took them out of the bill. We all should be grateful to him for that.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. KNOX].

Mr. KNOX. Mr. Chairman, I believe the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH], the chairman of the Committee on Rules, put this matter in proper focus in calling to the attention of this body the impact of the provision which would cost the Federal Treasury an additional $180 million. I believe the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH] used the figure of $140 million. That is in one sector. The other $40 million is for the increase from 50 to 75 percent of the participation by the Federal Government.

I am reluctant to extend further domestic programs beyond the ability of our Government to pay the bills out of current revenues. I feel very strongly in this field because of the fact that we have just increased the national debt to $300 billion. If the message we have received is correct, the administration will once again appeal to the Congress for an increase in the national debt by some $8 billion more than the $300 billion, which we have just set as a temporary ceiling. This disturbs me greatly.

Then I look back at our committee, of which I am proud to be a member, and which is the revenue-producing committee of the Congress, and find that by an amendment to the bill which was not budgeted we now provide for an additional $180 million of back-door spending. If I really thought this amount of money was going to be channeled into the proper purpose, of relieving some of the aged people of my State and this Nation, I think maybe I could tolerate it, but there certainly is no direction, as far as the $140 million is concerned, that the intended recipients will ever receive $1 of the $140 million.

This legislation certainly has gone a long way to correct some of the abuses that the Federal bureaucracy have brought upon the States. In my fair State of Michigan our legislature deemed it advisable, and I believe they were prudent at the time, when they initiated the law to protect the children who were eligible for aid to dependent children funds; that is, they provided a suitable home provision. If the home were not suitable for the rearing of the child, then that home would not receive any aid to dependent children payment for the care of the child. But the State did not leave the child at the mercy of those who would take from the child its rights of support. They did provide that the family then would start to receive assistance in the form of welfare orders.

Because of these abuses, which existed in the State of Michigan, the recipients receiving the money for the care of the child were using it for purposes other than the care of the child. Now we have overcome this problem in the State of Michigan by an amendment in this legislation which will permit the suitable home provisions still to exist in the State statute. However, the welfare that goes to the child shall go directly to the child in such case where the courts may be able to take the child out of the home and put it in a suitable home. This, of course, would be within the discretion of the probate court and I know that the probate court will act in the best interest of the child.

Practically every section of this bill delegates power to the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare where they may promulgate administrative rules which are, in effect, law and the States must conform. I am reminded of the period of time when the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare appeared before our committee, and I confronted him with a statement that I had read in the press wherein he made the statement—

> that we expect the State to cooperate. If they do not cooperate and conform, then we get tough and we cut off their funds.

The Secretary said he stood by this statement.

That is the thing that I fear mostly as far as the delegation of power without some guidelines to any secretary, whether it be the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare or the secretary of some other agency.

I had requested, but I was not successful in the committee, to give to the States the right to appeal to the district court so that the court may determine whether the Department's regulations followed the intent of the Congress. I was not successful in getting the amendment in the bill, but I did feel that it would be in the best interest of the State if they had a right to go to the judicial branch to get the court's interpretation. We are the legislative branch, the executive is the administrative and, of course, the judicial should interpret the laws. But under this bill there is no appeal by the States to go into the courts to get a determination as to whether or not the administrative rulings go beyond the intent of the Congress. It is my hope that we can keep the Nation solvent. I do not want to see another increase in the national debt. Therefore, without any direction in this legislation that the recipients of old-age assistance shall receive an increase in the amount under this $140 million which is set forth in this legislation, then I shall have to vote to recommit the bill with instructions to strike the $140 million which is not budgeted but which will be somewhat of a windfall to the States. I favor the other provisions of the bill.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the distinguished gentleman from California [Mr. KING] 10 minutes.

Mr. KING of California. Mr. Chairman, I rise on H.R. 10606 in support of the bill.

The bill before the Committee today implements the basic provisions of President Kennedy's welfare message. It provides a new look at the Nation's welfare legislation. It has been arrived at after months of consideration by the executive branch and hearings and careful consideration by the Committee on Ways and Means.

The President wisely noted in his message:

> Our basic public welfare programs were enacted more than a quarter century ago. Their contribution to our national strength and well-being in the intervening years has been remarkable.
>
> But the times, the conditions, the problems have changed—and the nature and objectives of our public assistance and child welfare programs must be changed, also, if they are to meet our current needs.

These changes are provided in this legislation.

The bill will afford the States more favorable Federal matching to improve and broaden rehabilitation services toward the dual ends of both getting people off the assistance rolls and preventing others from coming on. These funds will also be available for the training of urgently needed social workers in whose hands the success of these rehabilitative efforts ultimately will lie.

The desired results will not be brought about immediately. Some people, particularly the families in the aid to dependent children program, have problems which will take patient and skillful handling if they are to be alleviated. But I believe it is imperative that our public assistance programs continue to evolve so that instead of simply paying money these programs can provide the kind of skilled services which will return individuals to independence and dignity.

Others have pointed out many of the detailed provisions of the bill: Aid to dependent children—ADC—payments on the basis of the unemployment of the parent; increase in Federal matching formula for the aged, the blind, and the disabled; increase in Federal funds for child welfare services, including day care of children; ADC payments for both parents; community work and training programs under aid to dependent children programs.

These are but a few of the more important provisions in this most significant revision of the public assistance and child welfare programs since the enactment of the social security law in 1935. President Kennedy in his message to the Congress on February 2, 1962, said:

> The goals of our public welfare programs must be positive and constructive—to create economic and social opportunities for the less fortunate—to help them find productive, happy, and independent lives. * * * It must contribute to the attack on dependency, juvenile delinquency, family breakdown, illegitimacy, ill health, and disability. It must reduce the incidence of these problems, prevent their occurrence and recurrence, and strengthen and protect the vulnerable in a highly competitive world.

Finally, let me say that we can enact this legislation in the confidence that experience has shown it will bring results. For, as the President pointed out in the conclusion of his message:

> Communities which have tried the rehabilitative road—the road I have recommended today—have demonstrated what can be done with creative, thoughtfully conceived, and properly managed programs of prevention and social rehabilitation. In those communities, families have been restored to self-reliance, and relief rolls have been reduced.

To strengthen our human resources—to demonstrate the compassion of freemen—and in the light of our own constructive self-interest—we must bring our welfare programs up to date.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROBISON].

Mr. ROBISON. Mr. Chairman, I take this time mainly because I find myself caught—and this is not an unusual situation here—caught between two directly opposing points of view concerning the administrative features of H.R. 10606.

The first of those points of view is that expressed in the report accompanying the bill which says:

This bill involves a new, constructive approach which, by taking account of changing conditions and the existence of new rehabilitative skills, will assist the States in meeting their responsibility for the development and administration of realistic and sound public welfare programs and provide the States with much greater flexibility in the development and administration of such programs in the light of their particular needs and conditions.

The other point of view to which I refer is that recently sent to me, and to most of the Representatives from the great State of New York, by the New York State Board of Social Welfare, a nonpartisan board which is the policy-making and supervising body for the New York State public welfare program. That study under date of February 20, 1962, is set forth in the daily CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for Monday of this week, on page A1830; if anyone cares to refer to it. I quote from the statement:

This board has been concerned over the years with the many problems that have stemmed from Federal-State relationships in the public welfare field, especially with the steadily increasing domination by Federal authorities and the consequent loss of State and local autonomy.

Skipping a couple of paragraphs:

Once again this board finds it necessary to express concern, its very real alarm, over another threat to extend Federal dominance in public welfare—the latest welfare proposals of the Federal Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. Here again, this board and the staff of the State department of social welfare do not quarrel with objectives—providing for needy people who must be helped, rehabilitating individuals who can profit thereby, and using every known modern technique for breaking the chain of dependency in sorely deprived families. Our anxiety arises from the specific ways and means proposed to reach these objectives.

These new proposals, if adopted by the Congress, would give the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare in Washington full power to dictate in detail to all the States, and therefore to all the thousands of local communities in the Nation that administer public welfare, just how it is to be managed—almost down to the last piece of paper.

The discretion vested in the Secretary is without limitations.

The philosophy implied and inherent is in flat contradiction to the historic concern of New York State and its localities for home rule, and ignores the basic right and responsibility of the State and its localities to decide how they will conduct their public business.

We believe that a stand must be made now, by this State and, hopefully, every other State, to stop and to reverse the trend of increasing Federal domination, of a growing complexity that is getting completely out of hand, and of the constant threats to withhold Federal funds because of alleged nonconformity with Federal regulations.

Mr. Chairman, there are the two contrasting points of view, one from the report and one from the New York State Board. Can a committee member from either side of the aisle—I have no preference—tell me who is right and who is wrong in this instance?

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROBISON. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. I think there is in this bill many areas that tend to project a further Federal control and a Federal domination, and I think that becomes the case as you place greater reliance on the Federal Government in its matching and financing of the program. That is one of the reasons why some of us have been opposed to the proposal which would change the matching formula for all the salaries of social workers in the States from 50 to 75 percent. When that happens, when the Federal Government becomes the dominant supplier of the funds, there will be a more dominant control over the program.

Mr. ROBISON. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROBISON. I yield to the gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. MILLS. I must admit in the use of this 75 percent Federal matching money there is more direction from the Federal Government with respect to the area of that use. That is by design, for the reason we want it used for purposes that will result in these people becoming self-supporting and capable of self-care. I will agree, therefore, that we are saying that the Secretary can have more latitude in that area. But in other parts of the bill everyone will admit we are giving the States greater discretion, greater control over the operation of the programs in some respects than they ever had in the case of abuses, getting people off the rolls that are not in the opinion of the State entitled to be there. Many people within the States are saying today they cannot get these people off because the Federal laws and regulations will not let them. We are giving them that latitude. So the bill does give this latitude to the States in cases of abuse, and it can be a relaxation of Federal intervention in the program.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. ZABLOCKI].

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Chairman, I would like to commend the chairman and the Committee on Ways and Means for including certain needed changes in the law to curtail abuses under the aid to dependent children and families program. These amendments are contained in sections 107 and 108 of the bill, H.R. 10606.

There have been numerous abuses in the aid to dependent children program. They resulted, primarily, from an intolerable situation created by administrative regulations. On the one hand, the law clearly stated that aid to dependent children was to be spent to meet the urgent needs, and to provide for the welfare of, needy children. On the other hand, Federal administrative regulations, devised by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, prevented both the State and local authorities from enforcing the purpose of the law.

In other words, under administrative interpretation of the law, if a State, or a local community, moved to curb abuses and misuse of welfare assistance, the local agency would lose the Federal contribution to the aid to dependent children program.

In order to remedy this situation, early last year I introduced a bill, H.R. 9168. It was my intention to bring some sense into the administration of this program. The remedy I proposed was twofold: First, enabling local authorities to correct abuses and, second, authorizing them—when other methods have failed—to substitute vouchers or commodity payments in lieu of dollar payments in cases in which the adult relative of the child persisted in spending the benefits for purposes other than the child's welfare.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ZABLOCKI. I am delighted to yield to the distinguished chairman, the gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. MILLS. The gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. ZABLOCKI] is to be congratulated for having brought this matter to the attention of the committee. The gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. BYRNES] and other members of the committee and I went into it in great detail. We were much impressed with the background and study and the work that the gentleman had done in preparing this example for use in the committee. What we have tried to do is to permit your State to take this action under its State law if it desires to do so, providing for voucher payments. That is included within the phrase "other action taken by the State under State law." I said so in the opening remarks I made on this bill.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. I want to thank the chairman and those on the committee who have agreed and accepted the amendments. In order to clarify a doubt in my mind I would like to ask a question regarding the definition of State agency. It is my understanding that the term "State agency" as used in sections 107 and 108 includes any duly constituted local public welfare agency. As I understand it, the local welfare agency is empowered to make a determination that payments of aid to families with dependent children made with respect to a child are not being used in the best interests of the child and, further, that local authorities can take steps to enforce State law which prohibits the misuse of welfare payments without the State or the locality losing its Federal contribution.

Mr. MILLS. The gentleman is correct. The term means State or local.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. It also means State or local in section 108, providing for protective payment.

Mr. MILLS. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. I thank the chairman.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ZABLOCKI. I am happy to yield to my distinguished friend, the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. I want to say to the gentleman that in the committee's consideration of this bill I think the information that the gentleman furnished in his appearance at the hearings of the committee and the facts relating to the bill which he had introduced was very instrumental in putting in the protective language that now appears on page 38 of the bill and which was referred to by the chairman. And, I think that the gentleman can take considerable credit for the fact that we here finally recognize the rights of the State to try and keep improper action out of these programs.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. I thank the distinguished gentleman from Wisconsin.

The Committee on Ways and Means has adopted only one-half of my proposal—even this half is much better than nothing because it corrects the condition brought about by executive branch regulation.

Under the committee's bill, local authorities will be able to enforce State laws aimed at the prevention of abuses in welfare programs, including the aid to dependent children program. This is very important. After all, if a locality or a State cannot enforce its own sound laws without losing Federal assistance, then Federal assistance is worthless because it destroys respect for law and order, and undermines the very foundations of our society.

I am glad, therefore, that the committee incorporated the basic intent of H.R. 9168 and I urge the membership of the House to approve this provision.

The committee bill contains another safeguard in the form of "protective payments" which may be made on behalf of a needy child to a third party, if the child's own parents or nearest relatives prove incapable of managing welfare assistance and persist in using public assistance for purposes unrelated to the welfare of the child. I believe, however, that this safeguard will prove of small value. The procedure which must be followed and exhausted before "protective payments" can be made is so cumbersome, and potentially so expensive, that I doubt the value of this remedy. Further, the committee's bill restricts it arbitrarily to 5 percent of the recipients—as if one could accurately predict and confine to statistical tables, human frailties of this kind.

I think that the committee should have also accepted the second part of my proposal, authorizing voucher and commodity payments in lieu of cash payments in really troublesome cases. It provided a much simpler, straightforward, and effective remedy to abuses. I hope that some day this provision will be enacted.

As things stand, I believe that half a loaf is better than none, and I wish to urge the House to approve the committee's recommendations.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. BALDWIN].

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. Chairman, a problem has developed in the State of California with regard to the qualification of many of the counties which place children in foster homes for aid under the aid to needy children program. Many of the counties in the State of California follow the procedure of placement of children in foster homes through the probation department at the direction of the juvenile court.

Mr. Chairman, I addressed a letter to the Secretary of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare on November 24, 1961, asking him this question:

> Will you please let me know whether a dependent child who has been placed in a foster home by the county probation department at the direction of the juvenile court can qualify for a Federal grant of aid to needy children funds according to the terms of Public Law 87-31?

Mr. Chairman, I received a reply from the Secretary of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, dated February 1, 1962, in which he answered as follows:

> Payments with respect to the child who has been placed in a foster home under the conditions which you have described would not meet the requirements for Federal financial participation in the aid to dependent children program.
>
> It seems clear, therefore, that the condition in section 408(a)(2) would be met only if the county social service department is given responsibility for placement and care of the child.

Mr. Chairman, this means that for these counties in California which place children in foster homes through the probation department at the direction of the juvenile court, in order to qualify under the provisions of the aid to dependent children program they would have to change their entire procedure and eliminate the placement through the probation department, and instead make the placement through the social welfare department, which is not the desire of the juvenile courts in the various counties, and not the desire of the people of the State of California.

As the chairman of the committee knows, I appeared before the committee during the hearings to recommend an amendment to section 408 of the Social Security Act which would make it possible for payments to be made when children are in foster homes and when the placement is made by any local agency authorized to place and supervise dependent children under the laws of the State. This would, therefore, make it possible for the California procedure to qualify.

I would like to ask the chairman if he would be willing to comment on the views of the committee on this amendment, and what prospects there may be of getting some amended wording of this kind enacted into law?

Mr. MILLS. If the gentleman from California would yield, the gentleman did call this matter to the attention of the committee in a very forceful manner, and in a very logical manner, during his appearance before the committee. The committee spent some time in executive session in consideration of the problem. As I understand it, in the gentleman's home State the juvenile court may decide that it wants to retain control and supervision of a child and place it in a foster home and not permit the child to be handed over to the control and supervision of the welfare department.

The gentleman's amendment suggested that in that instance Federal funds should be used or permitted to be used in matching State funds in the case of that child. There was objection by the Department of HEW to that particular approach. There was some question in my own mind as to whether or not we should permit Federal funds to be matched for the care of a dependent child not under the jurisdiction, to any extent, of the welfare department, but exclusively and solely under the jurisdiction of the juvenile court. I am sure your juvenile courts do a good job. Perhaps in California in many instances they do a better job of supervision than even the Welfare Department is doing. We directed the Department of HEW to go into this matter, as Mr. KING of California pointed out in his letter to Mr. Dunbar, in the hope that the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare could develop a solution and recommend an amendment to the Senate Finance Committee by the time the bill is considered by that committee. Mr. KING and Mr. UTT did pursue this matter at length in the committee because they both expressed great interest in a solution to the problem.

If a satisfactory solution is found and such an amendment is adopted over there it would be our hope that it would be possible for us to bring it back to you as a part of a conference report.

My own thought is that this matter might be resolved by permitting the juvenile court to retain supervision of the child in the foster home, except that the needs of the child, the question of his needs initially, the question of his continuing need, would have to be under the supervision and jurisdiction of the Welfare Department of the State of California. I think such an arrangement might be worked out between these two State agencies where the welfare department will determine the initial needs of this child in the foster home and continue then to determine whether the child remains in this "needy" situation. Supervision, control, and the rest of the child actions, things of that sort, could be in the hands of the juvenile court. Something like that might be worked out. I think it might be a reasonable solution of this problem between your two State agencies.

Mr. BALDWIN. As I understand the chairman, his view would be that the

placement could continue to be through the juvenile court and the probation department, and the supervision could continue to be through that procedure, although the financial payments and determination whether the child would qualify for financial payments would be under the jurisdiction of the welfare department of the State?

Mr. MILLS. Yes; that is my thought. The gentleman's amendment I think may well have gone beyond the placement in a foster home. As I understood, there is this additional thought; the juvenile court may permit this child under its jurisdiction to remain in the home of his relatives; that is, the father, the mother, or both. In that instance a little bit different problem is posed, as we see it. The court has jurisdiction there, assumes jurisdiction over only this particular child. There may be other children in the household. Also the parents are there. At the moment I do not know how that problem could be resolved, because the Welfare Department of California would have to look at the entire family situation. They would have control over the other children, the parents, the relatives. Maybe that, too, can be resolved.

But the point I was making in my response to the gentleman had reference to the placement in a foster home.

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. DURNO].

Mr. DURNO. Mr. Chairman, it is not my purpose to come before this body today to discuss the design of this bill which would give greater direction to the Federal authorities and result in greater centralization of power in Washington. But rather I come before this body as a Member and as a doctor who is very much interested in the public welfare problems. In the face possibly of offending the members of this committee and with a full realization that I am going to be talking about something which has been talked about since 1950, I want to direct the attention of this body to title 16, section 1602(a), No. 12, which says:

> Provided, that in determining whether an individual is blind, there shall be an examination by a physician skilled in the diseases of the eye or by an optometrist, whichever the individual may select.

In other words, we are trying to determine from this section whether a person is blind. I consider a careful examination of the eye ground of an individual is most important. From such an examination, glaucoma, high blood pressure, ocular malignancies, vascular diseases, diabetes, nephritis, and many other things may be determined, in the event that the person involved goes to a skilled physician of the eye to have that eye examination.

The problem I know in the committee has been a matter of ophthalmology versus optometry. I would say to you, it requires at least 7 years of training beyond the college level to become a full-fledged ophthalmologist and it requires a much lesser period of training to become an optometrist. The ophthalmologist is concerned basically and primarily with the diseases of the eye, and yet he has been schooled in the general field of medicine. The optometrist is basically concerned with refraction and not with the diseases of the eye, and he has not been trained to the same degree that the ophthalmologist has been trained. I will admit there are only 4,000 ophthalmologists and that there are 18,000 to 20,000 optometrists. But, I do not believe that is an excuse for not having the best kind of examination we can provide for these old people who are losing their eyesight.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DURNO. I am happy to yield to my colleague.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. I want to state to the gentleman in the hearings, beginning on page 501 and going on for some 40 or 50 pages there is documentation that was submitted to this committee on this subject, I offered an amendment to eliminate this in the Committee on Ways and Means and the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare stated that they were strongly behind this and had been behind it. The argument used, and I thought it was a very sorry argument in the committee, was, "Well, the AMA, that is the American Medical Association, is for this so we are against it because we do not like the American Medical Association."

Now the point is this, and I am glad the gentleman who is a distinguished doctor is calling to the attention of the House the seriousness of this matter in the area of human suffering. To think that this matter would have been decided in our committee on the basis that it was, in my judgment, is a shame. I am very pleased that the gentleman is calling the attention of the House to this matter. It should be eliminated from the bill. It should never have been put in the bill back in 1950. The Department of Health, Education, and Welfare has recommended against it and all professional testimony points to the reason for eliminating it, because of the human values involved, why these people should be examined by a competent eye doctor.

Mr. DURNO. I thank the gentleman from Missouri for his comments.

Mr. Chairman, I just want to say and repeat my oft-repeated assertion, I am not a mouthpiece for the AMA. I am a doctor trying to do a good job on the floor of the House of Representatives. I think I have just as many good friends in the optometric profession as I have in the medical profession. Many of these people realize their limitations, but there are others of them who do not, and two wrongs or three wrongs do not make a right. I am concerned about these aged people. I am concerned about their eyesight. I am very sorry that this committee, in its wisdom, has not seen fit in the determination of blindness to limit this examination to a physician who is skilled in the diseases of the eye.

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. DURNO. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. ALGER. Is it not true in the testimony, there were a number of cases given where people lost their eyesight because of improper diagnosis which an ophthalmologist could have prevented?

Mr. DURNO. That is correct. There are a number of cases in the hearings. I have practiced medicine for 30 years before I came to this Congress. On numerous occasions, I saw people, who came to my office who had first gone to an optometrist.

I have had neurosurgical training and know something about the eye. I would refer such patients to an ophthalmologist.

So I would ask this Committee to advise the conferees when this matter goes to conference that they carefully consider eliminating the optometry provisions of this bill.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, as has been said by many previous speakers, in general the purposes of this bill are very laudable; in fact, I think the time is long past due when this Congress should take action to encourage the States to take appropriate action to put people in a position where they do not need to continue under a public assistance program, to use rehabilitation techniques, to use preventive techniques. In its emphasis on that phase of our public assistance program I think this bill makes a laudable step in the right direction. I think also there is material improvement under this program in the programs for dependent children.

I would, however, at this late hour and since we are practically ready to vote on this measure, put particular emphasis on two phases of this bill with which we on the minority disagree. One, which I will mention briefly, is the change in the Federal contribution to the States for the cost of the preventive and rehabilitative services from 50 to 75 percent. The chairman has suggested we are doing this because we are requiring greater emphasis on preventive and rehabilitative services. Mr. Chairman, I think we can apply that same emphasis without necessarily making the Federal Government the dominant partner in this undertaking. What is wrong, pray tell, with the proposition where the Federal Government matches the State funds on a 50–50 basis? This program, as most of these programs, is considered to be a program of Federal-State, not a Federal program, but a Federal-State program, with the State government having general control and determination as to the direction in which the program moves.

I suggest to the members of this committee that when we move from the 50- to the 75-percent matching formula in any of these programs we invite the further domination by the Federal Government, and we do not in any way necessarily improve the program. I would call your attention to the minority report and the history of the experience we had under the program of specialized training where we matched on a 50–50

basis until 1956. Then we changed the law to where we would match on an 80–20 basis. It was not implemented by the Congress or by the Appropriations Committee.

Then we changed it in 1961 to a 100 percent program. It still has not been implemented. Why? I think the reason was very well expressed by the Senate Committee on Appropriations when that committee said in its report in the 86th Congress:

> Federal financial participation has for many years been available in expenditures for educational leave granted for the purpose of developing and training personnel, such expenditures to be borne equally by the Federal and the State Governments.
>
> The States have made little use of the authority to train their employees with the Federal Government paying one-half of the cost. The amount sought in this item would have been on the basis of 80 percent Federal participation, 20 percent State. It is the committee's view that sufficient authority and sufficient funds are available in the appropriation for grants to States for public assistance to permit the training of each and every individual in the State groups who needs such training.

That is on the basis of a 50–50 matching formula.

As far as I am concerned, Mr. Chairman, I believe that the Appropriations Committee is basically right in the approach it has taken to this matter of matching beyond the 50 percent level.

Let me now address myself to that item of this bill which will be the subject of a motion to recommit. It is my intention at the proper time to offer a motion to recommit, with instructions to strike out that part of this bill which would change the Federal contribution to the States for public assistance payments by increasing from $24.80 out of the first $31 under existing law to $29 out of the first $35 under the bill and increasing the limit from $66 to $70, which would be subject to Federal matching.

Let me point out that this is an aid to the States program, not to the individual, not to any person receiving aid under the public assistance programs.

This item was never justified before the committee, was not asked for by any State appearing before the committee, was not discussed in the hearings, was not brought before the committee until the last day of the committee's consideration of this bill, and, may I add further, is opposed by the administration. This item does not assure that any additional funds will go to public assistance recipients. The chairman in stating his justification for this item on the floor today painted a picture of these poor people on public assistance which, he said, have been shown to be in need, and that we should therefore provide this money for them. He recited the history of the changes made in the Federal participation in this area. But may I recall a part of the history that I think the chairman should have brought to our attention. Every time we have made this kind of an increase, the following year there have been letters to Members of Congress from those on old-age assistance, and other aid assistance programs, to the effect: "I read in the newspaper where you increased by $5 or $4 or $1 the amount that we were supposed to get under our old-age assistance, but we are not getting it."

What did we have to do? We had to write back and say, "I guess that is true, because the State did not do it. There is no way we can force the State to do it." And we cannot. The State can use this $140 million in any way it sees fit. I would also point out that it is a permanent increase. You will never revert back. You will again have the Federal Government paying a greater and greater share of this aspect of the program. Today you are already paying $24.80 out of the first $30 of every State payment.

Mr. ICHORD of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. ICHORD of Missouri. I am inclined to support the gentleman's motion to recommit. However, does the motion to recommit strike out the section of the bill making a permanent program for the employable unemployed?

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. No. The only thing that the motion to recommit will do will be to strike out that last-minute addition to this bill, which has to do with increasing the Federal contribution to the States for public assistance programs. The motion if adopted would leave the law as it is today in that area. We do not change the $1 temporary addition that was put into the law and which this bill extends and puts on a permanent basis.

Mr. ICHORD of Missouri. I think the most dangerous thing is putting it on a permanent basis.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. You may be right.

Before we vote let me make one further point. We just recently were called upon to increase the public debt limit by $2 billion because the Government had spent beyond its income. We will shortly be asked to provide a further increase in the debt limit of $8 billion, bringing the debt ceiling to an alltime high of $308 billion. Your vote on this motion to recommit will indicate whether you will not put a stop to bigger and bigger deficits and debt. I trust you will vote for the motion to recommit and remove this unneeded and unbudgeted item of $140 million per year from the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin has expired.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 3 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, I must admit, as I said a few minutes ago, to the general observation of my friend from Wisconsin that there is nothing specific in this bill that requires this $4 additional that is involved in his motion to recommit to be paid by the State agency to people who are on old age assistance, aid to the blind, and aid to the disabled programs, but I want to call his attention to certain experience we have had. The fact is that in the past we have accepted such amendments offered in the other body when we were in conference, and the House has agreed to the conference report, often hardly paying any attention to what the Senate had done or without raising too much objection, let me say, though these matters are always discussed extensively in the conference. But in spite of the fact that in none of these five instances since 1946 has there been any specific direction to the State that these additional dollars had to be paid to these individuals, those moneys have been, in large part, paid to the people who were then on public assistance, aid to the blind, and aid to dependent children programs. I referred to that experience earlier when I spoke.

In October 1946 we increased Federal participation by $5. At the end of 12 months the average payment to the people under old-age assistance had been increased by $4.35. The remaining 65 cents had been used by the State not to reduce its contribution but in all probability to place additional people, found by the State to be in need, on the rolls. We were advised of no instance where the States reduced the amount of money that was made available by their own treasury for this purpose. There was similar experience in 1948, 1952, 1956; and, we get down to October 1958. In that instance we provided $4.73 average increase primarily as the result of the action by the House in that case. In that instance some of that money—not all of it but about $1.73 on the average, I am informed—did not go to the individual recipients of old-age assistance in dollar payments but went in implementation of their medical care. However, even so, 12 months later the average payments had increased by $3.

Now, the gentleman says that the administration downtown is opposed to this amendment. I must admit that the administration did not suggest this amendment. The administration did not ask me to offer the amendment when we were in committee. The administration may be against the amendment, but if the administration is against the amendment, they have not told me so in terms that they have asked me to see that it was defeated.

I will tell those of you who are concerned about other things what this money can be used for.

This money can be used—every dollar of it can be used, if the State wants to use it for that purpose—to provide enlarged medical benefits for these people. Did the gentleman realize that? Every dollar of it could be used for that purpose, but every dollar of it has to be used in behalf of these people and their needs. It cannot be used for any other purpose. The history of it is that when the Federal Government has done this, the States have not withdrawn their amounts of money and merely absorbed these Federal dollars. But the people for whom these programs are established have benefited as a result of the Federal action.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLS. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. First, I think maybe we ought to get it clear here whether the administration is for or

against it. I was advised in the committee by the spokesman for the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare that they were against it.

Mr. MILLS. Oh, yes, they said that in the committee, I know. They have not told me from downtown that they are dissatisfied with this amendment.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. MILLS. Yes.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Has the gentleman ever found the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare dissatisfied when somebody was going to give them some money that they might have control over, or could spend?

Mr. MILLS. Yes; like any other department of Government sometimes they are dissatisfied when somebody in Congress comes up with an idea that they did not conceive.

Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. BURKE].

Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, there are a number of provisions of H.R. 10606 which I believe are particularly important.

This bill extends the highly significant provision we enacted last year, on a temporary basis, which authorized Federal matching as to families where the breadwinner is unemployed. Previous law had restricted Federal participation solely to families in need because of the death, disability, or absence of the parent. The traditional arguments of earlier years did not seem persuasive to us, and we determined that this distinction was not justifiable. The bill before the House today would extend this program for 5 years.

To complement this provision, we are allowing, for the first time, Federal matching as to work and training projects, if they are inaugurated by the States and localities, and provided they comply with certain work and health standards prescribed in the bill. Also of great importance on this broadened concept of the role of the aid-to-dependent-children program is the section of this bill which authorizes Federal matching as to both parents in unemployment and disability cases, and making permanent the foster-care program we established last year.

To provide comparable assistance to the other federally aided programs—those for the aged, the blind, and the disabled—the bill also provides additional matching so that the States could increase payments by as much as $4 a month over what is now provided under last year's temporary legislation which will expire on June 30 of this year.

In addition, the authorization for child welfare services would be increased above the present maximum of $25 million to $30 million beginning in 1963, ascending upward in logical steps consistent with the expansion of this very important program until it reaches $50 million in the year 1969 and thereafter.

Many factors contribute to the need to expand child welfare services as rapidly as possible. Important among them are, first, continued increase in total child population; second, continued urbanization, bringing increased child welfare problems at the same time that there are still critical unmet needs in rural areas; and, third, continued rise in costs of those services.

This expansion of the preventive and protective services for children is urgently needed not only because of its importance to the rehabilitation of families receiving money payments through aid to dependent children, but also because it provides a wider range of constructive welfare services. The provision of such services puts to work the rehabilitative skills we are developing to help people get through the variety of family tragedies which affect the well-being of many children today.

Special attention is also given to the provision of day care services by earmarking $5 million of the child welfare appropriations for fiscal 1963 to be used for this purpose. In subsequent years under the higher authorizations, this earmarked amount would be increased to as much as $10 million a year. I will cite just one example of the need for this provision. The results of a survey conducted by the Children's Bureau in 1958 showed that 400,000 children under 12, whose mothers were working full time, were caring for themselves without any planned supervision.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLS. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. I would like to ask the gentleman this: After listening to the debate on this bill all afternoon I would like to ask the gentleman where this additional $140 million each year is going to come from? Who is going to pay the bill? Where is the money going to come from?

The gentleman is going to bring to the House, I understand, yet another bill to increase the debt limit by about $8 billion.

Mr. MILLS. Well, the gentleman from Arkansas is not so advised, I will say to his friend from Iowa, that he intends to come in with it immediately.

Mr. GROSS. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. MILLS. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. GROSS. Where is the $140 million going to come from? The Government is borrowing money now in the billions.

Mr. MILLS. This comes from the general fund of the Treasury, just where all of these other amounts that have been made available to public assistance come from.

Mr. GROSS. Borrowed money? The Government this year is faced with refinancing the staggering total of $56 billion.

Mr. MILLS. That will depend entirely on what the House does with respect to a number of other matters. But I think the gentleman from Iowa would agree with me that we are dealing here with a group of people who are on the lowest rung of the economic ladder. If we are going to start practicing economy on them, there are a lot of other places in which we might practice economy also.

Mr. GROSS. I will say to the gentleman from Arkansas that I think we need to go right across the board with economy if this Nation is to be saved from bankruptcy.

Mr. RYAN of New York. Mr. Chairman, I support H.R. 10606, the administration bill entitled "Public Welfare Amendments of 1962."

This bill contains a number of amendments to the public assistance and child welfare titles of the Social Security Act. I believe that these changes, for the most part, are sound policy in the field of public welfare. Under the bill greater emphasis is placed on positive action in the interests of welfare recipients. The bill provides, among other things, for increased Federal support under the State public assistance programs for rehabilitative services to promote self-sufficiency among applicants and recipients. They will be afforded, as they should be, an opportunity to become productive individuals, able to support and care for themselves.

In order to help furnish rehabilitative services, more and better trained public welfare personnel are needed throughout the country. The bill recognizes this need and provides that the increased Federal matching may be used to train persons who are employed or preparing to work in State or local welfare agencies.

Among the other public assistance amendments of the bill one of the most noteworthy is a provision to increase the Federal matching formula to provide higher payments for the needy aged, blind, and disabled. Under this amendment the monthly checks of recipients may be increased by as much as $4 a month—a small amount in relation to today's prices, but a significant amount in relation to the payments that are now being made.

The remaining provisions of H.R. 10606 include provisions to coordinate the child welfare and dependent children programs and the extension of temporary legislation enacted last year providing aid to dependent children of unemployed parents, Federal support for foster care of dependent children and aid to distressed American citizens returning from abroad.

However, I am disappointed with certain aspects of this bill. Several provisions that were included in the original administration bill, H.R. 10032, were omitted from the clean bill, H.R. 10606, reported out of committee.

The bill that was first introduced carried a provision which would have required the States to reduce their residence requirements for people who apply for benefits under the programs for the aged, blind, and disabled. Under present law the States may impose a residence requirement which excludes an individual who has not been a resident of the State for 5 of the last 9 years and continuously for the year preceding his application for aid. This is inhumane and unconscionable. It fails to meet the needs of our highly mobile population. A person who has lived and worked in a

State for 2, 3, or 4 years who becomes disabled or blind cannot qualify for aid under such a State requirement.

H.R. 10032 would have prohibited the imposition of a residence requirement of more than 1 year. It would also have provided an increase in Federal matching for States which abolish residence requirements in their public assistance programs. Social justice demands an end to retrogressive State residence requirements.

I regret that neither of these provisions is included in the bill under discussion and that the closed rule prevents me from offering appropriate amendments.

I am equally distressed that a provision in H.R. 10032 removing the dollar limitation on Federal patricipation in public assistance payments in Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands, and Guam was omitted from the reported bill. Instead of complete repeal, H.R. 10606 provides for a modest increase in these dollar limitations.

The repeal of the dollar limitations would, in effect, have afforded Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands, and Guam equal treatment with the States. There are no dollar limitations applying to the States. But for Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands, and Guam the Social Security Act in one place establishes dollar-for-dollar matching in the public assistance programs, while in another place it puts a dollar limitation on Federal participation which, if adequate assistance is provided under the programs, prevents the Federal Government from matching local funds on a dollar-for-dollar basis.

The Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, for instance, in fiscal 1961 supplied 53.8 percent of the funds spent on public assistance. The Federal Government, which is supposed to supply 50 percent of these funds, in actual fact supplied only 46.2 percent of them because of the dollar limitation.

The bill under consideration would alleviate this condition somewhat by raising the amount of the dollar limitations. In my opinion the limitations should be abolished completely as H.R. 10032 provided. This in turn would furnish a strong incentive for improved welfare programs.

With these reservations, Mr. Chairman, I support the bill under debate.

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Chairman, this bill, H.R. 10606, is the type of legislation which, so to speak, separates the men from the boys.

To oppose it is to invite a charge that one is opposed to extending and improving public assistance and child welfare.

However, certainly there is no justification for increasing the Federal cost of these programs in the amount of $180 million over and above the budget request of President Kennedy. Also, I would point out that this bill is back door spending in that it is such as to make appropriations mandatory in order to provide funds to the States authorized by the bill.

Furthermore, Mr. Chairman, this bill does not mean an increase to the individual recipient. Rather it undertakes to have the Federal share of the cost of the program increased. So a State can reduce its own contribution, and not pass these funds on to the recipients.

In the case of my State of Washington, the increase in the Federal share would be about $2.6 million, and much as I would like to help out my State I feel such a change in the formula would serve to diminish the incentive to a State to save and prevent waste. Always I find that a State under the difficulty of raising its own money is thereby more careful in spending.

There is much in H.R. 10606 that has merit. If the $180 million over the amount asked by the President is cut out I will probably vote for final passage, but otherwise I will vote "no" in the interest of holding down the national debt and in trying to balance the budget.

Mr. GARMATZ. Mr. Chairman, over the years, Congress has consistently pointed to the old-age, survivors, and disability insurance program as the basic family protection against destitution in a worker's old age, or in case of his death or disability—protection which can be supplemented by other private and public plans as well as by individual thrift.

Today over 16½ million people are receiving social security benefits totaling over $1 billion monthly.

Among these people are over 1 million disabled workers and their dependents who receive over $68 million a month in benefits under the disability insurance program. In Maryland alone nearly 14,000 disabled workers and their dependents are receiving benefits totaling $933,000 monthly.

Today special tribute is being paid to the Bureau of Old-Age and Survivors Insurance, the agency which administers the social security disability insurance program, the newest and in many respects the most difficult social insurance program, from an administrative standpoint.

Newest, in that the protection against the risk of disability was provided nearly 2 decades after the passage of the original Social Security Act in 1935. The most difficult to administer because disability determinations involve many more complicated considerations than does the process of determining eligibility for old-age or survivors benefits. Generally it is easy to find out when a given age has been reached or when death has occurred. However, in making a determination of disability, complex medical and vocational facts must be considered within the framework of the definition of disability in the social security law.

In addition, the disability determination is made by an agency in the State where the worker resides. The Bureau had to establish an effective working basis for this new and unique governmental relationship with the States. This meant bringing into being an administrative framework and assembling the technical skills needs to handle the complex problem of disability evaluation and establishing policies and procedures that lead to uniform treatment of all applicants regardless of where they file their claims. Currently there are 56 State agencies representing all States, the District of Columbia, and Puerto Rico under contract to the Federal Government. Most of these are State vocational rehabilitation agencies. In Maryland the division of vocational rehabilitation makes the disability determinations for workers residing here.

Although Congress had considered adding disability protection to the social security program as early as 1949 it was not until 1954 that the disability freeze provision was enacted. Under this provision a disabled worker's social security earnings record can be frozen so that the period during which he is disabled is not counted against him in computing future benefits or in determining his insured status. To qualify for the freeze a worker was required to meet the same general requirements that he does today to receive cash disability benefits.

In 1956 the social security amendments provided for cash disability benefits for workers 50 to 64 years of age, and cash benefits were provided for adult sons and daughters of retired or deceased workers if their disabilities began in childhood, i.e., under 18 years of age.

It was not until 1958, however, that cash benefits were provided for the dependents of disabled workers including those with childhood disabilities, thus bringing the disability provisions more closely in line with the provisions applicable to old-age insurance benefits.

The 1960 amendments removed the age 50 requirement for payment of cash disability benefits, so that now disabled workers of any age and their dependents are eligible for monthly disability payments.

Congress recognized the importance of helping the disabled start back on the road to work. The Social Security Act contains a declaration of policy by the Congress that disabled persons applying for disability benefits be promptly referred for vocational rehabilitation services. Specific provisions in the law also provide incentives for returning to work as well as encouraging the disabled worker to accept vocational rehabilitation services. For example, the 1960 amendments provided a trial work period of 12 months during which beneficiaries who work despite a severe handicap may continue to receive disability benefits. In administering the disability program, the Bureau has worked closely with the Office of Vocational Rehabilitation to facilitate the referral of disability applicants to rehabilitation agencies so that they may be enabled to resume their roles as productive members of society.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the bill is considered as having been read for amendment and no amendments are in order to the bill except amendments offered by direction of the Committee on Ways and Means.

(The bill is as follows:)

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act, with the following table of contents, may be cited as the "Public Welfare Amendments of 1962".

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Title I—Public welfare amendments

Part A—Improvements in Services To Prevent or Reduce Dependency

Sec. 101. Services and other administrative costs under public assistance programs.
(a) Federal financial participation in costs of services.
(b) State plan provisions for services.
Sec. 102. Expansion and improvement of child welfare services.
(a) Increase in authorization of appropriations.
(b) Coordination with dependent children program and extension of child welfare services.
(c) Allotments for day care.
(d) Definition of child-welfare program.
Sec. 103. Welfare services for each child under dependent children program.
Sec. 104. Technical amendments to reflect emphasis on rehabilitation and other services.
Sec. 105. Community work and training programs.
Sec. 106. Incentives for employment through consideration of expenses in earning income, and provision for future needs of dependent children.
Sec. 107. Use of payments for benefit of child.
Sec. 108. Protective payments under dependent children program.
Sec. 109. Aid for spouse of relative with whom dependent child is living.

Part B—Improvement in Administration Through Demonstrations, Training, and Public Advisory Groups

Sec. 121. Advisory council on public welfare.
Sec. 122. Waiver of State plan requirements for demonstrations.
Sec. 123. Training grants for public welfare personnel.

Part C—Improvement of Public Welfare Programs Through Extension of Temporary Provisions and Increase in Federal Share of Public Assistance Payments

Sec. 131. Extension of aid with respect to dependent children of unemployed parents or in foster family homes.
(a) Extension with respect to children of unemployed parents.
(b) Extension with respect to foster family home care.
Sec. 132. Increase in Federal share of public assistance payments.
Sec. 133. Extension of assistance to repatriated American citizens.
Sec. 134. Refusal of unemployed parent to accept retraining.
Sec. 135. Federal payments for foster care in child-care institutions.
Sec. 136. Certain State plans not meeting income and resources requirements for the blind.

Part D—Simplification of Categories

Sec. 141. Optional combined State plan for aged, blind, and disabled.

Part E—Miscellaneous and Technical Amendments

Sec. 151. Increase in limitation on total public assistance payments to Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands, and Guam.
Sec. 152. Payments to relative of child when child is dependent.
Sec. 153. Definitions of "State" and "United States".
Sec. 201. Meaning of Term "Secretary."
Sec. 202. Effective dates.

TITLE I—PUBLIC WELFARE AMENDMENTS

Part A—Improvement in services to prevent or reduce dependency

Services and Other Administrative Costs Under Public Assistance Programs

Federal financial participation in costs of services

SEC. 101.(a)(1) Section 3(a) of the Social Security Act is amended by striking out paragraph (4) and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

"(4) in the case of any State, an amount equal to the sum of the following proportions of the total amounts expended during such quarter as found necessary by the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare for the proper and efficient administration of the State plan—

"(A) 75 per centum of so much of such expenditures as are for—

"(i) services which are prescribed pursuant to section 2(a)(10) and are provided (in accordance with the next sentence) to applicants for or recipients of assistance under the plan to help them attain or retain capability for self-care, or

"(ii) other services, specified by the Secretary as likely to prevent or reduce dependency, so provided to such applicants or recipients, or

"(iii) any of the services prescribed pursuant to section 2(a)(10), and of the services specified as provided in clause (ii), which the Secretary may specify as appropriate for individuals who, within such period or periods as the Secretary may prescribe, have been or are likely to become applicants for or recipients of assistance under the plan, if such services are requested by such individuals and are provided to such individuals in accordance with the next sentence, or

"(iv) the training of personnel employed or preparing for employment by the State agency or by the local agency administering the plan in the political subdivision; plus

"(B) one-half of so much of such expenditures (not included under subparagraph (A)) as are for services provided (in accordance with the next sentence) to applicants for or recipients of assistance under the plan, and to individuals requesting such services who (within such period or periods as the Secretary may prescribe) have been or are likely to become applicants for or recipients of such assistance; plus

"(C) one-half of the remainder of such expenditures.

The services referred to in subparagraphs (A) and (B) shall include only—

"(D) services provided by the staff of the State agency, or of the local agency administering the State plan in the political subdivision, and

"(E) subject to limitations prescribed by the Secretary, services which in the judgment of the State agency cannot be as economically or as effectively provided by the staff of such State or local agency and are not otherwise reasonably available to individuals in need of them, and which are provided, pursuant to agreement with the State agency, by the State health authority or the State agency or agencies administering or supervising the administration of the State plan for vocational rehabilitation services approved under the Vocational Rehabilitation Act or by any other State agency which the Secretary may determine to be appropriate (whether provided by its staff or by contract with public (local) or nonprofit private agencies); except that any such services which are defined as vocational rehabilitation services under the Vocational Rehabilitation Act and which are available, from the State agency or agencies administering or supervising the administration of the State plan for vocational rehabilitation services, to individuals under programs for their rehabilitation carried on under such State plan, may be provided only by such State agency or agencies (in the manner described in subparagraph (E)) except to the extent agreed to by such State agency or agencies. The portion of the amount expended for administration of the State plan to which subparagraph (A) applies and the portion thereof to which subparagraphs (B) and (C) apply shall be determined in accordance with such methods and procedures as may be permitted by the Secretary."

(2) Section 403(a) of such Act is amended to read as follows:

"(a) From the sums appropriated therefor, the Secretary shall pay to each State which has an approved plan for aid and services to needy families with children, for each quarter, beginning with the quarter commencing October 1, 1958—

"(1) in the case of any State other than Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands, and Guam, an amount equal to the sum of the following proportions of the total amounts expended during such quarter as aid to families with dependent children under the State plan (including expenditures for insurance premiums for medical or any other type of remedial care or the cost thereof)—

"(A) fourteen-seventeenths of such expenditures, not counting so much of any expenditure with respect to any month as exceeds the product of $17 multiplied by the total number of recipients of aid to families with dependent children for such month (which total number, for purposes of this subsection, means (i) the number of individuals with respect to whom such aid in the form of money payments is paid for such month, plus (ii) the number of other individuals with respect to whom expenditures were made in such month as aid to families with dependent children in the form of medical or any other type of remedial care); plus

"(B) the Federal percentage of the amount by which such expenditures exceed the maximum which may be counted under clause (A), not counting so much of any expenditure with respect to any month as exceeds the product of $30 multiplied by the total number of recipients of aid to families with dependent children for such month;

"(2) in the case of Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands, and Guam, an amount equal to one-half of the total of the sums expended during such quarter as aid to families with dependent children under the State plan (including expenditures for insurance premiums for medical or any other type of remedial care or the cost thereof), not counting so much of any expenditure with respect to any month as exceeds $18 multiplied by the total number of recipients of such aid for such month; and

"(3) in the case of any State, an amount equal to the sum of the following proportions of the total amounts expended during such quarter as found necessary by the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare for the proper and efficient administration of the State plan—

"(A) 75 per centum of so much of such expenditures as are for—

"(i) services which are prescribed pursuant to section 402(a)(12) and are provided (in accordance with the next sentence) to any relative, specified in section 406(a), with whom any dependent child (applying for or receiving aid to families with dependent children) is living in order to help such relative attain or retain capability for self-support or self-care, or services which are so prescribed and so provided in order to maintain and strengthen family life for any such child, or

"(ii) other services, specified by the Secretary as likely to prevent or reduce dependency, so provided to any such child or relative, or

"(iii) any of the services prescribed pursuant to section 402(a)(12), and of the serv-

ices specified as provided in clause (ii), which the Secretary may specify as appropriate for any relative specified in section 406(a) with whom any child (who, within such period or periods as the Secretary may prescribe, has been or is likely to become an applicant for or recipient of aid to families with dependent children) is living, or as appropriate for such a child, if such services are requested by such relative and are provided to such relative or child in accordance with the next sentence, or

"(iv) the training of personnel employed or preparing for employment by the State agency or by the local agency administering the plan in the political subdivision; plus

"(B) one-half of so much of such expenditures (not included under subparagraph (A)) as are for services provided (in accordance with the next sentence) to any child who is an applicant for or recipient of assistance under the plan or who requests such services and (within such period or periods as the Secretary may prescribe) has been or is likely to become an applicant for or recipient of such assistance, or so provided to any relative, specified in section 406(a), with whom such a child is living; plus

"(C) one-half of the remainder of such expenditures.

The services referred to in subparagraphs (A) and (B) shall include only—

"(D) services provided by the staff of the State agency, or of the local agency administering the State plan in the political subdivision, and

"(E) subject to limitations prescribed by the Secretary, services which in the judgment of the State agency cannot be as economically or as effectively provided by the staff of such State or local agency and are not otherwise reasonably available to individuals in need of them, and which are provided, pursuant to agreement with the State agency, by the State health authority or the State agency or agencies administering or supervising the administration of the State plan for vocational rehabilitation services approved under the Vocational Rehabilitation Act or by any other State agency which the Secretary may determine to be appropriate (whether provided by its staff or by contract with public (local) or nonprofit private agencies);

except that any such services which are defined as vocational rehabilitation services under the Vocational Rehabilitation Act and which are available, from the State agency or agencies administering or supervising the administration of the State plan for vocational rehabilitation services, to individuals under programs for their rehabilitation carried on under such State plan, may be provided only by such State agency or agencies (in the manner described in subparagraph (E)) except to the extent agreed to by such State agency or agencies. The portion of the amount expended for administration of the State plan to which subparagraph (A) applies and the portion thereof to which subparagraphs (B) and (C) apply shall be determined in accordance with such methods and procedures as may be permitted by the Secretary."

(3) Section 1003(a) of such Act (as amended by section 132(b) of this Act) is amended by striking out clause (3) and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

"(3) in the case of any State, an amount equal to the sum of the following proportions of the total amounts expended during such quarter as found necessary by the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare for the proper and efficient administration of the State plan—

"(A) 75 per centum of so much of such expenditures as are for—

"(i) services which are prescribed pursuant to section 1002(a)(13) and are provided (in accordance with the next sentence) to applicants for or recipients of aid to the blind to help them attain or retain capability for self-support or self-care, or

"(ii) other services, specified by the Secretary as likely to prevent or reduce dependency, so provided to such applicants or recipients, or

"(iii) any of the services prescribed pursuant to section 1002(a)(13), and of the services specified as provided in clause (ii), which the Secretary may specify as appropriate for individuals who, within such period or periods as the Secretary may prescribe, have been or are likely to become applicants for or recipients of aid to the blind, if such services are requested by such individuals and are provided to such individuals in accordance with the next sentence, or

"(iv) the training of personnel employed or preparing for employment by the State agency or by the local agency administering the plan in the political subdivision; plus

"(B) one-half of so much of such expenditures (not included under subparagraph (A)) as are for services provided (in accordance with the next sentence) to applicants for or recipients of aid to the blind, and to individuals requesting such services who (within such period or periods as the Secretary may prescribe) have been or are likely to become applicants for or recipients of such aid; plus

"(C) one-half of the remainder of such expenditures.

The services referred to in subparagraphs (A) and (B) shall include only—

"(D) services provided by the staff of the State agency, or of the local agency administering the State plan in the political subdivision, and

"(E) subject to limitations prescribed by the Secretary, services which in the judgment of the State agency cannot be as economically or as effectively provided by the staff of such State or local agency and are not otherwise reasonably available to individuals in need of them, and which are provided, pursuant to agreement with the State agency, by the State health authority or the State agency or agencies administering or supervising the administration of the State plan for vocational rehabilitation services approved under the Vocational Rehabilitation Act or by any other State agency which the Secretary may determine to be appropriate (whether provided by its staff or by contract with public (local) or nonprofit private agencies);

except that any such services which are defined as vocational rehabilitation services under the Vocational Rehabilitation Act and which are available, from the State agency or agencies administering or supervising the administration of the State plan for vocational rehabilitation services, to individuals under programs for their rehabilitation carried on under such State plan, may be provided only by such State agency or agencies (in the manner described in subparagraph (E)) except to the extent agreed to by such State agency or agencies. The portion of the amount expended for administration of the State plan to which subparagraph (A) applies and the portion thereof to which subparagraphs (B) and (C) apply shall be determined in accordance with such methods and procedures as may be permitted by the Secretary."

(4) Section 1403(a) of such Act (as amended by section 132(c) of this Act) is amended by striking out clause (3) and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

"(3) in the case of any State, an amount equal to the sum of the following proportions of the total amounts expended during such quarter as found necessary by the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare for the proper and efficient administration of the State plan—

"(A) 75 per centum of so much of such expenditures as are for—

"(i) services which are prescribed pursuant to section 1402(a)(12) and are provided (in accordance with the next sentence) to applicants for or recipients of aid to the permanently and totally disabled to help them attain or retain capability for self-support or self-care, or

"(ii) other services, specified by the Secretary as likely to prevent or reduce dependency, so provided to such applicants or recipients, or

"(iii) any of the services prescribed pursuant to section 1402(a)(12), and of the services specified as provided in clause (ii), which the Secretary may specify as appropriate for individuals who, within such period or periods as the Secretary may prescribe, have been or are likely to become applicants for or recipients of aid to the permanently and totally disabled, if such services are requested by such individuals and are provided to such individuals in accordance with the next sentence, or

"(iv) the training of personnel employed or preparing for employment by the State agency or by the local agency administering the plan in the political subdivision; plus

"(B) one-half of so much of such expenditures (not included under subparagraph (A)) as are for services provided (in accordance with the next sentence) to applicants for or recipients of aid to the permanently and totally disabled, and to individuals requesting such services who (within such period or periods as the Secretary may prescribe) have been or are likely to become applicants for or recipients of such aid; plus

"(C) one-half of the remainder of such expenditures.

The services referred to in subparagraphs (A) and (B) shall include only—

"(D) services provided by the staff of the State agency, or of the local agency administering the State plan in the political subdivision, and

"(E) subject to limitations prescribed by the Secretary, services which in the judgment of the State agency cannot be as economically or as effectively provided by the staff of such State or local agency and are not otherwise reasonably available to individuals in need of them, and which are provided, pursuant to agreement with the State agency, by the State health authority or the State agency or agencies administering or supervising the administration of the State plan for vocational rehabilitation services approved under the Vocational Rehabilitation Act or by any other State agency which the Secretary may determine to be appropriate (whether provided by its staff or by contract with public (local) or nonprofit private agencies);

except that any such services which are defined as vocational rehabilitation services under the Vocational Rehabilitation Act and which are available, from the State agency or agencies administering or supervising the administration of the State plan for vocational rehabilitation services, to individuals under programs for their rehabilitation carried on under such State plan, may be provided only by such State agency or agencies in the manner described in subparagraph (E)) except to the extent agreed to by such State agency or agencies. The portion of the amount expended for administration of the State plan to which subparagraph (A) applies and the portion thereof to which subparagraphs (B) and (C) apply shall be determined in accordance with such methods and procedures as may be permitted by the Secretary."

State plan provisions for services

(b)(1) Section 2(a) of such Act is amended by striking out paragraph (10)(C), by inserting "and" after the semicolon at the end of paragraph (10)(A), by redesignating paragraphs (10) and (11) as paragraphs (11) and (12), respectively, and by inserting

after paragraph (9) the following new paragraph:

"(10) provide that the State agency shall make available to applicants for or recipients of old-age assistance under the plan at least those services to help them attain or retain capability for self-care which are prescribed by the Secretary; and include a description of the steps taken to assure, in the provision of these and any other services which the State agency makes available to individuals under the plan, maximum utilization of other agencies providing similar or related services;".

(2) Section 402(a)(12) of such Act is amended to read as follows: "(12) provide that the State agency shall make available at least those services to maintain and strengthen family life for children, and to help relatives specified in section 406(a) with whom children (who are applicants for or recipients of aid to families with dependent children) are living to attain or retain capability for self-support or self-care, which are prescribed by the Secretary; and include a description of the steps taken to assure, in the provision of these and any other services which the State agency makes available to individuals under the plan, maximum utilization of other agencies providing similar or related services".

(3) Section 1002(a)(13) of such Act is amended to read as follows: "(13) provide that the State agency shall make available to applicants for or recipients of aid to the blind at least those services to help them attain or retain capability for self-support or self-care which are prescribed by the Secretary; and include a description of the steps taken to assure, in the provision of these and any other services which the State agency makes available to individuals under the plan, maximum utilization of other agencies providing similar or related services".

(4) Section 1402(a)(12) of such Act is amended to read as follows: "(12) provide that the State agency shall make available to applicants for or recipients of aid to the permanently and totally disabled at least those services to help them attain or retain capability for self-support or self-care which are prescribed by the Secretary; and include a description of the steps taken to assure, in the provision of these and any other services which the State agency makes available to individuals under the plan, maximum utilization of other agencies providing similar or related services".

Expansion and Improvement of Child Welfare Services

Increase in authorization of appropriations

SEC. 102. (a) Section 521 of the Social Security Act is amended by striking out "there is hereby authorized to be appropriated for each fiscal year, beginning with the fiscal year ending June 30, 1961, the sum of $25,000,000" and inserting in lieu thereof "the following sums are hereby authorized to be appropriated: $25,000,000 each for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1961, and the succeeding fiscal year $30,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1963, $35,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964, $40,000,000 each for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1965, and the succeeding fiscal year, $45,000,000 each for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967, and the succeeding fiscal year, and $50,000,000 each for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1969, and succeeding fiscal years".

Coordination with dependent children program and extension of child welfare services

(b) (1) Section 523(a) of such Act is amended by striking out "each State with a plan for child-welfare services developed as provided in this part an amount equal to the Federal share" and inserting in lieu thereof "each State—

"(1) that has a plan for child-welfare services which has been developed as provided in this part and which—

"(A) provides for coordination between the services provided under such plan and the services provided for dependent children under the State plan approved under title IV, with a view to provision of welfare and related services which will best promote the welfare of such children and their families, and

"(B) provides, with respect to day care provided under the plan—

"(i) for cooperative arrangements with the State health authority and the State agency primarily responsible for State supervision of public schools to assure maximum utilization of such agencies in the provision of necessary health services and education for children receiving such day care.

"(ii) for an advisory committee, to advise the State public welfare agency on the general policy involved in the provision of day care under the State plan, which shall include among its members representatives of other State agencies concerned with day care or services related thereto and persons representative of professional or civic or other public or nonprofit private agencies, organizations, or groups concerned with the provision of day care,

"(iii) for such safeguards as may be necessary to assure provision of day care under the plan only in cases in which it is in the best interest of the child and the mother and only in cases in which it is determined under criteria established by the State, that a need for such care exists, and

"(iv) for giving priority, in determining the existence of need for such day care, to members of low-income or other groups in the population and to geographical areas which have the greatest relative need for extension of such day care, and

"(2) that makes a satisfactory showing that the State is extending the provision of child-welfare services in the State, with priority being given to communities with the greatest need for such services after giving consideration to their relative financial need, and with a view to making available by July 1, 1975, in all political subdivisions of the State, for all children in need thereof, child-welfare services provided by the staff (which shall to the extent feasible be composed of trained child-welfare personnel) of the State public welfare agency or of the local agency participating in the administration of the plan in the political subdivision, an amount equal to the Federal share".

(2) Such section 523(a) is further amended by striking out "costs of district, county, or other local child-welfare services" and inserting in lieu thereof "costs of State, district, county, or other local child-welfare services".

Allotments for day care

(c) (1) Section 522(a) of such Act is amended—

(A) by striking out "The sums appropriated for each fiscal year under section 521" at the beginning of such section and inserting in lieu thereof "All but $10,000,000 of the total appropriated for a fiscal year under section 521, or, if such total is less than $35,000,000, all but the excess (if any) of such total over $25,000,000,";

(B) by striking out "He shall allot to each State $50,000 or, if greater, such portion of $70,000 as the amount appropriated under section 521 for such year bears to the amount authorized to be so appropriated" and inserting in lieu thereof "He shall allot to each State $70,000 or, if the amount appropriated under section 521 for such year is less than $25,000,000, he shall allot to each State $50,000 or, if greater, such portion of $70,000 as the amount appropriated under such section bears to $25,000,000"; and

(C) by striking out "the remainder of the sums so appropriated for such year" and inserting in lieu thereof "the remainder of the sum available for allotment under this subsection for such year".

(2) Part 3 of title V of such Act is further amended by adding at the end thereof the following new section:

"DAY CARE

"SEC. 527. (a) In order to assist the States to provide adequately for the care and protection of children whose parents are, for part of the day, working or seeking work, or otherwise absent from the home or unable for other reasons to provide parental supervision, the portion of the appropriation under section 521 for any fiscal year which is not allotted under section 522 shall be allotted by the Secretary among the States solely for the provision, under the State plan developed as provided in this part, of day care in facilities (including private homes) which are licensed by the State, or are approved (as meeting the standards established for such licensing) by the State agency responsible for licensing facilities of this type, as follows: He shall allot to each State an amount which bears the same ratio to such portion of the appropriation as the product of (1) the population of the State under the age of 21 and (2) the allotment percentage of such State (as determined under section 524) bears to the sum of the corresponding products of all the States, except that the allotment of any State as so computed which is less than $10,000 shall be increased to that amount, the total of the increases thereby required being derived by proportionately reducing the allotments to each of the remaining States (as so computed) having an allotment in excess of that amount, but with such adjustments as may be necessary to prevent the allotment of any of such remaining States from being thereby reduced to less than that amount.

"(b) The amount of any allotment to a State under subsection (a) for any fiscal year which the State certifies to the Secretary will not be required for the purposes for which allotted shall be available for reallotment from time to time, on such dates as the Secretary may fix, to other States which the Secretary determines (1) have need in carrying out such purposes for sums in excess of those previously allotted to them under subsection (a), and (2) will be able to use such excess amounts during such fiscal year. Such reallotments shall be made on the basis of the need for additional funds in carrying out such purposes, after taking into consideration the population under the age of twenty-one, and the per capita income of each such State as compared with the population under the age of twenty-one, and the per capita income of all such States with respect to which such a determination by the Secretary has been made. Any amount so reallotted to a State shall be deemed part of its allotment under subsection (a)."

Definition of child-welfare services

(d)(1) Section 521 of such Act is further amended by striking out "public-welfare services (hereinafter in this title referred to as 'child-welfare services') for the protection and care of homeless, dependent, and neglected children, and children in danger of becoming delinquent" and inserting in lieu thereof "child-welfare services".

(2) Part 3 of title V of such Act is further amended by adding after section 527 (added by subsection (c)(2) of this section) the following new section:

"DEFINITION

"SEC. 528. For purposes of this part, the term 'child-welfare services' means public social services which supplement, or substitute for, parental care and supervision for the purpose of (1) preventing or remedying, or assisting in the solution of problems which may result in, the neglect, abuse, exploitation, or delinquency of children, (2) protecting and caring for homeless, dependent, or neglected children, (3) protecting and promoting the welfare of children of working mothers, and (4) otherwise protect-

ing and promoting the welfare of children, including the strengthening of their own homes where possible or, where needed, the provision of adequate care of children away from their homes in foster family homes or day-care or other child-care facilities."

Welfare Services for Each Child Under Dependent Children Program

SEC. 103. Section 402(a) of the Social Security Act is amended by striking out "and" after the semicolon at the end of clause (11), and by inserting before the period at the end of clause (12) the following: "; and (13) provide for the development and application of a program for such welfare and related services for each child who receives aid to families with dependent children as may be necessary in the light of the particular home conditions and other needs of such child, and provide for coordination of such programs, and any other services provided for children under the State plan, with the child-welfare services plan developed as provided in part 3 of title V, with a view toward providing welfare and related services which will best promote the welfare of such child and his family".

Technical Amendments To Reflect Emphasis on Rehabilitation and Other Services

SEC. 104. (a)(1) The heading of title IV of the Social Security Act is amended to read as follows:

"TITLE IV—GRANTS TO STATES FOR AID AND SERVICE TO NEEDY FAMILIES WITH CHILDREN"

(2) The heading of section 402 of such Act is amended to read as follows:

"STATE PLANS FOR AID AND SERVICES TO NEEDY FAMILIES WITH CHILDREN"

(3) The following provisions of such Act are amended by striking out "aid to dependent children" each time it appears and inserting in lieu thereof "aid to families with dependent children":

(A) clauses (4), (7), (8), (9), and (10) of section 402(a);

(B) section 402(b);

(C) section 403(b)(2)(B);

(D) section 406(b);

(E) clause (2) (B) of section 407;

(F) section 408(b);

(G) section 408(c);

(H) section 1002(a)(7); and

(I) section 1402(a)(7).

(4) The second sentence of section 401 of such Act is amended by striking out "State plans for aid to dependent children" and inserting in lieu thereof "State plans for aid and services to needy families with children".

(5) The following provisions of title IV of such Act are amended by striking out "plan for aid to dependent children" and inserting in lieu thereof "plan for aid and services to needy families with children":

(A) the portion of section 402(a) which precedes clause (1); and

(B) the portion of section 404 which precedes clause (1).

(b) Each State plan approved under title IV of the Social Security Act and in effect on the date of the enactment of this Act shall be deemed for purposes of such title, without the necessity of any change in such plan, to have been conformed with the amendments made by subsection (a) of this section.

(c)(1) The first sentence of section 1 of such Act is amended to read as follows: "For the purpose (a) of enabling each State, as far as practicable under the conditions in such State, to furnish financial assistance to aged needy individuals, (b) of enabling each State, as far as practicable under the conditions in such State, to furnish medical assistance on behalf of aged individuals who are not recipients of old-age assistance but whose income and resources are insufficient to meet the costs of necessary medical services, and (c) of encouraging each State, as far as practicable under the conditions in such State, to furnish rehabilitation and other services to help individuals referred to in clause (a) or (b) to attain or retain capability for self-care, there is hereby authorized to be appropriated for each fiscal year a sum sufficient to carry out the purposes of this title."

(2) The first sentence of section 401 of such Act is amended (A) by inserting "and rehabilitation" after "financial assistance", and (B) by inserting "or retain capability for" after "attain".

(3) The first sentence of section 1001 of such Act is amended (A) by inserting "to furnish rehabilitation and other services" before "to help such individuals", and (B) by inserting "or retain capability for" after "attain".

(4) The first sentence of section 1401 of such Act is amended (A) by inserting "to furnish rehabilitation and other services" before "to help such individuals", and (B) by inserting "or retain capability for" after "attain".

Community Work and Training Programs

SEC. 105. (a) Title IV of the Social Security Act is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new section:

"COMMUNITY WORK AND TRAINING PROGRAMS

"SEC. 409. (a) For the purpose of assisting the States in encouraging, through community work and training programs of a constructive nature, the conservation of work skills and the development of new skills for individuals who have attained the age of 18 and are receiving aid to families with dependent children, under conditions which are designed to assure protection of the health and welfare of such individuals and the dependent children involved, expenditures (other than for medical or any other type of remedial care) for any month with respect to a dependent child (including payments to meet the needs of any relative or relatives, specified in section 406(a), with whom he is living) under a State plan approved under section 402 shall not be excluded from aid to families with dependent children because such expenditures are made in the form of payments for work performed in such month by any one or more of the relatives with whom such child is living if such work is performed for the State agency or any other public agency under a program (which need not be in effect in all political subdivisions of the State) administered by or under the supervision of such State agency, if there is State financial participation in such expenditures, and if such State plan includes—

"(1) provisions which, in the judgment of the Secretary, provide reasonable assurance that—

"(A) appropriate standards for health, safety, and other conditions applicable to the performance of such work by such relatives are established and maintained;

"(B) payments for such work are at rates not less than the minimum rate (if any) provided by or under State law for the same type of work and not less than the rates prevailing on similar work in the community;

"(C) such work is performed on projects which serve a useful public purpose, do not result either in displacement of regular workers or in the performance by such relatives of work that would otherwise be performed by employees of public or private agencies, institutions, or organizations, and (except in cases of projects which involve emergencies or which are generally of a nonrecurring nature) are of a type which has not normally been undertaken in the past by the State or community, as the case may be;

"(D) in determining the needs of any such relative, any additional expenses reasonably attributable to such work will be considered;

"(E) any such relative shall have reasonable opportunities to seek regular employment and to secure any appropriate training or retraining which may be available;

"(F) any such relative will, with respect to the work so performed, be covered under the State workmen's compensation law or be provided comparable protection; and

"(G) aid under the plan will not be denied with respect to any such relative (or the dependent child) for refusal by such relative to perform any such work if he has good cause for such refusal;

"(2) provision for entering into cooperative arrangements with the system of public employment offices in the State looking toward employment or occupational training of any such relatives performing work under such program, including appropriate provision for registration and periodic reregistration of such relatives and for maximum utilization of the job placement services and other services and facilities of such offices;

"(3) provision for entering into cooperative arrangements with the State agency or agencies responsible for administering or supervising the administration of vocational education and adult education in the State, looking toward maximum utilization of available public vocational or adult education services and facilities in the State in order to encourage the training or retraining of any such relatives performing work under such program and otherwise assist them in preparing for regular employment;

"(4) provision for assuring appropriate arrangements for the care and protection of the child during the absence from the home of any such relative performing work under such program in order to assure that such absence and work will not be inimical to the welfare of the child;

"(5) provision that there will be no adjustment or recovery by the State or any political subdivision thereof on account of any payments which are correctly made for such work; and

"(6) such other provisions as the Secretary finds necessary to assure that the operation of such program will not interfere with achievement of the objectives set forth in section 401.

"(b) In the case of any State which makes expenditures in the form described in subsection (a) under its State plan approved under section 402, the proper and efficient administration of the State plan, for purposes of section 403(a)(3), may not include the cost of making or acquiring materials or equipment in connection with the work performed under a program referred to in subsection (a) or the cost of supervision of work under such program, and may include only such other costs attributable to such programs as are permitted by the Secretary."

(b) The Secretary shall submit to the President, for transmission to the Congress prior to January 1, 1967, a full report of the administration of the provisions of the amendment made by subsection (a), including the experiences of each of the States in paying for work under community work and training programs under the provisions of their respective State plans which are in accord with such amendment, together with his recommendations as to continuation of and modifications in such amendment.

Incentives for Employment Through Consideration of Expenses in Earning Income, and Provisions for Future Needs of Dependent Children

SEC. 106. (a) (1) Section 2(a) of the Social Security Act is amended by inserting before the semicolon at the end of subparagraph (A) of paragraph (11) (as redesignated by section 101(b)(1) of this Act) ", as well as any expenses reasonably attributable to the earning of any such income".

(2) Section 1002(a)(8) of such Act is amended by inserting before the first semicolon ", as well as any expenses reasonably

attributable to the earning of any such income".

(3) Section 1402(a)(8) of such Act is amended by inserting before the semicolon at the end thereof ", as well as any expenses reasonably attributable to the earning of any such income".

(b) Section 402(a)(7) of such Act is amended to read as follows: "(7) provide that the State agency shall, in determining need, take into consideration any other income and resources of any child or relative claiming aid to families with dependent children, as well as any expenses reasonably attributable to the earning of any such income; except that, in making such determination, the State agency may, subject to limitations prescribed by the Secretary, permit all or any portion of the earned or other income to be set aside for future identifiable needs of a dependent child;".

Use of Payments for Benefit of Child

SEC. 107. (a) Section 405 of the Social Security Act is amended to read as follows:

"USE OF PAYMENTS FOR BENEFIT OF CHILD

"SEC. 405. Whenever the State agency has reason to believe that any payments of aid to families with dependent children made with respect to a child are not being or may not be used in the best interests of the child, the State agency may provide for such counseling and guidance services with respect to the use of such payments and the management of other funds by the relative receiving such payments as it deems advisable in order to assure of such payments in the best interests of such child, and may provide for advising such relative that continued failure to so use such payments will result in substitution therefor of protective payments as provided under section 406(b)(2), or in seeking appointment of a guardian or legal representative as provided in section 1111, or in other action authorized under State law which is deemed necessary to protect the interests of such child; and any such action taken by the State agency pursuant to such State law, other than denial of such payments with respect to such child while in the home of such relative, shall not serve as a basis for withholding funds from such State under section 404 and shall not prevent such payments with respect to such child from being considered aid to families with dependent children."

(b) Section 404(b) of such Act is amended by inserting before the period at the end thereof the following: "; nor shall any such payment be withheld for any period beginning on or after such date by reason of any action taken pursuant to such a statute if provision is otherwise made pursuant to a State statute for adequate care and assistance with respect to such child".

Protective Payments Under Dependent Children Program

SEC. 108. (a) Section 406(b) of the Social Security Act is amended by inserting "(1)" after "includes" and by inserting before the semicolon at the end thereof: ", and (2) payments with respect to any dependent child (including payments to meet the needs of the relative, and the relative's spouse, with whom such child is living) which do not meet the preceding requirements of this subsection, but which would meet such requirements except that such payments are made to another person who (as determined in accordance with standards prescribed by the Secretary) is interested in or concerned with the welfare of such child and relative, but only with respect to a State whose State plan approved under section 402 includes provision for—

"(A) determination by the State agency that the relative of the child with respect to whom such payments are made has such inability to manage funds that making payments to him would be contrary to the welfare of the child and, therefore, it is necessary to provide such aid with respect to such child and relative through payments described in this clause (2);

"(B) meeting all of the need, as determined by the State, of individuals with respect to whom aid to families with dependent children is paid;

"(C) undertaking and continuing special efforts to develop greater ability on the part of the relative to manage funds in such manner as to protect the welfare of the family;

"(D) periodic review by such State agency of the determination under clause (A) to ascertain whether conditions justifying such determination still exist, with provision for termination of such payments if they do not and for seeking judicial appointment of a guardian or other legal representative, as described in section 1111, if and when it appears that the need for such payments is continuing, or is likely to continue, beyond a period specified by the Secretary;

"(E) aid in the form of foster home care in behalf of children described in section 408(a); and

"(F) opportunity for a fair hearing before the State agency on the determination referred to in clause (A) for any individual with respect to whom it is made".

(b) Section 403(a) of such Act, as amended by the other provisions of this Act, is further amended by adding at the end thereof (after and below paragraph (3)) the following new sentence:

"The number of individuals with respect to whom payments described in section 406(b)(2) are made for any month, who may be included as recipients of aid to families with dependent children for purposes of paragraph (1) or (2), may not exceed 5 per centum of the number of other recipients of aid to families with dependent children for such month."

(c) Paragraph (1)(A) of such section 403(a) (as amended by section 101(a)(2) of this Act) is amended by inserting immediately after "remedial care" the following: ", plus (iii) the number of individuals, not counted under clause (i) or (ii), with respect to whom payments described in section 406(b)(2) are made in such month and included as expenditures for purposes of this paragraph or paragraph (2)".

(d) The Secretary shall submit to the President, for transmission to the Congress prior to January 1, 1967, a full report of the administration of the provisions of the amendments made by this section, including the experiences of each of the States in making protective payments under the provisions of their respective State plans which are in accord with such amendments, together with his recommendations as to continuation of and modifications in such amendments.

Aid for Spouse of Relative With Whom Dependent Child Is Living

SEC. 109. Section 406(b) of the Social Security Act, as amended by section 108 of this Act, is amended by inserting "(and the spouse of such relative if living with him and if such relative is the child's parent and the child is a dependent child by reason of the physical or mental incapacity of a parent or is a dependent child under section 407)" after "relative with whom any dependent child is living" in clause (1) thereof.

Part B—Improvement in administration through demonstrations, training, and public advisory groups

Advisory Council on Public Welfare

SEC. 121. Title XI of the Social Security Act is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new section:

"APPOINTMENT OF ADVISORY COUNCIL AND OTHER ADVISORY GROUPS

"SEC. 1114. (a) The Secretary shall, during 1964, appoint an Advisory Council on Public Welfare for the purpose of reviewing the administration of the public assistance and child welfare services programs for which funds are appropriated pursuant to this Act and making recommendations for improvement of such administration, and reviewing the status of and making recommendations with respect to the public assistance programs for which funds are so appropriated, especially in relation to the old-age, survivors, and disability insurance program, with respect to the fiscal capacities of the States and the Federal Government, and with respect to any other matters bearing on the amount and proportion of the Federal and State shares in the public assistance and child welfare services programs.

"(b) The Council shall be appointed by the Secretary without regard to the civil-service laws and shall consist of twelve persons who shall, to the extent possible, be representatives of employers and employees in equal numbers, representatives of State or Federal agencies concerned with the administration or financing of the public assistance and child welfare services programs, representatives of nonprofit private organizations concerned with social welfare programs, other persons with special knowledge, experience, or qualifications with respect to such programs, and members of the public.

"(c) The Council is authorized to engage such technical assistance as may be required to carry out its functions, and the Secretary shall, in addition, make available to the Council such secretarial, clerical, and other assistance and such pertinent data prepared by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare as it may require to carry out such functions.

"(d) The Council shall make a report of its findings and recommendations (including recommendations for changes in the provisions of the Social Security Act) to the Secretary, such report to be submitted not later than July 1, 1966, after which date such Council shall cease to exist.

"(e) The Secretary shall also from time to time thereafter appoint an Advisory Council on Public Welfare, with the same functions and constituted in the same manner as prescribed for the Advisory Council in the preceding subsection of this section. Each Council so appointed shall report its findings and recommendations, as prescribed in subsection (d), not later than July 1 of the second year after the year in which it is appointed, after which date such Council shall cease to exist.

"(f) The Secretary may also appoint, without regard to the civil-service laws, such advisory committees as he may deem advisable to advise and consult with him in carrying out any of his functions under this Act.

"(g) Members of the Council or of any advisory committee appointed under this section who are not regular full-time employees of the United States shall, while serving on business of the Council or any such committee, be entitled to receive compensation at rates fixed by the Secretary, but not exceeding $75 per day, including travel time; and while so serving away from their homes or regular places of business, they may be allowed travel expenses, including per diem in lieu of subsistence, as authorized by section 5 of the Administrative Expenses Act of 1946 (5 U.S.C. 73b–2) for persons in Government service employed intermittently.

"(h)(1) Any member of the Council or any advisory committee appointed under this Act, who is not a regular full-time employee of the United States, is hereby exempted, with respect to such appointment, from the operation of sections 281, 283, and 1914 of title 18 of the United States Code, and section 190 of the Revised Statutes (5 U.S.C. 99), except as otherwise specified in paragraph (2) of this subsection.

"(2) The exemption granted by paragraph (1) shall not extend—

"(A) to the receipt or payment of salary in connection with the appointee's Government service from any source other than the private employer of the appointee at the time of his appointment, or

"(B) during the period of such appointment, to the prosecution or participation in the prosecution, by any person so appointed, of any claim against the Government involving any matter with which such person, during such period, is or was direectly connected by reason of such appointment."

Waiver of State Plan Requirements for Demonstrations

SEC. 122. Title XI of the Social Security Act is amended by adding after section 1114 (added by section 121 of this Act) the following new section:

"DEMONSTRATION PROJECTS

"SEC. 1115. In the case of any experimental, pilot, or demonstration project which, in the judgment of the Secretary, is likely to assist in promoting the objectives of title I, IV, X, XIV, or XVI in a State or States—

"(a) the Secretary may waive compliance with any of the requirements of section 2, 402, 1002, 1402, or 1602, as the case may be, to the extent and for the period he finds necessary to enable such State or States to carry out such project, and

"(b) costs of such project which would not otherwise be included as expenditures under section 3, 403, 1003, 1403, or 1603, as the case may be, and which are not included as part of the costs of projects under section 1110, shall, to the extent and for the period prescribed by the Secretary, be regarded as expenditures under the State plan or plans approved under such title, or for administration of such State plan or plans, as may be appropriate.

In addition, not to exceed $2,000,000 of the aggregate amount appropriated for payments to States under such titles for any fiscal year ending prior to July 1, 1967, shall be available, under such terms and conditions as the Secretary may establish, for payments to States to cover so much of the cost of such projects as is not covered by payments under such titles and is not included as part of the cost of projects for purposes of section 1110."

Training Grants for Public Welfare Personnel

SEC. 123. Section 705(a) of the Social Security Act is amended by striking out "for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1958, the sum of $5,000,000, and for each of the five succeeding years such sums as the Congress may determine" and inserting in lieu thereof the following: "for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1963, the sum of $3,500,000, and for each fiscal year thereafter the sum of $5,000,000".

Part C—Improvement of public welfare programs through extension of temporary provisions and increase in Federal share of public assistance payments

Extension of Aid With Respect to Dependent Children of Unemployed Parents or in Foster Family Homes

Extension with respect to children of unemployed parents

SEC. 131. (a) So much of the first sentence of section 407 of the Social Security Act as precedes paragraph (1) thereof is amended by striking out "1962" and inserting in lieu thereof "1967".

Extension with respect to foster family home care

(b) So much of the first sentence of section 408 of such Act as precedes paragraph (a) thereof is amended by striking out ", and ending with the close of June 30, 1962".

Increase in Federal Share of Public Assistance Payments

SEC. 132. (a) Paragraphs (1) and (2) of section 3(a) of the Social Security Act are amended to read as follows:

"(1) in the case of any State other than Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands, and Guam, an amount equal to the sum of the following proportions of the total amounts expended during such quarter as old-age assistance under the State plan (including expenditures for insurance premiums for medical or any other type of remedial care or the cost thereof)—

"(A) 29/35 of such expenditures, not counting so much of any expenditure with respect to any month as exceeds the product of $35 multiplied by the total number of recipients of old-age assistance for such month (which total number, for purposes of this subsection, means (i) the number of individuals who received old-age assistance in the form of money payments for such month, plus (ii) the number of other individuals with respect to whom expenditures were made in such month as old-age assistance in the form of medical or any other type of remedial care); plus

"(B) the Federal percentage (as defined in section 1101(a)(8)) of the amount by which such expenditures exceed the maximum which may be counted under clause (A), not counting so much of any expenditure with respect to any month as exceeds the product of $70 multiplied by the total number of such recipients of old-age assistance for such month; plus

"(C) the larger of the following: (i) the Federal medical percentage (as defined in section 6(c)) of the amount by which such expenditures exceed the maximum which may be counted under clause (B), not counting so much of any expenditure with respect to any month as exceeds (I) the product of $85 multiplied by the total number of such recipients of old-age assistance for such month, or (II) if smaller, the total expended as old-age assistance in the form of medical or any other type of remedial care with respect to such month plus the product of $70 multiplied by such total number of such recipients, or (ii) 15 per centum of the total of the sums expended during such quarter as old-age assistance under the State plan in the form of medical or any other type of remedial care, not counting so much of any expenditure with respect to any month as exceeds the product of $15 multiplied by the total number of such recipients of old-age assistance for such month;

"(2) in the case of Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands, and Guam, an amount equal to—

"(A) one-half of the total of the sums expended during such quarter as old-age assistance under the State plan (including expenditures for insurance premiums for medical or any other type of remedial care or the cost thereof), not counting so much of any expenditure with respect to any month as exceeds $37.50 multiplied by the total number of recipients of old-age assistance for such month; plus

"(B) the larger of the following amounts: (i) one-half of the amount by which such expenditures exceed the maximum which may be counted under clause (A), not counting so much of any expenditure with respect to any month as exceeds (I) the product of $45 multiplied by the total number of such recipients of old-age assistance for such month, or (II) if smaller, the total expended as old-age assistance in the form of medical or any other type of remedial care with respect to such month plus the product of $37.50 multiplied by the total number of such recipients, or (ii) 15 per centum of the total of the sums expended during such quarter as old-age assistance under the State plan in the form of medical or any other type of remedial care, not counting so much of any expenditure with respect to any month as exceeds the product of $7.50 multiplied by the total number of such recipients of old-age assistance for such month;".

(b) So much of section 1003(a) of such Act as precedes clause (3) is amended to read as follows:

"(a) From the sums appropriated therefor, the Secretary of the Treasury shall pay to each State which has an approved plan for aid to the blind, for each quarter, beginning with the quarter commencing October 1, 1958—

"(1) in the case of any State other than Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands, and Guam, an amount equal to the sum of the following proportions of the total amounts expended during such quarter as aid to the blind under the State plan (including expenditures for insurance premiums for medical or any other type of remedial care or the cost thereof)—

"(A) 29/35 of such expenditures, not counting so much of any expenditure with respect to any month as exceeds the product of $35 multiplied by the total number of recipients of aid to the blind for such month (which total number, for purposes of this subsection, means (i) the number of individuals who received aid to the blind in the form of money payments for such month, plus (ii) the number of other individuals with respect to whom expenditures were made in such month as aid to the blind in the form of medical or any other type of remedial care); plus

"(B) the Federal percentage of the amount by which such expenditures exceed the maximum which may be counted under clause (A), not counting so much of any expenditure with respect to any month as exceeds the product of $70 multiplied by the total number of such recipients of aid to the blind for such month;

"(2) in the case of Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands, and Guam, an amount equal to one-half of the total of the sums expended during such quarter as aid to the blind under the State plan (including expenditures for insurance premiums for medical or any other type of remedial care or the cost thereof), not counting so much of any expenditure with respect to any month as exceeds $37.50 multiplied by the total number of recipients of aid to the blind for such month; and".

(c) So much of section 1403(a) of such Act as precedes clause (3) is amended to read as follows:

"(a) From the sums appropriated therefor, the Secretary of the Treasury shall pay to each State which has an approved plan for aid to the permanently and totally disabled, for each quarter, beginning with the quarter commencing October 1, 1958—

"(1) in the case of any State other than Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands, and Guam, an amount equal to the sum of the following proportions of the total amounts expended during such quarter as aid to the permanently and totally disabled under the State plan (including expenditures for insurance premiums for medical or any other type of remedial care or the cost thereof)—

"(A) 29/35 of such expenditures, not counting so much of any expenditure with respect to any month as exceeds the product of $35 multiplied by the total number of recipients of aid to the permanently and totally disabled for such month (which total number, for purposes of this subsection, means (i) the number of individuals who received aid to the permanently and totally disabled in the form of money payments for such month, plus (ii) the number of other individuals with respect to whom expenditures were made in such month as aid to the permanently and totally disabled in the form of medical or any other type of remedial care); plus

"(B) the Federal percentage of the amount by which such expenditures exceed the maximum which may be counted under clause

(A), not counting so much of any expenditure with respect to any month as exceeds the product of $70 multiplied by the total number of such recipients of aid to the permanently and totally disabled for such month;

"(2) in the case of Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands, and Guam, an amount equal to one-half of the total of the sums expended during such quarter as aid to the permanently and totally disabled under the State plan (including expenditures for insurance premiums for medical or any other type of remedial care or the cost thereof), not counting so much of any expenditure with respect to any month as exceeds $37.50 multiplied by the total number of recipients of aid to the permanently and totally disabled for such month; and".

(d) Section 303 of the Social Security Amendments of 1961 (Public Law 87-64), and section 6 of the Act of May 8, 1961 (Public Law 87-31), are repealed.

Extension of Assistance to Repatriated American Citizens

SEC. 133. Subsection (d) of section 1113 of the Social Security Act is amended by striking out "1962" and inserting in lieu thereof "1964".

Refusal of Unemployed Parent to Accept Retraining

SEC. 134. Paragraph (3) of section 407 of the Social Security Act is amended by inserting "(A)" after "provision" and by inserting before the period at the end thereof ", and (B) for denying aid to families with dependent children to any such child or relative if, and for as long as, the unemployed parent refuses without good cause to undergo any such retraining".

Federal Payments for Foster Care in Child-Care Institutions

SEC. 135. (a) Clause (3) of paragraph (a) of section 408 of the Social Security Act is amended by inserting "or child-care institution" after "foster family home".

(b) Paragraph (b) of such section is amended by striking out "of this section in the foster family home of any individual" and inserting in lieu thereof the following: "of this section—

"(1) in the foster family home of any individual, whether the payment therefor is made to such individual or to a public or nonprofit private child-placement or child-care agency, or

"(2) in a child-care institution, whether the payment therefor is made to such institution or to a public or nonprofit private child-placement or child-care agency, but subject to limitations prescribed by the Secretary with a view to including as 'aid to families with dependent children' in the case of such foster care in such institutions only those items which are included in such term in the case of foster care in the foster family home of an individual".

(c) Clauses (1) and (2) of paragraph (f) of such section are each amended by inserting "or child-care institution" after "foster family home".

(d) The last sentence of such section is amended by inserting before the period at the end thereof the following: "; and the term 'child-care institution' means a nonprofit private child-care institution which is licensed by the State in which it is situated or has been approved, by the agency of such State responsible for licensing or approval of institutions of this type, as meeting the standards established for such licensing".

Certain State Plans Not Meeting Income and Resources Requirements for the Blind

SEC. 136. (a) Section 1002(b) of the Social Security Act is amended by adding at the end thereof (after and below paragraph (2)) the following new sentence: "In the case of any State (other than Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands) which did not have on January 1, 1949, a State plan for aid to the blind approved under this title, the Secretary shall approve a plan of such State for aid to the blind for purposes of this title, even though it does not meet the requirements of clause (8) of subsection (a) of this section, if it meets all other requirements of this title for an approved plan for aid to the blind; but payments under section 1003 shall be made, in the case of any such plan, only with respect to expenditures thereunder which would be included as expenditures for the purposes of section 1003 under a plan approved under this section without regard to the provisions of this sentence."

(b) Section 344 of the Social Security Act Amendments of 1950 is repealed.

Part D—Simplification of categories

Optional Combined State Plan for Aged, Blind, and Disabled

SEC. 141. (a) The Social Security Act is amended by adding after title XV the following new title:

"TITLE XVI—GRANTS TO STATES FOR AID TO THE AGED, BLIND, OR DISABLED, OR FOR SUCH AID AND MEDICAL ASSISTANCE FOR THE AGED

"Appropriation

"SEC. 1601. For the purpose (a) of enabling each State, as far as practicable under the conditions in such State, to furnish financial assistance to needy individuals who are 65 years of age or over, are blind, or are 18 years of age or over and permanently and totally disabled, (b) of enabling each State, as far as practicable under the conditions in such State, to furnish medical assistance on behalf of individuals who are 65 years of age or over and who are not recipients of aid to the aged, blind, or disabled but whose income and resources are insufficient to meet the costs of necessary medical services, and (c) of encouraging each State, as far as practicable under the conditions in such State, to furnish rehabilitation and other services to help individuals referred to in clause (a) or (b) to attain or retain capability for self-support or self-care, there is hereby authorized to be appropriated for each fiscal year a sum sufficient to carry out the purposes of this title. The sums made available under this section shall be used for making payments to States which have submitted, and had approved by the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, State plans for aid to the aged, blind, or disabled, or for aid to the aged, blind, or disabled and medical assistance for the aged.

"State plans for aid to the aged, blind, or disabled, or for such aid and medical assistance for the aged

"SEC. 1602. (a) A State plan for aid to the aged, blind, or disabled, or for aid to the aged, blind, or disabled and medical assistance for the aged, must—

"(1) provide that it shall be in effect in all political subdivisions of the State, and, if administered by them, be mandatory upon them;

"(2) provide for financial participation by the State;

"(3) either provide for the establishment or designation of a single State agency to administer the plan, or provide for the establishment or designation of a single State agency to supervise the administration of the plan;

"(4) provide for granting an opportunity for a fair hearing before the State agency to any individual whose claim for aid or assistance under the plan is denied or is not acted upon with reasonable promptness;

"(5) provide such methods of administration (including methods relating to the establishment and maintenance of personnel standards on a merit basis, except that the Secretary shall exercise no authority with respect to the selection, tenure of office, and compensation of any individual employed in accordance with such methods) as are found by the Secretary to be necessary for the proper and efficient operation of the plan;

"(6) provide that the State agency will make such reports, in such form and containing such information, as the Secretary may from time to time require, and comply with such provisions as the Secretary may from time to time find necessary to assure the correctness and verification of such reports;

"(7) provide safeguards which restrict the use or disclosure of information concerning applicants and recipients to purposes directly connected with the administration of the plan;

"(8) provide that all individuals wishing to make application for aid or assistance under the plan shall have opportunity to do so, and that such aid or assistance shall be furnished with reasonable promptness to all eligible individuals;

"(9) provide, if the plan includes aid or assistance to or on behalf of individuals in private or public institutions, for the establishment or designation of a State authority or authorities which shall be responsible for establishing and maintaining standards for such institutions;

"(10) provide that the State agency shall make available to applicants for or recipients of aid to the aged, blind, or disabled under the plan at least those services to help them attain or retain capability for self-support or self-care which are prescribed by the Secretary; and include a description of the steps taken to assure, in the provision of these and any other services which the State agency makes available to individuals under the plan, maximum utilization of other agencies providing similar or related services;

"(11) provide that no aid or assistance will be furnished any individual under the plan with respect to any period with respect to which he is receiving assistance under the State plan approved under title I or aid under the State plan approved under title IV, X, or XIV;

"(12) provide that, in determining whether an individual is blind, there shall be an examination by a physician skilled in the diseases of the eye or by an optometrist, whichever the individual may select;

"(13) include reasonable standards, consistent with the objectives of this title, for determining eligibility for and the extent of aid or assistance under the plan;

"(14) provide that the State agency shall, in determining need for aid to the aged, blind, or disabled, take into consideration any other income and resources of an individual claiming such aid, as well as any expenses reasonably attributable to the earning of such income; except that, in making such determination with respect to any individual who is blind, the State agency shall disregard the first $85 per month of earned income plus one-half of earned income in excess of $85 per month; and

"(15) if the State plan includes medical assistance for the aged—

"(A) provide for inclusion of some institutional and some noninstitutional care and services;

"(B) provide that no enrollment fee, premium, or similar charge will be imposed as a condition of any individual's eligibility for medical assistance for the aged under the plan;

"(C) provide for inclusion, to the extent required by regulations prescribed by the Secretary, of provisions (conforming to such regulations) with respect to the furnishing of such assistance to individuals who are residents of the State but are absent therefrom; and

"(D) provide that no lien may be imposed against the property of any individual prior to his death on account of medical assistance for the aged paid or to be paid on his behalf under the plan (except pursuant to the judgment of a court on account of benefits in-

correctly paid on behalf of such individual), and that there shall be no adjustment or recovery (except, after the death of such individual and his surviving spouse, if any, from such individual's estate) of any medical assistance for the aged correctly paid on behalf of such individual under the plan.

Notwithstanding paragraph (3), if on January 1, 1962, and on the date on which a State submits its plan for approval under this title, the State agency which administered or supervised the administration of the plan of such State approved under title X was different from the State agency which administered or supervised the administration of the plan of such State approved under title I and the State agency which administered or supervised the administration of the plan of such State approved under title XIV, the State agency which administered or supervised the administration of such plan approved under title X may be designated to administer or supervise the administration of the portion of the State plan for aid to the aged, blind, or disabled (or for aid to the aged, blind, or disabled and medical assistance for the aged) which relates to blind individuals and a separate agency may be established or designated to administer or supervise the administration of the rest of such plan; and in such case the part of the plan which each such agency administers, or the administration of which each such agency supervises, shall be regarded as a separate plan for purposes of this title.

"(b) The Secretary shall approve any plan which fulfills the conditions specified in subsection (a), except that he shall not approve any plan which imposes, as a condition of eligibility for aid or assistance under the plan—

"(1) an age requirement of more than sixty-five years; or

"(2) any residence requirement which (A) in the case of applicants for aid to the aged, blind, or disabled excludes any resident of the State who has resided therein for one year immediately preceding the application, and (B) in the case of applicants for medical assistance for the aged, excludes any individual who resides in the State; or

"(3) any citizenship requirement which excludes any citizen of the United States.

In the case of any State to which the provisions of section 344 of the Social Security Act Amendments of 1950 were applicable on January 1, 1962, and on the date on which its State plan for aid to the aged, blind, or disabled (or for aid to the aged, blind, or disabled and medical assistance for the aged) was submitted for approval under this title, the Secretary shall approve the plan of such State for aid to the aged, blind, or disabled (or for aid to the aged, blind, or disabled and medical assistance for the aged) for purposes of this title, even though it does not meet the requirements of paragraph (14) of subsection (a), if it meets all other requirements of this title for an approved plan for aid to the aged, blind, or disabled (or for aid to the aged, blind, or disabled and medical assistance for the aged); but payments under section 1603 shall be made, in the case of any such plan, only with respect to expenditures thereunder which would be included as expenditures for the purposes of section 1603 under a plan approved under this section without regard to the provisions of this sentence.

"(c) Subject to the last sentence of subsection (a), nothing in this title shall be construed to permit a State to have in effect with respect to any period more than one State plan approved under this title.

"Payments to States

"SEC. 1603. (a) From the sums appropriated therefor, the Secretary of the Treasury shall pay to each State which has a plan approved under this title, for each quarter, beginning with the quarter commencing October 1, 1962—

"(1) in the case of any State other than Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands, and Guam, an amount equal to the sum of the following proportions of the total amounts expended during such quarter as aid to the aged, blind, or disabled under the State plan (including expenditures for insurance premiums for medical or any other type of remedial care or the cost thereof)—

"(A) 29/35 of such expenditure, not counting so much of any expenditure with respect to any month as exceeds the product of $35 multiplied by the total number of recipients of such aid for such month (which total number, for purposes of this subsection, means (i) the number of individuals who received such aid in the form of money payments for such month, plus (ii) the number of other individuals with respect to whom expenditures were made in such month as aid to the aged, blind, or disabled in the form of medical or any other type of remedial care); plus

"(B) the Federal percentage (as defined in section 1101(a)(8)) of the amount by which such expenditures exceed the maximum which may be counted under clause (A), not counting so much of any expenditure with respect to any month as exceeds the product of $70 multiplied by the total number of recipients of aid to the aged, blind, or disabled for such month; plus

"(C) the larger of the following: (i) the Federal medical percentage (as defined in section 6(c)) of the amount by which such expenditures exceed the maximum which may be counted under clause (B), not counting so much of any expenditure with respect to any month as exceeds (I) the product of $85 multiplied by the total number of such recipients of aid to the aged, blind, or disabled for such month, or (II) if smaller, the total expended as aid to the aged, blind, or disabled in the form of medical or any other type of remedial care with respect to such month plus the product of $70 multiplied by such total number of such recipients, or (ii) 15 per centum of the total of the sums expended during such quarter as aid to the aged, blind, or disabled under the State plan in the form of medical or any other type of remedial care, not counting so much of any expenditure with respect to any month as exceeds the product of $15 multiplied by the total number of such recipients of aid to the aged, blind, or disabled for such month;

"(2) in the case of Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands, and Guam, an amount equal to—

"(A) one-half of the total of the sums expended during such quarter as aid to the aged, blind, or disabled under the State plan (including expenditures for insurance premiums for medical or any other type of remedial care or the cost thereof), not counting so much of any expenditure with respect to any month as exceeds $37.50 multiplied by the total number of recipients of aid to the aged, blind, or disabled for such month; plus

"(B) the larger of the following amounts: (i) one-half of the amount by which such expenditures exceed the maximum which may be counted under clause (A), not counting so much of any expenditure with respect to any month as exceeds (I) the product of $45 multiplied by the total number of such recipients of aid to the aged, blind, or disabled for such month, or (II) if smaller, the total expended as aid to the aged, blind, or disabled in the form of medical or any other type of remedial care with respect to such month plus the product of $37.50 multiplied by the total number of such recipients, or (ii) 15 per centum of the total of the sums expended during such quarter as aid to the aged, blind, or disabled under the State plan in the form of medical or any other type of remedial care, not counting so much of any expenditure with respect to any month as exceeds the product of $7.50 multiplied by the total number of such recipients of aid to the aged, blind, or disabled for such month;

"(3) in the case of any State, an amount equal to the Federal medical percentage (as defined in section 6(c)) of the total amounts expended during such quarter as medical assistance for the aged under the State plan (including expenditures for insurance premiums for medical or any other type of remedial care or the cost thereof); and

"(4) in the case of any State, an amount equal to the sum of the following proportions of the total amounts expended during such quarter as found necessary by the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare for the proper and efficient administration of the State plan—

"(A) 75 per centum of so much of such expenditures as are for—

"(i) services which are prescribed pursuant to section 1602(a)(10) and are provided (in accordance with the next sentence) to applicants for or recipients of aid or assistance under the plan to help them attain or retain capability for self-support or self-care, or

"(ii) other services, specified by the Secretary as likely to prevent or reduce dependency, so provided to such applicants or recipients, or

"(iii) any of the services prescribed pursuant to section 1602(a)(10), and of the services specified as provided in clause (ii), which the Secretary may specify as appropriate for individuals who, within such period or periods as the Secretary may prescribe, have been or are likely to become applicants for or recipients of aid or assistance under the plan, if such services are requested by such individuals and are provided to such individuals in accordance with the next sentence, or

"(iv) the training of personnel employed or preparing for employment by the State agency or by the local agency administering the plan in the political subdivision; plus

"(B) one-half of so much of such expenditures (not included under subparagraph (A)) as are for services provided (in accordance with the next sentence) to applicants for or recipients of aid or assistance under the plan, and to individuals requesting such services who (within such period or periods as the Secretary may prescribe) have been or are likely to become applicants for or recipients of such aid or assistance; plus

"(C) one-half of the remainder of such expenditures.

The services referred to in subparagraphs (A) and (B) shall include only—

"(D) services provided by the staff of the State agency, or of the local agency administering the State plan in the political subdivision, and

"(E) subject to limitations prescribed by the Secretary, services which in the judgment of the State agency cannot be as economically or as effectively provided by the staff of such State or local agency and are not otherwise reasonably available to individuals in need of them, and which are provided, pursuant to agreement with the State agency, by the State health authority or the State agency or agencies administering or supervising the administration of the State plan for vocational rehabilitation services approved under the Vocational Rehabilitation Act or by any other State agency which the Secretary may determine to be appropriate (whether provided by its staff or by contract with public (local) or nonprofit private agencies);

except that any such services which are defined as vocational rehabilitation services under the Vocational Rehabilitation Act and which are available, from the State

agency or agencies administering or supervising the administration of the State plan for vocational rehabilitation services, to individuals under programs for their rehabilitation carried on under such State plan, may be provided only by such State agency or agencies (in the manner described in subparagraph (E)) except to the extent agreed to by such State agency or agencies. The portion of the amount expended for administration of the State plan to which subparagraph (A) applies and the portion thereof to which subparagraphs (B) and (C) apply shall be determined in accordance with such methods and procedures as may be permitted by the Secretary.

"(b) (1) Prior to the beginning of each quarter, the Secretary shall estimate the amount to which a State will be entitled under subsection (a) for such quarter, such estimates to be based on (A) a report filed by the State containing its estimate of the total sum to be expended in such quarter in accordance with the provisions of such subsection, and stating the amount appropriated or made available by the State and its political subdivisions for such expenditures in such quarter, and if such amount is less than the State's proportionate share of the total sum of such estimated expenditures, the source or sources from which the difference is expected to be derived, and (B) such other investigation as the Secretary may find necessary.

"(2) The Secretary shall then pay, in such installments as he may determine, to the State the amount so estimated, reduced or increased to the extent of any overpayment or underpayment which the Secretary determines was made under this section to such State for any prior quarter and with respect to which adjustment has not already been made under this subsection.

"(3) The pro rata share to which the United States is equitably entitled, as determined by the Secretary, of the net amount recovered during any quarter by the State or any political subdivision thereof with respect to aid or assistance furnished under the State plan, but excluding any amount of such aid or assistance recovered from the estate of a deceased recipient which is not in excess of the amount expended by the State or any political subdivision thereof for the funeral expenses of the deceased, shall be considered an overpayment to be adjusted under this subsection.

"(4) Upon the making of any estimate by the Secretary under this subsection, any appropriations available for payments under this section shall be deemed obligated.

"Operation of State plans

"SEC. 1604. If the Secretary, after reasonable notice and opportunity for hearing to the State agency administering or supervising the administration of the State plan approved under this title, finds—

"(1) that the plan has been so changed that it no longer complies with the provisions of section 1602; or

"(2) that in the administration of the plan there is a failure to comply substantially with any such provision;

the Secretary shall notify such State agency that further payments will not be made to the State (or, in his discretion, that payments will be limited to categories under or parts of the State plan not affected by such failure), until the Secretary is satisfied that there will no longer be any such failure to comply. Until he is so satisfied he shall make no further payments to such State (or shall limit payments to categories under or parts of the State plan not affected by such failure).

"Definitions

"SEC. 1605. (a) For the purposes of this title, the term 'aid to the aged, blind, or disabled' means money payments to, or medical care in behalf of or any type of remedial care recognized under State law in behalf of, needy individuals who are 65 years of age or older, are blind, or are 18 years of age or over and permanently and totally disabled, but does not include—

"(1) any such payments to or care in behalf of any individual who is an inmate of a public institution (except as a patient in a medical institution) or any individual who is a patient in an institution for tuberculosis or mental diseases, or

"(2) any such payments to any individual who has been diagnosed as having tuberculosis or psychosis and is a patient in a medical institution as a result thereof, or

"(3) any such care in behalf of any individual, who is a patient in a medical institution as a result of a diagnosis that he has tuberculosis or psychosis, with respect to any period after the individual has been a patient in such an institution, as a result of such diagnosis, for forty-two days.

"(b) For purposes of this title, the term 'medical assistance for the aged' means payment of part or all of the cost of the following care and services for individuals who are sixty-five years of age or older and who are not recipients of aid to the aged, blind, or disabled but whose income and resources are insufficient to meet all of such cost—

"(1) inpatient 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;

except that such term does not include any such payments with respect to—

"(A) care or services for any individual who is an inmate of a public institution (except as a patient in a medical institution) or any individual who is a patient in an institution for tuberculosis or mental diseases; or

"(B) care or services for any individual, who is a patient in a medical institution as a result of a diagnosis of tuberculosis or psychosis, with respect to any period after the individual has been a patient in such an institution, as a result of such diagnosis, for forty-two days."

(b) No payment may be made to a State under title I, X, or XIV of the Social Security Act for any period for which such State receives any payments under title XVI of such Act or any period thereafter.

(c) Section 1109 of such Act is amended by striking out "sections 2(a)(7), 402(a)(7), 1002(a)(8), and 7402(a)(8)" and inserting in lieu thereof "sections 2(a)(11)(A), 402(a)(7), 1002(a)(8), 1402(a)(8), and 1602(a)(14)" and by striking out "a State plan approved under title I, IV, X, or XIV" wherever it appears and inserting in lieu thereof "a State plan approved under title I, IV, X, XIV, or XVI".

(d) Section 1111 of such Act is amended by striking out "and XIV" and inserting in lieu thereof "XIV, and XVI".

(e) Section 618 of the Revenue Act of 1951 is amended by striking out "or XIV" and inserting in lieu thereof "XIV, or XVI (other than section 1603(a)(3) thereof)".

(f) In the case of any State which has a State plan approved under title XVI of the Social Security Act, any overpayment or underpayment which the Secretary determines was made to such State under section 3, 1003, or 1403 of such Act with respect to a period before the approval of the plan under such title XVI, and with respect to which adjustment has not been already made under subsection (b) of such section 3, 1003, or 1403, shall, for purposes of section 1603(b) of such Act, be considered an overpayment or underpayment (as the case may be) made under section 1603 of such Act.

Part E—Miscellaneous and technical amendments

Increase in limitation on total public assistance payments to Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands, and Guam

SEC. 151. Effective for fiscal years ending after June 30, 1962, section 1108 of the Social Security Act is amended to read as follows:

"LIMITATION ON PAYMENTS TO PUERTO RICO, THE VIRGIN ISLANDS, AND GUAM

"SEC. 1108. The total amount certified by the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare under titles I (other than section 3(a)(3) thereof), IV, X, XIV, and XVI (other than section 1603(a)(3) thereof) for payment to Puerto Rico with respect to any fiscal year shall not exceed $9,800,000, of which $625,000 may be used only for payments certified with respect to section 3(a)(2)(B) or 1603(a)(2)(B); the total amount certified by the Secretary under such titles for payments to the Virgin Islands with respect to any fiscal year shall not exceed $330,000, of which $18,750 may be used only for payments certified with respect to section 3(a)(2)(B) or 1603(a)(2)(B); and the total amount certified by the Secretary under such titles for payment to Guam with respect to any fiscal year shall not exceed $450,000, of which $25,000 may be used only for payments certified with respect to section 3(a)(2)(B) or 1603(a)(2)(B). Notwithstanding the provisions of sections 502(a)(2), 512(a)(2), 522(a), and 527(a), and until such time as the Congress may by appropriation or other law otherwise provide, the Secretary shall, in lieu of the initial (or, in the case of section 527(a), the minimum) allotment specified in such sections, allot such smaller amounts to Guam as he may deem appropriate."

Payments to Relative of Child When Child Is Dependent

SEC. 152. Section 406(b) of the Social Security Act is amended by striking out "for any month" and by striking out "if money payments have been made under the State plan with respect to such child for such month".

Definitions of "State" and "United States"

SEC. 153. (a) Paragraph (1) of section 1101(a) of the Social Security Act is amended by striking out "X, and XIV" and inserting in lieu thereof "X, XI, XIV, and XVI".

(b) Paragraph (2) of such section is amended by striking out ", the District of Columbia, and the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico".

TITLE II—GENERAL

Meaning of Term "Secretary"

SEC. 201. As used in this Act and in the provisions of the Social Security Act amended by this Act, the term "Secretary", unless the context otherwise requires, means the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare.

Effective Dates

SEC. 202. (a) The amendments made by sections 101(b), 102(b)(1), 103, 106, and 134 shall become effective July 1, 1963.

(b) The amendments made by sections 102(c) and 123 shall be applicable in the case of fiscal years beginning after June 30, 1962.

(c) The amendments made by sections 101(a), 102 (b) (2) and (d), 132, 135, and 152 shall be applicable in the case of expenditures, under a State plan approved under title I, IV, X, or XIV of the Social Security Act or developed as provided in part 3 of title V of such Act, as the case may be, made after June 30, 1962.

(d) The amendments made by sections 107(a) and 109 shall be applicable in the case of expenditures, under a State plan approved under title IV of the Social Security Act, made after September 30, 1962.

(e) The amendments made by sections 105 and 108 shall be applicable in the case of expenditures under a State plan approved under title IV of the Social Security Act, made during the period beginning October 1, 1962, and ending with the close of June 30, 1967.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

On page 64, lines 23 and 24, strike out "who has resided therein for" and insert in lieu thereof "who has resided therein five years during the nine years immediately preceding the application for such aid and has resided therein continuously for".

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there further committee amendments?

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Chairman, there are no further committee amendments.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. LANDRUM, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 10606) to extend and improve the public assistance and child welfare services programs of the Social Security Act, and for other purposes, pursuant to House Resolution 563, he reported the bill back to the House with an amendment adopted by the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

The question is on the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on engrossment and third reading of the bill.

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

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. I am, Mr. Speaker.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin moves to recommit the bill (H.R. 10606) to the Committee on Ways and Means with instructions to report the same back to the House forthwith with the following amendments:

Page 48, line 18, strike out "29/35" and insert "four-fifths";

Page 48, line 20, strike out "$35" and insert "$31";

Page 49, line 10, strike out "$70" and insert "$66";

Page 49, line 19, strike out "$85" and insert "$81";

Page 49, line 24, strike out "$70" and insert "$66";

Page 50, line 16, strike out "$37.50" and insert "$35.50";

Page 50, line 23, strike out "$45" and insert "$43";

Page 51, line 3, strike out "$37.50" and insert "$35.50;

Page 51, line 25, strike out "29/35" and insert "four-fifths";

Page 52, line 2, strike out "$35" and insert "$31";

Page 52, line 16, strike out "$70" and insert "$66";

Page 53, line 1, strike out "$37.50" and insert "$35.50";

Page 53, line 19, strike out "29/35" and insert "four-fifths";

Page 53, line 21, strike out "$35" and insert "$31";

Page 54, line 11, strike out "$70" and insert "$66";

Page 54, line 21, strike out "$37.50" and insert "$35.50";

Page 66, line 17, strike out "29/35" and insert four-fifths";

Page 66, line 19, strike out "$35" and insert "$31";

Page 67, line 8, strike out "$70" and insert "$66";

Page 67, line 17, strike out "$85" and insert "$81";

Page 67, line 22, strike out "$70" and insert "$66";

Page 68, line 16, strike out "$37.50" and insert "$35.50";

Page 68, line 24, strike out "$45" and insert "$43"; and

Page 69, line 5, strike out "$37.50" and insert "$35.50".

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin (interrupting the reading of the amendment). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that further reading of the amendment be dispensed with; I believe the amendment is understood.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the motion to recommit.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion to recommit.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, on that I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 155, nays 233, not voting 48, as follows:

[Roll No. 39]

YEAS—155

Abbitt	Cunningham	Horan
Adair	Curtin	Hosmer
Alger	Curtis, Mass.	Jarman
Anderson, Ill.	Curtis, Mo.	Jennings
Arends	Dague	Johansen
Ashbrook	Davis, James C.	Jonas
Auchincloss	Derounian	Judd
Avery	Devine	Kearns
Ayres	Dole	Keith
Barry	Dominick	Kilburn
Bass, N.H.	Dooley	King, N.Y.
Bates	Dorn	Knox
Battin	Downing	Kyl
Becker	Durno	Laird
Beermann	Dwyer	Langen
Belcher	Findley	Latta
Bell	Ford	Lindsay
Berry	Frelinghuysen	Lipscomb
Betts	Fulton	McCulloch
Bolton	Garland	McDonough
Bow	Gary	McIntire
Bray	Goodell	McVey
Bromwell	Goodling	MacGregor
Broomfield	Griffin	Mailliard
Brown	Gross	Martin, Nebr.
Broyhill	Gubser	Mathias
Bruce	Hall	May
Byrnes, Wis.	Halleck	Meader
Cahill	Hardy	Michel
Chamberlain	Harrison Wyo.	Miller, N.Y.
Chenoweth	Harsha	Milliken
Chiperfield	Harvey, Ind.	Minshall
Church	Harvey, Mich.	Morse
Clancy	Hiestand	Mosher
Collier	Hoeven	Nelsen
Conte	Hoffman, Ill.	Norblad
Cramer	Osmers	Nygaard
Ostertag	Rousselot	Taber
Pelly	St. George	Teague, Calif.
Pike	Schadeberg	Thomson, Wis.
Pillion	Schenck	Tollefson
Pirnie	Scherer	Tuck
Poff	Schneebeli	Utt
Quie	Schweiker	Van Pelt
Ray	Schwengel	Wallhauser
Reece	Seely-Brown	Weis
Reifel	Short	Westland
Rhodes, Ariz.	Sibal	Wharton
Riehlman	Siler	Widnall
Robison	Smith, Calif.	Wilson, Calif.
Roudebush	Smith, Va.	Wilson, Ind.
	Springer	Younger

NAYS—233

Abernethy	Green, Oreg.	O'Neill
Addabbo	Green, Pa.	Passman
Addonizio	Griffiths	Patman
Albert	Hagan, Ga.	Perkins
Alexander	Hagen, Calif.	Peterson
Anfuso	Halpern	Pfost
Ashley	Hansen	Philbin
Ashmore	Harris	Pilcher
Aspinall	Hays	Poage
Bailey	Healey	Powell
Baldwin	Hébert	Price
Baring	Hechler	Pucinski
Barrett	Hemphill	Purcell
Bass, Tenn.	Henderson	Randall
Beckworth	Herlong	Reuss
Bennett, Fla.	Holifield	Rhodes, Pa.
Bennett, Mich.	Holland	Rivers, Alaska
Blatnik	Hull	Rivers, S.C.
Boland	Ichord, Mo.	Roberts, Tex.
Bolling	Inouye	Rodino
Bonner	Joelson	Rogers, Colo.
Brademas	Johnson, Calif.	Rogers, Fla.
Brewster	Johnson, Md.	Rooney
Brooks	Johnson, Wis.	Roosevelt
Buckley	Jones, Mo.	Rosenthal
Burke, Ky.	Karsten	Rostenkowski
Burke, Mass.	Kastenmeier	Roush
Burleson	Kee	Rutherford
Byrne, Pa.	Kelly	Ryan, Mich.
Cannon	Keogh	Ryan, N.Y.
Carey	Kilgore	St. Germain
Casey	King, Calif.	Santangelo
Celler	King, Utah	Saund
Chelf	Kirwan	Saylor
Clark	Kluczynski	Scott
Cohelan	Kornegay	Scranton
Cook	Kowalski	Selden
Corbett	Kunkel	Shipley
Corman	Landrum	Sikes
Daddario	Lankford	Sisk
Daniels	Lennon	Slack
Davis, John W.	Lesinski	Smith, Iowa
Dawson	Libonati	Smith, Miss.
Delaney	Loser	Stafford
Dent	McDowell	Staggers
Denton	McFall	Steed
Diggs	McSween	Stephens
Dingell	Mack	Stratton
Donohue	Magnuson	Stubblefield
Dowdy	Mahon	Sullivan
Doyle	Marshall	Taylor
Dulski	Martin, Mass.	Teague, Tex.
Edmondson	Matthews	Thomas
Everett	Merrow	Thompson, N.J.
Evins	Miller, Clem	Thompson, Tex.
Fallon	Miller, George P.	Thornberry
Farbstein	Mills	Toll
Fascell	Moeller	Trimble
Feighan	Monagan	Tupper
Fenton	Montoya	Udall, Morris K.
Finnegan	Moore	Ullman
Fino	Moorhead, Pa.	Vanik
Fisher	Morgan	Van Zandt
Flood	Morris	Vinson
Fogarty	Moss	Waggonner
Forrester	Multer	Walter
Fountain	Murphy	Watts
Frazier	Murray	Whalley
Friedel	Natcher	Whitener
Gallagher	Nedzi	Wickersham
Garmatz	Nix	Williams
Gathings	O'Brien, Ill.	Willis
Gavin	O'Brien, N.Y.	Winstead
Giaimo	O'Hara, Ill.	Wright
Gilbert	O'Hara, Mich.	Yates
Gonzalez	O'Konski	Young
Granahan	Olsen	Zablocki
Gray		Zelenko

NOT VOTING—48

Alford	Cederberg	Glenn
Andersen, Minn.	Coad	Grant
Andrews	Colmer	Haley
Baker	Cooley	Harding
Blitch	Davis, Tenn.	Harrison, Va.
Boggs	Derwinski	Hoffman, Mich.
Boykin	Elliott	Huddleston
Breeding	Ellsworth	Jensen
	Flynt	Jones, Ala.

Karth	Morrison	Spence
Kitchin	Moulder	Thompson, La.
Lane	Norrell	Weaver
McMillan	Rains	Whitten
Macdonald	Roberts, Ala.	
Madden	Rogers, Tex.	
Mason	Shelley	
Moorehead, Ohio	Sheppard	
	Shriver	

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Rogers of Texas for, with Mr. Boggs against.

Mr. Cederberg for, with Mr. Madden against.

Mr. Moorehead of Ohio for, with Mr. Cooley against.

Mr. Weaver for, with Mr. Sheppard against.

Mr. Mason for, with Mr. Morrison against.

Mr. Shriver for, with Mr. Karth against.

Mr. Ellsworth for, with Mr. Shelley against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Breeding with Mr. Andersen of Minnesota.

Mr. Alford with Mr. Derwinski.

Mr. Haley with Mr. Glenn.

Mr. Macdonald with Mr. Baker.

Mr. Lane with Mr. Jensen.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I walked into the Chamber just after my name was called. Do I qualify?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman must be present and listening, and failed to hear his name in order to qualify.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER. The question is on passage of the bill.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, on that I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 320, nays 69, not voting 47, as follows:

[Roll No. 40]

YEAS—320

Abbitt	Cannon	Farbstein
Abernethy	Carey	Fascell
Adair	Casey	Feighan
Addabbo	Celler	Fenton
Addonizio	Chelf	Finnegan
Albert	Chenoweth	Fino
Alexander	Chiperfield	Fisher
Anfuso	Clark	Flood
Arends	Cohelan	Fogarty
Ashley	Colmer	Forrester
Ashmore	Conte	Fountain
Aspinall	Cook	Frazier
Avery	Corbett	Friedel
Ayres	Corman	Fulton
Bailey	Cramer	Gallagher
Baldwin	Cunningham	Garland
Baring	Curtin	Garmatz
Barrett	Curtis, Mass.	Gary
Barry	Daddario	Gathings
Bass, N.H.	Dague	Gavin
Bass, Tenn.	Daniels	Giaimo
Bates	Davis, James C.	Gilbert
Beckworth	Davis, John W.	Gonzalez
Bell	Dawson	Goodell
Bennett, Fla.	Delaney	Granahan
Bennett, Mich.	Dent	Gray
Blatnik	Denton	Green, Oreg.
Boland	Diggs	Green, Pa.
Bolling	Dingell	Griffin
Bonner	Donohue	Griffiths
Bow	Dooley	Gubser
Brademas	Dowdy	Hagan, Ga.
Bray	Downing	Hagen, Calif.
Brewster	Doyle	Halleck
Brooks	Dulski	Halpern
Broomfield	Durno	Hansen
Buckley	Dwyer	Hardy
Burke, Ky.	Edmondson	Harris
Burke, Mass.	Everett	Harrison, Wyo.
Burleson	Evins	Harsha
Byrne, Pa.	Fallon	Hays
Cahill	Farnsley	Healey
Hébert	Milliken	Saund
Hechler	Mills	Saylor
Hemphill	Moeller	Schenck
Henderson	Monagan	Schneebeli
Herlong	Moore	Schweiker
Hoeven	Moorhead, Pa.	Schwengel
Holifield	Morgan	Scott
Holland	Morris	Scranton
Horan	Morse	Seely-Brown
Hosmer	Mosher	Selden
Hull	Moss	Shipley
Ichord, Mo.	Multer	Sibal
Inouye	Murphy	Sikes
Jarman	Murray	Siler
Jennings	Natcher	Sisk
Joelson	Nedzi	Slack
Johnson, Calif.	Nelsen	Smith, Iowa
Johnson, Md.	Nix	Smith, Miss.
Johnson, Wis.	Norblad	Smith, Va.
Jonas	Nygaard	Springer
Jones, Mo.	O'Brien, Ill.	Stafford
Judd	O'Brien, N.Y.	Staggers
Karsten	O'Hara, Ill.	Steed
Kastenmeier	O'Hara, Mich.	Stephens
Kee	O'Konski	Stratton
Keith	Olsen	Stubblefield
Kelly	O'Neill	Sullivan
Keogh	Ostertag	Taylor
Kilgore	Passman	Teague, Tex.
King, Calif.	Patman	Thomas
King, Utah	Perkins	Thompson, N.J.
Kirwan	Peterson	Thompson, Tex.
Kluczynski	Pfost	Thomson, Wis.
Knox	Philbin	Thornberry
Kornegay	Pike	Toll
Kowalski	Pilcher	Tollefson
Kunkel	Pirnie	Trimble
Kyl	Poage	Tuck
Landrum	Poff	Tupper
Langen	Powell	Udall, Morris K.
Lankford	Price	Ullman
Latta	Pucinski	Vanik
Lennon	Purcell	Van Zandt
Lesinski	Quie	Vinson
Libonati	Randall	Wallhauser
Lindsay	Reuss	Walter
Loser	Rhodes, Pa.	Watts
McDonough	Riehlman	Weis
McDowell	Rivers, Alaska	Westland
McFall	Rivers, S.C.	Whalley
McIntire	Roberts, Tex.	Wharton
McSween	Robison	Whitener
Mack	Rodino	Wickersham
Magnuson	Rogers, Colo.	Williams
Mahon	Rogers, Fla.	Willis
Mailliard	Rooney	Wilson, Calif.
Marshall	Roosevelt	Wilson, Ind.
Martin, Mass.	Rosenthal	Winstead
Mathias	Rostenkowski	Wright
Matthews	Roush	Yates
Meader	Rutherford	Young
Merrow	Ryan, Mich.	Younger
Miller, Clem	Ryan, N.Y.	Zablocki
Miller, George P.	St. George	Zelenko
Miller, N.Y.	St. Germain	
	Santangelo	

NAYS—69

Alger	Dole	Martin, Nebr.
Anderson, Ill.	Dominick	May
Ashbrook	Dorn	Michel
Auchincloss	Findley	Minshall
Battin	Ford	Osmers
Becker	Frelinghuysen	Pelly
Beermann	Goodling	Pillion
Belcher	Gross	Ray
Berry	Hall	Reece
Betts	Harvey, Ind.	Reifel
Bolton	Harvey, Mich.	Rhodes, Ariz.
Bromwell	Hiestand	Roudebush
Brown	Hoffman, Ill.	Rousselot
Broyhill	Johansen	Schadeberg
Bruce	Kearns	Scherer
Byrnes, Wis.	Kilburn	Short
Chamberlain	King, N.Y.	Smith, Calif.
Church	Laird	Taber
Clancy	Lipscomb	Teague, Calif.
Collier	McCulloch	Utt
Curtis, Mo.	McMillan	Van Pelt
Derounian	McVey	Waggonner
Devine	MacGregor	Widnall

NOT VOTING—47

Alford	Derwinski	Karth
Andersen, Minn.	Elliott	Kitchin
Andrews	Ellsworth	Lane
Baker	Flynt	Macdonald
Blitch	Glenn	Madden
Boggs	Grant	Mason
Boykin	Haley	Montoya
Breeding	Harding	Moorehead, Ohio
Cederberg	Harrison, Va.	Morrison
Coad	Hoffman, Mich.	Moulder
Cooley	Huddleston	Norrell
Davis, Tenn.	Jensen	Rains
Roberts, Ala.	Sheppard	Thompson, La.
Rogers, Tex.	Shriver	Weaver
Shelley	Spence	Whitten

So the bill was passed.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Boggs for, with Mr. Rogers of Texas against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Spence with Mr. Moorehead of Ohio.

Mr. Breeding with Mr. Jensen.

Mr. Alford with Mr. Baker.

Mr. Madden with Mr. Derwinski.

Mr. Cooley with Mr. Weaver.

Mr. Morrison with Mr. Cederberg.

Mr. Lane with Mr. Shriver.

Mr. Shelley with Mr. Andersen of Minnesota.

Mr. Sheppard with Mr. Mason.

Mr. Karth with Mr. Glenn.

Mr. Macdonald with Mr. Ellsworth.

Mr. Montoya with Mr. Hoffman of Michigan.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members desiring to do so may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks in the RECORD on the bill just passed.

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

There was no objection.

FURTHER MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A further message from the Senate by Mr. McGown, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate agrees 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) entitled "An Act 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."

TO ESTABLISH A CODE OF LAW FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. JAMES C. DAVIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk 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, with a Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

Resolved, That the bill from the House of Representatives (H.R. 5143) entitled "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", do pass with the following amendment: Page 3, line 1, after "may" insert "by unanimous vote".

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

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I take this time for the purpose of inquiring of the majority leader as to the program for next week.

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

Mr. HALLECK. Yes; I yield.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, on Monday the Consent Calendar is scheduled. There are no suspensions.

For Tuesday the Private Calendar is scheduled. Also scheduled for that day is the Interior Department appropriation bill for 1963.

For Wednesday, H.R. 9751, authorization, Armed Forces, aircraft, missiles and naval vessels, is scheduled.

For Thursday and the balance of the week, H.R. 10650, the Revenue Act of 1962, is scheduled if a rule is reported.

This is subject to the usual reservation that any further program may be announced later, and conference reports may be brought up at any time.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, I might suggest that it has been my understanding that we will adjourn over until Monday.

ADJOURNMENT TO MONDAY, MARCH 19, 1962

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, there will be no further legislative business this week.

In view of that, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourns to meet on Monday, next.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, and I shall not object, I wonder if the gentleman could give us information in regard to the financial condition of the United Nations?

As early as last December we were told that the financial condition of the United Nations was critical; that they had to have a loan and had to have some money. I wonder if the gentleman could give us any idea as to when this so-called loan or bond issue for the United Nations is going to come on for consideration to deal with the critical situation that has existed?

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, all that the gentleman from Oklahoma can do is to say that the matter is receiving the consideration of the appropriate committee, and will be on the floor, I am sure, in due course of events.

Mr. GROSS. I thank the gentleman.

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

There was no objection.

RECEIPT OF MESSAGES AND AUTHORIZATION FOR SIGNING OF BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that notwithstanding the adjournment of the House until Monday next, the Clerk be authorized to receive messages from the Senate, and that the Speaker be authorized to sign any enrolled bills and joint resolutions duly passed by the two Houses and found truly enrolled.

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

There was no objection.

ADDITIONAL COPIES, REVENUE ACT OF 1962

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of House Resolution 566.

The Clerk read the resolution as follows:

Resolved, That there be printed for the use of the Committee on Ways and Means, House of Representatives, four thousand additional copies of the report submitted by that committee pursuant to H.R. 10650, the "Revenue Act of 1962".

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

There was no objection.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

"ADMINISTERED PRICES, DRUGS"

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I call up Senate Concurrent Resolution 59 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the concurrent resolution as follows:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That there be printed for the use of the Committee on the Judiciary two thousand additional copies of Senate Report Numbered 448, Eighty-seventh Congress, first session, entitled "Administered Prices, Drugs", a report issued by the Committee on the Judiciary and made by its Subcommittee on Antitrust and Monopoly pursuant to S. Res. 52, Eighty-seventh Congress.

The concurrent resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ST. PATRICK

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. OLSEN. Mr. Speaker, some undeniably sincere folks keep writing me incessantly that what we need today is a man on horseback, 19th century variety.

I could not disagree more.

But what I am sure we could use is another fifth century St. Patrick.

Just a generous man of quiet courage, not a loudmouth, who, by example and not by slogans and malice, would aid us in winning the battle against the paganism of this day—communism.

Just a humble man, who, loving the oppressed and the enslaved, would champion their human rights and welfare, and not ignore them or begrudge them.

Just a tolerant man, who, by putting real meaning in the Christian words of charity and brotherhood, would bring light, instead of heat, to some of our dark corners, as St. Patrick did for Ireland.

In short, just a man of supreme love.

It would be grand if God would grant us another St. Patrick today.

Even though there would be some, I am afraid, who would be sure to make him out to be a Socialist or worse.

But what would count, of course, is not what today's newspaper would say, but what tomorrow's history books would record.

And history has recorded that St. Patrick was exactly that—a saint. And a pretty remarkable saint at that.

He brought to Ireland the Christian doctrine, and without a war.

His followers kept the doctrine alive and, indeed, radiated it to the Western World during the Dark Ages.

For that we are all thankful—Irish and non-Irish the world over—as we celebrate his day, St. Patrick's Day, Saturday.

THE AMERICAN LEFT AND CUBA

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, my colleagues in the House are certainly familiar with many statements which have come recently from a variety of sources to the effect that the people of the United States have no reason to fear internal subversion by the Communist conspiracy and its allies on the far left.

To agree with these statements would be, of course, to abandon the defense of the United States on the domestic front where the danger of subversion is clear and present.

There is little realization in the public opinion how wide in scope are the activities of our extreme left wing. In order to bring out a clearer picture of the extent of their publications and the number and names of the writers who supply material to those publications, I invite my colleagues to read an article entitled "The American Left and Cuba," written by Dennis H. Wrong and published

in the February 1962 issue of the magazine Commentary, a publication of the American Jewish Committee. The article follows:

THE AMERICAN LEFT AND CUBA

(By Dennis H. Wrong)

Now that Cuba has become a member of the Soviet bloc and Fidel Castro has proclaimed that he has for some time been a dedicated "Marxist-Leninist," the response of the American left to the Cuban Revolution may be examined without recapitulating the previously contested evidence for these developments. Supporters of the Castro regime, while they will certainly continue to blame the United States for the victory of Cuban communism, can no longer pretend that they are defending anything but a one-party dictatorship which has chosen a totalitarian course in internal politics and has completely forsworn neutralism in the cold war. No doubt many of Castro's American supporters will not draw back from such a defense, but others have had to undergo the only too familiar experience in this century of seeing their half-suppressed doubts about the trend of a new regime transformed into bleak certainties.

The Cuban tragedy of errors has been played out to the full. Events have entirely justified both the original fears of American policymakers about Cuba and of the Cuban revolutionaries about the United States. And the half-wishful nature of the fears on each side has helped make them self-confirming in their action and reaction upon one another. The disastrous American-sponsored invasion of last spring—morally and politically, not merely technically, disastrous—vindicated Castro in his demagogic anti-Americanism, although the violence and paranoia of his attacks on the United States helped bring about the very response he professed to fear. If the shock of the invasion forced liberal critics of Castro to confront the utter bankruptcy and irresponsibility of American policy, those whose willingness to give Castro the benefit of the doubt was strengthened by the invasion, can no longer evade full recognition of his primary allegiance in policy and ideology to the Sino-Soviet bloc. The air has cleared in the harsh daylight of the latest Cuban events, and a post-mortem on the attitudes of the American left toward the Cuban Revolution is now very much in order—and all the more so since the Cuban Revolution has provided the first significant test of the values and political intelligence of that amorphous entity, the "New Left."

In Britain, where the label originated, and to some extent on the European continent, the "new left" refers to a fairly definite grouping of radicals under 40 who possess some organizational unity, journals of their own, and ties to the leftwing of established Socialist Parties. In America it is far harder to identify a coherent movement of youthful political protest. Negro sit-in strikers in the South, northern groups sponsoring active resistance to segregation, young adherents of the peace movement, the essentially apolitical beats, and revived socialist clubs and journals in the big cities and on some university campuses, present a varied picture. Except for their attraction to the young, no single target or common denominator unites these expressions of protest. All of them, moreover, have depended heavily on the ideological and organizational leadership of older men with long records of participation in the crusades and battles of the past three decades. Compared to its European counterparts, the American new left is less fully an autonomous movement of the young generation—even the literary beats are indebted to middle-aged promotors and gurus. Thus any survey of reactions to the Cuban Revolution must also consider various sectors of "old left" opinion as well as the position of the left, old and new, in relation to the major historical developments of the past decade and a half.

Europe, which in the early years of the cold war was the main theater of political conflict, has successfully resisted further Communist expansion and has experienced unprecedented economic progress under moderate conservative governments. The once popular left view that only a Socialist "third force," encouraged by the United States, could prevent the Continent from falling to the Communists has been utterly refuted by events. In America, where there has never been an established left in the European sense, liberal and radical demands have been confined to marginal issues by the requirements of cold war diplomacy and the defense economy. Throughout the western world a parochial lack of concern with foreign policy and a concentration on secondary domestic issues has been the response of much of the left to this frustrating situation which deprives it of an independent political role.

Since the middle 1950's, however, there has been a growing tendency on the left to define the cold war as primarily a struggle over the political and economic destiny of the underdeveloped nations. As old-fashioned anticolonialism has become less relevant, with more and more Asian and African peoples winning national independence, a preoccupation with the economic development of the new nations has begun to replace it. In the political stasis of the cold war and prosperity at home, the politics of economic development are becoming a substitute for the politics of domestic class struggle as a special concern of the left; Asia, Africa, and now Latin America, rather than Europe or the United States, have become the parts of the world for which the left can still claim or possess relevant prescriptions. Essentially, this reorientation of interest represents a sensible and long overdue recognition that we truly live in one world and an awareness that conservatives are unable or disinclined to sympathize with revolutionary change in its underdeveloped half.

But an insistence on the primary importance of the political and economic problems of the underdeveloped world has the additional attraction to some leftists of permitting an ideological end-run around the military frontier of the cold war and the dilemmas of nuclear policy it poses. If it leads to an emphasis on the open, nonmilitary aspect of the East-West conflict, it also permits bypassing the cold war altogether and is easily combined with advocacy of total disengagement in Europe, demands for unilateral disarmament by the West, and an excessive readiness to believe that Khrushchev's Russia is more pacific and reasonable than Stalin's. The obvious irrelevance to the underdeveloped world of the anti-Communist monomania and military mindedness of the conventional American definition of the cold war enables the left to adopt a perspective which is oppositionist at home yet ideologically pragmatic on a world historical scale, and which transcends the weary issues of capitalism and socialism, or new dealism, communism, and anticommunism, as they have been conceived in the context of Western politics. Yet old problems of freedom, revolution, the price of economic progress, and the relevance of democracy reappear, though now at arm's length from the internal life of the Western political community.

The importance of the Cuban Revolution to the American left must be understood against this background rather than as the result of any long-standing interest in Cuba itself or even Latin America. Suddenly the task of overcoming poverty in backward countries was dramatized by a full-fledged social revolution in America's own underdeveloped sphere of influence, long dismissed as a politically hopeless area dominated by corrupt military dictators, where—the symbols of formal independence having been won long ago—even the dynamism of a rising nationalism was lacking. Castro's triumph coincided with the closing years of the Eisenhower administration, whose sterile anti-communism and hostility or indifference to revolutionary movements abroad had been reflected in its tolerance of the deposed Batista. Cuba represents several "firsts": the first successful popular social revolution with a worldwide impact in many years; the first political event in Latin America for decades to have had great repercussions in the United States; the first underdeveloped country to produce a leader capable of moving Western intellectuals to entranced identification with him; the first country geographically remote from the Communist bloc nations to pattern itself internally on them and to give them its full allegiance; the first country to become a victim of an American act of aggression since the beginning of the cold war. (Guatemala was ambiguous at the time, although it has aroused considerable retrospective indignation, particularly in light of Cuba.)

Castro had the almost universal support of American liberals and radicals—as well as of more conservative segments of opinion—for about a year after he came to power at the end of 1958. By the summer of 1959 it was evident that the Cuban Revolution amounted to more than the dramatic overthrow of an unpopular dictator and that its leaders possessed the drive and support to carry out a radical program of land reform and industrial nationalization. Expropriated American business interests began to make common cause with anti-Communist and nationalist American politicians and publicists on the right and with largely pro-Batista Cuban exile groups in attacking the Castro regime. Rising criticism in the United States, most of it emanating from such ignorant and profoundly ill-willed sources, had the effect of increasing American left-wing support of the Cuban Revolution. The Fair Play for Cuba Committee was founded by a number of prominent liberals and radicals in the spring of 1960 and established chapters on some university campuses, attracting the support of left-wing students. In the spring and summer of 1960 visits to Cuba "to see for oneself" by radical intellectuals who had shown little previous interest in Latin American politics became common. Before this period, the main accounts of the Cuban Revolution going beyond day-by-day reporting had come from a few journalists (Herbert Matthews of the New York Times was, of course, the most influential) and several academic specialists in Latin American affairs. Nearly all of them were strongly sympathetic to Castro and the revolution, although a few expressed reservations, less about the influence of the Communists than about the totalitarian implications of Castro's persistent fanning of a ferocious populist mood with diatribes against counter-revolutionaries, ex-Batistianos, and increasingly, "Yankee imperialism."

By the late summer and autumn of 1960, the first lengthy interpretations of the revolution by radical intellectuals, following their visits to Cuba earlier in the year, appeared. These included two books, Leo Huberman and Paul M. Sweezy's "Cuba, Anatomy of a Revolution," and C. Wright Mills' "Listen, Yankee," as well as Jean-Paul Sartre's series of articles, later published in the United States in a volume called "Sartre on Cuba." These writers took note of assertions that the Castro regime was moving in a Communist direction—but only as voiced in vulgar and inaccurate form by the popular American press. They paid little attention to charges of growing internal Communist

influence, except to deny them, and defended Cuba's economic ties with the Soviet Union (for which, of course, a good case could be made) as no more than a sound business proposition necessitated by the American suspension of the Cuban sugar quota. Yet months before these writers had visited Cuba, as early as the autumn of 1959, the growing power of the Cuban Communists had become a major issue within the Castro regime itself, and a number of Castro's closest revolutionary comrades—by no means respectable moderates opposed to basic economic reforms, as Castro's apologists allege—had defected or been forced out of office for opposing Communist gains at the expense of the original Fidelistas. Undeniably, most of the intellectuals who visited Cuba in early 1960 were in no position to observe or even to learn of these developments (for one thing few of them spoke Spanish), but they were scarcely disposed in any case to view the revolution with even a modicum of critical reserve.

Events were moving so quickly in Cuba that by the time the more lengthy analyses of the revolution had appeared in book form in the United States the situation had greatly changed. As a socialist writer, Michael Harrington, observed last August, "Listen, Yankee" is a faithful rendering of the point of view of a 26th of July militant of a year or so ago. * * * One reads, for instance, how his (Mills') militant feels about the Communist Party, and then turns to the most recent statement of the maximum leader. An enormous change has taken place, and Mills had no inkling of it." What is true of Mills' book is even truer of Sarte's existentialist celebration of the revolution as a movement guided by no fixed ideology but defining itself in practice.

Magazines and newspapers, however, can avoid being outdated by events more easily than books. By the end of 1960 and through the following year, division within the ranks of the left over Castro's Cuba became clearly evident and can be followed, especially in their correspondence columns, in Dissent, the Catholic Worker, Liberation, Monthly Review, the Nation, the New Leader, New Politics, the New Republic, Studies on the Left, and the Village Voice. These journals more or less cover the spectrum of left opinion in the United States, excluding official Communist publications and those of the tiny Marxist sects. None of them published articles or editorials defending the American-supported invasion of last April, even in its conception as distinct from its execution, and none of them have taken seriously the ultraright view that the entire Cuban revolution was simply a Communist plot from the beginning.

Articles on Cuba in the New Leader and Dissent have been almost uniformly critical of the Castro regime, expressing reservations even in the early period when left-liberal opinion was unanimously sympathetic. Monthly Review and Studies on the left, on the other hand, have been even more consistently pro-Castro and have increasingly engaged in polemics against the views of the anti-Castro left. The other journals, in varying degrees, have published both pro- and anti-Castro articles; their letters columns, and in the case of Liberation their editorial columns, have been filled with vigorous controversy. This rough lineup of pro and anti views on the trend of the revolution has, as we shall see, some significance, but it should be emphasized that it in no way corresponds to a broader continuum of views from moderate to extreme left—if, indeed, such a classification makes sense at all any longer, which is doubtful. However, the various groupings and ideological positions of both the old and the new left are reflected in reactions to the Cuban situation.

The New Leader and Dissent both represent the old anti-Stalinist left, the former from what was once a rightwing Socialist (or Menshevik) position, the latter from a more radical, often sophisticated Marxist or neo-Marxist, perspective. The New Leader last year published two long supplements on Cuba by Theodore Draper, which have made Draper the Trotsky of the Cuban revolution to Castro's supporters—a critic who is too well informed and formidable to be easily dismissed. Draper is an ex-Communist, the author of two excellent scholarly studies of American communism, whose first visit to Cuba in the spring of 1960 was followed by an article praising the reforms improving living standards initiated by the Castro regime in the first year of the revolution. Other survivors of the old anti-Stalinist left, whether they were formerly Communists, Trotskyites, or Social Democrats, and whether they are today moderate liberals or some species of Democratic Socialist have also—usually more in sorrow than in anger—turned against the Castro regime while continuing to condemn the invasion attempt and America's past record of tolerating rightist dictators and economic colonialism in Cuba and Latin America as a whole. Among those who have expressed themselves forcefully are Robert Alexander and Daniel Friedenberg (both authorities on Latin America long before the Cuban revolution), and Michael Harrington, Michael Walzer, and Sam Bottone. Inevitably, memories of a previous revolution betrayed made veteran anti-Stalinists sensitive to totalitarian tendencies in Cuba from the beginning; their doubts and suspicions were intensified when Castro denounced former comrades as traitors, when Fidelista exiles began to flock to Miami, when the Cuban leaders disparaged democratic institutions and destroyed civil fredoms in the name of the higher democracy of the revolution—and when some American leftists began to indulge in a painfully familiar brand of apologetics for the regime.

Monthly Review, on the other hand, represents that segment of American leftist opinion which, without associating itself in any way with the Communist Party either ideologically or organizationally, has continued to maintain that Russia and China are "Socialist" countries, more "progressive" and therefore more deserving of the sympathy of the left than the "capitalist" West. Monthly Review has often been critical of the Soviet Union since Hungary and de-Stalinization, buit its editors and contributors have never abandoned their conviction that Soviet society is bound to become more liberal now that it is fully industrialized and that its economic achievements provide the best model for the underdeveloped countries to follow. Joan Robinson, the well-known British Keynesian economist, recently exulted in Monthly Review that Western capitalism, although undeniably more stable than formerly, could pride itself on being the second-best economic system in the world, the growth rates of Russia and China allegedly having proven the superiority of socialism. Miss Robinson, Paul Baran, and Paul Sweezy (one of the editors), as well as several other regular contributors to Monthly Review, are all professional economists. Their fetishism of economic development, no matter what its political and social costs, curiously parallels the free market fetishism of their opposite numbers, the hard neoclassical economists who advocate abandoning all government welfare programs, including public education, and outlawing trade unions in order to maximize "consumer sovereignty" and "efficient allocation of economic resources," which can only be insured by a pure free market system.

Cuba has provided a heaven-sent ideological opportunity for the fetishists of state-directed economic growth. Since they are forced to concede that Western capitalism has partially resolved its "internal contradictions" and moderated class conflicts, the underdeveloped world now becomes the place where the "fetters of capitalism" prevent economic progress. And when, as in Cuba, a revolution occurs in a backward country directed against a corrupt native ruling class allied with American business interests, "capitalism," and better still American capitalism, can with some plausibility be blamed for underdevelopment, rather than the greed of domestic oligarchs, overpopulation, or the strength of pre-industrial traditions and institutions. Thus worldwide significance can be attributed to Cuba. Huberman and Sweezy and Baran have been quick to interpret the revolution in accordance with their view that "socialism," defined as centralized state planning and nothing more, is the sole road to economic dvelopment for backward countries. Dictatorships and the destruction of civil liberties are seen as temporary necessities justified by the long-run goal of economic development and the ruthlessness of the capitalist-imperialist enemy. These writers, not surprisingly, are undisturbed by the Communist take-over in Cuba and are far more ready to concede that there has been such a take-over than other American supporters of Castro. "A stranger arriving in Havana," Prof. J. P. Morray wrote last summer in Monthly Review, "would now have some difficulty distinguishing the official Communist Party newspaper from the others." His explanation, echoing that of Castro and Che Guevara themselves, is that, although there were few replacements of non-Communists by Communists in the top levels of the government, "the necessities of the revolution and the growing contacts with the socialist [read Soviet bloc] countries produced what appears to have been a mass conversion to Marxist-Leninist ideology." He concludes—probably accurately—that "the steady course of the revolution toward Leninist socialism is due to the hand of Fidel Castro, not of the Communist Party, at the helm of the Cuban state."

In effect, the Monthly Review group has adapted past apologias for Soviet totalitarianism to the Cuban situation in the language of a new theory of the requirements of economic development. Isolated by the cold war, disoriented by Hungary and de-Stalinization, they have been enabled by the Cuban revolution to regain some intellectual influence over the various politically inexperienced New Left groups emerging in the past few years. Yet their outlook is scholastic and heavily ideological; the New Left enthusiasts for Castro were, at least in the beginning, more naive, more directly concerned with Cuba as such, and more responsive to the immediate élan of the revolution itself. Sartre and Mills, with their stress on the freedom of the Fidelistas from the rigid ideological formulas of the past, were undoubtedly more in tune with the mood of those who were bored with old battles, who saw both the United States and Russia as bureaucratic managerial societies, and who wished as they listened with vicarious nostalgia to their elders talk of Spain and anti-fascism for a fresh new cause that their "generation" might embrace. They were anxious to agree with Daniel Friedenberg, one of the earliest of Castro's critics from the left, that "Castro's was a good fight, perhaps the only clean and unequivocal fight since the Spanish Civil War," but they were incapable of adding his immediate qualification: "At least I thought so in 1958 and still do with that part of my heart my mind tells me is unreliable."

This mood was most pronounced in England and received fullest expression in the pages of New Left Review. In America, Studies on the Left, edited by a number of graduate students at the University of Wisconsin, appeared in 1959 and presented itself as an American counterpart of the British New Left—although the association with the

journal of several older men of proto-Stalinist antecedents made its claim to be reviving a Marxist approach free of past commitments somewhat less convincing than in the case of the older English group. An early issue reprinted Sartre and Che Guevara on the Cuban revolution and hailed it in an editorial which, however, devoted more space to attacking American policy, concluding that "Cuba presents us with an urgent task and, at the same time, with the best opportunity to expose and destroy cold war ideology." Cuba was described as a "new humane society" and the conflict between "freedom" and "communism" as a "sham battle."

Studies on the Left represents a more self-consciously ideological tendency than the other youthful "new left" groups in the United States which have been more attracted by direct moral protest than by political analysis, and have valued action and the evidence of vitality over intellectual rigor. But the early issues of Studies on the Left also manifested this spirit in their eagerness to see the Cuban revolution as a new beginning, a new form of "existential" radical distinct both from communism and from liberal democratic reformism. Unhappily much of this spirit has now vanished and recent issues resemble Monthly Review in their doctrinaire defense of Castro and polemical onslaughts against his leftist critics. The current number, for example, contains a ponderous effort by a recent Ph. D. in social psychology employing the jargon of psychoanalysis to discredit "American Anti-Communist Liberals" (the term is the author's), especially their views on Cuba. Their outlook is characterized as a "defensive reaction to political anxiety"; Irving Howe and Lewis Coser, the editors of Dissent, reveal the mechanism of "projection" when they doubt that Khrushchev's Russia has ceased to be totalitarian; Theodore Draper is fixated on the "primitive political assumption" that "to reject capitalism is bad" and thus condemns Castro (nothing is said of his early support of Castro's socialistic reforms); and so on. One wearily recalls talk over a decade ago about the anti-Communist left's "Stalinophobia" and the "reaction formations" of allegedly "guilt-ridden" ex-Communists: the abuse of psychoanalysis as a political weapon is an old story.

Fidel Castro was a natural hero for the New Left from the first. The survival of his tiny group of fighters in the mountains, their brilliant feats of guerrilla warfare, and their amazingly sudden victory when Batista's army simply gave up, made Castro a genuine hero in an age of characterless bureaucratic leaders. Moreover, he and all his men were young and wore unruly beards, the newly publicized symbol of rebellious youth. His air of informality and creative improvisation, so evident on his brief American trip in early 1959, when he casually lit cigars, talked endlessly, and strolled on and off speech platforms in the middle of official receptions for him, stood in delightful contrast to the managed appearances of other politicians in this age of TV. And then it became apparent that he was the leader of a real live social revolution, no mere putsch, and was determined to carry out without delay genuinely egalitarian reforms. Thoughtless, pious, and reactionary voices were too quickly raised against him in the United States, as in the criticisms of the mass trials of Batista's thugs. Sartre and Mills came back from Cuba reporting that here was something new under the sun and pilgrimages from the mainland began in earnest.

Young radicals seeking a cause, like the editors of "Studies on the Left," went. Bohemian poets and painters, previously unpolitical though full of contempt for American middle-class life, went. And others, such as Warren Miller and Marc Schleiffer, both young novelists, Lawrence Ferlinghetti, one of the dozens of the San Francisco beat poets, and Leroi Jones, another new Bohemian poet and editor, wrote enthusiastic accounts of what they had witnessed in Cuba. They were caught up in a festive atmosphere, a mass euphoria generated by the revolution, which was alien to their previous experience, and their reports, often written with skill and feeling, are reminiscent of John Reed on Petrograd during the October revolution of 1917 or George Orwell on revolutionary Barcelona in 1957. Most of the literary rebels who thus celebrated the Cuban revolution have been silent for the past year or more, but the quality of their response to Castro was perhaps best expressed in an open letter to the "Maximum Leader" by Norman Mailer, published in the Village Voice just after the collapse of the invasion, but written, Mailer says, several months earlier. "You were the first and greatest hero to appear in the world since the Second War," he wrote. "There has been a new spirit abroad in America since you entered Havana. I think you must be given credit for some part of a new and better mood which has been coming to America." He goes on to warn Castro about his new friendship with Khrushchev, because "Commissars never made a revolution * * * [and] the Communists are used to considering small nations expendable—it is part of their pride that they will sacrifice their followers." In an open letter to Kennedy denouncing the invasion, published at the same time, Mailer tells the President, "You will never understand that the man [Castro] is the country, revolutionary, tyrannical, hysterical, violent, passionate, brave as the best of animals, doomed perhaps to end in tragedy, but one of the great figures of the 20th century, at the present moment a far greater figure than yourself."

Another group of Castro supporters on the left are, rather surprisingly, the "ethical" radicals: pacifists, libertarian anarchists, Catholic Socialists, and advocates of nonviolent resistance. The growing peace movement and the nonviolent campaign against racial segregation have in recent years given them a wider audience, which may account for their readiness to take up the cause of the Cuban revolution. Although most of their arguments and interpretations are similar to those from other pro-Castro sources, the tone of writers on Cuba for Liberation and the Catholic Worker is quite different from both the bland, doctrinaire apologetics of the Monthly Review group and the revolutionary romanticism of the literary Fidelistas. It is far more troubled, groping, and ready to confront, even if in the end to minimize, the evidence of totalitarianism and communism in Cuba. David Dellinger, an editor of Liberation, has written the second best factual and moderately sympathetic appraisal of the Castro regime's achievements in the early period of the revolution. (The author of the best account is Samuel Shapiro, an academic Latin Americanist writing in the New Republic, who has since become somewhat disillusioned with the revolution, though continuing to place major blame for the Communist take-over on the United States.)

Through 1960 Liberation published a large number of articles on Cuba expressing a variety of points of view. The majority were strongly sympathetic, but several were quite critical of internal developments—for instance, pieces by Robert Alexander and Kenneth Boulding, the well-known economist. In early 1961, Roy Finch, one of the editors, impressed by the suppression in Cuba of libertarian anarchists and other independent radicals, concluded that "the revolution has pretty well been taken over by totalitarian-minded people" and "the minuses begin to outweigh the pluses." The other editors were quick to express their disagreement with him and, after publishing a full statement of his point of view, Finch resigned from the editorial board in May on the grounds that the other editors' "continuing and relatively enthusiastic support for the Castro government (though with varying degree of reservations) seems to be at variance with our original policy." Correspondence supporting both Finch and the remaining editors, much of it lengthy, appeared in the magazine.

The April invasion seemed to strengthen the pro-Castro position of Liberation's editors. They published, among other things on Cuba, an excellent critical analysis of the shocking American press coverage of the event. Since then the editors have continued to regard Cuba as the exemplar of a "new humanistic radicalism," but their doubts and misgivings have perceptibly increased. In the December 1961 issue, Sidney Lens, an editor, reports on his latest trip to the island and deplores "bureaucratic tendencies," the arrogance of the secret police, the growing adulation of Castro, and the total absence of any criticism in the controlled press. Yet he is still able to maintain that "at the moment none of this has destroyed the humanism of the revolution." He suggests hopefully—and credulously—that "plans for a new, unified single party may result in the Communists being engulfed and subordinated * * * and perhaps the Communists will no longer be able to function as a tight-knit disciplined group in the broader movement." And he reports without comment the surely preposterous statement of "a prominent Cuban writer" that Kennedy could destroy the Communists "in 10 minutes" by reopening his embassy because "Fidel would agree to it immediately and undercut them."

If the old left has inevitably interpreted the Cuban revolution in accordance with an outlook shaped by the historical and ideological struggles of the past three decades, the revolution has been a new and formative experience for the new left. It is among the younger Castro partisans that one finds the will to believe in its purest form, brusque impatience with the past, and a readiness to attribute sweeping historical significance to Cuba. Unhappily, the ancient symptoms of wishful selection and reading of the evidence, and indulgence in wild and bitter attacks on doubters, especially those who are also of the left, have been quick to reveal themselves. Let us, in order to bear out these statements, look, in closing, at some of the arguments and counter-arguments advanced in Castro's favor.

Cuba is, after all, a small country, necessarily confined to a minor role in world politics and scarcely likely to be the scene of a social transformation that is vitally relevant to the experience of older and larger nations. But some of Castro's supporters are not content to interpret the Cuban revolution as an incident in the larger setting of the cold war or even as a feasible model for the economic development of other relatively poor and backward countries. They must see it as something more earth shaking than that, as an entirely new and unprecedented experience from which, not merely the other Latin American peoples or even the underdeveloped world as a whole, but we westerners ourselves can learn lessons applicable to our own societies. Thus Stuart Hall and Norman Fruchter, editors of the English New Left Review, argue that, far from possessing exclusive relevance to the revolutions in all the backward territories,

the Cuban revolution resumes fully the whole galaxy of questions involved in socialism in our time * * * [and] could be either the axis or the graveyard of socialism in the next decade.

Since, in the eyes of the new left, the world Communist leaders are as rigid, bureaucratic, and lacking in humanity as the leaders of the West, much has been made of the alleged difference between Castro's economic reforms and the priorities of Communist planning. Hall and Fruchter, Saul Landau (an editor of Studies on the Left), and others have pointed out that Castro's initial reforms in land distribution, housing, rent control, education, and public recreation have been directed toward the immediate improvement and equalization of living standards, whereas the orthodox Communist practice is to stress heavy industry and capital accumulation at the expense of consumer goods, thus sacrificing the needs of the living to an economic development which will benefit only future generations. The claim that Castro stands for a new humanist socialism is largely based on this contrast with the Communist pattern of enforced industrialization.

But, as Castro's partisans are only too ready to remind us in connection with other matters, a revolution is a process, and its final achievements outrun and transcend both the aims of its makers and the tendencies present at the beginning. More than two decades of violent struggle within the Bolshevik leadership, the failures of Communist movements in the mature industrial societies of the West, and the expansion of Soviet power as a result of war into the less advanced areas of eastern Europe and Asia, intervened between the Russian revolution and the eventual emergence of communism as a technique for rapidly and ruthlessly industrializing backward societies. Have the new leftists forgotten Lenin's new economic policy of the early twenties with its slogan of "enrich yourselves" addressed to the peasants? May not Castro's humanist reforms look equally remote a decade from now if the Cuban revolution follows its present course? Even where doctrinaire Communist movements triumphed, in eastern Europe and China, the redistribution of land and other popular reforms raising living standards were initiated in the early years of their consolidation in power. It was not long, however, before the peasants were forced into state-controlled collective farms, armaments production took precedence over consumer goods, and heavy sacrifices were demanded for the sake of increasing the tempo of industrialization. Already the same process is repeating itself in Cuba. The maximum leader boasts that Cuba is becoming an armed camp, although the United States could destroy him in a few days if it so wished. And, according to Theodore Draper, the agricultural cooperatives so praised by Castro's American admirers are increasingly being overtaken by granjas or people's farms, closely modeled on the Soviets' sovkhos or state farm system. Since we are urged to take a long view when the question of democracy and freedom in Cuba is at issue, let us do the same for Cuban economic policies and methods of industrialization.

Justifications of the absence of democracy in Cuba are worth examining because the particular arguments employed are highly selective. Castro's new left supporters are concerned not just with defending or excusing Castro, but with expressing a positive faith, a mystique of the Cuban revolution, that goes far beyond mere apologetics. American opinion is accused of having an obsession about elections. The explanations offered for Castro's failure to hold elections are on the whole reasonable: the revolution has been unquestionably popular with a large majority of the Cuban people, and few revolutionary governments, including the one headed by George Washington, have held elections until considerable time elapsed after they came to power. It is also true that the United States is disposed to raise the issue of elections only with reference to dictators who threaten American interests or pursue an independent foreign policy: little fuss was made about Batista, Rhee, Chiang, or Franco (who was recently praised lavishly by Secretary of State Rusk). As David Riesman has remarked, "the word 'freedom' becomes truly Orwellian when we use it to support the landing of Batista officers on Cuban beaches."

Castro's apologists, however, by concentrating on the question of elections, conveniently avoid the more fundamental issues of civil liberties: freedom from arbitrary arrest, the right to a fair and open trial, freedom of the press, the right to maintain free trade unions independent of Government control. It is the suppression of these freedoms, not Castro's failure to hold elections or even to permit rival political parties to organize, which has alarmed such critics as Draper, Friedenberg, and the old antitotalitarians of the left. Nor do Castro's supporters confine themselves to justifying the temporary postponement of elections: Like Castro himself, they now argue that the Cuban people don't want elections, where they were often rigged in the past and were followed by corruption and betrayed promises. Why, then, one wonders, couldn't Castro, in whom the people are said to have such profound faith and who has transformed Cuban society, overcoming tremendous obstacles, hold an honest election, at least when the time seems ripe? But Castro's admirers do not hesitate to take the further step of sneering at elections as such; they frequently write scathingly not merely of past electoral shams in Cuba but of the lack of a real choice in the United States when the voter is asked to opt for a Nixon or a Kennedy. And it now becomes plain that the old Marxist theory of the hoax of bourgeois democracy is being revived in a new guise. Its function is the same as before—to extol economic democracy at the expense of formal political democracy, to minimize the destruction of civil rights and liberties by treating voting and parties as the sole content of Western political institutions, and, finally, to celebrate the superior direct democracy of the single leader, or cadre of leaders, who needs no institutional apparatus to mediate his interpretations of the will of the people.

In an intemperate letter to the Village Voice denouncing "many self-styled American liberals" as men of little faith, Richard Gibson, acting secretary of the Fair Play for Cuba Committee, gives the game away: "For these young men of the east frontier," he writes, "Fidel Castro, Sekou Touré, Kwame N'Krumah, and Dr. Ahmed Sukarno are only dictators, not liberators acclaimed by millions of men and women who see in them the truest expression of their aspirations for a decent life free of the shackles of a cruel and corrupt West." Perhaps it would be useless to remind Mr. Gibson that millions also acclaimed Hitler, Mussolini, and, in Latin America, Peron and Trujillo. Popular dictators are scarcely a novelty in this century. (Why, incidentally, does he omit Gamel Nasser from his list?) But one wonders why the dictatorial leaders of new underdeveloped nations represent the truest expression of popular aspirations for a better life. Are, say, Jawaharlal Nehru, Habib Bourguiba, the late Ramon Magsaysay, José Figueres, and Romulo Betancourt to be regraded as less authentic leaders of the revolution of rising expectations just because they are not dictators with totalitarian inclinations who have eliminated all real alternatives to their own direction of their nations' destinies? And is it pessimistic and defeatist of American liberals and radicals to believe that such men are more deserving of their support and more likely to achieve both economic progress and political liberty than authoritarian demagogs?

Many people have seen a parallel between the totalitarian outcome of the Russian revolution and the far faster movement in the same direction of the Castro regime. Some of Castro's new left supporters in the United States seem in an equally short time to have traveled from a fresh rebellious idealism, sorely needed after the confusions and timidities of the fifties, to a fascination with populist totalitarianism that is scarcely distinguishable from that of the latter-day Communist apologists of the late thirties and early forties. One is forced to be thankful that Castro leads only Cuba and not, as Stalin did, one of the great nations of the world.

ARAB BOYCOTT

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, a constituent of mine was recently made aware of and suffered from the Arab boycott. In the face of his well-documented case of discrimination, one of many such cases, and some of which you are already familiar with, it seems to me to be timely to introduce a bill to emphasize to the Arab world our opposition to the violation of one of the fundamental principles of the democratic way of life.

The problem of discrimination has gained increasing importance, and our intention must be made clear, not only that we shall uphold our stated principle of nondiscrimination against any American citizen by reason of his race, color, or religion, but intend such implementation as will positively show our opposition to such a policy.

I appreciate the difficulties that may arise with some currently friendly governments when announcement is made of such a course of action. Nevertheless, we must support our beliefs with our program.

To this end, I am today introducing a bill which proposes that we do not assist in any manner any transactions financed by U.S. grants, loans, or any other form of financial assistance in those countries where discrimination is practiced against American citizens.

SENIOR CITIZENS RECEIVING SOCIAL SECURITY PENSIONS

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. Speaker, again I ask the Members of this House to come

to the assistance of our senior citizens who are receiving social security pensions.

In my previous pleas to the Members I have been asking their support for legislation I cosponsored with Congressman Forand over the years but, since his retirement, have sponsored myself a bill to provide medical care for the aged under the social security system.

My pleas—as you know—did not receive favorable consideration.

Today, I ask the Members of this House to assure the passage of the King-Anderson bill when it is brought to the floor for our consideration.

This is the least we can do.

The King-Anderson bill provides only hospital care, nursing home care, home visits by Public Health nurses or therapists, and some diagnostic care.

There is little doubt that this legislation, sponsored by the administration, is a compromise and the American Medical Association should be clapping their hands, with glee, over their success in having been able to force many of us, and the administration, to exclude medical care in our program.

However, this is not the case.

The AMA—or those of it who direct the policy of that organization—has decided that our social security pensioners shall not receive any help whatsoever unless they accept it from the Department of Public Assistance and be classified the same as a "relief recipient."

This kind of help can be secured under the Kerr-Mills Act—and that is sufficient, says the AMA.

The reasoning of the Medical Association amazes me at times—and this is one of those times.

All of us have heard and read the charges by now that the Forand bill, the Holland bill—and now—the King-Anderson bill will insure the practice of socialized medicine in this country.

We have heard that under any of our proposed programs the elder citizen would lose that personal patient-physician relationship.

Yet those opposing the King-Anderson bill endorse and encourage the use of the provisions of the Kerr-Mills Act.

If the Kerr-Mills Act does not practice socialized medicine, I do not know what you might call it.

Applicants for care, under the Kerr-Mills Act, must apply to the county board of assistance and bring with them papers to prove their age, their residence, the amount of their income, the value of any property they might have. They must also have with them the names and addresses of their husband or wife, their sons and daughters, the amounts of their incomes, the approximate amount of their expenses, and their dependents—grandchildren, if you please.

In Pennsylvania, as in other States, we have a law that requires "your husband or wife, living apart from you, your sons and your daughters to be responsible for your medical care." If such persons say they cannot afford to do so then the applicant is required to go to court and the decision of that court is honored.

For the sake of argument, let us say a pensioner is declared eligible.

He can have his own doctor—but his costs are not covered by this bill—and he can be admitted to the hospital for necessary care—just as a relief recipient. However, after the State department of public welfare pays the hospital for his care, the State then places a lien against his property for the amount of money it "loaned" him for hospitalization, medicines, and medical care while in the hospital.

Or, the applicant can go directly to the hospital and be admitted through the clinic, as are relief recipients, and receive the advice of the doctor on duty at that time. There will be no doctor bills then for the applicant to pay himself, but this will go into the total amount that will be "loaned" to him by the State and for which he will receive a lien against his property.

I cannot say there is much personal patient-physician relationship here.

Still we hear—from the great defenders of personal contact—that the Kerr-Mills Act is the ideal program for our pensioners.

What hypocrites we have among us.

Another point I would like to bring up—and this, too, is shouted from the housetops.

We hear that millions of our elder citizens will be cared for under this act.

This program, I would like to emphasize, is a voluntary Federal-State project.

Up to date, only 18 States have volunteered to enter it.

I cannot say we have such wide coverage for those of our people over 65.

My State of Pennsylvania was the 18th and our estimated cost for the fiscal year, ending June 1963, will be $12 million. The Federal Government will pay approximately $10 million. What will happen, under this act, is that our State and Federal taxes will go up, for in Pennsylvania certain individual counties maintained institutions to care for the aged—these costs now go into the Kerr-Mills program—the counties are relieved of paying, but taxes—local ones—are not reduced because few counties are existing on balanced budgets today. The result is a general increase of taxes for everyone.

The most important feature in the Kerr-Mills Act I have left for the last.

That is the inhuman treatment, or the degrading experience, we afford our pensioners.

Have you Members ever stopped to consider who the people are who receive social security pensions and what sort of people they might be?

I would be glad to wager that 95 percent of our pensioners were industrious, diligent, self-sacrificing and hard-working citizens.

These people struggled to earn a living, raise and educate their families, and buy a small home during their productive years with the hope that they would have a roof over their heads and a place in which they could spend together their declining years. They had contributed, during those years, to the social security program fully expecting the pension, they would receive, to be sufficient to pay their taxes, their utilities, the food and their clothing—and possibly a few extras which they might find necessary.

These are people who—never in their life—accepted charity nor expected to have to look to charity for help.

These are people who—by their sweat, blood and tears—helped our Nation grow into the position we now hold as the leader in the world.

We, the wealthiest Nation in the world, are now telling our elder citizens who made us what we are today, if they need help get it from the department of public assistance; if they need help, go on relief; if they need help, join the ranks of the indigent who contributed nothing to this Nation.

I think our pensioners deserve respect and I feel they should be permitted to retain their well-earned dignity.

Under the King-Anderson bill, our present pensioners could receive much needed hospitalization, nursing home care, home nursing visits and diagnostic services and be treated with the dignity they should have.

The cost of this care would be covered by the increased contributions into the social security system of those now employed and by the employers—many of whom are enjoying their present position because of physical and mental contributions made by the pensioners during their working years.

Their contributions would adequately cover the cost of such care and when they reached their retirement age, this care would be available for them.

The cost of this program: Approximately $1 a month for each person under the social security system now employed and $1 a month for each employee by the employer.

With profits and personal income at their highest in history I do not think either employee or employer would object.

The AMA—with all honesty—cannot object to this bill, for there is no place in it that refers to physicians or surgeons.

The personal patient-physician relationship has been maintained.

The bill provides hospital care, but the patient must pay $10 per day for the first 9 days. That means $90 at least it will cost the patient. And, it has been said, the average stay in the hospital is 9 days.

Nursing home care is provided—without additional cost—180 days.

Home visits of public health nurses are provided—without additional cost—240 visits.

Diagnostic services in outpatient hospital clinics are provided—but the patient must pay the first $20 of the charges.

I do not believe the hospitals need to worry about a sudden influx of patients, should the King-Anderson bill pass. According to a survey I made of the pensioners living in my congressional district, I know of none who have $90 or

even $20 extra to throw away for needless care. And, I do not believe the doctors of the Nation will recommend needless hospitalization—for we all know that, except in emergencies, admission to a hospital cannot be secured without the authorization of need by your own doctor.

With the King-Anderson bill written as it is, there is no valid objection that can be raised by the American Medical Association, the Hospital Association, the chamber of commerce, the National Association of Manufacturers.

These organizations have a record of opposing anything and everything that might benefit the average citizen—old and young.

However, once legislation has been passed it is amazing how they all manage to work, live and flourish under the new laws.

We will find this to be true in this case too.

Again I plead with the Members of Congress to pass the King-Anderson bill and give our pensioners the care they so badly need.

AT THE ROOTS: THE STATE AND THE PEOPLE

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, from a common beginning, realization that overly centralized government can lead to an overly controlled society, "The Liberal Papers" and the Republican policy committee papers move quickly apart in emphasis. On the liberal side there is concentration on government to improve the lot of the underprivileged and secure social justice. On the conservative side there is concentration on traditions, resistance to government, and calls for primary responsibility and accountability at individual and local levels. Material for "The Liberal Papers" in this area was prepared by David Riesman, Harvard professor of social science, and Michael Maccoby, U.S. Public Health research fellow engaged in a social study of a Mexican village. The Republican position paper in this area was by William Y. Elliott, Harvard professor of government:

LIBERAL

American liberalism seeks to combine the historical liberal attitude, which attributes primary value to individual freedom, with the progressive attitude, which is aware of imperfections in any status quo and is always ready to initiate reforms.

In its first aspect, liberalism is opposed to governmentalization—as Jefferson said, "the less government the better"—in its second aspect, liberalism is opposed to conservatism and committed to progress in the spirit of Franklin D. Roosevelt's New Deal.

The American liberal wants to protect the individual from Government impositions, thus looking critically at proposals for Government intervention in business, religion, opinion, and association; but he also wants to improve the situation of the underprivileged, to increase the opportunities for self-realization by all, and to advance social justice and the achievement of social values, thus looking critically at opponents of all social and economic legislation, national or international.

Liberal doesn't fear Government action

The liberal is ready to consider Government action designed to regulate business in the public interest and to open resources to promote public welfare; to provide security for the sick, aged, and unemployed; and to promote equality of opportunity for all by programs of education, economic development, and employment.

The liberal appreciates that this agenda of liberalism, if pushed too far, may result in excessive governmentalization, which will defeat the first aspect of liberalism.

On the other hand, excessive regard for freedom of enterprise, freedom of contract, freedom from taxation, even freedom of speech and association may result in the failure of society to adapt itself to new conditions, to utilize the opportunities presented by technological progress, and to prevent the subversion of liberal values by the propaganda or infiltration of minority agencies.

Liberalism must, therefore, continually seek a balance between the protection of individual freedom from the Government and the need of reform requiring action and appropriation by the Government.

CONSERVATIVE

The ant heap is not humanity's destiny.

The American tradition is a restless, questing tradition, which has the weakness perhaps of being always on the move and looking for new things, sometimes without digesting and settling down in the old: Main Street lies right down the middle of the town, with houses on each side. It marches through and marches on and the people are always on the move. This is disrupting in some ways. Yet it has advantages; it "mixes" us all up in the process so that there are no castes.

But it is a little extreme to compare us to a melting pot or a mixing bowl, or something that shakes us up, that whips us in, and maybe homogenizes us, or sifts us into the sameness of soft flour. We resist this atomizing by our sound habit of protecting the individual and keeping his own richness and flavor.

The great traditions of any society are carried in people who have their roots deep down in home ground, rooted in the unconscious behavior and social heritage of the past as well as the projection into the future.

Conservative looks to the traditional

If we do not want to be windblown by all the passing doctrines, we have to have security in our own background, in our institutions, and in the models that have been set for us—the old men and the old women we have known who have set a model like that—our parents, our friends, our community, our neighborhood, and traditions.

What is considered right is done because in some ways it has been proved to be a good thing for a long time. We are a conservative people, in the best sense, innovating to preserve old values, tested truths, to meet new times.

The free society is being tested by trends in both science and government toward amalgamation into large, more complex systems. But excellence in both derives not from monolithic but from decentralized organization. From outer space to the hometown, America's challenge is to produce scientific creativity and local government responsibility without overreliance upon central support and authority.

WEST'S HISTORIC MISSION: REALISM AND IDEALISM

Throughout the Liberal Papers and the Republican position papers there is constant difference between accepting the world as it is and working for its steady, if slow, improvement—conservative—or rejecting "traditional" reality in favor of actually remaking the world in a better mold—liberal. The tenor of the differences is sounded clearly in these excerpts. Material for the Liberal Papers was prepared in this area by James Warburg, author of "United States in a Changing World," "The West in Crisis," and the other works. The materia. for the Republican position papers was prepared by Gerhart Niemeyer, of Notre Dame, Paul Peeters, of Iona College, and William Y. Elliott, of Harvard:

LIBERAL

U.S. propaganda coveys an inaccurate impression of what we are. It portrays the United States as an extremely rich country with a government which stands benevolently aside, leaving all planning and all decision to a free-enterprise economy. This picture is not only one with which other people cannot possibly identify themselves; it is also untrue.

It is untrue because the cardinal principle of the great unfinished American experiment in freedom is that which was voiced by Abraham Lincoln, when he said: "The function of government is to do for the people that which needs to be done but which they cannot do for themselves at all or do equally well."

It is on the basis of this principle that our government regulates, stimulates, and protects agriculture, industry, labor, and the public services.

Republicans slow tempo of progress

The principle which Lincoln enunciated has been the dynamic of the American society ever since the Nation was founded, even though in recent years the tempo of progress under it has been slowed down by a Republican administration which suffers from myopic vision and addiction to obsolete economic theory.

This—a Nation conducting a great unfinished experiment in freedom through the cooperation of a people with its government—is what we are; and with this picture of the United States peoples throughout the world could in the past identify their own hopes and aspirations.

To be against change is to be against the hopes and longings of mankind.

Communist appeal identified with change

The appeal of communism is that it has identified itself with change. The fact that communism, once adopted, denies change is not evident to those who have not yet lived under its dominion.

For us to present ourselves as merely being against communism, and not as being, above all, the protagonists of a continuous flow of revolutionary change, is to commit psychological suicide.

To this end we believe that honest self-criticism is better propaganda than criticism of an adversary; that openly expressed interest in other people's ideas and experiments is better propaganda than glorification of achievements.

CONSERVATIVE

There is much room, indeed, for intelligent debate and for self-criticism. At no time

of our history was it more necessary to stress that an informed public opinion is essential to the conduct of government in a modern, pluralistic society.

All political philosophers have stressed, however, that injustice begins with meddling. There is no validity in the notion that systematic criticism is a sign of democratic validity. It is a sign of the moral decadence of a free country.

As a people, we have a pernicious inclination for abstractions, particularly those abstractions that put obstacles in the way of moral progress.

Communist view: West half dead

The Communist view of history has been allowed a virtual monopoly in the modern world. According to that view, we represent the (already half dead) past and the Communists, together with the colonial peoples, the budding and hopeful future. We must restore to the Western World a sense of historic reality. To this end, we must place the Soviet power itself into the perspective of history and begin publicly to envisage a world that has been delivered from the Soviet threat. We must begin to speak of a future beyond communism, of things as they would be when Communists have been toppled from their dictatorial seats of power, of the pursuit of true happiness which Emerson rightly said was achieved by finding and following principles.

Character cannot be had without risks, hardship, and suffering, as we can observe from a great deal of human history which is difficult to refute. Men decay as men when the going gets so soft that there is no challenge.

Whatever else may be said of us, no one will deny that our values are profoundly religious ones, a fact which accounts for one characteristic in our behaviors which is extremely important: It stresses charity or loving kindness in the full Christian sense. It stresses also the concept of duty to offset the idea of rights. And to the degree that we have lost that conception of duty as a balance we have been false to our own tradition. We lose one of the great elements in American character when we stress only a philosophy of "rights."

ECONOMIC DIRECTIONS: MORE GOVERNMENT OR LESS

Inasmuch as "The Liberal Papers" and the Republican position papers are basically philosophical rather than specific political campaign ammunition, their treatment of economic issues is inferential rather than head on. On the liberal side there is confident assurance that the great tool of Government can be the reliable key lever in solving such economic problems as that which eventual disarmament might bring. On the conservative side, there is equal confidence that private energies can and should do the job. Material for "The Liberal Papers" in this area was prepared by Emile Benoit, professor in the graduate school of business at Columbia. Material for the Republican position papers was prepared by John Stambaugh, vice chancellor of Vanderbilt University, and Don Paarlberg, special assistant to President Eisenhower on economic affairs:

LIBERAL

To preserve or replace the more dynamic effects of the defense program is a challenge to initiative, imagination, and the spirit of adventure.

A solid part of any defense savings should be earmarked for expanding higher education and research, especially in the training of scientists and engineers and for subsidies to teaching and research in these fields. This might even lead to the creation of a new "Department of Higher Education and Research."

A further portion of the savings should be earmarked for the rapid development of promising new processes and products, including the building of pilot plants—possibly by endowing public Research and Development Institutes.

Another promising move would be to earmark a part of defense savings to set up productivity centers in this country such as the United States has successfully promoted and underwritten in Europe, and for area and regional development plans for our own underdeveloped or permanently depressed areas. * * *

Fundamental difficulty arises out of congressional and public attitudes toward national debt. * * * About a third of total debt is now public debt. Attempts to reduce this part of the debt structure throw an additional burden on private debt formation * * * since the public debt is now such an important part of the total, attempts to remove it could have a profoundly unsettling effect. * * *

CONSERVATIVE

The Federal Government cannot long force a high rate of economic growth upon us unless basically the people want it. And if we want it, which we should, there are many ways to bring it about besides making it the sole responsibility of the Federal Government.

The business community can enhance economic growth by adopting new techniques, by more competitive pricing and by a more open stance with respect to the entry of new firms.

Labor can promote economic growth by accepting the consequences of technological change and by accepting the responsibilities as well as the benefits of size and power.

The Federal Government can help provide a climate within which enterprise and economic growth can flourish. * * * But the Federal Government cannot, singlehanded, take responsibility for producing a specified rate of economic growth.

The simple fact is that for every dollar of Federal aid, the citizen who believes in State sovereignty forfeits a dollar's worth of States rights. It is entirely logical that Federal control follows Federal funds.

Among our citizens an attitude of dependency on Washington has developed. This trend toward "Let Uncle Sam do it" argues in effect that only Federal bureaucrats and their intellectual associates are wise enough to tell us how we attain "life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness."

TWO PATHS TO PEACE: MASSIVE GAMBLE VERSUS NATIONAL POWER

Perhaps the most radical departure from existing policies advocated in the liberal papers is in a suggestion for "reciprocal initiative" prepared by Charles Osgood, University of Illinois professor of psychology and director of the Institute of Communications Research. Professor Osgood's thesis is that farsighted unilateral action toward peace by the United States could be accompanied and placed by expectations of equal reciprocal action by the Soviet. The excerpt presented here is an actual timetable of how such actions might proceed. The other side of the picture is from the summary statement of the Republican position papers and from a paper prepared by Robert Neumann, director, Institute of International and Foreign Studies, University of California:

LIBERAL

May 1: We announce that, as of May 15, all discriminatory trade and travel restrictions with respect to Communist China will be lifted.

May 20: We announce a unilateral test ban that will be continued indefinitely and invite reciprocal announcement from Russia, England, and France.

June 1: We announce that at the next convening of the General Assembly of the U.N. (June 20) we will move the seating of Communist China.

June 15: We announce that, as of July 15, one of our oversea bases in Japan will be publicly denuclearized, and we invite U.N. and Russian inspection; reciprocation is invited but left open ended.

August 1: We announce that, as of next September, student exchanges will be offered in proportion to the populations of the countries involved; reciprocation is invited generally. We announce that, as of August 20, the DEW line (early warning system) will be made bidirectional (warning of our flights toward Russia as well as vice versa), and we invite the Soviets to "plug in."

August 15: We announce that, with agreements from some of the major mass media, beginning September 1, material on contemporary world affairs prepared by Russian sources may appear on Sundays in special newspaper sections and certain TV and radio programs without censure; reciprocation in kind invited.

September 1: We announce that, as of January 1, we will be prepared to have all launchings of flights into outer space supervised by a new agency of the U.N. which we propose be established.

September 15: We announce that, as of October 15, the islands of Quemoy and Matsu will be publicly demilitarized and turned over to proper authorities from the mainland, and clear statements about the unchanged status of Taiwan are made.

November 20: We announce that, as of the next meeting of the U.N. (December 1), we will move the substitution of Communist China for Nationalist China on the Security Council—reciprocation in the form of recognition of Taiwan as a soverign country with representation in the General Assembly requested; we announce that, as of February 1, we will open this country unilaterally to inspection and monitoring by authorized U.N. teams, as further evidence that we have no intention of surprise attack—reciprocation in kind is invited from all countries.

CONSERVATIVE

History abounds with examples of nations forced both to fight and surrender because of failure to convince an enemy that it will not only live for its ideals, but is prepared to die for them.

No way has been shown to disengage from this responsibility without also disengaging from freedom.

Nations cannot drift into peace. They can only drift into war. Thus, the national responsibility is to unite in purpose, no matter how divided as to technique. Criticism within such a framework of purpose can be constructive. Criticism oblivious of such purpose can only be destructive.

It is the heavy responsibility of criticism in a republic that it be accompanied by clear and specific alternatives.

It is the responsibility of citizens in a republic to constantly demand this criticism of clear alternatives and to reject those appeals which are simply to disunity, discontent, and discord. The philosopher Ortega y

Gasset has noted that the fall of Rome began when discord outweighed concord.

The decisive battles of history which dramatize the death of nations after centuries of life came as a result and not as the cause of decline and decadence.

National character is the key element of national power.

"Survival only" is unacceptable as the objective of American strength and strategy. Liberty, justice, and open societies are the only goals worthy of our heritage, and these are promoted by the rule of law, by a stable world, and by independent, internally healthy republics.

Since 1953, national policy has renounced any defensive method of meeting aggression on the terms of the aggressor, has embraced a diplomacy of firmness which has deterred a Soviet adventure in Berlin, invasion of Formosa, reinvasion of Korea, and Soviet takeover in the Middle East.

But whether we like it or not, we cannot afford to lose sight of an unpleasant, but nevertheless very real fact; that the uneasy peace of our time, the fact that despite all tension and provocation, full-fledged war is not likely to break out, is primarily due to this balance of terror which has made it very unsafe for an aggressor to unleash atomic war. If, by the same token, disarmament were to be undertaken in such a way as to gravely upset this balance, it would immeasurably increase the fearful danger of war.

TO FORGE A SHIELD OR BEGIN TO DROP IT?

The purpose and nature of alliances and diplomatic recognition in the cold war is a key issue. Material for "The Liberal Papers" was prepared by H. Stuart Hughes, Harvard professor of history. The Republican position papers quoted from were by Representative Craig Hosmer, of California; Arthur Peterson, University of Wisconsin; and Gerhart Niemeyer, of Notre Dame:

LIBERAL

A neutralist or partially demilitarized Germany under Social Democratic leadership would be much more reassuring.

We believe that the time has come when the United States should liberalize its restrictive trade policy vis-a-vis the Soviet Union.

Even if it is by no means certain that the Peiping 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.

CONSERVATIVE

It must be established at the outset that men do not fight because they have arms. Rather they have arms because they find it necessary to fight.

At all times we must proceed on the premise that any disequilibrium in total military power vis-a-vis the Soviet Union might prove fatal to the free world.

Our defensive will must be guarded by a continued effort to recognize the Soviet threat for what it is, and to beware of all temptations to enter into a summit agreement that would in fact amount to a peaceful acceptance of the Soviet Empire.

HEALTH CARE FOR THE AGED

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CURTIS] is recognized for 90 minutes.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, in view of the lateness of the hour, I ask unanimous consent that on Monday next, after the legislative business and other special orders previously entered, I be allowed to address the House for 90 minutes, to discuss the subject I was going to discuss today, which is health care for the aged, in answer to the remarks on that subject made by the gentleman from California [Mr. KING].

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

There was no objection.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for a unanimous-consent request?

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

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that, following the legislative business and other special orders previously entered, I be permitted to address the House for 1 hour on Monday next, immediately following the distinguished gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CURTIS].

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

There was no objection.

THE LIBERAL PROJECT

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

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

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, tomorrow a paperback edition entitled "The Liberal Papers" will be published by Doubleday. The 12 essays on foreign policy contained therein are selections prepared by scholars, scientists, and so-called foreign policy experts at the direction of a group of House Democrats calling themselves the liberal project. While only 12 Congressmen held active membership in this project, 23 other Democratic Congressmen were "close to the liberal project" and constituted a group which the study refers to as "far to the left."

Granted that these members are not responsible to or leaders of either the Kennedy administration or the House Democratic leadership. However, three are currently in Government service, two in the Agency for International Development and one with the Department of the Interior. The staff director of this study, formerly on the staff of the chairman of the liberal project, is currently on the special staff of the National Security Council. He played "a leading role in the development of the project." One of the study paper authors has been a consultant to the Institute of Defense Analysis when it worked for the State Department's Disarmament Administration on Project Vulcan. Another is on the staff of the Rand Corp. which carries on a good deal of Government contract work.

It has been truly written that "by their fruits ye shall know them." While attempts have been made to paint the Republican Party as an adjunct of the John Birch Society, it appears that there is both thunder and lightning on the left. In order that the American people might know some of the ideas our more liberal Democrats today profess in the vital area of American foreign policy, various Members will today take the floor to sketch excerpts from the portion of this book which most reveals views which most Americans would find either naive or dangerous to our security. They are held by persons to whom an influential segment of the Democratic Party looks for guidance in the field of foreign policy.

Caesar had his Brutus and Charles the First his Cromwell. It now appears that the leaders of our executive and legislative branches of Government should profit by their example and repudiate those in their midst who would advocate suicide on the installment plan.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my colleague, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DERWINSKI] may insert his remarks following my remarks in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, in joining in the criticism of the "Liberal Papers," to be published tomorrow, I would like to elaborate on the ideas held by Mr. Arthur Waskow, who visualizes the theory and practice of deterrence as something completely unlike any policies designed to insure free world supremacy in the cold war. He wishes that we would take Soviet disarmament proposals seriously long enough to find out whether they mean them, and also feels that atomic testing is not vital to American security because it involves only a marginal addition to firepower.

The papers continue in the same vein. Vera Dean warns us not to refuse aid to Communist countries if aid is requested. Professor Whiting, of Rand, writes off the murder of Indian border guards by Chinese Communist troops as "incidents," and feels in essence that Red China evolved strength because of an alleged United States-Japanese rapprochement against her in 1949–50. Professor Hughes feels that the prime problem of our policies depends on assumptions that have long outlived their usefulness as, he implies, have such statesmen as Adenauer, De Gaulle, and Macmillan. Small wonder our administration continues to berate and lose our former European allies right and left. Dangerous signs that these basic policies are being accepted by the administration are evident to us.

Further, Professor Hughes favors a drastic reduction of our military policies in Europe; curtailment of nuclear aspirations of our allies; and encouragement of a "disengaged zone or zones," in Europe. He favors, as does Warburg, the Rapacki plan—a Soviet plan using a satellite spokesman as a front—as "a realistic alternative to the liberation of east central Europe about which Republican politicians have talked so much and done so little." He wants us to begin right now to close down missile and

Polaris bases throughout Europe and the United Kingdom, and to pave the way for the defense of Western Europe "through conventional weapons alone."

Mr. Speaker, I call upon the responsible Democratic leaders of this body and responsible members of the Kennedy administration to repudiate the irresponsible set of concepts above which have been advocated in this study and accepted by some Members of this body. We, on the Republican side of the aisle, must make this a major campaign issue and must alert the American people to this design for destruction.

If these impractical theorists have the degree of influence they claim over present State Department policies and over the President, our position will indeed be precarious. Now is the time for the Kennedy administration to shake off its dangerous left advisers and chart a course compatible to previously successful U.S. diplomatic and military policies.

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

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Speaker, one of the more dangerous and native writings in the "Liberal Papers" previously referred to was written by Professor Osgood, who reliable sources indicate was under consideration as a consultant by the Disarmament Agency. He feels that the cold war is really nothing more than a misunderstanding, and that we must take certain unilateral actions in our future foreign policy even though "an opponent may or may not reciprocate in any particular instance." Professor Osgood's program for so-called relaxation of tensions, a sort of ROT program, is as follows: First, make public all medical information concerning man in space; second, set up a unilateral test ban indefinitely; third, remove all discriminatory trade and travel restrictions with Red China; fourth, move the seating of Red China in the U.N.; fifth, invite the Soviets to plug in on the distant early warning line, which will be made bidirectional; sixth, reduce NATO forces in West Germany; seventh, have outer space flights supervised by a new U.N. agency; and, eighth, publicly denuclearize one of our oversea bases in Japan.

Other suggestions are made by Professor Osgood, who believes that "there is nothing more Communist about Castro Cuba than there is democratic about Franco Spain." He hopes his policies will work, but admits a possibility exists that Russia would interpret them as a sign of weakness and thus be encouraged to encroach further on the free world. He admits that we would be brought close to the brink of destruction by these policies, but yet has been active in the preparation of a State Department report on "Arms Control and a Stable Military Environment." The question is, Stable for whom?

Mr. Speaker, this as an example of the shoddy, naive and downright dangerous suggestions and recommendations made by these "liberal" scholars and accepted, supported and even published by Members of this body. The gentleman from California [Mr. ROOSEVELT] edited and wrote the introduction for this edition. The gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KASTENMEIER] chaired the group, which included former Representative Wolf—now with AID in Brazil; former Representative Johnson of Colorado, now with AID in the Bureau of Latin American Affairs; and former Representative Meyer, now a consultant to the Department of the Interior as well as a senatorial candidate from Vermont. Two other defeated Congressmen, Representatives Kasem, of California, and Porter, of Oregon, are now seeking once more election to the House. Thunder from the left? Of course. But the gathering storm threatens to cast destruction upon the entire Democratic Party, the administration and the Nation unless responsible members of the opposition rebel against these tactics and views on foreign policy.

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

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

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, previous speakers have alluded to the "Liberal Papers," which will be published tomorrow. They continue the idolatry with which certain liberals regard verbal abstractions such as "peace," "law," and "disarmament." They continue the hallucinations of a single-world-order approach and ignore the jagged truths of interest and power and struggle. They lose all understanding of what is needed for survival and victory.

Let us examine some of the essays in this publication. One, for example, is written by Riesman and Maccoby, and holds that "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." They contrast our supposed hysteria about communism to the British, whom they envy because of the ease with which they can discuss alternatives to nuclear war, ranging from unilateral disarmament to diplomatic maneuvers "aimed at easing particular points of tension in the cold war."

The next author, Mr. Warburg, continues along the same tack in a supposed "reexamination of American foreign policy." He claims that our alliance with Chiang Kai-shek is an element of weakness, and decries former President Eisenhower's dependence on the Pentagon, the Treasury and the Bureau of the Budget. He pleads for disarmament under world law, which of course would require to his mind a change in our policies with respect to Red China, Outer Mongolia and the presently divided nations of Germany, Korea, and Vietnam. Nowhere in this study is Red China referred to as anything other than the People's Republic of China.

Warburg states that "from the Western point of view, West Berlin is of no particular value." He favors reunification of Germany at the price of its military neutralization. He feels that we should recognize that "withdrawing from Europe and liquidation of our bases is what we eventually want to do." He favors withdrawal of our opposition to Red China's admission to the U.N. and liberalization of our "restrictive trade policy vis-a-vis the Soviet Union."

Mr. Speaker, America's strength and purpose could well be ended for all time by pronouncements such as these. I only trust that the American people are not as naive as several of their elected representatives have been by being taken in by writing of this nature.

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

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

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Speaker, continuing with the critical analysis of "The Liberal Papers," I would like to join my colleagues in examining Prof. Quincy Wright's ideas for strengthening the United Nations. He feels that "the worse the behavior of a state the more important that it be a member of the United Nations." He urges "recognition by the United States and admission to the U.N. of Red China, both Germanys, both Koreas and both Vietnams. 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." Perhaps this would strengthen the United Nations, but at whose expense?

Mr. Speaker, the gentlemen responsible for this study may strongly believe in the points it advocates. However, most Members of this body, I trust, join me in opposition to concepts urging, first, unilateral disarmament; second, recognition of Red China and her admission to the U.N.; third, abandonment of West Germany; fourth, unilateral abandonment of atomic testing; fifth, reliance on conventional weapons alone; sixth, increased trading with the enemy; seventh, increased negotiation with the enemy with no adequate preparation; eighth, sharing military secrets with the enemy; ninth, abandoning the hopes of the captive nations; and, tenth, a naive view of Red Chinese as mere agrarian reformers and of the Russian Communists as friendly coexistors, leading to a policy of mere release of tensions throughout the world at any cost to our economic and military security.

Mr. Speaker, I cannot believe that more than a handful of my colleagues feels that the cold war is a misunderstanding. I cannot believe that many share the views of these authors that we are better Red than dead. We can remain alive, and we can remain free. But in this life-or-death struggle there is no room for shyness about our determination to survive regardless of the ambitions of other states. The American people, and their leaders in Government, must rid themselves of bad conscience about the requirements of survival and victory in the cold war and find anew

the confidence to assert American and free-world supremacy.

Mr. Speaker, many of my colleagues have taken the floor today to protest against the schemes of those so-called experts who wrote the papers to be published tomorrow on behalf of the liberal project. We Republicans in the House have a special interest in this technique, since within a month's time the House Republican policy committee's subcommittee on special projects will present on the floor of this House a study on "American Foreign Policy and Free World Supremacy."

It will become a public document and will rely on background study papers by over 50 academic and professional experts on foreign policy. Several of our Members will stand before their colleagues and factually spell out positive recommendations for an effective and practical foreign policy for all Americans. While the contributing experts range from one extreme to the other in philosophy, background, and policy suggestions, we have rejected the impractical and culled the best ideas, criticisms, and proposals from these study papers. We have not accepted willy-nilly every idea, regardless of its effect on the capabilities of the free world in its present struggle against communism. As we did in "American Strategy and Strength" 2 years ago, we will enunciate policies designed to strengthen and not hobble America.

In contrast, the study foisted upon the American public by the leaders of the liberal Democratic Party contains policies which will cause the four horsemen of famine, war, pestilence, and death to once more visit America and the world, if they are adopted. The famine of positive policies in the administration will continue. The pestilence visited upon us by an enemy sworn to bury us will result. The war of a strong enemy against a weakened and divided free world may ensue. And the death of freedom as we know it today could well be the end result.

The papers have been written and the American people can well recognize that their ideas are crippling to the cause of the free world. They represent the combined judgment of a good proportion of our Democratic membership. They were written and approved by various persons now in or close to the administration. If the Democratic Party is to be taken over or has been taken over by appeasers of this ilk, it is well nigh time that the American people be informed so that in the all-important congressional elections of 1962 the party of responsibility in foreign as well as in domestic policies may properly replace them.

We believe that this open, frank type of discussion is important to the two-party system, and we feel that operating through our policy committee we can give the American people a real insight into the basic principles and objects of our Republican Party.

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

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. I yield.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I want to commend the gentleman from Wisconsin for his comment. I want to say that the purpose he is serving here today and the purpose that my Republican colleagues are serving in making this information available to the House of Representatives and the public is very valuable. I commend the gentleman in view of the fact that the last time the Republicans in the House of Representatives did this, most of them got beat; and I want to say that is the greatest public service that Members who participated in that particular operation performed for the Congress and for the people of the United States.

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

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. I yield.

Mr. LAIRD. I would just like to say to the gentleman that I do not believe his remarks are borne out by the facts. He will find that not a single one of the Members who took part in that study of American strategy was defeated; on the contrary he will find that the majority of them increased their margin of support.

Let me further point out that the minority gained 22 seats in the House of Representatives. We are proud of these policy studies that are carried out by the Republican policy committee. I believe that the remarks the gentleman made are certainly out of order.

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

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. I yield.

Mr. BERRY. Mr. Speaker, if fighting Communists defeats any Member we are not afraid of them on this side; maybe they are on the other side.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I think this is a healthy discussion and debate, and I hope that those Members who do not have the opportunity of hearing these papers will take the opportunity of reading them and so advance the debate in that fashion.

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

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. I yield.

Mr. HAYS. I would just like to say to the gentleman who was interested in fighting communism that in my opinion each one of us who fights down here in the well by doing a lot of talking are not doing any effective fighting like some of us do back in the precincts.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. I do not know that that was a contribution to the debate.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

MEDICAL CARE FOR THE AGED

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Speaker, I think we all recognize that there is room for an honest difference of views in respect to some of the considerations underlying the administration's proposal to provide health insurance for the aged through the social security system. But, Mr. Speaker, when I hear this proposal subjected to the irresponsible charge that it would impair the quality of medical care of our older people—and eventually for people of all ages—I am impelled to rise to answer that charge.

I am very much concerned about the quality of medical care provided to the people of this country and I believe that every Member of this body has the same concern. None of us would support any measure that would impair the quality of medical care. Therefore, I have been spending some time investigating this proposal. I have carefully read the statements of those who testified—both for and against the bill—when the Ways and Means Committee held public hearings last summer and I have talked with a number of these people.

Mr. Speaker, I am convinced that the proposed health insurance plan would actually improve the quality of medical care. Those who repeat the allegation that the administration's proposal would somehow lower the quality of medical care are quite vague when it comes to specifics. They usually start off by bragging that this country has by far the best medical care in the world. Is this really so? Is the medical care available in this country of such unimpeachably high quality that we can boast about it and even go so far as to be complacent and not seek for improvement? I do not believe so. I do not mean to say that good medical care is not available in this country—certainly some of the best doctors, medical training facilities, and hospitals in the world are located here, but it does not take much comparison of vital statistics to reveal that there are some shortcomings.

Two indications of the quality of care are life expectancy at birth and the infant mortality rate. Unfortunately, in these two basic criteria our country does not stand as high in comparison with other countries in the world as many believe and all would hope. In nine countries for example, a smaller proportion of live-born infants die before they reach age 1 than is true in the United States. Within our own country the infant mortality rates are not by any means uniform for all Americans. One good example of this lack of uniformity is that about twice as high a proportion of Negro babies as white babies fail to live as long as 1 year. As to the second basic criteria—life expectancy at birth—I regret to say that there too we are not the leader. In at least six countries, life expectancy at birth is longer than in the United States.

There are other indications of the kind of care available that could stand a bit of scrutiny. It is no secret that few nursing homes are capable of providing health care of even minimum acceptable quality. According to the State agencies responsible under the Hill-Burton Act for conducting annual inventories of medical facilities, 4 out of every 10 nursing home beds are unacceptable because

of fire or health hazards. A much higher proportion of the nursing home beds would fail to meet even minimal requirements for quality of care if such factors as the adequacy of their food service and nursing services were also taken into account.

Many factors have contributed to the generally low quality of nursing homes. The rapid growth of nursing homes has taken place without the benefit of generally accepted criteria for satisfactory operation and, indeed, without an understanding of the skilled nursing home's role in health care. Patients in nursing homes generally are not able to pay for a higher level of care than they are getting—about half the people in nursing homes are public assistance recipients.

All too frequently there are different standards of hospital service for the rich and the poor. Despite the confident complacency of many people, many indigent persons do not get any care at all or get care of substandard quality. Let us be aware that the majority of people over age 65 are in an income class which is unable to pay for satisfactory care. The median income for an aged couple is only slightly over $2,500 a year and for single aged people—most are widows—the median is only a little over $1,000. It is not hard to understand why aged people may not be getting high-quality medical care. They cannot afford it.

Now let us consider the plan that is said by the gentleman from Missouri and some of its other opponents to seriously threaten the present quality of our medical care. First of all, the provisions of this bill were drafted with the advice and counsel of physicians whose greatest concern is to improve the quality of medical care in the United States. The Public Health Service, which is charged with the responsibility of seeking ways to improve the Nation's health, participated in drafting the measure. The views of eminent physicians in various fields of medicine were sought and are reflected in the bill. If one thing is crystal clear, it is that the objective of those who developed the measure was to improve, not impair, the quality of medical care.

What of the proposed program itself? Just how would it operate to protect or improve quality of care? While the plan would in no way dictate or control how hospitals or other providers of services would operate, it would set up certain conditions that would have to be met by those facilities to which payment could be made.

The administration bill spells out the conditions that an institution must meet if it is to receive payments, but these conditions describe basic elements which responsible professional people insist are necessary for a setting in which adequate care can be provided. The Secretary would have the authority to prescribe conditions of participation in addition to those spelled out in the bill only where they are necessary in the interest of the health and safety of beneficiaries. One of the listed conditions that an institution would be required to meet to receive payment for hospital services is to provide 24-hour nursing service rendered or supervised by registered professional nurses. This is nothing more than a statement of one of the things an institution must do if it is to be called a hospital.

The conditions of participation in the administration bill are necessary to provide assurance that the program would not undercut the efforts of the Joint Commission on the Accreditation of Hospitals—of which the American Medical Association and the American Hospital Association are members—or Blue Cross organizations and State agencies to improve the conditions in hospitals and nursing homes. The bill provides for the States and professional organizations interested in the advancement of quality care to give their advice and to take part in administration.

It seems to me to be very significant that the proposal is endorsed by such an organization as the American Public Health Association—a professional organization which takes a primary interest in the health of the Nation and includes some of the physicians most skilled in this field. Another important supporter is the Group Health Association of America, whose member groups provide care to 5 million Americans. Individual physicians such as Dr. Dean A. Clark, director of the Massachusetts General Hospital, Dr. Martin Cherkasky, director of Montefiore Hospital, New York City, Dr. Paul Dudley White, President Eisenhower's heart specialist, and many others support it. Let me read to you the words of Dr. Philip R. Lee, an eminent member of the California Medical Association, who testified before the Committee on Ways and Means on behalf of more than 70 physicians of the San Francisco Bay area.

Dr. Lee testified that the measure "if passed into law in its present form, will improve the quality of medical care services available to the great majority of our aged because it will: first, remove the fear of catastrophic medical care costs; second, promote earlier utilization of medical care services since the fear of possible high costs will be removed; third, permit continuity and coordination of the aged person's care by his own personal physician; fourth, stimulate improvement in the standards of the care provided in our hospitals and nursing homes; and fifth, make available medical care, such as rehabilitation, presently unavailable to many aged because they cannot pay for it.

Dr. Lee pointed out that the plan will provide the great majority of aged Americans, regardless of their place of residence, access to the available medical care services. It will provide a uniformity of access so that an individual may move from one State to another without losing this privilege.

He stated:

> The method of financing protects the prudent members of our society by requiring practically everyone to have some financial protection after age 65 for certain expensive medical care services, while other available programs require the prudent person who has purchased his own health insurance to pay part also of the cost for the medical care of the less prudent through the general tax mechanism and various public assistance programs.

I am particularly amazed by the notion that health insurance for the aged under social security would have disastrous effects on everybody—young and old alike. People who say such a thing have attempted to base their argument on the assumption that the program—and all the evils they say are in it—will be extended to younger age groups and eventually to people of all ages. As have been so many of the arguments of so many of the opponents of health insurance, this too is an interesting exercise in illogic—an argument with a built-in rebuttal. The health insurance proposal would be a first step toward extending coverage to people of all ages only if first, they were dissatisfied with present private methods of providing medical care not only for the aged but for everyone; and, second, people found the small amount of Government participation and financing of medical care for the aged so much better than what is provided in the private sector that the program would be expanded to cover all of the population and to cover more services. In effect, then, what the opponents say is that the program will be so bad that everyone will want it. Actually, there is no reason to believe that younger people will want or need to be covered by such a program as is proposed for the aged. Private voluntary methods show good indication of being adequate to provide protection for younger people. If private voluntary methods are relieved of the problem of trying to protect the aged against the cost of medical care they can do an increasingly better job for younger people and so avoid any need for a Government health insurance program for everyone.

I invite the opponents of health insurance for the aged to reexamine what they have heard from the gentleman from Missouri and others about quality of care under the proposed health insurance plan. I am very glad they are concerned about the exceedingly important subject of good medical care, and I want them to be assured that the health-insurance program will protect and improve the quality of medical care in this country.

SPECIAL ORDER VACATED

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DINGELL] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the special order I have for today be vacated and that I may address the House for 60 minutes on Monday, next, following the gentleman from Missouri.

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

There was no objection.

MEDICAL CARE FOR THE AGED

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Bow] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include therein a copy of a bill, together with a chart explaining the bill.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced today a measure that will provide medical care insurance for every elderly American who wishes protection from the expenses of medical care.

My bill is based upon tax incentives and Government assistance that will permit every American age 65 or over to take fullest advantage of the free enterprise health insurance system of this country and the services of our hospitals and the medical profession.

Unlike any other legislative proposal, my bill will offer protection to every aged American, and each may choose, beyond the broad basic plans spelled out in the bill, the kind of coverage best suited to his circumstances.

If enacted it should remove any apprehension or worry that may trouble our fellow citizens who do not know how they can support the cost of sudden or prolonged illness in their old age.

I am introducing this legislation because I am convinced that we have a problem in America in respect to medical care for older citizens and I am convinced that something must be done to raise that problem out of the political controversy now surrounding it, and expedite its solution.

My mail every day contains an example of how major medical expenses can wipe out the savings of an elderly couple, or leave the surviving spouse unable to discharge the obligations arising from a prolonged illness without stripping himself of all of his assets, including in some cases his home.

Frequently I receive letters that begin like this:

> I am conservative by nature, but I am beginning to believe we must accept President Kennedy's social security approach to medical care because of a problem I have just encountered. My old neighbor is unable to pay her doctor bill.

And there I stop, for it is obvious my well-intentioned friend does not realize that the Kennedy approach to medical care, as embodied in the King-Anderson bill, would not pay his friend's doctor bill.

People who are receiving social security benefits write to me and relate stories of serious and sudden illness which required prolonged treatment and they report that they simply cannot pay out of the pittance they receive. But they do not realize that the provisions of the King-Anderson bill would leave them little if any better off than they are now.

Nevertheless, these letters do reveal the extent of the problem and the very general feeling that the Federal Government must take the lead in doing more than we have done as yet to help the growing number of Americans who reach and live beyond age 65.

This is a problem that has been discussed time and again in the House, and I have yet to see a satisfactory solution that first, is in keeping with the American free enterprise system while second, providing adequate medical care for the special problems of the aging.

Mine is the first suggestion I have seen that provides for everyone, takes fullest advantage of the remarkable growth of our health insurance system, and preserves freedom of choice for the individual.

As we know, the administration proposal to make health insurance a part of the social security system leaves out 2 or 3 million of our most needy citizens, while it includes many in very comfortable circumstances who have no need for this kind of program.

Further, the administration proposal provides only limited hospitalization and nursing services, requiring the individual to pay $10 per day for the first 9 days of hospitalization. I know many elderly people in Ohio whose social security benefit is $50 or $60 per month. How can they be expected to meet this requirement?

Experts tell me that the benefits in the administration proposal would cover only about 30 percent of the annual average medical expenses of a man or woman over 65.

How disappointing it would be to these good citizens if the King bill should be enacted. Can you conceive the extent of of their disillusionment when they found that the legislation so widely publicized and in which they had such faith provided so little.

Finally, with regard to the administration proposal, I am convinced that it is nothing more than the foot-in-the-door, or the nose of the camel under the tent, and that it would lead inevitably to the nationalization of medicine and a decline in the quality of medical care in the United States.

I have seen medical care in the nations of Europe where socialized medicine is the vogue, and in the Soviet Union, and I know from personal observation that it cannot compare with the high standards of American medicine.

PROVISIONS OF THE BILL

My bill creates no new Federal agency. It permits no Federal control of hospitals. It will encourage the medical profession to continue the progress that has made it outstanding in the world. It will take advantage of the free enterprise health insurance system that now covers 53 percent of all Americans over 65 under a variety of insurance programs that permit each of us almost unlimited choice. This is in the American tradition.

I would provide a tax credit for the cost of premiums on an approved medical care insurance, up to $125. This amount would be subtracted from the Federal income tax each individual owed the Government.

The tax credit could be taken by any individual age 65 or over who buys insurance for himself or his spouse, or by any relative who buys the insurance for an individual over 65, or by an employer who buys it for retired employees over age 65.

We would encourage people to look out for themselves and many would wish to buy insurance during their working years which could be carried, with the benefit of this tax credit, on a guaranteed renewable basis.

We would encourage sons and daughters, nephews, sisters and brothers to help their relatives by providing health insurance.

We would encourage what is already a growing practice in American industry—the protection of retired employees on a group basis by their former employers.

These provisions would cover the vast majority of Americans aged 65 or over, but I do not intend to forget 2 or 3 million others who may have no Federal income tax liability, no relatives, no employer enrolled in a program of this kind.

The basis of this bill is that each individual over age 65 who wishes protection will file a Federal income tax return each year.

For those who have a tax credit, there is no problem.

For those whose tax is less than the amount of the allowable tax credit, including those who have no income tax to pay, my bill authorizes issuance of a medical care insurance certificate, by the Treasury Department, which may be used by the individual to pay the premiums on a medical care policy, and which will be redeemed by the Treasury, in an amount not exceeding $125, when presented by the insurance carrier.

Those who have followed the development of this idea since I announced it in January will note that I have eliminated reference to a proposed income limitation. The tax credit will have great significance for the man of low income, and progressively less significance as income increases. Therefore, it seems to me that a tax credit program does not require an income limitation.

BASIC INSURANCE PLANS

My bill outlines two medical care insurance plans.

The first is a plan under which all of the covered expenses are paid by the insurance carrier. There is no deductible feature such as is required in the King bill. An individual in the most dire financial circumstances could have good medical care with this basic plan.

The second is a more extensive plan of the major medical type, involving coinsurance not to exceed 25 percent and a deductible.

I have consulted with many people in the insurance industry, and I have been assured that either of these can be offered to an individual age 65, regardless of his prior medical history, on a guaranteed renewable basis, with a premium cost not exceeding $125.

I am assured, furthermore, that these policies at a premium cost of $125 leave

little, if any, profit for the insurance carrier. The diversity of policies offered by the insurance industry, by various group practice plans and by Blue Cross and Blue Shield can be adapted to these basic plans, and all have shown in the past their willingness to contribute to the solution of the problem of which we speak.

In summing up, my bill offers every aged American the opportunity to have complete and meaningful medical care insurance, including payments for surgery and doctor's services, through the free enterprise health insurance system, using the facilities of an existing Government agency, with no possibility of Government interference in medicine.

The administration proposal, on the other hand, helps only a part of the older population, offers only limited hospitalization and nursing services subject to a deductible item, and is most certainly the first step toward the deterioration of medical services in this Nation.

I wish to include with my remarks the text of the bill and a table comparing its features with those of the King-Anderson bill at this point:

H.R. 10755

A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide for the medical care of the aged through the allowance of a tax credit as an incentive for health insurance coverage

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) part IV of subchapter A of chapter 1 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to credits against tax) is amended by redesignating section 38 as section 39, and by inserting after section 37 the following new section:

"SEC. 38. COSTS OF MEDICAL CARE FOR THE AGED.

"(a) GENERAL RULE.—There shall be allowed to an individual, as a credit against the tax imposed by this subtitle for the taxable year, an amount equal to the aggregate of the premiums paid during the taxable year by such individual under one or more qualified medical care insurance programs for the aged (as defined in subsection (d)), to the extent that the aggregate of such premiums does not exceed $125 for any one person covered by such program or programs, plus—

"(b) INDIVIDUALS ELIGIBLE FOR CREDIT.—The credit under subsection (a) shall be allowable to a taxpayer only if—

"(1) he is the beneficiary of the medical care insurance program involved and is 65 years of age or over, or

"(2) each beneficiary for whom the premiums were paid under such program is a person 65 years of age or over who bears any of the relationships to the taxpayer defined under section 152(a).

For purposes of this section, an individual shall be considered to be 65 years of age or over throughout any taxable year if he has attained such age by the close of such year.

"(c) COVERAGE CERTIFICATE. — Each insurance carrier offering a qualified medical care insurance program for the aged (as defined in subsection (d)) shall issue, to each individual who is covered under such program, a medical care coverage certificate setting forth the name of the insured, the amount of the premium, and a certification that the coverage meets the requirements of this Act. The credit provided by subsection (a) shall be allowed for any taxable year only if such certificate or a copy thereof is attached to the taxpayer's return for such year.

(d) DEFINITION OF CARRIER. — "Carrier" means a voluntary association, corporation, partnership, or other nongovernmental organization which lawfully offers a health benefits plan.

"(e) DEFINITION OF QUALIFIED MEDICAL CARE INSURANCE PROGRAM FOR THE AGED.—As used in this section, the term 'qualified medical care insurance program for the aged' means a program, offered by one or more insurance carriers operating in accordance with State law, providing protection under guaranteed renewable insurance for individuals 65 years of age or over against the costs of medical care (as defined in section 213(e)) through a system of benefits including either—

"(1) a plan providing benefits which may not be less than:

"(A) $12 for hospital room and board charges per day of confinement and $1,080 for all days of confinement in a calendar year;

"(B) $120 for hospital ancillary charges in any calendar year including any such charges in connection with surgery or emergency treatment on an out-patient basis;

"(C) $6 for convalescent hospital room and board charges per day of confinement and $186 for all days of confinement in any one calendar year, immediately following confinement in a general hospital;

"(D) surgical charges according to a fee schedule with a $300 maximum; or

"(2) A plan providing payment at the rate of not less than 75 percent of the following covered medical expenses after a deductible and subject to a maximum as specified in (B) below:

"(A) covered medical expenses must include at least the following:

"(i) hospital room and board charges equal to the hospital's customary charges for semi-private accommodations;

"(ii) hospital ancillary charges including any such charges in connection with surgery or emergency treatment on an out-patient basis;

"(iii) $6 for convalescent hospital room and board charges per day of confinement immediately following confinement in a general hospital and $540 for all days of confinement in any one calendar year;

"(iv) surgical charges according to a fee schedule with a $300 maximum;

"(v) $5 per call for physician's services, other than for surgery or post-operative care;

"(vi) $16 for professional (registered) nursing charges per day and $480 for all days in any one calendar year;

"(vii) charges for drugs and medicines which require a doctor's prescription; diagnostic X-rays and other diagnostic and laboratory tests; X-ray, radium, and radioactive isotope treatment; blood or blood plasma not donated or replaced; anesthetics and oxygen; and rental of durable medical or surgical equipment such as hospital beds or wheelchairs; or

"(B) payment of benefits for the foregoing charges may be subject to either

"(i) a deductible of not more than $100 in a calendar year and a lifetime maximum of not less than $5,000;

"(ii) a deductible of not more than $200 in a calendar year and a lifetime maximum of not less than $10,000;

If a medical care insurance program which is otherwise qualified under the preceding provisions of this section offers protection for individuals under age 65 as well as those 65 and over, such program shall be considered a 'qualified medical care insurance program for the aged' for purposes of this section but only with respect to beneficiaries who are 65 years of age or over.

"(f) CREDIT IN CASE OF CERTAIN EMPLOYERS.—Under regulations prescribed by the Secretary or his delegate, if any employer provides protection against medical costs for its retired employees who are 65 years of age or over, by purchasing coverage for such retired employees under one or more qualified medical care insurance programs for the aged, such employer shall be entitled to a credit against the tax imposed by this subtitle equal to the amount of the credit to which it would be enttiled under subsection (a)(1) if it were an individual taxpayer and such retired employees were persons described in subsection (b)(2).

"(g) INDIVIDUALS NOT DERIVING FULL BENEFIT FROM CREDIT.—In the case of any individual—

"(1) who is 65 years of age or over,

"(2) whose tax under this subtitle for the taxable year will be less than $125 (as estimated in accordance with regulations of the Secretary or his delegate), and

"(3) who is not the beneficiary of a qualified medical care insurance program for the aged,

the Secretary shall upon application by such individual issue to him a medical care insurance premium certificate which may be used by him in purchasing coverage under such a program and will be redeemed for cash by the Secretary when presented by an insurance carrier who certifies that it was accepted in payment of the premiums on such a program. The amount for which any certificate will be redeemed under the preceding sentence shall be the amount of the premiums payable on the program for the year or $125, whichever is less, reduced by the amount (if any) of the individual's tax for such year as estimated under clause (2) of such sentence and further adjusted (unless such an adjustment would be inequitable or impose undue hardship) to take account of any amounts by which benefits made available to such individual under this subsection in previous years were greater or less than they would have been if the estimate under such clause (2) for such years had been correct. No certificate under this subsection shall be issued to any individual for any taxable year unless he furnishes the Secretary with satisfactory proof of his compliance with clauses (1), (2), and (3) of the first sentence.

"(h) CREDIT NOT TO CAUSE REFUND OF TAX.—The credit allowed by this section shall not exceed the amount of the tax imposed by this chapter for the taxable year, reduced by the sum of the credits allowable under sections 33 (relating to foreign tax credit), 34 (relating to credit for dividends received by individuals), 35 (relating to partially tax-exempt interest), and 37 (relating to retirement income).

"(i) REGULATIONS.—The Secretary or his delegate shall prescribe such regulations (including regulations providing for the application of this section in the case of joint returns) as may be necessary or appropriate to carry out the provisions of this section."

(b) The table of sections for such part IV is amended by striking out

"Sec. 38. Overpayments of tax."

and inserting in lieu thereof

"Sec. 38. Costs of medical care for the aged.

"Sec. 39. Overpayments of tax."

SEC. 2. Section 213 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to deduction for medical, dental, etc., expenses) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(h) EXCLUSION OF AMOUNTS ALLOWED AS CREDIT.—Any expense allowed as a credit under section 38 shall not be treated as an expense paid for medical care for purposes of this section."

SEC. 3. The amendments made by this Act shall apply only with respect to taxable years ending after the date of the enactment of this Act.

Comparison of Bow and King-Anderson proposals for medical care

	Bow bill		King-Anderson
Who is covered	Everyone who reaches age 65 who wishes health insurance		OASDI eligible persons age 65 and over, including employed aged; also includes railroad retirees; 13.75 million OASDI beneficiaries and 0.5 million railroad retirees.
How many	16.2 million (as of 1962)		14.25 million (as of 1963).
Benefits	Medical care insurance under a choice of policies, the minimum benefits of which are described as plans 1 and 2.		Hospitalization, nursing home and diagnostic care subject to deductible charges enumerated below.
	Bow plan 1 (payment of all charges is made by the insurance carrier)	Bow plan 2 (subject to a deductible feature with not to exceed 25 percent coinsurance) [1]	
Hospitalization	Hospital room and board up to $12 per day, and up to $1,080 in a calendar year; other hospital charges including charges for surgical or emergency outpatient treatment up to $120 in any calendar year.	Hospital room and board equal to charges for semiprivate accommodations; other hospital charges including charges for surgical or emergency outpatient treatment.	90 days per benefit period, with $10 per day deductible required for first 9 days, with a minimum deductible of $20.
Nursing homes	Convalescent hospital room and board up to $6 per day, and up to $186 in any 1 calendar year, following discharge from hospital.	Convalescent hospital room and board up to $6 per day, and up to $540 in any 1 calendar year, following discharge from hospital.	180 days per benefit period, or 2 days for each unused hospital day up to a total of 150 units of service.
Home health service	None	None	240 visits a year; 2¾ visits for each unused hospital day; includes therapy and homemaker services; medical social work, etc.; no prior hospitalization required.
Nurses' fees	None	Up to $16 per day for registered nurse, and up to $480 in any 1 calendar year.	None.
Surgeons' and physicians' fees.	Surgical charges according to a fee schedule with a $300 maximum.	Surgical charges according to a fee schedule with a $300 maximum, and $5 per call for other than surgery or postoperative care.	None.
Diagnostic, laboratory, and X-ray services.	When hospitalized as above	Diagnostic X-rays and other diagnostic and laboratory tests; X-ray, radium, and radioactive isotope treatment.	Provides for necessary laboratory tests and X-rays in a hospital, either on inpatient or outpatient basis, but requires $20 deductible for each diagnostic study on an outpatient basis.
Drugs and related requirements.	Drugs used in hospitals	Charges for drugs and medicines which require a doctor's prescription; blood or blood plasma not donated or replaced; anesthetics and oxygen; rental of durable medical or surgical equipment such as hospital beds or wheelchairs.	Only drugs used in hospital.
Financing method	Through tax credits for individuals who pay their own premiums or are covered by insurance paid for by near relatives or former employers, and through issuance of "medical care insurance certificates" for all others.		Increases OASDI taxable wage base from $4,800 to $5,000 beginning with 1962; provides for rate increase beginning in 1963 of ½ of 1 percent of 1st $5,000 of employee wages; ⅜ of 1 percent of 1st $5,000 for self-employed.
Total costs (estimate)	Cost estimated to be comparable to other legislation, but difficult to predict because of lack of (a) precise information on amount of deductions now taken by or for individuals over 65 which would be an offset against cost of tax credit; (b) knowledge concerning probable degree of participation.		$1.1 billion, early year cost.

[1] Payment of benefits may be subject to either (1) a deductible of not more than $100 of not more than $200 in a calendar year and a lifetime maximum of not less than $10,000. in a calendar year and a lifetime maximum of not less than $5,000; or (2) a deductible

THE REVENUE ACT OF 1962

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. VANIK] is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Speaker, like every other Member of this body, I have endeavored in the past several weeks to carefully weigh the provisions of H.R. 10650, the Revenue Act of 1962. There is much in the bill that is desirable; there is much more that is not. It is my considered judgment that the bad features of the bill are overwhelming.

At the outset, the work on the bill was dramatized as an effort to close tax loopholes and preserve the integrity of the income tax structure. While efforts were quite obviously made to calk tax seepage in some areas, legislative bulldozers were used in the tax credit sections to break down the tax structure. The estimated tax loss of $1.8 billion is a modest price tag on the tax loss. These provisions pose a potential devastating threat of draining the Treasury of scores of billions of dollars. The loss in tax revenue could equal the Treasury losses from the fast tax writeoffs authorized during the Korean crisis. It is not good for the country on either the long-term or the short-term basis.

The ostensible purpose of the tax credit sections is to "accelerate new investment, to stimulate the production, sale, and use of new machines, new tools, and expanded facilities." If this credit were to be made available as a standby emergency power—available for use when the Executive may deem it necessary in the national security—or in the event of a deep economic recession—it might have some merit.

But how can it be justified as a permanent part of the Nation's tax structure? With the steady improvement of business conditions—it does not appear that the use of the stimulant is now warranted. If this provision becomes law, it would serve to provide the basis for an industrial boom for the next year or two after which the buildup skirmish would settle down to an accepted tax loss with little beneficial effect on the Nation's economy. When industry returns to its normal attitude toward business investment, the tax credit will be of little effect with respect to expansion.

While the tax credit will slash at tax revenues, it will also serve to remove taxpayers from the tax rolls—substantial taxpayers who will be able to completely escape taxation. In any year that a taxpayer spends $1,275,000 for almost any purpose except the acquisition of real property, he will be able to pocket $200,000 or more in tax-free income.

The legal intricacies of this provision should provide the basis of a real tax break. Does new investment include the purchase of entire businesses? What effect will this have upon merger, the steady concentration of industrial power, the weakened status of small business? A large, growing corporate structure can acquire total business operations each year and build the investment credit into an annual tax-saving benefit without contributing an iota to the Nation's economic growth potential. What will preclude the periodic interchange of production facilities between several corporate structures as a permanent part of tax-saving barter?

What real assurance do we have that this measure will make any substantial contribution to the economic growth claimed to be its advantage? As long as the provisions of the section fail to limit new investment to investment in newly created facilities, it is totally defective. The tax credit under this bill will serve as a tax break for mergers and acquisition. The government will, in effect, pay a tax bounty for merger or acquisition of existing property or equipment. This use of the tax credit will not create a single new tool or machine and will not provide an hour's work for a single additional workman.

As the Treasury is subjected to deeper cuts in revenues through the tax credit provisions, the increasing tax losses will

have to be replaced by the imposition of higher taxes upon those least able to pay—those who constitute the tax base.

The sections relating to the withholding of interest and dividends are equally as objectionable. It seems to me that mandatory reporting of such income by the payer to the Treasury Department should be given a trial. If every taxpayer is appraised of the fact that his dividend and interest income has been reported to the Treasury and reported to him at year end, the Treasury should be able to recover all revenues anticipated by the withholding provisions. Taxpayer failure to report such income constitutes a serious violation of the law with severe penalties.

My principal objection to the withholding provision of the bill is that it will result in withholding of small amounts of interest to which the Government has no claim. Although entitled to a refund, millions of depositors with small accounts will not claim refunds of withheld interest. How can they be expected to pay even $10 in fees for the services of a tax expert if the recovery or refund is less. The withholding of interest in these small accounts will result in unjust enrichment to the Treasury.

Over 12 million deposit accounts of less than $100 will earn less than $4 annually of which $1 or less will be withheld. Over 52 percent of the total deposit accounts in banks and savings and loan associations are less than $1,000 of which less than $8 will be withheld.

This type of withholding will create massive opposition to the entire income tax system which may ultimately lead to its demise.

INDEMNITY PROVISIONS OF ATOMIC ENERGY ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PRICE] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, I am introducing today a bill to amend the Atomic Energy Act of 1954 so as to extend its indemnity provisions to cover certain nuclear incidents occurring outside the United States under the AEC contractor program.

On September 15, 1961, near the end of the last session, I introduced a similar bill, H.R. 9244, for the purpose of obtaining comments from interested persons. Since then, the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy has received some suggestions and comments from interested persons. This bill incorporates some of these suggested improvements.

Sections 1 and 5 of this bill are identical to the corresponding sections in H.R. 9244. Changes have been made in sections 2, 3, and 4, as described in a brief bill analysis. Without objection, I request that this analysis be inserted in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

The Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, through its Subcommittee on Research, Development, and Radiation, of which I am chairman, is planning to hold hearings next month on nuclear reactor safety problems and liability and indemnity coverage. I am introducing this bill at this time in order that it may be studied by the AEC and other interested persons prior to the hearings. I hope that this bill, as well as H.R. 9244, will be considered during the April hearings.

BILL ANALYSIS

The general purpose of this bill is to make Price-Anderson Act indemnity coverage available in the AEC contractor program for nuclear incidents occurring outside the United States, with certain limitations as described below.

Section 1 of the bill amends section 11o of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, concerning the definition of "nuclear incident." It is identical to Section 1 of H.R. 9244, as described in the bill analysis reprinted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 107, part 15, page 19777.

Section 2 of the bill amends section 11r of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, to establish two separate categories of coverage depending primarily upon whether the incident occurs within or outside the United States.

Clause (1) covers nuclear incidents occurring within the United States or in connection with the nuclear ship *Savannah*. It extends coverage to the person with whom an indemnity agreement is executed and to any other person who may be liable for public liability. It is identical to clause (1) in the amendment to section 11r proposed by H.R. 9244.

Clause (2) with respect to nuclear incidents occurring outside the United States has been redrafted to more clearly cover contractors who qualify for indemnification solely on the basis of participating in a joint project.

Section 3 of the bill amends section 170d of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, by adding a proviso at the end of the second sentence. This proviso states that in the case of nuclear incidents occurring outside the United States, the amount of indemnity provided by the Commission shall not exceed $100 million.

The act currently provides an indemnity of $500 million to cover incidents occurring within the United States or in connection with the nuclear ship *Savannah*. The figure of $100 million for incidents outside the United States is considered reasonable because this is the maximum amount generally provided by countries other than the United States as indemnity for nuclear incidents within their borders.

Section 4 of the bill amends section 170e of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, by adding a similar proviso at the end of the first sentence. This proviso states that with respect to any nuclear incident occurring outside the United States and covered under the AEC contractor indemnity provisions of subsection 170d, the aggregate liability shall not exceed $100 million, together with the amount of financial protection required of the contractor. This limitation corresponds to the $100 million limitation on the indemnity under section 170d, and it is intended that there should be no gaps between the liability exposure under 170e and the indemnity and financial protection coverage under 170d.

The limitation of liability, although lower than the $500 million limitation applicable in the United States, is considered reasonable since it corresponds generally to the highest limitation applicable in any country outside of the United States. Most countries developing atomic energy limit liability for nuclear incidents to a far lower figure.

Section 4 of the bill also amends section 170e of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, to establish a single place of venue over all applications for limitations of liability in connection with incidents occurring outside the United States. The place of venue established is the U.S. District Court for the District of Columbia. This change was also included in H.R. 9244.

It is hoped that any foreign court will apply the $100 million limitation on liability provided by subsection 170e. In any event, even if ignored by a foreign court, it shall be applied by the U.S. District Court for the District of Columbia.

Section 5 of the bill provides that as of the effective date of this act, the terms "nuclear incident" and "persons indemnified" as used in existing indemnity agreements with AEC contractors shall have the meaning provided in sections 1 and 2 of this bill. It is identical to section 5 in H.R. 9244.

LET'S KEEP SOYBEANS OUT OF GOVERNMENT BINS

Mr. KEITH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. FINDLEY] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, today I introduced a bill which would relate price supports on soybeans to market prices instead of parity. This legislation is needed to keep soybeans out of Government bins. Under present USDA policy, soybeans are headed for the same trouble that now plagues wheat and the other feed grains.

My bill would establish price supports for the 1963 soybean crop, and subsequent crops, at 90 percent of the average market price received by farmers during the 3 preceding years. It would prohibit acreage allotments on soybeans and also prohibit net sales of Government-owned soybeans at less than 115 percent of current support price.

As a result of Secretary Freeman's action last year raising price support from $1.85 to $2.30, soybean production increased so sharply that heavy supplies will be carried over this year, despite costly giveaways of soybean oil.

Secretary Freeman's newly announced rate for 1962—$2.25—is not low enough to keep soybeans out of trouble, and we can expect the economic planners to demand acreage control if stocks continue to mount. This would indeed be a tragic development, because the soybean is the wonder grain that was selling well at

home and abroad and making money for farmers when Mr. Freeman took office.

Mr. Freeman's artificial pricing has soybeans headed for trouble, and the only way to prevent it is to keep price supports at a level which permits the private enterprise marketplace to operate.

There has been a gradual but healthy increase in acreage planted and utilization of soybeans over many years.

Farmers have insisted that soybeans be produced for a market and not for a Government bin or warehouse. They have insisted that price supports be kept at a relatively low level so as to permit the market to function and the product consumed at home and abroad. Soybean producers have insisted that support rates be kept low, relative to the troubled crops: such as wheat, corn, and other supported commodities in heavy surplus.

Until 1961 producers' wishes on price support for soybeans were generally agreed to by responsible USDA officials.

PETER FRANCISCO

Mr. KEITH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. CONTE] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, today, March 15 is the day which we of Massachusetts have set aside in tribute to Peter Francisco, a man who adopted our country as his home and who contributed his heart and soul to defending America's cause as have so many. He is extraordinary, though, for his feats and the circumstances of his life project him as the image of those who came to our shores early in our history and found a way of life worthy of risking their lives to perpetuate.

Despite the relative historical obscurity of this famous Portuguese, Peter Francisco is a moving force in America's drive for independence, a man whose impact upon his times is to be reckoned with, whose imprint upon our history should be properly noted. He is a man whose stature through the years grows, not so much for his deeds performed, as for the admirable trait of American character which he represents—that of a true patriot.

And so, Mr. Speaker, before I came to the Congress of the United States, while I was still serving in the Massachusetts State Senate, I supported the measure which is now law, proclaiming March 15 as Peter Francisco Day throughout the Commonwealth. For it was on this day in 1781 that Francisco put his patriotism to the ultimate test in mortal battle at Guilford's Courthouse in Greensboro, N.C.

Peter Francisco was not a native of his home State of Virginia. Neither for that matter, was he a native-born citizen of the United States. At the age of 6, friendless and alone, Peter was abandoned on a lonely dock at Hopewell, Va. Who left him there is unknown. All that was known about him was that his features and language indicated his Portuguese origin. No more was known or considered. Fate here interceded and saw him adopted by Judge Anthony Winston, uncle of Patrick Henry, whose impassioned and immortal words must surely have inspired young Peter to his enlistment in 1776. For then, at the age of 16, he joined the 10th Virginia Regiment of Continental troops, thereby initiating as extraordinary a military career as can be found in the annals of the American Revolution.

During his convalescence from a battle wound inflicted during the combat at Brandywine, the first of six such wounds, Francisco established his lifelong friendship with General Lafayette, a relationship which further imbued Francisco with his Nation's cause. Twice more, at Monmouth in 1778 and Stony Point in 1779, Peter was wounded in battle only to return once more to the task of American independence. On March 15, 1781, the American and British collided in the famous and bloody battle of Guilford Courthouse in Greensboro, N.C. On this day, Peter Francisco slew 11 British soldiers before he himself was critically wounded and forced from the encounter. The accounts of his efforts at Guilford Courthouse became legendary throughout the American Army. Offered a commission in recognition of his courage, Francisco refused on the grounds that he was not sufficiently well educated. A monument is located on the site of Guilford Courthouse in the National Military Park, and on this tablet are related the exploits of Peter Francisco:

> A giant in stature, might, and courage, who slew in this engagement 11 of the enemy with his own broadsword, rendering himself thereby the most famous private soldier of the Revolutionary War.

After the battle at Guilford Courthouse, Peter Francisco's military career continued, and he added further glory to his enviable record of courage and bravery. There is related an amusing incident at Ward's Tavern which occurred just previous to Yorktown and the war's end. Confronted and surrounded unexpectedly by nine British dragoons, Francisco refused to surrender to their demand for his silver shoe buckles, a cherished gift from his friend, Judge Winston. When one of the troopers dismounted, tucked his sword underarm and prepared to remove the buckles, Peter grasped the hilt of the sword, wrenched the saber free, and in almost the same motion, delivered an awesome blow, thereby splitting the solder's head and neck in half down to his shoulders. The dragoons rushed him. One raised a pistol and fired pointblank at his head, the ball grazed Francisco's side thus inflicting his sixth wound, but one saber thrust severed the hand that fired the shot. Another musket was lowered at his head. It misfired. He grabbed the weapon, knocked the soldier from his horse, mounted the horse himself, and, rising in the stirrups with a great yell, feigned a summons for nonexistent help. The dragoons broke and, with sheer fright at the contemplation of more of the same treatment, scattered throughout the nearby woods in confused panic. Francisco escaped down a back country road and easily eluded his would-be captors. He saw the British surrender at Yorktown soon after.

Peter returned to his beloved Buckingham County at the end of the war and settled down to a relatively quiet life running a small store and tavern. He had made many friends during the conflict. Such great American personages as John Marshall, Patrick Henry, George Washington, Nathaniel Greene, and Henry Clay speak admirably of Francisco in their personal notes, calling him a man of considerable charm and wit and of great valor and strength.

Undoubtedly, he is all of this. He is justly recognized through an engraving which hangs in Philadelphia's Independence Hall and depicts his encounter with Tarleton's British dragoons at Ward's Tavern. Likewise, it is fitting and proper that in Massachusetts, in recognition of his contribution to our struggle for independence, March 15 annually is proclaimed as Peter Francisco Day. As a common soldier of the ranks, we recognize him even further for his representation of a spirit of those times—an admirable and desirous patriotism which is always so vital to a great society and people. As a native son of Portugal, Peter Francisco, like Thaddeus Kosciusko, of Poland, and Lafayette, of France, is respected and admired as an example of American solidarity in time of national crisis. The same fervor of person and unshakable faith in the ideals of independence which motivated this great patriot to give so unselfishly of his soldierly services are typical of the contributions of the many native-born Portuguese Americans in our Nation's proud history. We all, as Americans, are indebted to them as our ancestors were to Peter Francisco, for they, like him, are true Americans as well. True Americans who represent the American strength, fearless courage, and patriotic love of liberty. Mr. Speaker, I salute a great American, Peter Francisco.

LIBERTY AMENDMENT

Mr. KEITH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. ROUSSELOT] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. ROUSSELOT. Mr. Speaker, on January 23, 1962, Mr. Willis Stone, chairman of the National Committee for Economic Freedom, testified before a committee of the South Carolina Legislature on behalf of House Joint Resolution 23 by Representative JAMES B. UTT of California. This resolution is commonly referred to as the liberty amendment.

Last year I distributed a questionnaire in my congressional district in which I asked:

> The proposed liberty amendment to the U.S. Constitution—the amendment has been introduced in the current session of Congress by Representative JAMES B. UTT, Republican, of California, and is identified as House Joint Resolution 23—would do away

with the need for the Federal personal income tax by eliminating agencies of the Federal Government which compete directly with private enterprise. Elimination of such agencies would decrease the budget needs of the Government by approximately $40 billion annually. Furthermore, proceeds from the sale of the assets of the agencies (the assets would be disposed of over a reasonable period of time) could be used to reduce the national debt—$262 billion is the estimated value of the assets. Do you think I should support the liberty amendment?

The response was yes, 73.7 percent; no, 13.5 percent; no opinion, 12.8 percent.

Believing that Members of Congress will be interested in Mr. Stone's testimony, under leave to revise and extend my remarks, I wish to place it in the body of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. Anyone interested in additional comments on the liberty amendment should read a speech by Representative UTT entitled "The Chains of the Constitution," which appeared in the body of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on March 16, 1961.

Mr. Stone's testimony is as follows:

Thank you Mr. Chairman and members of the Judiciary Committee of the South Carolina House of Representatives for affording me the opportunity of coming before you to discuss some of the monumental problems of taxing and spending which confront us.

As a matter of identity, I am Willis E. Stone, chairman of the National Committee for Economic Freedom, 6413 Franklin Avenue, Los Angeles, Calif. I am also the publisher of Fact Sheet which analyzes the functions and costs of various Federal agencies, and publisher of American Progress magazine which fosters a better understanding of our American Constitution. Through these activities I have had the opportunity of correlating a great deal of evidence which supports the resolution for the liberty amendment now pending before you as a concurrent resolution identified as House bill 1758.

It has been said that I have accumulated a great deal of data on the subject of the Federal individual income tax, and that I am an advocate of the repeal of the 16th, or income tax amendment. This is true, but it is equally true that we must first comprehend the nature of taxes before we can effectively discuss repeal or even the modification of taxes in any area.

Taxes have a legitimate function—to pay the cost of government. Taxes, unfortunately, have been much too low in recent years to pay the costs of government, despite the fact that taxes have put an inhuman burden on the backs of the American people. This is self-evident as the Federal Government has spent an average $12 billion per year more than it has been able to gather in taxes during the past 20 years. As a result we find the national debt is $240 billion greater than it was 20 years ago.

Taxes are the price we pay for the government we get. If we are ever to solve the tax problem, we must solve it at the spending level. It is evident that if we were to repeal the 16th (income tax) amendment at sunup this morning we would be in deep trouble before sundown. We would be faced with one of three very grim alternatives.

First, we would face immediate national bankruptcy if we were to eliminate half the Nation's revenue while leaving all the obligations in force. This would solve nothing.

Second, we would face the nationalization of all land, business and wealth as government might take over the rest of these items to offset the loss of revenue through the income tax. This would be galloping communism, and certainly is no solution to the problem.

The third alternative would be to quickly levy the same amount of taxes on the same people under a different title, which would solve Government's dilemma without relieving the taxpayers in any way.

There is only one logical solution to the taxing problem—that we should first reduce the costs of Government adequately to accommodate the loss of revenue.

Fundamentally the liberty amendment now under consideration is not primarily involved with taxes. It was first proposed over 17 years ago when, as you will recall, Mr. Sewell Avery was physically removed from his office in Chicago. The then Attorney General of the United States justified that act by stating "the Government can do anything not specifically prohibited to it by the Constitution." This is a philosophy of "implied powers" entirely foreign to our way of life.

One of the most dangerous ways in which the Federal Government has used "implied powers" is in the creation of more than 700 Federal corporate activities which carry on business-type operations in direct competition with private enterprise.

The first section of the liberty amendment was framed to stop this abuse of power. It provides that: "The Government of the United States shall not engage in any business, professional, commercial, financial or industrial enterprise except as specified in the Constitution."

This provision does not add to, nor subtract from, the original Constitution. It does, however, give positive force and effect to terms of the Constitution by stipulation. General terms thus become specific and again enforceable by the American people. All four sections of the liberty amendment are similarly devised to attain this single purpose. There is nothing in the proposal which in any way would alter the basic provisions of the Constitution, but it is designed to plug the loopholes through which power has been usurped. It would restore the Constitution to full force and effect.

It required a lot of research to illustrate the need for the amendment by first discovering the areas in which the Federal Government has usurped powers from the States and from the citizens, and then to document the extent of that usurpation, its cost in taxes and lost liberties, and the benefactions which would flow to Government and people by restoring the Constitution. In this quest we discovered the enormous magnitude of the Federal invasion of private enterprise and the tragic erosion of our historical concept of State sovereignty and jurisdiction over its internal affairs.

We found this departure of Government from the basic functions of governing and regulating vast in scope and so tremendously extravagant that, if we were to invoke the terms of section No. 1 of the liberty amendment we would cut the costs of the Federal Government more than enough to compensate for revenue lost through repeal of the 16th (income tax) amendment. Thus, by applying the terms of the liberty amendment, the expenditures of Government would be reduced more than the present yield of personal income, estate and gift taxes, which are the only taxes involved in the 16th amendment.

Repeal of the income taxes would not strip the Government of revenue. It would leave the Federal Government all the revenue sources it ever had from the very beginning until 1913, such as corporate taxes, excises, imposts, duties, and a host of miscellaneous taxes which have always been within the power of the Federal Government.

The States have a big stake in the liberty amendment. When the Federal Government gained access to the purse and earnings of the individual through the 16th amendment, the individual lost much of his freedom, and the States lost their sovereignty. Every State is today suffering from this preemption of their taxing powers by the Federal Government.

The invasion of the States has many dimensions. The Federal ownership of property within States has reached enormous proportions. In my home State of California the Federal Government holds 48 percent of the land area, so we are, in reality, only half of the State we should be. Our problem is by no means the worst, as we find that Arizona is 75 percent federally owned. Nevada comes close to having no statehood at all, as the Federal Government owns 88.8 percent of the State's land area, letting the Governor, the legislature, and the people hold jurisdiction over only 11.2 percent of their State. This, assuredly, is not statehood in the meaning of the Constitution.

These are some of the problems which affect our States, and your State is not immune from the attack. What has happened in other States inevitably will happen in yours. And the pace at which the Federal takeover of land and wealth is accelerating is awe inspiring. In this last year the Interior Department which, according to page 236 of the 1961–62 Government Organization Manual holds custody of 750 million acres of land, has moved to put 65 million acres into deep freeze through the so-called wilderness bill. This, in effect, would remove this land forever from access by the American people.

At the same time there has been a rash of demands for making national parks out of well developed and well populated areas. This has been noteworthy in Kansas, Michigan, and other States in Midwest, East, South, and West. Your State cannot be immune.

These problems confronting the States have many faces. We cannot encompass all the alarums coming to us through the multiplicity of attacks. Doctors are unconcerned about the real estate problems, builders have little in common with the problems of the insurance business, yet every facet of the many apparently unrelated problems is interlocked and, in greater or lesser degree, threatens the very existence of the individual States and their political subdivisions. Strangely, the common denominator felt by everyone everywhere is taxes. This is where we all hurt, but to remove the agony we must get to the cause.

Through our research we have identified more than 700 Federal agencies which are in direct competition with private enterprise although they have no constitutional authority for so doing. The list of these agencies, published in Fact Sheet, is the product of reading and cross-indexing approximately 50 million words from official records. In this list adequate references make it possible for anyone to check the facts that they have earned a place on the list of agencies competing with private enterprise. If we are to solve the tax problem we must first consider these invalid activities of the Federal agencies and evaluate the potential savings which can be achieved by removing them from direct competition with our citizens, as provided by section 1 of the liberty amendment.

Case histories of the operations of some of these agencies, compiled by Fact Sheet provide shocking examples of the misuse of power which enabled the Federal bureaucracy to undertake this strange business of encroachment upon private enterprise and private property, while compelling the American people to pay for their destruction through the channels of the income tax.

Thirty-seven Federal agencies have been analyzed by Fact Sheet. Every single fact comes directly from the Federal budget and Federal documents of similar authenticity. In summarizing the losses identified by Fact

Sheet in these 47 specific cases we find that, although the Federal agency is not required to pay operating costs as private organizations must do, and are not charged rent for the space they occupy, nor interest for the money they use, and are not required to pay taxes at any level, local, State, or Federal, they have managed to lose a total of $54,870,704,410. We have over 700 agencies still to be analyzed.

The agencies studied by Fact Sheet include names seldom known to the average person. Such a one is Abaca Production and Sales, the first in the series. This agency invaded four central American republics to engage in the agricultural business of growing Abaca, or Manila hemp. Fortunately this has been terminated at a total loss, but this at least terminates the sizable annual losses it incurred.

There is the story of the Cuba Nickel Company in which our Government involved $90 million of our taxes in an attempt to develop a very low-grade nickel deposit in Cuba. Now Castro has it, and it will probably drain him as it did us.

Another involves Eskimo dwellings, a lending program later meshed with several other similar Federal lending programs which have suffered a loss of more than 60 percent of original capital, and the liquidation agony is not yet over. The loss to date in this group of lending programs exceeds a billion and a half of our tax dollars.

Rama Road through the jungles of Nicaragua is another. This might well become a permanent project because we built it once and started rebuilding it immediately after it was declared completed.

The Texas City Tin Smelter, which lost fantastic quantities of our tax dollars in an attempt to corner the world's tin supply has finally been sold to private operators, putting it into profitable operation and paying taxes, local, State, and Federal.

The Sugar Act program is another excursion into the international control of economics by our bureaucrats. By Federal law your farmers may not grow sugar, except under a strict quota to protect the international sugar cartel which supplies 46 percent of our domestic consumption of sugar. The cartel buys sugar on the world market at $64 per ton, selling it on the New York market at $128 per ton, for a net profit to them of $250 million per year. But this is not all. The Castro commotion brought to light the fact that our State Department had been paying the tyrants of Cuba $125 million a year for the privilege of buying Cuban sugar. Add one more item. We pay approximately $80 million a year in taxes to police the American farmer to prevent him from growing sugar for domestic consumption. There can be no pretense of a free economy under these pressures.

The list is long—and disgraceful. It includes the improbable fact of the steam-heated tunnel on the Alaska Railroad, and how more than $10 billion was dissipated in the single year of 1948 by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation. The list includes analysis of the deceptions practiced by TVA and Bonneville to invade private enterprise, involving us in the apparently irretrievable cost of approximately $4 billion to destroy taxpaying enterprises in these two areas alone.

That a single one of these examples exist constitutes a major crime against the intents and purposes of the Constitution. The great number of such examples merely indicates the magnitude of the attack upon the American private enterprise system by Federal bureaucrats. It is one thing to protest these activities, to bemoan the conditions which have restricted personal freedom and State sovereignty, and put upon us the inhuman taxload we now carry. But this business of feeling sorry for ourselves is not an American trait. We believe in action—considered and logical action—to correct that which we regard as a violation of our American tradition, history, and law. It does no good to cry over the recurring tax we must pay to sustain this condition. It is more to the point that we analyze the errors which have developed, devise the proper, legal methods for removing these errors, and evaluating the benefactions which will accrue to us as a result of applying the terms of the liberty amendment.

When the Federal Government sells back to the American people the enterprises it now operates without constitutional authorization, the national debt will be cut more than 20 percent. This is based on the anticipation of a recovery of better than 25 percent of the valuation placed on Federal land and facilities by the Government Operation Committee itself. Cutting $65 billion or more from the national debt while restoring those properties to the tax rolls of communities, States, and the Nation, too, will eliminate interest and amortization charges on that portion of the national debt. This, in itself, would afford a tax saving of about $4 billion per year.

If this vast amount, measured in billions which are beyond our understanding, seems impossible, it might be well to refer to pages 241–246 of the 1961 Federal budget and learn that, as of June 30, 1960, funds already spent on major construction projects incomplete on that date amounted to approximately $6½ billion. This again emphasizes the magnitude of the Federal attack upon private enterprise.

The saving of $4 billion per year in interest and amortization charges just referred to is only the beginning in the savings potential under the liberty amendment. Each year the Federal corporate activities operating in direct competition with private enterprise manage to lose fantastic quantities of our tax dollars. In 1959 these losses amounted to more than $19 billion although the Federal corporate activities operated all year long, in direct competition with taxpaying enterprises, on an interest-free, dividend-free, rent-free, and tax-free basis. These fantastic losses would vanish as the enterprises are restored to private ownership and State jurisdiction.

These Federal corporate activities pay very little of the normal operating costs. It is estimated that more than $4 billion of the payroll of the Federal Government charged to the general fund provides the Federal corporate activities with free services. We have learned that it is "a rule of the thumb" in Government, as in industry, that $3 worth of goods, services, and facilities is required for every dollar of payroll. Thus, by selling these enterprises back to the American people from whom they were taken, more than $4 billion of payroll would be saved each year, and more than $12 billion in goods, services, and facilities, which makes that payroll operative, would also be saved.

The aggregate savings under the liberty amendment in such a year as 1959, the last full year of record we have analyzed, would approximate $45 billion. This is well supported by the evidence accumulated through over 17 years of assembling data.

This potential saving for 1959 of $45 billion is an amount of money $8 billion greater than all the income taxes gathered from all the American people during that same year.

With such data as this it becomes crystal clear that, by getting the Federal Government out of direct competition with its own citizens, we can eliminate the 16th (income tax) amendment entirely, which is provided in section 4 of the liberty amendment.

In the process your State and every State will again become sovereign over your domestic affairs, having jurisdiction of all things and activities within your boundaries, exactly as the Constitution intended when designed by the Founding Fathers.

And your people will be tremendously enriched. No longer will they live in dread of the tax collector. Restored to self-reliance, they will get a full paycheck again, which means, in effect, that the take-home pay of American labor will be increased better than 20 percent without changing the rate of pay by a single penny. This will solve the problem of both producers and consumers, producing the greatest single advance in standard of living ever achieved by mankind.

The liberty amendment pending before you as House bill 1758 can achieve this restoration of Americanism, not because it adds something new to the Constitution or takes anything from it, but because it will give that precious original Constitution new force and effect. Instead of grinding the people down under an inhuman load of individual income taxes, those taxes and the need for them will be abolished.

Instead of the Federal Government operating at an average annual deficit of $12 billion, as it has during the past 20 years, we can balance the budget, amply maintain our defense posture and all other essential and constitutionally authorized functions of Government, plus paying off the national debt at a rapid rate.

Instead of the violent conflict between government and people regarding who shall own and operate the enterprises created by the people, we will have a government devoted to protecting our lives and property.

Instead of the Federal Government being the greatest pauper in history, and going deeper in debt each day, it will be returned to a solvent position and regain the respect of all nations and the affection of the American people—and the affection of the citizen is the greatest asset any government can possess.

This all adds up to the simple equation that—when we stop political competition with the private enterprises of the taxpayers, the tax problems will be solved.

At the same time the sovereignty of the States will be restored, just as the Constitution intended.

It will restore international justice, confidence and honor.

It will reestablish the American ideal of "equal justice under law," with government back at its rightful job of governing and regulating, protecting our lives and property.

This will constitute a great rebirth of freedom, making us free in fact, when we are brave enough to face the issue and do the job.

Even the strife between labor and management will vanish when labor regains the full reward for toil by eliminating the withholding tax. This will put a greater net increase into the pay envelope of labor than any politician or any labor leader ever dared suggest.

These are the rewards which await us when we restore the Constitution. Enormous quantities of evidence, gathered from the official records support the liberty amendment in principle and practice.

It staggers the imagination that so many benefactions to both government and people can arise from the restoration of economic justice and fiscal balance, yet all of our history and tradition verify these facts. We urge your support of the liberty amendment pending in Congress as House Joint Resolution 23 and already approved by the States of Wyoming, Texas, Nevada, and Louisiana. It is in accord with your own history, your own tradition, with Calhoun, and Hayne and the host of great men who faced the same challenge before you today, and brought lustre and fame to your great State and freedom to your people.

(NOTE.—On February 16, 1962, Georgia became the fifth State to approve the liberty amendment.)

CITY OF HUNTINGTON PARK URGES CONGRESS TO INVESTIGATE THE IRREGULARITIES IN SUPPLEMENTAL ACTIVITY

Mr. KEITH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. ROUSSELOT] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. ROUSSELOT. Mr. Speaker, Senate bill 1969, a bill which would give permanent status to supplemental air carriers in the airline industry, has now gone to conference. As was pointed out to us yesterday when the rule to send the message to conference was under discussion, Public Law 86–661 expired as of midnight last night. Thus supplemental air carriers are now operating on a tenuous ground.

Many of my colleagues from California and other parts of the country have become interested in the legislation as a result of the Arctic Pacific Air Lines crash in Toledo, Ohio, which claimed the lives of 16 members of the Cal-Poly football team—San Luis Obispo campus. The crash can be traced to poor safety practices and unsound financial management, conditions which the Civil Aeronautics Board and Federal Aviation Agency should have taken steps to correct long before the crash occurred.

A resolution of the City Council of Huntington Park, Calif., which was recently called to my attention, so closely relates to S. 1969 that I think it will be of interest to Members of Congress. Under leave to revise and extend my remarks, I wish to insert the resolution at this point in the RECORD:

RESOLUTION 4639

Resolution of the City Council of the City of Huntington Park, Calif., urging Congress to deny passage of S. 1969 and H.R. 7318; to investigate irregularities in administrative procedures of the Federal Aviation Agency and the Civil Aeronautics Board; and to establish adequate operational, financial, and managerial standards for supplemental air carriers

Whereas there is now pending before the Congress of the United States S. 1969 entitled "An act to amend the Federal Aviation Act of 1958, as amended, to provide for supplemental air carriers, and for other purposes," and H.R. 7318 entitled "A bill to amend the Federal Aviation Act of 1958, as amended, to provide for a class of supplemental air carriers, and for other purposes"; and

Whereas if enacted in its present form this pending legislation would legalize a class of air carriers now operating on a temporary, interim basis and regularly engaged in nonscheduled or charter passenger flights without previous investigation of financial responsibility, reliability of management, safety of equipment, or previous operation experience; and

Whereas the Federal Aviation Agency and the Civil Aeronautics Board have heretofore exhibited a gross laxity in the granting of temporary certificates of convenience under section 1371 of title 49 of the United States Code by issuing certificates to insolvent and bankrupt persons; to persons with no physical assets, with no aircraft or spare parts, and with insufficient capital to pay operating expenses for even a single flight; and to persons with no previous experience in air-carrier management; and

Whereas the present legal requirements of "fitness, willingness, and ability" for certification of air carriers are totally meaningless in light of recent court decisions and actual Board practice; and

Whereas gross negligence in the administration of inadequate laws has resulted in many unnecessary and senseless deaths, injuries, hardships, and inconvenience to passengers, not the least of which was the tragic crash of an Arctic-Pacific Airlines plane in Toledo, Ohio, which took the lives of 16 members of the Cal.-Poly football team, including 2 graduates of Huntington Park High School—Lynn Lobaugh and Guy Hennegan—and permanently and severely maimed many other young athletes:

Now, therefore, the City Council of the City of Huntington Park does resolve as follows:

1. That the Congress of the United States is urged to deny passage of S. 1969 and H.R. 7318 in their present form;

2. That the city council, on behalf of its 30,000 citizens, emphatically asserts that no further operational authority should be granted to supplemental air carriers beyond the March 14 expiration date of Public Law 86–661 until such supplemental carriers have met the same operational, financial, and managerial requirements exacted from regularly scheduled airlines;

3. That this Congress is urged to begin an immediate and thorough investigation of current administrative practices and procedures of the Federal Aviation Agency and the Civil Aeronautics Board, and to recommend adequate legal restrictions upon certificates of convenience which will insure the safety and welfare of the air-traveling public, and the ability of air carriers to respond in damages for negligent operation;

That copies of this resolution shall be forwarded immediately to the President of the United States, to each Senator and Congressman from California, to each member of the Senate Subcommittee on Aviation, to each member of the House Subcommittee on Transportation and Aeronautics, to Budget Director David E. Bell, to Al M. Maranai, and to Harold Lobaugh.

A. R. KELLOGG,
Mayor of the City of Huntington Park.

Attest:

AGNES R. PLATT,
City Clerk.

CREDIT PROVISIONS FOR H.R. 10010 NEED CAREFUL ANALYSIS

Mr. KEITH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Maine [Mr. MCINTIRE] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MCINTIRE. Mr. Speaker, the 1962 version of the administration's omnibus farm program is more than 100 pages in length and will have a direct impact on the farmer. It could change substantially existing farm programs to such an extent that benefits intended for farmers and farm families will be diverted to other uses.

One of these diversions is included under section 501 of title V of the new bill which amends the Consolidated Farmers Home Administration Act of 1961 to provide that loans may be made to develop recreational facilities.

This change may seem insignificant, but when one studies this in light of the basic objectives of the farm credit program, there is real cause for concern. The historic pattern established over the past nearly 30 years could be substantially altered to divert credit available for farmers and farm families to uses other than agriculture.

The Farmers Home Administration was established expressly to assist operators of family-type farms. The principal statutory authority for it is the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act of 1937 which has as its objective the rendering of credit assistance to operators of family-type farms. Other statutory authorities, including the Water Facilities Act, the Housing Act of 1949, and others, authorize loans to farmers, in most cases to operators of family-type farms. One of the greatest needs of the small, family-type farmer is an adequate farm with suitable equipment to cultivate the land. To assist the farmer in acquiring an operational unit with sufficient capital to operate the farm, the Farmers Home Administration was established to provide credit. The objective was to encourage tenant farmers to become owners and for farmers with inadequate farms to expand their productive resources. The purpose of the Farm Home Administration is to provide credit to those farmers who cannot obtain credit elsewhere at a reasonable rate of interest.

The history of the Farmers Home Administration in making such loans is excellent. The loss rate has been low, and substantial benefits have accrued to the farmer. The purpose of these loans has been limited entirely to farm families on farms to increase the farmers' incomes and to provide them with a business operation which would benefit the general economy.

The proposals in H.R. 10010 to amend authorizations broadening Farmers Home Administration lending powers would change this agency into a broad rural redevelopment authority. It would duplicate authority already enacted in law administered by the Area Redevelopment Act and Housing Acts. No attempt is made to limit lending to specific farm operations, which has been the traditional service of Farmers Home Administration.

We should look carefully for sound amendments to assist in supplemental income directly related to the opportunities of the farm family but not weaken a system for farm credit that has been helpful in the past.

The term "Recreational facilities" needs careful definition to make sure that this farm lending by this agency is strictly oriented to the farm family.

The Secretary of Agriculture has just recently released a $50 million contingency fund for use of the Farmers Home Administration to meet the demands placed on the applications for loans for this fiscal year because the authorized funds have already been expended. One of the reasons for the shortage of funds for this year is the rapidly expanding use of funds for the development of housing units in rural areas not especially for farmers, which has created a shortage of funds for farmers' family-type operations.

This is only an indication of what the situation would be if Congress were to adopt the amendments proposed in the new farm program. It would be but a short time before the farmers' interests would be neglected, and programs which historically have been intended to serve their needs would be diverted to other uses and farmers will be left holding an empty credit bag.

FEDERAL GOVERNMENT NOW OPENLY ENGAGED IN BUILDING STEAM ELECTRIC GENERATING PLANTS

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SAYLOR] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, I note with some interest that on March 5, 1962, the Rural Electrification Administration announced the approval of a loan of $15,602,000 to the Colorado-Ute Electric Association, Inc., Montrose, Colo., to help finance the construction by that cooperative of 150,000-kilowatt steam electric generating plant in western Colorado.

Colorado-Ute is a federated generation and transmission cooperative. Its membership consists of 11 REA-financed distribution co-ops in western Colorado and the Arkansas Valley Generation and Transmission, Inc., of Pueblo, Colo. This latter G. & T. cooperative furnishes wholesale power to three other REA-financed distribution cooperatives in southeastern Colorado.

The loan to Colorado-Ute will be augmented by $6 million to be assigned Colorado-Ute by the Arkansas Valley G. & T., Pueblo, Colo., from a loan previously authorized by REA, and $9,657,000 to be provided by the Salt River Power District, Phoenix, Ariz.

What is contemplated here is that of the initial capacity of 150,000 kilowatts of the proposed plant, 100,000 kilowatts will be marketed to the Salt River Power District in Phoenix, some 750 miles away. The remaining 50,000 kilowatts will be marketed to member cooperatives of Colorado-Ute, including the Arkansas Valley G. & T. at Pueblo, Colo.

This proposed 150,000 kilowatt plant is only the initial unit of what eventually will be a 600,000 kilowatt plant to be constructed by Colorado-Ute. The plant will be interconnected with the Federal transmission system of the Colorado River storage project.

Here is a classic example of REA 2 percent funds being diverted to a purpose far beyond the original intent and purposes of the REA Act. The Salt River Power District serves in and around the highly urbanized Phoenix area and is a non-REA borrower completely capable of financing additional generating facilities of its own without obtaining a subsidy of 2 percent Federal moneys from REA.

It is also reported in that area that the Plains Electric Generation & Transmission Cooperative, Inc., of Albuquerque soon plans to apply to the REA for a $20 million loan to build a 100,000 kilowatt electric plant near Farmington, N. Mex. This plant will also be interconnected with the Federal transmission system of the Colorado River storage project. Ultimate capacity of this plant may be as much as 325,000 kilowatts and it is reported that 225,000 kilowatts of such capacity will be provided for the Salt River project of Arizona.

The argument is made that these proposed plants are needed to firm up Colorado River storage project hydoelectric power. As I understand it the electric companies in the area will soon have a capacity in excess of 4 million kilowatts and if the Colorado River storage project needs firming up by steam generating plants, the existing plants of these companies can be utilized for this purpose. In fact, recently the Secretary of the Interior announced approval of proposals made by the companies to the Bureau for this very purpose.

It seems to me that what we have here is an obvious effort through the backdoor of REA borrowings to build federally financed steam electric generating plants to firm up a Bureau of Reclamation hydroelectric project, where funds on a direct appropriation basis would not be available to the Bureau for such purpose. These REA loans are nothing more than a means of thwarting the will of Congress, since Congress has repeatedly denied appropriations for Federal construction of steam electric generating plants outside the TVA area.

Under regulations formulated by the REA administration, an applicant for an REA generation and transmission loan is required to secure alternative power proposals from other power suppliers in the area. In the case of Colorado-Ute, it is my understanding that Colorado-Ute has not contacted any of the electric companies in the area, which are currently the principal producers of power in the State. In an effort to justify this oversight, Mr. Clapp in a letter to one of the companies in the area states as follows:

> In the particular situation with respect to the proposed applicant, Colorado-Ute Electric Association, because of its status as a preferred user, the logical supplier for additional power other than its own generation is the Colorado River storage project. Our borrower has been working very closely with the Colorado River storage project officials in connection with this matter. We consider that this meets all essential requirements in regard to this matter.

Apparently Mr. Clapp is of the opinion that his only responsibility in considering an application for a generation and transmission type loan is to review alternative proposals of the Bureau of Reclamation. Investor-owned power suppliers in the area can be ignored. This, Mr. Speaker, is a very novel and far-reaching concept, which if allowed to persist would result in millions of dollars of public funds being doled out in the form of 2-percent loans to duplicate facilities which could otherwise be provided by taxpaying business enterprise in this country. The Rural Electrification Administration Act was not intended for this purpose.

It now comes to my attention that this same Plains Electric Generation & Transmission Cooperative has submitted a letter of intent to Secretary Udall to furnish transmission line capacity needed by the Bureau for transmission of Colorado River storage project power between the Farmington area and the Albuquerque area in New Mexico. The letter of intent submitted to Mr. Udall on March 5, 1962, is an obvious effort to underbid the proposal of Public Service Co. of New Mexico to provide the same service under a proposal already approved by the Secretary. I understand that Mr. Clyde T. Ellis, manager of the National Rural Electric Cooperative Association and his partner Mr. Alex Radin of the American Public Power Association are urging cooperatives in Colorado, Utah, and Wyoming to make similar bids.

Here is an obvious scheme to use the 2-percent money provided by the Federal Government under the REA loan program, with the attendant exemption of Federal and State income taxes, enjoyed by cooperatives, to build a completely independent integrated federally financed power system under the guise of water resource development and rural electrification.

This whole situation to me smacks of an unholy alliance between the REA Administration and the Bureau of Reclamation to push further the federalization of the power industry in this country, with Messrs. Ellis and Radin calling the signals from the sidelines.

It was my understanding that when the Congress authorized the Colorado River storage project, one of the arguments advanced was that additional power resources were needed to meet the needs of preference customers in the area. This was a fallacious argument, but in any case, one that was made. It now appears that these preference customers do not need the Colorado River storage project power at all because they can come to the REA Administrator and obtain unlimited amounts of 2-percent money to build steamplants of their own to meet such requirements. And with the 2-percent money, which is less than half of the cost of such money to the Federal Government, they can build generating plants to develop power cheaper than can be obtained from Bureau of Reclamation projects. In addition, they do not need a Federal transmission system to be constructed by the Bureau of Reclamation. They can build their own with the same 2-percent money provided by the Federal Government.

This Congress may soon have under consideration the proposed Fryingpan-Arkansas project. The argument is made here that this project is needed to meet the power requirements of preference customers in the area. I note with some interest, however, that the Arkansas-Valley C. & T. of Pueblo, Colo., is participating in the proposed Colorado-Ute plant. If the Arkansas Valley C. & T. is going to get its power from the Colorado-Ute plant, who is going to take the output of the Fryingpan-Arkansas project? Argument will be made that the preference customers need both sources. If this is the case, why

does not the REA Administrator simply loan more 2-percent money to the co-ops in the area? This is cheaper than the cost of money to the Federal Government and the co-ops will be able to get their power cheaper than from the Fryingpan-Arkansas project.

Mr. Speaker, this whole situation raises many questions in my mind as to the propriety of loans currently being made by the Rural Electrification Administration. This whole program has been shrouded in a cloak of secrecy, and it is not until the horse is out of the barn that this Congress is aware of the loans made by the Administration. I believe that it is time that Congress take a closer look at this program and the interrelationship between the program of the REA and that of the Bureau of Reclamation.

The proponents of public power are making use of two popular programs, the reclamation of arid lands and the electrification of farms, to promote expansion of Federal power. It seems that the men who have been selected to direct reclamation and the REA program are more dedicated to the expansion of Federal power than to the intended purposes of the organizations they head. I opposed the Colorado River storage project because I recognized it at the time as just what it has panned out to be—a public power project. Before we approve any more of these Bureau of Reclamation projects—and I am thinking in particular now of the Fryingpan-Arkansas project which we may be called upon to consider shortly—we had better have a long hard look at their true objectives. If the Bureau of Reclamation is going to make power its primary objective let us change its name to the Bureau of Power.

Since practically all of the farms have been electrified and new users coming on rural cooperative lines are 5 to 1 nonfarm users, the REA program has ceased to be a farm program. It is now interested in building large generating plants and serving industrial loads and in particular it seems interested in promoting more Federal power.

As REA works with the Bureau of Reclamation to promote more Federal power, I see no reason why they should not join up in a Bureau of Power then they could really work together under one director. Then they would not be hiding behind a reclamation or farm program. We could look at them in their true light.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. KEITH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. GRIFFIN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. GRIFFIN. Mr. Speaker, in order to fulfill a speaking engagement of longstanding, unfortunately, it was necessary of me to be absent from the Chamber earlier in the day when the vote was taken—rollcall No. 38—on the adoption of the conference report accompanying H.R. 8723, the Welfare and Pensions Plan Disclosure Act Amendments of 1962.

However, I should like the RECORD to reflect that if I had been present, I would have voted "aye."

BUREAUCRATIC HARASSMENT

Mr. KEITH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. MACGREGOR] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MACGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, on March 13 I offered an amendment to S. 167 which was adopted by the House. The purpose of my action was to protect innocent third party witnesses from the possibility of bureaucratic harassment.

It should be borne in mind that this legislation applies to civil actions only. Any opposition arguments referring to criminal violations are simply a smokescreen.

We are giving to the Department of Justice a right not granted to any other civil litigant. We would permit the Department to make use of a portion of the "discovery of evidence" procedures set out in the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure without the requirement that a lawsuit be started. This would be a unique privilege.

We are proposing that the service of a civil investigative demand be authorized without the prior approval of any court or any judge. Such a grant of power should be extended with great concern for its conceivable consequences. As legislators, we have an obligation to consider primarily the possibilities of an abuse of new executive power, rather than the probabilities of its proper exercise.

The case for ultimate approval by the Congress of the MacGregor amendment is spelled out very well indeed in the following editorial from the Washington Post of March 15, 1962:

AID IN TRUST-BUSTING

Antitrust investigations will be facilitated by a bill which the House passed this week, if a satisfactory reconciliation with the similar Senate bill can be worked out. The measure is designed to encourage civil antitrust suits by the Department of Justice in cases where there is little or no evidence of criminal intent. At present the Department is handicapped in bringing such civil suits because it cannot compel a company under investigation to yield pertinent documents. If the company refuses to cooperate in the inquiry, the Department can obtain the documents it needs only by pressing criminal charges before a grand jury.

This situation has encouraged, on one hand, the presentation of frivolous cases to grand juries and, on the other hand, the neglect of investigations that should be pursued in the public interest. The Supreme Court has ruled that grand juries may not be used to compel evidence for use in civil suits. The House logically decided, therefore, to let the Department obtain specified documents from companies under investigation, without pressing criminal charges.

Similar authority has long been used by the Federal Trade Commission and other administrative agencies. The new powers that would be granted to the Department of Justice in the House bill appear to be carefully safeguarded. The Department could make investigative demands on a company, setting forth the alleged violations of the antitrust laws, and describing the documents to be produced. If the company should resist the demand, the Department would have to prove to a Federal judge that the documents sought were relevant and the request reasonable. Privileged documents could continue to be withheld. If the court should decide that some documents should be yielded, the Department could copy them at the company offices but not cart them away. Such papers would have to be kept confidential.

In addition the House added a Republican amendment which would have the effect of limiting the reach of the bill to companies under investigation. This seems to us a wise precaution despite the vigorous opposition it brought from the bill's sponsors. The Department can always broaden the scope of an investigation, if it finds reason to do so, but it should not be allowed to reach into the files of corporations under no suspicion. Apparently this amendment brings the bill into line with the recommendations of the American Bar Association. It ought to be preserved by the House-Senate conference committee.

PARKING FEES AT DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA STADIUM

Mr. KEITH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. BROYHILL] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. BROYHILL. Mr. Speaker, I wish to bring to the attention of the House a problem which I feel is threatening the financial integrity not only of an arm of the District of Columbia government, but of an organization which we hope will become a fixture on the Washington scene, the Senators baseball team. The problem is the $1 fee which the District of Columbia Armory Board proposes to charge to park an automobile during ball games held in the new District of Columbia Stadium.

The Washington Senators are the principal tenant of the new District of Columbia Stadium. The Senators must be highly successful to enable the Armory Board to meet its obligations on the bonds it issued to build the stadium.

The $1 parking fee that the Board wants to charge would arouse much resentment among baseball fans. This resentment would be so great that it would cut down attendance at the Senators' games to the point where they would be unable financially to keep going. If that happened, it would destroy all chance of paying off the stadium bonds. The stadium would become a $21 million monument—expensive, as monuments go, even in Washington.

The $1 parking fee already has caused one organization to call off an exhibition it had scheduled in the District of Columbia Armory, next door to the stadium. If it has this effect on a large, well-financed national organization, think how much resentment the buck parking charge will have on ordinary

people who otherwise would buy a ticket and spend the afternoon or evening watching a major league baseball game.

The resentment could amount to a real boycott and even the ruination of the Senators.

Mr. Speaker, I cannot help but deplore this proposed action. Washington is a good baseball town. For years the loyal fans have suffered under several severe handicaps, not the least of which was the lack of convenient, inexpensive, and safe parking facilities. It has been my understanding, Mr. Speaker, that the facilities at the new stadium were designed to remedy this situation. But I submit that a $1 charge for parking is exorbitant, inconsistent, and will prevent this objective from being achieved. This is striking a real blow at the Senators Baseball Club at a time when maximum support is needed from all lovers of the game.

I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that parking facilities at the new stadium, as is done with similar facilities of the National Park Service at such places as the Carter Barron Theater, be offered to the baseball-loving public free of charge. I am informed, by the president of the Washington Baseball Club that he supports this statement and is willing to assume the expense and responsibility which free parking would involve.

I have also been advised that the stadium parking lot, the largest in the District, unoccupied most of the time, can be utilized effectively for fringe parking for our friends in the bordering Maryland counties. This will contribute to the solution of the District business area traffic problem and plans can be devised for the Washington Transit System to provide transportation from the fringe area lot to downtown.

I am one, Mr. Speaker, who feels deeply that the Nation's Capital should be represented in the national pastime by a top flight team. We have the ball park; this morning's sports columns indicate we have the potential to achieve the eminence the loyal fans of this area deserve. Now the team must have the support of all. No handicaps should be placed in the way of achieving that goal. A $1 parking fee would be a severe handicap.

COMMUNIST BLUEPRINT FOR AMERICA

Mr. KEITH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Washington [Mr. PELLY] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, a widely circulated and prominently played up news item last week had to do with a quotation falsely attributed to Premier Khrushchev. It seems that Mr. K did not say "We cannot expect the Americans to jump from capitalism to communism, but we can assist their leaders in giving Americans small doses of socialism until they suddenly awake to find they have communism."

I can imagine, Mr. Speaker that the spenders and welfare staters were pretty happy to be told that Premier Khrushchev never did say any such thing.

But painful as it is for me to throw cold water on any such allegation, I must remind them that there are other authenticated quotations as to the Communist blueprints for America. For example, William Z. Foster who has been described by our colleague, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALTER] as being the Kremlin's 40-year American branch manager said almost the same thing as the so-called fake Khrushchev statement. Foster, in his book, "Toward Soviet America" said:

> From capitalism to communism, through the intermediary state of socialism; that is the way American society, like society in general, is headed.

Mr. Speaker, those who favor a centralized Federal bureaucracy and socialistic programs, cannot avoid the ultimate consequences of their socialization by assailing the veracity of one quotation. Extremist individuals and leftist groups should realize that just because Mr. K. did not say one particular thing that what he did not say is necessarily not so. Spurious or not, the substance if not the identical words of the supposed Khrushchev statement can be correctly attributed to other Communist leaders, including not only William Z. Foster, the one time national chairman of the American Communist Party, but also to Gus Hall, the present secretary of the American Communist Party.

FOOD AND AGRICULTURE ACT OF 1962

Mr. KEITH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. DOLE] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. DOLE. Mr. Speaker, under title II, the Food and Agriculture Act of 1962, it is proposed that title II of Public Law 480 be amended by removing the limitation on what surplus agricultural commodities may be made available for donation to friendly countries or peoples suffering from famine or other extraordinary emergency, to needy peoples for work projects, and to underdeveloped countries for assistance in economic development.

Under the current law, only stocks held by CCC may be made available for donation under this title. The proposed amendment would give the Secretary of Agriculture authority to determine that almost any agricultural commodity is in surplus and made available. In cases where the CCC does not have the designated surpluses in hand, it would have to go into the market and purchase from the private trade, provide for the reprocessing, packaging, and transportation to the country of destination.

When this title was originally enacted, it was deemed appropriate that the President should have authority to donate agricultural surpluses, accumulated by CCC through its price support operations, to needy peoples suffering severe famine or other calamity. I do not believe anyone can object to this kind of humanitarian endeavor. CCC had the stocks and was and still is paying out annually huge sums for storage and handling charges. CCC also continues to accumulate these stocks. Even so, Congress saw fit to put a limitation on the amount, $300 million worth per year, and on what commodities could be made available.

In May 1960, the purposes of this title were expanded to include donations of CCC stocks to needy peoples abroad for work projects, and for the promotion of economic development of underdeveloped countries. This change in the act has expanded the donation program considerably. For the 6 fiscal years, 1955 through 1960, a total of $518 million worth of commodities was obligated under title II or an average of about $86 million per year. With the addition of the authority to donate for the purpose of work projects and economic development, the total for fiscal 1961 was $290 million. A large part of the increase over the average was for economic development in Africa and Asia.

Now, for what purpose does the administration wish to remove the limitation as to the kinds of commodities which may be included in this program? There are ample supplies in stock of those commodities which CCC necessarily must purchase to carry out the price support program. In the last fiscal year, almost all of the annual authorization, $300 million, was obligated. It appears that the prime purpose of the amendment is to enlarge the donation program. It is a part of the plan to change the purpose of the Public Law 480 act from a trade development program to a gigantic giveaway scheme. At the same time it will bring more commodities, more producer groups under the control of the Government. A review of the list of commodities made available under the current law discloses that the products not available are poultry, livestock, tobacco, and fruits and vegetables. These are all relatively high cost products and will add greatly to the total cost of the program.

It seems strange that the administration would make this proposal at this time, because we hear so many complaints that the farm program is already costing the Government too much. In his budget message, the President said that he was going to propose a new farm program which would cost less. How can this policy be made to coincide with the amendment to force CCC to purchase additional commodities in order that the giveaway program can be increased. On the basis of the record, it certainly does not make sense.

CANADIANS READY TO PICK THE BONES OF TAMPA CIGAR INDUSTRY AS RESULT OF GAPING LOOPHOLE ON CUBAN EMBARGO

Mr. KEITH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman

from Florida [Mr. CRAMER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, I call to the attention of my colleagues in the House the following editorial in the Tampa Times, Tuesday, March 13, 1962, titled "Canadians Ready To Pick Our Bones," which refers to a matter I have previously called to the attention of the House and that is the gaping loophole in the so-called Cuban embargo which permits foreign countries to ship Havana tobacco products to this country and thus circumvent the embargo.

As I have stated on the floor of the House previously, this results in not only destroying the effectiveness of the embargo but also will eventually put out of business the Havana Tampa cigar industry, of which a thousand cigar workers are already out of work.

It did not take Canada long to realize the loophole exists; and, as a matter of fact, for a Mr. H. W. P. Thompson, of Canada, to appear on the Tampa scene in an effort to attract away some of these cigar workers to Canada. As the article says "like scavengers picking the bones of the victim," in this instance even before the victim is dead.

This is the best evidence of fact that Canada, as do other foreign countries, intends to ship Havana cigars into this country and take advantage of the vacuum of production that will eventually result in curtailment of the industry in Tampa. Yes, like scavengers, the foreign countries that are engaged in the manufacturing business, and that are trading with Cuba and can tool up for such business, are already preparing to raid this industry and to be ready to destroy this $50 million consumer demand in this country that has largely been built up by the Tampa industry. And yet the administration sits idly by with promises of relief if justified, despite the demands for plugging this loophole made by many throughout the country.

What better proof does the State Department and the President need? It is the duty of this administration to put Canada and other countries on notice before they make preparation in reliance on this loophole that Cuban tobacco will not be permitted to be imported in any form from any country, or is the administration going to wait until these countries prepare for production or increased production and then claim it is too late to act?

The article follows:

CANADIANS READY TO PICK OUR BONES

Most scavengers have the good taste to wait until the victim is dead before they begin their feast.

Canada can't wait. A representative of the Canadian consulate in New York City came to Tampa yesterday looking for 1,000 cigar workers for the expanding cigarmaking business in his country. Canada is one of several nations expected to begin heavy purchases of Cuban tobacco embargoed by the United States.

H. W. P. Thompson, the visiting Canadian shed a few dusty tears over the plight of the cigar industry here.

"Although it is regrettable to see an industry leave an area," he remarked unctuously, "it is even more regrettable to see individuals suffer and nothing done for them."

Mr. Thompson's concern might be better directed toward those Canadian communities helped last Christmas by a generous airlift sponsored by MacDill Air Force Base personnel.

Actually, Mr. Thompson may be whetting his knife too soon. The local cigar industry has not yet breathed its last. And even if it does eventually cease the manufacture of Havana cigars, it expects to demand and receive an embargo on all products containing Cuban tobacco. In addition, we expect that any person in the United States smoking imported Havanas will be stigmatized as pro-Castro—just as Canada has stigmatized itself by failing to aid in combating the Communist menace in the Caribbean and by selling goods to Red China.

Mr Thompson wants 1,000 cigar workers for Canada. Well, perhaps he will find some interested persons who are discouraged by local conditions. However, we would advise those Tampans tempted by his offer to demand two things:

1. An airtight contract spelling out conditions of employment.
2. A round-trip ticket.

FAIR PLAY FOR CUBA COMMITTEE STILL NOT PLACED ON SUBVERSIVE LIST: ANOTHER SIGN OF WEAKNESS AND INDECISION IN FIGHTING CASTRO'S COMMUNISM

Mr. KEITH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Florida [Mr. CRAMER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, beginning in April of 1960 and continuing for a period of some 14 months, the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee held hearings to determine whether the Fair Play for Cuba Committee was a subversive organization and, thus, whether it should properly be placed on the Attorney General's subversive list.

Because large numbers of Cuban citizens have sought refuge in my district and in other areas of my State which, incidentally, lies less than 90 miles from the Castro prison state of Cuba, I have a more than academic interest in our Government's attitude toward the Fair Play for Cuba Committee, and, accordingly, I checked recently with the Department of Justice in order to ascertain the status of the organization and the Department's present attitude toward it.

Imagine my continuing surprise and consternation to learn that the Attorney General has not yet seen fit to list the Fair Play for Cuba Committee as being subversive, in spite of overwhelming evidence to the contrary produced at the several hearings by the Senate subcommittee.

Indeed, I ascertained a certain amount of misguided feeling that this group of rabble rousers had gone underground after Fidel Castro made his open announcement that he had formally embraced communism, and I seemed to gain the impression that the Department of Justice might feel that there no longer remained any need for being apprehensive about what the Fair Play for Cuba Committee has recently been up to.

Because I detect this feeling among those who should be chasing Communists instead of forgetting about them, I should like at this time to bring some vital facts to the attention of the distinguished Members of both branches of the Congress, and to sound an unmistakable warning that the Fair Play for Cuba Committee is still organizing new chapters in order to hasten the fall of our way of life and the spread of Cuba's communism.

To illustrate, I should like briefly to describe the activities of the chapter in Tampa, Fla., the largest city in my district and one which has the largest percentage of persons of Cuban nationality or blood in the United States. Practically all of these people are strongly opposed to Castro or any other dictator, but as in most situations of this type, there is a handful of sympathizers, many of whom probably came to Tampa since the rise of Castro.

But, first, I shall briefly review the background of the parent organization, with headquarters in New York City. It is the same organization that the distinguished chairman of the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee, Senator EASTLAND, and Senator THOMAS DODD, a member of the subcommittee, described as being an obvious Communist operation.

The Senate subcommittee became interested in this outfit shortly after the Fair Play for Cuba Committee was born in the spring of 1960, less than 2 years ago. At the opening hearing on April 29 of that year, a resident of Connecticut named Carleton Beals testified to having received a letter dated February 9 of that year from one Robert Taber, apparently on the letterhead of CBS News, and requesting that Beals take an interest in this new committee, whose objective would be the launching of a counterpropaganda campaign. Later, Beals was asked to become cochairman, but he declined, or so he said.

Speaking of CBS News, later in my remarks I expect to show how this division of the Columbia Broadcasting System and the parent company itself were so expertly duped by this man Taber and by others involved in this nefarious plot to picture Fidel Castro as a regular "salt of the earth."

There is small reason to believe that Beals remained active, or even very interested in this thing for long, but Taber has been the kingpin since its inception, and, so far as is known, is in Cuba right now.

Robert Taber can be described as a disgruntled American, a man who might have gone on to a distinguished career as a broadcasting official or in public information, but somewhere along the line he became caught up in the frenzy to protect the Castro name and image, and so with another man named Waldo Frank, he put together the Fair Play for Cuba Committee.

Waldo Frank, incidentally, as far back as 1932 wrote an article for New Masses

magazine entitled "How I Came to Communism: Symposium."

Soon after the nucleus of a committee had been formed, Taber placed a full-page ad in the New York Times headlined "What Is Really Happening in Cuba?" Cosponsors of the ad were listed in the margin, the left margin, quite appropriately, and included the names of Truman Capote, Norman Mailer, Jean Paul Sartre, all well-known leftwing authors, and a man named Richard Gibson. Of Gibson we shall hear more.

The ad listed Waldo Frank as chairman and Carleton Beals as cochairman of the Fair Play for Cuba Committee.

The Senate Internal Security Subcommittee quizzed both Taber and a prominent New York City physician, Dr. Charles A. Santos-Buch, as to the cost of the ad and the source of the funds used to pay the bill for $4,725. While Taber either refused to testify against himself or, at best, was exceedingly evasive in his answers, Dr. Santos-Buch, on the other hand, proved to be a remarkably candid witness and was most cooperative and revealing. It seems that their efforts to raise the money through private and voluntary subscriptions fell flat, and aside from a few hundred dollars they managed to raise, the funds came to Taber and Santos-Buch from the Cuban Government, specifically from Raulito Roa, the son of Castro's foreign minister and himself a member of the Cuban delegation to the U.N. The tale of how they made contact and rode around Manhattan in a cab, trying to cash the check obtained from Roa, is almost tragically funny, but the thought behind it was far from funny.

Santos-Buch, a graduate of Cornell University and now assistant pathologist at New York Hospital-Cornell Medical Center, freely admitted that the money handed over by Roa was used to pay the New York Times for the ad and, of course, the Times was able to prove that Taber both ordered and paid for the ad.

Santos-Buch, incidentally, is registered as a foreign agent, so I was informed the past week by the Justice Department.

Another interesting witness was a Miss Joanne Grant, at the time a 30-year-old graduate of Syracuse University, a native of upper New York State but with a checkered career that included a long history of hobnobbing with persons of questionable motives, such as Red China's premier, Chou En-lai, with whom she was photographed. Miss Grant took the privilege granted American citizens to travel abroad, but overdid herself by traveling to places and at a time that were not covered by her visa. Her troubles with American passport officials are almost legendary, but her resorting to the first and fifth amendments while being questioned by the Senate subcommittee scarcely hide the well-known fact that she is secretary of the Fair Play for Cuba Committee.

There are others involved in the organization, many of them too small fishes to bother mentioning, but the final one I shall allude to is one Richard Gibson, who seems to be a very mixed-up man, who seemed to be obsessed with his Negro blood and what he felt was prejudice against his race. Gibson is longtime president of the Fair Play for Cuba Committee. Along with Taber, the national secretary, Gibson seems clearly to be the power behind the throne.

Gibson, in fact, along with Taber, is no stranger to the Columbia Broadcasting System family. His interesting career began with 1 year at Kenyon College in Ohio, which he fled without paying his bill. That was in 1950. From there he went on to 1 year at the university in Rome, which was paid for by the John H. Whitney Scholarship Foundation. Four years later he was at the Sorbonne in Paris, and this leg of his schooling was paid for by the U.S. Government under the GI bill.

In addition to kicking around, educationwise, for several years, Gibson spent 3 years in France working as a newsman. He has since testified that there was pressure upon CBS News to hire Negroes, and that since he was qualified, they offered him a job. The pressure, incidentally, was being applied by the Urban League of New York, according to Gibson. Two months after beginning his employment, he became acquainted with Taber, who was also on their payroll.

Gibson testified that during his employment with CBS News he had occasion to prepare news broadcasts dealing with the Cuban situation.

About a year and a half after he was employed by them, Gibson was asked by CBS to submit his resignation, which he blamed on a letter from the distinguished senior Senator from Virginia, Senator BYRD, who brought to the attention of CBS his criticisms of Gibson's actions involving certain Negro causes in the South, as well as his involvement in the Fair Play for Cuba Committee, and because the FBI was investigating him.

One of the strange things about the Gibson-CBS relationship is the comparative ease with which he apparently obtained his job. It seems strange to me that a man with such a checkered and disjointed educational background should have been given the opportunity to prepare broadcasts to be heard by the American people over such a large communications system, but I am not that well acquainted with hiring practices in the radio industry.

However, it does seem strange indeed that upon terminating his services, CBS, through its subsidiary CBS Foundation, thought well enough of Gibson to send him to Columbia University in New York on what is known as a CBS fellowship. Soon after he arrived on campus, Columbia University found itself with an active, full-fledged chapter of the Fair Play for Cuba Committee on its hands.

In his testimony, Gibson admitted to some interesting things, but denied others. For instance, he took the time of the members of the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee by refusing to acknowledge any connection with the placement of another full-page ad in the New York Times, this time one which ran on April 21, 1961, at a cost of $4,536 and which was signed by Richard Gibson, acting national executive secretary. The Senate subcommittee staff had to go to the expense, time, and trouble of bringing in handwriting witnesses to prove that Gibson's signature matched the one on the check for the payment of the cost of the ad to the advertising agency. Later he admitted the connection.

The ad, incidentally, stated that the Fair Play for Cuba Committee has more than 6,000 members, or had at that time, with 21 chapters in U.S. cities and 4 in Canada. And that leads me to mention exactly what is happening in my district, specifically in Tampa.

The ostensible kingpin of the Tampa chapter is one V. T. Lee, self-styled retired sailor, though he is a 35-year-old native of New York City and was born to Mr. and Mrs. Charles Tappin. He has served 2 years in the U.S. Army, and has served as an odd-jobs or maintenance man for a children's home in Tampa. To the best of my knowledge, he founded the Tampa chapter and has been its day-to-day director.

Last December 14 Lee was interviewed by a staff writer of the Tampa Tribune. During their conversation, Lee claimed that he had no interest in Castro, but that his concern was with better relations between Cuba and the United States. He repeatedly ducked answering the questions of the writer, Tom O'Connor, but he did volunteer information that had little bearing on the subject. He admitted getting much of his information from the Havana-published newspaper, Revoluccion, which is a recognized crackpot sheet written at Castro's direction.

Lee himself is unimpressive, confused, ignorant of the basic differences between Cuba and this country and insolently indifferent to the problems of the Cuban people, but he does happen to have confined his efforts to a very sensitive area, the Spanish-speaking center of Tampa, known as Ybor City. Since the coming of Castro, this relatively small section has taken in thousands of displaced Cuban relatives of those already there and, of course, these are people who long for news from home. This makes them a sympathetic target for a radical such as Lee.

And to reach this readymade audience, he began to edit and distribute a bilingual newsletter. I have in my possession the issue of last November, and the masthead identifies it as volume 1, number 3. The trash contained in this issue is not worthy of being repeated here, but two or three references within it should be brought to the attention of the Congress.

First, the newsletter states that "with this edition we will have produced and distributed a total of 1,701 copies of Tampa Fair Play." In the same paragraph, incidentally, he begs for funds, admitting that he desperately needed help in order to continue.

The same issue accuses President Kennedy and Senator EASTLAND of withholding diapers from Cuban babies.

The Senator, in fact, is labeled a hatchetman and a loudmouth in this issue. Reference is likewise made to those "jackasses in Washington." The Cuban exiles now in Miami are called "pimps,

prostitutes, gamblers, thieves, murderers, and the scum of society." In short, claimed the newsletter, "Castro got all the cream and here in Florida are the dregs and scum."

A Tampa Tribune article dated January 27 of this year states that the Tampa chapter is still alive and, in fact, another newsletter was distributed in January. The latter I have not yet been able to obtain, but I am now told that it was probably published somewhere other than in Tampa. The article said that the paper had learned that Lee was at that time in New York, and had been for several weeks. That was less than 1 month ago.

My point, Mr. Speaker, is that the Tampa chapter may be small and its leaders pathetic, but a newsletter of this type can do irreparable damage to our reputation, especially among those who have sought refuge within our borders.

The point, too, is that the Attorney General allows this menace to go unchecked, in spite of overwhelming indications and evidence that the Fair Play for Cuba Committee, and its members or sponsors or devotees, are devoted to Castro, and I think there is small doubt that he is dedicated to communism and the overthrow of our form of government.

The Attorney General's failure to place this group on the subversive list becomes all the more baffling when we consider that the annual FBI report for fiscal year 1961 states, in part:

FBI investigations also have shown that the Fair Play for Cuba Committee has been heavily infiltrated by the Communist Party and the Socialist Workers Party, and these parties have actually organized some chapters of the committee.

Both organizations, of course, are on the Attorney General's subversive list.

Now we all know that Cuba today is a Communist state. The top people are old-line Commies and have been for years. Recently, Castro himself publicly embraced the Commie cause. Ergo, it is a Communist state, openly wooed and supported by Russia and other Communist countries. Thus, it seems to me that any organization that openly admires and supports this sort of police state, has many known Communist sympathizers supporting it and brazenly and openly defines a duly constituted congressional committee seeking ways and means of combatting communism should be on the Attorney General's subversive list.

The question may be asked: "Why should we put them on the list?" Well, it seems to me that when the Cuban Government, through one of its delegates to the United Nations, sends $3,600 up here so that an anti-United States and pro-Castro advertisement in the New York Times can be paid for, we have a perfect example of a foreign agent. And foreign agents are supposed to register.

If the Attorney General is still reticent about recognizing a Communist state even when it shows itself as one, let me bring another fact or two to his attention. First, we have the very obvious fact that scores of Reds have visited Cuba since Castro came to power. Indeed, a few weeks ago some 30 Yugoslav officers were present at a huge Cuban review of its armed strength on the anniversary of Castro's third year in power. To compound the mystery, last year the United States sold 130 F–86D Sabrejets and 24 jet trainers to Yugoslavia at cut-rate prices. Newspaper reports now tell us that a number of these planes were shipped from this country aboard Yugoslav freighters, and that at least one of these freighters, en route to Yugoslavia, made a 5-day stopover in Havana under a complete blackout and heavy guard.

And reports have persisted for more than 7 months that Cuba now has anywhere from 26 to 100 Mig jets in her forces, all of which were manufactured in Red Czechoslovakia.

Mr. Speaker, I have long been concerned with this threat from the south, especially when it comes from a country just 90 short miles from our coastline. In the last session I was sufficiently disgusted with Castro's offer to trade 1,200 Cuban prisoners for 500 heavy-duty tractors to have introduced House Concurrent Resolution 322, in which I urged that this country oppose the "swap." I have long urged a complete embargo against Cuba, and while it was interesting to see the President finally take some action, I am afraid he waited much too long.

To abstain from taking more definitive action against the Castro regime, and to fail to properly list it as a subversive regime, amounts, in my opinion, to fully as great a fiasco as was the Bay of Pigs invasion. We simply do not have a sensible, planned, cohesive approach to this Cuban problem.

In fact, our policy of helping our enemies has gone too far already. After seeing India march in and steal Goa, long a recognized constitutional Portuguese colony, it strikes me that our policy toward so-called neutrals has been a failure. As I stated above, why should we continue to coddle Tito and his Yugoslav Reds?

Then there is Poland, to which we have sent $500 million in surplus wheat under the 480 program and which has used this to keep the Communist government in power rather than to feed the starving Poles. On my recent trip to Poland I saw this with my own eyes, not to mention to have learned of two huge shipyards that they have built in Cuba in exchange for $15 million to $20 million of Cuba's sugar, which Poland does not need and must get rid of, largely to Great Britain.

Not only must we review our policy of assisting Iron Curtain countries, but we must take immediate, strong, positive steps here at home. First, Congress must repeal the Executive order of January 1961, when President Kennedy opened the U.S. mails to Communist propaganda, which had previously been banned since 1957. The House has already passed this amendment in the postal increase bill. This would allow us to keep such Communist propaganda sheets as La Revoluccion from Havana out of circulation, currently being shipped in from Havana. It is obvious this is done on orders from Moscow. As a matter of fact, Czechoslovakia takes and carries out similar orders providing orders to Cuba.

Then, too, we must plug the loophole in the Smith Antisubversion Act by making changes through my bill, H.R. 3247, that would outlaw the organization of Communist cells anywhere in this country, and that would certainly cover the Fair Play for Cuba Committee.

Mr. Speaker, this is not an appeal based on partisanship, but instead is an appeal based upon the merits and the need and the very real threat from both outside and inside our country. I intend to introduce certain remedial legislation to accomplish some of the things I feel need to be done, but nothing is of more immediate importance than to have the Attorney General recognize communism for what it is and take the proper steps to put it out of business.

ADDRESS BY JAMIE L. WHITTEN

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. NATCHER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Speaker, the following is a speech by Representative JAMIE L. WHITTEN, of Mississippi, delivered before the National Rural Electrification Cooperation Association convention at Atlantic City, N.J., on March 7, 1962:

THE REA, KEY TO OUR HIGH STANDARD OF LIVING

(Speech by Representative JAMIE L. WHITTEN, of Mississippi, chairman, Committee on Agricultural Appropriations)

It is a real honor for me to be able to address this national meeting of your organization and to discuss with you a subject close to the hearts of all of us, rural electrification.

My service in Congress and on the Appropriations Committee, 14 years as chairman of the group which authorizes REA loans, has almost paralleled the growth and development of REA. I've watched the program grow; and may I say here it required no effort for me to appreciate this fine program and its contribution to all Americans. Sound and solid, it has proven to be the best investment any government ever made.

I am proud of the job REA has done for the American farmer, but more important the job it has enabled the American farmer to do for all of us. I am proud of the part I have had in the development of the program of REA.

One of the greatest achievements of the last 100 years is the bringing of electrical energy to rural areas. It has enabled a few people on the farms of America to produce food and fiber for our 183 million consumers, while others are freed to meet other national needs.

I serve on the Appropriations Subcommittee which handles the budget for the Defense Department. For the coming fiscal year, we will spend 63 percent of our total Government income for defense and closely

related activities. It is expected that nearly 2.7 million persons will be on active military duty and another 1 million Reserves will be maintained in a state of readiness for recall to active duty. In addition, millions and millions of our people are employed in supporting this vast Army, producing planes, submarines, ships and missiles and all the other things defense requires.

TEN PERCENT OF POPULATION NOW FEEDS 100 PERCENT

Though we have been and are now suffering some inflation, our standard of living has continued to be the highest ever enjoyed by the people of any nation in history.

We have been able to carry such a heavy defense burden, with the resulting inflation, without decreasing our standard of living because fewer and fewer people are producing more and more food, which releases more and more of our population for other purposes.

When this country was young, 90 percent of the people had to produce their own food and fiber with the plow and the hoe. Today, about 10 percent of our people produce enough to feed our entire population.

It now takes so few of us to produce the food, clothing, and shelter for the rest of us, that the rest of us can provide the highest standard of living ever known for all of us.

Because farming efficiency has increased rapidly, food costs have risen much less since World War II than the cost of most other consumer items in the market.

Food is an outstanding bargain in the United States today. It is usual for people in most areas of the world to spend one-third to one-half or more of their total income for food. United Nations figures show the percentage of income spent for food in certain areas as follows: Italy, 46 percent; Japan, 51 percent; Ceylon, 57 percent; Nigeria, 71 percent. In the United States, food costs take 20 percent or less of the disposable income, as compared to over 50 percent in Russia.

American consumers also enjoy the greatest variety and the finest quality of food available anywhere in the world. Further, such food is the most wholesome and healthful in the world. For the first time in the history of man, the terror of famine has been replaced by the problems of feast.

This did not just happen, nor was it an accident. It has been due to the technological revolution in American agriculture, brought on by the needs of a growing national and international economy.

Certainly the availability of cheap electric energy to the American farmer is a basic factor in making this technological revolution possible. REA has provided this energy. There are 400 uses of electricity on the farm and in the home, and at least 250 of them increase production and make farming more profitable.

Let's look at this program of REA and see just what it has done for the American farmer, and how it has accomplished this fine work.

GROWTH OF RURAL ELECTRIFICATION PROGRAM

REA was established on May 11, 1935, and the Rural Electrification Act of 1936 gave it permanent status with a 10-year lending program. In 1944 Congress extended this program indefinitely.

At the time the act was passed some people thought that only a small percentage of farmers would take electricity if offered. Events since 1935 have proved them wrong.

In 1936 only 10.9 percent of the farms had electricity. There were only 7,508 consumers in 1936 being served by 29 REA borrowers. Now 96.8 percent have electricity. Around 1,000 REA borrowers were serving a total of over 5 million consumers in January of this year in 46 States, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands.

In my own State of Mississippi, only nine-tenths of 1 percent of the farms had electricity in 1935; today over 90 percent are receiving electrical service.

Despite the fact that REA had to reach out and provide area coverage to many of the more thinly populated areas of rural America, it has been able to provide excellent service to such areas on a sound financial basis. Average monthly consumption per consumer has increased from 147 kilowatt-hours in 1950 to 357 kilowatt-hours in 1960—an increase of 143 percent in 10 years. Areas served by REA still average only 3 customers per mile as compared to an average of 40 customers per mile served by private companies.

The committee which I am privileged to head has continually urged area coverage as fully as possible, so that every farm needing electricity might receive it to the fullest extent. Those in charge of the program in the Department of Agriculture through the years have also stressed this approach. Together we have been successful.

REPAYMENT RECORD OUTSTANDING

Let's look at the financial record of the REA. One of the most remarkable features has been its excellent repayment record. It is one in which everyone in the Nation can take pride. No bank or other lending agency in the United States can boast a better record of payment.

A total of 1,091 borrowers have obtained financing through the REA program. Sixty-five have repaid their loans in full, leaving 992 active borrowers in the REA program at the present time. The facilities of these borrowers include 1,483,000 miles of line.

Since the inception of the program in 1935, loans have totaled over $4.5 billion. Loan funds advanced to borrowers exceeded $3.8 billion by December 1961. As of last June 30, $874,686,215 of principal had been repaid. In addition, over $422 million of interest has been paid on these loans.

A notable milestone this year was the receipt by REA of the one-billionth dollar repaid on the principal of electric power loans. One of the remarkable things about this program is the amount of funds which has been repaid in advance of the dates required. As of last June 30, over $176 million had been repaid ahead of schedule by REA borrowers. This is truly a remarkable record.

Another achievement of which we can all be proud is the fact that only 1 out of 1,091 borrowers was behind schedule at the end of last year. Less than $95,000 of repayments were overdue more than 30 days as of last June 30. This is a record that few if any credit institutions can match.

This record was so great and the repayment rate so fine that, when I became chairman of my committee, I started the practice of making additional funds available in the form of a contingency fund to meet loan demands beyond those which could be met with the regular amount carried in the bill. We have continued this policy each year since that time and have found it very helpful. If the requirements of the law and standards of REA are met, funds are always available to meet new applications as they come in.

We all know that the REA program proved early that the American farmer is just as much interested in electricity as the next fellow and in later years, electrical energy has become a necessity. He is willing to buy it and he is paying for it. There are some now who would be willing to take him and his highly developed REA system over. I wouldn't mind owning a good system myself. However, we must not let the cream be raked off, for that would let the man in the thinly populated area go without service once again.

FUTURE OUTLOOK

Power requirements of the rural electrification systems are increasing rapidly. The demand for electric energy in rural areas is doubling every 5 to 7 years. It is estimated by REA experts that power requirements of REA borrowers will increase from the present annual level of 32 billion kilowatt-hours to 50 billion kilowatt-hours in 5 years and to around 69 billion kilowatt-hours by 1970.

With the ever increasing demand by rural areas for electric power, due to additional customers each year as well as increased consumption per consumer, the need for loan funds for systems rephasing and improvement will continue to grow. Likewise, additional funds will be needed to develop new sources of power to meet this expanded demand. In 1961, 5.2 billion kilowatt-hours of electricity were generated by REA borrowers, whereas 27.6 billion kilowatt-hours were purchased from outside sources, nearly half from private power companies.

REA must continue to insure that an abundant, low-cost, secure power supply is available to the rural areas of our Nation. It has been this abundant, low-cost supply that has been such an important factor in the agricultural technological revolution which is taking place in this country.

It is significant to note that the cost of electrical energy, something I am concerned with as I know you are, dropped from 4.08 cents per kilowatt-hour in 1945, to 3.34 cents in 1950, to 2.71 cents in 1955. It dropped further from 2.32 cents per kilowatt-hour in 1960 to 2.29 cents per kilowatt-hour in 1961. This gradual reduction of electric rates through the years has been one of the greatest accomplishments of the REA program.

REA BENEFITS OUR ENTIRE ECONOMY

As I have said earlier, one of the greatest achievements of the last 100 years has been the bringing of reasonably priced electrical energy to all sections of the country. We are all dependent upon production on the farm for food and fiber, the necessities of life. Not only can a large share of present abundant production be attributed to electricity in rural areas, but the only reason we have some people on the farm at all is because of this development.

Life on the farm has always had much to offer, but there has been the drudgery and lack of conveniences. Today with electricity, with the automobile, good roads, and other things, people on the farm have many of the comforts enjoyed by people in other walks of life.

The benefits of REA, however, extend far beyond our rural areas. The farmers are just one segment of the population which benefits from REA.

The general public receives many indirect benefits, including more and better food at less cost. In addition, urban workers benefit in a major way by virtue of the fact that the rural demand for machinery, equipment, appliances, etc., which use electricity provide a sizable market for industrial products.

Agriculture uses more steel in a year than is used for a year's output of passenger cars. It uses more petroleum products than any other industry in the country. It uses more rubber each year than is required to produce tires for 6 million automobiles. Its inventory of machinery and equipment exceeds the assets of the steel industry, and is five times that of the automobile industry.

Much of this tremendous rural market is the result of the availability of reasonably priced electrical power to farmers.

The most obvious example of a segment of industry that benefits from REA is the electrical appliance industry.

Surveys by your organization indicate that there is a potential market of over $1 billion for electrical appliances in rural America. For every dollar invested in rural power facilities, the farmer spends from $3 to $4 in wiring, plumbing, and electrical appliances.

Your surveys indicate further that over 1 million rural households now have adequate electrical capacity for most of the new electrical appliances. I would venture to guess that there are as many TV sets in rural America as there are bathtubs. The farm housewife now enjoys the same modern conveniencies as does her urban neighbor.

FINANCIAL RESERVES NECESSARY BUT MUST BE REASONABLE

For several years questions have been raised by critics of the program and others concerning the accumulation of financial reserves by cooperatives and the use of such reserves. My own committee has brought this matter to the attention of REA officials as well as officials of your organization on several occasions. In our report last year on the appropriation bill for fiscal year 1962, we specifically called on the REA to establish standards to be used in determining what should be considered as adequate reserves. We felt that everyone would benefit from such a determination.

I am happy to note that a set of standards has been established by the REA Administrator. While I don't profess to know exactly what level of reserves should be considered adequate, it is obvious that the adoption of such standards is a step in the right direction. The entire program will be strengthened by such action.

Apparently your organization is in accord with the action taken by the Department to establish criteria for the measurement of financial reserves needed by the cooperatives. This represents a healthy and practical realization of your responsibility to the taxpayers of the Nation who, after all, provide the funds to finance the REA systems.

I wish to commend those responsible for this action, which is essential if we are to keep this program sound and free from any possible criticism.

I have always insisted upon maintaining the right of REA to make power generation loans, so that it could make certain power is available at reasonable rates and on reasonable terms. Such right, however, should not be abused. I believe some criteria should be developed in this latter field and I believe some guide rule should be set up by the REA. We must not forget that excesses have caused trouble always; and today in the House of Representatives only 137 Members out of 437 come from rural districts. Our operations should always be sound. Too, one must remember these 300 nonrural House Members of Congress are looking over our shoulder.

Rural electrification has made a major contribution to rural America. It has added much to the comfort of farm people and has made it possible for farmers to stay in business, despite decreasing prices, and increasing costs for seed, fertilizers, insecticides, machinery, and all other items of production. It must be preserved.

I have seen the benefits of this program in my own State and I've seen them nationwide. I want to point out again that it has played a major role in enabling American agriculture to perform a vital service to the Nation with 10 percent of our people providing our entire 183 million people with the best food at the lowest cost in the history of the world.

CONCLUSION

I repeat, I am proud of the part I have had in the expansion of the REA. I take pride in area coverage and the reduction in rates which has been brought about by having the REA and its authority. I am happy that nearly 97 percent of the farms of the Nation are now receiving electrical service.

We have just about reached the point where the future need for the rural electrification program will be primarily in the improvement and rephasing of present systems to provide the additional capacity necessary to meet the ever-increasing demands for power in rural areas, to make up for labor which is not available.

My Committee on Appropriations for Agriculture, and a large majority of Members of Congress have consistently provided adequate funds for the REA program.

We intend to continue to actively support the REA system and to do everything in our power to see that the American farmer continues to benefit from an abundant supply of electrical energy, that he may serve the Nation. I believe that Congress will continue to support us in this effort. We have a wonderful program. We must continue to see that it is operated in a sound and responsible manner.

I know that the National Rural Electric Cooperative Association and all of you will join us in that endeavor.

FEDERAL DEFENSE SPENDING IN VARIOUS STATES

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. ASHLEY] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include tables.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. ASHLEY. Mr. Speaker, during recent weeks I have undertaken a study, based on information from the Department of Defense, the Library of Congress, and other sources, to analyze the trend of the last decade with respect to Federal defense spending in various States.

In making this study, I selected nine key States which I believe reflect a fair geographical distribution—Arizona, California, Florida, Illinois, Massachusetts, Michigan, Ohio, Pennsylvania, and Texas—and 3 key years, reflecting the changed emphasis or pattern in defense spending during the past decade.

Arizona, California, Florida, and Texas in recent years have been enjoying tremendous industrial expansion which to an appreciable extent can be attributed to governmental policy in defense procurement. I selected Massachusetts because it is the anchor State of New England industry, and Illinois, Michigan, Ohio, and Pennsylvania because these States historically represent the backbone of American manufacturing. Together these four Midwestern States accounted for 27.1 percent of total U.S. nonfarm employment in 1950 and 26.1 percent of corporate and individual Federal income tax revenue in the same year; in 1930, for 29.5 and 28.6 percent, respectively.

Nineteen hundred and fifty-two was selected because that was a year in which the United States was engaged in a limited conventional war; 1956 because it was a year in which there came to be reliance upon instant nuclear retaliation as the principal deterrent to war, and 1961, a year in which a new defense policy was evolving which recognized the necessity of preparing for both conventional and nuclear warfare, as well as a year in which there was particular concentration of the U.S. space effort.

My inquiry has been into two principal areas, the first involving military and civilian personnel and payroll in the nine selected States during fiscal years 1952, 1956, and 1961 and the second involving the net value of military procurement actions for these same States during these years and percent change from fiscal year 1952 to fiscal year 1961. It is to be acknowledged, of course, that these figures don't reflect the full story. Complicating factors in defense production defy completely accurate measurement, but I believe these figures do reflect accurately the trends which have taken place during the past 10 years, and furnish a useful indicator of the relative position of the subject States.

With respect to the first area of inquiry, active duty military and civilian personnel and payroll in the United States and selected States for fiscal years 1952, 1956, and 1961—see table I and II attached—it can be seen that Ohio is holding its own, as are Michigan, Illinois, and Pennsylvania. With respect to the much more important area of the net value of military procurement actions in these same States during fiscal years 1952, 1956, and 1961 and the percentage change from fiscal year 1952 to fiscal year 1961, however, the situation is vastly different.

In table II we find that the total civilian and military payroll increased from $9.8 billion in 1952 to $11.6 billion in 1961. Together, Illinois, Ohio, Michigan, and Pennsylvania accounted for 10.7 percent of total U.S. Department of Defense payroll in 1952 as against 10.9 percent in 1961. The most significant fact in table II is that of a total Department of Defense payroll which increased from $9.8 billion in 1952 to $11.6 billion in 1961, approximately 14 percent of this or roughly $1.5 billion each year is attributable to California. By the same token, Texas has enjoyed about 9 percent of the total payroll, averaging something over $900 million a year. Together these two States account for 22 percent of the total, compared to the approximate 11 percent of total Defense Department payroll for the four Midwestern States.

Moving then to the more significant area, namely, the net value of military procurement actions in these nine States for 1952, 1956, and 1961, the picture dims. We find that of the total net dollar value of military procurement throughout the entire United States, California has registered an astonishing increase from 12.6 percent of the total in 1952 to 20.1 percent in 1956 and 23.9 percent in 1961. Texas' share of U.S. defense procurement, though considerably less, showed healthy growth from 3.4 percent of total in 1952 to 5.6 percent in 1956 and 5.1 percent in 1961. To-

gether it can be seen that California and Texas accounted for 16 percent, 25.7 percent and 29 percent of total U.S. defense procurement spending, or $6 billion, $4.2 billion and $6.3 billion, in 1952, 1956, and 1961, respectively.

Turning to the four Midwestern States during the same years we find that Illinois went from 4.5 percent—$1.7 billion—in 1952 to 5.4 percent—$6.8 billion—in 1956, to 2 percent—$6.4 billion—in 1961; Michigan went from 13.5 percent—$5.1 billion—in 1952 to 1.9 percent—$0.3 billion—in 1956 to 2.7 percent—$0.5 billion—in 1961; Ohio went from 6.3 percent—$2.3 billion—in 1952, remained constant percentagewise but dropped more than $1 billion in 1956 and dropped further to 4.5 percent—$1 billion—in 1961; Pennsylvania went from 5.1 percent—$1.9 billion—in 1952 to 4.2 percent—$0.6 billion—in 1956 to 3.6 percent—$0.8 billion—in 1961.

Thus we find that of the total value of all U.S. military procurement in 1961, Illinois, Michigan, Ohio, and Pennsylvania accounted for 13 percent or $2.7 billion, while California and Texas combined accounted for 29 percent or $6.3 billion—a difference of 16 percent or nearly $4 billion.

It is important to note that each of the four Midwestern States since 1952 has registered a steady if not spectacular decline in the years since 1952 while the dramatic increase registered in California and Texas combined has seen these two States practically double their percentage of total defense business in the last 10 years.

As I stated earlier, 1952 was selected as a target year in order to reflect expenditures for Defense Department personnel and procurement during a period of actual hostility. In the intervening years—from fiscal 1952 to fiscal 1961—of so-called peace, Department of Defense military and civilian personnel decreased by 27½ percent. Because of pay increases and other factors, Department of Defense civilian and military payroll increased by 18.8 percent during these same years. Generally speaking, these changes are reflected in the percentage changes of most of the States under consideration. When we compare the net value of defense procurement, however, we again find a significant disproportion—see table IV attached.

Between 1952 and 1961, total defense procurement spending fell by 42.2 percent. During these same years, however, we find that Arizona and Florida, respectively, registered increases of 373.4 percent and 235 percent.

Although total defense procurement spending decreased more than 40 percent between 1952 and 1961, Texas fell off only 11.4 percent and California registered a net gain of 9.4 percent in 1961 over the share of the defense procurement dollar which it received in 1952.

Illinois, Michigan, Ohio, and Pennsylvania, as might be expected, were not so lucky. While the national defense dollar was shrinking by 42.2 percent, defense activity in Illinois fell off by 74.7 percent, in Michigan by 88.6 percent, in Ohio by 58 percent, and in Pennsylvania by 58.9 percent. The above-national percentage decline in defense activity in the four Midwestern States reflects an above average loss in dollar volume which is staggering. If Illinois, Michigan, Ohio, and Pennsylvania had merely suffered a cutback from their 1952 activity equivalent to the 42.2 percent national cutback, the value of their combined defense business in 1961 would have been $4.7 billion. Instead it was $2.8 billion. By suffering a loss averaging nearly 30 percent greater than the national average, these four States thus lost additional defense business in 1961 totaling $1.9 billion. When we consider that a comparable loss was suffered each year since 1952, it is readily apparent that the four Midwestern States in question lost to other areas of the country between $15 and $20 billion in defense contracts during the last decade over and above the 42.2 percent national cutback.

It is my strong conviction, Mr. Speaker, that forceful and effective efforts must be taken to reverse this trend. If defense procurement is to be placed more and more on the basis of climatic conditions, as appears to be the situation, the future of industrial activity throughout our great Middle West and other parts of the country will be bleak indeed. Certainly we must wonder when the Army tells us with a straight face that it is closing down Rossford Ordnance Depot because it cannot meet safety requirements for the storage of solid propellant missile fuels while at the same time our Defense Establishment is directing the expenditure of $5 billion a year—or about 25 cents out of every military procurement dollar—into one single State. Is California blessed with invulnerability in this nuclear age or are we in Ohio considered to be accident prone?

In the final analysis, of course, we support that which is in the national interest. Can it be said, though, that the direction which military procurement has taken since 1952 is, from the military, economic and social standpoints, in the best interest of all Americans? If the truth were told, has not our procurement policy been given credit for judgment and foresight which is largely undeserved? How much planning has there actually been?

TABLE I.—*Active-duty military and civilian personnel in the United States and selected States, fiscal years 1952, 1956, and 1961* [1]

State	1952		1956		1961		State	1952		1956		1961	
	Total	Percent of total	Total	Percent of total	Total	Percent of total		Total	Percent of total	Total	Percent of total	Total	Percent of total
United States (State totals)	3,417,838	100.0	2,793,421	100.0	2,478,525	100.0	Massachusetts	78,898	2.3	63,172	2.3	62,634	2.5
							Michigan	32,864	1.0	23,388	.8	31,039	1.3
Arizona	25,611	.8	30,063	1.1	26,465	1.1	Ohio	73,964	2.2	65,256	2.3	56,411	2.3
California	494,452	14.5	384,948	13.8	341,362	13.8	Pennsylvania	128,678	3.8	93,933	3.4	82,323	3.3
Florida	103,546	3.0	98,600	3.5	79,866	3.2	Texas	293,089	8.6	250,806	9.0	229,014	9.2
Illinois	98,032	2.9	89,331	3.2	71,719	2.9							

[1] Military personnel includes all shore-based personnel. Those in Navy and Marine Corps aboard ship not included. Includes Department of Defense employees only.

Source: Directorate for Statistical Services, Manpower Division, Office of the Secretary of Defense.

TABLE II.—*Estimated civilian and military payroll in the United States and selected States, fiscal years 1952, 1956, and 1961* [1]

[In thousands of dollars]

State	1952		1956		1961		State	1952		1956		1961	
	Total	Percent of total	Total	Percent of total	Total	Percent of total		Total	Percent of total	Total	Percent of total	Total	Percent of total
United States (State totals)	9,802,515	100.0	10,579,953	100.0	11,649,557	100.0	Massachusetts	238,104	2.4	244,268	2.3	304,006	2.6
							Michigan	92,943	0.9	90,251	0.9	151,931	1.3
Arizona	72,937	.7	112,021	1.1	120,721	1.0	Ohio	246,524	2.5	272,393	2.6	300,966	2.6
California	1,434,514	14.6	1,457,268	13.8	1,597,742	13.7	Pennsylvania	417,757	4.3	398,332	3.8	454,314	4.0
Florida	293,230	3.0	368,639	3.5	374,530	3.2	Texas	820,363	8.4	933,224	8.8	1,046,401	9.0
Illinois	294,775	3.0	338,003	3.2	346,315	3.0							

[1] Military data includes allowances. Includes Department of Defense employees only.

Source: Directorate for Statistical Services, Manpower Division, Office of the Secretary of Defense.

TABLE III.—*Net value of military procurement actions for selected States, fiscal years 1952, 1956, and 1961*

[In thousands of dollars]

State	1952		1956		1961		State	1952		1956		1961	
	Total	Percent of total	Total	Percent of total	Total	Percent of total		Total	Percent of total	Total	Percent of total	Total	Percent of total
United States (State totals)	38,229,233	100.0	16,490,564	100.0	22,112,446	100.0	Massachusetts	937,758	2.5	509,301	3.1	1,072,370	4.8
Arizona	51,719	.1	140,683	.9	244,837	1.1	Michigan	5,163,036	13.5	308,292	1.9	590,480	2.7
California	4,823,338	12.6	3,311,203	20.1	5,276,760	23.9	Ohio	2,392,051	6.3	1,046,613	6.3	1,004,245	4.5
Florida	147,019	.4	163,253	1.1	492,654	2.2	Pennsylvania	1,959,360	5.1	619,502	4.2	804,389	3.6
Illinois	1,727,513	4.5	887,053	5.4	437,250	2.0	Texas	1,285,273	3.4	929,438	5.6	1,138,471	5.1

Source: "Military Prime Contract Awards by State: July 1950, June 1954, June 1959, and September 1961." Office of the Secretary of Defense.

TABLE IV.—*Percent change in net value of military procurement actions, estimated Department of Defense civilian and military personnel and payroll for the United States and selected States, from fiscal year 1952 to fiscal year 1961* [1]

State	Department of Defense civilian and military personnel	Department of Defense civilian and military payroll	Net value of procurement actions
United States	−27.5	+18.8	−42.2
Arizona	+3.3	+65.5	+373.4
California	−31.0	+11.4	+9.4
Florida	−22.9	+27.7	+235.0
Illinois	−26.6	+17.5	−74.7
Massachusetts	−20.6	+27.72	+14.4
Michigan	−5.6	+63.5	−88.6
Ohio	−23.7	+22.1	−58.0
Pennsylvania	−36.0	+8.8	−58.9
Texas	−21.9	+27.6	−11.4

Source: Computed from data supplied by the office of the Secretary of Defense.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

Mr. VANIK, today, for 15 minutes, and to revise and extend his remarks.

Mr. PRICE, today, for 10 minutes, to revise and extend his remarks and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. HALPERN (at the request of Mr. KEITH), for 15 minutes, on Monday, March 19.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mr. CORBETT and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. WICKERSHAM.

Mr. ALGER and to include extraneous matter during debate in the Committee of the Whole.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. KEITH) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. HOSMER in three instances.

Mr. MCINTIRE.

Mr. KEITH.

Mr. BERRY.

Mr. MORSE.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. ALBERT) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. BOLAND.

Mr. ADDONIZIO.

Mr. JOELSON.

Mr. ANFUSO.

Mr. CAREY.

Mr. RODINO in two instances.

Mr. BAILEY.

Mr. KOWALSKI in two instances.

Mr. ELLIOTT in two instances.

Mr. ROSENTHAL.

Mr. GREEN of Pennsylvania.

ADJOURNMENT

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

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 6 o'clock and 5 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Monday, March 19, 1962, at 12 o'clock noon.

CONTRACTUAL ACTIONS, CALENDAR YEAR 1961, TO FACILITATE NATIONAL DEFENSE

The Clerk of the House of Representatives submits the following report for printing in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD pursuant to section 4(b) of Public Law 85–804:

MARCH 12, 1962.

The Honorable JOHN W. MCCORMACK,
Speaker of the House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR MR. SPEAKER: There is forwarded herewith the annual report for the calendar year 1961 of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration of contractual actions taken pursuant to Public Law 85–804 (50 U.S. Code 1431–5).

Sincerely yours,

PAUL G. DEMBLING,
Director, Office of Legislative Affairs.

ANNUAL REPORT OF THE NATIONAL AERONAUTICS AND SPACE ADMINISTRATION: CONTRACTUAL ACTIONS TAKEN PURSUANT TO SECTION 4 OF PUBLIC LAW 85–804 (50 U.S. CODE 1434)

During the calendar year 1961, the Contract Adjustment Board of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration granted relief under this statute in two cases presented to it. The total amount of the relief granted in these cases is $396,386. The first case involved the formalization of informal commitments; and the second, an amendment to express the original intent of the parties, and to extend the time and provide the funds required for completion of the contract. The two cases are set forth on the attachment hereto. No other cases were considered by the Board in calendar year 1961.

List of contractual actions with actual or potential cost of $50,000 or more taken pursuant to Public Law 85–804 to facilitate the national defense, January–December 1961

Name and location of contractor	Actual or estimated potential cost	Description of property or service	Justification
(1) Geophysics Corp. of America, Bedford, Mass.	$345,552	Construction and delivery of 19 instrumentation sections for Nike-Asp, Nike-Cajun, and Javelin rockets, participation in field programs for rocket firings and acquisition of data, and reduction and analysis of scientific results.	Formalization of informal commitments adding to existing contract NAS 5-215 following progress and development in problem area, in view of urgency of requirement for the rockets, and the heavy contractual workload.
(2) The Display House, Philadelphia, Pa.	50,834	Design of U.S. technical exhibit on peaceful uses of outer space	Amendment of contract to express understanding of parties, to extend time, and to provide additional funds required to complete performance.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

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

1812. A letter from the Director, Office of Legislative Affairs, National Aeronautics and Space Administration, transmitting the Annual Report of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration of Contractual Actions Taken for the Calendar Year 1961, pursuant to Public Law 85–804; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1813. A letter from the Chairman, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting a copy of the report on backlog of pending applications and hearing cases in the Federal Communications Commission as of January 31, 1962, pursuant to Public Law 554, 82d Congress; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1814. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief

of Engineers, Department of the Army, dated January 29, 1962, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and an illustration, on a letter report on the Ohio River at and in the vicinity of Pomeroy, Ohio, requested by a resolution of the Committee on Public Works, House of Representatives, adopted June 19, 1952; to the Committee on Public Works.

1815. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, U.S. Department of Justice, transmitting copies of orders entered in the cases of certain aliens who have been found admissible to the United States, pursuant to the Immigration and Nationality Act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1816. A letter from the Under Secretary of Commerce, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to provide penalties for certain offenses committed in connection with highway construction"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

Mr. ASPINALL: Committee of conference. H.R. 4130. A bill to amend the Menominee Termination Act (Rept. No. 1437). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. HAYS: Committee on House Administration. House Resolution 566. Resolution providing for printing additional copies of the report submitted by the Committee on Ways and Means pursuant to H.R. 10650, the Revenue Act of 1962; without amendment (Rept. No. 1444). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. HAYS: Committee on House Administration. Senate Concurrent Resolution 59. Concurrent resolution authorizing the printing of additional copies of Senate Report 488, 87th Congress, entitled "Administered Prices, Drugs"; without amendment (Rept. No. 1445). Ordered to be printed.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

Mr. LANE: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 2018. An act for the relief of Robert B. Kasparek, Robert M. Kearny, Richard A. Stokes, J. R. Whitehouse, Jr., and Herbert A. Wolff, Jr.; without amendment (Rept. No. 1438). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. LINDSAY: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 7332. A bill, for the relief of Mrs. Ethel Knoll; without amendment (Rept. No. 1439). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. DONOHUE: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 9445. A bill for the relief of Miss Grace Smith, and others; without amendment (Rept. No. 1440). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. MACGREGOR: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 3825. A bill for the relief of T. W. Holt & Co. and/or Holt Import & Export Co.; without amendment (Rept. No. 1441). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. SHRIVER: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 5061. A bill for the relief of James L. Merrill; without amendment (Rept. No. 1442). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. GILBERT: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 7876. A bill relating to the effective date of the qualification of the joint pension plan for employees of Local Unions 645, 1507, and 1511, Brotherhood of Painters, Decorators, and Paperhangers of America as a qualified trust under section 401(a) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954; with amendment (Rept. No. 1443). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mr. BARRETT:

H.R. 10754. A bill to amend the Small Business Act to provide that the program under which Government contracts are set aside for small-business concerns shall not apply in the case of contracts for maintenance, repair, or construction; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. BOW:

H.R. 10755. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide for the medical care of the aged through the allowance of a tax credit as an incentive for health insurance coverage; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BROYHILL:

H.R. 10756. A bill to increase annuities payable to certain annuitants from the District of Columbia teachers' retirement and annuity fund; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. CELLER:

H.R. 10757. A bill to provide for the establishment of the Oriskany Battlefield National Historic Site; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H.R. 10758. A bill to provide for audit of accounts of private corporations established under Federal law; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JAMES C. DAVIS:

H.R. 10759. A bill to amend the Subversive Activities Control Act of 1950 to authorize the payment of rewards to persons who furnish information leading to convictions of organizations or individuals of failure to register as required by such act; to the Committee on Un-American Activities.

By Mr. DULSKI:

H.R. 10760. A bill to increase the maximum travel allowance for postal transportation clerks, acting postal transportation clerks, and substitute postal transportation clerks; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. FINDLEY:

H.R. 10761. A bill to support the price of soybeans; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. GARLAND:

H.R. 10762. A bill to make available to individuals suffering speech and hearing impairments the trained speech and hearing specialists (variously called speech pathologists, audiologists, speech and hearing clinicians, speech correctionists, and so forth) needed to help them overcome their handicaps; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. GUBSER:

H.R. 10763. A bill to amend section 1074 of title 10, United States Code, to provide that retired reservists with 30 years of Federal service who performed active duty during World War I and World War II shall have the same privileges with respect to medical care as retired reservists who served 8 or more years on active duty; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Maryland:

H.R. 10764. A bill to authorize a grant to the State of Maryland for rehabilitation of certain coastline areas; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. MONTOYA:

H.R. 10765. A bill to bring certain holders of star route and other contracts for the carrying of mail within the purview of the Civil Service Retirement Act, the Federal Employees' Group Life Insurance Act of 1954, and the Federal Employees Health Benefits Act of 1959, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. PUCINSKI:

H.R. 10766. A bill to amend the Davis-Bacon Act, as amended; the Federal Airport Act, as amended; and the National Housing Act, as amended; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 10767. A bill to amend section 302 of the Labor-Management Relations Act, 1947; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. RANDALL:

H.R. 10768. A bill to amend the Subversive Activities Control Act of 1950 to authorize the payment of rewards to persons who furnish information leading to convictions of organizations or individuals of failure to register as required by such act; to the Committee on Un-American Activities.

By Mr. RYAN of New York:

H.R. 10769. A bill to amend section 203 of the Social Security Act to provide that the amount of an individual's medical, dental, and related expenses shall be subtracted from his outside earnings before determining under such section the amount of any reduction in his benefits by reason of such earnings; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. SULLIVAN:

H.R. 10770. A bill to amend the Meat Inspection Act to extend its coverage in certain areas; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois:

H.R. 10771. A bill making appropriation for advance engineering and design on the Freeport Pecatonica River, Ill., flood control project, administered by the Department of the Army for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1963; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. CELLER:

H.R. 10772. A bill to provide for the establishment, ownership, operation, and regulation of a commercial communications satellite system, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. JOHNSON of California:

H.R. 10773. A bill to provide relief for residential occupants of unpatented mining claims upon which valuable improvements have been placed, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. LOSER:

H.R. 10774. A bill to amend the Subversive Activities Control Act of 1950 to authorize the payment of rewards to persons who furnish information leading to convictions of organizations or individuals of failure to register as required by such act; to the Committee on Un-American Activities.

By Mr. PRICE:

H.R. 10775. A bill to amend the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, and for other purposes; to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

By Mr. RODINO:

H.R. 10776. A bill to amend section 144 of title 28 of the United States Code; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WICKERSHAM:

H.R. 10777. A bill to authorize the coinage of 50-cent pieces in commemoration of the first U.S. manned vehicle orbital flight around the earth; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. FARBSTEIN:

H.R. 10778. A bill to amend the International Claims Settlement Act of 1949, as amended, relative to the return of certain alien property interests; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. GARLAND:

H.R. 10779. A bill to make available to children suffering speech impairments the

specially trained speech pathologists and audiologists needed to help them overcome their handicaps; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mrs. HANSEN:

H.R. 10780. A bill to provide for the reopening of the recently closed Veterans' Administration contact offices; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. KOWALSKI:

H.R. 10781. A bill to outlaw various devices which are used to deny citizens the right to vote because of their race or color, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 10782. A bill to provide for the equal administration of justice and for protection against violence under color of law; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 10783. A bill to provide for the desegregation of all public schools with all deliberate speed. Requires every school board which has failed to achieve desegregation in its schools to adopt and file with the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare a desegregation plan providing for first step compliance; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 10784. A bill to establish a Commission on Equal Employment Opportunity to encourage and enforce a policy of equal job 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 the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 10785. A bill to provide for relocation of families displaced by the Interstate Highway System, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. ROOSEVELT:

H.R. 10786. A bill to establish standards for hours of work and overtime pay of laborers and mechanics employed on work done under contract for, or with the financial aid of, the United States, for any territory, or for the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 10787. A bill to provide that the Government of the United States shall furnish no aid or assistance to any foreign nation or citizen thereof in carrying out any activity under which American citizens will be discriminated against; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. COOLEY:

H.R. 10788. A bill to amend section 204 of the Agricultural Act of 1956; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. ABBITT:

H.J. Res. 665. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States providing for the election of President and Vice President; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TOLLEFSON:

H.J. Res. 666. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to equal rights for men and women; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GUBSER:

H. Con. Res. 452. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress as to a study and investigation concerning a nationwide program of remunerative occupational training for youth; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. McVEY:

H. Con. Res. 453. Concurrent resolution to set aside the week beginning November 4, 1962, as National Country Music Week; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FISHER:

H. Res. 565. Resolution authorizing salary increases for the file clerk and assistant file clerk (minority); to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. MILLS:

H. Res. 566. Resolution providing for printing additional copies of the report submitted by the Committee on Ways and Means pursuant to H.R. 10650, the Revenue Act of 1962; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. RODINO:

H. Res. 567. Resolution extending the greetings and felicitations of the House of Representatives on the occasion of the 150th anniversary of the establishment of the municipality of Bloomfield, N.J.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mr. ANFUSO:

H.R. 10789. A bill for the relief of Anna Maria Rifilato; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CASEY:

H.R. 10790. A bill for the relief of Rufina Juan Escudero; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GUBSER:

H.R. 10791. A bill for the relief of Charlotte T. van Kesteren; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 10792. A bill for the relief of Gregorio Alvarez Lopez; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HOFFMAN of Illinois:

H.R. 10793. A bill for the relief of Dimitrios Dagiantis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KEARNS:

H.R. 10794. A bill for the relief of Dr. Chul Nam Lee; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 10795. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Hae Kyong Han, and her minor children, Myong Suk Lee, Ki Dong Lee, and Kyong Dong Lee; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KEOGH:

H.R. 10796. A bill for the relief of Kazimierz Krupinski; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MOSS:

H.R. 10797. A bill for the relief of Koji Kojima; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 10798. A bill for the relief of Mrs. M. Orta Worden; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. O'BRIEN of Illinois:

H.R. 10799. A bill for the relief of Jean Dimakis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. PFOST:

H.R. 10800. A bill for the relief of Yu Liao; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RYAN of New York:

H.R. 10801. A bill for the relief of Dr. Enrique Balbastro Silla; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Bent's Old Fort, Colorado

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN A. CARROLL
OF COLORADO
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, March 15, 1962

Mr. CARROLL. Mr. President, in the pageant of our Nation's history, no more colorful era exists than that of the taming of the West and Southwest in the 19th century. Bent's Old Fort, in my State of Colorado, played a significant part in this drama—as a business, social and military center on the Old Santa Fe Trail for both whites and Indians.

Established as a national historic site in 1960, much fine work has been done toward the preservation and development of Bent's Old Fort. However, the work continues, and in connection with this, I appeared before the Senate Appropriations Committee several days ago in support of the National Park Service budget request for Bent's Old Fort.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that my statement before the Senate Appropriations Committee be printed in the RECORD.

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

BENT'S OLD FORT, COLORADO

(Statement by Senator CARROLL of Colorado)

Mr. Chairman, I appear this morning in support of an appropriation request of $38,148 by the National Park Service for the preservation and development of Bent's Old Fort National Historical Site, which is located on the bank of the Arkansas River near La Junta, in southeastern Colorado.

Bent's Old Fort, for the information of my colleagues who may not yet be aware of its historical significance, is one of the most famous landmarks on the mountain route of the Old Santa Fe Trail.

Built by the three Bent brothers and Ceran St. Vrain, the Canadian fur trapper, in 1832, Bent's Old Fort was both a business and social center as well as a refuge for travelers and a supply depot for Generals Kearney and Price and John C. Fremont in their expeditions and explorations. As such, Bent's Old Fort is a highly significant landmark in our Nation's expansion in the southern plains area and the Southwest in general.

Since coming to the Senate, I have worked hard to see that Bent's Old Fort be made a national historical site, and in 1957 I introduced a bill (S. 2699) to this effect. In 1959, the National Parks Advisory Board completed its study of various historical sites, and favorably reported Bent's Old Fort. In 1960, both Houses of Congress passed legislation (signed into law June 30, 1960) establishing Bent's Old Fort National Historic Site and authorizing appropriations for its development and maintenance. I supported this legislation.

In 1961, the Colorado State Historical Society generously donated the 5.77 acres containing the fort site and access roadway to the Federal Government. It has long been recognized that an additional 170 acres of privately owned land would be necessary to maintain the integrity of the site and provide adequate space for parking and other facilities necessary to the park's operation.

The National Park Service appropriations for fiscal year 1962 included funds for this land acquisition (as well as for rehabilitation and maintenance of the site) and I am informed that negotiations for the purchase of this land should be completed within the next week or 10 days.

Local interest in Bent's Old Fort has been high. For the past several years the La Junta Chamber of Commerce, cooperating with James Grafton Rogers, president of the Colorado State Historical Society, and many Arkansas Valley groups such as the La Junta DAR and individuals, including Mr. James Baldridge, Mr. Milt Andrus, and Mr. Fred Betz, publisher of the Lamar Daily News, have worked toward the improvement of Bent's Old Fort.

Local and State time, energy and resources have contributed much to this project. As was recognized by the appropriations for Bent's Old Fort in the fiscal year 1962 budget, however, local resources could not be tapped indefinitely.

In supporting and urging support of the Bent's Old Fort appropriations for fiscal year 1963 ($38,148), I would remind my colleagues that this is a small price to pay for the preservation of an important part of our American heritage. Western history has been and will, I'm sure, continue to be a very great part of our national culture.

In underscoring this point, I would close with a quote from a Denver Post editorial of May 29, 1960:

"Bent's Old Fort was to the West what Times Square is to New York or Piccadilly Circus is to London. It was the center of a universe. It deserves restoration and preservation."

The Value of St. Patrick in the World of Today

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUGH J. ADDONIZIO
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 15, 1962

Mr. ADDONIZIO. Mr. Speaker, we honor today the name of St. Patrick, the patron saint of Ireland, champion of the faith, and a symbol of hope to all the captive peoples of the world. The story of Patrick is no tale isolated in space and time; no saga of a local hero, nor peculiar to any one people or to any one faith. Indeed, the problems faced by Patrick in the 5th century, A.D., were universal problems, as yet unsolved, and the course he followed hewed a path which all good men of all faiths have sought to follow since the day of his death, more than 14 centuries ago.

Carried into slavery in his youth, Patrick was spirited away to Ireland, from which he was not to escape for 6 long years. In the manner of a man born free, he chafed under his bonds and bided his time, awaiting the opportunity to regain the gift of freedom.

Here we have the story of millions upon millions of persons throughout the world in this very century—robbed of their freedom by those who would impose upon them the chains of communism. Yet they, too, in the manner of St. Patrick, bide their time in anticipation of the freedom that will undoubtedly be theirs again some day.

Escaping his bonds, Patrick fled to France, where he took up missionary work, and in the year A.D. 432, returned to Ireland in the role of bishop to give counsel and advice to those who had enslaved him in his youth.

Again we are reminded of his counterparts of the present era: those who have fled from countries overrun with tyranny, yet who plan to return, at the first opportunity, to rebuild what tyranny has sought to destroy.

From the day he reappeared in Ireland, until the day of his death, nearly 30 years later, Patrick worked incessantly in behalf of the Christian faith, against those who hoped to preserve paganism in the hearts of the Irish people. In the manner of a colossus, St. Patrick swept the field before him, instilling the knowledge of the Lord throughout a land where spiritual darkness had for so long prevailed.

In the period embracing Patrick's lifetime, Ireland was but a conglomeration of municipalities ruled by a score of self-designated kings. To these men Patrick appealed until, one by one, they were all converted to Christianity, and ready to recognize their minor standing in the kingdom of the Lord.

Through fables and folk tales we are told of Patrick's genius and ability, and of the many wondrous things he accomplished, to win the confidence of the people. It is said that he drove the snakes and toads from Ireland, for instance; that in contests with the Druid priests he was known to have performed many miracles; that he was able to confound his enemies by bringing darkness upon them, and that when he died the sun shone steadily for 12 days.

From these accounts, the people of Ireland came to revere St. Patrick as they did no other spiritual force, save that of the Lord, Himself; and with the passage of time they would be required to call upon this force to see them through the bitterest period in their national history.

The period in question was, of course, that of a century ago, when the Irish people were driven, helter-skelter, to the four corners of the world. Yet in fleeing their beloved homeland, they kept within themselves the light instilled by St. Patrick; the confidence that God, in His mercy, will ultimately prevail in all things, and that justice—eternal justice—must, in the end, triumph.

It was this knowledge, inculcated by the teachings of St. Patrick, that made of him the most noteworthy of all the saints, so far as the Irish people are concerned. It was this that produced the national love for him which has shone for 1,500 years, without once flickering.

Moreover, it is this love and the power of this love that has spread the interest in St. Patrick far and beyond the confines of Ireland, to lands distantly removed from Patrick's scenes of glory and accomplishment.

So, again, we are entitled to compare the past deeds of St. Patrick with those of the peoples and governments who would work in the same directions today. And once more we are justified in saying that the work of the freedom-loving people of the world plays havoc with the plans and designs of the slavemasters, even when the conflicting interests are separated by hundreds and thousands of miles.

For the spirit of freedom is a powerful force which, in itself, is inclined to create miracles, in the manner of St. Patrick. And one of the miracles is to shake and rattle the foundations of tyranny from afar.

There is an old saying that "words move, example draws." It was Patrick's example that proved the sincerity of his words, in the same manner that the sincerity of the free world proves the meaning of its code today.

And as the Druids fell before Patrick, so, by necessity, must the tyrannies of the world today fall before the impact of freedom in the days ahead.

The writings and deeds of St. Patrick show how splendidly he met the test of true greatness. In the face of the most fierce opposition from the pagan Druids, he boldly declared: "regardless of danger, I must spread everywhere the name of God so that after my decease I may leave a banquet to my brethren whom I have baptised in the Lord."

Such was the courage and the will of this saint we honor today—inspiring throughout the free world the greatest admiration, by persons of every nationality.

It is therefore necessary to advise the Irish people that although Patrick remains their patron saint, they must be ready to yield up the right to claim him exclusively for themselves. Indeed, he is far too popular to permit such an arrangement as that.

As the symbolic enemy of slavery, St. Patrick looms larger today than ever before; and, as always, the slavemaster can be expected to tremble at the sound of his name.

Truly, St. Patrick will stand as a hero of mankind, so long as Christianity endures and the fight for human justice prevails.

Government Must Remain Neutral in Labor-Management Disputes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK KOWALSKI
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 15, 1962

Mr. KOWALSKI. Mr. Speaker, Federal subsidy payments to certain air carriers are being misused in a most unjust fashion. In blunt terms, these subsidies are used by air carriers engaged in labor disputes for strikebreaking purposes. I have felt compelled to introduce legislation—H.R. 10697, text of which follows—that will deny Federal subsidies to certain air carriers which do not make every reasonable effort to settle their labor disputes. This bill provides that the Secretary of Labor shall appoint a three-man board which will determine whether such air carrier has made every reasonable effort to settle any dispute with its employees, and whether any payments attributable to the period of a strike should be disallowed because of the failure of the carrier to make such effort. This board would direct the Civil

Aeronautics Board to make any such disallowance.

Legislation such as this will set a favorable climate for fruitful negotiations in labor disputes. The avoidance of strikes is the major objective. However, if the Federal Government indiscriminately continues the payment of subsidies to air carriers who do not make reasonable efforts to settle their labor disputes, settlement becomes virtually impossible. The incentive for management to bargain in good faith is lost, and the basic right of labor to bargain collectively is destroyed. The U.S. Government then finds itself in the untenable position of taking sides. No group of employees can hope to settle a dispute with a management that has access to the Federal Treasury to finance its strikebreaking activities.

Since 1947, 67 work stoppages have occurred in the whole U.S. airline industry. The Civil Aeronautics Board in its history of operation has reviewed only two cases and found in both instances that subsidies were used to pay for unnecessary strike losses. The existing mechanism is ill equipped to handle these labor-management disputes.

The U.S. Government must remain neutral in the field of labor disputes. Public policy dictates that management and labor be free to settle their problems without outside interference. This bill and a companion bill, H.R. 10341, which relates to Government procurement contracts, would assure that the taxpayers' dollars that are presently being paid in subsidies to air carriers will be properly used. And it will enable both management and labor to meet their responsibilities to the general public and to each other.

That this particular situation is one of importance is exemplified by the fact that the President has appointed Dr. Nathan P. Feinsinger as chairman of a Commission on Aviation Matters, to investigate this problem. In addition, the President has appointed Secretary of Labor Goldberg to head a task force to investigate fully this broad and important area.

I would hope that every Member of Congress will critically explore this problem that vitally affects the public interest and the basic rights of the workingman. And I urge my colleagues to support legislation that will protect this interest and these rights.

The text of H.R. 10697 follows:

H.R. 10697

A bill to amend the provisions of the Railway Labor Act, relating to carriers by air, in order to deny Federal subsidies to certain air carriers which do not make reasonable efforts to settle labor disputes

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 204 of the Railway Labor Act is amended by inserting "(a)" immediately after "SEC. 204.", and by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(b) (1) Each carrier by air which is eligible to receive payments under the second sentence of section 406(c) of the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 and is engaged in a labor dispute with its employees or with a representative of such employees shall make every reasonable effort to settle such labor dispute.

"(2) Whenever there is a labor dispute involving a carrier by air described in paragraph (1) of this subsection, the Secretary of Labor shall appoint a board consisting of three members who shall determine whether such carrier has complied fully with the provisions of subsection (a) and whether any such payments attributable to the period of such labor dispute should be disallowed because of failure to so comply.

"(3) If such board determines that such carrier has not fully complied with paragraph (1) of this subsection and that any of such payments should be disallowed, it shall notify the Civil Aeronautics Board, in writing, of such fact and of the amount of such payments so disallowed, and the Civil Aeronautics Board shall not make any such payments, or, if such payments have been made, shall recover the amount thereof from such carrier."

Cooperative Fishery Research Unit for Colorado State University

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN A. CARROLL
OF COLORADO
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, March 15, 1962

Mr. CARROLL. Mr. President, the 86th Congress authorized the establishment of Cooperative Fishery Research Units in conjunction with universities offering fisheries science curricula.

The Department of the Interior, early in 1961, announced it would establish 10 or 12 of these units.

To date, only one has been funded by the Congress.

Several days ago I asked the Senate Appropriations Committee to include $30,000 in the Interior budget in order to establish a Cooperative Fishery Research Unit at Colorado State University in Fort Collins, Colo.

To my mind there is no more logical, deserving nor qualified institution in the United States to harbor a fishery research facility than Colorado State University.

This university, in 1949, originated the Cooperative Fisheries Research Unit.

The cooperators, until 1953, were the U.S. Government, the State of Colorado, and the university.

In 1953 the Federal Government discontinued its participation.

Now that the Congress has established a Federal cooperative fishery research program, I asked the Senate Appropriations Committee to appropriate funds to restore the cooperative relationship that first started in 1949.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that my statement before the Senate Appropriations Committee be printed in the RECORD.

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

COOPERATIVE FISHERY RESEARCH UNIT FOR COLORADO STATE UNIVERSITY

(Statement by Senator CARROLL, of Colorado)

Mr. Chairman, Public Law 686 of the 86th Congress gave the Interior Department the authority to establish fishery research units on a cooperative basis with a State game and fish agency and a university offering a curriculum in fisheries science.

The necessary appropriation for a Cooperative Fishery Research Unit in a State is $30,000.

Only one such unit has been funded by the Congress since President Eisenhower signed the authorizing legislation on September 2, 1960. This unit is in our sister State of Utah. However, early in 1961, the Department of Interior announced its intention to establish as many as 12 of these units.

I appear before you today to ask that you include in the bill before you $30,000 for a Cooperative Fisheries Research Unit to be located at Colorado State University at Fort Collins, Colo.

Mr. Chairman, there is no more logical or deserving location in the country for a research project of this type than Colorado State University. Colorado State University originated this concept in 1949. In that year Colorado State University established what was called the Colorado Cooperative Fisheries Research Unit, which was operated in conjunction with the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service and the Colorado Game and Fish Department.

Federal cooperation in this research project ended in 1953. However the university and the State have continued the program and it is functioning today, ready once again to welcome the Federal Government to participate and avail itself of the vast knowledge and experience accumulated in a 13-year-old program.

If the Department of the Interior moves in any direction on cooperative fishery research, it will be most wasteful not to move first to reestablish its affiliation with Colorado State University, the pioneer in this program.

Dr. William E. Morgan, president of Colorado State University, told me a few days ago that the objectives and functions of his cooperative fisheries research unit are essentially the same as those announced by the Interior Department. As I understand it, the objective of the units proposed in Public Law 86-686 will be to offer improved and expanded training for graduate students in order to provide more and better trained personnel for the management of the Nation's recreational and commercial fisheries resources.

This is precisely what the existing program at Colorado State University is doing.

This program can be immeasurably strengthened by once again joining hands, brains, and resources with the Federal Government.

Dr. Morgan said to me:

"There is a definite need for a vigorous fishery research training program in our part of the United States. The impact of water development projects in Colorado and the surrounding States will present many opportunities for new fishing areas, but associated with these opportunities will be serious fishing problems which will require an expanded fishery research and management effort."

Our existing fisheries unit has a fine record of performance and we view the announced intent of Federal participation in this educational area as an opportunity to expand and strengthen our program in the field of fishery science at Colorado State University.

Colorado State University is one of the few institutions of higher learning offering a degree in fishery science. Our program not only serves the needs of Colorado students but attracts students from nearby States where such courses of training are not available. We need to strengthen and expand our existing program in this area of research.

I ask your committee, Mr. Chairman, to give favorable consideration to my request for designation of $30,000 for Federal participation in the Colorado cooperative fisheries research program. This amount is

sufficient, I am told by Assistant Secretary of the Interior Frank Briggs, to cover costs of salaries, travel costs related to the program, equipment, supplies, and limited funds for student assistance and graduate projects.

If the committee grants this request for $30,000 for cooperation in fishery research with the State of Colorado and Colorado State University, I can assure the committee, Mr. Chairman, that the resulting contributions to fisheries science will be of significance not only to my own State of Colorado, but all the States in the West where sport fishing abounds.

I hope the committee will add this amount to the bill before it.

Our Nation's Fisheries

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WARREN G. MAGNUSON
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, March 15, 1962

Mr. MAGNUSON. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD remarks by myself on our Nation's fisheries. I expect to make similar remarks at the convention of the National Fisheries Institute.

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

OUR NATION'S FISHERIES

Today's fisheries, like almost everything else in our modern lives, differ greatly from the fisheries of our forefathers. This is true not so much in outward form as in understanding of the resource and in complexity of processing and distribution. Our fisheries are becoming ever more deeply involved in the highly complex and highly competitive world market.

The time has come when the maintenance of our fishing industry depends on the fullest and most cooperative effort at all levels of government and industry. The developing foreign production and planned economic systems differing in every respect from our own almost preclude the go-it-alone approach to fisheries problems.

Speaking as a long-time member of the legislative branch, I want to assure you of our desire to be an active partner with the executive branch and with the industry in a concerted attack on fisheries problems. Our job in the Congress is to pass constructive legislation. The executive branch, through the Bureau of Commercial Fisheries, implements that legislation as a part of its many program responsibilities. You, in industry, have the responsibility to guide us in the formulation of legislation and to advise us as to its effectiveness after implementation.

As most of you well know, the fishing industry for many years was to some degree a stepchild, at least as far as the legislative branch of Government was concerned. There was no well-delineated national policy on fisheries. Major legislation with broad application to fisheries problems was almost nonexistent. The fishing industry lacked a real champion in Government similar to those agencies looking out for the interests of other industries.

The first piece of fisheries legislation, the act of March 3, 1887, authorized the Commissioner of Fisheries to "prosecute investigations and inquiries concerning the supply of food fishes of the coasts and lakes of the United States and the determination of protective, prohibitory, or precautionary measures to be adopted." In the nearly seven decades that intervened between 1887 and 1954 there was other fisheries legislation enacted into the law of the land but it really wasn't until that year, 1954, with passage of the so-called Saltonstall-Kennedy Act, in which your speaker played an important part, that the fisheries began to receive the broad recognition that they deserved. This act, as I am sure most of you know, provided certain moneys from the duty on imports of fishery products for promotion of the flow of domestically produced fishery products in commerce by conducting a fishery educational service and fishery technological, biological, and related research programs. Innumerable worthwhile programs have been conducted under the terms of this act.

Close on the heels of the Saltonstall-Kennedy Act came the comprehensive Fish and Wildlife Act of 1956, a truly monumental piece of fisheries legislation and one on which I am proud to say that I personally did a lot of work during the 2d session of the 83d Congress.

Long prior to the passage of the act of 1956, I was aware of and disturbed by a situation that existed in our relations with other fishery nations. I decided, at that time, that our State Department was not cognizant of the national importance of our industry and as a result we were not properly represented at international meetings. During that time I was present at meetings where our representative could not speak with the same full authority, due to lack of official standing, as did our conferees who usually were of Cabinet status. In company with other Senators—I particularly mention Senator SALTONSTALL—we called upon the State Department and urged that this situation be corrected and that a new position be established in the State Department to represent us with the authority that this vital segment of our industry deserved.

Finally, after many meetings with the Department of State and the passage of too many years, we now have a Special Assistant to the Under Secretary of State for Fisheries and Wildlife in the State Department. Our status at international conferences, due in part, I believe, to our awareness of the need for more authority for our industry, has been strengthened and improved.

Perhaps the most significant accomplishment of the Fish and Wildlife Act of 1956 was the establishment of a firm national fishery policy. That policy is threefold:

1. To increase and maintain forever, for the people of the United States, a fishery resource capable of yielding the maximum annual product.

2. To strengthen and maintain a vigorous fishery industry by assuring full and fair access to its raw material and full and fair access to the American market.

3. To do these things in partnership with the States and in full accordance with our international obligation, and without sacrificing the system of free enterprise.

The act of 1956 did many other things as well. It established the Bureau of Commercial Fisheries as a full-fledged Federal agency to deal exclusively with fishery matters. It created a Commissioner of Fish and Wildlife and an Assistant Secretary for Fish and Wildlife, thus elevating the consideration of fisheries problems to the subcabinet level for the first time in history. The act provided for a a loan fund and for transfer of fisheries functions from other Government agencies, notably the Department of Commerce and the Department of Agriculture, to the Department of the Interior. The systematic preparation and distribution of reports to the public, the Congress, and the President was provided for, and the role of fisheries in international affairs was more clearly spelled out.

The record proves the wisdom of the passage of these two important acts. Among other things, they have resulted in the greatly increased exploratory activities which made available the new shrimp fisheries of Alaska, Oregon, and my home State of Washington, the new royal red shrimp and calico scallop concentrations off our southeastern coast, the new standards development program and the industry-financed $400,000 product inspection and certification program in which we all take pride as a giant step forward in quality improvement.

All of these activities, and many more, stem from these two fundamental expressions of congressional intent and of our Government's continuing interest in and support of your industry.

We have, therefore, a common interest and several other recent congressional actions attest to this fact. For example, the passage of the Fair Labor Standards Act, a piece of necessary and humanitarian legislation, posed special problems for the crabmeat industry, inasmuch as economic studies had indicated strongly that the consumer would not accept the increased labor costs in the form of increased prices for crabmeat. The Congress, thereupon, made funds available to permit studies to increase productivity and efficiency of crabmeat plants through more careful production scheduling and through increased automation. I am informed that this program is already bearing fruit in that recommendations for increased efficiency have already been adopted by several processors.

Another example of the increasing interrelations of Government and industry interests occurred during the recent recession in the fish meal industry. The U.S. Delegation to the International Conference in Rome, which meeting was necessary to resolve the problem of speculation and unwise marketing practices, was led by an official of our State Department. The delegation's position was largely conditioned by the national foreign policy and our antimonopoly laws. Consequently, the delegation's freedom of action and decision was very rigidly limited. The great amount of preparative work done and the constructive leadership shown by the executive branch, nevertheless, brought the Conference to conclusion which was eminently satisfactory to the United States. Your Congress, in turn, again acted promptly to assist the industry. Funds were made available for a program to diversify your market outlets and to resolve some of the pressing problems in transportation rate which had developed. I am informed that one such rate problem, through the cooperative efforts of the National Fisheries Institute and the Government, was settled at an annual saving to the industry of $700,000 per year. Surely this is an indication of the effectiveness of enlightened Government-industry cooperation.

We, in Congress, also are closely following the very interesting findings as to the usefulness of fish body oils in the treatment of excessive amounts of cholesterol in the blood, the usefulness of fish protein concentrate as a supplement to the world's inadequate food protein supply, and the very valuable information on the nutritive value of fish as food.

I am sure that you appreciate that congressional interest in the fisheries is not limited to the enactment of specific, basic legislation. There is the appropriation process, too. Congress has shown great interest in oceanography over the past 3 years. Several Government agencies have an interest in the oceans, and the Departments of the Navy, Interior, and Commerce, and special agencies such as National Science Foundation and Atomic Energy Commission, have been supporting programs of oceanographic research for many years. But until recently these efforts have been far too slight. In 1961, for example, the total Government budget in oceanography was only $60 million. The program proposed for fiscal year 1963 is more than double this amount, and almost half of the increase has been earmarked for the ships and shore-based

facilities needed for an accelerated program. Your interests are most directly concerned with the work of the Bureau of Commercial Fisheries, and I am sure you all understand the prominent part that Don McKernan and his staff are playing. They are stepping up their research on the ocean and its living resources and are deeply engaged in planning and coordinating the Government's program as a whole.

But you have a stake in oceanographic research far greater than the program of this one Bureau. Every piece of research done on the oceans will benefit the fishing industry sooner or later. The Navy supports a very broad series of studies on ocean currents, distribution of dissolved salts, kinds and numbers of marine organisms, composition of bottom sediments, and many other investigations, each of which adds to the basic knowledge necessary to reduce the cost of catching fish and obtain maximum yields from fishery resources. Half a dozen Government agencies are cooperating in financing and operating the National Oceanographic Data Center in Navy's Hydrographic Office. Fishery scientists will draw upon this growing repository of oceanographic data more and more as time goes on, and the results will be to your advantage.

Congress also has passed, or has under consideration, special legislation to broaden the authority of certain agencies where necessary to allow them to play their full part in the national program. Public Law 87-336, enacted last year, expands the functions of the Coast Guard, allowing them for the first time to conduct oceanographic research from their vessels.

The National Science Foundation and Atomic Energy Commission also support broad programs in all aspects of oceanography. Some of these have direct application to fishery problems. Indeed a part of the program at the Biological Laboratory of the Bureau of Commercial Fisheries at Beaufort, N.C., is financed with AEC money. The many activities supported by these agencies at universities and private research laboratories add immeasurably to our knowledge of the oceans.

We have some very special problems in the Pacific Northwest. The big dams, so valuable for electric power and irrigation, are obstacles to fish passage. To reach upstream spawning grounds, salmon must somehow pass over these dams; and their progeny must negotiate these barriers successfully if they are to reach the sea. These problems were brought to a head with recent proposals to build high dams in the Columbia River system. We in Congress were able to secure supplemental financing for such an accelerated fish passage research program. Th.. is now underway. It is designed to show by 1964 the direction in which a sound program for both fish and power should go.

Of course, I do not need to tell an audience like this about the effect of foreign fisheries. You know the extent to which our markets have been invaded. You have also heard, I am sure, of the skyrocketing catch of such countries as Japan and Soviet Russia in waters close to American shores. The Japanese catches of American red salmon, the 2 billion pounds of groundfish per year from the Bering Sea, the Russian trawling off Cape Cod, all are cases in point. Here, again, we in Congress have been able to help by providing funds for sharply increased research on the affected fish. Results of this research will strengthen the hand of the United States in negotiations and treaty arrangements with other nations.

Congress is well aware of the catastrophic decline in gulf shrimp production which has caused so much hardship in this area. We recognize that additional knowledge of shrimp biology is bady needed in order that such occurrences may be predicted or avoided. During the current fiscal year funds have been made available for studies in the western gulf. It has been brought to our attention that additional funds are needed, and these requests will be considered by Congress.

Another resource that I know is of interest to many of you is the Atlantic and gulf menhaden. The Bureau of Commercial Fisheries tells me its biologists expect a below-normal menhaden run in 1962. When such fluctuations result from natural conditions of the seas there is not much that we can do about them. Here again, however, increased knowledge and better prediction may ease the strains on the industry.

People of America's breadbasket—the Great Plains of the Midwest—have traditionally not been fisheaters. Far from the coasts, they have in the past been turned against fish by the loss of quality the products suffered before they reached the consumer's hands. Now you have developed new methods which make it possible to bring the products of the oceans and shores great distances with the tang of the sea still in them. Commercial fisheries are also being developed in lakes and reservoirs.

As a Member of the Congress I am particularly proud of a development that started back at the beginning of the 1950's. A Senator secured passage of an appropriation that provided for the first full-scale attack on the predatory sea lamprey of the Great Lakes. In the ensuing years special chemicals and electrical devices have been developed to kill lampreys while leaving food and game fish untouched. The Bureau of Commercial Fisheries tells me that real inroads on the lampreys are beginning. Soon it may be possible to restore the lake trout, prime delicacy of the Great Lakes region until decimated by the lamprey. Other developments in the use of new kinds of fish and the making of new fish products should help introduce the Midwest to the delights of good sea food.

In short, we are moving as rapidly as possible to enlarge the fund of useful knowledge about the seas around us and both inshore and offshore fishery resources. We are training men to do the job, and furnishing financial support as rapidly as possible. Our Government is prepared to meet with those of other nations in solving problems of high-seas fishing. Research teams are moving into regions where food needs exist. The total program cannot solve every problem nor anticipate every contingency, but it can make us stronger than we now are in fishery affairs.

Obviously, we can't stand still. We must move forward. As a member of the lawmaking branch of our Government, I urge you to make your views known when you feel new legislation is needed, or existing laws changed. The purpose of the Congress is to reflect the will of the people. Don't hesitate to let us know what you think.

Richard McArdle, Chief of the Forest Service, Retires

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLIFFORD G. McINTIRE

OF MAINE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 15, 1962

Mr. McINTIRE. Mr. Speaker, tomorrow Richard McArdle, Chief of the Forest Service, retires after 39 years of distinguished public service. Chief McArdle has brought honor to his profession of forestry. He has set an example of the highest order to those who find in public service an opportunity for service far above the monetary rewards. He has particularly brought honor to his country because he is known throughout the world for his high professional attainment, his personal integrity and leadership, and understanding of sound relationships between public responsibilities and the opportunities for private development.

During my service in Congress it has been my privilege to continue my deep interest in forestry. This has afforded me an opportunity to know of his effective administration of his responsibilities.

Chief McArdle has richly earned the privilege of retiring from long years of heavy responsibility. We shall miss him. May I extend our warmest best wishes.

The Secretary of Agriculture has appointed a capable career man, Ed Cliff, to succeed Chief McArdle. I commend the Secretary on filling this position from the Forest Service, thus continuing in this high office a man experienced in the problems and opportunities of the Service.

Fish Pesticide Lab for Fort Collins, Colo.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN A. CARROLL

OF COLORADO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, March 15, 1962

Mr. CARROLL. Mr. President, the Department of Interior has asked the Congress for $50,000 to fund a site selection survey for a Fish Pesticide Laboratory.

Several days ago I supported that request in a statement to the Senate Appropriations Committee.

At the same time I suggested the most ideal site for this laboratory: Fort Collins, Colo., the home of Colorado State University, one of the most outstanding academic institutions in the United States in scientific research and education in natural resources and wildlife.

I ask unanimous consent that my statement, describing the advantages of locating this laboratory in Fort Collins, be printed in the RECORD.

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

FISH PESTICIDE LAB FOR FORT COLLINS, COLO.

(Statement by Senator CARROLL, of Colorado)

Mr. Chairman, I appear before you this morning to support an appropriation request for $50,000 by the Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife for site selection surveys for a new fish pesticide laboratory.

In supporting this appropriation for study of a new laboratory site, I do so with the strong recommendation that the Bureau give full attention to the advantages of locating the laboratory at Fort Collins, Colo.

The Fish Pesticide Laboratory is presently temporarily located in Denver, Colo. It is in makeshift quarters in the Federal Center.

In this connection, the Bureau is asking for $215,000 to maintain and operate the existing temporary lab. I support this requested appropriation also.

But the lab must soon be relocated and it is to that matter that I address myself this morning.

Colorado State University at Fort Collins has, through its president, Dr. William E. Morgan, already offered to cooperate with the Bureau in selection of a site on or near university property. Dr. Morgan has indicated that, in his opinion, the known site requirements of the Bureau can be admirably met in the Fort Collins area.

I know, for example, that one of the most stringent site requirements is a proper supply of water in quantity, quality, and constancy of temperature.

These water needs can, I am confident, be adequately met at a site near the Bellvue Fish Hatchery, close to Fort Collins. Also, I am advised that sufficient land of a proper type is available near the fish hatchery.

At the same time, the university's own foothills campus, 2 miles west of the academic campus, is also an area ideal for location of a fish pesticide laboratory. This is a growing research campus anchored around a brandnew $1.3 million hydraulics laboratory. Other research being conducted at the foothills campus is as follows: hydrobiology, fisheries management, evaporation retardation, wildlife studies, veterinary science, and forest nursery.

Some of the foregoing research programs are carried out at the giant Bureau of Reclamation Horsetooth Reservoir and at College Lake and other reservoirs, all proximate to the university and the city of Fort Collins. Temperature and water quality studies of the water in Horsetooth Reservoir are in process right now and will soon be made available to the Interior Department.

There are other reasons that make Fort Collins, what to me would seem to be, an irresistibly attractive site for this type of project.

The Colorado Game and Fish Department research laboratories are located on the edge of the Colorado State University campus.

Colorado State University offers a graduate program in fisheries science associated with its department of forest recreation and wildlife conservation.

Add to the foregoing facilities and programs the excellent Colorado State University library and the university's many other research and graduate programs, from pathology to biochemistry and it would seem that no more ideal location than Fort Collins, Colo., could be found for a fish pesticide laboratory.

Thus Mr. Chairman, I support not only the $215,000 requested to keep the temporary fish pesticide laboratory in Colorado functioning, but I also ask that you grant the $50,000 needed for a new site study, and I hope the Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife will give most thoughtful consideration to the multiple advantages of the sites now offered nearby in Fort Collins, Colo.; sites that have the benefits of good water, fish hatchery and fish science activities, and proximate access to a university (Colorado State) that has a solid, national reputation in advanced scientific achievements in natural resource and wildlife research programs.

Citizens Compliment SBA, FCC, and Navy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CRAIG HOSMER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 15, 1962

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, complaints are common and compliments few for those who have devoted their careers to public service. Within the last few days, three citizens of my constituency have had occasion to compliment various Government officials. I think it proper to make these compliments a matter of record.

On March 8, Mr. John Hutchison wrote me about his contact with the Los Angeles Regional Office of the Small Business Adiministration. Mr. Hutchison said in part:

Mr. George Rands is the acting head of the department and showed me every courtesy. In fact, I was agreeably surprised to find that every contact I had in their office, from the receptionist to my final conference, was of a most pleasant nature. If this is a sample of Federal bureaucracy, let's have more of it.

Under date of March 9, Mr. Paul Turner wrote me that he had undergone surgery on the U.S. hospital ship *Haven*. His letter said in part:

I found the urologist, Lt. Comdr. D. Wallstreicher, so considerate and such a hard working doctor. He seemed to be around many hours every day, 7 days a week, ever mindful of the fact that his patients needed his personal attention. Of all the doctors I have seen in the Navy, Dr. Wallstreicher certainly would receive the highest commendation were I his superior. To go on I must also praise the nurses and hospital corpsmen thereon—never during my years of service did I ever meet a more efficient staff.

On the date of March 5, Dr. Ira S. Cohen, assistant professor of political science at Long Beach State College wrote me regarding his contact with the FCC local headquarters at 849 South Broadway, Los Angeles, Calif. The service he received from that office was excellent. They acted immediately to solve his problems which he stated could have been solved in no other way. In writing me he said he wished me to know of these circumstances so that the excellent work of the office might not be left hidden and unrewarded.

A Bill To Authorize the Coinage of 50-Cent Pieces Commemorating the Orbital Flight of Lt. Col. John H. Glenn, Jr.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. VICTOR WICKERSHAM
OF OKLAHOMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 15, 1962

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Mr. Speaker, it was my privilege today to introduce in the House of Representatives a bill authorizing the coinage of 50-cent pieces commemorating the orbital flight of Lt. Col. John H. Glenn, Jr., a member of the U.S. Marine Corps.

This same bill was introduced in the Senate by the Honorable ALAN BIBLE, of Nevada, and the Honorable STUART SYMINGTON, of Missouri.

This House has heard many words spoken by many world and national leaders from its rostrum, but none have been so straightforward and honest as the words of Colonel Glenn when he appeared before a joint session of this Congress.

Patriotism and devotion to this country are not old fashioned. The American people are prepared to stand up and be counted. Communism or any other "ism" had best read the words of Colonel Glenn if they want to know if we Americans will sacrifice to defend our loved ones, our home and our democratic way of life.

Our coins bear the words "In God We Trust." When Colonel Glenn appeared before House Science and Astronautics Committee, he was questioned about his feelings relative to his Maker while in space. The colonel's reply to this question would make the words "In God We Trust" more than appropriate for the coinage this bill authorizes.

I believe the American people want the John Glenn coin, and I hope we can pass this bill in record time.

Libraries for Rural People

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CARL ELLIOTT
OF ALABAMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 15, 1962

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Speaker, hearings on the fiscal 1963 appropriation for the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare are now being held. Included in President Kennedy's budget request for this Department is $7,500,000, the full amount authorized, for grants for public library services under the rural Library Services Act.

A summing up of the accomplishments of this act in its first 5 years well justifies the statement in the report of the House Appropriations Committee in 1961:

For the small amount of Federal funds involved this has been not only one of the most popular, but one of the most worthwhile programs of the Federal Government.

These examples of progress under the act since its inception in 1956 can be cited:

First. Thirty-six million rural people now have new or improved public library service.

Second. Approximately 115 rural counties and more than 120 New England towns have been introduced to library service for the first time.

Third. More than 8 million books and 300 new bookmobiles have been placed at the service of rural communities.

Fourth. The quality of the program has been enhanced by the strengthening of State library agencies, including the addition of some 115 field consultants to carry out the programs under the State plans.

Fifth. Most telling of all, perhaps, is the fact that largely under the stimulation of the Library Services Act, since 1956 State funds for the development of rural public library service have increased approximately 92 percent and local appropriations by some 73 percent.

The total cash grants to local libraries from State revenues in 1956 were $4,365,000; in fiscal 1962, they are $16,766,000, nearly four times as much.

Rural people have responded by using their new and improved library services. In my own State of Alabama, the circulation of books and other library materials has increased from over 6 million in 1955–56 to well over 9 million during 1959–60, a 50-percent increase. With more books and other resources at their disposal, citizens of Alabama are demanding longer hours of library service. Local and State support of public libraries in that State has increased by approximately 70 percent.

In Alabama the improved status of libraries has become a cooperative venture between the State library agency and organized groups such as home demonstration clubs, the Alabama Federated Women's Clubs, the American Association of University Women, Pilot International, and others. The junior chamber of commerce's Operation Library played a direct role in the development of five county library programs.

Shifts in population, greater industrialization, positive bids for tourist trade, mechanized farming and dairying, higher standards for education all indicate that Alabama is not in a state of apathy or lassitude. And public libraries and the Alabama Public Library Service, with the stimulation of the Library Services Act, are a part of, and a leader in, this exciting development.

It has been a source of gratification to me to have been associated with both the original passage and the extension in 1960 of the Library Services Act. That President Kennedy recognizes the important contribution of this program to the Nation is clear from the following letter which I received from him at the time when passage of the extension of the act was pending in the House of Representatives:

U.S. SENATE,
Washington, D.C., August 19, 1960.

Hon. CARL ELLIOTT,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CARL: I should like to congratulate you on the magnificent fight you have made to assure the extension of the Library Services Act. I am confident that when the House acts under a suspension of rules on August 22 the bill will be passed.

As you know, I have long had a similar interest in the extension of this act, and supported it both in committee and when it passed the Senate.

When this program was first inaugurated in 1956, some 76 million people in rural communities had little or no library service. By the stimulus provided by this program, in which 49 of the 50 States now participate on a matching basis, library facilities have been available to even the smallest towns. I understand that some 5 million books have been purchased, and 200 bookmobiles have been put in operation. The program is an important asset to our Nation. It helps provide both recreation for our minds and strength and vitality for our human resources.

With every good wish, I am,
Sincerely yours,

JOHN F. KENNEDY.

Questionnaire Returns

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. E. Y. BERRY

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 15, 1962

Mr. BERRY. Mr. Speaker, each year I send out a questionnaire to all addresses and boxholders in my district covering the principal issues that will confront Congress in the coming session.

In January I sent out such a questionnaire receiving back about 11 percent. The results and some of the comments follow:

Questionnaire returns

	Percentage		
	Yes	No	No opinion
1. The administration has requested legislation authorizing the withholding of taxes on dividends and interest by banks and savings institutions. Do you approve?	28	68	4
2. Medical care for the aged will be an important issue in this session. Check the system you favor:			
(a) Compulsory program under the social security system, financed by an increase in social security taxes	16		
(b) Voluntary health insurance for everyone over 65, with Federal assistance where the individual is unable to pay premium	35		
(c) State-administered program of welfare care for medically indigent	49		
3. President Kennedy has requested authority to extend the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act, with authority to cut all tariffs drastically. He suggests Federal subsidies to industries injured by imports, and retraining for workers losing their jobs as a consequence. Would you favor this lowering of trade barriers?	23	73	4
4. A 1-cent increase in 1st-class postal rates and approximately 25 percent increase in 2d- and 3d-class rates has been requested by the President. Do you favor?	46	52	2
5. The President has asked that this country buy up to $100 million of the $200 million bond issue which the United Nations finds necessary to meet its obligation in the Congo and elsewhere. Do you approve?	20	74	6
6. The establishment of a Cabinet post of Secretary of Urban Affairs and Housing has been proposed by the administration. Do you favor?	16	79	5
7. Should the foreign aid program be retained at its present level?	30	61	9
8. The administration plans to offer farm legislation providing stricter controls through production and marketing quotas and compulsory land retirement. Do you approve?	21	74	5
9. A $2,600,000 program of Federal assistance for college classroom construction and scholarships will be considered this session. Do you favor?	39	57	4
10. Do you favor—			
(a) continuation and expansion of the Peace Corps?	44	44	12
(b) a nationwide fallout shelter program costing $¾ billion?	19	76	5
(c) providing educational benefits for peacetime veterans?	37	60	3
(d) making labor unions subject to antitrust laws?	86	8	6
(e) increasing the national debt ceiling by $10 billion?	14	84	2
(f) presidential authority to raise and lower income taxes?	9	88	3
(g) admission of Red China to the United Nations?	6	85	9

In 1774 a great British statesman by the name of Edmund Burke described the responsibilities and obligations of both public officials and constituents in these words:

"Certainly, gentlemen, it ought to be the happiness and glory of a representative to live in the strictest union, the closest correspondence, and the most unreserved communication with his constituents. Their wishes ought to have great weight with him; their opinions high respect; their business unremitted attention. It is his duty to sacrifice his repose, his pleasure, his satisfactions, in theirs—and above all, ever, and in all cases, to prefer their interest to his own.

"But his unbiased opinion, his mature judgment, his enlightened conscience, he ought not to sacrifice to you, to any man, or to any set of men living. These he does not derive from your pleasure, no, nor from the law and the constitution. They are a trust from Providence, for the abuse of which he is deeply answerable. Your representative owes you, not his industry only, but his judgment; and he betrays, instead of serving you, if he sacrifices it to your opinion."

I would add to this, however, that your opinion helps in forming the judgment of your Representatives. I would like to quote from some of the many thoughtful statements:

Spending: "Philanthrophies must be governed by the purse." "Am wondering how long the goose will be able to lay the golden egg." "Come down to earth; don't spend so much money." "Let's not try to spend ourselves rich." "The Nation is as optimistic as a couple of teenagers getting married with no income to support extravagant tastes." "The basic law of chemistry is that you cannot make something from nothing." "When someone gets something for nothing, someone else gets nothing for something."

Taxes: One lady said, "My boss can deduct the money he spends for whisky, but my husband can't deduct the gas he uses to drive to work." Another referred to the "Department of back-door spending and contingent liabilities." Another said, "If communism is going to bury us, we should be stubborn enough not to dig our own grave." Another: "Talk about horse and buggy days, we are allowed only a $600 tax deduction and are trying to raise and educate our children under horse-and-buggy deductions."

Farm program: "I trust you will support the President's program." "I prefer a few rough years to socialism." "Struggle made this country." "Mr. Freeman must have misunderstood the President. The President

said, 'Let's get the country moving,' and Mr. Freedman thought he said, 'Let's get the country moving into town.'" Referring to the farm message, one said, "Would he still be referring to this country as part of the free world?"

Centralization of power: "I thought it was the responsibility of the people through Congress to levy taxes, tariffs and appropriate funds. That's your job; don't give that right of the people away, too." "I am strongly opposed to increasing the power of the President." "Still the power of socialism everywhere." "One world socialism." "Let's not vest any more power and authority in one man." "Any retaining action that will prevent us from becoming completely socialized under the New Frontier would be in the right direction." "It looks like creeping socialism is now walking." One referred to Attorney General Robert Kennedy as "the ambassador of international interference."

Foreign aid: A number said, "Foreign aid should be sharply reduced." Many others said: "No foreign aid to any Communist country." "If we can't stop communism in this country, at least we can stop the spread of their propaganda at taxpayers' expense." "We should know by now we can't buy friends."

Tariffs: "Better admit 5 million workers into this country. They would at least contribute something to our economy. When they compete overseas, they take the jobs of our workers without any contribution to our tax economy." "The Constitution provides that it is the duty of Congress, not the President, to levy tariffs." "If we must defend the free world, these countries should at least be willing to contribute something to their own defense on the products they sell here."

Conservatism: "In all the talk that is being stirred up over conservatism, it should be remembered there is no threat to the Constitution from conservatism, there is no threat to the free enterprise system from conservatism, there is no threat to individual freedom from conservatism, and certainly there is no threat to the next generation from conservatism."

A Tribute to St. Patrick

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD P. BOLAND
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 15, 1962

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, there have been only a handful of great teachers in the history of man. And if there is anything to the so-called luck of the Irish, I would say it is mainly that they have had the luck to be taught by two of the greats: Our Lord Jesus Christ and Patrick, the patron saint of Ireland.

The principles, of course, were those of Jesus; the instrument of their teaching: Patrick.

Emerging from slavery in Ireland, Patrick entered the church and, as a bishop, returned to the land of his captivity to serve the Lord and at the same time to serve the Irish, under whom he had suffered slavery.

Here was the first great principle of Jesus, set forth by a loving believer: that to punish those who do wrong is nothing compared to showing them the true light and the path to righteousness. This Patrick was able to do through service to the Irish people, converting them—each and every one—to the cause of Jesus Christ, the Saviour.

In the centuries following the death of Patrick, his followers were able to employ his principles to such an extent as to render Ireland one of the outstanding nations of the earth, in the matter of devotion, courage, and the pursuit of democratic principles. Moreover, St. Patrick imbued in the Irish people a spirit of freedom so all engrossing and so permanent, as to prevent their subjugation by any foreign power. True, they have been required on occasison to yield, temporarily, to the power of superior military force. But so great is the Irish spirit and so firm the resolution of the Irish heart that one fact has been borne out, time and again: that the rulers of Ireland cannot rule according only to their whim; that the people will not stand for it, and will in fact demand a popular government based on principles indorsed by the people as a whole.

This is beyond doubt the result of St. Patrick's work. For just as he could not and would not abide the slaveholding policies of his pagan masters, so his followers today refuse to accept the slightest hint of tyranny.

That is Patrick's legacy to the Irish people; that, and their overall faith in the Christian principles he held so dear.

Recognizing the value of his teaching, in the overall struggle for human decency, the freedom-loving peoples of the earth salute his name today—regardless of their faith, regardless of all, save that here was a man—a saintly man—devoted to justice, to learning, to freedom, and to love.

These are qualities respected wherever the name of God is respected; qualities which have established St. Patrick as one of the greatest of all historical figures in the record of human existence.

George C. Eliades

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. F. BRADFORD MORSE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 15, 1962

Mr. MORSE. Mr. Speaker, my home city of Lowell, Mass., and yes, the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, suffered a great loss recently in the death of George C. Eliades, a former chief executive of Lowell. George Eliades came to the United States from his birthplace in Asia Minor when he was 21 years old. He knew the hardships of life in the Old World and recognized his responsibilities as a citizen of his adopted land.

He was a graduate of Boston University Law School and practiced in Lowell for over 35 years. He was the first American citizen of Greek heritage to serve as mayor of any city in the United States.

He served the people in almost every capacity of service. He was president of the Lowell Bar Association and one of its most respected members. His work in the Greek-American community was acknowledged by the King and Queen of Greece when he and Mrs. Eliades were their guests at the royal palace in Athens.

My hometown and my State have suffered a great loss in the death of this distinguished citizen. My heartfelt sympathy goes to his devoted wife and family.

The Hungarian Revolution of 1848

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PETER W. RODINO, JR.
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 15, 1962

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, today, March 15, is the 114th anniversary of the Hungarian Revolution of 1848. It is appropriate and fitting to observe this anniversary in the United States of America where one of the leaders of the revolution, Lajos Kossuth, was enthusiastically welcomed after he fled from his oppressors following the defeat of the Hungarian Army.

When the news of the February revolt in Paris and the mass demonstrations in Vienna on March 13 reached Budapest, a young poet, Sandor Petofi, was inspired to write a paean to Hungarian nationalism. His fellow conspirators—poets, lawyers, law students, and undergraduates—marched to the Landerer Printing House on March 15, 1848, seized the printing press and printed Petofi's national song. They also printed a list of national demands which had long been pressed by Kossuth in his many stirring articles.

The national demands—the March laws—called for responsible government, equality before the law, universal taxation, popular representation, abolition of serfdom, and union with Transylvania. It is a measure of the reactionary character of the Austrian Empire that such long overdue reforms could be achieved only by outbursts of violence. The Emperor was forced to accede to these demands in April 1848.

Unfortunately, the coalition of political factions which united on the March laws fell apart almost immediately. The diverse nationality groups which made up Hungary pressed for their own narrow goals or reverted to conservatism.

In September of 1848 Hungary was invaded by the Austrian Army. Hungary was placed under martial law, and the Hungarian ministry resigned. Kossuth headed up a committee of national defense.

Under the Emperor Francis Joseph a new constitution was adopted which led the Hungarian Parliament to declare itself an independent state. Kossuth was declared Governor, and the Hungarian generals recaptured the capital in May.

However, the Hungarian victory was short lived. The Emperor called upon Czar Nicholas I for help. Hungary was once more invaded—from the west by the Austrians and from the north by the

Russians. The Hungarian Army was crushed between the two forces of the enemy and surrendered on August 13, 1849.

The Austrian General Haynau, called the Hyena of Brescia for his atrocities in Italy, executed the Hungarian national leader, Batthyany, and 13 of the Hungarian generals who were afterward known as the martyrs of Arad. The poet Petofi had disappeared in battle. Kossuth escaped to Turkey and later went to England and the United States. Thousands of Hungarians fled the country, finding asylum and happiness in our own Nation.

Impressed into the Austro-Hungarian Empire, ruled by the Emperor of Austria, the Hungarian people kept bright the flame of liberty in their hearts and spirits. Finally, with the defeat of the Central Powers in World War I, the dissolution of the short-lived Empire, and the disappearance of the Hapsburgs, the Hungarian people seized the opportunity for self-expression and formed their own government.

Following World War II, in 1947, the courageous nation was again overwhelmed by outside forces, as the Reds moved in and forced President Tildy out of office. With the revered memory of their forefathers of 108 years before as their inspiration, the Hungarian people again revolted against oppression. But again they were crushed by the Russian hordes, even as they had been in the previous century. Again the refugees from this conflict fled their country rather than be killed or forced to live in enslavement. And, once more, thousands found refuge in the United States of America.

On this 114th anniversary of their epic struggle for liberty and freedom, I join with my Hungarian friends, American friends of Hungarian ancestry, and lovers of freedom everywhere in the prayer that liberty and peace will again prevail in this nation where though the land has often been, the minds and hearts of those who live there have never been conquered.

Max Strumpf, Career Man

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES S. JOELSON
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 15, 1962

Mr. JOELSON. Mr. Speaker, I have learned with much pleasure from the Honorable Stanley O. Styles, able Comptroller of Customs at the Port of New York, of the half century of loyal service of a dedicated public servant, Max Strumpf.

Mr. Strumpf entered the Government service at the customhouse on August 16, 1911, as a messenger boy. He was promoted to the position of clerk in 1917 and advanced to customs liquidator in 1923 and supervisory liquidator in 1949. He was appointed to his present position of Assistant Deputy Comptroller in 1952.

Because of his long experience and wide knowledge, the Bureau of Customs in Washington designated him for special assignments in 1929 to the port of San Francisco, in 1931 to the port of New Orleans, and in 1943 to the port of Laredo. In these districts he assisted the administrative officers in eliminating heavy arrearages in liquidations and was a consultant to establish procedures to expedite the workload.

Mr. Strumpf is a charter member of the National Customs Services Association and the founder of the New York Customhouse Employees Federal Credit Union. He was cited for his efforts in behalf of the U.S. Treasury bond sales program.

A diamond-studded pin for 50 years service was awarded in recognition of his service, presented by Comptroller Styles in the present of his fellow employees on February 28, 1962, at the customhouse.

Mr. Strumpf has lived in the Bronx for over 40 years and presently resides with his wife and family at 1777 Grand Concourse. He is a charter member of the Harvar Society of the U.S. Customs.

Public Opinion Poll

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT J. CORBETT
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 15, 1962

Mr. CORBETT. Mr. Speaker, I am here reporting the findings of my most recent poll of public opinion in my congressional district. This district comprises most all of northern Allegheny County, including three wards of the city of Pittsburgh. It is largely industrial and residential with some coal mining and farming in the areas farthest removed from Pittsburgh.

There are a few thousand more registered Democrats than Republicans in the district and all were given an equal opportunity to reply. For purposes of accurate evaluation it is safe to assume that a somewhat greater number of Republicans than Democrats responded.

The tabulated results in percentage figures follow without any editorial content:

1. Do you favor a Federal program to create public fallout shelters for up to 50 million persons? Yes, 24 percent; no, 76 percent.

2. Would you vote for the United States to buy $100 million worth of U.N. bonds? Yes, 32 percent; no, 68 percent.

3. Do you favor foreign aid for countries behind the Iron Curtain like Poland and Yugoslavia that show some independence from Russia. Yes, 32 percent; no, 68 percent.

4. Should the Peace Corps be expanded? Yes, 46 percent; no, 54 percent.

5. The President desires the power to adjust personal income taxes up or down subject to congressional veto. Should he be given this right? Yes, 26 percent; no, 74 percent.

6. Are you in favor of Federal aid for public schools below the college level? Yes, 38 percent; no, 62 percent.

7. Would you vote for medical care for the aged financed through social security payments? Yes, 56 percent; no, 44 percent.

8. Do you think that the United States should resume atmospheric testing of nuclear devices? Yes, 74 percent; no, 26 percent.

9. Do you believe that we should set up a Federal Department of Urban Affairs and Housing? Yes, 25 percent; no, 75 percent.

10. Do you share the President's opinion that there will be no important inflation in the next few years? Yes, 22 percent; no, 78 percent.

11. Should the President be given further power to lower tariffs? Yes, 41 percent; no, 59 percent.

12. Do you think the President is doing a good job in domestic affairs? Yes, 47 percent; no, 53 percent.

13. Do you think he is doing well in foreign affairs? Yes, 42 percent; no, 58 percent.

14. Should the United States fight if necessary to retain the freedom of West Berlin? Yes, 80 percent; no, 20 percent.

Voice of Faith and Brotherhood

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CRAIG HOSMER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 15, 1962

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, on March 11 an event of significance occurred in the city of Long Beach under sponsorship of the religious community of that city including Catholic, Greek Orthodox, Jewish, and Protestant churches. It was the uniting of all Long Beach church choirs into a gigantic song festival appropriately called the voice of faith and brotherhood.

The idea was conceived several years ago by members of the Long Beach B'nai B'rith Lodge as a suitable observance for Brotherhood Week. Some 30 choirs took part in the festival held at the Long Beach municipal auditorium and attended by large numbers of the area's residents. James Weeks, minister of music at the First Congregational Church acted as musical director of the combined choirs, assisted by Rolla Alford, choir director of the First Methodist Church. Chairmen and coordinators for the event were Mr. Gene Lentzner, president of the Long Beach B'nai B'rith Lodge and Rev. Donald C. Cooke, minister of the North Long Beach Methodist Church and chairman of the Human Relations Committee of the Long Beach Council of Churches.

The church choirs participating in this event, together with the names of their choir directors, were the following:

Bay Shore Community Congregational Church, Helene Allen; Bixby Knolls Christian Church, Carole Smith; Calvary Baptist Church, Rocco Leggett; Calvary Presbyterian Church, Ray

Chace; Christ Presbyterian Church, Mildred Leaman; Cross Roads Community Church, June Sams; East Side Christian Church, Marion Miller; First Church of the Brethren, Robert Walker; First Congregational Church, James Weeks; First Methodist Church, Rolla Alford; First Presbyterian Church, Frank Pooler; Grace Methodist Church, Phil Haynes; Greek Orthodox Church, Nick Karidokis; Lakewood First Presbyterian Church, Mrs. James Lobbett; Los Altos United Congregational Church, Leon Smith; New Hope Baptist Church, Hazel Henderson; North Long Beach Christian Church, Lloyd Todd; North Long Beach Community Presbyterian Church, Gilbert Philo; North Long Beach Methodist Church, Ted Gardner; Second Presbyterian Church, Martha Smith; Silverado Park Community Methodist Church, Robert Goodwin; Starr King United Presbyterian Church, Wallace Schurr; St. Bartholomew Catholic Church, Henry Keating; St. Cornelius Catholic Church, William Schreeweis; St. Matthews Catholic Church, Gardner Roth; St. Timothy's Episcopal Church—Compton, Edgar Carswell; Temple Israel, Mabel Persons; Temple Sinai, Morris Greenfield; Trinity Evangelical Lutheran Church, Harold Agal; and Trinity Methodist Church—Lakewood, Robert Thorpe.

Clergymen participating in the voice of faith and brotherhood program were as follows:

Welcome: Rev. Wendell Tredick, minister, First Presbyterian Church.

Invocation: Rev. Nicholas Billiris, pastor, Assumption of the Blessed Virgin, Greek Orthodox.

Scripture: Rabbi Wolli Kaelter.

Offering: Rev. Donald Cooke, minister, North Long Beach Methodist Church.

Benediction: Rev. John B. Fitzgerald, St. Bartholomew Church.

A Tribute to St. Patrick

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PETER W. RODINO, JR.
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 15, 1962

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, St. Patrick, the patron saint of Ireland, has proven to be as remarkable in death as he was in life. For seldom in history does a man of local prominence and the hero of a single people come to serve as an outstanding symbol to persons of every faith and every clime. Yet this has been the case with St. Patrick, and so it shall be, so long as the qualities he possessed retain the respect of freedom-loving people everywhere.

Enslaved at an early age, St. Patrick escaped his bonds to enter the ministry in France, and when he returned to Ireland, the land of his captivity, he did so in the role of a bishop.

In this capacity he baptized thousands upon thousands of persons, ordained a great many ministers and established the Christian church in a land theretofore dominated by paganism. Moreover, so great was his zeal that Ireland became and stands today as one of the most devout Christian nations of the earth.

No wonder, then, that St. Patrick evolved, in the eyes of the Irish people, into the great symbol of Christian values. It was he, they say, who drove the snakes and toads from Ireland. But far more than that: It was he who brought the light of God to an area where previously there had been no light, but merely superstition.

Nor was that all. He also provided the great example of Christian forebearance, seeking not to punish those who had enslaved him, but to reward them with the kindness of his nature. This he did throughout the full 30 years of his service as bishop in Ireland, notwithstanding the severe treatment he had received there in his youth as a slave.

The example of St. Patrick's love and devotion to the cause of Jesus Christ has won him a fame far outranking that of most other Christian saints, until today his name is known far beyond the confines of Ireland and beyond even the confines of the Christian world.

Indeed, so impressive were his talents as a teacher, philosopher and servant of the Lord, that his day—St. Patrick's Day—is no longer a time for celebration on the part of the Irish people alone. For he has come to be recognized as a universal symbol—the symbol of freedom, education, and the good life; qualities dear to the heart of every member of the civilized world community. The divinity of the principles of St. Patrick renders him one of the outstanding figures in Christian history, today in this era, and tomorrow, in the many eras to come.

Since the 17th of March this year falls on a Saturday, and we shall not be here assembled, I shall take the opportunity and pleasure now of joining with millions of non-Irish people in saluting both St. Patrick and the Irish in tribute to his and their contributions to the improvement of life around us in this and the other Chamber of this building, in another part of the city, across our whole Nation, and in fact everywhere men live on this earth.

Space Effort Spurs U.S. Economy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. VICTOR L. ANFUSO
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 15, 1962

Mr. ANFUSO. Mr. Speaker, I was privileged this afternoon to participate in a panel discussion at the annual space-missile conference held at the Sheraton Park Hotel in Washington, where I discussed the impact of the space program on the economy of the country. I cited several interesting examples where space research is already producing results and benefits for everyday living.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to insert into the RECORD the text of my address at the above conference:

REMARKS BY THE HONORABLE VICTOR L. ANFUSO, REPRESENTATIVE FROM NEW YORK, AT THE ANNUAL SPACE-MISSILE CONFERENCE, THURSDAY, MARCH 15, 1962, WASHINGTON, D.C.

In his message on the state of the Union, delivered to Congress in January of 1962, President Kennedy said that the objective of our national space program "is to develop—in a new frontier of science, commerce and cooperation—the position of the United States and the free world."

Why is this country going all-out into space? You've heard many reasons given: Scientific knowledge, national defense, international cooperation and prestige. These are good reasons. But there are also bread-and-butter reasons, dollar-and-cents reasons, which we're here to talk about today. Basically, the space program is expected to produce a number of valuable payoffs. It's not only expected to do so, it's doing so right now.

Government spending on space programs acts directly as an economic spur. The Government is already spending billions of dollars on space research and development, billions more on space hardware. These sums are growing rapidly year by year. As you know, they are spread across the whole industrial spectrum from plastics to electronics. In addition to creating new jobs—nearly a million already—and virtually new industries such as cryogenics and solid rocketry, this vast national effort has generated a tidal wave of new technology—many new materials, devices, and processes. In a moment, I will give you a number of striking examples.

The future looks even brighter. New scientific knowledge resulting from research always takes time to become useful. Yet historical experience shows that this is the real payoff, that fundamental new knowledge produces an even greater harvest of benefits than even the most spectacular invention.

Of course, no one can predict all the future applications of new knowledge. General Gavin has told us that the developers of the atomic bomb, less than 20 years ago, were unable to foresee the use of isotopes in medicine, industry, and agriculture. So you will excuse me if I merely suggest some general areas where basic space research seems likely to result in widespread economic benefits.

One such area is power sources—power not only from atoms but from fuel cells, plasma, ions, and solar and photoelectric cells. For instance, 10 towns along the Mason-Dixon line are preparing to experiment, and will light themselves by plasma. Another promising area involves the sources and uses of water, including the extraction of valuable elements from sea water. Still others are noise engineering, computer technology, and solid-state physics. A final example is the study of superconductivity, which holds promise of maintaining high magnetic fields with relatively low power.

Some commentators have suggested that this country is now standing at the threshold of the fourth industrial revolution. There is plenty of evidence to support their belief.

If we look back in time to the beginning of the 18th century and before, we see a technology in which the basic materials were wood and iron, and the sources of power were wind and muscle. The first industrial revolution followed and resulted from the widespread introduction of steel and steam. Then, in the 19th century, better and cheaper

steel became available, and electricity and internal-combustion engines came into general use. This may be called the second industrial revolution. A third similar change occurred in World War II and the postwar period with the growing use of synthetics, plastics, and alloys, and the introduction of atomic energy. Today, if we look around us at the new technologies and their applications in transportation, communications, and industry, we find good reason to think that another such major change is in the making.

In the past, each industrial revolution has transformed the world. Each has promoted economic growth and progress by providing new and greater opportunities for investment, enterprise, and employment. We may confidently expect the fourth industrial revolution to produce the same results as its predecessors.

Now let me turn to the space technologies that have already arrived in the sense that we now have, or can soon produce or use, the resulting materials, devices and processes.

Among these, I include the commercial uses of satellites, particularly for long-range communications. Whatever the roles and relations of Government and private industry in this field may turn out to be, there is no doubt of the benefits that will accrue to all the populations of the world. Furthermore, there is good reason to believe that private enterprise will play a major role in operating space systems—not only satellite systems but possibly rocket transport as well. Many people have forgotten the proposal made by the Wiesner report, just over a year ago, that the Government set up a special organization to direct the Federal support of space activities. This proposal envisioned that some important space activities would be conducted by private enterprise. Nothing has happened since to change that basic assumption.

A variety of other processes, materials, and devices resulting from space research are becoming available now, in our own lifetimes. These have already found applications in the home, the factory, the hospital, the marketplace, and on the highway. For example, remote-control television switches enable us to turn a program on or off without moving from our chairs. Pyroceram, a ceramic developed for missile nose cones, is used to make pots and pans that can be taken from the freezer and put immediately on the stove without damage. Many new methods have been applied to metallurgy—one for extruding beryllium, another for making a fluxless aluminum solder, still another for ultrasonic welding of high-temperature metals.

Newly developed tools for doing the work of a wrench or a screw driver are operated with a mere squeeze of the fingers. One of the richest fields of application has been medicine. A drug developed from a missile propellant (hydrazine) is now used to treat mental illness. Two other medical applications are made possible by the greatly reduced size of electronic equipment. One is an "electronic nurse," which monitors heartbeat, temperature, blood pressure and breathing, permits a patient to be watched by remote control, and broadcasts a warning if the patient is in trouble. The other is a Cardiac Pacemaker powered by tiny mercury batteries, which supplies electrical stimulation to keep the heart functioning while the patient leads a normal life. The same electronic techniques can reduce a complete radio to the size of a lump of sugar. These techniques are now applied to a variety of uses, from wrist watches to automobiles.

Perhaps the most dramatic application of space technology to medicine is the use of space suits for victims of strokes and similar afflictions. Space suits were designed to maintain the normal bood circulation of astronauts. Today, they are being used to do the same thing for victims of circulatory disorders. Victims of strokes, such as President Kennedy's father, are often unable to walk or even stand without losing consciousness. But specially adapted space suits can maintain the normal blood pressure of these people, enabling them to sit up, stand or even walk. In the near future, it may not be uncommon to see people walking around in space suits who are not astronauts at all and who until recently would still be bedridden patients.

Hundreds of other examples could be given to show the benefits already produced by the space program for everyday living.

What I have just described are only the first fruits. The full harvest will keep growing, down the length of human history.

Civil Rights Action

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK KOWALSKI
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 15, 1962

Mr. KOWALSKI. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced today five bills to curb certain discriminatory practices in voting, education, employment, housing, and the administration of justice.

These bills are identical with S. 2979, S. 2980, S. 2981, S. 2982, and S. 2983 which were introduced on Tuesday by Senators KEATING, JAVITS, CLARK, SCOTT, and HART, respectively, for themselves and other Senators. Senator DOUGLAS is the principal cosponsor of these bills.

These bills are based on legislative recommendations of the U.S. Civil Rights Commission, contained in five reports filed by the Commission last fall. The reports of the Commission's 2-year study and investigation present its comprehensive findings and recommendations relating to discrimination in the abovementioned fields because of race, color, religion, or national origin.

The first bill, the Federal Voting Rights Act of 1962, would outlaw practices which are used in some States to deny citizens the right to vote because of their race and color. Under its provisions, such discriminatory devices as the poll tax and property qualifications would be abolished and States employing literacy tests would be required to accept 6 years of formal education as proof of literacy.

The second bill, the Federal Equality of Education Act of 1962, is designed to speed up public school desegregation by requiring school boards that have failed to desegregate to file with the Attorney General within 180 days a plan providing for at least first-step compliance when schools open next fall. It would also provide financial and technical assistance to aid school desegregation and it would restrict Federal aid for segregated public schools and institutions of higher education.

The third bill calls for the establishment of a Commission on Equal Employment Opportunity. The Commission would be charged with halting discrimination in Government employment and in employment connected with Government contracts and Federal grants-in-aid. In addition, it would also make it an unfair labor practice for a labor union to discriminate against its members or against applicants for membership because of race, color, religion, or national origin.

In accordance with the Civil Rights Commission recommendations on equal housing opportunity, I have introduced a fourth bill that would provide relocation assistance to families displaced by highway clearance programs.

The fifth bill seeks to curb police brutality and mob violence with police connivance by holding State and local governments liable under Federal law for the actions of police officers. Another provision is aimed at prohibiting the practice of excluding members of minority groups from serving on juries.

I will at a later date introduce additional legislation based on other of the Commission's recommendations.

Discrimination is a slap in the face of human dignity. It damages the fabric of our entire society. It shadows the lives of millions of Americans. The Civil Rights Commission has suggested a reasonable and proper course of action, and sooner or later Congress will have to grapple with its responsibilities.

I hope and trust that Members of the House will grant these bills the same bipartisan support that so distinguished Tuesday's action in the Senate, and I urge that they may be made law.

The United States at the World's Fair

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BENJAMIN S. ROSENTHAL
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 15, 1962

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I would like to include herein an editorial which appeared in yesterday's New York Times, entitled "The United States at the World's Fair":

[From the New York Times, Mar. 14, 1962]

THE UNITED STATES AT THE WORLD'S FAIR

President Kennedy asked Congress yesterday for $25 million to build and furnish with exhibits a United States pavilion at the New York World's Fair, which is scheduled to open April 22, 1964. He thus confirmed his earlier promise of support. Now it is up to Congress to do promptly what has been too long delayed: endorse the planning and construction of a showcase that will document before the world our way of life.

It is not easy making a world's fair. But Robert Moses and his organization have dogged confidence in the final success that this enterprise deserves. We are now past the midway point between start of basic planning and the opening day celebration, when an expected 70 million visitors will begin coming through the gates.

The contracts and commitments by nations, by States, by business and industry guarantee an exciting show. It would be unthinkable for the United States to go into this half-heartedly, or fail to provide a

pavilion appropriate to the occasion. Time is wasting. There is no excuse for any serious delay on this question in Congress.

Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that the New York World's Fair is located in the congressional district I have the honor of representing in Congress, I was naturally very pleased when President Kennedy requested funds of the Congress for the building of a U.S. pavilion and for extensive exhibits. As an endorsement of the request for $25 million for the above-mentioned purposes, I sent similar telegrams to President Kennedy and to Hon. Robert Moses, president of the Fair Corp., offering my cooperation in every way possible in insuring the outstanding success of this forthcoming fair.

A copy of my telegram to President Kennedy follows:

MARCH 13, 1962.

Hon. JOHN F. KENNEDY,
The President,
The White House,
Washington, D.C.:

As the Member of Congress in whose district the New York World's Fair will be situated, I am delighted that you have today requested of the Congress $25 million to build a U.S. pavilion and provide extensive exhibits at the fair. There can be no doubt but that the residents of my district, together with the entire country, are tremendously excited about the forthcoming fair. We recognize that not only will we receive a great deal of personal satisfaction in viewing these exhibits, but we also realize that the fair plays an important role in permitting communications, out of normal diplomatic channels, with foreign countries and their peoples—which is all important in furthering the cause of peace. I sincerely hope that you will call upon me to render assistance in the Congress on behalf of this great project.

Congressman BENJAMIN S. ROSENTHAL.

Hail to James A. Farley on St. Patrick's Day: "We'll All Be in Step With Jim"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUGH L. CAREY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 15, 1962

Mr. CAREY. Mr. Speaker, on Saturday, March 17, the feast of St. Patrick in all of the Americas, Erin's harps shall wake again in rapture from their slumber. In the shadow of the Andes, the specter of Bernardo O'Higgins, son of the Irishman, Ambrosio, will tread again the trail of Chilean liberation. The seas that wash the continent will be greener and brighter as the memory of a County Wexford man, Comdr. John Barry of the American Navy stirs in sailors' hearts. Across the plains and along the river banks of Missouri, Minnesota, and Illinois the heroic figure of Gen. James Shields will rise again in magnitude. Senator James Shields of Illinois, the same man was born in Altmore in County Tyrone—yes, "Tyrone among the bushes." Well did Illinois count him its illustrious son and place his image in Statuary Hall of the Capitol. No other American has represented three States, in the U.S. Senate, as did General Shields as Member, not only from Illinois, but later Minnesota and finally Missouri.

But the frame of reference to great Americans of Gaelic origin rests not solely in the past.

On Saturday, March 17, New York City will observe the 200th anniversary of the commemoration of St. Patrick's feast day in our city. From 1762 to 1962 this day has grown in size and significance until we may properly say that on St. Patrick's Day everyone who is Irish is happy and everyone who is happy is Irish. For this celebration unites all New Yorkers regardless of origin. It is fitting on this bicentennial occasion that our grand marshal for the parade up Fifth Avenue will be one of our State and Nation's finest sons, Hon. James A. Farley, former Postmaster General of the United States. "Big Jim" will lead us well, as he has led our people in fairness, faith in God and country, and the exercise of principles of democracy through every day of his manly life. When we are in step with Jim we move toward greatness and on Saturday next we will all be in step with Jim. From on high the corps of O'Higgins, Shields, and Barry should be well pleased to gaze upon the splendor of 100 marching bands, the spectacle of a million parading and watching along the way, and the flags of faith and freedom proudly flying. And Edmund Burke, Thomas Moore, Daniel O'Connell may well join them in approbation for the marshal of the 1962 St. Patrick's parade will one day stand with them in greatness. Until he does, it is my hope that James A. Farley, businessman, politician, philosopher, and patriot will continue to lead us not only on St. Patrick's Day but through the next decade in active participation in the government of our State and Nation.

Public Welfare Amendments of 1962

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM J. GREEN, JR.
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 15, 1962

Mr. GREEN of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, the public assistance and child welfare titles of the Social Security Act provide a Federal-State partnership in public welfare.

I believe that it is important to recognize that this partnership has been highly successful in promoting the general welfare of all the people.

The public assistance programs were developed during the great depression to meet the massive problem of millions of persons without enough money to buy the necessities of life. Therefore, these programs were designed to evaluate an applicant's financial need and give him the amount of money he needed. The design was good. The Federal-State partnership does meet financial need with flexibility patterned upon conditions in each State.

Today, many of our fellow citizens still need financial help. However, the reasons for this need vary from family to family.

Most persons receiving public assistance today are either young children, aged, or disabled. Others are unemployed because their jobs disappeared because of changes in technology.

To meet the needs of our time, the public assistance program must become a public welfare program. It is necessary to continue money payments but we need to help our most unfortunate fellow citizens become independent of public charity.

This requires services to help families become self-supporting, prevention of dependency by dealing with the causes, incentives to the recipients to improve their condition and to the States to improve their welfare program, rehabilitation of recipients, promotion of individual independence through community work and training programs, and training of public welfare personnel to enable them to reach these goals.

This also requires an expansion and improvement of the traditional Federal-State partnership. Public assistance should become true public welfare. Public and private agencies should work together. Agencies for children, for the handicapped, for the aged, for the socially maladjusted are all needed and the work of all of them has to be organized for maximum efficiency.

H.R. 10606 now being considered by the Congress is designed to accomplish these purposes.

On December 17, 1961, the Honorable Ruth Grigg Horting, Pennsylvania secretary of public welfare, endorsed these changes as proposed by Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, Abraham Ribicoff.

On February 2, 1962, the Honorable David L. Lawrence, Governor of Pennsylvania, said:

President Kennedy's compassionate and economically sound welfare program presented to Congress yesterday, emphasizing the rehabilitation and prevention phases of public welfare, deserves wholehearted support.

The President's program with emphasis on rehabilitation to restore dignity and independence to the needy is a direct approach to one of the most critical problems of government, and will greatly help our State program already patterned along the same line.

The Pennsylvania State Board of Public Welfare, under the chairmanship of the Honorable Harry Boyer, also endorsed H.R. 10606 by a resolution adopted on March 1, 1962. The resolution follows:

Whereas the Pennsylvania Board of Public Welfare recognizes that the basic purpose of public assistance is to help those in financial need through circumstances beyond their control; and

Whereas after many years of public welfare services which consisted largely of money payments, President Kennedy and Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, Abraham Ribicoff, have proposed a new approach

stressing social, health, preventative and rehabilitative services instead of support alone; and

Whereas the Pennsylvania State Board of Public Welfare recognizes the vital impact and the overwhelming importance of the general objectives of this approach as a major turning point in the humanitarian public welfare program as a means of helping the needy toward rehabilitation instead of merely giving them the money which they need; and

Whereas many of the principles of the Kennedy-Ribicoff program have long been recognized in Pennsylvania, and in fact put into experimental operation with such projects as the family rehabilitation program; and

Whereas legislation in the form of House bill 10606 has been introduced in Congress to enable early action to assure that the public welfare program, while recognizing day-to-day needs, will also emphasize the return of individuals to the highest degree of self-sufficiency of which they are capable: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Pennsylvania Board of Public Welfare go on record in support of the principles and objective purposes of House bill No. 10606; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be forwarded to Pennsylvania's Representatives and Senators in the Congress and to other interested parties.

St. Patrick and the Irish

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLEVELAND M. BAILEY
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 15, 1962

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Speaker, two Irishmen shared a cell at Sing Sing, the famous—and equally infamous—prison of the State of New York. They were on death row, and while one of them still hoped for successful appeal of his conviction, the other was scheduled to die very soon. Despite his energetic efforts, the appellant was entirely unable to cheer the doomed man, for the latter was in fear for his soul and in terror of the electric chair. Finally, as the poor fellow was led off to be executed, his cellmate had an inspiration: "More power to you," he called. The humor of this rather grisly joke is due to the combination of two desperate elements of our experience: humanity toward the unfortunate and the grim reality which makes them unfortunate. This is a combination which is particularly Irish, for it is the strength of Irish people that their warmth and charity have never distorted the world around them, while their realism has never destroyed their humanity.

The Irish have ever been conscious of their identity as a people, despite the fact that the size, strength, and location of Ireland has subjected them to difficulties which could easily have been avoided by capitulation. There is a story of three men who were discussing their experiences with racing. "The closest race I ever saw," said one, "was an auto race. Car No. 1 had just been repainted, and it won by the thickness of that coat of paint." The second man claimed to have witnessed a horserace where the winner beat the horse behind him only by sticking out his tongue. But the third man was Irish, and he remarked, "The closest race I ever saw is the Scotch." Any joke of this kind, commonly told by Irishman to Irishman is in part a joke on the Irish. No people has ever been so realistic about its own separateness from the world around it as to accumulate such a body of humor about that very subject. I cannot resist another story about the origin of bagpipes. Any discussion of the invention of so important an item as bagpipes is certain to take up time, and after listening to such a conversation for longer than he could bear, an Irishman spoke up as follows: "Sure, the Irish invented bagpipes and sold them to the Scots for a joke. The Scots just have not seen the joke yet." Of course, the English and French have been as much the subjects of Irish scorn as any other people. "Sir," said the Englishman to the Frenchman, "If I were not English I would indeed be French." "And I, Monsieur," returned the other, "would be English were I not French." "Well as for me," the Irishman said in disgust, "if I were not Irish I would be ashamed."

Now all of this has much more to do with St. Patrick than you might imagine at first. Coherence and solidarity as a people in its own right has always been a characteristic of the Irish. When St. Patrick was born—sometime in the fourth century A.D.—Ireland had a much more complex and well-organized society than is generally credited to it. Seven semi-independent rulers acknowledged the supremacy of the High King, or Ard Ri, who was located at Tara, and shared a common language and a common legal system. Most important, while the culture of the time showed traces of Christian and classical influence, it was basically Irish and completely unique. Ireland was never conquered by the Roman legions and has never really been subdued by anyone else. Its traditions and heritage are rigorously its own and any outside influences have been accepted—even welcome—but never imposed.

The establishment of Irish independence was originally due to its remoteness and to its characteristic of being an island in the sea. Ironically, this ancient strength has been in more recent times, with the streamlining of communications and transportation, a modern weakness. Still, despite their physical isolation and the vulnerability of their shores, the Irish people have maintained that independence of mind and spirit which came more easily to them in the past. That Christianity was the crystallizing force for Irish culture, and that Christianity has been the source of Irish strength and endurance ever since is indubitable. St. Patrick, of course, is therefore responsible for the spine of the Irishman and the backbone of his culture.

The Irish have taken their religion seriously enough, and—more significantly—have understood it well enough, to make it an important part of their humor. When Cornelius Murphy went up to Heaven, he remarked to St. Peter that the venerable saint had been at his job for a long time. "One million years is but a minute here, and a million dollars but a cent," replied St. Peter. "Well then," said Murphy, "since I'm needin' cash, perhaps you'd lend me a cent." "Sure," answered St. Peter; "just wait a minute."

A good Irishwoman who had lost her sense of God remarked to her neighbor that she no longer felt the touch of the Lord. "Ah," said the neighbor, "if you can only close your eyes and raise your head and pray with your heart, why the good Lord'll reach down with His hand and touch you as He used to." The woman did as she was told until she felt a hand upon her sleeve. She opened her eyes and looked, expecting to see the hand of God—and saw her neighbor withdrawing his own hand with a start. "Oh!" she cried. "That was your hand I felt and not the hand of God!" "Of course," the neighbor replied. "Heaven is a long ways off, and the Lord is not one to waste any motion that He could use for beneficent works. He just took the nearest hand and used that."

That religion is important to Irish humor is indicative of the fact that it plays a role of vast importance in the life of every Irishman. Furthermore, when the spiritual nature of God and of the Saints is well understood, and established as other-worldly, there is no blasphemy in jokes of this kind. Irish religious humor, like humor about the Irish people, is based upon a faith too strong to be shaken by jokes or scorn or the attitudes and actions of others. This rockbound individuality and this unshakable patriotism are qualities well adapted to a country with principles such as ours. The United States has recognized this. The days of "No Irish Need Apply" are long gone from this Nation and today an Irishman with all the noble characteristics of Ireland and the Irish people sits in our own White House. We can bestow no greater tribute upon a people which has retained its national identity while blending at the same time with American tradition and culture.

Our celebration of St. Patrick is a gesture of gratitude and affection toward the Irish people. No other figure is so honored except a few of our very great presidents. The virtues of faith, humanity, and strength are epitomized by St. Patrick and by the Irish people. And there are no finer virtues and none more basic to America or to the very human race itself.

The Agricultural Conservation Program Appropriation for Next Year Should Be $250 Million

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CARL ELLIOTT
OF ALABAMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 15, 1962

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Speaker, I believe the budget for 1963, which was recently submitted to the Congress is, on the whole, realistic and I support it. How-

ever, there is one phase of the agricultural section dealing with the agricultural conservation program to which I would like to take exception.

The President's budget requested an advance authorization for the 1963 agricultural conservation program of $150 million, which represents a reduction of $100 million in the amount which has been available for this vital program during the recent past. Only last week we read of Mr. Khrushchev's disappointment in the Russian farmer's inability to produce sufficient food and fiber to meet the people's needs. In Russia about 50 percent of the workers are engaged in agricultural pursuits. As a consequence, there are not enough workers available to produce the things that make life very pleasant in that country.

The average output per worker in American agriculture has more than doubled in the last quarter century. This is a record of increased efficiency of which we can be very proud and one which can be matched or surpassed in very few places in our entire economy. Our farmworkers are doing their work so efficiently that over 90 percent of our population is available to produce a wide variety of goods and services that make up the American standard of living.

As a boy, I can remember when gullied hillsides, wornout fields, and abandoned farms were commonplace in our Nation. If these conditions had been allowed to continue, we would probably find ourselves today in a position similar to that which prevails in Russia where it takes too large a percentage of the available workers to produce the food, fiber, and forestry products needed to keep their population going. Fortunately for us, however, in the midthirties the Congress recognized that there was a need to conserve and protect our natural resources of soil, water, and woodland and keep them productive for generations to come. To do this, the Congress enacted legislation which created what is known today as the agricultural conservation program. This program has operated as a vital conservation partnership wherein the Government and the farmer join together to perform needed conservation work on the land that is in the national interest, as well as the interest of the farmer.

The agricultural conservation program is based on the very frank acceptance that while needed conservation pays the Nation in the long run, many conservation measures do not offer sufficient and immediate returns to the farmer that are attractive enough to encourage him to get the needed amount of such conservation applied.

The population in the United States is growing at the rate of 1.7 percent per year. In fact, the total U.S. population has more than doubled since 1910 from 90 to 185 million and is expected to exceed 260 million by 1980. At the same time, increasing amounts of our farmland are being used for building new roads, new housing developments, airports and the endless things we see happen around us every day. These developments take more and more farmland out of agricultural production. With a rapidly growing population, a shrinking farm acreage and a need to maintain or to improve our living standards, conservation takes on a very serious aspect for the future. We must maintain our farmland at the highest production level if we are to be assured that future generations of Americans are to have the food, fiber, and forestry products needed to live comfortably. This can be done only if the agricultural conservation program and our other fine conservation programs are maintained at substantial levels.

This being the case, I would like to go on record in support of a $250 million advanced authorization for the agricultural conservation program in 1963 in lieu of the $150 million requested in the President's budget.

The Case Against Big Government

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CRAIG HOSMER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 15, 1962

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, American misgivings about big government are both historical and practical.

Millions have come to our shores to escape big government's domination of their lives. The Revolt of 1776 was against dictatorship of individual lives by big government.

To keep American Government from getting too big, our Constitution reserves many powers to the people. It also divides powers of government between State and Federal Governments and between legislative, executive, and judicial branches of government.

In the United States control over our destiny is in the people. Power and decisions flow from the broad base of a triangle—the people—to the top of the triangle—government.

Millions of private citizens each day make millions of individual decisions, which, when all combined together, determine the economic health and strength of our country.

Not every individual decision is a good one. But experience has shown the good ones cancel out the bad ones with something to spare. Because of this we have grown steadily from 13 struggling colonies to a giant nation.

We have proved this politico-economic system works. It keeps us strong all the time.

In contrast, the U.S.S.R. has big government. Power and decisionmaking are at the top of the triangle, out of the people's hands.

If somebody in the Kremlin makes a bad decision, there is nothing to cancel it out. The whole country suffers.

For instance, suppose Moscow bureaucrats miscalculate and set the country's fuel requirements too low. People all over the U.S.S.R. go cold through the winter. Factories cannot produce enough goods. Even the Red army's strength is weakened.

All that is inconvenient in the U.S.S.R., but it is not fatal. Some other country has not sworn to "bury" the U.S.S.R. the moment it becomes weak.

To the United States such a situation would not be merely inconvenient. It would be fatal. Some other country has promised to "bury" the United States should it ever become weakened for any reason.

This is the practical reason why today, just as in 1776, Americans still have good reasons to be wary of big government.

We simply cannot run the risk, inherent in big government, of having some Washington bureaucrat's miscalculation deliver us to the designs of our enemy.

Yet we have needs which push us toward big government. As our society becomes more and more complex, there are more and more things which people either cannot do for themselves or find it increasingly difficult to do for themselves.

At first blush it seems attractive to have the Federal Government do them. But each time it steps into some new area of authority, power in the United States moves a little closer to the top of the triangle.

The challenge of our times is, with patience and understanding, to find ways of meeting these new needs adequately—without involving ourselves in the fatal hazards inherent in big government.

Peter Francisco: American Hero

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HASTINGS KEITH
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 15, 1962

Mr. KEITH. Mr. Speaker, today is Peter Francisco Day in Massachusetts. Since 1955 when Gov. Christian A. Herter first proclaimed March 15 as a fitting occasion to pay tribute to the most famous private soldier of the Revolutionary War, Portuguese-Americans have celebrated the heroic courage, and exemplary citizenship of this outstanding patriot.

I would like to inform my colleagues in the House of the deeds of Peter Francisco because I feel that in his life there is a lesson for all Americans who love their country and who would dedicate themselves to its service.

Peter Francisco was not a native of Virginia nor, indeed, of this country. His origin is obscure but he was apparently the victim of a kidnaping in a foreign land. In 1765, at the age of five or six, he was left, friendless and alone, on the wharf at City Point, now Hopewell, Va., by a ship that immediately sailed away. His dark complexion, his features, and his name seemed to point to Portugal as the land of his origin. His rich clothing—although seaworn and showing hard usage—the silver buckles engraved "P.F." that adorned his shoes,

and his courageous bearing and engaging manner encouraged the impression that he was of noble parentage.

It was fortunate for Peter Francisco that, shortly after his arrival, Judge Anthony Winston stopped by City Point on business. Winston was returning home from Williamsburg where he had heard the fiery "Caeser and Brutus" speech of his nephew, Patrick Henry. He was interested in the lad and took a load off the shoulders of the parish authorities by obtaining their readily given permission to take the boy to "Hunting Towers," his home in Buckingham County. There Francisco spent the next 10 years. His formal education seems to have been neglected, but from the discussions of Patrick Henry and other visitors he gained an understanding of the principles of freedom and a zeal for the cause of liberty.

YOUNG PATRIOT

In the fall of 1776, at the age of 16, Francisco enlisted in the 10th Virginia Regiment of Continental troops and joined the army under Washington at Middlebrook. He was a sturdy youth, standing 6 feet 6 inches in height and weighing 260 pounds. He received his baptism of fire with Lafayette at Brandywine. He fought at Germantown and Monmouth. At the storming of Stony Point on the Hudson, he was the first man after Maj. James Gibbons of Richmond to scale the walls of the fort, despite a 9-inch wound in the abdomen. Again, at Powell's Hook, undaunted by a bayonet wound in the thigh, he proceeded into the British lines to kill two grenadiers.

After serving the 3 years for which he had enlisted, he returned to Virginia, but his bold and adventurous spirit and his devotion to the American cause impelled him to return to the army. He enlisted this time in Col. William Mayo's regiment and went with him to serve with Gates in the Carolinas. It is reported that in the Battle of Camden, Francisco, singlehanded moved a 1,100-pound cannon several hundred feet to a new position—the two artillery horses ordinarily required to do the job had been killed by British fire. It was in that battle that he saved Colonel Mayo's life and then made possible the colonel's escape. Francisco with a single bayonet thrust, disposed of the British trooper attempting to capture Mayo, then gallantly gave the Britisher's horse to the fleeing colonel.

HEROIC DEEDS

After the defeat of Gates at Camden, Francisco returned to Prince Edward County, but soon reenlisted, equipped himself with a good horse, and joined Captain Watkins' command under Colonel Washington in the South. It is not recorded how many of the British he killed at Guilford Courthouse before he was wounded "from hipsocket to knee," but afterward, "with his terrible broadsword" he dispatched 11 of the enemy. Left for dead on the battlefield, he was later carried by an old man named Robinson to a nearby farmhouse where he was given medical attention and where he recuperated. On the battlefield at Greensboro, N.C., there stands a monument of granite blocks marking the place where "Peter Francisco * * * killed 11 British soldiers with his own broadsword, and although badly wounded by bayonet, made his escape." At Yorktown the military career of Francisco closed. There, serving under Lafayette, his first commander, he witnessed the surrender of Cornwallis.

WIT AND DARING

Francisco's most famous exploit occurred in Amelia County after his return from Guilford Courthouse. He was at Ben Ward's Tavern when the house was suddenly surrounded by nine of Tarleton's troopers. One of them demanded his watch and another his silver knee buckles. When Francisco pretended to acquiesce, the cavalrymen dismounted and one of them stooped to take the buckles off, placing his sword under his arm. Francisco stepped back one pace, seized the sword by the hilt, and gave the trooper a blow across the skull. Just then Tarleton's troops, consisting of about 400 men, came in sight, and Francisco called aloud as if ordering out his own command of men. The British near him were deceived and fled, leaving their horses behind them. Francisco mounted one of the deserted horses and, driving the others before him, escaped down an obscure road, although Tarleton's troopers were dispatched in all directions in search of him.

TESTS AND REWARDS

Francisco's exploits did not go unnoticed by his commanding officers. General Greene gave Peter a beautiful razor appropriately inscribed, and General Washington, himself, gave Private Francisco a magnificent broadsword, which only a man of Francisco's prodigious strength could wield.

The story is told of a burly backwoodsman named Pamphlett who rode all the way from Kentucky to test his strength against that of Francisco. After Francisco threw him over a 4-foot fence and lifted his horse over after him, the amazed Pamphlett mounted his horse and headed back toward Kentucky.

MARRIED THREE TIMES

In 1781 Francisco met and feel in love with Susannah Anderson, but 4 years elapsed before they could secure her family's consent to the marriage and Peter could take the lovely Susannah to Hunting Towers as his bride. Perhaps he never worked harder than during those 4 long years, with the twofold purpose of obtaining an education and acquiring the means of supporting a wife.

Five years after their marriage Susannah died, leaving him with a little son to whom she left a home, Locust Grove, and the Cumberland County lands inherited from her father.

In 1794 Peter married Catherine Fauntleroy Brooks, a devoted friend and relative of Susannah. They had four children and spent 27 happy years together at Locust Grove before she died in 1821. His third marriage, in 1823, was to Mary Beverly Grymes, the widow West, who survived him. Since she disliked the country they moved in 1825 to Richmond, where during the last 6 years of his life Francisco served as sergeant at arms of the Virginia House of Delegates. His kindness, sincerity, gracious manner, and ever-present wit endeared him to all who knew him.

TRUE AMERICAN

Peter Francisco died in Richmond on January 16, 1831. The house adjourned in respect and joined with the senate, the Governor, and the city council in attending the funeral. The services were conducted in the hall of the house of delegates by Bishop Channing Moore and burial took place with full military honors in Shockoe Cemetery.

From obscurity to immortality, from penniless waif to prosperous planter and respected public servant, a man honored by his contemporaries and revered by us today, Peter Francisco's story is one which makes all Americans proud.