but it would seem inevitable that such a result would frequently prevail through innocent act.

It is well known that the payors of interest and dividends in most cases have been forced in recent years to turn the entire payment operation over to modern machinery. Any large paying agent will tell you that machines now available to him can barely take the present traffic, and that if they have to be worked twice to separate exempt from nonexempt payments, the administrative chore becomes almost impossible. The paying agents will also tell you that they have difficulty getting these machines and to the extent that they must secure new equipment just for their present needs they have to wait months or years for it.

Expanded provisions permitting the use of exemption certificates were hastily added by the Committee on Ways and Means on the eve of reporting the bill. Apparently they are intended as a sop to the national clamor from millions of people who are going to be the victims of over-withholding, people who could either owe no tax at all or considerably less than the amount of tax withheld. This involves also the millions and millions of senior citizens in this country who are living on small sums of invested income—usually dividends and interest. Twenty percent of their support money is to be collected and put into the public till and then doled out to them much later in the forms of refunds or credits—at the mercy of the red tape mill of a Federal agency. During the interim they must figure out some other way to meet their rent and food obligations.

The exemption certificate rules in the bill are a poor sop in this regard. They are limited to children under 18 and to persons who are willing to state that they will owe zero Federal income tax. But the vast majority of people who will be affected by over-withholding of tax on dividends and interest are people who have some tax liability. They cannot avoid withholding by making a statement that they will owe no income tax. They are still left to the meat-grinder process of this antiquated tax collection device.

The situation is an absurdity. The limited rules for exemption certificates that have been put into the bill complete the task of making the withholding provisions an administrative monstrosity, and confusing the accounts and records of payors, payees and the Internal Revenue Service. And—these provisions still do not give the broad relief from over-withholding for which their sponsors are aiming. Probably no more than 10 percent, probably as low as 5 percent, of the people on whom there will be over-withholding of tax are completely immune to income tax. The remaining 90 to 95 percent are people who cannot file an exemption certificate and honestly state that they will owe no income tax. As to these people, including the many millions of senior citizens, as to whom tax will be over-withheld, and whose standard of living is to be contracted by this weird tax collection device—they are to be surrendered to the administrative jungle of an antiquated and completely unnecessary tax collection device.

Mr. Speaker, this recitation of facts pertaining to the withholding provisions of H.R. 10650 raises serious questions as to the need for interest and dividend withholding in view of the development in the automatic data processing field. Section 19 of the bill should not become a part of our tax structure.

SENATE

WEDNESDAY, MARCH 21, 1962

(Legislative day of Wednesday, March 14, 1962)

The Senate met at 9 o'clock a.m., on the expiration of the recess, and was called to order by the President pro tempore.

Rev. Oscar Muspratt, vicar of Penn, Buckinghamshire, England, offered the following prayer:

The prayer is adapted from William Penn's prayer for Philadelphia, in 1684:

O Almighty God, our Heavenly Father, we commend this Nation to Thy merciful care. Grant that her people may be kept from the evil that would overwhelm them; that faithful to the God of all mercies, they may stand in the day of trial; that their children may be blest of the Lord; and that their people, saved by His power, may be preserved to the end.

Bless Thy servants, the President of the United States and all others in authority. Grant that ever conscious of their accountability to Thee, they will always faithfully fulfill their duty to support power in reverence with the people, and so secure the people from the abuse of power that they may be free by their just obedience, and the magistrates ever be honorable for their just administration. Through Jesus Christ, our Lord. Amen.

And from St. Francis of Assisi:

Lord, make us instruments of Thy peace. Where there is hatred, may we bring love; where there is injury, may we bring pardon; where there is discord, may we bring unity; where there is doubt, may we bring faith; where there is despair, may we bring hope; where there is darkness, may we bring light; where there is sadness, may we bring joy; for Thy mercy and for Thy truth's sake. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Tuesday, March 20, 1962, was dispensed with.

ORDER FOR RECESS UNTIL 9 A.M. TOMORROW

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it stand in recess until 9 o'clock tomorrow morning.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

OPENING PRAYER BY REV. OSCAR MUSPRATT

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President——

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I yield briefly to the Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. CLARK. I appreciate the courtesy of my friend, the majority leader, in yielding briefly to me, so that I may say just a word for the RECORD.

Mr. President, Rev. Oscar Muspratt, vicar of Penn, of Buckinghamshire, England, who delivered the morning prayer, which I thought most appropriately was adapted from the famous prayer of William Penn, of whom we Philadelphians and Pennsylvanians are so proud, has come to this country to complete his research on the history of the Penn family.

Penn, in Buckinghamshire, England, is where the Penn family originated, and from which eventually William Penn came to Pennsylvania.

I should like to thank Reverend Muspratt for being with us; and, through the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I wish to call the attention of my colleagues and the attention of all the people of the country to this happy historical link between England and the United States of America, to which Reverend Muspratt has come to complete his research on the ancient home of the Penn family overseas.

ANNOUNCEMENT OF COMMITTEE HEARING ON NOMINATIONS OF JOHN K. REGAN AND JOHN W. OLIVER FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE FEDERAL JUDICIARY

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President——

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I yield to the Senator from Missouri.

Mr. SYMINGTON. I thank the majority leader.

Mr. President, at the request of my colleague from Missouri [Mr. LONG], I announce, for him, that there will be a meeting of the subcommittee of the Judiciary Committee to consider the nominations of the Honorable John K. Regan and the Honorable John W. Oliver, for appointment to the Federal judiciary, at 6 o'clock this evening or as soon thereafter as, based on the situation in the Senate, the subcommittee can meet. The meeting will be held in room 2300 of the New Senate Office Building.

I thank the majority leader for his courtesy in yielding.

REPORT OF BOY SCOUTS OF AMERICA

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a letter from the Chief Scout Executive, National Council, Boy Scouts of America, New Brunswick, N.J., transmitting, pursuant to law, a re-

port of that organization, for the year 1961, which, with the accompanying report, was referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

THE ALEXANDER HAMILTON NATIONAL MONUMENT — AMENDMENT TO THE CONSTITUTION DEALING WITH POLL TAXES

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

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. 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.

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

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. METCALF in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

CONFISCATION OF AMERICAN PROPERTY

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, as we move into consideration of foreign aid to South America, some of the news from that part of this hemisphere is not reassuring.

I refer to the expropriation of U.S. property in Brazil—the arbitrary confiscation by part of the Government in that country of American property, with an offer by the Government of about 5 percent of the value of the property.

In that connection, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD a chronological fact sheet of background information concerning the expropriation of Companhia Telefonica Nacional, a telephone operating subsidiary at Porto Alegre, Rio Grande do Sul, Brazil, of the International Telephone & Telegraph Corp.

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

CHRONOLOGICAL FACT SHEET

(Background information concerning the expropriation of Companhia Telefonica Nacional, telephone operating subsidiary at Porto Alegre, Rio Grande do Sul, Brazil, of International Telephone & Telegraph Corp., February 19, 1962)

(A) For several years, the State of Rio Grande do Sul has fixed the company's rates at a level which would not permit the recovery of depreciation, let alone a fair return on the investment. The company has tried on numerous occasions to work out a proper basis of rate regulation which would permit a fair return on investment and give the company the ability to raise funds for the expansion of the service.

(B) This was never possible and the rate base presently permitted the company is less than one-sixth of replacement value.

(C) In 1960, the Governor, Leonel Brizola, proposed an appraisal of the property to determine its fair value in connection with his suggestion that we consider the formation of a mixed company. This appraisal was carried out by two appraisers, one appointed by the company and one by the Governor.

(D) The value, agreed to by the two appraisers, converted at the then existing rate of exchange, was $7,300,000.

(E) The Governor, on June 12, 1961, proposed to the company that the appraisal be accepted by both parties as a basis for the formation of a mixed company. However, he did not indicate the basis on which the mixed company would be formed, who would control it, or what the State's contribution would be. (The Governor did announce to a radio audience that the ITT subsidiary would have no more than a 25-percent interest in the mixed company.)

1. June 22, 1961: The company replied that it could neither agree nor disagree to formation of a mixed company until it knew the terms. It also offered five alternative solutions, including sale of the company at fair value to the State. The company also requested that certain obvious deficiencies in the appraisal be corrected, such as the understatement of land values. No reply has been received to date from Gov. Leonel Brizola.

2. July 28: Governor Brizola, in radio broadcasts, announced plan for a pilot company (mixed company with State control), stating: "It is expected that equipment from Iron Curtain countries will be obtained and installed * * * the State no longer wants anything to do with the present telephone company or the holding company * * * the State is not going to expropriate the CTN, nor does it consider it convenient to buy it out with the State holding its obsolete materials."

3. August 19: Governor Brizola in a 2-hour-long conference before law students, declared that "if the United States is really interested in helping Latin Americans, I advise the U.S. Government to help Brazil expropriate and expel the foreign companies now exploiting its people."

4. August 25: President Quadros' resignation resulted in profound politico-military disturbances. Three military ministers in Quadros' cabinet opposed Joao Goulart as president because of his extreme leftist leanings. The third army in Rio Grande do Sul, Santa Catarina and Parana States, joined a movement led by Governor Brizola in support of his brother-in-law, Vice President Goulart.

5. September 2: Goulart arrived in Porto Alegre in an atmosphere of near civil war. Frantic negotiations were being conducted in Brasilia, the nation's capital, negotiations which resulted in changing the powers of the president by a constitutional amendment from presidentialism to parliamentarianism. The memorandum was approved September 3 and Goulart accepted the new formula and went from Porto Alegre to Brasilia.

6. September 22: Governor Brizola in radio and television broadcasts at Rio de Janeiro talked again to students and journalists with the theme song: "Without pretending to declare the Soviet Union innocent of what it is accused, we must have the courage to affirm that the problem of our liberation is linked to the need for elimination of the spoliatory process exerted on our people by the capitalist world, with its polarizing center, today, in the United States."

7. September 27: In the absence of Brizola, Acting Gov. Helio Carlomagno told a group of U.S. consultants that their proposal "would not be accepted as the negotiations with countries of the Socialist bloc, especially East Germany, had more chance for a satisfactory conclusion, as we (the State government) do not hold anything against them, while we have grave reservations regarding the North American capitalists."

8. October 13: The Porto Alegre archbishop, Dom Vincente Scherer, in two letters to Brizola, denounced Communist infiltration in the State government and similarly denounced statewide distribution given to a pamphlet on guerrilla warfare prepared by the Cuban Communist leader "Che" Guevara. State Agriculture Secretary, Alberto Hoffman publicly admitted the archbishop's denunciations were justified.

9. October 24: Brizola, continuing his activities in support of the National Front of Liberation, called it an action group to "emancipate Brazil." Meantime, one of the largest communities which would be affected by the proposed mixed company proposal—the community of Novo Hamburgo—began expressing doubts as to execution of the project. They began publishing weekly reminders of their telephone needs, talked of government apathy and evasiveness.

10. November 20: Incorporator of mixed company appointed by Brizola.

11. December 10: Brizola, in meeting with four U.S. Senators, made bitter attack on the behavior of American companies operating public utilities in Brazil. The Senators were CLAIR ENGEL, California, STEPHEN YOUNG, Ohio, FRANK EDWARD MOSS, Utah, and GALE W. MCGEE, Wyoming. But he assured them there was no danger of communism in South America, only restlessness created by poverty and underdevelopment. Shortly afterward, he signed a telegram to the Federal Senate expressing his full support of legislation controlling remittances of funds to foreign countries. This legislation requires nationals and foreigners to register all foreign holdings, requiring government authorization for all future transfers, and allowing banks to operate only if their respective governments give reciprocal privilege. This has been approved by the Chamber of Deputies.

12. December 13: Luis Carlos Prestes, Brazilian chief of the Communist Party, was quoted in a Sao Paulo newspaper as declaring in Moscow that the "birth of the FLN (National Front of Liberation) is a logical culmination of the integration of forces which arose recently in my country * * * the Communists were the ones who demanded that the constitution be respected and that Goulart be anointed as Brazil's legitimate president * * * the creation of the FLN proposed by Brizola * * * and other progressive elements opened the way for a patriotic, democratic, ample and firm movement which will conduct us to a complete national liberation * * * the reestablishment of diplomatic relations with Hungary, Bulgaria, Rumania, and now with the Soviet Union, is an excellent omen"

13. December 22: Solicitations of subscriptions for the mixed company announced to start January 2, with incorporation of mixed company to be completed within 30 days.

14. January 23: Sale of subscriptions in mixed company extended to February 15 because of relatively poor response, despite heavy full-page propaganda in Porto Alegre newspapers.

15. February 4: Reports in Rio Grande do Sul indicate public support for the mixed company was very poor, with only 27 percent of the shares offered subscribed.

16. February 15: Brizola issued decree of expropriation of the Companhia Telefonica Nacional for $400,000, or about 5 percent of its value.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, in a letter of March 16, from Mr. Edward J. Gerrity, Jr., vice president of the International Telephone & Telegraph Corp., Mr. Gerrity states that for 9 years the company has been unable to negotiate with Governor Brizola. Mr. Gerrity further states:

We feel that the Brazilian Federal Government should assume responsibility for prompt action and should guarantee payment of the final indemnity within a mutually agreed-upon period. On that basis the company is ready to arbitrate as to the value of the property.

Mr. President, the people of the United States have come a long way to express their friendship for and their interest in the people of Brazil, and it would seem most unfortunate that a matter of this character at this time cannot be handled on a just basis.

I ask unanimous consent that the letter from Mr. Gerrity be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

INTERNATIONAL TELEPHONE & TELEGRAPH CORP.,
New York, N.Y., March 16, 1962.

The Honorable STUART SYMINGTON,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR SYMINGTON: Since the Brazilian Government through its Embassy in Washington has seen fit to issue a press release concerning the expropriation of U.S. property in Brazil, we thought you would be interested in the company side of the matter.

We do not challenge the right of Brazil to expropriate our property if done under proper legal procedures and so long as prompt and adequate compensation is paid. But in this case we have challenged the very method of procedure under Brazilian law and have, in fact, filed suit in Porto Alegre, capital of Rio Grande do Sul, for an injunction compelling Gov. Leonel Brizola to return our property, the Companhia Telefonica Nacional (CTN). Our suit is based, among other things, on the fact that in violation of Brazilian law no notice of impending seizure was given and, again contrary to Brazilian law, no hearing on the petition to expropriate was held.

It is indeed true that our company did not accept as final an appraisal of our property which estimated the value at $7,300,000 in 1960.

Among the reasons the company objected to the appraisal was the inclusion of a parcel of real estate at Porto Alegre at $250,000 when the company had been offered $750,000 for the land only 3 months earlier. The press release carries an implication that CTN would have been paid this amount had it accepted the appraisal. The fact is that no offer of payment was made and the appraisal was only made in connection with the possibility of forming a so-called mixed company. Neither prior to nor subsequent to the appraisal was CTN informed of the essential elements of the proposed mixed company.

The company suggested that the appraisal serve as a basis for negotiation and so wrote the Governor, offering five alternatives toward a solution.

The Governor has failed to this day even to acknowledge the offer.

It is also true that the company's concession to operate had expired, but that occurred in 1953, and the company in good faith continued to render service. CTN also continued to make considerable new investments in the hope that the State authorities would adopt a reasonable attitude.

Unfortunately, it proved impossible to obtain tariff adjustments, and without a concession contract, it was impossible to attract the large amounts of capital needed to expand to meet the demand for service. Governor Brizola rejected in 1960 a company proposal made in 1959 providing for expansion of telephone service on the basis of a concession contract. Instead he suggested the mixed company in which CTN would join but he was vague on the details of how the company would operate. He ignored subsequent inquiries.

The company is willing, as it has been from the start, to participate in negotiations—if they have a chance of succeeding. We have been unable in 9 years to negotiate with Governor Brizola and so are requesting that the Brazilian Federal Government at least assume responsibility for negotiations that have a chance of success. We feel that the Brazilian Federal Government should assume responsibility for prompt action and should guarantee payment of the final indemnity within a mutually agreed-upon period. On that basis the company is ready to arbitrate as to the value of the property.

Enclosed for your information is a fact sheet outlining the history of this matter. I will be glad to supply additional information.

Sincerely,

E. J. GERRITY.

A GREAT EDITORIAL ON THE FLIGHT OF COLONEL GLENN

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, of all the written reactions to the epochal orbit flight of Lt. Col. John Glenn, one especially appealed to me as representative of the reaction of the people of this Nation and of all peoples.

The morning after the flight, we woke up proud to be Americans; and it was left to Dr. Max Ascoli, in the March 15 issue of the Reporter magazine, to express that pride in words I shall always remember.

How could one forget the line:

The Russian people were told the tale; they did not live it.

I ask unanimous consent that Dr. Ascoli's editorial entitled "February 20, 1962," be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

FEBRUARY 20, 1962
(By Max Ascoli)

What one felt during the long hours of John Glenn's adventure must be written down before time blurs the quality of those hours. It had nothing to do with that mass exhilaration that makes one lose his identity. Rather, those were intensely personal hours in which each one of us, I suppose, felt the burden of his loneliness, in no way like that lonely man in outer space, but certainly because of him. With him, we knew at every moment that the adventure might end in disaster. But the risk was all his.

Each one of us was a spectator, safely attached to his speck of land here on earth, made self-conscious and certainly awed by his distance from him. But deep inside each one there was a stirring, a tenseness that was just the opposite of a spectator's detachment. A heroic action was being performed that we kept following minute by minute, never losing our contact with the hero, constantly fearing that the contact would break, never relieved of the awareness that he was acting for us.

Each of us, I suppose, reacted differently throughout those hours; and the thoughts or prejudices we might have had before the adventure and about the adventure itself came back, though somehow tuned down: like the irritation, for instance, over the enormous publicity surrounding all the Cape Canaveral experiments, the merciless coverage by the radio and TV networks, and the why, oh, why, has the whole thing to be done, this whole outer-space competition with the Russians. Yet at the moment the capsule was launched into space, who did not feel like praying, or wish he knew how? It was so until we were told that Colonel Glenn was safe: an intimate yet unanimous emotion, personal yet collective, shared by the whole Nation and well beyond its borders.

To understand better what has happened, to establish some link between this latest adventure and similar ones in the past, the mind goes back to other deeds that gave the Nation and the world a sense of proud cohesiveness. One thinks, of course of Lindbergh's flight. I remember, as if it were yesterday, when the news came to the little Italian university town where I was teaching. People felt stirred there, as everywhere in the world, by what that clean-cut, sober young American had done. He is such a typical American, people said, such an honest and daring puritan. Never to that degree before had I felt that modesty and daring were among the typical characteristics of the country which, a few years later, was to become mine.

Each one of these great, individual, immensely representative deeds is unique in itself, although their list makes a continuity of greatness. John Glenn's orbital flight owes its uniqueness both to the appalling technological complexity of the devices which made it possible and to the means of communication which gave us and will forever give to future generations some knowledge of his flight from the go to the landing.

For what was given us during that time, and for what we felt inside, we owe an enormous debt of gratitude to our radio and TV networks, to our free institutions, and to the men of Project Mercury. These men themselves insist on telling us how limited and tentative their knowledge of space travel is; how, as John Glenn himself put it, they have just started scratching the surface. They, the experts, in a new, fantastically esoteric branch of technology, tell us of their comparative ignorance. But what about us, the vicarious participants in their exploits? What do most of us know about the TV sets we were glued to during those 4 hours, or the transistor radios we clutched? We will never forget the mystery of John Glenn's adventure and our closeness to him. He and his colleagues have made us feel that man may have extended a bit his reach into the skies, but is not likely to dislodge God.

The people on the other side; the countrymen of Gagarin and Titov, certainly rejoiced and danced when they were told the great news and the two live heroes were exhibited to them. Yet the Russian people deserve some better compensation for their hard work and their drab life. But between the people and their heroes there is the government that rations the news and decides what is good for the public to know. The Russian people were told the tale; they did not live it.

There is no possible comparison between the Russian conquests in orbit and ours. Gagarin and Titov may be as brave and as skillful as our John Glenn, just as the human qualities of the Russian people are as good as ours. But there is no possible comparison between the two systems of doing things. The way our system operated in the case of John Glenn's flight is even more important

than the results of that flight. Indeed, it has been its main result: we have felt united, but as persons who have lived through a great day. We have felt humbled by John Glenn's trial, close to each other, proud of our free institutions and of John Glenn. It has been a very good feeling.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, I thank the majority leader for his courtesy in yielding to me.

THE ALEXANDER HAMILTON NATIONAL MONUMENT — AMENDMENT TO THE CONSTITUTION DEALING WITH POLL TAXES

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. ROBERTSON obtained the floor.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator from Virginia yield briefly to me, if it is understood that in doing so he will not lose his right to the floor?

Mr. ROBERTSON. I yield.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The Senator from Virginia has the floor.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, at the outset of my remarks, I wish to make it crystal clear that we of the South who have been debating the issue of a poll tax regret that in these critical days an issue which to many persons appears to be inconsequential has been forced upon us—whether or not five States may impose a poll tax. The issue, however, is not inconsequential. This issue affects the sovereignty of the States that compose this Union.

But for the assurance given by James Madison, Alexander Hamilton, and others who participated in the Constitutional Convention in 1787, the Constitution would never have been ratified.

Even then, such grave doubts about the protection of the States were expressed in the State ratifying conventions, that several States adopted resolutions, to accompany the vote to ratify, which called for a clarification of the rights of the States.

The Virginia ratifying convention recommended 12 safeguarding amendments, and James Madison, in the first Congress, offered all 12 of them. The Congress adopted 10 of the 12, and one of those 10 is the 10th amendment, which provides that the rights not delegated to the Central Government nor prohibited to the States are reserved by them or the people thereof.

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

Mr. ROBERTSON. I yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. May I ask respectfully of the distinguished Senator if it is not true that he joined the Senator from Florida in introducing an antipoll tax amendment——

Mr. ROBERTSON. Well, certainly it is true. I had to choose between the lesser of two evils. On the one hand was an effort to abolish the poll tax by an act of Congress, which required only a majority of votes and the signature of the President, which might have been forthcoming, even though the measure was clearly unconstitutional. So the Senator from Virginia thought, well, a constitutional amendment requires a two-thirds majority of each House of Congress, and then it must be ratified by three-fourths of the States. By supporting the amendment—a lesser of two evils—we may then be able to gain the necessary time with which to present a case to the Congress showing that, while the amendment would affect the laws in only five States, it would set a precedent for undermining one of the sacred rights which was reserved to the States when they agreed to ratify the Constitution; namely, the right set out in section 2 of article I of the Constitution, that the States should fix the qualifications of their electors provided——

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

Mr. ROBERTSON. No, I do not yield until I finish my answer to the Senator's question.

Mr. HOLLAND. The Senator did not permit me to finish asking my question——

Mr. ROBERTSON. The Senator asked me if I joined him on the proposed amendment once. I said that I joined him once but that I have not joined the Senator in recent years, because the situation has changed.

Therefore, the Senator from Virginia replies, "Yes, I did say 'Well, if I must choose between an unconstitutional bill and the Holland amendment,' I will take my chances on the amendment." That proved to be good judgment, for neither measure has yet passed both Houses.

The Senator from Virginia feels that he was well justified at the time, in choosing between the lesser of two evils, to go along with this proposed amendment.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator permit me to finish my first question?

Mr. ROBERTSON. I am sorry. I thought the Senator had completed his question—a question, I might add, which he has asked my distinguished colleague from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] and every other Senator who has taken the floor to oppose his amendment.

Mr. HOLLAND. I merely asked the Senator whether he joined in the 81st Congress. I was going to ask whether he joined also in the sponsorship of this particular amendment in the 82d Congress and in the 83d Congress.

Mr. ROBERTSON. I do not remember; however, if I did support the proposed amendment, it was to block congressional action and not because I favored the measure for any other reason.

The Senator from Florida must know that what we really face here is the Javits bill, not his proposed amendment. Those who want to get political credit for opposing the poll tax know that they cannot get any political credit from an amendment to the Constitution, because the States amend the Constitution. The Congress cannot. All we can do is to submit an amendment to the States. Then, if the States ratify, the States have changed the Constitution.

Those who are seeking the votes of the NAACP cannot get much political mileage out of that. What they want to do, in effect, is to amend the Constitution by congressional action.

A man should have some stake in government and some intelligent understanding of government before he acquires the right to vote.

We of the South deeply deplore the fact that this poll tax proposal is considered in a period of crisis, when we ought to be concerned about the Communist aggression in South Vietnam; when we ought to be concerned over the Berlin issue; when we ought to be concerned as to what new weapons must be added to our arsenal to prevent a shooting war; when we ought to be concerned over the financial crisis which America presently faces.

The United States will furnish this fiscal year, in a period of the greatest prosperity in the history of the Nation, with a budget deficit that the President says may not be less than $7 billion. The President has predicted a budget surplus approaching $500 million for the next fiscal year. But it now seems extremely unlikely that we will have any surplus at all.

Already we find that the "boom" predicted for early this year has not been so big as was expected. Our gross national product is now running below the level that was anticipated only a few months ago.

We are not in any depression. We are having good times. The predictions are that we shall continue to have good times. But the fact remains that we may not, in the coming fiscal year, receive all the budget revenue that was predicted last January. In order to do so, we would have to receive about $11 billion more next year than in this fiscal year, and that is quite a large increase.

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

Mr. ROBERTSON. I yield for a question. The Senator understands that we are being subjected to tight restrictions.

Mr. BENNETT. Yes.

Mr. ROBERTSON. We shall have to make it clear that if I yield it will be for a question, or else some Senator may make a point of order that I have lost the floor. So, for a question only, I yield to the Senator from Utah.

Mr. BENNETT. The Senator has referred to the fact that in order to balance the budget there must be an increase in revenue of about $11 billion. Is it not true that in order to get that increase, particularly out of the tax on corporations, there would have to be an increase of about $22 billion in corporate profits before taxes?

Mr. ROBERTSON. The Senator is correct. The top corporate rate is 52 percent. We would have to have an increase of about $22 billion in corporate profits in order to get a $11 billion increase in taxes from corporations.

Mr. BENNETT. Is it not also true that for the past 10 years, corporate profits before taxes have been very stable, and have been running around $45 billion a year?

Mr. ROBERTSON. The Senator is correct.

Mr. BENNETT. Is it not true, then, that in order to balance the budget on that basis, we would have to have an increase of more than 50 percent in corporate profits before taxes?

Mr. ROBERTSON. The Senator is correct. For that and other reasons, I do not think there will be any surplus in the budget.

Mr. BENNETT. I thank the Senator.

Mr. ROBERTSON. In my opinion, the issue is not whether there will be a budget deficit in the next fiscal year, but rather how large the deficit will be. Yet in 1962, we shall have by far the largest gross national product in our history and by far the largest personal income in our history. The President has estimated that the former will be close to $570 billion, and the latter will be about $448 billion.

Even so, it is said that we cannot balance the budget. If we cannot balance the budget now, will we ever balance it? That, to me, is a serious question. If we cannot balance the budget this year and next year, will we ever balance it—unless, of course, God changes the hearts of the Politburo, and its representatives suddenly say, "Let us disarm. We will give you free and full inspection everywhere. Let the lion and the lamb lie down together." If such an unlikely eventuality took place, we could reduce the $50 billion or more that we appropriate for our defense establishment. We might then balance the budget. But if a large reduction in defense expenditures was made at once, we would probably have a severe depression for some time after that spending stopped.

So, Mr. President, I say that we are living in critical times. Yet because five States exercise a constitutional right which they have had ever since the Union was formed, a right to fix the qualifications of the electors in their States, the Senate is plunged in debate. We come in at 9 o'clock in the morning and remain until 7 o'clock in the evening. Perhaps the sessions will eventually run until 9 o'clock in the evening. No committees can function. I am privileged to be chairman of the Appropriation Subcommittee on Treasury and Post Office, which has reported what is supposed to be a minor bill, although it involves $6 billion or $7 billion.

We have the bill ready for action on the floor of the Senate. But we cannot take up an appropriation bill. We must discuss poll taxes.

Yesterday the House of Representatives passed the appropriation bill for the Department of the Interior. We should proceed and complete action on that bill right away. But proposals to limit States' rights must take precedence.

I wonder if Senators have forgotten that not until midnight on the last day of the first session of this Congress did we complete action on the appropriation for foreign aid amounting to over $3 billion, and the appropriation for public works amounting to over $1 billion. Since time was of the essence, nobody knew exactly what was contained in the conference report when it was finally acted upon.

After a conference on the public works bill had been agreed to, the House removed some provisions that were in the conference report, and we had either to accept the report or have Congress called back into special session.

This year is an election year. Presumably we will adjourn early for that very reason. Yet the Senate has not passed a single appropriation bill.

There are a number of very important bills in the offing. In particular, we will consider a tax bill and a foreign trade bill. No one should be under any illusion about the time which debate on these bills will consume.

Nevertheless, we are forced to appear in the Senate and spend hour after hour—doing what? Opposing attempts to dispossess the States of their constitutional rights. I am sure all Senators remember that years ago, when Lord Macauley was in our country—and I paraphrase his remark—he said, "Your Constitution is all sail and no anchor. You will come to the time when there will be more feeding out of the Treasury than there will be those paying money into the Treasury. That is when your Government will be wrecked."

We have never had in this country a greater or wiser group of men than the men who assembled in Philadelphia to write the Constitution. Lord Gladstone did not overpraise the Constitution when he said that it was the greatest instrument ever struck off by the brain and purpose of man. It is the only instrument which has kept a representative democracy together as long as ours has been held together. Our Government, in its present form, is older than any other government in the world today.

What are we doing? We are gradually pulling out the foundation stones of a superstructure that unites national sovereignty with States rights.

Mr. President, it seems that we cannot hold a session of Congress without the Senate's consideration of proposals which, in one form or another, would withdraw powers from the sovereign States—powers that are guaranteed to them by the Constitution and by the 10th amendment, which provides:

> The powers not delegated to the United States by the Constitution, nor prohibited by it to the States, are reserved to the States respectively, or to the people.

Today I am rising to oppose two such proposals, Senate Joint Resolution 58 and S. 478.

Both of the proposals to which I am referring would prohibit the use of a poll tax or any property requirement as a voter qualification in Federal elections.

Proposals of this type are not, of course, new to Senate debate. On January 28 of 1960 I discussed at length on the floor the doubtful constitutionality of S. 2868, a bill which is similar to S. 478. On February 1 of that year I argued against a proposed constitutional amendment—similar to Senate Joint Resolution 58—which, if approved by the required three-fourths of the State legislatures, would have accomplished the same result.

Although the proposals presently before the Senate have similar objectives, Senate Joint Resolution 58 would amend the Constitution in accordance with the requirements of article V. Unfortunately, the Congress and the courts have not always resorted to constitutional means in their fervor to change the structure and principles of our Government. S. 478 represents an attempt of this type. Recent history abounds with similar examples of this lapse in constitutional procedure, two of the most prominent being the Supreme Court's Brown against Board of Education decision of 1954 and the so-called Civil Rights Act of 1960.

Nevertheless, even though Senate Joint Resolution 58 would follow a constitutional avenue, both this resolution and the bill suffer from a common defect: Their reliance upon the false premise that every citizen of the United States has an inherent right to vote.

In support of Senate Joint Resolution 58, its author, the learned senior Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND] recently said on the floor:

> In my opinion every citizen should, as a matter of right, be entitled to vote for President, Vice President, and Senators and Representatives; and that is all that is involved in this case.

I would like to remind the Senate that every American has a dual citizenship in that he is a citizen both of our Nation and of his particular State. The rights of individuals are clearly defined in the Bill of Rights which consists of the first 10 amendments to the Constitution. These amendments are substantially what George Mason proposed in his immortal Virginia Declaration of Rights, and nowhere in the first 10 amendments is there any guarantee of a right to vote.

There is a guarantee in the 15th amendment that no citizen can be denied the right to vote because of race, creed, or color. In the 19th amendment it is provided that no citizen shall be denied the right to vote on account of sex.

However, we are not to conclude from these amendments that every citizen of the United States has a right to vote. He may vote only if he meets the qualifications set by his State under article I, section 2, of the Constitution within the limitations of the 15th and 19th amendments.

Suffrage, therefore, is basically a privilege. It becomes a right only if it is denied under the guarantees of the 15th and 19th amendments. Or, as the Supreme Court said in *Minor* v. *Happersett*, 21 Wall. 162 (1864):

> The Constitution of the United States does not confer the right of suffrage on anyone.

New York chooses to require that its voters be able to read and write English. Georgia extends the franchise to those who have reached the age of 18. Alabama has a residence requirement of 2 years. The constitution of North Dakota provides that the legislature shall establish an educational test as a qualification for voting. Mississippi requires that its citizens be able to give a reasonable interpretation of any section of the Constitution. And Virginia through its duly elected representatives has provided that its citizens must pay a poll tax of $1.50.

Who is better qualified than the elected representatives of each State to determine what voter qualifications are in that State's best interest? No one in the Virginia General Assembly, for example, would presume to tell his Georgia colleagues that the voting age in that State should be raised to 21, for he realizes that the Georgia legislators are much better qualified than he to decide what is best for Georgia.

Mr. President, it is also worth noting that an inherent right to vote was as nonexistent in colonial times as it is today. Indeed, the early legislatures set qualifications which were more stringent than those prescribed by present State legislatures. The qualification that the voter must be a freeholder, for example, was prominent in early State constitutions and charters.

It is appropriate at this time to review the voter qualifications prescribed by the constitutions and legislatures of the Thirteen Colonies:

NEW HAMPSHIRE

The Senate shall be the first branch of the legislature, and the Senators shall be chosen in the following manner, viz: Every male inhabitant of each town and parish with town privileges in the several counties in this state, of twenty-one years of age and upwards, paying for himself a poll tax, shall have a right at the annual or other meetings of the inhabitants of said towns and parishes, to be duly warned and holden annually forever in the month of March; to vote in the town or parish wherein he dwells, for the Senators in the county or district whereof he is a member.

And every person qualified as the constitution provides shall be considered an inhabitant for the purpose of electing and being elected into any office or place within this state, in that town, parish, and plantation where he dwelleth and hath his home.

The Members of the House of Representatives shall be chosen annually in the month of March, and shall be the second branch of the legislature.

All persons qualified to vote in the election of Senators shall be entitled to vote within the town district, parish, or place where they dwell, in the choice of representatives.

MARYLAND

ARTICLE II. That the House of Delegates shall be chosen in the following manner: All freemen, above twenty-one years of age, having a freehold of fifty acres of land, in the county in which they offer to vote, and residing therein—and all freemen, having property in this state above the value of thirty pounds current money, and having resided in the county, in which they offer to vote, one whole year next preceeding the election, shall have a right of suffrage, in the election of Delegates for such county; and all freemen, as qualified, shall on the first Monday of October, seventeen hundred and seventy-seven, and on the same day in every year thereafter, assemble in the counties, in which they are respectively qualified to vote, at the courthouse, in the said counties, or at such other place as the Legislature shall direct; and, when assembled, they shall proceed to elect, viva voce, four Delegates, for their respective counties, of the most wise, sensible, and discreet of the people, residents in the county where they are to be chosen, one whole year next preceding the election, above twenty-one years of age, and having, in the State, real or personal property above the value of five hundred pounds current money; and upon the final casting of the polls, the four persons who shall appear to have the greatest number of legal votes shall be declared and return, duly elected for their respective counties.

NEW JERSEY

ARTICLE IV. That all inhabitants of this Colony, of full age, who are worth fifty pounds proclamation money, clear estate in the same, and have resided within the county in which they claim a vote for twelve months immediately preceding the election, shall be entitled to vote for Representatives in Council and Assembly; and also for all other public officers, that shall be elected by the people of the county at large.

ARTICLE XIII. That the inhabitants of each county, qualified to vote as aforesaid, shall at the time and place of electing their representatives, annually elect one Sheriff and one or more Coroners; and that they may reelect the same person to such offices until he shall have served three years, but no longer, after which, three years must elapse before the same person is capable of being elected again. When the election is certified to the Governor, or Vice President, under the hands of the six freeholders of the county for which they were elected, they shall be immediately commissioned to serve in their respective offices.

SOUTH CAROLINA

The qualification of electors shall be that every free white man, and no other person who acknowledges the being of a God, and believes in a future state of rewards and punishments, and who has attained to the age of one and twenty years, and hath been a resident and an inhabitant in this State for the space of one whole year before the day appointed for the election he offers to give his vote at, and hath a freehoold at least of fifty acres of land, or a town lot, and hath been legally seized and possessed of the same at least six months previous to such election, or hath paid a tax the preceding year, or was taxable the present year, at least six months previous to the said election, in a sum equal to the tax on fifty acres of land, to the support of this government, shall be deemed a person qualified to vote for, and shall be capable of electing, a representative or representatives to serve as a member or members in the Senate and House of Representatives, for the parish or district where he actually is a resident, or in any other parish or district in this state where he hath the like freehold. Electors shall take an oath or affirmation of qualification, if required by the returning officer.

NEW YORK

ARTICLE VII. That every male inhabitant of full age, who shall have personally resided within one of the counties of this State for six months immediately preceding the day of election, shall, at such election, be entitled to vote for representatives of the said county in assembly: if, during the time of aforesaid, he shall have been a freeholder, possessing a freehold of the value of twenty pounds, within the said county, or have rented a tenement therein of the yearly value of forty shillings, and been rated and actually paid taxes to this State: *Provided always,* That every person who now is a freeman of the City of Albany, or who was made a freeman of the City of New York on or before the fourteenth day of October, in the year of our Lord one thousand seven hundred and seventy-five, and shall be actually and usually resident in the said cities, respectively, shall be entitled to vote for representatives in assembly within his said place of residence.

ARTICLE XII. That the election of Senators shall be after this manner: That so much of this State as is now parceled into counties be divided into four great districts: the southern district to comprehend the city and county of New York, Suffolk, Westchester, Kings, Queens, and Richmond Counties; the middle district to comprehend the counties of Duchess, Ulster, and Orange; the western district, the city and county of Albany, and Tryon County; and the eastern district, the counties of Charlotte, Cumberland, and Gloucester.

That the Senators shall be elected by the freeholders of the said districts, qualified as aforesaid, in the proportions following, to wit: In the southern district, nine; in the middle district, six; in the western district, six; and in the eastern district, three. And it be ordained, that a census shall be taken, as soon as may be after the expiration of seven years from the termination of the present war, under the direction of the legislature; and if, on such census, it shall appear that the number of Senators is not justly proportioned to the several districts, that the legislature adjust the proportion, as near as may be, to the number of freeholders, qualified as aforesaid, in each district.

MASSACHUSETTS

ARTICLE II. There shall be a meeting on the first Monday in April, annually, forever, of the inhabitants of each town in the several counties of this commonwealth, to be called by the selectmen, and warned in due course of law, at least seven days before the first Monday in April, for the purpose of electing persons to be Senators and Councilors; and at such meetings every male inhabitant of twenty-one years of age and upward, having a freehold estate within the commonwealth of the annual income of three pounds, or any estate of the value of sixty pounds, shall have a right to give in his vote for the Senators for the district of which he is an inhabitant. And to remove all doubts concerning the meaning of the word "inhabitant," in this constitution, every person shall be considered as an inhabitant, for the purpose of electing and being elected into any office or place within this State, in that town, district, or plantation where he dwelleth or hath his home.

The selectmen of the several towns shall preside at such meetings impartially, and shall receive the votes of all the inhabitants of such towns present and qualified to vote for Senators.

PENNSYLVANIA

SEC. 6. Every freeman of the full age of twenty-one years, having resided in this state for the space of one whole year next before the day of election for representatives, and paid public taxes during that time, shall enjoy the right of an elector: provided always, that sons of freeholders of the age of twenty-one years shall be entitled to vote although they have not paid taxes.

GEORGIA

ARTICLE IX. All male white inhabitants of the age of twenty-one years, and possessed in his own right of ten pounds value, and liable to pay tax in this State, or being of any mechanic trade, and shall have been resident six months in this State, shall have a right to vote at all elections for representatives, or any other officers herein agreed to be chosen by the people at large; and every person having a right to vote at any election shall vote by ballot personally.

NORTH CAROLINA

ARTICLE VIII. That all freemen of the age of twenty-one years, who have been inhabitants of any one county within the State twelve months immediately preceding the day of any election, and shall have paid public taxes, shall be entitled to vote for the members of the House of Commons for the county in which he resides.

ARTICLE IX. That all persons possessed of a freehold in any town in this State, having a right of representation, and also all freemen, who have been inhabitants of any such town twelve months next before, and at the day of election, and shall have paid public taxes, shall be entitled to vote for a member to represent such town in the House of Commons: *Provided always*, That this section shall not entitle any inhabitant of such town to vote for members of the House of Commons, for the county in which he may reside, nor any freeholder in such county, who resides without or beyond the limits of such town, to vote for a member for said town.

VIRGINIA

The constitution of Virginia of 1776 simply incorporated the right of suffrage as it existed under the ancient charter and the acts of the assembly which had been passed prior to that time, under these words:

"The right of suffrage in the election of members for both Houses shall remain as exercised at present; and each House shall choose its own Speaker, appoint its own officers, settle its own rules of proceeding, and direct writs of election, for the supplying intermediate vacancies."

The acts of the earier assemblies under the colonial charter had prescribed not only tax-paying requirements but also property-owning requirements.

COLONIAL CHARTER

Delaware, Rhode Island, and Connecticut were all operating under colonial charters and had not adopted new constitutions. The qualifications of their electors were fixed by statute.

CONNECTICUT

That the Town Clerks in the several Towns in this Colony, shall enroll in their respective Offices, the Names of all such Persons in their respective Towns as are or shall be admitted Freemen of this Corporation, which enrollments shall be made by the direction of the Authority and Selectmen of the Town, in the open Freemen's Meeting, legally Assembled.

That all such inhabitants in this Colony as have accomplished the Age of Twenty-one Years, and have the Possession of Freehold Estate to the value of Forty Shillings per Annum or Forty Pounds personal Estate in the General List of Estates in that Year wherein they desire to be admitted Freemen; and also are Persons of a quiet and peaceable Behaviour, and civil Conversation, may, if they desire it, on their procuring the Selectmen of the Town wherein such Persons inhabit, or the major Part of them, to certify that the said Persons are Qualified as abovesaid, be admitted and made Free of this Corporation, in case they take the Oath provided by Law for Freemen; which Oath any one Assistant or justice of the peace is hereby impowered to administer in said Freemen's Meeting.

DELAWARE

SEC. 2. *Provided always*, That no inhabitants of this government, shall have right of electing or being elected, as aforesaid (election for members of assembly), unless he or they be natural born subjects of Great Britain, or be naturalized in England, or in this government, or in the province of Pennsylvania and unless such person or persons be of the age of twenty-one years or upwards, and be a freeholder or freeholders in this government, and have fifty acres of land or more well settled, and twelve acres thereof cleared and improved, or be otherwise worth Forty Pounds lawful money of this government clear estate, and have been resident therein for the space of two years before such election: And that every man who shall give his vote without being questioned as aforesaid, or that shall receive any reward or gift for his vote, or that shall give, offer or promise any reward to be elected, or shall offer to serve for nothing or less allowance than the law prescribes, shall forfeit Five Pounds, the one-half thereof to the Governor, and the other to him or them who will sue for the same in any court of record within this Government; and the person so elected shall be incapable to serve for that year.

RHODE ISLAND

SECTION 1. *Be it enacted by the General Assembly, and by the authority thereof it is enacted*, That the freemen of each respective town in this State, at any of their town meetings, shall and they hereby have full power granted them, to admit so many persons, inhabitants of their respective towns, freemen of their towns, as shall be qualified according to this act.

SEC. 2. *And be it further enacted*, That no person whosoever shall be permitted to vote or act as a freeman in any town meeting in this State, but such only who are inhabitants therein, and who at the time of such their voting and acting are really and truly possessed, in their own proper right, of a real estate within this State, to the full value of one hundred and thirty-four dollars, or which shall rent for seven dollars per annum, being an estate in fee-simple, fee-tail, or an estate in reversion which qualifies no other person to be a freeman, or at least an estate for a person's own life, or the eldest son of such a freeholder: And that no estate of a less quality shall entitle any person to the freedom of this State.

Mr. President, by the proposals presently before the Senate, the States would be prohibited from levying poll taxes. Enactment of either the joint resolution or the Javits bill would lay the foundations for corresponding proposals designed to deprive the States of the power to determine all other voter qualifications.

The so-called literacy test bill—S. 2750—is already very much with us. However, at a later date I shall discuss my objections to that.

The Senate must know by now the dangers involved in permitting the "Federal camel" to get its nose under the "State tent." We have witnessed, for example, the interstate commerce clause stretched beyond recognition and the general welfare clause given a scope it never was intended to have.

Nevertheless, I want to emphasize that today we are not debating the merits of a poll tax, any more than we are debating the advisability of Georgia's extending the franchise to 18-year-olds or New York's requiring that its voters be able to read and write the English language.

Rather, we are debating whether a State is to have the power to determine its voter qualifications. The issue is clear.

Whatever conceivable evils a poll tax could spawn, I submit that there are far greater evils in forcing increased uniformity on the States, by transferring piecemeal to the Federal Government the power to determine voter qualifications at a time when our national leaders should be concentrating on measures which, to the contrary, would increase initiative and discourage uniformity.

Our Founding Fathers knew that uniform voter qualifications would not be satisfactory. They realized, as the Convention debate shows, that a provision limiting suffrage to freeholders, for example, would not receive every State's approval. As George Mason remarked:

> Does no other kind of property but land evidence a common interest in the proprietor? Does nothing besides property mark a permanent attachment? Ought the merchant, the moneyed man, the parent of a number of children whose fortunes are to be pursued in his own country, to be viewed as suspicious characters, and unworthy to be trusted with the common rights of their fellow citizens? (Elliot's Debates, vol. 5, p. 387.)

Unfortunately, there is a parallel between the erosion of the power of the States and the increase in the percentage of those Americans who ask not what they can do for their country but what their country can do for them. Indeed, it is not unnatural that as power becomes centralized, individual initiative wanes; conformity increases; and tyranny—which our Founding Fathers understood so well—stands at the gates of our republican form of government.

I do not argue that there are no outmoded State statutes. I do, however, take issue with the proposition that, whatever the problem involved, the Federal Government is best qualified to bring about its solution. The framers of our Constitution, after crushing one tyranny, were not so naive as to lay the framework for the establishment of another.

As I have indicated, both Senate Joint Resolution 58 and Senate bill 478 are founded on the false premise that every citizen should have the right to vote. Clearly suffrage is, and must remain, a privilege subject to the qualifications which each State, in the best interest of its citizens, may elect. Furthermore, as I have pointed out, the abolition of poll tax requirements is a step in the direction of uniform voting qualifications to be imposed and enforced by the Federal Government. The unfortunate trends toward uniformity and Federal encroachment upon the rights of the States should not be encouraged.

Although both measures are objectionable on policy grounds, the bill, S. 478, has the particularly detrimental aspect of being clearly unconstitutional.

This bill would conflict with article I, section 2, of the Constitution, which provides that the qualifications of electors are to be prescribed by the States. Here are the provisions of the Constitution of the United States which are involved:

ARTICLE I

SEC. 2. The House of Representatives shall be composed of Members chosen every second year by the people of the several States, and the electors in each State shall have the qualifications requisite for electors of the most numerous branch of the State legislature.

SEC. 4. The times, places, and manner of holding elections for Senators and Representatives shall be prescribed in each State by the legislature thereof; but the Congress may at any time by law make or alter such regulations, except as to the places of choosing Senators.

If the imposition of a poll tax is a matter of the qualifications of a voter, it is controlled exclusively by the State under article I, section 2, and the Federal Government cannot under article I, section 4, prohibit the imposition of a poll tax under the guise of regulating the manner of the election. Accordingly, article I, section 4, of the Constitution is not a proper basis for S. 478.

Section 3 of this bill defines the imposition of a poll tax as an interference with the manner of holding elections and also states that poll taxes shall be deemed an abridgment of the right and privilege of citizens of the United States to vote for such officers, meaning Federal officials. This may be a reference to the 14th, 15th, and 19th amendments.

Court decisions have held that the 14th and 19th amendments do not preclude the imposition of a poll tax. Moreover, since the case of Butler against Thompson, below, has held that the Virginia poll tax is a valid exercise of the State's authority under article I, section 2, of the Constitution, neither in its terms nor its application violating the 15th amendment, S. 478 would be clearly unconstitutional.

Fortunately, the framers of the Constitution left us in no doubt on that subject, as the exclusive control of the States over voter qualifications is clearly shown in the Constitutional Debates and Federalist Papers.

DIFFERING QUALIFICATIONS OF THE STATES

A. THE CONSTITUTIONAL CONVENTION

At the outset, we should take note of the fact that in 1789 the States had rigorous and widely differing requirements for voting. These were summarized by Chief Justice Waite in his opinion in *Minor* v. *Happersett*, 21 Wall. 162 (1874) at page 172.

For example, the general requirement was ownership of property, usually real estate. In 1789 Georgia liberalized its requirements by extending the vote to those who had prepaid taxes, even though they did not qualify by property ownership. Other States followed suit. As the usual course men of 21 years of age enjoyed the franchise. Residence restrictions sometimes existed.

These differences occasioned many debates in the Constitutional Convention on the possibility of uniform qualifications for voters. The dispute centered on whether the Constitution should limit the franchise to landowners or whether limitations should be left to the individual States. James Madison and Gouverneur Morris of Pennsylvania favored the former position. The argument was that landowners would be the safest depository of republican liberty. Moreover, they feared making qualifications dependent on the will of the States not because the States would unduly restrict the electorate, but because they would be too generous in extending the privilege.

As presented by Oliver Ellsworth, of Connecticut, James Wilson, of Pennsylvania, and George Mason, of Virginia, the argument on the other side related to the diversity of existing State qualifications. They warned that the right of suffrage was a tender point carefully guarded in the State constitutions, and that tampering with it might wreck the new Government. They pointed out that it would be difficult to settle on a uniform rule for all States and that it would be awkward if the electors of the State legislatures and Congress were not the same—volume 5, Elliott's Debates, 385, 1866.

At this point I would like to comment on a statement made last Monday by the distinguished author of the proposed constitutional amendment when my able colleague, the senior Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], was speaking on the Senate floor against both the resolution and the bill.

The distinguished Senator from Florida said that his amendment would apply only to the election of a President, a Senator, or a Member of the House of Representatives; it would not in any way disturb the qualifications of the electors for all State officers. Of course, the senior Senator from Virginia promptly replied that it would be utterly impractical to have a dual voting list, one group qualified to vote for Federal officers and a different group qualified to vote for State officers.

As I have said, the very awkward, cumbersome nature of dual voting lists, to which the senior Senator from Virginia referred, was apparent to the Convention delegates and indeed figured prominently in the Convention's rejection of the dual voting list alternative.

In addition, during the Convention debates, Ellsworth, Wilson, and Mason argued also that a power to alter the qualifications of voters would be a dangerous power in the hands of the National Legislature. Once the principle is established that the Congress can make such changes, the power used at one time to expand the electorate might be used at another to restrict it, and, theoretically at least, the restriction could be carried so far that there would result a despotism.

Mr. President, here I would like to refer to the fact that the proposal of the distinguished Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND], to alter the Constitution by constitutional means has been criticized by the NAACP and the Americans for Democratic Action as being too slow and too cumbersome. They contend that the result could be accomplished much more quickly by an act of Congress, passed, of course, by a majority, and signed by the President.

I say, Mr. President, we are dealing with a provision which was very maturely discussed before it became an integral part of the Constitution; namely, the provision to leave the determination of voter qualifications to the States.

As I have indicated, the members of the Constitutional Convention were conscious of the need to satisfy the people of the various States sensitive on the subject of suffrage rights. It was, therefore, one of the subjects which received close attention in the Federalist Papers written at the time to convince State conventions to adopt the Constitution.

B. THE FEDERALIST

In No. 52 of the Federalist, it was pointed out that the Constitution made the qualification for Federal electors the same as those of the electors of the most numerous branch of the State legislature:

> The definition of the right of suffrage is very justly regarded as a fundamental article of republican government.

The Federalist author continued:

> It was incumbent on the convention, therefore, to define and establish this right in the Constitution. To have left it open for the occasional regulation of the Congress would have been improper for the reason just mentioned. To have submitted it to the legislative discretion of the States would have been improper for the same reason, and for the additional reason that it would have rendered too dependent on the State governments that branch of the Federal Government which ought to be dependent on the people alone.

The following words of the paragraph should be noted:

> To have reduced the different qualifications in the different States to one uniform rule would probably have been as dissatisfactory to some of the States as it would have been difficult to the Convention.
>
> The provision made by the Convention 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. It will be safe to the United States because, being fixed by the State constitutions, it is not alterable by the State governments, and it cannot be feared that the people of the States will alter this part of their constitutions in such a manner as to abridge rights secured to them by the Federal Constitution.

Then in the 54th Federalist, it was remarked:

> The qualifications on which the right of suffrage depend are not, perhaps, the same in any two States. In some of the States the difference is very material.

C. RATIFYING CONVENTIONS

Later, at the Massachusetts ratifying convention, in answer to a query as to whether Congress might prescribe a property qualification for voters, Mr. Rufus King, a member of the Federal Convention, said:

> 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 elections, not the qualifications of the electors.

And James Wilson, who had warned in the Constitutional Convention of the difficulty that might result if qualifications of State and National electors were different, had this to say in the Pennsylvania convention:

> In order to know who are qualified to be electors of the 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 State legislatures is proved to be essential to the existence of the General Government.

Those familiar with the Virginia ratifying convention know that Patrick Henry opposed the ratification of the Constitution on the ground that it gave

the Federal Government too much power. One issue was whether the Federal Government could pass on the qualifications of the voters or whether Virginia, as in the past, could fix those qualifications. If the latter, the Federal Government would merely determine the times, places, and manner, if it wished to do so, of holding those elections, but those who had the right to vote under the State law would then freely participate.

Wilson Nicholas, a member of the Virginia convention, gave the members positive assurance that the Federal Government could not and never would undertake to pass upon and fix the qualifications of voters.

Virginia agreed to ratify only on the assurance that the first session of the Congress would propose bill-of-rights amendments to the Constitution and even went a step further when the Convention named a committee headed by Gov. Edmond Randolph and including James Madison and John Marshall, to draft a form of ratification that would include certain reservations as to States rights.

The resolution reported by that committee and adopted by the Convention said:

> The powers granted under the Constitution, being derived from the people of the United States, be resumed by them whensoever the same shall be perverted to their injury or oppression, and at their will * * *.

In explaining the voting plan to the North Carolina convention, John Steele, like Wilson Nicholas, said:

> Can they, without a most manifest violation of the Constitution, alter the qualifications of the electors: The power over the manner of elections does not include that of saying who shall vote. The Constitution 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 significance of this history is reinforced by the fact that as late as 1912, when the 17th amendment was proposed by Congress, providing for popular election of Senators, language was used identical to that of article I, section 2. This amendment says:

> The electors in each State shall have the qualifications requisite for electors of the most numerous branch of the State legislatures.

It should be noted that these words were adopted after more than a century of experience with the suffrage provisions contained in the Constitution and also after there had been ample time to observe operations of the newer poll taxes which were imposed between 1875 and 1908.

D. FEDERALIST INTERPRETATION OF "MANNER"

The fourth section of article I reads:

> The times, places, and manner of holding elections for Senators and Representatives, shall be prescribed in each State by the legislature thereof; but the Congress may at any time by law make or alter such regulations, except as to the places of choosing Senators.

The main purpose of this section was to enable both the State and Federal Governments to preserve themselves by the regulation of elections—see Nos. 59 and 60, Federalist Papers.

Also, discussing article I, section 4, in the Virginia ratifying convention, Mr. Madison explained:

> It was found impossible to fix the time, place, and manner of the election of Representatives in the Constitution. It was found necessary to leave the regulation of these, in the first place, to the State governments, as being best acquainted with the situation of the people, subject to the control of the General Government, in order to enable it to produce uniformity and prevent its own dissolution.
>
> And, considering the State governments and General Government as distinct bodies, acting in different and independent capacities for the people, it was thought the particular regulations should be submitted to the former and the general regulations to the latter. Were they exclusively under the control of the State governments, the General Government might easily be dissolved. But if they be regulated properly by the State legislatures, the congressional control will very probably never be exercised.

This, it should be remarked, deals only with the times, places, and manner of holding elections and not with qualifications of voters since, under the provision of article I, section 2, a State could not attempt to dissolve the General Government by disqualifying voters without automatically dissolving its own government. It is essentially a distinction between substance and procedure. This distinction was made by a concurring opinion in *Newberry* v. *U.S.*, 256 U.S. 232, 280 (1920).

Arguments have been made that "manner" does not refer merely to procedure of elections; but to accept that premise is to agree to what the entire thrust of the constitutional debates refute, that the Central Government could impose uniform franchise qualifications. Rather, Hamilton argues that once the States set up a qualification, the Central Government could insist that it be carried out, i.e., that elections be held. Hamilton's analysis was reinforced by the majority opinion in Newberry against United States where Justice McReynolds states that "manner" of holding elections does not mean power broadly to regulate them—at 256.

Moreover, this clause has been used as the author foresaw, to protect a Federal election from corruption, later referred to.

The foregoing history is convincing evidence that the members of the Constitutional Convention and the Ratifying Conventions intended the Constitution to give to the States and to the States only the authority to prescribe qualifications for voters. The courts have consistently followed this interpretation.

COURT INTERPRETATION OF SECTIONS 2 AND 4 OF ARTICLE I

In *Ex parte Yarbrough*, 110 U.S. 651 (1884), the court said, after quoting section 2, article I:

> The States in prescribing the qualifications of voters for the most numerous branch of their own legislatures, do not do this with reference to the election for Members of Congress. Nor can they prescribe the qualifications for voters for those eo nomine. They define who are to vote for the popular branch of their own legislature, and the Constitution of the United States says the same persons shall vote for Members of Congress in that State. It adopts the qualification thus furnished as the qualification of its own electors for Members of Congress (at 663).

See also *Swafford* v. *Templeton*, 185 U.S. 487 (1902), following Yarbrough and pointing out once more that it is the Constitution, not Congress, that adopts the qualifications of State electors. *McPherson* v. *Blacker*, 146 U.S. 1, 27, 35 (1892), reaches the same conclusion.

State power over definition of voter qualification was again affirmed by the Supreme Court as recently as June 8, 1959. In Lassiter against Northampton County Board of Elections, upholding a North Carolina illiteracy test, Justice Douglas said:

> The States have long been held to have broad powers to determine the conditions under which the right of suffrage may be exercised (at p. 6).

The main discussion of the court in Yarbrough was interpretation of section 4, article I, Congress' power over the "manner" of holding elections. The theory of protection against corruption of qualified voting was fully developed in this case.

Yarbrough and others were prosecuted for interfering by physical attack with the exercise of the right to vote of certain qualified voters in an election of a Member of Congress from Georgia. After holding that Congress under the quoted section could pass an act prohibiting such violence, Justice Miller wrote:

> Can it be doubted that Congress can by law protect the act of voting, the place where it is done, and the man who votes from personal violence or intimidation and the election itself from corruption and fraud? (at 661).

Or a suppression of voting rights by electors who refuse to accept payment of a poll tax prerequisite may be protected by congressional action under section 4, article I, *United States* v. *Munford*, C.C.E.D. Va. 16 Fed. Rep. 223, 228 (1883).

It is here in the realm of protection that *United States* v. *Classic*, 313 U.S. 299, 320 (1941) is appropriate. It points out that section 4 of article I is supplemented by Congress' power to pass implementing legislation under the "necessary and proper" clause, article I, section 8, clause 18. The case does not stand for a general regulation of qualifications, for the holding of the case was that a primary was part of a general election.

The foregoing authorities demonstrate that the Federal Government may protect the purity of its elections—but to equate all poll tax statutes with corruption is to miss the point. Those who believe corruption is the result have power to pass Federal legislation specifically outlawing such abuses as the purchase of poll tax receipts.

I have endeavored to show that the purpose of the two sections of the Constitution when written and as judicially

interpreted does not admit of any restriction on State power to define voter qualifications. Nowhere in the body of the original Constitution will be found a restriction on the discretion of the States in fixing the qualifications of voters. However, restrictions were later added by the 14th, 15th, and 19th amendments. I point out that they were made effective by amending the Constitution, which is the only proper approach that should be taken by those who seek to eliminate the poll tax requirement.

What is the nature of these restrictions? Do they forbid a poll tax qualification?

THE MEANING OF THE 14TH AND 19TH AMENDMENTS

The 14th amendment provides:

SECTION 1. All persons born or naturalized in the United States and subject to the jurisdiction thereof, are citizens of the United States and of the State wherein they reside. No State shall make or enforce any law which shall abridge the privileges or immunities of citizens of the United States; nor shall any State deprive any person of life, liberty, or property, without due process of law; nor deny to any person within its jurisdiction the equal protection of the laws.

In *Minor* v. *Happersett*, 21 Wall. 162 (1874), following the adoption of the 14th amendment, a woman argued that a Missouri law which limited the franchise to men deprived her of citizenship rights which the amendment gave her. The court denied her claim, because the right to vote before the amendment was not necessarily one of the privileges or immunities of citizenship, and the amendment did not add to them. It simply furnished an additional guarantee for the protection of such as she already had—at 171. The court concluded with the statement that it was "unanimously of the opinion that the Constitution of the United States does not confer the right of suffrage upon anyone, and that the constitutions and laws of the several States which commit that important trust to men alone are not necessarily void"—at page 178. See also *U.S.* v. *Cruikshank*, 92 U.S. 542, 554 (1875).

In the case of *Breedlove* v. *Suttles*, 302 U.S. 277, 238 (1937), a Georgia statute making a poll tax a voting prerequisite to Federal and State elections was attacked on the ground that it violated the 14th and 19th amendments. The tax in question applied to all inhabitants of Georgia between the ages of 21 and 60, with an exception for females who did not register for voting. The court held that the classification of the law, not being an invalid discrimination, did not violate the equal protection clause of the 14th amendment. The court also held that the exemption for women who did not vote was not in violation of the 19th amendment. In the course of its opinion the court also stated clearly that the poll tax was not prohibited by the privileges and immunities clause of the 14th amendment and was a proper qualification for voting for the States to impose.

To make payment of poll taxes a prerequisite of voting is not to deny any privilege or immunity protected by the 14th amendment. Privilege of voting is not derived from the United States, but is conferred by the State and, save as restrained by the 15th and 19th amendments and other provisions of the Federal Constitution, the State may condition suffrage as it deems appropriate. *Minor* v. *Happersett*, 21 Wall. 162, 170 et seq. *Ex Parte Yarbrough*, 110 U.S. 651, 664–665. *McPherson* v. *Blacker*, 146, U.S. 1, 37–38. *Guinn* v. *United States*, 238 U.S. 347, 362.

The privileges and immunities protected are only those that arise from the Constitution and laws of the United States and not those that spring from other sources. *Hamilton* v. *Regents*, 293 U.S. 245, 261.

There have been attempts to distinguish the Breedlove case on the grounds that the voting registration was for both State and Federal elections, and thus the necessity for a State to control its own election dictated the result.

But the distinction appears without merit since a later case solely involved a Federal election, *Pirtle* v. *Brown*, C.A. 6 (1941) 118 F. 2d 218, cert. den. 314 U.S. 621. A citizen of Tennessee otherwise qualified was refused the right to vote in a special election to fill a vacancy in the House of Representatives because he had not paid the poll tax. The reasoning of Breedlove was followed, and the Supreme Court denied a petition for review.

These two cases also serve to destroy the notion, sometimes advanced, that a poll tax is a tax on a national function, that of voting, and hence unconstitutional.

THE MEANING OF THE 15TH AMENDMENT

The restrictions of the 14th and 19th amendments have been studied. I should now like to examine that of the 15th, which reads:

SECTION 1. The right of citizens of the United States to vote shall not be denied or abridged by the United States or by any State on account of race, color, or previous condition of servitude.

SEC. 2. The Congress shall have power to enforce this article by appropriate legislation.

In *United States* v. *Reese*, 92 U.S. 214 (1875), the Court construed a statute passed under Congress' power of section 2 to enact appropriate legislation. The act was invoked by the applicant because his failure to pay a poll tax enabled the inspectors to prohibit his voting in a municipal election. In the opinion of Chief Justice Waite the following statement is made:

Rights and immunities created by or dependent upon the Constitution of the United States can be protected by Congress. * * *

The 15th amendment does not confer the right of suffrage upon anyone. It prevents the States, or the United States, however, from giving preference, in this particular, to one citizen of the United States over another on account of race, color, or previous condition of servitude. Before its adoption, this could be done. It was as much within the power of a State to exclude citizens of the United States from voting on account of race, etc., as it was on account of age, property, or education. Now it is not.

See also *Guinn and Beal* v. *United States*, 238, U.S. 347, 362 (1915) where Chief Justice White stated for the Court that the States retained the power under article I, section 2, to establish qualifications of voters, "except of course as to the subject with which the 15th amendment deals and to the extent that obedience to its command is necessary."

VIRGINIA POLL TAX HELD VALID

The question of Virginia poll tax as a prerequisite to voting was reviewed by a special three-judge court as recently as 1951 in *Butler* v. *Thompson*, D.C.E.D. Va., 97 F. Supp. 17, affirmed, 341 U.S. 937. Judge Dobie quoted from an earlier opinion in the case of *Saunders* v. *Wilkins*, 152 F. 2d 235, 237, as follows:

The decisions generally hold that a State statute which imposes a reasonable poll tax as a condition of the right to vote does not abridge the privileges or immunities of citizens of the United States which are protected by the 14th amendment. The privilege of voting is derived from the State and not from the National Government. The qualification of voters in an election for Members of Congress is set out in article I, section 2, clause 1 of the Federal Constitution which provides that the electors in each State shall have the qualifications requisite for electors of the most numerous branch of the State legislature. The Supreme Court in *Breedlove* v. *Suttles*, 302 U.S. 277, 283, 58 S. Ct. 205, 82 L. Ed. 252, held that a poll tax prescribed by the constitution and statutes of the State of Georgia did not offend the Federal Constitution.

Then followed the quotation from Breedlove against Suttles, which I quoted earlier.

In the latter part of the decision in the case of Butler against Thompson the Court discussed the general principle that a statute may be administered in such a fashion as to be unconstitutional even though it is fair on its face, under the 14th amendment, as in *Yick Wo* v. *Hopkins*, 118 U.S. 356 or under the 15th amendment as in *Lane* v. *Wilson*, 307 U.S. 268. Judge Dobie reviewed the administration of the poll tax in Virginia, and came to the conclusion, on the basis of the evidence presented to him, that it was being fairly administered, without discrimination on the basis of race.

Accordingly, Judge Dobie, speaking for the unanimous three-judge court, held that the Virginia poll tax statute did not violate either the 14th amendment or the 15th amendment, and was valid under article I, section 2 of the Constitution of the United States.

Mr. President, Butler against Thompson shows clearly that the administration of the poll tax in Virginia has not been used as a vehicle of discrimination against voters on account of race or color. As the senior Senator from Virginia stated earlier in the week, Virginia's modest $1.50 poll tax approximates the compensation, these days, for 1 hour of work. Virginia now has more than 100,000 qualified persons who pay the poll tax and vote. It is true that many colored people do not pay it; but it is likewise true that many white persons do not pay it either. Those people are simply not interested enough in government to pay the $1.50. Nor do they wish to take the trouble to register, although as my colleague from Virginia observed, our State has permanent registration.

The requirement in some States, for example, in New York, that voters register before each general election disqualifies far more persons than are disqualified in Virginia by our $1.50 poll tax. Yet the finger of scorn is pointed at Virginia and the four other Southern

States which have a poll tax as though we were engaging in some immoral action. Nothing could be further from the truth.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Virginia yield for a question?

Mr. ROBERTSON. I yield for a question.

Mr. STENNIS. From the Senator's study of the Constitutional Convention, does he not believe that one of the most important considerations during the Convention related to the very strong debate on the question of the qualifications of electors and how they were to be designated?

Mr. ROBERTSON. Absolutely. The Convention delegates knew that the question of determining the qualifications of voters was a tender one with each of the States. They deliberately left it within the State's power provided that no State could set a voter qualification for Federal officials which was different from those qualifications set for electors of the most numerous branch of the State legislature. That provision was clearly explained in the State conventions. It was frankly admitted by many that the Federal Constitution would not have been ratified if there had been an attempt to impose uniform qualifications.

James Madison and Gouverneur Morris thought, and not without some merit, that unless a man owned property or, at least, had income from it; he should not be permitted to vote. However, that proposal was rejected.

As the Senator from Mississippi has stated, it was stressed that the power to determine voter qualifications was a cherished right of the sovereign States, they did not intend that the Federal Government should take it away from them.

Mr. STENNIS. Is it not true that article I, section 2 of the Constitution means that there can be no Federal qualifications for electors? It does not mean that there can be anything such as a Federal test, does it? Does it not clearly show that the drafters of the Federal Constitution adopted State tests as the sole and only tests?

Mr. ROBERTSON. Absolutely; and time after time our Supreme Court has held that, with the exception of the amendments relating to race and to sex, there are no Federal restrictions upon the States with respect to determining the qualifications of voters, except the requirement of article I, section 2 and the 17th amendment that the qualifications of voters in Federal elections shall be the same as for the most numerous branch of the State legislatures.

Mr. STENNIS. I am sure the Senator will recall that in the first debate on this subject after the Senator from Mississippi came to the Senate, the Senator from Virginia raised this point. Is it not true that in the Senator's research on qualifications, he has found that, after all, the poll tax came into being as one of the qualifications used by the various States as a liberalizing measure, as a milder requirement than the demand of a property tax?

Mr. ROBERTSON. That is correct.

Mr. STENNIS. Or the ownership of property. Is not that true?

Mr. ROBERTSON. Yes. Many of the States insisted on very large property holdings or on rent from very large property holdings.

Mr. STENNIS. Yes.

Mr. ROBERTSON. And some said, "A merchant who has a stock of goods, accounts payable, and all that, should be allowed to vote"; so merchants were allowed to vote.

Others said, "If a resident pays a mere poll tax, to show his interest in government, we will let him vote."

So, as I have stated, the poll tax was a liberalizing influence in some instances.

My colleague from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] pointed out, this week, in his remarks on the Senate floor that from this tax more than $1,500,000 a year is obtained for the schools.

Mr. STENNIS. I thank the Senator from Virginia for yielding.

ENABLING LEGISLATION OVER POLL TAXES PREEMPTED BY COURT DECISION

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, Senate bill 478 and similar bills would make unlawful all poll taxes as a prerequisite for voting, presumably as a violation of the 14th or 15th amendment. On its face, S. 478 would prohibit the Virginia poll tax as a prerequisite for voting. But the Court in its decision in the case of Butler against Thompson above, has held that the Virginia poll tax is a valid exercise of the State's authority under article I, section 2, of the Constitution, and neither in its terms nor in its application violates the 14th or 15th amendment. Senate bill 478 purports to make a congressional finding of a fact which the Supreme Court has held not to be a fact. It exceeds the power of the Congress under the 14th or 15th amendment to enforce those amendments by appropriate legislation.

REPUBLICAN FORM OF GOVERNMENT

Not more than passing attention need be given to argument based on section 4, article IV. This section provides:

> The United States shall guarantee to every State in this Union a Republican Form of Government, and shall protect each of them against Invasion; and on Application of the Legislature, or of the Executive (when the Legislature cannot be convened) against domestic Violence.

Under this section it is contended that Congress may pass appropriate legislation under the necessary and proper clause to outlaw the poll tax, because it reduces the size of the electorate, therefore denying a republican form of government. It is added that this legislation will not be unconstitutional, since the Supreme Court historically has refused review of such a political question.

The short answer to this approach is that the definition of a republican form of government may be found only by examining those of the States when they adopted the Constitution. Among the qualifications which prohibited universal suffrage were tax statutes, including poll taxes. I refer to the explanation of this section by Madison in No. 43 of the Federalist Papers. Moreover, such is the judicial interpretation in Minor against Happersett, at pages 175–176.

The poll tax proposals represent another attempt to transfer to the Federal Government a power which our forefathers, after great debate, determined must remain with the States. Today, authority is sought to prohibit one type of voter qualification. Tomorrow, authority may be sought to determine all. I do not accept the principle that the Federal Government is better qualified to determine voter qualifications for all citizens than is each of the individual States for its own citizens, nor do I believe that a strong central government is in our national interest if its strength must be acquired by a corresponding weakening of the sovereign States.

Mr. President, I have read into the RECORD the voting qualifications of the Thirteen Original States. I now hold in my hand a compilation of the present voting requirements of all the States in the Union at the present time. This compilation may be found in part 5 of the supplemental hearings on Senate Joint Resolution 58 and Senate Joint Resolution 81, concerning poll taxes, of August 25 and 30 and September 8, 1961, when similar issues were under consideration in the hearings before a subcommittee of the Judiciary Committee. Mr. President, I believe it pertinent to call attention to some of these voter requirements, in order to show how varied they are in the different States.

Referring to them in alphabetical order, I shall start with the requirements in Alabama:

ALABAMA

Unless otherwise designated, references are to Code of Alabama, Recomp. 1959, and to the 1959 supplement thereto—title 17.

VOTERS' QUALIFICATIONS (CONSTITUTION OF ALABAMA 1901, AMENDMENT XCI TO SECTION 181)

Age: 21 years.

Citizenship: Must be citizen of the United States.

Residence: 2 years in State, 1 year in county, 3 months in precinct or ward immediately preceding election (constitution of 1901, amendment XCVI to sec. 178).

Literacy: Must be able to read and write in English any article of the Constitution of the United States which may be submitted to him by board of registrars (also code sec. 32).[1] Those persons who were registered as voters before 1903 are still qualified and need not register again (constitution of Alabama, amendment XCI to sec. 181).

Character: Must be of good character and embrace the duties and obligations of citizenship under the Constitution of the United States and Alabama (also code sec. 32).

Poll tax: Must have paid by February 1, next preceding election, all poll taxes due from him for the last 2 years (constitution of 1901, amendment XCVI to sec. 178).

Exemption: Blind and deaf persons and persons who honorably served in the military service of the United States during hostilities, are exempt from the poll tax payment as a prerequisite to voting (constitution of 1901, amendments XC (90) and CIX (109)).

[1] Prior provision, amendment No. 55, was declared to be unconstitutional—*Davis* v. *Schnell* (336 U.S. 933 (1949)). Present provision, amendment No. 91, was adopted in 1951.

DISQUALIFIED FROM VOTING (CONSTITUTION OF 1901, SEC. 182)

1. Idiots and insane persons.

2. Those who by reason of conviction of crime were disqualified at the time of ratification of constitution of 1901.

3. Those who shall be convicted of treason, murder, arson, embezzlement, malfeasance in office, larceny, receiving stolen property, obtaining property or money under false pretenses, perjury, subornation of perjury, robbery, assault with intent to rob, burglary, forgery, bribery, assault and battery on wife, bigamy, living in adultery, sodomy, incest, rape, miscegenation, crime against nature, or any crime punishable by imprisonment in the penitentiary, or of any infamous crime or crime involving moral turpitude.

4. Any person who shall be convicted as a vagrant or tramp, or of selling or offering to sell or buy his vote or the vote of another, or of making or offering to make a false return in a general or primary election to procure the election or nomination of any person to office, or of suborning any witness or registrar to secure the registration of any person as an elector.

REGISTRATION

Registration is permanent (code sec. 36) and must be made in person only (supp. sec. 31; code sec. 27(1)).

Registration application: Applicant shall fill out a questionnaire in his own writing, duly signed and sworn to, in the presence of the board of registrars, without assistance unless physically handicapped. Application is not a public record. If denied, must be preserved by board for 30 days, after which, if no appeal has been taken, they shall be kept with the records of the board or disposed of in such manner as the board may direct (supp. sec. 31).

Contents: The form and contents of the questionnaire shall be prescribed by the Supreme Court of Alabama and filed with the secretary of state and shall be so worded that the answers will give the board of registrars the information necessary to pass upon the qualifications of the applicant (constitution 1901, amendmend XCI; code supp. sec. 31).

Loyalty oath: Questionnaire shall contain an oath to support and defend the Constitutions of the United States and of Alabama, and a statement disavowing belief in or affiliation at any time with any group which advocates the overthrow of the Federal or State Government by unlawful means (constitution 1901, amendment XCI; code supp. sec. 31).

Other data: Applicant may be required to state under oath his name, addresses, and employers for the past 5 years (code, 1940, sec. 43).

PENALTY FOR VIOLATIONS

Perjury: Any person, in registering, who willfully makes a false statement as to his name, address, or employment for the last 5 years, or who falsely takes the registration oath, shall be guilty of perjury and shall be imprisoned in the penitentiary for not less than 1 year nor more than 5 years (code, title 17, secs. 309, 323, 334; title 14, sec. 378).

Illegal voting: A vote cast at a place other than the voting place at which the voter is entitled to vote shall be illegal (sec. 90 (3)). Any person who votes more than once at any election, or deposits more than one ballot for the same office, or knowingly attempts to vote when he is not entitled to do so, or is guilty of any kind of illegal or fraudulent voting, shall be imprisoned in the penitentiary for not less than 2 nor more than 5 years, at the discretion of the jury (sec. 302).

Voting without registration and oath: Any person voting at any county or State election who has not registered and subscribed to the registration oath shall be fined from from $100 to $1,000 or imprisoned in the county jail, or sentenced to hard labor for the county for from 1 to 6 months (sec. 303).

Unlawful registration: Any person who registers for another, or who knowingly registers or procures the registration of any person not possessing the qualifications of a voter, or who registers more than once shall be guilty of a felony punishable by imprisonment in the penitentiary for from 1 to 5 years (sec. 308).

There are 1½ printed pages of laws under the constitution and on the statute books for just 1 of the 50 States of the Union—Alabama—and one of the relatively minor provisions in the Alabama law relates to the poll tax, which the proposal we are discussing seeks to nullify.

The hearings to which I have referred contain 62 pages of State laws relating to the qualifications of voters. As I have said, that is more than 1 printed page for each State, containing State laws which, under the Constitution, the States have legally adopted.

Now it is proposed to start taking away from the States the power to fix voter qualifications, and to confer that power on the Congress.

As I have said, Mr. President, I shall not encumber the RECORD with 62 pages of State voter qualifications. I have referred to Alabama, which is a southern State, for which the provisions took a page and a half. Now let us review the voter qualifications of the most populous State in the Union, New York.

I was particularly interested in reading the qualifications of voters of New York, because the Senators of New York have been in the forefront of those who have been complaining so bitterly about unfair restrictions:

VOTERS' QUALIFICATIONS

Age: 21 years on election day.

Citizenship: Must be U.S. citizen at least 90 days prior to election.

Residence: 1 year in State, 4 months in county, city, or village, 30 days in election district next preceding the election.

Literacy: Unless he became entitled to vote prior to January 1, 1922, must, in addition to above qualifications, be able to read and write English unless prevented by physical incapacity.

DISQUALIFIED FROM VOTING

1. Persons who shall pay or receive or offer to pay or receive money or thing of value for giving or withholding a vote at an election, or for registering or refraining to register as a voter, or who shall make any promise to influence the giving or withholding of any such vote or registration—

I ask Senators to listen to this disqualification:

[Persons who] * * * shall make or become directly or indirectly interested in any bet or wager depending on the result of an election shall not vote at such election.

Anybody in New York who bets on an election or who becomes directly or indirectly interested in such a bet, is disqualified from voting. The big bookmakers in New York quote the odds on a presidential election right up to election day; but a person who bets is not allowed to vote. Paradoxical? Yes, indeed.

Nevertheless, the State of New York has the unqualified right to put such a requirement in its law. I do not know of any other State which has such a requirement, and, as I say, State authorities apparently do not pay any attention to it, but Congress has no right to dictate otherwise.

I continue to read:

2. Persons convicted of a felony pursuant to laws of New York shall not have the right to register or vote at any election unless previously pardoned or restored to civil rights of citizenship by the Governor or unless awarded a certificate of good conduct granted by the board of parole pursuant to the provisions of the executive law to remove the disability under the section because of such conviction. The Governor, however, may attach as a condition to any such pardon a provision that any such person shall not have the right of suffrage until it shall have been separately restored to him.

3. Persons convicted of a felony in a Federal court if offense would constitute felony under laws of New York unless pardoned or restored to the rights of citizenship by the President of the United States.

4. Persons convicted of a felony in a Federal court for an offense of which such court has exclusive jurisdiction unless pardoned or restored to the rights of citizenship by the President of the United States.

5. Persons convicted in another State for a crime which would constitute a felony under the laws of New York unless restored to the rights of citizenship by the Governor or other appropriate authority of such other State.

6. Persons who have been adjudged incompetent or committed to a mental institution by judicial authority unless thereafter adjudged competent or found to have recovered and discharged from the institution.

REGISTRATION

Voter must register in person before every general election in cities or villages having 5,000 inhabitants or more.

I would conservatively estimate that more people are prevented from voting in New York City by failing to register every 2 years than are disqualified for failure to pay poll taxes in all the five Southern States which still have such a payment as a prerequisite for voting. That again, however, is the privilege of New York. We in Virginia prefer permanent registration. It is more simple. It is easier to enforce.

In election districts outside of cities and villages of 5,000 or more inhabitants registration is permanent, subject to cancellation for failure to vote at a general election within a 4-year period.

Think of that provision. In the small towns the registration is permanent, but if a person does not vote for 4 years he loses his registration.

I think that is a rather complicated provision, but if that is what New York wants, I say that is what New York has the right to have.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question on the point he has made?

Mr. ROBERTSON. I yield.

Mr. STENNIS. Is it not true, with reference to any State having either one or more qualifications, conditions, or provisions as to electors, that is a matter for the State to decide, and so far as the qualifications for Federal electors are concerned, they are automatically adopted and accepted?

Mr. ROBERTSON. The Senator is correct. As I say, I hold in my hands 62 pages of State laws dealing with qualifications of voters. The States have

always had the right to set them, provided they do not discriminate as to race, color, sex, or previous condition of servitude, and provided they do not require a different qualification for voting for a Federal officer from that required for voting for a member of the most numerous branch of the State legislature. In other words, the State can require anything it pleases. That has always been the right of the State.

As I said before, the Constitution would not have been ratified if it had not left to the States their right to fix qualifications of electors.

Mr. STENNIS. I believe the Senator said there are 62 pages of such laws.

Mr. ROBERTSON. That is correct.

Mr. STENNIS. Is it not true that even though there are the 62 pages of qualifications, the proposal before the Senate relates to only 1?

Mr. ROBERTSON. And a relatively minor one.

Mr. STENNIS. A relatively minor one; and it applies to only a few States.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Yes. However, once the trend to Federal control begins, it is difficult to stop.

As I pointed out, the framers of the Constitution said at times the drive might be to liberalize the right to vote and at other times it might be to restrict the right to vote to the point of despotism.

If Congress can broaden voting qualifications, it can also restrict them until only a select few may vote. Then there would be a despotism.

Mr. STENNIS. Is it not true that already there is pending, not yet on the calendar but before the Senate, a proposed statutory enactment?

Mr. ROBERTSON. I have heard that such a provision is to be brought up, dealing with the subject of a literacy test.

Mr. STENNIS. Is it not true that the records already show the Attorney General has advocated it, and the floor leader has introduced the bill and made the statement that it is the administration bill? Has not the procedure already gone that far?

Mr. ROBERTSON. Undoubtedly, but let us read some more about New York:

> Veterans and their spouses, parents, or children, who are inmates of a veterans' bureau hospital in the State may be registered by inspectors of election who will call at the hospital. If the hospital is located outside the State, the signing of his name to an application for an absentee ballot by a veteran, spouse, parent or child of such veteran accompanying him shall constitute personal registration. A voter who expects to be unavoidably absent from his residence on the day of the next general election by reason of being in Federal service, a member of the Armed Forces, a teacher or student in an institution of learning outside the county, or outside the county on business may register by mail.
>
> Permanent registration. The city of New York, the city of Plattsburgh, the city of Watertown, and any country or any city of over 5,000 outside the city of New York may, by local law, elect to adopt a permanent registration system. In such cases registration shall be in person except for absentee veterans.

In the hearings from which I am reading, two printed pages are devoted to New York's voting restrictions. As I have said, there is hardly a State in the Union that has placed more restrictions on voting than has New York State. It so happens that New York State does not have a poll tax; and, therefore, its representatives are on safe ground in advocating the abolition of the poll tax in the five Southern States which still have it.

In closing, I wish to emphasize that the right to vote is derived from citizenship of a State and not of the Nation. It is a privilege that is extended under certain conditions. As the Supreme Court has said, the Constitution conferred no right to vote upon anyone.

I think it is unfortunate in these days of stress, storm, and peril that we must stand here hour after hour debating the question of the preservation of the rights of the States and how important it is, if our Republic is to survive, that we do not tear down these landmarks.

The Bible states:

> Remove not the ancient landmark, which thy fathers have set.

This Biblical reference has a broad meaning. It warns us to hold dear the fundamental principles of ethics, morality, and principles of government that were handed down to us by our forefathers and which have been tested by time. Our Constitution has survived many storms. It has been often tested, and under it we now have the oldest form of government of any nation in the world. Whether or not it will survive when our population becomes twice 185 million I do not know. Certainly it cannot survive if we fail to preserve the rights of the States as they were intended to be preserved in the Constitution and as they are specifically spelled out in the 10th amendment.

The right of a State to fix the qualifications of its electors is the only right that is spelled out twice in the Constitution. Mr. President, we should be very zealous in maintaining that right. The Holland joint resolution should be rejected. I assume that when the poll-tax measure introduced by the Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS], S.478, comes before the Senate, a motion will be made to lay that bill on the table. Naturally, I hope that motion will be carried.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. ROBERTSON. I yield for a question.

Mr. STENNIS. I invite the attention of the Senator to one of the outstanding cases decided by the Supreme Court of the United States, Ex parte Yarbrough, decided in 1884, and reported in 110 U.S. Supreme Court Reports, beginning at page 651, on the subject of the qualifications of electors. My question of the Senator is whether he thinks it is sound law and is still the law. I now quote from the opinion of the Court:

> The States in prescribing the qualifications of voters for the most numerous branch of their own legislatures, do not do this with reference to the election of Members of Congress. Nor can they prescribe the qualification for voters for those eo nomine. They define who are to vote for the popular branch of their own legislatures and the Constitution of the United States says the same persons shall vote for Members of Congress in that State. It adopts the qualifications thus furnished as the qualification of its own electors for Members of Congress.

Mr. ROBERTSON. The Supreme Court has consistently followed that opinion. The opinion was handed down more than 75 years ago and is as sound today as it was in 1884. It is still the law of the land. It has never been repudiated.

Mr. STENNIS. Has not the principle been reaffirmed by constitutional amendment, which had to be proposed in Congress, passed by a two-thirds vote, and then adopted by the necessary three-fourths of the States?

Mr. ROBERTSON. The Senator is correct. Ex parte Yarbrough was confirmed by *Swafford* v. *Temple* (185 U.S.), and later in Lassiter against Northampton County Board of Elections, when Justice Douglas passed on the question.

Mr. President, there can be no question whatever about the clear meaning of the Constitution and about the interpretation given the language by those who wrote it and by the Court which interprets it.

Those who would change our Constitution regarding the qualifications of voters, are disputing both wisdom and tradition.

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. KUCHEL. 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. McCARTHY. Mr. President, the poll tax should really be no subject for extended debate in 1962. It is a primitive and undemocratic requirement. It is the last vestige of old property-holding limitations on the right to vote. It should be quickly abolished.

I do not believe that there is any real support for the principle behind the poll tax. Even the amount of the tax is usually no problem in those places still requiring this tax, although in some places because of cumulative features in the tax, the amount might become a real barrier to voting.

I do not believe that a constitutional amendment is necessary to eliminate this tax. Simple legislative action is enough. But if it is impossible to enact legislation on this subject, then I believe that we should pass the constitutional amendment provided that section II denying the right to vote to persons supported at public expense or by charitable institutions is stricken from the bill.

Along with the consideration that the poll tax, which is an unwarranted obstacle to participation in full citizenship, there is another problem which deserves the attention of the Congress. This is the problem of residency requirements which in almost every State are a serious obstacle preventing millions of people from exercising the right to vote.

I am preparing a resolution asking for congressional study of this problem in

the hope that procedures can be worked out so that by the use of absentee ballots many of those who are currently deprived of the right to vote may have this right restored.

It has been estimated by the U.S. Census Bureau and the American Heritage Foundation that State or local residency requirements prevented about 8 million citizens from voting in the presidential election of 1960. Another 2,600,000 were traveling for reasons of business or health and were unable to obtain absentee ballots. Another 500,000 citizens were living or traveling abroad and were unable to vote in 1960.

This is a most serious problem and one which should be considered by the Congress of the United States.

THE RS–70 WEAPON SYSTEM

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, this Nation's changing strategic posture has many implications which are not often recognized. With the development of advanced weapons of great firepower and the increasing capability of Communist nations, the requirement for human judgment and actions will be at its greatest premium in history. However, our planned strategic force is approaching an inflexible state with a much reduced capability for exercising trained human judgment and control.

There is a grave concern that we are abandoning to the enemy the development and production of the flexible weapon system which has successfully kept the peace for many years. Although there is clear need for a manned strategic reconnaissance-strike aircraft, no continuing manned strategic aircraft system is planned for development or production in the entire free world. The United States is the only Western nation with the capability to meet the challenge.

As our missile force grows, the role for manned strategic aircraft shifts more toward observing, reporting, evaluating, and exercising on-the-spot judgment and action. Incorporation of recent state-of-the-art advances in missiles, communications, and reconnaissance sensors in the B–70 can provide an advanced reconnaissance-strike system which is ideally suited for operation in the missile era. The system, designated the RS–70, would have numbers of long-range missiles, long-range standoff reconnaissance sensors, and advanced communications equipment.

Unlike ballistic missiles, the RS–70 will not have to rely primarily on high speed, high altitude, and low radar cross section for penetration. It will have other important advantages—it is maneuverable; it can carry large quantities of countermeasures; it can employ tactics; it does not have to fly over or into the target; it has its own defense suppression weapons; and finally, it has a man aboard to exercise judgment to adjust to a changing environment.

The remarkable reconnaissance aids would allow the RS–70 crew member to study targets in detail, report condition, and release an air-to-surface missile only if the requirement or further destruction was verified. All of this can be accomplished while well away from the target and out of range of most of the defenses. The air-to-surface missiles can be used to destroy the remaining defenses from hundreds of miles away.

Four essential tasks would be performed by the RS–70—observe and report the condition of the enemy during and after the initial strikes; increase assurance of destruction of priority targets; seek out and destroy unique targets—the extremely hard, the mobile, and those not precisely located; and provide the precision, discrimination, and flexibility which must be an inherent part of our strategic capability.

The specific roles defined for the RS–70 would complement the future ballistic missile force. It would fill a serious void by adding vision, strength, flexibility, and human judgment which is so essential to our strategic posture. Failure to provide this capability may result in an inflexible force which cannot cope with the unexpected.

The concept of employment of the RS–70 has many advantages not previously attainable. It can observe the condition of the enemy, take on-the-spot action as required, and report to command authority the information essential for competent force management. In the absence of firsthand knowledge of the results of our strikes, further effort is keyed only to the mathematical probabilities used in the development of the strike plan. The RS–70 will be the eyes of the national command element.

The speed of delivery of modern weapons requires the elimination of any time delay between identification of a threat and the neutralization of that threat. The ability to destroy a large number of targets coupled with the ability to seek out targets with minimum exposure to enemy defenses increases the assurance of destroying the critical targets.

Some targets are likely to be hardened to the extent that precise accurate delivery is the only method of neutralizing them. This same accuracy and precision increases the range of possible responses to threats through the ability to use discriminate nuclear weapons which limit the area of destruction to the immediate vicinity of the target.

This is a point which is seemingly overlooked by the IBM machines in the Pentagon—that is by the civilian part of the Pentagon. When we talk about hardened targets, we are talking about targets which are possibly as large as a football field, but, probably no larger than half the size of a football field.

While our ICBM's have built into them remarkable accuracy—an accuracy which I once described as being a higher accuracy than that possessed by a rifle, if it were possible to make a rifle which could send its missile some 5,000 miles—expecting a missile to travel 5,000 to 6,000 miles and hit a target the size of a football field is really expecting a great deal. It might take six or eight missiles to accomplish one mission. It might take only one, of course, but six or eight might do it completely.

Therefore the RS–70 or the B–70—whichever we come up with—will be the type of weapon which will be needed if we are to really get at the enemy offensive capabilities which are those targets which are placed under a hardened head.

The RS–70 as a weapons system which our country should or should not have is now in the midst of a controversy of a constitutional nature. It is the point whereby an important segment of the House of Representatives, the House Armed Services Committee, is challenging the Executive as to whether or not the Congress has the authority to require the expenditure of funds authorized and appropriated.

In my opinion, the Constitution does not give the legislative body direct authority to require expenditures of funds appropriated by that body, but this possibly could be established by the rather dangerous negative approach whereby concessions would have to be made by both sides. The whole matter should be determined on the basis of whether or not this weapons system is needed to protect our country.

This is another fact that the IBM group in the civilian offices in the Pentagon choose to overlook. During World War II, the Soviets flew fewer than 200 strategic bombing sorties against the enemy. During World War II the U.S. Air Force flew hundreds of thousands of sorties. One does not perfect the art of aerial bombing by flying fewer than 200 strategic missions during a war.

The fact that the Strategic Air Command of the U.S. Air Force has the greatest ability in the world, or the greatest ability the world has ever known, to hit targets of any size, from any altitude, at any speed is what makes our deterrent force a real need. It has not been opposition to the missiles; it has been opposition to men—the men who understand the dreadful art of bombing. No power in the world, or no combination of powers, has the ability which the men in the Strategic Air Command have. It is a dreadful ability, an ability in which we all insist they must remain skillful.

There is evidence that the ability of the Soviets in strategic bombing was enhanced by the experiences of World War II. Neither is there anything to lead us to believe that they have improved their techniques at all since World War II. In fact, in the important field of air-to-air refueling, there is great question as to their ability. There is great question as to their ability even to sustain such an effort long enough to accomplish a successful attack on this country.

The little black boxes, the electronic gadgets, the inertial guidance systems are fine and wonderful devices, and they will accomplish what is intended, provided they work all the time. This is where man enters the picture, for it is of no avail to start a missile toward a target and have it miss. If there is a miss, I do not feel for one moment that the enemy is going to immediately communicate with us and tell us whether or not our weapons hit the target. The arguments for full development of the 70 system, whether it be a bomber or a reconnaissance strike, are many, but I am afraid that the Secretary is tending to ignore them in favor of those who see no further need for man in the sky.

I am very hopeful, as one interested in our offensive ability, whether it be surface or air, that this argument between the legislative and executive branches can come to an end in the immediate future, with an understanding that we will go ahead with the full development of this weapons system.

Mr. President, this week's edition of Newsweek contains a very interesting article entitled "R–70: Doomed by Non-Military Computers?" The article was written by Gen. Thomas D. White, U.S. Air Force, retired. General White is a former Chief of the Air Force. I urge Senators to read the article, because General White gets at the real problem—the fact that the Air Force has not been consulted about the use of this plan or other plans for these planes. We hear astronomical figures of $10 billion tossed around by the Secretary of Defense. The Air Force has never supplied those figures. To my understanding, the Air Force has not made a public declaration as to what it will do with these planes.

Before any judgment is passed by Members of this body, I think the men who are charged with the responsibility of attack and defense should be heard. I have high respect for the academic mind when it applies itself to academic problems; but I do not believe the academic mind can solve military problems as well as military personnel can.

My suggestion to the Secretary of Defense would be to turn a little away from the mechanical IBM's and the human IBM's and start to listen to the men of our Strategic Air Command who make it possible for the United States to keep peace in the world, not with gadgets, but with men.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the article to which I have referred may be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

RS–70: DOOMED BY NONMILITARY COMPUTERS?

(By Gen. Thomas D. White, USAF, retired)

The House Armed Services Committee has taken almost unprecedented action in claiming for Congress the right to positive and not merely negative action in defense matters. It has directed an executive element of the Government to develop, as a weapons system, the 2,000-m.p.h. RS–70 or B–70 bomber.

The action reflects more than a dispute on an individual weapon. It is a sign of a growing schism between the intellectuals and some military men.

Aside from some disputed technical aspects, it appears to be the contention of the Department of Defense that the required size and composition of our strategic forces can be computed with almost mathematical accuracy. There are scientists who claim that missile effectiveness can be predicted electronically with such accuracy that no requirement exists for a weapon to meet unforeseen contingencies. It is considered in the Defense Department that, in this age of missiles, the RS–70 need not now be developed as a weapon, and that the present program of building three test model aircraft retains an option to go ahead with production at a later date.

The House Armed Services Committee, on the other hand, wants to build three additional RS–70's, the last of which would be a complete weapons system, thereby advancing considerably the date on which an option to go into production would be available. Highly experienced military airmen agree. Aside from the fact that nuclear-armed missiles have never been used in war, nor even fully tested in peace, modern warfare would be fraught with uncertainty and utter confusion and cannot be solved by mathematical equations. It is claimed our knowledge of enemy capabilities is and will be inadequate to provide the vital factors needed in mechanical solutions of such equations and which in any case would require the application of critical judgments based on experience.

Therefore, they say, a highly mobile manned and versatile weapon such as the RS–70 is vitally needed and should be developed to deal with the unexpected and to provide the flexibility which would cause an enemy enormous defensive problems.

The Joint Chiefs of Staff are cited as being in disagreement on the matter, as is too often the case in major programs, notably in such examples as the aircraft carrier and the Nike-Zeus missile. Like the B–70/RS–70, almost every major bomber program in the past has suffered from controversy, with costly delays and setbacks.

The B–70 controversy is unique only because it is the first bomber that has been "computed" out of full development. This decision was influenced by studies performed largely by a nonmilitary intellectual community with the aid of high-speed computers in integrating military and nonmilitary factors of both our own and enemy capability.

BLENDING

This community is composed of scientists and other experts working for the more than 350 nonprofit corporations. But another vital component of national power is our vast body of military experience. If we are to realize maximum benefit from the emergence of this new community, we have to insure that the talents of these two components are blended to support each other.

Congressional action not only joins the issue of legislative versus executive authority, but also highlights divergence among nonprofessional and professional military opinions. It is to be hoped that this and other controversial defense matters can be settled, not on the basis of jurisdiction, but by the thorough integration of all competent views.

REHABILITATION OF NAVAJO AND HOPI TRIBES OF INDIANS

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, for myself and on behalf of the senior Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN], the senior Senator from Utah [Mr. BENNETT], the senior Senator from Colorado [Mr. ALLOTT], the senior Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], and the junior Senator from Utah [Mr. MOSS], I introduce a bill and ask that it be referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 3033) to amend the act of April 19, 1950, relating to the rehabilitation of the Navajo and Hopi Tribes of Indians, to authorize certain additional highway projects, introduced by Mr. GOLDWATER (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

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

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session,

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

FACILITATION OF SCHOOL DESEGREGATION

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill that would, if enacted, authorize the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare to make grants to local school districts to cover the cost of drawing up desegregation plans, the cost of training school personnel in the many problems incident to desegregation, and the cost of employing specialists who are equipped to advise local school districts on these problems.

The decision of the Supreme Court that segregation in schools is unconstitutional and that desegregation should proceed with all deliberate speed was handed down in 1954. I believe that progress toward desegregation should have been made far more swiftly than has been the case, but I am fully aware of the difficulties involved in securing full compliance with this Court mandate by all local school districts.

Desegregation of schools is the law of the land. Equally important, it is the inevitable and proper policy for a nation which was founded upon the principles of freedom and equality of opportunity.

Desegregation can be delayed by the bitter hostility of those who oppose it; it can be delayed by the rashness and the injudicious zeal of those who favor it. But it cannot be stopped, and it must not be stopped. It should, rather, be helped forward by reasonable proposals.

The effort for desegregated schools must be waged against habits of mind and social attitudes that are deeply ingrained and have a long history. The past 8 years have taught us that desegregation can come about peacefully and successfully, or it can be accompanied by violence and disorder. This violence and disorder can be avoided, and it is the purpose of the bill to assist in establishing those conditions under which desegregation can take place peacefully and lawfully.

The Federal Government can help in a very positive way. It can do so by extending financial aid to local school districts to assist them in drawing up realistic school desegregation plans and to provide trained counselors and advisers who can help to minimize dangers and pitfalls.

It may well be asked, "Isn't this the responsibility of the local authorities?"

Since desegregation is brought about by a decision of the Federal judiciary, based upon its interpretation of the Federal Constitution, I think there can be no doubt that there is a Federal respon-

sibility to do all that can be done to effect this vast social change in cooperation with local authorities.

We are all aware of the present economic plight of our school districts and of their need for funds both for the construction of new schools and for teachers' salaries. I do not think that the costs of desegregation should have to compete with school construction and teachers' salaries for the funds now available to school districts. At the same time we must recognize that the desegregation of our schools is a constitutional necessity, and we cannot permit it to be slowed simply for lack of money.

I should like to add a few words of comment on the text of the bill.

First. It would expressly bar any grant from being used for school construction or teachers' salaries, and hence there is no possibility that the bill would become a device for granting aid to education generally. Though I favor Federal aid for both purposes, and though I feel there is a particular Federal obligation to help local authorities meet the expenses for school construction and teachers' salaries which will be caused by a revamping of their school system, I do not wish to encumber this bill with controversial proposals which should be dealt with in more general legislation.

Second. The bill would authorize the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare to grant financial aid only. The bill expressly states that it shall not be construed to authorize any Federal agency or officer to exercise any direction or control over local school instruction or administration, and hence there is no danger that the bill would become a device for Federal intervention in local education.

Third. Since it is impossible at this time to determine how long Federal financial assistance to desegregating school districts will be needed, or in what amount each year, the bill is silent as to the duration of the Secretary's authorization and as to the amount he shall be permitted to expend each year, because I think both these questions should be left to the appropriation process.

Mr. President, I am under no illusions that this bill will bring about instantaneous school desegregation. As I have indicated, the fight for desegregated schools is one that must be waged against deep-rooted, ancient habits of mind and social attitudes. But where there is some will for desegregation on the part of a local school district, Federal financial aid may prove to be of considerable help in permitting school desegregation to be accomplished more speedily and with less friction and less ill will between the races than otherwise would be the case. This is the justification of this bill, and I urge favorable consideration by the Senate.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the bill which I am introducing today be printed at this point in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 3034) to authorize grants to local school boards to assist in defraying certain costs incident to the elimination of segregation in public elementary and secondary schools, introduced by Mr. DODD, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare (hereinafter referred to as the "Secretary") is authorized to make grants, from sums appropriated therefor pursuant to section 6, to local educational agencies to assist in eliminating segregation in public elementary and secondary schools.

(b) For purposes of this Act, the term "local educational agency" means a board of education or other legally constituted local school authority having administrative control and direction of public elementary or secondary schools in a city, county, township, school district, or other political subdivision in a State; and includes any State agency which directly operates and maintains public elementary and secondary schools.

SEC. 2. Grants under this Act may be made by the Secretary to assist any local educational agency to defray, in whole or in part—

(1) the costs of preparing plans and programs for desegregating public elementary and secondary schools over which the local educational agency has control and direction;

(2) the costs of giving to teachers, school administrators, and other school personnel inservice training in dealing with problems incident to desegregation;

(3) the costs of employing specialists in problems incident to desegregation and of providing other assistance to develop understanding by school children, their parents, and the general public of plans and efforts for desegregation of the public elementary and secondary schools over which the local educational agency has control and direction; and

(4) other costs which the Secretary determines are directly occasioned by the desegregation of such schools.

No grant may be made under this Act to defray any part of the cost of construction, enlargement, or alteration of any school facility, and, except as provided in paragraph (3) of this section, no grant may be made under this Act to defray any part of the cost of employing any teacher or other employee of a local educational agency or of any public elementary or secondary school over which it has control and direction.

SEC. 3. (a) Grants may be made under this Act by the Secretary only upon application therefor made by local educational agencies. Each application shall provide such detailed breakdown of the measures for which financial assistance is sought as the Secretary may prescribe by regulations.

(b) Each grant under this Act shall be made in such amounts and on such terms and conditions, not inconsistent with the provisions of this Act, as the Secretary shall prescribe. In determining whether to make a grant and in fixing the amount thereof and the terms and conditions on which it may be made, the Secretary shall take into consideration—

(1) the amount available for grants under this Act and the applications which are pending before him;

(2) the financial condition of the local educational agency making application, and other resources available to it;

(3) the nature, extent, and gravity of its problems incident to desegregation; and

(4) such other factors as he finds relevant.

SEC. 4. Payments of grants under this Act may be made in advance or by way of reimbursement and may be made at such intervals as the Secretary may determine. Payment of any grant under this Act shall be made to the local educational agency making application therefor, if such local educational agency has authority to receive and expend the funds constituting such grant. In any other case, payment of such grant shall be made to the local government which has authority to receive and expend funds on behalf of such local educational agency, but only if the Secretary is satisfied that such local government will expend such funds solely for the purposes for which the grant is made.

SEC. 5. Nothing contained in this Act shall be construed to authorize any department, agency, officer, or employee of the United States to exercise any direction, supervision, or control over the curriculum, program of instruction, administration, or personnel of any public elementary or secondary school or of any local educational agency.

SEC. 6. There are authorized to be appropriated for each fiscal year such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this Act.

INSTRUCTION OF TWO BELGIAN CITIZENS AT U.S. NAVAL ACADEMY

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I introduce a joint resolution authorizing the Secretary of the Navy to admit for instruction at the U.S. Naval Academy two citizens and subjects of the Kingdom of Belgium. Four Belgians have previously been admitted to the Academy. Two were graduated in 1959 with outstanding records, and were succeeded by two other Belgian citizens, who presently are studying there. The joint resolution which I am introducing at this time makes it possible for Belgium to send two more young men to the Academy when the present Belgian midshipmen graduate.

Belgium, which has no naval academy of its own, has been pleased by the training received by its nominees to Annapolis, and desires to continue the program. The favorable reaction of the Departments of State and Defense to this desire reflects the interest of the United States in cooperating in this worthwhile project. An undertaking of this nature provides unusual opportunities for establishing personal bonds of friendship between United States and Belgian naval officers, and strengthens the feeling of good will which presently exists between the peoples of our two countries.

The joint resolution (S.J. Res. 175) authorizing the Secretary of the Navy to receive for instruction at the U.S. Naval Academy at Annapolis two citizens and subjects of the Kingdom of Belgium, introduced by Mr. SALTONSTALL, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Armed Services.

MANAGEMENT OF THE NATIONAL DEBT

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I now introduce a bill relating to the total national debt of the United States.

Our national debt limit has recently been increased to $300 billion, and there is discussion to the effect that it should be increased to $308 billion. We receive

regular reports on the public debt, which is subject to statutory limitation; but in our consideration of that problem, I feel that the Congress is less than fully informed. The contingent liabilities—guarantees and insurance programs to which the United States is a party—have multiplied sharply in the last few years. These are programs which have helped stimulate the economy, but which also have an effect on the credit picture of the Treasury and of the dollar in our foreign trade.

The Federal Government is making greater use of leases of Post Offices, Federal office buildings, office space, warehouses, and even ships, as a substitute for direct Federal investment therein. This activity has cut down the necessity of issuing Treasury bonds within the public debt limit; nevertheless it places on the Treasury a fixed obligation which, to my knowledge, at least, is rarely, if ever, accounted for and measured against the alternative of direct debt. We also receive reports when considering the appropriations of funds which the executive departments and agencies have been authorized to spend, but which as yet remain unspent. These reports come to us in piecemeal form, and we seldom have an opportunity to see the total spending power of the Federal Government.

In order to provide the Congress with this information on a regular basis, I am introducing this bill to clarify by regular reports these components of the national debt and thereby to assist in its management. The senior Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] has joined me in cosponsoring this measure; and I hope that it may be referred to the Finance Committee, where it may be considered with the national debt proposals before that body.

The bill (S. 3035) to clarify the components of, and to assist in the management of, the national debt, introduced by Mr. SALTONSTALL (for himself and Mr. BYRD of Virginia), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Finance.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Bartlett, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed the following bills, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 1435. An act for the relief of Jacinto Machado Ormonde;

H.R. 1599. An act for the relief of Pasquale Marrella;

H.R. 1701. An act for the relief of Mrs. Kikue Yamamoto Leghorn and her minor son, Yuichiro Yamamoto Leghorn;

H.R. 1703. An act for the relief of Maximo B. Avila;

H.R. 2687. An act for the relief of Miss Helen Fappiano;

H.R. 2833. An act for the relief of Franziska Aloisia Fuchs (nee Tercka);

H.R. 5610. An act for the relief of Pierino Renzo Picchione;

H.R. 6772. An act for the relief of Hendrikus Zoetmulder (Harry Combres);

H.R. 6773. An act to repeal the act of August 14, 1957 (Private Law 85–160); and

H.R. 10643. An act for the relief of Gail Hohlweg Atabay and her daughter; and

H.R. 10802. An act making appropriations for the Department of the Interior and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1963, and for other purposes.

HOUSE BILLS REFERRED

The following bills were severally read twice by their titles and referred as indicated:

H.R. 1435. An act for the relief of Jacinto Machado Ormonde;

H.R. 1599. An act for the relief of Pasquale Marrella;

H.R. 1701. An act for the relief of Mrs. Kikue Yamamoto Leghorn and her minor son, Yuichiro Yamamoto Leghorn;

H.R. 1703. An act for the relief of Maximo B. Avila;

H.R. 2687. An act for the relief of Miss Helen Fappiano;

H.R. 2833. An act for the relief of Franziska Aloisia Fuchs (nee Tercka);

H.R. 5610. An act for the relief of Pierno Renzo Picchione;

H.R. 6772. An act for the relief of Hendrikus Zoetmulder (Harry Combres);

H.R. 6773. An act to repeal the act of August 14, 1957 (Private Law 85–160); and

H.R. 10643. An act for the relief of Gail Hohlweg Atabay and her daughter; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 10802. An act making appropriations for the Department of the Interior and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1963, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Appropriations.

RELIGIOUS PERSECUTION IN THE SOVIET UNION

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, the refusal of the Soviet Government to permit the baking of the traditional unleavened bread, or matzoth, during Passover is a deliberate affront to the Jewish people of the Soviet Union and an attack upon religious freedom. In the past the Soviet Government has cloaked its anti-Semitism with the excuse of combating black marketeers and speculators. It has even implied that the Government is not responsible for such actions.

Now, Mr. President, the mask is off. It is clear that the Soviet Government is directing the campaign against the Jewish religion, against the Roman Catholic religion, and, in fact, against all religion.

Moreover, at the same time when the Soviets are trying to strangle Judaism in Russia, they are also refusing to permit Soviet Jews to emigrate to Israel.

Mr. President, life under communism is a prison, not only for the human body, but also for the soul. Nothing could indicate that more clearly than these policies. I am extremely concerned over these developments and over the failure of our Government, in the United Nations and elsewhere, to mobilize the pressure of world opinion against these outrages.

Mr. President, I have contacted Ambassador Stevenson, our Ambassador to the United Nations, and have urged that he call on the United Nations Human Rights Commission and urge an immediate hearing and investigation into these developments. The full force of enlightened world opinion should be directed upon this persecution right now, during the Passover and Lenten seasons, when free peoples are worshipping God with renewed dedication.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, following my remarks, two articles from the New York Times. One, written by Theodore Shabad, details Soviet refusal to provide matzos during the Passover season. The other indicates the efforts being made by Rabbi Maurice N. Eisendrath, president of the Union of American Hebrew Congregations, in urging the Soviet Government to permit free emigration of Jews from the Soviet Union.

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

SOVIET CURBS SALE OF MATZOTH FOR JEWISH PASSOVER FESTIVAL—GOVERNMENT BAKERIES WILL NOT MAKE UNRAISED BREAD THIS YEAR—ORTHODOX EASTER CAKE ALSO MAY BE BANNED

(By Theodore Shabad)

Moscow, March 19.—The chief rabbi of Moscow was reported today to have told his congregation that no matzoth would be available from the State-operated bakeries this year.

The rabbi, Yehuda-Lieb Levin, made the announcement last Saturday in the city's central synagogue, according to Jewish sources.

He was reported to have told the congregation that in view of the Government ban on the Jews' traditional unleavened bread, they would not be held to strict observance of dietary rules during the Passover festival, which starts April 18.

The Passover is celebrated by Jews in commemoration of the Exodus from Egypt. The celebration involves a family feast on the first evening and abstention from leaven during the 7 days of the festival. The eating of unraised bread during this period is believed to reflect the haste with which the Jews left Egypt.

In the absence of official comment tonight, it could not be determined whether the ban on matzoth baking was directed specifically against the Jewish religion or whether it was part of the general antireligious campaign of the Soviet regime.

There have been reports that the traditional Russian Orthodox Easter cake, known as kulich, will not be available in state-operated bakeries this year. The sale of this cake in bakeries last year was criticized by Soviet newspapers, which charged that a religious item was being sold under the name of "spring cake."

In past years matzoth was available at some Moscow bakeries during the Passover season. Jews also baked matzoth privately for sale, but this practice was prohibited as a form of private enterprise.

About a fourth of the Soviet Union's 2,500,000 Jews live in Moscow. Only a small percentage of elderly people are believed to follow Jewish religious traditions, including the dietary laws. The majority of the Jews in the Soviet capital, according to one Jewish source, would not be aware of the presence or absence of matzoth.

The source commented that, in addition to the specific problem of matzoth, there were no public eating places in Moscow that provided kosher food which is ritually prepared according to Jewish law.

Visiting foreign Jews who adhere to such food laws have found that Intourist, the official Soviet tourist agency, does not arrange for restaurants to prepare kosher food.

PLEA TO SOVIET ON JEWS—U.S. RABBI ASKS MOSCOW TO ALLOW EMIGRATION TO ISRAEL

WASHINGTON, March 18.—The Reverend Dr. Maurice N. Eisendrath, president of the Union of American Hebrew Congregations,

appealed to the Soviet Union Sunday to allow Jews there to emigrate to Israel.

In a statement issued on the eve of the Jewish festival of Purim, which begins at sundown tomorrow, Rabbi Eisendrath said:

"As we begin the celebration of a holiday commemorating the struggle of the Jews against the Persians for the right to worship in freedom, we cannot ignore the continued suppression of our bretheren in the Soviet Union."

He said that if the Soviet Union could not allow its Jews religious freedom it "should at least open the doors of the Iron Curtain to permit these people the right to leave."

REQUEST FOR HEARINGS ON DOPE SMUGGLING

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, the arrest of several Cuban nationals in Miami on opium smuggling charges in my opinion has significance beyond this instance. For many years Red China has attempted to push heroin and opium into the United States, to undermine the physical and moral strength of our people.

Red China may now be using her Communist base in Cuba for these operations. Mr. Henry L. Giordano, Acting Commissioner of the Narcotics Bureau, has informed me that the opium picked up in Miami, in all probability, came from Yunnan Province, in Communist China, a prime world source of opium.

The Narcotics Bureau believes that the opium arrived in this country by way of Cuba. The Bureau is especially interested, because this is one of the few seizures of crude opium in recent years.

This is a concrete sign and a serious warning signal of Red efforts to use Cuba as a way station for expanding its narcotics traffic to the United States. The evil can serve the Communists in two ways: First, it could help provide Cuba with badly needed American dollars. Second, it could effectively sap the courage and intelligence of its victims.

The extent to which the Communists have engaged in narcotics traffic here has been examined previously. But new facts are emerging. The developments I have described point to new Communist tactics and, therefore, new hazards.

I have asked the Internal Security Subcommittee of the Judiciary Committee to explore the situation fully. I am hopeful that executive session hearings will begin shortly.

The Narcotics Bureau is to be commended for its fine work on this case.

RESOLUTION OF THE ALBANY COUNTY CENTRAL FEDERATION OF LABOR

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, recently I met with a delegation of New York hotel and restaurant workers, including Mr. Nick Campus, secretary-treasurer of local 471 in Albany of the Hotel and Restaurant Employees and Bartenders Union. One of the major topics of discussion was giving tipped employees tax credit for tip income for social security purposes. Although this matter must orignate in the other body, I believe that action is long overdue to permit waitresses, bellboys, and other tipped personnel to obtain full social security credit for both salary and tip income.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent today to have a resolution on this subject adopted by the Albany County Central Federation of Labor printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

Whereas hundreds of thousands of waiters, waitresses, bellmen and other workers who earn a considerable portion of their income through the receiving of tips are paid a low wage; and

Whereas, the Internal Revenue Service of the Treasury Department considers these tips earned as wage and requires the payment of income tax on these moneys; and

Whereas under the present social security law the tips earned by these workers are not considered wages and no credit is given for them when the workers retire; and

Whereas this situation creates an injustice to the worker upon retirement when he collects only about half of what he should in old-age benefits; and

Whereas the Hotel and Restaurant Employees and Bartenders International Union, AFL–CIO, has been urging Congress to amend the social security law to correct this injustice: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Albany Central Federation of Labor endorse the position of the Hotel & Restaurant Employees & Bartenders International Union on this question; and be it further

Resolved, That the Albany Central Federation of Labor inform U.S. Senator JACOB K. JAVITS and Senator KENNETH B. KEATING, U.S. Senators from New York State, and Congressman LEO W. O'BRIEN of this action; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent to U.S. Senators JACOB K. JAVITS and KENNETH B. KEATING and to Congressman LEO W. O'BRIEN.

NO SUBSTITUTE FOR VICTORY

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, the Henry Regnery Co. of Chicago, Ill., has published many great books which have made valuable contributions toward enlightening the American public on the nature of the enemy we face in the cold war and the need for facing the many facets of the threat posed to our Nation by the forces of world communism with realism, strength, determination, and the will to win. This company has just published one of the best books on this subject. It is entitled "No Substitute for Victory" and was written by Mr. Frank J. Johnson, a former officer in the Office of Naval Intelligence, who has established himself as a specialist on all aspects of Soviet political and military strategy.

Because of his concern that the American people do not yet fully understand the true nature of the Communist challenge and how to meet it, Mr. Johnson left Government service in February 1961, in order to be able to write this book. His belief in a philosophy of victory over communism is not just an abstraction. He presents a specific program to bring it about.

At the present time, Mr. Johnson is editor of the Washington Report for the American Security Council, and in this capacity is continuing his diligent efforts to awaken the American public and our leaders to the need for victory in the cold war.

The foreword for "No Substitute for Victory" has been written by a distinguished American military leader, Adm. Arleigh Burke, another strong advocate of instilling in our national policies the will to win over the forces of world communism in the cold war. I ask unanimous consent that the foreword to the book as written by Admiral Burke be printed at the conclusion of these remarks together with an excellent review of this book, which has been printed in the Greenville (S.C.) News of March 19, 1962. This review was written by Col. W. D. Workman, a noted and respected columnist for a number of daily newspapers in the Southeast.

I also ask unanimous consent to have printed at the conclusion of my remarks a statement about the book as printed on the flyleaf. I commend this book to all Americans as being vital reading material in the most critical period of our national history.

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

FOREWORD OF BOOK ENTITLED "NO SUBSTITUTE FOR VICTORY"

(By Adm. Arleigh Burke)

The people of the United States are concerned.

The world is in a state of turmoil.

It is evident that strife will increase in many areas of the world, Berlin, Latin America, southeast Asia, Africa, the Middle East and even in Europe. The United States will be confronted in the immediate future with a whole series of crises, any one of which may determine whether the United States will continue to be a great Nation.

Why is this?

This is because the Soviet Union is attemping to carry out her avowed aim of 40 years to dominate the world. Her recent scientific successes in missiles and space, her political advances in Cuba and Asia, have served to replace the old inferiority complex with arrogance and inflated self-confidence. Our own forbearance and reluctance to take action promptly are interpreted by the Communists as loss of moral stamina and virility. Khrushchev's recent speeches and actions indicate his intention to force issues on the West at an ever-increasing rate. He appears bent on testing his premise that the Western World in general, and the United States in particular, no longer have the will to win.

This is grim competition for supremacy, for survival, in all fields and in all areas, and it will last until either the Western World or the Communists win.

The United States is the leader of the Western World. What happens to the free world is largely dependent on what the United States decides to do, and on what she does do.

We are the most powerful Nation on earth. We have the greatest military power, the greatest economic power, the most brilliant scientists in the world. We have developed a system of government which has been remarkably successful in maintaining the rights of individuals and the dignity of man. We lead the world in technology. We have the highest standard of living, greater individual opportunity, more educational facilities than any other nation. We have nearly everything that other nations are striving for.

Yet the trend of events in the last few years has not been in our favor. We are not winning.

We are losing because we have not resolved to win.

This is the basic premise of this provocative book.

We may be losing because vast numbers of our people are not even conscious that that race is on, let alone the consequences of failure to win. This is why Mr. Johnson's book has a claim on the thoughtful and patriotic citizen of this country.

In strong, simple language, Mr. Johnson analyzes past events, the Russian moves and U.S. moves and comes to the conclusion in each case that where we acted with determination and strength, communism has been stopped. When we have displayed fear or indecision, it has advanced. What might be if the United States were to act with the bold determination to win in the cold war is projected convincingly.

In direct, clear language, he searches the future of this century of conflict and rightfully concludes that if the United States stands ready for action instead of reaction, more peoples of the world will have real peace, real freedom, and real liberty. If the United States does not implement the will to win, the world will become a police state, ruled by ruthless Communist tyrants, and mankind will have lost its freedom.

Not everybody, including me, will agree with all the points made by the author nor on the various factors he uses to determine who will win and who will lose; but everybody will agree that the United States must win this struggle for survival and that this will take will to win and all that expression implies. The vital "will to win" means we must compete in every field with all the strength, all the skill, all the imagination and all the courage that our forefathers demonstrated when they formed this great Nation.

The future of this country is in the hands of its citizens. The country will go where our citizens will it to go. Our future is in our hands. We can mold it in the forge of industry and strong desire. There is truly "no substitute for victory."

[From the Greenville (S.C.) News, Mar. 19, 1962]

NATIONAL FIGURES INSIST ON VICTORY IN ANY KIND OF WAR

(By W. D. Workman)

Gen. Douglas MacArthur, Senator Strom Thurmond, and Frank J. Johnson are highly diverse individuals, but they have one thing in common—they are all dedicated to victory over international communism.

Day by day in Washington, Senator THURMOND is lashing out at what he terms the "no win" policy of the United States.

Back in April of 1951, General MacArthur had this to say before Congress: "War's very object is victory, not prolonged indecision. In war there is no substitute for victory."

And today, March 19, Frank Johnson unveils (through the Henry Regnery Co.) a forthright book which takes its title from General MacArthur's congressional address of 11 years ago: "No Substitute for Victory."

Johnson is a youngish man, but he served for 6 years as a specialist on Soviet political and military strategy following his graduation from the Naval Intelligence School in 1954.

Last year he left Government service in order to present to the reading public his ideas of winning the war against communism.

He prescribes strong medicine for the United States, but the real secret of his prescription is moral rather than physical. Reduced to its simplest terms it simply is the will to win.

Johnson is considerably more frightened by the current American mentality than by Russian military might (which he feels is greatly overrated in every category except intercontinental ballistic missiles). He presents a persuasive case of American superiority in military hardware and capabilities—but he is pessimistic about the willingness of the United States to flex its muscles.

His continuing thesis is not only that Soviet Russia does not want war, but that it will back down whenever it is faced with American willingness to risk war.

"The subjugation of the United States," Johnson says, "will only come after we have been thoroughly defeated and isolated in the cold war and corrupted from within by the argument that communism is not so bad after all, and anyway it is certainly better than death. * * * It is but a short step philosophically from saying that victory is not worth the possibility of war to saying that defeat, perhaps sugarcoated as 'compromise,' is preferable to the certainty of war."

Johnson traces much of our trouble back to the Korean war, which he terms significant for these reasons:

"First, it [the Korean war] reaffirmed the doctrine of containment, and promoted the fatal belief that there is a substitute for victory. Second, we made a false estimate of Soviet military power and an unrealistic assessment of Soviet willingness to fight the United States which continues to this day. Third, we failed to seize the opportunity to discredit, and possibly bring down, the Chinese Communists by destroying the cream of their armies in Korea.

"In fact, we boosted Communist China's prestige by allowing her to boast that she had successfully met America on the field of battle. Fourth, by accepting less than our goal of a reunited Korea, we suffered a loss of face in Asia. Fifth, we began the policy of allowing our allies and the United Nations to exert undue influence on American policy."

Johnson goes on to call for a tough-minded, openly declared, and power-backed American policy which would serve blunt notice on Russia—and the rest of the world—that the United States is determined to win in its battle against international communism.

More specifically, Johnson calls for:

1. A naval blockade of Cuba to seal off any further Soviet aid.

2. Support of a liberation movement in Albania (the most exposed of the Communist nations in Europe).

3. The development of continuing paramilitary warfare in the Communist satellites of Eastern Europe.

4. The withdrawal of U.S. blessings and support from the so-called neutrals.

5. The limiting of foreign aid to those expenditures which are clearly and directly in support of our objective of defeating world communism.

"This means," he adds, "that we must recognize who our friends are and support them, rather than our enemies or the neutrals. * * * As it stands today, a neutral may get as much or more aid than an ally. Let us take the profit out of neutralism. If we are really for freedom, then let us cease contributing to the coffers of those governments whose policies support the enemies of freedom."

As Adm. Arleigh Burke states, in a foreword to Johnson's book, "Not everybody will agree with all the points made by the author * * * but everybody will agree that the United States must win this struggle for survival. * * * There is truly 'no substitute for victory.' "

STATEMENT

"The United States is at war, not at peace. We are losing, not winning, the struggle for survival which the Communists have forced upon us. We are losing because we have, so far, not resolved to win. In order to win, we must change our foreign policy. We must take the offensive."

This is the theme through which an intelligence expert on the Soviet Union exposes the facts behind the cold war.

It is the author's contention that we have unnecessarily subordinated our policy and national interests to the views of our allies, the United Nations, the neutrals, and world opinion. The author believes that our Nation, the bastion of freedom in the free world, is in mortal danger. But it is in danger, not because we face an enemy possessing greater military power—we are far stronger than Russia, the author believes, but because we have abandoned the will to win.

The importance of "no substitute for victory" rests not only on its theme, but on relentless marshaling of the facts. The author knows, from his own experience with the Office of Naval Intelligence, the real nature of Soviet military strength and the crisis confronting the free world in our time. The reader of this book will know not only what we face but what we can do about it.

CENSORSHIP OF STATEMENTS BY MILITARY PERSONNEL

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, on Wednesday, March 14, 1962, the Senate Special Preparedness Subcommittee heard the most interesting, informative and candid witness to appear before our subcommittee this year. He testified on all phases of the investigation into censorship of anti-Communist statements from military speeches and articles, troop information and education programs, and participation of military personnel in cold war seminars. This witness was Lt. Col. William E. Mayer, who is currently stationed at Brooke General Hospital at Fort Sam Houston, Tex. He is the famous and highly regarded Army neuropsychiatrist who interviewed 1,000 American prisoners of war upon their return after the Korean war.

The testimony of Colonel Mayer has drawn much attention and interest. The Chicago Daily Tribune of March 19 has printed an excellent editorial on the colonel's testimony. I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, that this editorial and a newsletter I prepared on the subject of Colonel Mayer's testimony both be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of these remarks.

Mr. President, it would require too much space to print in the RECORD all of Colonel Mayer's eloquent testimony and his forthright answers to all of the questions put to him during his day-long appearance before the subcommittee. In lieu of this, Mr. President, I have a copy of a news article which gives an excellent summary on a memorandum which Colonel Mayer presented to the subcommittee following an interview with staff investigators on November 7, 1961. This article was written by Cecil Holland and appeared in the Evening Star of March 13, 1962. I ask unanimous consent that this article also be printed at the conclusion of my remarks.

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

[From the Chicago Daily Tribune, Mar. 19, 1962]

BRAINWASHED AT HOME

Lt. Col. William E. Mayer, an Army psychiatrist who studied the failure of training and character which led one American sol-

dier out of three taken prisoner by the Communists in Korea to collaborate with the enemy, reported an even more distressing discovery to a Senate Armed Services Subcommittee.

Colonel Mayer said that not only do the same weaknesses appear in today's soldiers, who have never been in combat or held as prisoners of war, but that they are endemic among the American people as a whole.

What is wrong with us? Colonel Mayer's answers were blunt, and they will not endear him to his superiors, either in the Military Establishment or in Government.

The basic cause of this sickness of the soul, the colonel said, is the warped objectives of contemporary society. The schools, the home, and the churches all are not doing their job, and it does not require a Communist to brainwash an American—to empty his mind and refill it with compliance to Communist purposes—for the Government of the United States is brainwashing the populace in advance of any contest with the enemy.

When, as it has in recent years, the Government is forever emphasizing and advancing the goals of the "welfare state," said Colonel Mayer, it is robbing the people of personal responsibility, of initiative, of the will to resist and stand on their own feet. When it promises them total security and undertakes to minister to all their needs—health, welfare, education, thought itself—it is enfeebling their vitality and debilitating their strength and resolution.

In his analysis of the Korean prisoners, and of another thousand soldiers he examined in 1960, Colonel Mayer found that the prevalent philosophy could be expressed in the phrase, "What's in it for me?" And that attitude, encouraged from Washington, has spread out through the majority of the people. Everyone is more dependent on outside authority and lacking in responsibility to fend for himself.

The permissiveness of progressive education contributes to the softening process. Soft courses are substituted for hard discipline, and everybody passes upward, regardless of poor marks. It does not require accomplishment to get by. There is a regrettable ignorance among many young people about their country's history and institutions, and about the values and liberties of their society and of Western civilization.

The Army's training program cannot make up these accumulated deficiencies. The character of the man in uniform has been formed by the time he is subject to service indoctrination, and the indoctrination is faulty because the noncommissioned officers who are responsible for its presentation are not equipped by education and training to mold the men under them.

When the recruiting posters offer good pay, training in some craft, and pensions for staying a required time, the point is blurred that a man is in service out of loyalty and respect for his country, that he must expect to suffer hardship and exposure to danger, and that he must be willing to lay down his life.

The Communists may not be admirable persons. They may be dedicated to the defense of a slave system. But we know from Russian fighting qualities in World War II and from the performance of the Red Chinese in Korea that they are adversaries not to be despised. If we're going to survive in this world, we must get iron back into the American soul. We will not do it as long as grasping politicians and shortsighted schoolmen are directing all their exertions toward the creation of a mollycoddle society.

A Lesson for America

(By Senator Strom Thurmond, Democrat, of South Carolina)

The Senate's Special Preparedness Subcommittee investigating muzzling of the military has turned to troop information and education programs of the armed services. Sometime within the next few weeks the investigation will focus again on censorship of anti-Communist statements when the State Department returns with its package of alibis about its heavy hand in censorship.

This second phase of the investigation has already revealed some glaring deficiencies in preparing our military personnel to face the Communist enemy and his devious methods in either a hot or cold war. As evidence of this Defense Department witnesses have revealed a new comprehensive program which was put together after the investigation was authorized.

The most interesting, informative and candid witness to come before our subcommittee thus far has been Lt. Col. William Mayer. He is the famous Army neuropsychiatrist who interviewed more than 1,000 Americans who became captives in the Korean war.

Colonel Mayer testified on all three phases of the investigation—censorship, troop information, and cold war seminars. On censorship he favors this be done only for security purposes. On Army troop information programs he said they had been more often than not a failure, useless or even negative in their effect, in many instances. As to military participation in seminars, he supported the position that the military should share such of its observations and expertise with the public as is possible.

The overall message Colonel Mayer delivered to the subcommittee was addressed to all Americans. Simply stated it was this:

The cooperation given the enemy by approximately one-third of the POW's—and Mayer says most of this was done without torture or particular duress—reflects "aspects of our individual and national character that deviate significantly from what is generally believed to be the standard of morally responsible behavior required of freemen in a free society."

He added: "Soldiers are not a separate species. Most of them are typical Americans, somewhat above the average in physical and mental health and education. If a code [of conduct] is needed for these young men, then the ideas in it are needed by all Americans, and needed as working, vital, active standards for the self-regulation, self-discipline, and individual honor required of the citizens of a State which would govern itself by the intelligent consent of the governed.

"I believe that our phenomenal comfort and success and apparent security in this country, among other things, are leading to the languishing of our basic principles, and can lead ultimately to our destruction, whether Communists or other tyrants exist in the world or not. And I believe that values and principles must be enunciated, clearly defined, and actively taught—not just once by the authors of the Federalist Papers or the Constitution, but by each succeeding generation of parents and teachers, preachers and Governors. I think that, if we fail to do this, we live in a fool's paradise, whose days are numbered."

In effect the colonel said we have gone soft in America, and until we toughen up we're not going to solve the novel and frightening problems we discovered about our national character in Korean POW camps. The job is one for all Americans, and revolves around very basic American principles—individual personal responsibility and initiative.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Evening Star, Mar. 13, 1962]

Indoctrination Fails in Army, Senators Told

(By Cecil Holland)

An Army psychiatrist who has made an extended study of Communist brainwashing of American prisoners in Korea has labeled the military's troop indoctrination program "more often than not a failure, useless, or even negative in its effects."

A large part of the blame, according to Lt. Col. William E. Mayer, falls on commanders down to the company and unit level who are responsible for administering the program. Too often, he said, they are not interested and not equipped for the task.

Colonel Mayer, who has spoken widely on Communist techniques in handling prisoners, also said that speeches by military leaders should be screened only for security reasons.

Policy reviews, the Army doctor said, represent "a prior prohibition on what is both a requirement and a privilege of the citizen: free expression of his honest belief."

Presents Memorandum

He expressed his views in a memorandum prepared for the Senate Armed Services Subcommittee which is investigating military censorship, troop education programs, and participation by the military in public seminars on the dangers of communism.

Colonel Mayer is expected to be a witness when the hearings resume, probably tomorrow, on the troop information phase of the inquiry.

In his 20-page statement, Colonel Mayer related some of the difficulties he had encountered in getting his speeches on Communist brainwashing cleared by military censors. He indicated that in recent months he had been given more freedom to address both military and civilian groups—a period covered largely by the subcommittee's inquiry.

Clearance Required

Both before and since returning to active duty in 1960, Colonel Mayer said, he has been required to obtain clearances of a speech, even before military groups, which he had given scores of times before and which has been widely reprinted, including in the Congressional Record.

He said he was led to return to the service by the urging of high military friends and by disturbing findings in a survey he made covering 1,000 troops in the Army in the Pacific.

"I had become convinced," he wrote, "that many of the characterological defects which were dramatized by the stresses of captivity during the Korea conflict had not been remedied among our people or among our citizen-soldiers * * * and that many defects were, in fact, becoming more serious."

Colonel Mayer said the defects partook of what psychiatrists once diagnosed as "psychopathic personality." Such defects, he said, are marked, by a lack of values except "what's in it for me."

More Like Psychopaths

"We are by no means yet 'a nation of psychopaths,'" Colonel Mayer continued, "but we appear to be far closer to that than would have seemed possible a few years ago, and there is no guarantee that we are immune."

Colonel Mayer was a member of a board which questioned and studied the American prisoners after they were released by the Chinese Communists at the end of hostilities in Korea.

He said the board classified its report only as "confidential" in hopes that it would be widely disseminated among Army officers. He said the board later learned that all copies except one, which was sent to Washington, were destroyed. The explanation given, he added, was that "the public wasn't ready to hear this sort of thing."

Because of this, Colonel Mayer said, he began speaking before military groups in the Far East about the Communist methods of handling prisoners and about troop morale and leadership. His speaking was extended to public groups after his return to the United States and his assignment to the 4th Army Headquarters in Texas.

FOR WIDER KNOWLEDGE

"I am convinced that Americans need to know far more than they do about the nature of communism as it is practiced today in much of the world," Colonel Mayer said. "I am further convinced that horror-story or name-calling approaches to the subject do not lead to understanding, and can create hatreds * * * which accomplish nothing and can be dangerous."

He said that what was revealed in the prisoner-of-war study had their roots far outside the prison camps and related to things learned or not learned at home.

Colonel Mayer, who disclaimed any connections with such organizations as the John Birch Society, said that contrary to the beliefs of many, the Communists did not resort to violence or torture with the prisoners. Moreover, he added, they were not interested in converting them to communism.

What they undertook to do, the psychiatrist said, was to create in them a passive, acquiescent state. This was done by the application of the principle of divide and conquer, with prisoners being encouraged and rewarded for reporting on one another. Unlike American captives in the past, Colonel Mayer said that in Korea there was no organized effort to escape, no effective assumption of command by one prisoner and an almost total lack of effort to care for those who became ill.

CITES COLLABORATION

He described as utterly misleading statements by defense leaders, saying that men performed as well in Korean captivity as they have in similar circumstances, and citing as a fact of this that only 14 were tried for misdeeds and 11 convicted.

Only 14 were tried, Colonel Mayer said, because of the difficulty of obtaining proof. He added that many hundreds collaborated with the enemy in one way or another and 1 in 10 of more than 900 who were questioned admitted telling on fellow prisoners.

The psychiatrist said that present indoctrination methods are not reaching the troops. He cited a survey he made last year which indicated that the indoctrination hour usually was looked forward to as a chance to "goof off."

He advocated better presentation of programs, better instructors and other means of indoctrination.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HICKEY in the chair). The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

[No. 27 Leg.]

Aiken	Eastland	Long, Mo.
Allott	Ellender	Long, Hawaii
Anderson	Engle	Long, La.
Bartlett	Ervin	Magnuson
Beall	Fong	Mansfield
Bennett	Fulbright	McCarthy
Burdick	Goldwater	McClellan
Bush	Gore	McGee
Butler	Gruening	McNamara
Byrd, Va.	Hart	Metcalf
Byrd, W. Va.	Hartke	Miller
Cannon	Hayden	Monroney
Capehart	Hickenlooper	Morse
Carlson	Hickey	Morton
Carroll	Hill	Moss
Case, N.J.	Holland	Mundt
Chavez	Hruska	Murphy
Church	Humphrey	Muskie
Clark	Jackson	Neuberger
Cooper	Javits	Pastore
Cotton	Johnston	Pearson
Curtis	Keating	Pell
Dirksen	Kefauver	Proxmire
Dodd	Kerr	Robertson
Douglas	Kuchel	Russell
Dworshak	Lausche	Saltonstall
Scott	Stennis	Wiley
Smathers	Symington	Williams, N.J.
Smith, Mass.	Talmadge	Yarborough
Smith, Maine	Thurmond	Young, N. Dak.
Sparkman	Tower	Young, Ohio

Mr. HUMPHREY. I announce that the Senator from Nevada [Mr. BIBLE] and the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. JORDAN] are absent on official business.

I further announce the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH] is necessarily absent.

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senators from Delaware [Mr. BOGGS and Mr. WILLIAMS] are absent on official business to attend a funeral in the State.

The Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from Vermont [Mr. PROUTY] is necessarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BURDICK in the chair). A quorum is present.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. TOWER obtained the floor.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me for the purpose of introducing a bill, without losing his right to the floor?

Mr. TOWER. I yield to my colleague from Texas for a question only.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator declines to yield.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. I ask only to introduce a bill, and that the Senator yield to me without losing his right to the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. STENNIS. Under the announcement of the majority leader, would the junior Senator from Texas yield the floor, or would his statement be counted as the beginning of a speech on the bill if he yields?

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, in order to avoid any question at that point——

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, I withdraw the request in order not to cause confusion. I shall introduce the bill later.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Texas yield to the Senator from Oregon on a privileged matter, with the understanding that he will not lose his right to the floor? I am sure the matter I wish to present will not take more than 30 seconds. It is a unanimous-consent conference report on the District of Columbia Unemployment Compensation Act; early action on which is important, so that it may take effect.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. STENNIS. The Senator from Mississippi has no intention of objecting. My only concern is—and I ask the question—if the Senator from Texas yields under the circumstances, would his yielding be charged as a speech against the joint resolution?

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, may I be heard on that point?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair recognizes the Senator from Montana.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I am quite sure the understanding was that it would not be charged as a speech against the Senator from Texas, and certainly there was no intention or idea of that sort in the mind of any Senator.

Mr. STENNIS. If that is clear——

Mr. TOWER. Under those circumstances, I yield to the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, in view of the fact that a conference report is a privileged matter, and in view of the fact that consideration of the conference report will not be charged against the Senator from Texas as a speech, I am in favor of the report being considered at this time.

AMENDMENT OF DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA UNEMPLOYMENT COMPENSATION ACT — CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I submit a report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 5968) to amend the District of Columbia Unemployment Compensation Act, as amended. 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 March 22, 1962.)

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. MORSE. Mr. President, the conference report had the unanimous approval of both the Senate conferees and the House conferees. When such approval takes place on a District of Columbia matter, it is something to take note of, and I ask that the report be agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The report was agreed to.

Mr. MORSE. I ask unanimous consent that an explanation of the amendments be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

AMENDMENTS TO THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA UNEMPLOYMENT COMPENSATION ACT AS APPROVED BY CONFEREES

Section 1 extends the coverage and protection of the District of Columbia Unemployment Compensation Act to employees of scientific, educational, literary nonprofit, and humane organizations.

Section 2 provides a new definition of insured work which is necessary because of

the flexible maximum weekly benefit amount established elsewhere in the act.

Section 3 contains a provision requiring the District of Columbia Unemployment Compensation Board to credit all of the interest earned by the trust fund to the employer's experience rating accounts. Presently, all of the interest is not credited because of the fact that some of it is earned by out-of-business accounts.

Section 4 lowers the requirements for reduced contribution rates for employers by one-tenth of 1 percent in each rate step.

This section also allows employers to make voluntary contributions within 30 days of their contribution (tax) rate in order to reduce their rate for the calendar year in question.

Section 5 establishes the maximum weekly benefit amount each year as 50 percent of the average covered wage in the District of Columbia. It also establishes an individual's weekly benefit amount as one twenty-third of his high quarter wages in his base period. This permits the maximum weekly benefit amount to increase year by year in accordance with the economy without congressional action. In order to qualify for any benefits an individual must have received wages of not less than $130 in one quarter of his base period and been paid wages of not less than $276 in at least two quarters of his base period. In addition, in his base period he must have received at least 1½ times his high quarter wages. An individual not receiving the last requirement may receive benefits of $1 less per week if he is within $35 of this requirement or may receive benefits of $2 less per week if he is within $70 of this requirement.

This section also prevents an individual from drawing benefits for 2 successive benefit years without additional work after his first benefit year commenced, and thus would prevent individuals from drawing benefits for 2 years in a row based on one separation from work. This requirement is that the individual must earn at least 10 times his original benefit amount to qualify for the second benefit year.

In addition, this section contains a provision designed to prevent retirees from drawing unemployment compensation benefits. The provision is identical to the one contained in the temporary Federal unemployment program now in operation. It provides that any retirement contributed to by a base-period employer shall be deducted from the individual's benefits. The provision excludes disability and old-age and survivors insurance benefits.

Finally, the section increases the duration of an individual's benefits to the lesser of 34 times his weekly benefit amount or 50 percent of the wages received by him in his base period.

Section 6 contains a technical amendment removing the old $30 maximum weekly benefit amount and includes in lieu thereof the established maximum benefit amount.

Section 7 also contains a technical change. The change is necessary because the benefit table has been replaced in the act by a flexible provision establishing the maximum weekly benefit amount.

Section 8 denies individuals who refuse training courses approved by the District of Columbia Unemployment Compensation Board from receiving benefits. Under existing law this section is limited to individuals under 21 years of age.

The section affirmatively provides that individuals taking a training or retraining course approved by the Board or the Employment Service shall be deemed available for work and thus eligible for benefits.

Comparison of amendments to the District of Columbia Unemployment Compensation Act as passed by the House and Senate and proposed agreement

Provision	Existing law	House bill	Senate bill	Agreement
1. Maximum benefit amount.	$30 a week maximum. Table is based on 1/23 of high quarter wages.	Increases maximum to $38. Benefits up to $30 based on a 1/23 table, benefits from $31 through $35 based on a 1/24 table and benefits from $36 through $38 based on a 1/25 table.	Sets the maximum weekly benefit annually as 50 percent of the average covered wages in the District of Columbia. The individual's weekly benefit amount would be 1/23 of his high quarter wages. This would presently set the maximum at $47.	Senate version.
2. Duration	Variable: 26 weeks or 1/3 of base period wages, whichever is the lesser.	Variable: 26 weeks or 1/3 of base period wages, whichever is the lesser.	34 weeks uniform	34 weeks or 1/3 of base period wages, whichever is the lesser. (This takes 1 feature from each the House and Senate bills.)
3. Disqualifications: Voluntary leaving without good cause, misconduct, refusal of suitable work.	Individual disqualified from 5 to 10 weeks commencing in the week in which the act occurred and his total benefits reduced by an amount equal to the number of weeks disqualified times the weekly benefit amount.	Individual to receive no benefits for as long as he remains unemployed and until he earns wages of 8 times his weekly benefit amount (approximately 4 weeks' work).	Deletes the provision for reduction of benefits but retains the variable disqualification period.	Existing law. (Is somewhere between the House and Senate bills.)
4. Exemptions	Sec. 1(b)(5)(G): "(G) service performed in the employ of a corporation, community chest, fund, or foundation, organized and operated exclusively for religious, charitable, scientific, literary, or educational purposes, or for the prevention of cruelty to children or animals, no part of the net earnings of which inures to the benefit of any private shareholder or individual."	No provision	Extends coverage to employees of nonprofit organizations (except ministers, members of religious orders, and handicapped in sheltered workshops).	Extends coverage to employees in educational, literary, and scientific nonprofits.
5. Training	Individuals under age 21 disqualified in respect to any week in which they refuse training to which they are referred to by the Board or manager of the Employment Service.	do	(1) Removes age level of present provision and (2) provides that benefits will not be denied any otherwise eligible individual who is in a training program with the approval of the Board.	Senate version.
6. Pension or retirement disqualifications.	No provision. Covered by usual requirements that an individual be able and available for work.	Individual's weekly benefit amount reduced by the amount of pension received from any public or private plan or fund to which a base period employer contributed, except (A) disability pension or annuity or (B) OASI.	Individual who voluntarily leaves employment without good cause and has applied for or is receiving a pension to which a base period employer contributed cannot use the wages from that employer as a basis for unemployment benefits.	House version.
7. Requalification (double dip).	No provision	Precludes an individual from receiving benefits in successive benefit years, though otherwise qualified, unless after the beginning of the benefit year, he has earned at least 10 times his weekly benefit amount, of his 1st benefit year (approximately 5 weeks' work).	No provision	Do.
8. Qualifying requirements.	Permits unlimited stepback	Limits stepback to 2 steps	Substantially the same as House bill but geared to the Senate benefit amount formula rather than House schedule.	Limits stepback to 2 steps as in both bills.
9. Financing changes: Reduction in rate requirements.		Reserve ratio requirements reduced 1/10 of 1 percent in each contribution rate step.	No provision	House version.
		Both bills would also permit employers to retain or protect favorable ratings by voluntary contributions and the House bill contains a provision, sought by employers, that would credit active employers all interest earned by the fund. Under existing law they receive only the interest earned by their reserve ratios.		Both provisions.

GOVERNMENT COMPETITION WITH PRIVATE BUSINESS

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, there is a great deal of talk these days about the necessity of expanding American markets abroad. To this end it is proposed that we lower tariffs and therefore stimulate American markets abroad by making domestic markets in this country *more attractive* for foreign goods.

We are the most productive people in the world. We have the greatest industrial power that any nation has ever mustered. We are potentially capable of competing with any nation or nations in the world on a favorable basis in the sale of goods and services in the international market.

Mr. President, I believe that American business can compete with any nation or nations in the world. We have the greatest productive facilities. We have the necessary technology. We have the methods of salesmanship that would enable us to compete favorably with any other country in the world, were it not for the fact that in this country production costs are well above competitive levels in many areas.

For that reason, we have tariffs to protect our domestic industry.

There are several reasons why production costs in this country are above competitive levels. For example, very often the Government sponsors wage increases not tied to per man productivity. The Government is in the money market, bidding up interest rates and competing with private business for capital. There is an intensive tax and regulatory burden imposed on business.

There is one particular element that I should like to discuss on the floor of the Senate this afternoon with reference to our production levels being above competitive levels, and that is the fact that the Federal Government is in many areas and on many fronts in active competition with private business.

One of the greatest of many opportunities for substantial savings in Federal expenditures lies in the termination or curtailment of Government business type activities that are in direct competition with private enterprise.

The scope and magnitude of these activities has become so great that no one actually knows the total number of them, the capital investment in them, the total number of their employees, or the gross value of the goods and services they produce or provide.

They are found in every agency of Government, and they reach into every segment of the American economic structure.

It should be understood at the outset that the expression "Government competition" means Government ownership and operation of facilities producing or providing products and/or services that are readily available from commercial sources. It does not necessarily mean readily available at the same price because, in most instances, there is no valid basis for a realistic comparison of industry and Government costs. Furthermore, whether or not the Government can or thinks it can do it cheaper should not even be a consideration whenever there is competitive bidding.

It also should be understood that there are three major classifications of Government competition; namely, facilities providing: First, products and services for the Government's own use; second, products and services for the use of Government employees; and, third, products and services to be sold or given to the general public.

HISTORICAL BACKGROUND

Detailed congressional studies of the Government competition problem date back to 1933 when a special committee of the House of Representatives made an exhaustive investigation. It found 232 such activities started during World War I still in operation, and commented:

> The evidence in general indicates that the operations of the Federal Government in the field of private enterprise has reached a magnitude and diversity which threatens to reduce the private initiative, curtail the opportunities, and infringe upon the earning powers of taxpaying undertakings while steadily increasing the levies upon them.

The next major congressional study of the problem began in 1947, when the second Hoover Commission was instructed to look into this matter. In March 1949, the Commission submitted a detailed report to Congress. The introduction to that report stated:

> There are about 100 important business enterprises which the Federal Government owns or in which it is financially interested. These concerns engage directly or indirectly in lending money, guaranteeing loans and deposits; writing life insurance; the producing, distributing, and selling of electric power and—
>
> Of all things—
>
> fertilizers; the operation of railways and ships; the purchasing and selling of farm products; and the smelting and sale of metals.
>
> The Government's direct investment in these enterprises is in excess of $20 billion, and there are further authorized commitments to supply about $14 billion to them. In addition, the Government guarantees directly and indirectly about $90 billion of deposits or mortgages, and the life insurance written by Government agencies approaches $40 billion.

The first Hoover Commission did not attempt to say how much could be saved by adopting and implementing its recommendations regarding Government business enterprises, but emphasized that the savings to the taxpayers to be made in these agencies are very large.

The next significant investigation of the Government competition problem took the form of a 1954 House Government Operations Subcommittee study under the chairmanship of Representative Cecil M. Harden, Republican, of Indiana. This study resulted in four volumes of hearings and a report that stated:

> Though economy in Government operations may be proved in a given case or the necessity for the Government to operate a service may be proved at one time, it is essential to develop competitive industries as soon as possible and the Government should step out of the picture at the earliest possible date.

The most recent and most comprehensive study of this complicated and controversial subject was completed in May 1955, when the Second Hoover Commission submitted its report on business enterprises. During the approximately 2 years that most of the Commission's task forces were at work, so much information on Government competition was uncovered that it was necessary to discuss the problem in some detail not only in the wrap-up report on business enterprises but also in the separate reports on lending agencies, transportation, water resources, and depot utilization.

In spite of the voluminous data it accumulated, the Commission would not even attempt a Government-wide estimate of the Government competition problem, explaining that it was unable to discover the full extent of such activities. However, the Commission was able to determine that in the Department of Defense alone, there were 2,621 commercial and industrial-type activities, in 48 categories, employing an estimated 600,000 persons and involving an initial capital investment of more than $15 billion. The Commission said at least 1,000 of these 2,621 activities could and should be discontinued without adversely affecting our national security program.

EXECUTIVE AGENCY HISTORICAL BACKGROUND

The Eisenhower administration's Govment-wide effort to close or curtail unnecessary business-type activities and prevent the establishment of new commercial-industrial activities that were unnecessary was formalized with the issuance, on January 15, 1955, of Budget Bureau Bulletin No. 554. This bulletin stated:

> It shall be the general policy of the administration that the Federal Government will not start or carry on any commercial activity to provide a service or product for its own use if such product or service can be procured from private enterprise through ordinary business channels.

It should be noted, however, that the Department of Defense, as early as November 17, 1952, had inaugurated its own so-called decompetition program with the issuance of DOD Directive No. 4000.8, which directed a survey of all military business-type activities to determine the need for their continued operation and retention.

Approximately 1 year later—November 24, 1953—the Defense Department issued DOD Directive No. 4100.15, which laid down detailed policy guidelines with respect to the ownership and operation of commercial and industrial-type facilities. This directive, issued by Secretary Charles E. Wilson, stated in part:

> The Department of Defense supports the basic principle that free competitive enterprise should be fostered by Government. Therefore, privately owned or Government-owned and privately operated commercial and industrial-type facilities will be used by the Department of Defense to the greatest extent practicable, recognizing the basic military necessity for integrated, self-sustaining units responsive to command and the necessity for operating anywhere in the world. It is the policy of the Department of Defense not to engage in the operation of commercial-type facilities unless it can be

demonstrated that it is necessary for the Government to perform the required work or service.

The Pentagon then issued DOD Directive No. 4100.16, on March 8, 1954, in which a comprehensive review of specific categories of commercial-industrial activities was ordered. The directive covered 1,679 such activities. Between the date of its issuance and January 1, 1958, 268 activities were discontinued, 57 were curtailed, 127 were earmarked for closing, and 133 were earmarked for curtailment.

During the 18 months immediately following January 1, 1958, the Defense Department resurveyed 695 activities. Of this number, an additional 63 were closed, curtailed 13, decided to close 77 more, and decided to curtail 11 more.

Two other significant Department of Defense actions should be noted here before discussing the Government-wide implementation of Budget Bureau Bulletin No. 55–4.

On April 27, 1955, the Department of Defense revised and reissued DOD Directive No. 4100.15, which was first issued in November of 1953. The revised directive stressed that the use of Government-owned and operated commercial-industrial-type facilities would not be authorized except when it can be clearly demonstrated that private enterprise cannot perform the service or provide the products needed to meet current and mobilization requirements, or that in the execution of the military mission, operation by the Government is a necessity. The revised directive also permitted the continued use of or establishment of Government-owned activities in those instances when the product or service cannot be obtained from private sources at a reasonable price.

But less than a year later, on January 31, 1956, the Assistant Secretary of Defense for Supply and Logistics found it necessary to issue a clarifying directive in which he explained that a commercial price will be considered reasonable when the commercial price to the Government is not greater than the price paid by other purchasers considering the existence of adequate competition, volume of purchases, and quality of products and/or services obtained.

Reverting now to the issuance of Budget Bureau Bulletin No. 55–4, this policy directive called upon Government agencies to do two things: First, report their commercial-industrial activities; and second, evaluate their Government-operated manufacturing activities to determine which ones should be continued or terminated in accordance with the general policy.

The reports received in response to this directive were compiled in an inventory of certain commercial-industrial activities of the Government, issued in May 1956. This inventory disclosed the existence of 19,711 activities with capital assets of nearly $12 billion and employing 258,425 civilians and 8,096 military personnel. All of these activities were in one category—providing products and services for the Government's own use.

As the next phase in this decompetition program, Budget Bureau Bulletin No. 57–7 was issued on February 5, 1957. This bulletin restated the general policy and included instructions for the evaluation of commercial-industrial activities classified as services.

After reviewing the responses to this directive, the need for clarification of the data published in the Bureau's 1956 inventory became evident, so it was decided to spell out more specific and uniform criteria for determining the application of the Government's general policy in specific situations. At the same time, the Bureau recognized a need for better criteria for making decisions where cost differentials were an important consideration.

After full discussions with the principal agencies concerned, the President approved a revised directive which was issued on September 21, 1959, as Budget Bureau Bulletin No. 60–2 and is still in effect. Its stated purpose was: First, to clarify the program based upon experience; and second, to complete the evaluations of all remaining activities. The general policy remained essentially unchanged, pointing out that because the private enterprise system is basic to the American economy, the general policy establishes a presumption in favor of Government procurement from commercial sources.

Bulletin No. 60–2 also recognized that there are factors which may make it necessary or advisable for a Government agency to produce goods or services for its own use; but it placed the burden of proof squarely on the agency. Guidelines and criteria were provided for determining whether compelling reasons existed due to, first, national security; second, relatively large and disproportionately high costs; or third, clear unfeasibility.

In a May 12, 1960, progress report, Deputy Budget Bureau Director Elmer Staats told the Senate Select Committee on Small Business that, as of July 31, 1959, the civilian agencies of Government had taken action to discontinue 1,516 of the activities listed in the Budget Bureau's 1956 inventory. He also said an additional 226 had been curtailed. Elsewhere in his testimony, he also said:

> Most of the more than 19,000 activities were not competitive with private enterprise.
>
> Between January 1957 and July 1959, 236 new commercial-industrial activities were established by civilian agencies.

CONGRESSIONAL ACTION

While the Budget Bureau and other executive agencies were attempting to implement the administration's Government competition policy directive, Congress grappled with the recommendations made in the Second Hoover Commision's Report on Business Enterprises. Hearings were held on numerous bills and several were approved. These included disposal of the Texas City, Tex., tin smelter, and authorization for a 5-year lease of the Alaska Railroad to private interests. But there was no final action on the most important Government competition bill—the so-called Anti-Government Competition Act, introduced by six Senators and four Members of the House. Even worse, Congress caused the Pentagon's decompetition program to grind to a virtual halt, by inserting in the 1956 Defense Appropriations Act a rider—section 638—requiring congressional approval of every Pentagon proposal to close or curtail an activity at least 5 years old and employing 10 or more persons.

The Anti-Government Competition Act would have:

First. Put Congress on record as directing all Federal agencies to get out and stay out of most business-type activities. It would have limited such activities to those that are necessary for the Government itself to perform in the public interest or in furtherance of national programs and objectives established by statute.

Second. Required the Department of Defense to investigate business complaints of unfair competition.

Third. Required the Budget Bureau to review each proposed Government activity that might be competitive with private enterprise.

Fourth. Instructed the President to submit an annual report on actions taken pursuant to the legislation.

The section 638 veto power over proposed Pentagon decompetition actions originated with the House Appropriations Committee, and caused the Defense Department virtually to discontinue its campaign to close or curtail its business-type activities. In 1956, Congress refused to extend the veto authority, in spite of strong Appropriations Committee pressure in favor of such action. In 1957, the House Appropriations Committee did not even recommend such a provision, but the House Armed Services Committee attempted to insert a similar rider in the military construction authorization bill. The House approved the proposal but a vigorous campaign to have it deleted in the Senate was successful. Since then, Congress has made no further efforts to enact such restrictive language.

Another congressional committee that has interested itself in the Government competition problem is the Senate's Select Committee on Small Business. In its 1957 annual report, the committee recommended:

> That all Government agencies abstain from initiating any commercial activity and expedite the discontinuance of any such activity already engaged in which provides a product or service for Government use when such product or service may be obtained, with reasonable convenience, in like quality and quantity at a fair and reasonable price, through ordinary business channels. Exceptions should be made only when it is clearly demonstrated that the public interest is better served.
>
> That the Defense Department accelerate the rate at which its competitive commercial enterprises are being closed.

Two years later, in the select committee's eighth annual report, it repeated both of the above recommendations, and also observed as follows:

> The Congress should carefully consider the possibility of enacting legislation to require greater action in this field.

The most recent expressions of congressional concern regarding Government competition involve research and development generally and the experimental space satellite communications system.

During the last session of Congress, the House Government Operations Committee and the House Appropriations Committee were very critical of the large and ever-increasing number of organizations which have been established, mostly on a nonprofit basis, to do business solely or primarily with the Government in the research and development area. Because of this criticism, President Kennedy, on August 5, instructed a five-member ad hoc committee, headed by Budget Director David Bell, to make a comprehensive review of the Government's so-called contracting out policies. The Bell Committee report was due December 1, but has not as yet been delivered.

The House Committee on Science and Astronautics, in a recent report on commercial applications of space communications systems, called upon NASA to harness and utilize the demonstrated extraordinary capacity of private enterprise to the maximum extent practicable in the Nation's space programs. A statement by President Kennedy indicated he also strongly favors this course of action.

But shortly thereafter, when a group of nine international common carriers proposed the organization of a nonprofit corporation to develop, construct, operate, maintain and promote the use of a commercial satellite communications system, a group of Congressmen warned against possible monopolistic results and the proposal was sharply criticized at a Senate Small Business Subcommittee hearing chairmaned by the distinguished junior Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG]. Since then, the distinguished Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR], chairman of the Senate Space Committee, sponsored legislation and held hearings on this subject. The Kerr proposal would authorize private ownership of the U.S. part of a global communication satellite system.

EXAMPLES

Because any such undertaking would be futile, I shall not attempt to measure, or present an inventory of, the scope and magnitude of current Government owned and operated business-type activities. However, it is possible to identify some of the more glaring current examples of unfair and unnecessary Government competition with privately owned, taxpaying enterprises. They are as follows:

First. The Postal Savings System, which outlived its usefulness many years ago, continues to compete with commercial savings institutions in urban areas.

Second. The Military Air Transport Service, in spite of repeated congressional criticism, continues to operate excessive numbers of flights on routes served by the commercial airlines.

Third. The Alaska Communication System is still Government owned and operated, in spite of the availability of a number of buyers.

Fourth. The Tennessee Valley Authority, which got into the fertilizer production business on an experimental basis, now sells about $20 million worth annually, at less than cost, and now wants to get into the coal mining business.

Fifth. The Navy is currently assigning more than 75 percent of its repair, alteration, and conversion work on naval vessels to its own shipyards, in spite of its admission that costs are as much as 15 percent higher in the naval shipyards than in private yards.

Sixth. The Federal Government, in 1960, generated 112,305,000 kilowatt-hours of electric energy, an increase of nearly 200 percent over the 40,387,000 kilowatt-hours it generated in 1950.

Seventh. Loans, guarantees, and insurance in Federal lending agencies, plus the authority to obtain additional capital from the Treasury, exceeds $250 billion.

Eighth. The Federal Supply Service uses its own warehouse facilities almost exclusively. The Defense Materials System uses its own facilities primarily, but only a limited number of commercial warehouses.

Ninth. The Navy continues to do a large percentage of its aircraft overhaul and maintenance work in its own shops, while the Army and Air Force place much greater reliance upon the aircraft service industry.

Tenth. The Defense Department still owns and operates more than 100 local telephone systems that it would rather dispose of but has found it difficult to dispose of because of congressional restrictions on their sale by negotiated contracts.

Mr. President, on March 1 I introduced Senate Resolution 303, to authorize the Committee on Government Operations to investigate Government competition with private business and to determine means and methods by which such functions can be transferred to private enterprise.

I respectfully call attention to this resolution and ask unanimous consent to have it printed in the RECORD at this point.

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

S. RES. 303

Resolved, That the Committee on Government Operations, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized under section 134(a) and 136 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, and in accordance with its jurisdiction specified by rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate, to make a full and complete study for the purpose of determining—

(1) the extent to which departments and agencies of the Government are engaged in the production or furnishing of goods and services which can be supplied by private enterprise;

(2) the extent to which necessity or the national security require that such goods and services be produced or furnished by departments or agencies of the Government; and

(3) the means and methods by which the function of producing or furnishing such goods and services may be transferred at the earliest practicable time and to the greatest practicable extent to private competitive enterprise within the United States.

SEC. 2. For the purposes of this resolution, the committee, from February 1, 1962, through January 31, 1963, is authorized to (1) make such expenditures as it deems advisable; (2) employ upon a temporary basis, technical, clerical, and other assistants and consultants: *Provided*, That the minority is authorized at its discretion to select one person for appointment, and the person so selected shall be appointed and his compensation shall be so fixed that his gross rate shall not be less by more than $1,200 than the highest gross rate paid to any other employee; and (3) with the prior consent of the heads of the departments or agencies concerned, and the Committee on Rules and Administration, to utilize the reimbursable services, information, facilities, and personnel of any of the departments or agencies of the Government.

SEC. 3. The committee shall report its findings upon the study and investigation authorized by this resolution, together with its recommendations for such legislation as it deems advisable, to the Senate at the earliest practicable date, but not later than January 31, 1963.

SEC. 4. Expenses of the committee, under this resolution, which shall not exceed $125,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, our productive capacity is based on a system of free enterprise and profits. No government exists for profits; it exists by profits. The earnings of industrial enterprises are the basis for most of our taxes that enable the Government to obtain appropriations for those functions it is constitutionally authorized to perform.

There is in America today, from diverse sources, an almost constant pressure to inject more government into our daily lives, including competitive activities with the very productive enterprises which largely support government in the first place.

Some of the functions performed by the Federal Government in competition with private enterprise, however, have a sound basis of economic necessity. I am sure we will all recognize that this is especially true in the Department of Defense and some related agencies, such as the Atomic Energy Commission.

Even here, however, there is a need for continuous vigilance as defense production changes to meet new military and security requirements, especially in the area of space exploration.

We find the Federal Government today still engaged in the telephone and related communications business; in producing and distributing electric power; in building and repairing seagoing vessels; in loaning money; in storing surpluses; in warehousing; in commercial transportation; and in financing homes, office buildings, stores, and other retail outlets.

There is competition between Government and industry in the area of patents, in forestry, in mining, in water power, in chemicals—yes, even in amusement and entertainment.

More important than individual instances that deprive the Government of tax revenues is the overall perpetuation of the philosophy that private enterprise is inadequate, that Government largess is endless and costless, and that any

economic system can be improved by constant tampering and redirection.

The facts are that a system of free enterprise has its own built-in levers for purging the unwanted, the unnecessary, the costly, and shoddy.

In our economy, what the people want determines what is produced.

Mr. President, there is no democracy like the democracy of the marketplace. The consumer in this country determines what goods and services he wants produced. In the United States, I would say, management and proprietors are the employees of the consumers.

The Federal Government has reached the point that it takes more and more money from the pockets of the taxpayers. I hope the taxpayers of this country realize that the more money the Federal Government takes from them the less democracy of the marketplace we shall have. Of course, the dollar might not mean only material things to the individual—in any case, it should not mean only material things, but should recognize freedom of choice. The more of the dollar that Uncle Sam takes away from the individual the less freedom of choice he will have, and then democracy of the marketplace will operate less well.

Our people are fortunate to live in an economy in which they cast ballots in the marketplace to determine what is to be produced.

Under Federal control, political, military, and propaganda considerations influence what shall be produced.

Under Federal guidance, risk is largely eliminated, with a consequent leavening of skills and economic adventures by individuals willing to invest in the new and untried.

Today's industrialist in America must compete for workers. Under Government control of production, a worker would be told where to work and under what conditions.

Today we have a freedom of choice in how we spend our money, for a radio or automobile of one manufacturer or another; tomorrow we may pay a controlled price for a single product, produced at Government specifications with attendant lethargy over improvements and performance.

I had the privilege of living in Great Britain for a time. I lived there not too long after the Socialist government of that country had nationalized the railroads. Gone was the competition of the private enterprise system that had developed Britain's great network of railroads. Gone with it was the fine service that had always been connected with the various privately owned British railroads. Gone was the esprit de corps of the worker who used to take pride in the company for which he worked—very much, I suppose, like a soldier has pride in his flag and his unit. Now all the employees of the British railway system have been reduced to the status of Government employees. The consumer is the one who suffers in such a situation.

It seems to me that a broad-scale approach to this subject is the obligation of the Congress and of extreme necessity at this moment in our history, when we are witnessing a realinement and resurgence of the economic growth both here and abroad.

All of us, every American, be he a worker, owner, investor, or Government administrator, has a stake in a calm appraisal of trends of Federal activity and control in this and other areas of our economic and social life.

If I may digress a moment, in connection with my statement that all of us—workers and owners—have a stake in appraisal of current trends, we should never recognize the fallacy which holds that the interests of management and ownership and the interests of labor are contrary and incompatible with each other. I believe that what is good for business is good for everyone. If business does not prosper in the United States, labor cannot prosper.

And when it is proposed to stimulate the economy by creating the freest possible climate for the conduct of business, that is not only a probusiness movement, but it is also a prolabor movement as well. The American workingman has been the big beneficiary of our system of private enterprise. It has produced for him the highest standard of living enjoyed by working people anywhere in the world.

As a dramatic example, I note that the 18 million American Negroes who have not had the educational, job, and economic opportunities that others in our land have had, have, I must frankly admit, been discriminated against and mistreated. As a result they have tended to be low on our socioeconomic scale. Yet the 18 million American Negroes own more automobiles, more television sets, more refrigerators, and more homes than all of the 200-plus million people in the Soviet Union. I think that is a good illustration of what the free enterprise system has done for everyone in our society. We are a highly productive, comfortable, and yet self-reliant and resourceful people. I think we should determine that the system of private enterprise must be preserved in this country.

It is the avowed aim of the Communists to destroy capitalism. It should therefore be our participating goal to defend and sustain capitalism with a new vigor and intelligence if we are to survive and flourish.

Many of us forget that the weapons being used by the Communists in this economic onslaught against us are ostensibly innocuous.

Communists divide and confuse; they smile, then frown, placate then growl defiance, spoon feeding diplomatic, economic, and propaganda dismay to nations and individuals, creating disruption, stirring the irrational, and confusing the world.

And for what purpose? To pave the way for conquest by arms or by default. And part of the master plan is, in lieu of outright military conquest, to nibble away at the foundations of capitalistic, free enterprise strength with subtle urgings among our intellectuals and doers that centralism is a cure-all and can be arrived at painlessly if only we will be patient.

Many years ago Marx said:

I can tell you in a word—

In describing communism—

that it is the confiscation of private property.

The whole target of the Communist effort is the destruction of the capitalist system. It is my hope that we shall not be well intentioned but unwitting allies in their efforts to destroy us.

Let us take a look at the thinking of Marx and Engels and Lenin and their peculiar twisted and distorted interpretations of history. They hold that the history of human society has been characterized by class warfare, and that class warfare has always existed. This is the basic premise on which they proceed. They hold that eventually the proprietors of wealth, because they are basically avaricious, greedy, and cannibalistic, will diminish their own numbers, so that the number of proprietors of wealth will diminish, and the number of the "have nots," the people without wealth, the workers, will increase. Because the proletariat will ultimately grow exceedingly strong numerically, by sheer weight of numbers they will overcome the capitalists, the owners of property, and will destroy them and establish the dictatorship of the proletariat. They say this is historically inevitable.

Once the dictatorship of the proletariat has been established, it will use the coercive power of the state to bring about the nationalization of all the means of production, distribution, and exchange.

They frankly say that all opposition must be ruthlessly and brutally suppressed, if necessary, because of the end that they seek to achieve. They do not hold that government ownership of the means of production, distribution, and exchange is an end unto itself but is a means to an end.

At this point the Marxist proffers to the world a utopia, which he calls the promised society. The promised society will be a happy place. Everyone will work for the good of the community. There will be no more avarice and no more greed; the trappings of the State will wither away gradually; the trappings of capitalism will be used until they can be destroyed; there will be no currency; there will be no government; there will be a sort of anarchical syndicalism, under which everyone will be happy. That is what they say.

Of course, this is an idealistic goal that conceivably appeals to many of the downtrodden and gullible.

However, I believe most of us have enough good sense to know that this type of promised society would be impossible to achieve, because, although we are all created equal in the eyes of God, whereas in this country we are all equal in the eyes of the law, and our votes count equally at the polling place, we are not equal.

We are different. We are separate individuals. We cannot all be measured by the same yardstick. I found out that

we are not all equal when I tried out for the basketball team. Each of us has different capacities, different abilities.

Therefore, once the dictatorship of the proletariat is established, it must use the coercive authority of the state to force everyone into the same mold, for if that coercive authority were ever removed, we would not have the Marxist promised society, but we would ultimately return to the type of society that we have in the United States, if the people were allowed to be free.

However, this is an attractive goal to the unenlightened, and this is what we compete with. Therefore we must show the rest of the world, by precept and example, that we believe in the capitalist system and intend to preserve it. This system offers man the best opportunity, not merely for comfort, not merely for things, but for spiritual and intellectual and social progress.

I do not charge that many of our economic planners have adopted Marxism; I say only that what may appear to us to be innocuous today may be deadly tomorrow.

Men of noble intention and lofty aims, dissatisfied with society as they see it, may feel that by planning, society can be reordered to provide a better life for everybody. So they set about doing grand things. The function of the government then becomes no longer just that of preserving order in society, but of ordering and regimenting society. The planners inevitably set out simply to control things; but when their plans are implemented, they end by controlling the people, and we do not want our people controlled. This is not the function of government.

In our society, government should be the servant of the people, not the master of the people. So our system of a free economy really serves as a buffer between the people and the inclination of those in power in the political sphere to gather more power unto themselves, because it prevents the peoples being reduced to a state of dependency upon and subordination to the central government.

Mr. President, there are many ways to confiscate private property or to replace it with government-run operations. Inequitable and excessive taxation is one way. Attempts to cure the threat of bankruptcy by more spending is another. Stringent government controls are another. Government ownership is the most direct way, and it is this method that should be examined and corrected by Congress as soon as possible.

THE ALEXANDER HAMILTON NATIONAL MONUMENT — AMENDMENT TO THE CONSTITUTION DEALING WITH POLL TAXES

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. TOWER. Mr. President, the Senate is now debating a motion to consider a joint resolution to which will be offered an amendment calling for the submission to the States, for ratification, of a constitutional amendment which will prohibit the collection of a poll tax as a requirement for voting in a Federal election. I approve of the manner in which the able, distinguished, and responsible senior Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND] has approached this problem. He has taken a statesmanlike approach. If, indeed, we are to act to prevent the States from imposing a poll tax, then it should not be by the enactment of a statute; it should be done by constitutional action, because the conduct of elections comes within the peculiar purview of the functions, the rights, and the responsibilities of the States.

But, however much I admire the statesmanlike and sound legal approach of the distinguished Senator from Florida, I am compelled to say that, in my estimation, such an amendment is not necessary. Only five States currently have the poll tax: my own State of Texas, the State of Virginia, the State of Arkansas, the State of Mississippi, and the State of Alabama. Technically speaking, the poll tax is not a qualification for suffrage. The poll tax is a tax which is levied, in my State in any case, on every individual. Admittedly, it is not enforced. But the payment of a poll tax is an evidence of residence; and residence is a generally accepted requirement for suffrage. It is not a qualification. Everyone who is a resident is entitled to pay his tax and to vote. That is his privilege.

I point out, further, that the poll tax does not really operate to prevent people from voting. The amount of the tax is so low that it does not really deter anyone from voting, regardless of his socioeconomic or financial status. In Texas, we have a good record of not only permitting, but actually encouraging, minority ethnic groups to participate in the political process. My State has a number of Negro citizens and citizens of Latin American origin. They vote in substantial numbers, and no effort is made to prevent them from voting. The poll tax in Texas does not serve to prevent people from voting.

I think the poll tax is a nuisance. I can see not much reason for continuing the poll tax. But, again, the poll tax exists in only 5 States out of the 50. It does not really serve to prevent people from voting. I cannot understand, then, why we should concern ourselves with a constitutional amendment on the subject. If I were to venture a prognostication, I would predict that, probably by the time such an amendment were ratified, two or three of the States which currently have the poll tax would have abolished it on their own initiative. I can testify that in Texas there is considerable sympathy for the abolition of the poll tax; and I believe that in my State it will be done away with before too long a time.

Evidence of interest in the matter is found in the fact that the Republican State Executive Committee of Texas recently had the issue placed on its primary ballot for a referendum as to whether the poll tax should be continued; and I believe that in my State the sentiment for abolition of the poll tax is so strong that ultimately it will be abolished, regardless of whether there is any Federal action.

Madam President (Mrs. NEUBERGER in the chair), since the poll tax is operative in only five States, let me say at this point that I wish to emphasize that I believe every citizen should have the right to participate in the political process, through voting, and no citizen should be denied that right. I think it reprehensible that in a few areas of our country some men are denied this constitutional privilege because of their ethnic background, and I make no apology and raise no defense for anyone who would deny an American citizen his right to vote, regardless of the coloration of his skin or his views.

But, Madam President, why should we attack the poll tax or single out the poll tax, when only five States have it? In the various States of the United States, there are many different types of qualification for suffrage; but if we are going to impose some arbitrary Federal standard on the five States which have a poll tax, why not go into some of the other little oddities and strange qualifications for suffrage which we find in many other States, and then establish uniform Federal standards for suffrage? Believe me, Madam President, I do not favor such a course; but there is more logic in such a proposal than there is in the proposal that we worry about the poll tax and the literacy tests. I do not think we should adopt any uniform standard, because I believe ultimately that would mean that we would destroy the State electoral machinery, and then we would have to create some Federal electoral machinery.

But now let us consider some of the variations in voter qualifications under various State election laws. For instance, there is quite a wide range of requirements as to residence. The length of State residence required in order to vote varies from 6 months to 2 years. The length of county residence required for voting purposes varies from 30 days to 1 year; and the length of residence in a precinct varies from zero days to 1 year.

The minimum age required differs in various States. Two States have given the suffrage to 18-year-olds. One State has given the suffrage to 19-year-olds. The remaining 47 States still cling to the old Anglo-Saxon legal concept of majority age, and require one to be 21 years of age before one is qualified to vote.

Madam President, so long as we must establish an arbitrary age for maturity, I believe 21 years is as good as any. But if we are talking about liberalizing the suffrage, why not propose a constitutional amendment which would affect 47 States, and would compel them to lower their voting-age requirement to 18 or 19 years of age—if we are really talking about liberalizing the suffrage.

And, Madam President, what about citizenship requirements? All States require a person to be a citizen if he is to vote; but one State requires such citizenship for 1 month before the election is held; and four States require such citizenship for 90 days or 3 months before the election is held; and one State requires U.S. residence for 5 years prior to the election. So we could go on and on into that matter.

Madam President, what about the literacy tests? Twenty-one States have literacy tests. This information might come as a surprise to a great many persons, for probably in these United States there are a great many persons who think that the only States of the Union in which certain minimum requirements or qualifications are imposed on suffrage are the States south of the Mason-Dixon line—States which use such qualifications or requirements, so some think, as a means of preventing a substantial segment of the citizenry from voting. However, Madam President, that is not true. As a matter of fact, the voting requirements in many of the Southern States, in many of the States south of the Mason-Dixon line, are less stringent than are the voting requirements in some of the States in other parts of the country which are supposed to take a more enlightened position in regard to these matters.

Now let us consider the literacy-test problem. Such tests may vary from merely requiring one to be able to sign his name to some very complex ones. Twenty-one States have literacy tests. These States include Alaska, California, Connecticut, Hawaii, Massachusetts, New Hampshire, New York, North Dakota, Oklahoma, Oregon, and Washington—and these are States which are outside of what we traditionally regard as "the Solid South."

For example, in Alaska it is required that one be 19 years of age in order to be allowed to vote—a very liberal requirement, insofar as age is concerned—and he must also be a citizen of the United States, and must be a resident of Alaska for 1 year, and a resident in the election district for 30 days immediately preceding the election.

What about the literacy aspect? One who wishes to vote there is required to be able to read or speak the English language, unless he is prevented from complying with this requirement because of physical disability only, or unless he had legally voted at the general election of November 4, 1924.

Madam President, it might be interesting to note who are disqualified from voting: Persons convicted of a felony involving moral turpitude, unless their civil rights have been restored judicially; persons who are determined to be of unsound mind, unless such disability has been removed. It seems to be a general tendency in the various States to punish one who has been a convicted felon by denying him suffrage and to punish persons who are declared to be mentally unsound by pretty unsound methods by declaring them to be unfit for voting. Perhaps this provision will provide an area of interest to those persons who are desirous of liberalizing suffrage requirements in the various States.

Very often the various requirements are tailored to suit the local conditions extant in the State. Let us take, for example, our newest State, Hawaii. In Hawaii one must be able, except for physical disability, to speak, read, and write the English or Hawaiian language. Of course, that is a valid requirement for Hawaii, where there is a multilingual situation.

I am aware that in some States literacy tests are used as a means of denying certain persons the vote for considerations other than literacy, and are unfairly administered; perhaps not so much in some States as in some localities. I think we should pin it down further. Again, I do not think that fact makes it urgent or necessary that we provide some sort of uniform standards of literacy to be applied. Again, it would not apply to all States, because not all of them have literacy tests. Twenty-one States have literacy tests. Actually, there are adequate remedies available in the courts for those who are denied their constitutional privilege of suffrage.

What are some of the other requirements or qualifications that exist in various States?

Seven States require a loyalty oath. Those States are: Alabama, Connecticut, Florida, Idaho, Mississippi, North Carolina, and Vermont. It is easy to see that those States are pretty well spread out geographically. It is a pretty good geographic cross section of the United States. Those various States require a loyalty oath.

Looking further for reasons for disqualifying persons from voting, 45 States disqualify idiots, the insane, and persons under guardianship. Only five States have no such requirement.

Forty-four States disqualify voters on the ground of commission of a felony or infamous crime. There is very wide and diverse variation as to what constitutes such a crime. Six States have no such qualifications.

Nine States disqualify paupers: Delaware, Maine, Massachusetts, New Hampshire, Rhode Island, South Carolina, Texas, Virginia, and West Virginia.

I wonder if we should not raise the question as to whether it is right to deny the vote to paupers. I would say persons who are paupers are not, for the most part, paupers by choice. I do not think anyone aspires to be impoverished. Paupers are very often persons who are paupers because of circumstances over which they have no control. I wonder if we should not consider a constitutional amendment that would prohibit the States from denying paupers the right to vote in Federal elections.

I would point out that the poll tax is a qualification in only five States. Paupers are denied the vote in nine States. If it is desired to liberalize suffrage, why do we not look at the stringent qualifications that exist in the greatest number of States?

Here are some very interesting odds and ends of requirements. In some States vagrants and others cannot vote. Aliens ineligible for citizenship cannot vote. Persons in prison cannot vote nor can persons convicted of election offenses or persons who have been disfranchised for 10 years.

In Florida, anyone interested in an election wager cannot vote.

Now, I wonder if one should be denied the vote in the great and sovereign State of Florida just because he has made a bet on an election. That is a provision of Florida.

Chinese and Mongolian descendants not born in the United States cannot vote in Idaho.

So there are a number of different types of requirements. Why do we have to pick the poll tax?

In one State dishonorably discharged soldiers or those who have been convicted of bribery cannot vote.

An inmate of a charitable institution cannot vote in another State.

Anyone who is guilty of corrupt election practices is disfranchised for 3 years in another State.

In some States Indians are denied the right to vote.

And so it goes. I cannot quite understand why we should single out the poll tax for action at this time. I cannot see how the poll tax precludes anyone from voting.

As a matter of fact, conceivably, it assures that those persons who are interested in public affairs will vote.

In my State the poll tax is $1.75. Anybody can afford $1.75. That seems to be a pretty small price to pay just to establish one's legal residence in the State, which is the qualification. It is not the payment of the money, but the establishment of the legal residence in the State that is the qualification, and it is established by payment of the poll tax. If anyone does not think that a vote is worth a dollar and six bits, he probably does not have any intention to vote, anyway.

Mr. RUSSELL. Madam President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TOWER. I will yield for a question.

Mr. RUSSELL. Does the Senator know that it costs more than that to procure a driver's license in order to drive an automobile in most of the States?

Mr. TOWER. I was not aware of that. I appreciate the receipt of that information from the distinguished Senator from Georgia. I think perhaps it should be made a little more costly to get permission to drive an automobile.

I think a person who exercises his voting privilege irresponsibly is perhaps as dangerous a citizen to have in our society as someone who gets out on the highway in an automobile without knowing how to properly operate that automobile.

Madam President, I should like to get some reflections of editorial opinion on this matter into the RECORD. As I say, in Texas we are not rabid on this subject. The poll tax is pretty much of a nuisance, and eventually we shall do away with it, but there is a principle involved.

From the Fort Worth Star-Telegram of March 19, 1962, I read the editorial entitled "Complications in Barring Poll Taxes":

The administration seems interested this year in passing only token civil rights legislation in Congress. It has made known that it will press for nothing more than action to eliminate the poll tax as a qualification for voting—a requirement that applies in only five States—plus the abandonment of all literacy tests for would-be voters.

Attorney General Bobby Kennedy, testifying before the House Judiciary Committee, has called for a constitutional amendment to outlaw use of the poll tax in the election of Federal officials. This is a method that certainly is within the purview of the Constitution, and the method that should be followed if it is considered that there is urgent need for Federal action on the subject. There is considerably more doubt about the validity of the Attorney General's view that the same purpose could be accomplished by a simple act of Congress, though past decisions of the courts and the opinions of past attorneys general might have no bearing on what would be held now.

We hold no special brief for the poll tax, nor do we view it as the thing of iniquity that some contend it is. Doing away with it would have more the appearance than the reality of eliminating a restriction on the right to vote. However, barring the poll tax requirement in voting for Federal officials would cause Texas either to follow suit in all its elections or to maintain a double system of voter qualification. The complications of the latter would make it almost intolerable.

Certainly if Federal action on the matter is to be taken, it should be by submission to the States of a constitutional amendment. And the time required for that would give Texas—one of the remaining poll tax States—a chance to decide for itself whether to remove this requirement for voting. If it is done, that is the way it should be done, and Texas may already be moving in that direction.

Mr. EASTLAND. Madam President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. TOWER. I am glad to yield to the distinguished Senator from Mississippi for a question only.

Mr. EASTLAND. The distinguished Senator knows, does he not, that the present administration has adopted the policy that in the United Nations a state should not vote unless it has paid its dues? In other words, in the United Nations the international policy of the United States is, "If you vote you must pay." Is there any difference between that and the principle of the poll tax?

Mr. TOWER. I cannot see a great deal of difference. The poll tax is something which is required of everyone. It is an evidence of residence. It is not a qualification for suffrage, because anybody can pay a poll tax, so it does not become a qualification for suffrage.

Perhaps the fact that the administration is a little bit lax with respect to the paying by some of the member nations of their obligations to the United Nations, and does not seem to be quite as concerned about that as it should be, is an explanation of why the administration takes a singularly cavalier position toward the idea of a citizen of a State being required to pay a tax to show his legal residence and then to have the right to vote, having met his responsibilities of citizenship.

Mr. EASTLAND. The distinguished Senator knows, does he not, that a poll tax is not onerous and does not mean anything, yet dues to the United Nations could mean something to certain member nations?

Does the Senator know that the President of the United States has taken the position that those nations must pay up before they are entitled to vote; and that representatives of this Government—the Secretary of State, the Ambassador to the United Nations, and other officials of this Government—have taken that same position, that these nations must pay their assessments before they can vote? Is that not an endorsement of the principle of the poll tax?

Mr. TOWER. I appropriate the lucidity of the distinguished Senator's argument. I am moved by it. I concede it would certainly appear to be a position on the part of the administration in favor of having a person pay his obligations before he can exercise his privileges.

Mr. EASTLAND. It means, does it not, that we have an international policy which endorses a poll tax and a domestic policy which is diametrically opposed?

Mr. TOWER. Which, I suppose, demonstrates we should not have a double standard in this matter. We should have a uniform standard.

Mr. EASTLAND. But the administration has a double standard, does it not?

Mr. TOWER. It appears to me that the administration does have a double standard on this particular issue, because it is insisting that individuals not be required to fulfill their responsibilities.

I think one of the most serious things which is wrong with the American people is that too many of us tend to think only in terms of our privileges and immunities as citizens and not enough of us think in terms of the responsibilities of citizenship.

Because a State wishes to make sure that an individual citizen is really interested in his vote and because there must be money available in some way to finance the electoral machinery of the State, are we to say that the State is discriminating against an individual?

Mr. RUSSELL. Madam President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. TOWER. I yield to the distinguished Senator from Georgia for a question.

Mr. RUSSELL. Madam President, does not the Senator think, over and above all the very cogent arguments he has been making, that the great danger in or the great vice of a proposed amendment to the Constitution relating to a matter so small, which has been blown up all out of proportion to its real effect on the people of the States, lies in the fact that it is an effort to use the power of a majority to coerce a minority in respect to the Constitution on a matter of form and not of substance? Does not the Senator know that every one of the Original Thirteen States—up to the time there were 28 States in this Union—had a poll tax or else more rigorous qualifications for voting? Most of the States required the voters to be freeholders and to own land in their own right before they could vote. The Senator, I am sure, observes that we have reached the stage that we are asked to move all power to the banks of the Potomac, to say, "The Federal system must not endure any longer. We must coerce every State that is not willing to conform. This must be the day of the conformist."

Does not the Senator believe that what made ours the greatest Nation on earth and the American way of life the envy of the other peoples of the earth was the fact that we did not have a central power to make people conform to a single set of standards and one mold into which all could be poured? The trend toward socialism and centralization results in measures such as the one proposed. They are measures which are not of such vast importance in themselves, but represent blow after blow at our Federal system of a Union of States having their own rights, powers, and responsibilities. The thinking is that the bureaucrat on the banks of the Potomac has more knowledge, is wiser, and can give better advice as to how Georgia or the Senator's hometown in Texas should be operated than can the people who live in those States and communities. That is the great danger of legislation of the kind proposed which is forced into Congress by minority pressure groups in this country.

Mr. TOWER. I concur wholeheartedly in what the distinguished Senator from Georgia has said. I thank the distinguished Senator for bringing those points out, because they are points upon which we need to reflect, particularly as concerns the protection of a minority. Thomas Jefferson said that though the will of the majority in all cases is to prevail, that will, to be right, must be reasonable. That the minority have their rights cannot be denied.

Furthermore, what is one of the major functions and purposes of the Senate of the United States? What is one of the major functions of almost unlimited debate? It is to protect the minority against the precipitate and emotional tyranny of the majority. Why are we asked to single out five States that have a poll tax and submit a constitutional amendment to all the States, that would affect those five States? What will come next?

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. TOWER. I yield to the distinguished Senator from Alabama for a question.

Mr. HILL. Is it not true that unlimited debate in the Senate is really a part of the checks-and-balances system of our Government?

Mr. TOWER. By all means. When Mr. Jefferson returned from France, after the Constitution had been adopted, he visited George Washington and said to him:

George, why did you establish a bicameral legislature instead of a unicameral legislature?

Mr. Washington said:

Tom, why are you pouring coffee from your cup into the saucer?

Mr. Jefferson's reply was:

To cool it, sir.

Mr. Washington said:

That is why we established a bicameral legislature. We pour the legislation from one House into another to cool it.

I believe that the proposed action is ill advised. It is one that stems from an emotional approach to a problem as much as anything else. I am inclined to think that perhaps it was intended to be symbolic and not substantive. Nine States deny paupers the right to vote. Why not add to the proposed constitutional amendment, or submit in another form, a provision that would prohibit States from denying to paupers the right to vote?

I cannot understand why we are merely asked to assault the poll tax. I wish that more Americans would become concerned, not so much about their rights, privileges, and immunities, but about their responsibilities. The distinguished Senator from Georgia pointed out a while ago that the Government is becoming more and more powerful. More and more power is being concentrated in the hands of the Central Government.

It is not only a question of power being concentrated in the hands of the Central Government. The tendency is even to transfer such power from the Congress into the executive branch. As power begins to concentrate in Washington, the ever decreasing concentric circle will not stop at the city limits. It will continue to bore in. What will happen? We shall leave more and more to the arbitrary rule and discretion of a few individuals.

We may think that we could never have a totalitarian system in this country. But I point out that Mr. Hitler came to power in a free election. It could happen here.

Why has the present trend been allowed to develop? It is because the people have let it develop, because people have very often thought too much in terms of the question, "What can the Government do for me?" and not so much in terms of, "What can I do for my country?" It is because people have arrived at the notion that they can accept the bounty of the Federal Government; that they can accept various welfare benefits; that they can be born in a Federal hospital and be subsidized through life, die, and be buried in a Federal box, and not give up anything. But the people must realize that they are giving up their individual liberty and freedom of choice.

A while ago we noted that there is no democracy like the democracy of the marketplace. The consumer determines what goods and services will be produced in this country. If the consumer is going to insist on certain federally sponsored benefits, he will have to pay for them. The money must come out of his pocket.

The more the Government takes from the consumer, the less he has to spend for himself, and the less freedom of choice he has. It is my hope that the citizenry of the great Republic will come to realize that we do not get something for nothing. We must pay for it; and it not only costs money, but it costs the right and privilege of making one's decisions.

I still believe that people can and will accomplish for themselves on the local level what is necessary, so long as Uncle Sam does not reduce them to a state of abject dependency upon and subordination to the Central Government.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. TOWER. I yield to the distinguished Senator from Georgia for a question.

Mr. RUSSELL. Does not the Senator from Texas place in that category efforts like the one proposed, which would place the States in a Federal straitjacket and require them to adopt exactly the same policy? The Senate is the last forum of local self-government. If the Senate is to be bemused by such issues as the one before us—as I have said, only five States are involved—and strike blows at local self-government, does not the Senator agree that by eliminating laws in the various States that are different from those of the majority of the States, we could soon have so uniform a system that city law would emanate from Washington, including even parking laws in every community in the land? That is what makes the sort of legislation proposed so vicious. Does not the Senator agree with me?

It so happened that my State was the first State to adopt an 18-year-old voting age. During the war we provided that those citizens who reached the age of 18 might vote. It has worked out very well in my State. However, when a constitutional amendment was proposed to require the same thing of all other States, I opposed it on the floor as vigorously as I knew how, and I will do so again, because I believe this cult of conformity, to make all conform to the views of the busy beavers who do not have anything else to do but to try to reform everyone else and who sit down and devise theories and philosophies of government, is a greater danger than the dread missiles the Soviets are supposed to possess. Does not the Senator agree?

Mr. TOWER. Yes; I do agree with the distinguished and able Senator from Georgia, that if we pursue this course to its logical conclusion we will be establishing uniform laws for every State, and we will have destroyed the Federal system and established a unitary system in this country. The Federal system, as it operates in the United States, is the envy of all the world.

I am sure that the distinguished Senator from Georgia is aware of the fact that our Constitution is the oldest written constitution still in force and effect in this world, and yet we are one of the younger nations; but ours is the second oldest Government in the world, second only to that of Great Britain, currently in force and effect.

Why is this so? What has given our system its durability? Its durability comes from the fact that our system is not rigid and inflexible. It is resilient to change. It is responsive to people wherever they are, and whatever their station in life is, because the Government is close to the people.

If we ever destroy the federal system, if the Government ever moves farther away from the people and is concentrated in the city of Washington, then this great system which has been so durable because of its resilience and flexibility will become rigid and will crack from within; and I do not believe it could survive under those circumstances.

It was plainly the intent of the framers of the Constitution to preserve the federal character of this Republic. They created the Senate of the United States, to give every State as a corporate entity equal representation regardless of its size. They insisted that certain powers be retained to the States, and they only surrendered certain of the concomitants of national sovereignty to be exercised by the Central Government. It must always be thus.

I know we can add any amendment we please to the Constitution. However, is there any point to adding an amendment which tends to be destructive of the federal character of this system? I believe we should maintain the federal system as a model for others to follow. Let us look at the Congo. In the Congo the people are tribally oriented; they are not nationally oriented. Some sort of federal arrangement will have to be set up if they are to create a national government. Is it not wonderful that we have this great working model of federalism here in the United States for others to emulate and to copy? If our system could be successfully copied, it might mean stability in many areas where there is now chaos with an established and strong unitary government rigid by nature and unresponsive to the needs of the people.

Madam President, I should like to have printed in the RECORD an editorial published in the Dallas Morning News of March 15, entitled "Poll Tax 600 Years Old." I believe the editorial accurately reflects the opinion on the poll tax and what it does in the way of providing for financing in my State. I ask unanimous consent that the editorial may be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

POLL TAX 600 YEARS OLD

Poll taxes are under fire again, as they have been for most of their 600-year history. This time, there's a double-barreled attack—a proposal in Congress to submit a constitutional amendment to ban the tax, and a referendum to be held in the Texas primaries on poll-tax abolition.

England initiated poll taxes in 1377. The objective was to tax everyone, and the name comes from the old English word "poll,"

meaning head. Since this is a per capita tax, it also has been called a capitation levy.

Bloody rebellion, led by Wat Tyler, was the peasants' answer to the English poll tax in 1381. But the English continued to use this method to raise revenue, often for wars against the French.

Although designed to tax everyone, English poll taxes usually were graduated according to presumed ability to pay, as our income taxes are. For example, in 1379, the English rate ranged from 1 groat poll tax per peasant upward to 10 marks for John of Gaunt, Duke of Lancaster.

Introduced in the English colonies here in the 17th century, the poll tax was unpopular in North America. It was one of the primary causes of the 1775 Meckenburg Declaration of Independence, predecessor of the July 4, 1776, action at Philadelphia.

Very few American States levied a poll tax for the period from the Revolution until the War Between the States.

Texas was among the former Confederate States that levied a poll tax after the 15th amendment to the U.S. Constitution enfranchised Negroes. Texas ratified a poll tax amendment to its own constitution in 1896 and adopted the present poll-tax amendment in 1902. This was amended again in 1921 and in 1954, but without changing the basic provisions.

In the North and East, the impression is widespread that a poll-tax requirement to vote was adopted to keep Negroes away from the polls. In 1902, when the present law became a requirement in Texas, the reason was not racial; it was to prevent mass "buying" of votes by political machines.

Only five States (Texas, Arkansas, Mississippi, Alabama, and Virginia) now have poll taxes. Texas voters on November 8, 1949, rejected a proposed constitutional amendment to abolish the poll tax. The vote was close, 160,012 to 127,200, and many observers at the time thought that this amendment was defeated because so many voters opposed an amendment to raise legislative salaries and require annual legislative sessions. Eight out of ten proposed amendments lost in this election.

Public schools get most of the poll tax revenue in Texas. The law provides for $1.50 tax per person, with counties given an option of levying 25 cents more, so that the total is $1.75 in most counties. Schools get $1, the State's general fund 50 cents, and counties 25 cents for general expenses.

Texas, in the fiscal year ended August 31, 1961, received $2,156,310.56 revenue from poll taxes. This was 0.0018 cent out of each $1 of State revenue.

About 2 million Texans, or approximately 1 out of 5, usually pay their poll taxes, the figure varying greatly from general election to off years. In 1960, the total was 2,239,189, but only 1,525,790 in 1959.

Dallas County has 248,749 persons who paid their poll tax or received exemptions qualifying them to vote in 1962. This is 21,554 fewer than the record high reached in the presidential election year of 1960.

Mr. TOWER. Madam President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

Mr. STENNIS. I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard. The clerk will continue the call of the roll.

The Chief Clerk resumed and concluded the call of the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

[No. 28 Leg.]

Aiken	Fulbright	Miller
Allott	Goldwater	Monroney
Anderson	Gore	Morse
Bartlett	Gruening	Morton
Beall	Hart	Moss
Bennett	Hartke	Mundt
Burdick	Hayden	Murphy
Bush	Hickenlooper	Muskie
Butler	Hickey	Neuberger
Byrd, Va.	Hill	Pastore
Byrd, W. Va.	Holland	Pearson
Cannon	Hruska	Pell
Capehart	Humphrey	Proxmire
Carlson	Jackson	Robertson
Carroll	Javits	Russell
Case, N.J.	Johnston	Saltonstall
Chavez	Keating	Scott
Church	Kefauver	Smathers
Clark	Kerr	Smith, Mass.
Cooper	Kuchel	Smith, Maine
Cotton	Lausche	Sparkman
Curtis	Long, Mo.	Stennis
Dirksen	Long, Hawaii	Symington
Dodd	Long, La.	Talmadge
Douglas	Magnuson	Thurmond
Dworshak	Mansfield	Tower
Eastland	McCarthy	Wiley
Ellender	McClellan	Williams, N.J.
Engle	McGee	Yarborough
Ervin	McNamara	Young, N. Dak.
Fong	Metcalf	Young, Ohio

The PRESIDING OFFICER. A quorum is present.

What is the pleasure of the Senate?

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Bartlett, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House insisted upon its amendments to the bill (S. 167) to authorize the Attorney General to compel the production of documentary evidence required in civil investigations for the enforcement of the antitrust laws, and for other purposes, disagreed to by the Senate; agreed to the conference asked by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. CELLER, Mr. RODINO, Mr. ROGERS of Colorado, Mr. MCCULLOCH, and Mr. MEADER were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 641) to provide for the free entry of an intermediate lens beta-ray spectrometer for the use of Tulane University, New Orleans, La.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The message further announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the enrolled bill (S. 2165) for the relief of Jean L. Dunlop, and it was signed by the Vice President.

FINANCIAL STATUS OF UNITED NATIONS

Mr. AIKEN. Madam President, one of the most difficult tasks I have undertaken during recent weeks is to attempt to get before the American public and Members of Congress a few basic facts with respect to the financial status of the United Nations.

Driving a four-horse hitch through the Berlin wall would be easy compared to getting the facts of United Nations financing before the American public.

Facts are hard to come by; half-truths come easy.

I should now like to provide a few facts for the columns of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

First, let us look at the record to see how many United Nations members voted for U.N. action in the Congo, and then compare that figure with the number of members who have paid their Congo assessments.

The General Assembly resolution of September 20, 1960, which endorsed United Nations action in the Congo and appealed to "all member governments for urgent voluntary contributions to a United Nations fund for the Congo," received the affirmative votes of 70 members. At that time the United Nations had 82 members.

Although 70 members voted for this resolution, 62 members of the United Nations have not paid anything on their assessments for the Congo operations.

Furthermore, the only United Nations member which in 1961 responded to the request for voluntary contributions was the United States.

Second. Ninety-nine members were assessed for payments to the Congo account covering the period from January 1 to October 31, 1961. Only 25 members have paid their assessments for that period in full.

I wish to read the names of these states into the RECORD, because they comprise a sort of international honor roll: Australia, Burma, Canada, Ceylon, Dahomey, Denmark, Finland, India, Ireland, Israel—paid in March—Ivory Coast, Japan, Liberia, Luxembourg, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nigeria, Norway, Pakistan, Senegal, Sweden, Thailand, Turkey, United Kingdom—paid in January—and the United States.

In other words, one out of four United Nations members has taken the Congo operation seriously enough to have paid its assessments in full.

Sixty-two members have paid nothing, according to the Department of State—this will be found in the report of the hearings, at page 278—and an additional 12 members have not yet paid their 1961 assessments in full.

The third fact I wish to present is this. Members of the Senate should be cautioned against using the table supplied by the Department of State which appears on page 33 of the joint Foreign Relations-Foreign Affairs Committee print. That table lists the assessments on the Congo accounts, and the balances due.

If one examined that table for the year 1961, he would be led to believe that 19 members had paid their assessments in full, and that practically all the remaining members had made some payments on the Congo account.

That is not true. The fact is that the United States made a voluntary contribution during 1961 totaling $15,305,596.

That contribution was used, pursuant to the terms of a General Assembly resolution—which will be found on page 39 of the committee print—to reduce the

assessment of certain states by 80 percent, and the assessments of other states by 50 percent.

According to information which the Department of State supplied to me on specific request, the U.S. voluntary contribution made it possible for 75 members, out of the 99 assessed, to reduce their assessments for the Congo operation by 80 percent.

I am going to read into the RECORD the names of the member states for whom we paid 80 percent of the Congo assessment for 1961. They are as follows: Afghanistan, Albania, Argentina, Bolivia, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burma, Cambodia, Cameroun, Central African Republic, Ceylon, Chad, Chile, Colombia, Congo—Brazzaville, Congo—Léopoldville, Costa Rica, Cuba, Cyprus, Dahomey, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, El Salvador, Ethiopia, Federation of Malaya, Gabon, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Ireland, Israel, Ivory Coast, Jordan, Laos, Lebanon, Liberia, Libya, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Mali, Mexico, Morocco, Nepal, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Pakistan, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Portugal, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Somalia, Spain, Sudan, Thailand, Togo, Tunisia, Turkey, United Arab Republic, Upper Volta, Uruguay, Venezuela, Yemen, and Yugoslavia.

Our contribution to the Congo fund has enabled these nations to reduce their assessments by 80 percent. Further than that, because of our generous contribution, the following additional four states had their Congo assessments reduced by 50 percent: China, Poland, India, and Japan.

In addition to making a voluntary contribution to the Congo operations, we made another generous contribution to UNEF—that operation in the Middle East, at the Gaza Strip—which was also used to reduce the assessments of other nations.

Madam President, I am aware that making facts of this kind public it unpalatable to Americans committed to the proposition that the United States must now purchase $100 million of 25-year, 2-percent United Nations bonds in order to rescue the U.N. from bankruptcy. If we go that route we should do so with our eyes open.

We should realize that the United States has already assumed the lion's share of the burden. We not only have paid our assessed 32 percent of the Congo operations and UNEF, but also we have made additional voluntary contributions which have been applied to the scale of assessments in such a way as to reduce the assessments of a total of 79 of the total assessed membership of 99 states.

The reason why this number is not 104 is that the first year a state becomes a member, usually late in the calendar year, it is not assessed. Therefore, only 99 states are now assessed, instead of 104.

The sickness of the U.N., which is not financial sickness alone, runs far too deep to be cured by spreading a $200 million borrowing over 25 years.

This sickness can only be cured by drastic action at an early date—action which will continue the United Nations as a truly multilateral organization, and not permit it to become constantly dependent upon the beneficence of the United States.

It is for this reason that I have urged Congress to support a short-term loan to the United Nations.

This would bring home to United Nations members in a realistic fashion the fact that the American people are interested in assisting an organization which is multilateral in meeting its obligations.

But the American people are fed up with supporting an organization which is willing to vote its convictions, but not willing even to give token support to the action which it has voted.

Madam President, before I conclude, I wish to pay my respects to the junior Senator from Washington [Mr. JACKSON] for the speech he made yesterday before the Press Club, in which he pointed out some very pertinent situations which exist in the United Nations. I wish to congratulate the reporters who wrote up his speech as it was delivered. I noticed that Marguerite Higgins of the New York Herald Tribune wrote a completely factual and fair analysis. I noticed that whoever wrote the story for the New York Times did the same.

I congratulate the Senator from Washington [Mr. JACKSON] for the great good he did in calling attention to the conditions which ought not to exist in the United Nations.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Madam President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. AIKEN. I yield to the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. LAUSCHE. It is my understanding, on the basis of what has been said by the Senator from Vermont, that our national assessment for these special operations is between 32 and 33 percent.

Mr. AIKEN. The Senator is correct.

Mr. LAUSCHE. That applies both to the Gaza Strip operation and to the Congo operation?

Mr. AIKEN. The Senator is correct.

Mr. LAUSCHE. In addition, the United States has made voluntary contributions. I think the Senator from Vermont has said that in the last year there was a contribution of $15 million to the Congo operation.

Mr. AIKEN. To the Congo.

Mr. LAUSCHE. When the United States made that $15 million contribution, the obligation of some 72 nations was reduced by 80 percent?

Mr. AIKEN. Seventy-five nations.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Seventy-five nations?

Mr. AIKEN. The obligation was reduced 80 percent for 75 nations: Cuba, Albania, Hungary, and 72 others.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Will the Senator from Vermont again state how many nations have contributed their full assessment to the Congo operation? Does the Senator have that information immediately at hand?

Mr. AIKEN. Twenty-five out of 99 have paid their full assessments, up to November 1, 1961. Of those nations assessed for 1962, only Finland and Norway have paid their assessments. These assessments have been due for some time but only Finland and Norway have paid those assessments toward the Congo.

I understand the United States owes a substantial amount, 32 percent of about $68 million, and has not paid. I believe it is claimed an appropriation will be necessary by the Congress before payment can be made.

Only two nations have paid the 1962 assessments for the Congo operations.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Seventy-nine out of 99 have not paid their full assessments on the Congo operation?

Mr. AIKEN. The correct number for the 1961 assessment is 74.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Has the same principle been applied to the Gaza Strip operation; that to the extent the United States contributes voluntarily, to that extent the obligations of the other nations are reduced?

Mr. AIKEN. That is true. In the fall of 1960 the United States contributed to UNEF, as I recall, slightly less than $2 million, which was used to reduce the assessments of other countries. In 1961 the appropriation was larger.

The countries which pay on the Congo operation and which pay on the Gaza Strip operation are not exactly identical. Two or three are different. I point out that Yugoslavia pays the full assessment for the Middle East operation, or the Gaza Strip operation, but has not paid for the Congo operation.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Would the Senator mind again reading the list of those nations whose obligations have been reduced by 80 percent as a result of our voluntary contribution?

Mr. AIKEN. There are 75 of them. I am willing to read them.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Will the Senator read the names of the nations the Senator previously read?

Mr. AIKEN. The nations which had their assessments reduced by 80 percent, by reason of our voluntary contribution, were Afghanistan, Albania, Argentina, Bolivia, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burma, Cambodia, Cameroun, Central African Republic, Ceylon, Chad, Chile, Colombia, Congo—Brazzaville, Congo—Leopoldville, Costa Rica, Cuba, Cyprus, Dahomey, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, El Salvador, Ethiopia, Federation of Malaya, Gabon, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Ireland, Israel, Ivory Coast, Jordan, Laos, Lebanon, Liberia, Libya, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Mali, Mexico, Morocco, Nepal, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Pakistan, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Portugal, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Somalia, Spain, Sudan, Thailand, Togo, Tunisia, Turkey, United Arab Republic, Upper Volta, Uruguay, Venezuela, Yemen, and Yugoslavia.

Those are the 75 nations which had their assessments reduced 80 percent as a result of the U.S. special contribution.

The four countries which had their assessments reduced 50 percent as a result of our contribution were China, Poland, India, and Japan.

When I asked the State Department for certain data, I hoped I would find that several other countries also had made voluntary contributions toward this cause; but, lo and behold, the United States of America was the only one.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Is it the opinion of the Senator from Vermont that to the extent we, in a panicky state of mind and a stampeded state of mind, provide these additional moneys practically to that same extent we dissuade the other countries from carrying their honest share?

Mr. AIKEN. If we show a willingness to pick up the tab for every project for which the 104 members, or the majority of the 104 members, of the United Nations see fit to appropriate, then we shall have a permanent job so long as the United Nations lasts, and we shall be expected to pay those costs indefinitely.

What is being done now is that the United Nations is proposing to use money from the sales of bonds instead of assessments for the paying of the costs of United Nations' operations.

To show how determined the proponents of the bond issue are, I point out that they have made no assessment to carry the costs of the Congo operations or the Middle East operations after July 1 of this year. In other words, they throw the bond proposal at us and say, "Now it is up to you."

I am surprised at the type of propaganda that has been put out. Yesterday morning I read in a reputable newspaper a statement that Iceland had agreed to purchase $80,000 worth of bonds. The newspaper reported, "This makes $147 million—and some odd thousand—which has now been pledged." The writer of the article included the $100 million that we have not pledged, and which no one except the Congress has the right to pledge in making up the total stated. That is a sample of the misrepresentations and half-truths that are going out all over the United States today.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Madam President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. AIKEN. I yield.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I listened with attention to what the Senator from Vermont stated because I know that throughout the whole life of the United Nations the Senator has been a believer in it.

Mr. AIKEN. Yes.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I have implicit faith that the course which the Senator from Vermont is taking is motivated not by a purpose to destroy the United Nations, but to give it strength through inducing its members to perform their honest obligations, and thus giving stature, instead of indifference and instability, to that institution.

Mr. AIKEN. Madam President, I thank the Senator from Ohio for his remarks. At the beginning of my remarks I said that it would be easier to drive a four-horse hitch through the Berlin wall than to get information regarding U.N. functions before the American people. I wish now to say that some information is beginning to trickle through. The speech that was made yesterday by the Senator from Washington [Mr. JACKSON] will be helpful. The report on that speech, which appeared in some newspapers, will be helpful. The column of Doris Fleeson in yesterday's issue of the Washington Star was also helpful. I commend that article to anyone who wishes to go into the subject.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Madam President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. AIKEN. Madam President, I do not know whether it is permissible to yield for any purpose other than a question. If I may yield to the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT] and the Senator from Texas [Mr. YARBOROUGH] in order to make insertions in the RECORD, without losing my right to the floor, I shall certainly be glad to do so.

Mr. JAVITS. Madam President, reserving the right to object, I would like the Senator from Vermont to add to his unanimous request that certain remarks I wish to make may follow the insertion that the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT] wishes to make in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD a very perceptive speech delivered by the Senator from Washington [Mr. JACKSON]. There is much good sense in his speech, and I commend it to the attention of Senators.

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

THE UNITED STATES IN THE U.N.: AN INDEPENDENT AUDIT

(Address before the National Press Club, March 20, 1962, by Senator HENRY M. JACKSON)

Mr. Chairman, distinguished guests, and members of the National Press Club, the place of the United Nations in American foreign policy is now receiving a good deal of attention. Unfortunately, the debate seems to be polarized around extreme positions. On the one hand, there are those who say, "The U.N. is the only source of hope; let's leave everything to the U.N." On the other hand, there are those who say, "The U.N. is the source of catastrophe; let's get out of the U.N." Each view is like the distorted reflection in a carnival mirror—one too broad, the other too narrow. Neither view is really helpful.

No doubt the quiet, steadying majority of the American people have a more balanced view of the United Nations, and see it for what it is: an aspiration and a hope, the closest approximation we have to a code of international good conduct, and a useful forum of diplomacy for some purposes.

The United Nations is, and should continue to be, an important avenue of American foreign policy. Yet practices have developed which, I believe, lead to an undue influence of U.N. considerations in our national decisionmaking. Indeed it is necessary to ask whether the involvement of the U.N. in our policymaking has not at times hampered the wise definition of our national interests and the development of sound policies for their advancement.

The test of the national security policy process is this: Does it identify our vital interests and does it develop foreign and defense policies which will defend and promote these interests? In our system, two men must bear the heaviest responsibility for giving our national security policy focus and structure. One is, of course, the President. The other is his first adviser, the Secretary of State.

The United Nations is not, and was never intended to be, a substitute for our own leaders as makers and movers of American policy. The shoulders of the Secretary General were never expected to carry the burdens of the President or the Secretary of State. But do we sometimes act as though we could somehow subcontract to the U.N. the responsibility for national decisionmaking?

At the founding of the United Nations there was the hope that all its members shared a common purpose—the search for a lasting peace. This hope was dashed.

The Soviet Union was not and is not a peace-loving nation. Khrushchev has announced his support for wars of liberation. He has threatened to bury us. In their more agreeable moments the Russians promise to bury us nicely, but whatever their mood, the earth would still be 6 feet deep above us.

We must realize that the Soviet Union sees the U.N. not as a forum of cooperation, but as one more arena of struggle.

The maintenance of peace depends not in the United Nations as an organization but on the strength and will of its members to uphold the charter.

The truth is, though we have not often spoken it in recent years, that the best hope for peace with justice does not lie in the United Nations. Indeed, the truth is almost exactly the reverse. The best hope for the United Nations lies in the maintenance of peace. In our deeply divided world, peace depends on the power and unity of the Atlantic Community and on the skill of our direct diplomacy.

In this light, some basic questions need to be asked:

First, are we taking an exaggerated view of the U.N.'s role?

In one way and another the conduct of U.N. affairs absorbs a disproportionate amount of the energy of our highest officials. The President and the Secretary of State must ration their worry time; and the hours spent on the U.N. cannot be spent on other matters. All too often, furthermore, the energies devoted to the U.N. must be spent on defensive actions—trying to defeat this or that ill-advised resolution—rather than on more constructive programs.

The Secretary of State has called the United Nations a forum in which almost every aspect of our foreign policy comes up. The fact is correctly stated, but does it reflect a desirable state of affairs? Should we take a more restricted view of the organization's capacity for helpfulness?

I think we should. The cold war may destroy the United Nations, if that organization becomes one of its main battlegrounds, but the United Nations cannot put an end to the cold war.

As a general rule, might it be more prudent, though less dramatic, not to push the U.N. into the fireman's suit unless we are sure the alternatives are worse and, above all, that we are not seeking to evade our own responsibilities.

I believe the United Nations can best gain stature and respect by undertaking tasks which are within its capabilities, and that its usefulness will be diminished if it is impelled into one cold war crisis after another and

asked to shoulder responsibilities it cannot meet.

With these thoughts in mind, I read with some concern proposals to increase the executive responsibilities of the organization. Also, I have serious doubts about current suggestions to provide more pervasive and efficient U.N. presences to help halt infiltration of guerrillas across frontiers; and to help halt internal subversion instigated by a foreign power.

Dag Hammarskjold, who was a brilliant and devoted servant of the United Nations, clearly saw the dangers in overrating the peacekeeping power of the organization. In a letter to a private citizen, he once decried the tendency to force the Secretary General into a key role in great power disputes through sheer escapism from those who should carry the responsibility.

Second, may not the most useful function of the United Nations lie in serving as a link between the West and the newly independent states?

Most international business is best handled through normal bilateral contacts or through regional arrangements among the states concerned.

However, the United Nations provides a useful meeting ground for many new governments with other governments. These relationships may be of mutual benefit.

The U.N. affords good opportunities to explain Western policies, to correct misrepresentations of the Western position, and to expose the weaknesses in the Soviet line. In fact, the Soviet singing commercials themselves offend the most hardened ear. They inspire a healthy skepticism about Russian three-way cold war pills—guaranteed to end the arms race, relieve colonial oppression, and ease poverty, if taken regularly, as directed.

The U.N. and its specialized agencies may be of great usefulness in supplying technical assistance for economic development, in providing financial aid, and in preparing international development programs.

The organization may sometimes be helpful in reaching peaceful settlements of certain issues and disputes of concern to the newly independent states—especially if it is used to seek out areas of agreement rather than to dramatize conflicts of interest.

In this connection there has been too great a tendency to bring every issue to a vote. Indeed, there are too many votes on too many issues in the U.N.—and too much of the time and energy of every delegation is spent in lobbying for votes.

A vote requires a division of the house, a sharpening and even an exaggeration of points at issue, and it emphasizes the division of opinion rather than the area of agreement. Not every discussion needs to end in a vote. The purposes of the members might be better served if the U.N. forum becomes more often a place where diplomatic representatives quietly search for acceptable settlements of issues between their countries.

Voting has a way of raising the temperature of any body, and I think that we should be doing what we can to keep the temperature of the United Nations near normal.

Third, in our approach to the U.N., do we make too much of the talk and too little of the deed?

New York City is the foremost communications center of the United States, if not of the world. Once the decision was made to locate the headquarters of the United Nations in New York, it was inevitable that what went on there would receive attention disproportionate to its significance. Newsmen and photographers have to produce news stories and pictures, and politicians from any land rival the celebrities of stage and screen in their hunger for free publicity.

The Unted States is of course host to the United Nations. Day in and day out we are conscious of the presence of the organization in our midst. And the role of host entails special obligations. Consequently, it is often difficult to keep one's sense of proportion. There is, for example, a tendency, to which the press itself is not immune, to believe the U.N. makes more history than it really does.

A Secretary of State—responsible for policy—must weigh his words carefully. For that reason he seldom makes good copy. One of the reasons for the extensive coverage of the United Nations is that the right to the floor of the General Assembly is not subject to the sobering influence of responsibility for action.

I have been struck, for example, by the serious disproportion in the press, radio, and television coverage of our U.N. delegation and the coverage of the Department of State. The space and time devoted to the former does not correctly reflect the relative importance of what is said in New York against what is said in Washington.

If the U.N. were used less for drumbeating on every nerve-tingling issue, and if its energies were quietly devoted to manageable problems, there might be fewer headlines from the U.N. but more contributions to the building of a peaceful world.

Everyone talks too much. It is a worldwide disease. Sometimes it seems that the appropriate legend to place above the portals of the U.N. might be: "Through these doors pass the most articulate men and women in the world."

Fourth, should our delegation to the United Nations play a larger role in the policymaking process than our representatives to NATO or to major world capitals?

I think the answer is no, and the burden of proof should lie with those who advocate a unique role for our Embassy in New York.

Our delegation to the United Nations is, of course, frequently and necessarily involved in promoting or opposing particular actions by the United Nations which may have an important bearing on our national security policies. If it is not to commit the United States to positions inconsistent with our national security requirements, the delegation must be kept in closest touch with, and have a thorough understanding of, these requirements. Furthermore, the President and Secretary of State require information and advice from our U.N. delegation.

This is not to say, however, that the requirements of sound national policy can be more clearly seen in New York than elsewhere, or that our Embassy in New York should play a different role in policymaking from that played by other important embassies.

The precedent set by President Eisenhower in this matter, and continued by this administration, seems unfortunate. The Ambassador to the United Nations is not a second Secretary of State, but the present arrangement suggests a certain imbalance in the role assigned to the U.N. delegation in the policymaking process.

The problem is not to give the U.N. delegation a larger voice in policymaking but to give it the tools to help carry out the policy.

Rational, effective negotiation on complex and critical matters, like the reduction and control of armaments, requires unified guidance, and instruction to those conducting the negotiations. This is a basic principle of sound administration and avoids the dangers of freewheeling. The unified source of instructions should be the Secretary of State, acting for the President, or the President himself, not others in the White House or the Executive Office, not lower levels in State, certainly not the U.N. delegation itself.

The U.N. delegation in New York should not operate as a second foreign office. Such confusion of responsibility reinforces a tendency to give undue weight in national policy formulation to considerations that seem more important in New York than they ought to seem in Washington, D.C. The effect of decisions on something called our relations in the U.N. may receive more weight than their effect on, say, the strength, and unity of the Atlantic Community. The result may be a weakening or dilution of policy positions in deference to what is represented in New York as world opinion.

The concept of world opinion has been, I fear, much abused. Whatever it is and whatever the importance that should be attached to it, I doubt that it can be measured by taking the temperature of the General Assembly or successfully cultivated primarily by currying favor in New York. To hide behind something called world opinion is all too often the device of the timid, or the last resort of someone who has run out of arguments.

Fifth, is our U.N. delegation properly manned for the diplomatic and technical tasks we require of it?

We have established the tradition of choosing for top U.N. posts Americans of considerable prestige—prestige acquired, furthermore, not in the practice of diplomacy but in national politics, business, the arts and sciences and other fields of endeavor. For the most part, these people have served us well, in effective advocacy of America's concerns, and in persuasive championship of progress toward a world of good neighbors.

A start has been made in staffing the U.N. mission more as other embassies, with experienced diplomats and experts in technical fields in which the United Nations may be able to make quiet but useful contributions. Further progress in this direction should be encouraged.

The sum of the matter is this:

We need to take another look at our role in the United Nations, remembering that the U.N. is not a substitute for national policies wisely conceived to uphold our vital interests. We need to rethink the organization and staffing of our Government for United Nations affairs.

For this purpose, we should have a top-level review conducted under the authority of the President and the Secretary of State. The review should, of course, be handled in a nonpartisan manner.

Debate over the United Nations is now centered on the U.N. bond issue. This debate reveals some of the symptoms of the basic disturbance. Congress has been requested to approve the purchase of U.N. bonds up to a total of $100 million to help cover the cost of two controversial peacekeeping operations. The money in question has been spent and it would be a serious mistake to prolong the financial crisis. I trust the Congress can help find a wise way to help cover the deficit.

But the fundamental questions will still remain, and will plague us until they are answered:

Do our present relations with the United Nations assist the wise definition of our vital interests and the establishment of sound policies? Are we sometimes deferring to the United Nations in the hope that we may somehow escape the inescapable dilemmas of leadership? Are we failing to make the most of the United Nations by encouraging it to attempt too much?

Mr. Chairman, I close as I began: The United Nations is, and should continue to be, an important avenue of American foreign policy. But we need to revise our attitudes in the direction of a more realistic appreciation of its limitations, more modest hopes for its accomplishments, and a more mature sense of the burdens of responsible leadership.

Mr. JAVITS. Madam President, in view of the speech made by the Senator

from Washington [Mr. JACKSON], which was put in the RECORD a few minutes ago by the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], I wish to make some points with respect to it, although at this time I do not desire to engage in a full-dress debate on the matter because, first, the Senator from Washington is not present, and, second, undoubtedly he will want to talk about the matter himself.

However, it does seem to me that a speech of this character, the key to which is, let us not rely too heavily on the U.N., is unfortunate, though I am sure, and I need have no reassurance on this score, Senator JACKSON supports the U.N., as I believe he has shown throughout his career. But, nevertheless, coming at this time in the frame of reference of the attack by the Soviet Union on the U.N. and on its administration, of the controversy over the U.N. bond issue, and of the attack on the U.N. by the radical right in the United States it could be very worrisome. I would hope, therefore, that Senator JACKSON himself might take action to clear up some of the points in his speech.

I do not believe it is necessary that we should try to relegate the U.N. to second place and say that we are going to rely primarily in first place on our military alliances. It is unfortunate, therefore, that this speech should concern itself with the supposition that we are placing too much reliance on the U.N.

I refer now to two speeches which were made in the great bipartisan tradition of our country, by President Eisenhower and President Kennedy, both of whom addressed themselves specifically to the same subject to which the Senator from Washington addressed himself. President Eisenhower, in a speech to the U.N. General Assembly, said:

> The first proposition I place before you is that only through the United Nations organization can humanity make real and universal progress toward the goal of peace with justice. I believe that to support the United Nations organization and its properly constituted mechanisms and selected officers is the road of greatest promise in peaceful progress. To attempt to hinder or stultify the United Nations or to deprecate its importance is to contribute to world unrest and, indeed, to incite the crises that from time to time so disturb all men. The United States stands squarely and unequivocally in support of the United Nations and those acting under its mandate in the interest of peace.

In almost the same historic commitment, just about 1 year later, on September 21, 1961, President Kennedy, also addressing the U.N., said:

> That is why my Nation—which has freely shared its capital and its technology to help others help themselves—now proposes officially designating this decade of the 1960's as the United Nations decade of development.

He then again pledged the great faith and confidence and strength of the United States to the activities of the U.N.

Senator JACKSON'S speech is a provocative and thoughtful one, and it comes from a man whom I respect very greatly. I was a member of his Subcommittee on National Policy Machinery and I believe the Senator drew upon his experiences in that subcommittee in expressing these views. Indeed, I have some sympathy with the fact that this problem of policymaking machinery troubles the Senator from Washington.

The difficulty, however, that I find with the speech is that it is likely to be taken in the context of today as a depreciation of the importance of the United Nations as a world force. I believe it would be most unfortunate if we were to try to assign number one importance or number two importance to it, because the fact is that the U.N. is the world forum which is the world's great hope for peace.

Again, it is not necessary to say that it should be secondary to our alliances, upon which we will primarily rely. The fact is that our alliances are there, and they are important and we do rely on them. I yield to no one in my support of NATO, and everything that that support means, including economic and other forms of cooperation. But it is not necessary to apply to NATO a number one or a number two label—or to the U.N. either. The U.N., I say, can stand on its own. We have every interest in supporting it strongly.

It would be most unfortunate if the Russians should get the idea that the U.N. was to be written down somewhat in importance in this country, and that thereby the door would be opened for them to step in, because the Russians would gladly, I believe, take over the role of preeminence in the U.N. held by the United States, primarily because the United States has pledged itself heavily to the support of the U.N.

I believe that it is of great importance to us in terms of the peace of the world that we do not rock that boat.

It is true that the Senator from Washington is only one Senator. However, he is an important Senator. I bring this matter up at this time not in criticism, but in the hope that by a composite of our thinking—mine, Senator JACKSON'S, and other Senators—we can contribute to an understanding of the true policy of the United States with respect to the United Nations, and that it may be made clear to the world.

That view may be summarized as follows: We do not expect miracles. This is not the millennium. The U.N. will not solve everything. But we do expect that this world organization, to which we have pledged our full support, will maintain its place of preeminence in seeking to preserve the peace of the world.

It is unnecessary to place it in first or second place so far as its importance is concerned as an instrument of our foreign policy. This approach of not writing it down as being in first place or in second place is not being woolly-headed but rather being hardheaded. By placing the U.N. in the frame of reference of its world importance as a means of maintaining the peace we enable it to stand on its own, we respect fully the historic pledges of support we have made to it, and we give the proper assurance of substance and authority to the many nations—especially the newer and smaller nations—to which the U.N. represents their major participation in world affairs.

Mr. AIKEN. Madam President, under the same condition stated, I yield to the Senator from Texas.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Madam President, I desire to wait until the Senator from Vermont yields the floor.

Mr. MORTON. Madam President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. AIKEN. I yield under the same conditions stated.

Mr. MORTON. Is it not true that some of the propaganda, as the Senator from Vermont has described it, is beginning to flow into certain patterns, although fallacious patterns? First, there is the implication that by going the bond issue route, Russia, its satellites, and those nations not paying their share would be forced to pay their share of the Congo expense.

Mr. AIKEN. I have noticed that phase of the propaganda. Of course, that is not correct.

Mr. MORTON. Of course it is not correct. I have had some experience in these problems. In fact, I sat at the conference table with Mr. Molotov, who has more or less fallen from grace, but his successor is little different from him in being a shrewd and ruthless trader.

Mr. AIKEN. He is as sharp as Mr. Molotov was.

Mr. MORTON. By withholding 4 percent, 5 percent, or 6 percent of their annual assessment and saying, "None of our payments shall be used for servicing or the retirement of the bonds," Russia could go for 20 years before it would be 2 years in arrears in its general assessment, or it would require 20 years before it would in any way jeopardize its own vote. Is that statement correct?

Mr. AIKEN. The Senator from Kentucky is correct.

Mr. MORTON. Secondly, we are told that the Gaza Strip and the Congo incident were special operations, and that nothing like them would ever occur again. The Gaza problem began in 1957, is that correct?

Mr. AIKEN. I believe the Senator is correct.

Mr. MORTON. The problem is still with us now, 5 years later.

Mr. AIKEN. The Senator is correct.

Mr. MORTON. It probably will be with us 5 years from now. We do not know how long the Congo expense will continue. I cannot tell, nor can any other man, what will happen in 1965, 1966, or 1967. But as surely as we are today in the Senate Chamber, the U.N. can be called upon for some sort of emergency operation somewhere on our planet.

Mr. AIKEN. If the U.N. should succeed in selling $200 million of bonds, it would have to call for further methods of financing within 2 years' time.

So far as the Congo is concerned, when Prime Minister Adoula was here a couple of weeks ago and visited with the Committee on Foreign Relations, he

indicated that it would be a long time—and he would not be willing to predict when—before it would be possible to withdraw United Nations forces from the Congo.

It is my impression that 10 years would be a minimum length of time, and probably 20 years would be more likely the case.

So far as the Gaza Strip is concerned, 5,100 men are reported to be stationed there. I have been told that there are actually about 5,600 men there. The cost is almost $20 million a year. That operation has been built into the economy of the area. It would be virtually impossible to withdraw those troops, even if we could get a vote today to do so. But I was told when I was at the United Nations in the fall of 1960 that 2,000 men would probably suffice there.

Mr. MORTON. In any event, we cannot predict what might happen in the future that would require the U.N. to go into some special operation. But we do know that once we start on a funded debt, and a long-range bond issue for financing it, it will become standard operating procedure.

Mr. AIKEN. It certainly will be. We cannot tell how many places in the world the United Nations might vote to establish police or military operations. Such operations could be established even in the Western Hemisphere. The situation in Argentina does not look too good. The United Nations could intervene in Cuba or in any other part of the world, and every time they would intervene they would increase the costs of the United Nations by so many additional millions or hundreds of millions of dollars, assessing us to bear the lion's share of the cost, or else expecting us to purchase the lion's share of the bonds if the U.N. goes permanently and completely into a deficit financing program.

Mr. MORTON. One other argument that is being raised today is that the Secretary General cannot borrow money. Therefore the plan of the Senator from Vermont will not work. If selling bonds is not borrowing money, what is it?

Mr. AIKEN. Yes. An article appeared in the New York Herald Tribune last Sunday written by Don Rogers which set forth the fact that in undertaking the issue bonds, the United Nations was completely discarding the capitalist method of issuing bonds or borrowing money and adopting completely the Communist method of issuing bonds for government support, even though not a single member of the Soviet bloc is expected to buy a single dollar's worth of the bonds.

Mr. MORTON. I thank the Senator from Vermont and commend him on his remarks.

THE NEED FOR AN INFORMED PUBLIC ON THE TRADE ISSUE: THE STAND OF LABOR

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, some weeks ago I addressed the Senate on the need for a personal campaign by President Kennedy to explain the issues underlying the trade policy debate. No such initiative has been taken as yet but I wish to call the attention of the Senate to the public spirited efforts being undertaken by labor unions and various other groups to get the facts across to the American people.

I have already placed in the RECORD excerpts from the January 1962 Focus on Trade issue of Intercom, a monthly publication of the Foreign Policy Association-World Affairs Center, which is a nonprofit organization supported by private contributions. The League of Women Voters is conducting a great national campaign of education and discussion on the trade issue. The U.S. Chamber of Commerce is sending teams across the country in order to bring information to local communities and to mobilize a thoughtful public opinion. Business groups, port associations, and trade groups throughout the Nation are making their position known in the service of the national interest.

Individuals have also taken their stand. I have had the honor to place in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a remarkable speech on the subject of foreign trade delivered by Henry Ford II. Others in private life, such as former Secretary of State Herter, former Under Secretary of State Clayton, and former Governor Landon are engaged in this vital effort.

Two days ago I received a letter from a very courageous and patriotic woman who lives in my State. She writes that her husband, a chemist, had received from his employers a letter asking that he request me to vote against the new trade policy which, in my opinion, is essential to the welfare of the United States and to the survival of freedom in the world. She writes:

> Well, Senator, here is one family that does not wish you to protect its livelihood by such means. I think that as world markets open, many segments of American industries will need help in adjustment to the new economic situations, and that means of sustaining people who will be put out of work will be needed and ways to retrain them for new jobs, and research for new jobs for them will be needed.
>
> I would much rather see you and my other representatives in my Government work for such constructive means, than to have you pile the sand higher around the ostriches' necks.

Mr. President, that is a rather interesting expression from the wife of a man whose ox may be gored in the trade struggle.

The voice of labor, I am pleased to see, which should certainly support forward-looking trade policies, is being heard with increasing strength and frequency. Among others, George Meany, president of the AFL–CIO, and Alfred Hayes, president of the International Association of Machinists, have spoken often and eloquently.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD an editorial and an article from the Machinist, of February 22, 1962, directed to the members of the International Association of Machinists in the service of public information. They present the kind of background which is vital to the balanced judgment of our people.

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

CATS' PAW

Union members in some cities are being used as cats' paws to pull chestnuts out of the fire for their employers. There's a propaganda campaign underway to line up labor in opposition to legislation needed to help expand U.S. world trade.

This is to warn every union member to be on guard against misinformation, distortions and exaggerations about this problem of exports and imports. Unless we know the facts, we may find ourselves cheering for the wrong team and wind up lobbying ourselves out of work.

This world trade subject is tricky because it is complicated and because we are conditioned to use the boycott to solve a problem like foreign competition. In this case, the boycott will hurt no one as much as it does union members.

Here are three basic facts to keep in mind:

1. More jobs in the United States depend on the sale of U.S. goods in other countries than are affected by the import of foreign goods to this country. The ratio is usually put at 5 to 1. We want to increase the volume of U.S. goods sold overseas.

2. Some employers argue that they cannot sell in foreign markets because wage rates are higher. The records show clearly, however, that higher wages in the United States are more than made up for by the higher productivity of American workers. Higher wages will not prevent the expansion of U.S. world trade.

3. Other nations cannot pay for goods from the United States unless they can sell their own products inside the United States. In some instance, foreign producers can undersell U.S. producers even in American stores. Where this happens, there is usually a better answer than higher tariffs. Proposals now before Congress would provide financial assistance from the Federal Government for workers, plants and communities that are hurt by competition from imports. A few Americans should not have to pay the entire cost of expanding U.S. world trade.

Watch out for propaganda on this world trade issue. Keep yourself informed. Several publications are available. If you have questions about a specific industry, have your lodge officers write directly to IAM headquarters in Washington. Meantime, this newspaper will continue to keep union members up to date on developments.

FOREIGN TRADE: ROUTE TO JOBS

American labor is convinced the United States now needs a new, more effective world trade law for these four major reasons:

The present Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act expires June 30. This is the law that gives the President power to negotiate agreements with other countries cutting the tariffs (taxes) on goods we ship them and they ship us. Over the years since 1934 when it was first adopted, the law has helped the United States increase exports and jobs considerably.

Six European nations have formed a Common Market which, by 1970, will eliminate all tariff barriers between them—like the States of the United States and the provinces of Canada. The six countries are Germany, France, Italy, Belgium, Holland, and Luxembourg. Indications are that Britain, Switzerland, the Scandinavian nations and others will join.

This highly industrialized area of 250 million people can be (1) a vast market for U.S. products; or (2) the graveyard for a

lot of existing U.S. jobs if we can't negotiate reciprocal agreements to lower trade barriers at their borders and ours. If they can't sell profitably to us, they will produce in Europe the products they normally buy from us.

The United States urgently needs to maintain trade lines with Japan and some of the newly emerging nations that are particular targets of the Communists. We must continue to buy their goods or lose them to the Reds.

Continuing high unemployment here demands that the number of jobs in manufacturing be increased. The foreign market offers the brightest hope for increasing sales and jobs.

WORLD TRADE HAS TO FLOW TWO WAYS

As the name implies, a reciprocal trade agreement is a double-edged tool. To negotiate agreements with the Common Market permitting more of our goods to be sold in Europe, we will have to let them sell more of their goods here.

Inevitably, some of these imports will compete with products made in the United States. The problem is to increase exports—and jobs producing goods for export—with the least possible impact on jobs in U.S. industries that compete with imported goods. It's estimated that more than 3 million Americans now work at jobs producing for export and about half a million others—one-sixth the number—have been displaced by competitive imports.

TRADE ADJUSTMENT CUSHIONS IMPACT

The new device sought by labor to cushion the impact of increased imports on U.S. jobs is a trade adjustment program. Here's how it would work:

Employees who suffered layoffs or cutbacks in hours would be entitled to readjustment allowances of about two-thirds of their pay up to 52 weeks. The allowances would be reduced by the amount of any unemployment compensation due the employees and by half of any wages they earned.

Example: A worker earning $90 a week is cut back to half time and makes $45 weekly. In addition to his pay, he receives a readjustment allowance of 65 percent of $90 or $58.50, minus 50 percent of $45 (his part-time pay), or $22.50 for a total of $36. With his part-time pay of $45, he draws a weekly total of $81.

Workers hurt by imports would also be eligible for retraining to give them the skill to get another type of job. Those receiving training would be eligible for up to 78 weeks of readjustment allowances.

Heads of families who can't find jobs in their present community could obtain a relocation allowance to pay for moving where there are jobs.

Businesses and farms hurt by imports would be eligible for special aid. This would include technical assistance to help develop more profitable production, tax relief, and loans for modernization or switching to another line.

The program also calls for international fair labor standards to prevent exploitation of workers abroad and unfair competition here from sweatshop goods. In addition, U.S. labor wants to plug the tax loophole which encourages U.S. plants to run away abroad. This would halt the export of U.S. jobs.

WHAT YOU CAN DO

Your most important task in this complex field is to keep informed so that you will not be misled by propaganda and misstatements (see editorial.) To help you, the AFL–CIO has three recent publications that are available without charge. Write to Pamphlet Division, AFL–CIO, 815 16th Street, Washington, D.C. Ask for: "Why More Trade," "An Analysis of the Kennedy Trade Program," and "The Common Market and the United States."

If your employer says your industry needs higher tariffs, find out the facts before you take any action. Have your lodge officers direct specific questions to IAM headquarters in Washington.

If your company is not selling overseas, find out if management has taken advantage of assistance available from the Bureau of Foreign Commerce, Commerce Department, Washington, D.C.

NATIONAL LUTHERAN COUNCIL, 44TH ANNUAL MEETING

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, the National Lutheran Council, at its 44th annual meeting held in Atlantic City, N.J., from January 30 to February 1, 1962, adopted two resolutions dealing with issues of national interest.

More than 10 years ago the council adopted a resolution supporting participation by the United States in the United Nations. Because of various pressures throughout the country to alter or weaken such support, the council at this annual meeting reaffirmed its earlier statement.

In its resolution concerning the Peace Corps, the council gave general endorsement to the objectives of the Peace Corps and encouraged qualified Lutherans to participate in it. At the same time, it expressed the judgment that the council itself, as a church agency, should not enter into any contractual relationship with the Peace Corps.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the two resolutions adopted by the National Lutheran Council.

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

RESOLUTION ON PEACE CORPS

Whereas the Peace Corps has been established by the U.S. Government "to help the people of interested countries and areas in meeting their needs for skilled manpower" as well as "to promote a better understanding of the American people on the part of the peoples served and a better understanding of other peoples on the part of the American people"; and

Whereas the Peace Corps provides a creative opportunity for citizens of good will and competence to serve human need, and to demonstrate the power of disciplined service given without prospect of pecuniary advantage; and

Whereas the Christian's call into the fellowship of the Church is at the same time a call to active participation, under the sign of the cross, in the world recognized as a realm in which God is active in creation, judgment, and redemption: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the National Lutheran Council—

1. Register its general endorsement of the objectives of the Peace Corps.

2. Commend the President and the Congress for the inauguration of a Peace Corps program which has already given evidence of high standards of performance.

3. Commend the administration of the Peace Corps for its announced policy of not approving churches and religious agencies as sponsors of Peace Corps projects and express the hope that this policy will be maintained.

4. Encourage qualified Lutherans to participate in the Peace Corps program as a significant opportunity for service.

RESOLUTION ON UNITED NATIONS

Whereas Christians everywhere in a divided and strife-torn world continue to proclaim the power of love and justice, and seek peace for all men and nations; and

Whereas the United Nations has been under increasing pressures both here in America and abroad from those who have become impatient when its political and diplomatic efforts toward world peace have achieved less than perfect results in an imperfect world; and

Whereas the United Nations has achieved noteworthy results in preserving a degree of peace in a series of military crises, and has established praiseworthy advances in fields that include health, education, labor, trade, relief, rehabilitation, resettlement and human rights; and

Whereas this organization presents to mankind, under the providence of God, a most hopeful opportunity for sharing the benefits of civilization, and using man's new powers to enhance the dignity and freedom of individuals and nations: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the National Lutheran Council hereby reaffirms its 1951 statement of confidence in the usefulness of the United Nations, and expresses the hope that the Government of the United States, maintaining a place in the family of nations in a way which seeks to cooperate for the good of all rather than to exercise domination for achievement of narrowly self-centered purposes, may continue to contribute leadership and support to this agency of international cooperation; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be sent to the Secretary General of the United Nations and the Secretary of State of the United States of America.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. ELLENDER obtained the floor.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator from Louisiana yield, so that I may propound a unanimous-consent request, with the understanding that he will not lose the floor?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, while what I am about to say may seem to be in conflict with the statement made by the leadership yesterday that Senators would be called to account if they yielded for anything but questions, I think this is a special circumstance; therefore, I shall make this request on that basis, but with the other statement still holding.

I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate recesses at 6 o'clock this evening, the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] be allowed to continue his first speech tomorrow, with the proviso that upon the convening of the Senate tomorrow morning at 9 o'clock, the Senator from Arkansas will be recognized in the meantime for his speech.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SMITH of Massachusetts in the chair). Is there objection?

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, reserving the right to object——

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I withdraw my request.

Mr. JAVITS. I do not understand the Senator.

Mr. President, may I be recognized?

Mr. ELLENDER. Provided I do not lose my right to the floor.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, if the Senator from New York does not wish to ask a question, I must object.

Mr. JAVITS. I do wish to ask a question; but in asking the Senator from Louisiana to yield for a question, I desire to propound my question to the majority leader. May we know what is the plan of the majority leader in connection with this proposal?

Mr. MANSFIELD. There is no plan; I am trying to accommodate two Senators for reasons which are, in a sense, personal but very understandable. I have made this specific request, first, so that I could notify the Senate that the session would terminate at 6 o'clock this evening; and second, so that the Senator from Louisiana, who has a long speech, might be protected. He cannot be here at 9 o'clock tomorrow morning because of a prior commitment over which he has no control. In the meantime, another Senator would be allowed to make his second speech. My request is for the purpose of protecting the Senators concerned.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I have such high respect for the majority leader—and I see my own leader here—that I have no objection if my own leader has no objection.

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

THE ALEXANDER HAMILTON NATIONAL MONUMENT — AMENDMENT TO THE CONSTITUTION DEALING WITH POLL TAXES

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. ELLENDER. Mr. President, the question at issue has been discussed by this body on many occasions. As a matter of fact, I covered the ground in 1938, after I had been a Senator for only about a year, and I engaged in my first long debate.

Once again a small group of us stand before the Senate in an attempt to halt a further move to gnaw away at the founding precepts of this Nation—the sovereign and precious rights of the individual States.

Today we see a blatant attempt to push down our throats a piece of legislation which would be the opening foot in the door to establishing Federal voting requirements.

This move, in the form of an amendment to a noncontroversial measure, would take away from the individual States the rights to charge a poll tax; then I fear a move to write in educational qualifications would be presented, to be followed by other moves designed to further weaken the rights of the individual States to set forth their own voter qualifications. Some Senators may ask why I oppose this measure when my State of Louisiana does not charge a poll tax, but has other qualifications covering other aspects of a citizen's right to vote.

Mr. President, the poll tax issue is not the whole story. At stake is not whether the State of Alabama should charge a $1.50 poll tax. The issue before the Senate today is whether the Federal Government shall have the power to tell the State of Alabama, or the State of Louisiana, or the State of New York what its voting qualifications shall be, down to the crossed "t" and dotted "i".

The debates of the constitutional drafting period show very clearly that if the right to determine voter qualifications had not been left in the hands of the individual sovereign States, the Constitution never would have been ratified.

I believe that in the past this question has been discussed thoroughly. There is no doubt that our early history shows that from the time of the creation of the Colonies and before we became the United States, even the Colonies zealously guarded their right to fix the qualifications for voting. At the very beginning there were all sorts of qualifications.

For instance, in the State of Georgia a citizen could not vote if he belonged to the Catholic Church. In New York, Jews were prevented by statute from voting. There were many other qualifications of a similar nature throughout the Colonies. Those qualifications were aside from property taxes or, at least, the ownership of property as a requirement for the right to vote, or the imposition of some kind of poll tax. So such taxes have been imposed as a condition for voting from the early formative period of our Nation. They were continued in effect when the Colonies became the United States.

Mr. President, as I have just now pointed out, some of the main debates regarding ratification of the Constitution centered around the proposition of whether the Federal Government or the States should fix the qualifications for the right to vote. Judging from the debates which then occurred, there is no doubt that if it had not been for the fact that the States reserved to themselves the right to provide for the qualifications of voters, our great Constitution never would have been ratified.

Section 2 of article I of the Constitution provides:

> The House of Representatives shall be composed of Members chosen every second year by the people of the several States, and the electors in each State shall have the qualifications requisite for electors of the most numerous branch of the State legislature.

Section 4 of article I of the Constitution provides:

> The times, places and manner of holding elections for Senators and Representatives shall be prescribed in each State by the legislature thereof; but the Congress may at any time by law make or alter such regulations, except as to the places of choosing Senators.

Mr. President, I have no apologies to offer when I say that on several occasions in the past, when there was introduced a joint resolution dealing with abolishment of the poll tax, I thought the manner in which the distinguished Senator from Florida desired to settle the question was a proper one, and on two or three occasions I joined him in sponsoring such a measure. But in so doing, it was my hope and belief that that would be the end of all civil rights legislation. However, now we are faced with a situation which could see the opening gun in a battle to abolish all rights of the States to set forth voter qualifications.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from Louisana yield for a question?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Louisana yield to the Senator from Florida for a question?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield for a question.

Mr. HOLLAND. I appreciate the fact that on several occasions the Senator from Louisana joined me in sponsoring such a measure; I wish to ask him if it is true that he joined me as a cosponsor of this measure or a similar one in the 81st Congress, the 82d Congress, the 83d Congress, the 84th Congress, and the 85th Congress.

Mr. ELLENDER. I am sure the Senator from Florida is correct. I did, and I have no apologies to make for doing so. But the Senator from Florida may recall that I often expressed the hope that passage of the legislation he refers to would be the end of all civil rights legislation—in other words, that if we passed legislation providing that payment of a poll tax is not a condition to voting, that would be the end of such matters. I said that with that understanding, I was willing to follow that course.

However, as I have said before, I have been in the Senate for 26 years, and I do not know of one session in which Senators were not confronted with some type of proposed civil rights force legislation affecting the right of Negroes to vote. Furthermore, during the past 26 years, Congress has passed many measures which to some extent, have clarified the ways and means by which citizens would be permitted to vote. So, in my humble judgment, we need simply to have enforcement of the laws which now exist covering the field of voting rights—not only the Federal statutes, but also State laws.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from Louisiana yield again to me?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield for a question.

Mr. HOLLAND. The Senator from Louisiana spoke of giving the Negroes the right to vote. Is it not true that this proposed constitutional amendment applies equally to white people and to colored people—to all the citizens of the several States?

Mr. ELLENDER. Yes; but primarily it is being brought about to satisfy a few minority groups, including Negroes. That is why some Members of Congress each year come forward with some new type civil-rights legislation. I feel definitely now that nothing will ever satisfy these Members in their desire to attract support of minority groups. It is true that in the State of Louisiana there have been quite a few parishes in which there

has been considerable objection to the registration of Negroes. The simple truth is that in four or five of our parishes, over 70 percent of the population are Negroes; and, of course, the whites have tried to protect themselves from the possibility of the election of Negro officials.

But, Mr. President, conditions all over the South have changed. I feel confident that conditions affecting equal voting rights would improve if only we were let alone. That is why I no longer support measures designed to do away with the poll tax by Federal legislation. Many persons are advocating these measures merely to satisfy just a few minority leaders in their States. As I said earlier, if we did not have so much agitation in the South from the North, it is my firm belief that the Negroes in the South would fare much better. As a matter of fact, I have had occasion to talk to many Negroes who had wandered from the South to the North; and on many occasions they admitted they were always better treated in the South than they were in the North. I am satisfied that conditions would be progressively better if the matter were left in the hands of those who had the problem directly confronting them. These agitators will never be satisfied, and I intend to oppose them with all the strength at my command. I now return to my prepared text.

Mr. President, there are also the two amendments which have to some extent contracted the otherwise unqualified right of the States, as guaranteed in section 2 of article I, to establish the qualifications of voters. I refer to the 15th amendment, which provides that a citizen of the United States may not be denied the right to vote on account of race, color, or previous condition of servitude; and the 19th amendment, which establishes the same protection against discrimination based on sex. And then, of course, there is the 17th amendment, adopted in 1913, whereby the right of the States to establish the qualifications of electors was again reaffirmed, this time with respect to the choosing of U.S. Senators.

Mr. President, our Nation has profited greatly from the rich heritage of learning left to us from the great constitutional lawyers of years gone by. One of the greatest of those illustrious pioneers of American constitutional history was George Ticknor Curtis. Mr. Curtis' name will live forever in the annals of American history, for many reasons; first and foremost, of course, because he was the author of two monumental works; the first, which was to become a standard authority, ranking alongside of Justice Storey's "Commentaries on the Constitution," was published in 1854 in two volumes and entitled "History of the Constitution of the United States." The second of this great constitutional lawyer's legal compositions was entitled "Constitutional History of the United States," published in 1896, 2 years after his death. Mr. Curtis also will be remembered by students of American history for his able and successful defense of President Andrew Johnson in the impeachment proceedings instituted against the American Chief Executive in 1867; George Ticknor Curtis is remembered, too, for the brilliant and cogent argument he presented to the U.S. Supreme Court on December 18, 1856, in the famed Dred Scott case.

During the course of his presentation to the Supreme Court, in the Dred Scott case, Mr. Curtis made this significant statement as a preface to his analysis and interpretation of the constitutional provisions in issue in the Dred Scott case—that is, the provisions of our Constitution relating to the status and government of American territories:

> I wish, in the next place, to say, may it please your Honors, what indeed is obvious to every one—that this is eminently a historical question. But I shall press that consideration somewhat further than it is generally carried on this subject, and much further than it has been carried by the counsel for the defendant in error; for I believe it to be true of this, as it is of almost all questions of power arising under the Constitution, that when you have once ascertained the historical facts out of which the particular provision arose, and have placed those facts in their true historical relations, you have gone far toward deciding the whole controversy. So true is it that every power and function of this Government had its origin in some previously existing facts of the national history, or in some then existing state of things, that it is impossible to approach one of these questions as one of mere theory, or to solve it by the aid of any merely speculative reasoning. Hence it is eminently necessary on all occasions to ascertain the history of the subject supposed to be involved in a controverted power of Congress, and, above all, to approach it with the single purpose of drawing that deduction which the constitutional history of the country clearly warrants. ("Constitutional History of the United States," George Ticknor Curtis, p. 502.)

Mr. President, keeping these words of George Ticknor Curtis in mind, I shall ask the indulgence of the Senate while I embark upon the task of reviewing the circumstances surrounding the genesis of the constitutional provisions at issue in the right-to-vote legislation now before the Senate. It is with the utmost humility that I undertake the enormous assignment of refreshing the memories of Members of the U.S. Congress, and the public at large, with the historical backdrop against which the language of article I, sections 2 and 4, of our Constitution was framed.

It was no easy job, I can assure Senators, to research and assemble the vast amount of data that I am about to present to the Senate. It was a monumental task, but it will be well worth the effort if it helps to awaken in Senators a better understanding and awareness of the precarious, perilous ground we are about to tread upon—to point up the misguided, imprudent, unwise course that is being urged upon us.

It is sheer folly, Mr. President, for the Congress of the United States to seek to enact laws aimed at undermining and destroying our one great constitutional bulwark against despotism—our time-tested system of local elections controlled and operated by the 50 sovereign State governments, free from coercion or subversion from a Federal bureaucracy. Heaven help us if this precious birthright is lost forever to us and to our posterity because we here today are unable to distinguish between political expediency and commonsense.

Mr. President, a study of colonial history reveals that regulation of suffrage was one of the first tasks to concern the American pioneers. From their inception, the colonies maintained qualifications of voters. As I shall point out during the course of these remarks, when the colonies formed the Original Thirteen States of our Union, they still jealously and zealously guarded their right to prescribe qualifications for voting. Even a cursory reading of the discussions that took place during the Constitutional Convention at Philadelphia, and of the debates in the Thirteen States while the proposed Constitution was up for ratification, leads to the inescapable conclusion that a majority of the Thirteen States would never have formed a union and bound themselves under the Federal Constitution if clear and unmistakable language had not been included to guarantee to the respective States the right to establish qualifications of electors. Nor is there any doubt, Mr. President, that the Thirteen Colonies did not intend to surrender to the Federal Government their primary right to control the time, manner, and places of holding elections; all evidence points to the unmistakable conclusion that they intended to vest in the Central Government only secondary authority to regulate elections, limited to those situations in which extraordinary circumstances prevailed or when the States refused to conduct elections for Members of the House of Representatives and thereby threatened the very existence of the Federal legislative branch.

Later during these remarks I shall discuss more fully the meaning given to section 4 of article I by the framers of our Constitution. Now I want to direct the attention of Senators to the interpretation placed by our Founding Fathers on the language found in section 2 of article I—the requirement that "the electors in each State shall have the qualifications requisite for electors of the most numerous branch of the State legislature."

As early as 1750 there were different qualifications for voting in the different Colonies. I quote from "Formation of the Union," 1750–1829, by Hart, page 15:

> In each there was an elective legislature; in each the suffrage was very limited; everywhere the ownership of land in free-hold or other property, or the occupancy of a house was a requisite, just as it was in England for the country suffrage. In many cases there was an additional provision that the voter must possess a specified large quantity of land or must pay specified taxes. In some Colonies there was a religious requirement.

All these requirements I have just mentioned were prerequisites for the exercise of the voting privilege.

While there were few specific provisions concerning suffrage in the charters of the Colonies, popular elections existed in each of the Colonies from the earliest date down to the Revolution. Popularly elected assemblies carried on local gov-

ernment. Virginia had a House of Burgesses as early as July 30, 1619.

And what was the first consideration of these colonial groups who were fiercely protective of their rights?

One of the first tasks of these colonial assemblies was to regulate the elective franchise. (See McCulloch, Suffrage and Its Problems, at p. 18.)

While the qualifications were vague and indefinite, there were many requirements, each a proof of the local regulation of voting qualifications. Even the Crown and the English Parliament made no serious attempt to modify or harmonize the various suffrage regulations. I quote from the same volume, page 19:

This left each colony practically free to pass its own laws providing for the franchise. By the time of the Revolution this practice became thoroughly established, thus allowing each Commonwealth to make suffrage laws to fit its peculiar electoral problem.

Down to 1776 there were seven qualifications for the elective franchise. The outstanding one was the landed property qualification, which probably arose because of the business corporationlike nature of the early Colonies. A piece of land was considered as giving a person the freedom of the company, as provided by Massachusetts in 1621, exactly as a block of stock entitles its holder to vote in a corporation.

Porter, "History of Suffrage in the United States," pages 3 and 4:

But this very simple test of property holding could not long hold out alone, although it was the first and the dominating consideration for almost 200 years following. The population became so complex, the interests of colonists expanded so far beyond mere commercial enterprise that other standards of fitness for participation in the affairs of the community were sought out and established. Strict limitations had been put upon the right to join the company, and after the companies ceased to exist and the Colonies became exclusively political institutions, the same limitations were carried over for the suffrage with some elaboration. They dealt with all the various things which are supposed to determine capacity to take intelligent interest in community affairs. Race, color, sex, age, religion, and residence were now investigated before the applicant was admitted to the suffrage. The theory was that only those who clearly had an interest in the colony—measured in terms of tried standards—should exercise the right of suffrage.

There we find a yardstick or a method of providing qualifications for voters during colonial days.

Virginia had varying requirements. In 1655 a voter had to be a habitant and a householder; in 1699 he had to be 21 years of age, a male habitant and freeholder, papists barred. By 1762 this had been further refined by the freeholder being particularly required to own 50 acres, or 25 acres and house 12 by 12.

Massachusetts first required religious standards, Puritan and Orthodox, in 1631. By 1691 Massachusetts required a voter to be English and to own 40 shillings freehold or 40 pounds of property.

Connecticut in 1638 required a voter to be a habitant, a Puritan and a freeman, and varied this by 1702 to specify that he have 40 shillings freehold or 40 pounds of property.

Rhode Island, as early 1665, required a competent estate and barred Christian papists. By 1767 Rhode Island added to this the requirement of living in a town, plus owning 40 shillings freehold or 40 pounds of property.

New Hampshire in 1680 required that a voter be 24 years of age, English, Protestant, and have an estate of £20. By 1728 the last requirement was increased to £50 in realty.

North Carolina in 1669 required a voter to be a deist and to have a 50-acre freehold. By 1760 this had varied. The qualifications were 21 years of age, 1½ years residence, British nationality and a 50-acre freehold.

South Carolina in 1669 required a person to be a deist and to have 50 acres freehold. By 1759 a South Carolina voter had to be white and 21 years of age, Protestant, and have a settled freehold.

Georgia demanded a man to be 21 years of age and to have 50 acres of land, papists barred. In 1775 the land requirement took on a subtle change. It was replaced by the word "taxpayer," plus one-half year's residence required, and papists barred.

Pennsylvania in 1683 required a voter to own 100 acres—10 cultivated; or 50 acres—20 cultivated; or taxes. In 1700 Pennsylvania required a man to be 21 years of age, a 2-year resident, English, and own 50 acres—12 cultivated; or £50 in property.

Delaware, in 1701, had a 2-year residence requirement, 21-year age requirement, and land ownership of 50 acres—12 cultivated; or £50 in property. By 1733 British citizenship had been added to the list.

Maryland's only requisite in 1637 was that voters be freemen. In 1718 Maryland had barred Catholics and required 50 acres or £40 property.

New York in 1683 accepted a vote from any freeholder. In 1701 21 years age requisite and £40 realty was necessary, and papists and Jews were barred.

New Jersey in 1668 allowed any freeholder to vote. In 1725 that freeholder had to be a 1-year resident, and must own 100 acres or £50 of property.

It is interesting to regard some of the varying reasons for the above requirements, keeping in mind that the very fact they have varied in each State, with the particular conditions of growth and the existing population, adds undeniable power to the case I am presenting for each State in the Union, for their own continued right to judge their own needs and provide therefor.

I read from Porter, "History of Suffrage in the United States," pages 4 and 5:

Standards of character and fitness varied from one part of the country to another. In Massachusetts the Puritans believed that only by restricting suffrage to men in their churches could the future well-being of the colony be insured. The problem of the right to vote became distinctly subordinate. They restricted the suffrage for the good of the community. The fact that their standard of good character (church membership) was narrow is not at all surprising. The character of the man's employment was often considered a criterion of his ability to vote intelligently, and thus college men and clerical officers were presumed to be especially fit for the suffrage.

The philosophy of suffrage has always been more or less opportunistic, if the word is permissible. Suffrage qualifications are determined for decidedly materialistic considerations, and then a theory is evolved to suit the situation. In the early days riot and disorder might accompany an election. The authorities would thereupon fix the qualifications so that the disorderly people could not vote next time. Then would come the theory to justify it—only those owning a certain number of acres would be considered fit to vote, only those of a certain religious faith, etc.

Unquestionably this has happened in times of stress, for theory did not come to be the preliminary determining factor until complete peace and order prevailed, and even then theory was not uncolored by materialistic considerations. Suffrage limitations were bound to adapt themselves to social and economic conditions. In rural Virginia the freehold requirement of 50 acres excluded very few of the best type of men. But such a requirement in an urban community would have been intolerable. Obviously an absolute criterion could not obtain. It became necessary to adopt whatever criterion was calculated to embrace the best men.

Moral qualifications were restricted almost exclusively to New England. It was sometimes necessary for the voter to show proof of his good character. At other times if one were accused of improper conduct it would cost him his vote, although the particular offense was not mentioned in the law. In the South there were restrictions against men of certain race—foreigners and Negroes were excluded.

I read further from Porter, "History of Suffrage," bottom of page 5 and all of page 6:

All of the restrictions and qualifications can be seen to support one of two fundamental principles: One may be called the theory of right and the other the theory of the good of the State. Every qualification imposed had one of these two principles in view. Either it was established in order to fulfill the right which certain people were supposed to have, or else it was established simply in order to serve the best interest of the State. It might have been said that a man had a right to vote because he owned property, or because he was a resident, or because he paid taxes, or simply because the right to vote was a natural right. And this would be the guiding consideration without regard to the effect it might have on the well-being of the community. Thus in some places nonconformists were allowed to vote because their property right was recognized. Nonresidents were permitted to vote where they owned property solely because they were supposed to have a right to vote on account of their holdings. This theory of right was the first to appear and has always persisted. Each generation would seek to add a new subhead to the title, as it were, and base a right to vote on some new ground.

The other great principle or theory had to do with the good of the state. It developed as soon as the narrow business-corporation concept was abandoned, and it was most emphasized by the Puritans. It continues to the present day but has never been entirely divorced from the theory of right. Under this theory of the good of the state men were excluded because they were not church members, because they were criminals, because they had not been residents a long-enough time. It is not always possible to classify every restriction definitely, but it may be said that one of these

two theories controls every modification of the suffrage.

In the North, there were no race qualifications, because the few free Negroes scattered through the northern Colonies seemed to have caused little alarm along suffrage lines. North Carolina, Georgia, South Carolina, and Virginia were the only colonies which disfranchised Negroes before the time of the Revolution, showing that either very few of them tried to vote or there was little aversion to it, the former probably being correct. At any rate, there was no race issue injected generally into the suffrage regulations. Another generation saw a marked change.

There was in none of the Colonies except Pennsylvania the rigid residence requirement of 2 years. And why the particular need there, true locally, yet not present elsewhere? Probably because of the conservative proprietor's desire to limit the influence of the many recent immigrants.

The property test was the most frequent and weightiest qualification. The cheapness of land led to the requirement above stated, in some instances, that the land be worth a certain sum in money or produce a certain income. Again we see the ever-present variations in the different Colonies. In Georgia there could not be the same money value requirement as in more thickly populated New England, and conversely, a voter in crowded New England could not have been required to own the same quantity of land as the voter in sparsely settled Georgia. In Virginia the varying standard of 50 acres of land, or 25 acres of land being worked and occupied by a house 12 feet square, or a town lot with a house of similar dimensions, was the answer to the rural versus urban problem. The city dwellers could not acquire land to a broad extent, and the rural dwellers resented a value fixation being set on the land to be held.

Five of the Colonies allowed the substitution of personal property for real estate:

This indicates a distinct concession of the urban communities, and it is significant that four of these States are in the small New England group, where the supply of real estate was limited. This adaptation of the suffrage qualification to the particular economic situation illustrates the willingness of men to adjust their ideas of what is fundamentally right to the needs of the dominant group. (Porter, "History of Suffrage in the United States," p. 9.)

The next breakdown in this type requirement is from personal property to taxpaying. As condition change, a trend emerges, the picture alters, and the statutory machinery with which we are equipped permits each State to shift or vary its position with the times.

Religious tests were decisive in New England, and common everywhere except in Pennsylvania. In the South, papists were usually specifically barred, New York barred Jews. Maryland also barred Catholics.

Massachusetts supplemented the religious tests by moral character qualifications. Later a property qualification was inserted as an alternative. Later the religious test disappeared. South Carolina, with her requirement that a voter acknowledge the being of God, was the last State to have the statutory religious standards for suffrage and religion as a qualification for voting passed out with the colonial period.

Citizenship and residence were of comparatively little importance in a new country, predominantly British.

Before turning to the Articles of Confederation and our Constitution, the following words concerning voting qualifications in the Colonies seem particularly appropriate:

It is of moment to note that there were no efforts at uniformity in the regulation of suffrage. In each Colony by charter, or more often by acts of the assembly, the elective franchise, was controlled independently. This commonwealth treatment of suffrage was the natural result of colonial history. So thoroughly grounded was this policy that when the Colonies seized sovereignty and organized a Federal Government the suffrage program was undisturbed.

It continued as the basic foundation on which all Federal elections must rest. (See McCulloch, "Suffrage and Its Problems," p. 29.)

The truth of the proposition that each State best knows its own conditions, and is best equipped to handle them, is shown by the direction of the Continental Congress, on May 10, 1776, following the outbreak of the Revolution, to each of the Colonies to "adopt such governments as shall best conduce to the happiness and safety of their constituents in particular, and America in general." Hart, "Formation of the Union, 1750–1829," at page 89. Following these instructions, the Colonies had already begun, before July 4, 1776, to draw up written instruments of government. I now desire to read a few paragraphs from McCulloch on "Suffrage and Its Problems." I read from page 30, the first paragraph:

With the separation from the mother country came very little change for the Colonies severally. The Union took the place of the Crown, while the various Commonwealth governments went on very much as before. Therefore, suffrage regulations were not disturbed at all; each Commonwealth continued to regulate the elective franchise independently. The several States sought directions of the Continental Congress as to framing constitutions to replace the old charters which had been granted by the King.

But after this had been done, the two sets of governments moved along independently. The central government under the Articles of Confederation interfered with the States as little as possible, and they do not seem to have looked to it even for advice.

The only point at which the two governments could touch even indirectly on suffrage matters was article V, which provided that the delegates to the Confederation Congress should be appointed in such manner as the legislatures of each State should direct.

Also, quoting directly from the Articles of Confederation, and to demonstrate the doctrines that remained ever uppermost in the minds of the founders of our country, I quote article II:

Each State retains its sovereignty, freedom, and independence, and every power, jurisdiction, and right which is not by this confederation expressly delegated to the United States in Congress assembled.

I now read from the Federalist Articles of Confederation, article V, the first paragraph:

For the more convenient management of the general interest of the United States, delegates shall be annually appointed in such manner as the legislature of each State shall direct, to meet in Congress on the first Monday in November, in every year, with a power reserved to each State to recall its delegates, or any of them, at any time within the year, and to send others in their stead, for the remainder of the year.

Also:

In determining questions in the United States in Congress assembled, each State shall have one vote.

The above provisions show clearly that matters of voting qualifications were to be left strictly to each State. The Articles of Confederation were inadequate and hurried, and later proved insufficient to cope with the changing United States and its manifold problems. A new and farsighted instrument was needed, a considered and well-debated structure built on a framework with a future. But, it is noteworthy, before we turn from the Articles of Confederation, that even though the country was in the midst of revolution, torn by varying doctrines and lacking in all organization at the time they were written, there was one thing that was not left out.

Many important things were left out, much was left a blank, but even in a time of crisis these men who were struggling for a workable governing organ to suit their needs and their hopes, kept one thing before them, the inviolable right of each State to determine the qualification of its voters and to control its own elections. They did not fail to preserve this right in the articles they drafted.

When the Articles of Confederation, which were adopted in time of stress without full cognizance of the problems to be solved and with the States themselves ill defined geographically and politically, proved unsatisfactory and insufficient, it was suggested by Hamilton in 1780, and later by Tom Paine, that a convention be called to revise the Articles of Confederation, and to draft a Constitution of the United States of America.

Let us go back to that Convention. There is drama in the air. Vital provisions for the constitutional structure of a new country are in the making. Each delegate has his own theories, his own pet beliefs to advance. All are filled with a desire for the best in government for their new country.

Maj. William Pierce, of Georgia, made some notes on the membership of the Convention. Among those historically well known to us today who were prominent in drafting provisions affecting voting qualifications was Rufus King, about whom Major Pierce said:

Mr. King is a man much distinguished for his eloquence and great parliamentary talents. He was educated in Massachusetts, and is said to have good classical as well as legal knowledge. He has served for 3 years in the Congress of the United States with great and deserved applause, and is at this time high in the confidence and approbation of his countrymen. This gentleman is about

33 years of age, about 5 feet 10 inches high, well formed, a handsome face, with a strong expressive eye, and a sweet high toned voice. In his public speaking there is something peculiarly strong and rich in his expression, clear, and convincing in his arguments, rapid and irresistible at times in his eloquence but he is not always equal. His action is natural, swimming, and graceful, but there is a rudeness of manner sometimes accompanying it. But take him tout en semble, he may with propriety be ranked among the luminaries of the present age. ("United States Formation of the Union, Documents," p. 96.)

There was Nat Gorham, about whom it is said:

Mr. Gorham is a merchant in Boston, high in reputation, and much in the esteem of his countrymen. He is a man of very good sense, but not much improved in his education. He is eloquent and easy in public debate, but has nothing fashionable or elegant in his style; all he aims at is to convince, and where he fails it never is from his auditory not understanding him, for no man is more perspicuous and full. He has been President of Congress, and 3 years a member of that body. Mr. Gorham is about 46 years of age, rather lusty, and has an agreeable and pleasing manner. ("United States Formation of the Union, Documents," p. 96.)

One of the highlights was Alexander Hamilton.

Colonel Hamilton is deservedly celebrated for his talents. He is a practitioner of the law, and reputed to be a finished scholar.

To a clear and strong judgment he unites the ornaments of fancy, and whilst he is able, convincing, and engaging in his eloquence the heart and head sympathize in approving him. Yet there is something too feeble in his voice to be equal to the strains of oratory; it is my opinion that he is rather a convincing speaker, than a blazing orator. Colonel Hamilton requires time to think, he inquires into every part of his subject with the searchings of philosophy, and when he comes forward he comes highly charged with interesting matter, there is no skimming over the surface of a subject with him, he must sink to the bottom to see what foundation it rests on. His language is not always equal, sometimes didactic like Bolingbroke's, at others light and tripping like Stern's. His eloquence is not so defusive as to trifle with the senses, but he rambles just enough to strike and keep up the attention. He is about 33 years old, of small stature, and lean. His manners are tinctured with stiffness, and sometimes with a degree of vanity that is highly disagreeable. ("United States Formation Union, Documents," p. 98.)

From Connecticut came Oliver W. Ellsworth, who was on the committee of detail charged with forcing the provisions affecting elections:

Mr. Ellsworth is a judge of the supreme court in Connecticut; he is a gentleman of a clear, deep, and copious understanding; eloquent, and connected in public debate, and always attentive to his duty. He is very happy in a reply, and choice in selecting such parts of his adversary's arguments as he finds make the strongest impressions, in order to take off the force of them, so as to admit the power of his own. Mr. Ellsworth is about 37 years of age, a man much respected for his integrity, and venerated for his abilities. ("United States Formation," supra, p. 98.)

From Pennsylvania, on this committee, came Mr. James Wilson:

Mr. Wilson ranks among the foremost in legal and political knowledge. He has joined to a fine genius all that can set him off and show him to adavntage. He is well acquainted with man, and understands all the passions that influence him. Government seems to have been his peculiar study, all the political institutions of the world he knows in detail, and can trace the causes and effects of every revolution from the earliest stages of the Grecian commonwealth down to the present time. No man is more clear, copious, and comprehensive than Mr. Wilson, yet he is no great orator. He draws the attention not by the charm of his eloquence, but by the force of his reasoning. He is about 45 years old. ("United States Formation," supra, p. 101.)

From Virginia came James Madison and Edmund Randolph:

Mr. Madison is a character who has long been in public life; and what is very remarkable, every person seems to acknowledge his greatness. He blends together the profound politician with the scholar. In the management of every great question he evidently took the lead in the convention, and though he cannot be called an orator, he is a most agreeable, eloquent, and convincing speaker. From a spirit of industry and application which he possesses in a most eminent degree, he always comes forward the best informed man of any point in debate. The affairs of the United States, he perhaps, has the most correct knowledge of, of any man in the Union.

He has been twice a Member of Congress, and was always thought one of the ablest Members that ever sat in that council. Mr. Madison is about 37 years of age, a gentleman of great modesty, with a remarkable sweet temper. He is easy and unreserved among his acquaintances, and has a most agreeable style of conversation. ("United States Formation," supra, p. 104.)

Mr. Randolph is Governor of Virginia, a young gentleman in whom unite all the accomplishments of a scholar and a statesman. He came forward with the postulate, or first principles, on which the convention acted, and he supported them with a force of eloquence and reasoning that did him great honor. He has a most harmonious voice, a fine person, and striking manners. Mr. Randolph is about 32 years of age. ("United States Formation," supra, p. 105.)

Robert Morris, with James Wilson, Benjamin Franklin, Gouverneur Morris, and others, represented Pennsylvania:

Robert Morris is a merchant of great eminence and wealth, an able financier, and a worthy patriot. He has an understanding equal to any public object and possesses an energy of mind that few men can boast of. Although he is not learned, yet he is as great as those who are. I am told that when he speaks in the Assembly of Pennsylvania, that he bears down all before him. What could have been his reason for not speaking in the convention I know not, but he never once spoke on any point. This gentleman is about 50 years old. ("United States Formation," supra, p. 101.)

On May 29, 1787, Edmund Randolph presented the following resolution:

Resolved therefore, That the rights of suffrage in the National Legislature ought to be proportioned to the quotas of contribution, or to the number of free inhabitants, as the one or the other rule may seem best in different cases.

Resolved, That the National Legislature ought to consist of two branches.

Resolved, That the Members of the first branch of the National Legislature ought to be elected by the people of the several States every (blank) for the term of (blank). ("United States Formation," supra p. 116.)

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I now yield the floor upon the conditions which were agreed upon before I began to speak.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, do I correctly understand that when the Senate convenes at 9 o'clock tomorrow morning, the Senator from Arkansas will have the floor for a speech which he intends to make on the pending motion; that at the conclusion of that speech the floor will once again be taken by the distinguished Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER]; and that the speech which the Senator from Louisiana will make then will be considered to be a part of the first speech he is making this afternoon?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. PELL in the chair). The Senator's statement is in accordance with the previous order, and is correct.

TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS

By unanimous consent, the following routine business was transacted:

REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

The following report of a committee was submitted:

By Mr. YARBOROUGH, from the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, with amendments:

S. 2697. A bill to amend chapters 33 and 35 of title 38, United States Code, to preserve the rights of reservists and National Guardsmen called or ordered to active duty on or after August 1, 1961 (Rept. No. 1309).

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION INTRODUCED

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

By Mr. GOLDWATER (for himself, Mr. HAYDEN, Mr. BENNETT, Mr. ALLOTT, Mr. CHAVEZ, and Mr. Moss):

S. 3033. A bill to amend the act of April 19, 1950, relating to the rehabilitation of the Navajo and Hopi Tribes of Indians, to authorize certain additional highway projects; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

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

By Mr. DODD:

S. 3034. A bill to authorize grants to local school boards to assist in defraying certain costs incident to the elimination of segregation in public elementary and secondary schools; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

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

By Mr. SALTONSTALL (for himself and Mr. BYRD of Virginia):

S. 3035. A bill to clarify the components of, and to assist in the management of, the national debt; to the Committee on Finance.

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

By Mr. BEALL:

S. 3036. A bill for the relief of Max Kahn; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CHURCH:

S. 3037. A bill for the relief of Noreen Joyce Baden; and

S. 3038. A bill for the relief of Eng Ton Ho; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FONG:

S. 3039. A bill for the relief of Bartola Maria S. La Madrid; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SMATHERS:

S. 3040. A bill for the relief of Paul Griffith; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. YARBOROUGH:

S. 3041. A bill to authorize the conveyance of certain lands in Harris County, Tex., to the State of Texas or the county of Harris; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. SMITH of Massachusetts:

S. 3042. A bill for the relief of Mr. Giuseppe Abbatiello; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HART (for himself, Mr. KEATING, Mr. HUMPHREY, Mr. JAVITS, Mr. MCNAMARA, Mr. LONG of Missouri, Mrs. NEUBERGER, Mr. CLARK, Mr. PROXMIRE, Mr. LONG of Hawaii, and Mr. DOUGLAS):

S. 3043. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

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

By Mr. MAGNUSON (by request):

S. 3044. A bill to amend the Interstate Commerce Act to grant to any carrier of coal by pipeline, subject to any of the provisions of part 1 of the act, the right of eminent domain, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce.

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

By Mr. EASTLAND:

S. 3045. A bill to provide for the conveyance of all interests of the United States in certain land in Jefferson County, Miss., to the holders of record of the fee interest in such land; and

S. 3046. A bill to provide for the conveyance of certain mineral rights to D. C. Smith of Fayette, Miss.; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. MOSS:

S. 3047. A bill to amend the act of June 14, 1926 (44 Stat. 741), as amended, to provide that conveyances under such act for State park purposes shall be made without consideration;

S. 3048. A bill to amend the act of June 14, 1926, as amended, to provide that lands conveyed under such act for State park purposes shall not be subject to the 640-acre limitation contained in such act, and to provide that conveyances for such purposes shall be without consideration; and

S. 3049. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to take possession of the experimental oil-shale demonstration facility near Rifle, Colo., and through contract or lease to a public or private organization to encourage the use of the plant for further research in the mining and utilization of oil shale; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

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

By Mr. SALTONSTALL:

S.J. Res. 175. Joint resolution authorizing the Secretary of the Navy to receive for instruction at the U.S. Naval Academy at Annapolis two citizens and subjects of the Kingdom of Belgium; to the Committee on Armed Services.

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

RESOLUTION

ANDREW J. METCALF—REFERENCE OF BILL TO COURT OF CLAIMS

Mr. MAGNUSON submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 320) to refer a private bill to the Court of Claims; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary:

Resolved, That the bill (S. 1460) entitled "A bill for the relief of Andrew J. Metcalf", now pending in the Senate, together with accompanying papers, is hereby referred to the Court of Claims; and the court shall proceed with the same in accordance with the provisions of sections 1492 and 2509 of title 28 of the United States Code and report to the Senate at the earliest practicable date.

AMENDMENT OF IMMIGRATION AND NATIONALITY ACT OF 1952

Mr. HART. Mr. President, on behalf of myself, and Senators KEATING, HUMPHREY, JAVITS, MCNAMARA, LONG of Missouri, NEUBERGER, CLARK, PROXMIRE, LONG of Hawaii, DOUGLAS, WILLIAMS of New Jersey, SCOTT, and DODD, I introduce for appropriate reference, a bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act.

A decade has passed since Congress enacted the Immigration and Nationality Act of 1952 to replace the act of 1924. By consolidating a number of statutes into a single law and favorably modifying some of the nationality and racial discriminations, the act of 1952 marked an advance over previous legislation. Unfortunately, however, it also perpetuated many of the old discriminations and added some new ones. President Truman vetoed the act, but Congress passed it over his veto.

Since 1952, the act has engendered severe criticism from many American citizens. The nature of this criticism is given eloquent expression in the 1960 platforms of both the Democratic and Republican Parties.

The Democratic Party plank on immigration in pertinent part states:

> We shall adjust our immigration, nationality and refugee policy to eliminate discrimination and to enable members of scattered families abroad to be united with relatives already in our midst.
>
> The national-origins quota system limiting immigration contradicts the founding principles of this Nation. It is inconsistent with our belief in the rights of man.
>
> The revision of immigration and nationality laws we seek will implement our belief that enlightened immigration, naturalization, and refugee policies and humane administration of them are important aspects of our foreign policy.

The Republican Party plank on the present immigration quota system reads as follows:

> Immigration has been reduced to the point where it does not provide the stimulus to growth that it should, nor are we fulfilling our obligation as a haven for the oppressed. Republican conscience and Republican policy requires that—
>
> The annual number of immigrants we accept be at least doubled.
>
> Obsolete immigration laws be amended by abandoning the outdated 1920 census data as a base and substituting the 1960 census.
>
> The guidelines of our immigration policy be based upon judgment of the individual merit of each applicant for admission and citizenship.

The strictures in the present quota system have made the reunion of families difficult and sometimes impossible. In the conduct of our international relations, the act's discriminatory provisions on national-origins quotas and the Asia-Pacific triangle increasingly come in conflict with our position in world affairs.

The United States need not, however, apologize for our immigration record since 1952. It is a commendable one. Over 2½ million immigrants have been admitted to this country, including nearly 1 million displaced persons, refugees, and escapees. Much progress has also been made in the reunion of families. But this record has not been achieved under the Immigration and Naturalization Act of 1952. It has been achieved in spite of it. The purpose of this bill is to set the record straight, and to bring our immigration statutes in line with our national goals.

The present national origins quota system has not worked. Congress has periodically recognized its shortcomings and has repeatedly enacted special, short-term immigration and refugee legislation. The cumulative effect of this special legislation has so modified our immigration practice that the act of 1952 no longer represents our immigration quota policy. Of the 1½ million quota immigrants authorized during the 1950's, only a million actually entered the United States. However, 1½ million nonquota immigrants were admitted during the same period. In short, out of a total immigration of 2½ million, 3 out of 5 persons were admitted outside the quota provisions of the Immigration and Naturalization Act of 1952.

Through special legislation, the Congress has drastically revised the pattern of immigration envisioned by the act of 1952. Nations with very small quotas have been among the most substantial contributors to recent immigration. Italian immigration, for example, has been three times greater than its quota allotment. Japanese immigration has been over 20 times greater. Immigration from Greece and China has been 16 times the very small number permitted by their quotas.

This transformation of our immigration practice has most desirable results. Thousands of families are reunited, hundreds of thousands of refugees from political and religious persecution are finding an opportunity to create new lives in a free land, and this country profits greatly through the addition of thousands of skilled and talented persons who are contributing to our social and economic growth.

We have demonstrated the vitality of our democratic society and its ability to respond to human needs, but the discriminatory quota provisions of the Immigration and Naturalization Act of 1952 still remain on our books giving offense to peoples of many nations who

are our friends. America's role of leadership in the free world is one of great sensitivity and our position is not enhanced by an immigration policy which implies that some nationalities and some races are less desirable members of the family of man than are others.

Just as world events of 25 years ago forced us to abandon splendid isolation the events of today must move us toward an immigration policy consistent with our philosophy as a free and democratic nation.

America's struggle with totalitarianism is far more than a contest for dominance in world power politics. Above all, it is a struggle for the vindication of democracy's belief in the individual worth of human beings as opposed to the totalitarian concept that individuals have no identity except as components in the political and economic structure of society.

The incongruities of our basic immigration statute deeply trouble those of us who join in the introduction of this new proposal. Until those provisions of our immigration laws which discriminate against certain national and racial groups are eliminated, our laws needlessly provide grist for the propaganda mills of Moscow and Peiping.

The bill which we offer today is not a general revision of the Immigration and Nationality Act. It is concerned only with the number of immigrants to be admitted and the distribution of their selection. It is the result of careful and painstaking study of our immigration practice and experience over the past 15 years. In preparing the bill, we had the invaluable counsel and experience of the American Immigration and Citizenship Conference and its affiliated organizations—the voluntary service agencies and community, civic and labor organizations.

Particular acknowledgment should go to an ad hoc committee of these organizations which has given intensive study to this problem for almost 2 years.

In July 1961 these organizations submitted a statement to the President of the United States which was also circulated to Members of Congress. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that this statement, with the names of the participating organizations, be inserted in the RECORD at this point.

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

JULY 21, 1961.

To the PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES:

We, the undersigned agencies, having a long and continuing interest in American immigration policy, wish to urge you to take the lead in developing a nondiscriminatory, humanitarian immigration policy consistent with and in fulfillment of the immigration plank adopted by the Democratic Party in July 1960 and in harmony with the spirit of the Republican plank also adopted in July 1960. These planks implicitly acknowledge the fact that the present law is discriminatory and impedes the achievement of our national purposes.

We respectfully call your attention to the following goals as being in the national interest:

1. A total number of admissions of quota immigrants based upon one-seventh of 1 percent of the total population of the United States according to the most recent census rather than the present basis of one-sixth of 1 percent of the white population of the United States according to the 1920 census, while retaining nonquota status for the Western Hemisphere.

2. The replacement of the national origins quota system and the Asia Pacific triangle by some formula such as that based on the relative populations of the countries of the world, combined with such factors as actual admissions under the basic immigration law and special immigration legislation during the postwar years.

3. A greater emphasis in legislation on family reunion in the United States by extending nonquota and preference quota status to family members abroad seeking to join their families in the United States.

4. Permanent provision in the basic immigration law for the allocation of a percentage of the total proposed quota to refugees from any refugee area and to persons with special skills needed by our economy.

In view of your long record of concern for better immigration policy, we feel confident that as Chief Executive you will effectively pursue these goals.

Respectfully submitted by the following:

Allegheny County Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.
Amalgamated Clothing Workers of America.
American Council for Emigres in the Professions.
American Council for Nationalities Service.
American Committee on Italian Migration.
American Friends Service Committee.
American Fund for Czechoslovak Refugees.
American Jewish Committee.
American Jewish Congress.
Anti-Defamation League of B'nai B'rith.
Brethren Service Commission.
Church World Service, National Council of Churches of Christ.
Commission on Human Relations, City of Pittsburgh, Pa.
Community Church of New York, Social Action Committee.
Congregational Christian Service Committee.
Council for Christian Action of the Congregational Christian Church.
Governor's Commission on Refugees, Massachusetts.
Immigrants' Service League, Chicago.
International Institute of Gary, Ind.
International Institute, Jersey City.
International Institute of Los Angeles.
International Institute of Minnesota.
International Institute of Providence.
International Institute of San Francisco.
International Institute of Toledo.
International Rescue Committee.
International Social Service, American Branch.
International Union of Electrical, Radio and Machine Workers.
Iuliu Maniu American Romanian Relief Society.
Italian Welfare League.
Japanese American Citizens League.
Jewish War Veterans.
Methodist Committee for Overseas Relief.
Michigan Committee on Immigration.
National Community Relations Advisory Council.
National Conference of Catholic Charities.
National Council of Jewish Women.
National Council, Protestant Episcopal Church.
New York Association for New Americans.
New York Protestant Episcopal City Mission Society.
Polish American Immigration and Relief Committee.
Selfhelp of Emigres from Central Europe.
The United Presbyterian Church in the U.S.A., Committee on Resettlement Services.
Tolstoy Foundation.
Union of American Hebrew Congregations, Social Action Commission.
United Automobile Workers of America, AFL–CIO.
United Hias Service.
United States Committee for Refugees.
United Steelworkers of America.
Young Women's Christian Association of the U.S.A.

Mr. HART. Mr. President, our bill closely follows the recommendations in the above statement. Its major provisions are as follows: 250,000 quota visas are authorized per year, of which 50,000 are to be made available to refugees and/or escapees without regard to quota areas. The remaining 200,000 quota visas are to be allocated to countries under a two-part computation.

First, 80,000 quota visas are to be divided among countries in proportion to the size of their population to world population, but no one country is to get more than 3,000 numbers under this category.

Second, 120,000 quota visas are to be allocated to countries based on the proportion of their immigration to the United States over the past 15 years to total of all immigration to the United States for the same period.

No quota area shall get less than it got under the old law, except that the maximum is 25,000. The minimum quota is 200.

Quotas are allocated to applicants either by country of birth or by country of citizenship, provided he has been domiciled for 10 years or more in the place of citizenship.

All unused quota numbers at the end of the year are pooled and divided among quota areas having a backlog of applicants waiting for immigrant visas. No quota area shall get from this pool a number of visas greater than its regular annual quota and no more than 100,000 numbers may be used from the pool in any one year.

Quotas under the bill will be revised every 5 years based on latest data. Within the quotas 60 percent are available to "blood relatives of a citizen or of an alien lawfully admitted for permanent residence through the third degree of consanguinity, their spouses and children." The remaining 40 percent is available to other qualified immigrants.

Persons born in the Western Hemisphere remain nonquota. Also nonquota status is expanded to include the parents of a U.S. citizen and persons with special skills, including spouse and children.

The bill automatically eliminates the Asia-Pacific triangle provisions.

To provide a more precise understanding of how the proposal would operate, the Visa Division of the Department of State has made a computation of the proposed new quotas.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a table be printed in the RECORD at this point which sets forth the

present immigration quotas, average actual immigration by countries over the last 10 years, the new quotas provided under this bill, and the present number of registrants in oversubscribed quota areas. The table includes those countries which have been the principal contributors to immigration to this country from 1951 to 1960.

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

Comparative table of recent immigration levels and oversubscribed quotas to existing quotas and quotas proposed under 1962 bill, principal countries contributing to recent immigration

	Present quota	Average immigration, 1951–60	Proposed quotas	Immigrants registered oversubscribed quotas
Europe:				
Austria	1,405	2,968	2,595	4,590
Belgium	1,297	1,292	1,710	
Czechoslovakia	2,859	2,880	3,357	
Denmark	1,175	1,370	1,293	3,071
Finland	566	668	792	2,992
France	3,069	3,802	6,172	7,756
Germany	25,814	34,545	25,000	
Greece	308	4,844	3,458	105,659
Hungary	865	6,455	4,556	17,470
Ireland	17,756	6,455	17,756	
Italy	5,666	18,700	15,648	268,723
Latvia	235	1,913	2,292	1,709
Lithuania	384	1,186	1,841	2,286
Netherlands	3,136	4,719	3,902	8,666
Norway	2,364	2,467	2,364	
Poland	6,488	12,798	13,848	57,657
Portugal	438	2,043	1,892	50,559
Rumania	289	1,743	2,441	13,892
Spain	250	1,072	2,614	16,396
Sweden	3,295	1,886	3,295	
Switzerland	1,698	1,719	1,698	3,392
Turkey	225	684	2,367	18,123
United Kingdom	65,361	20,887	25,000	[1] 48,573
U.S.S.R.	2,697	4,650	6,487	8,613
Yugoslavia	942	5,866	5,295	79,732
Asia:				
China	205	3,274	5,335	[2] 2,860 [3] 22,000
India	100	314	3,233	14,057
Indonesia	100	1,012	3,789	8,576
Iran	100	291	1,586	10,384
Iraq	100	190	458	7,320
Israel	100	935	810	15,196
Japan	185	4,467	5,378	8,882
Jordan	100	511	507	3,194
Korea	100	702	2,616	1,192
Lebanon	100	337	365	5,358
Philippines	100	1,809	2,913	8,124
Africa:				
Morocco	100	216	964	5,278
Tunisia	100	137	259	4,518
Union of South Africa	100	232	1,243	3,286
United Arab Republic	100	618	1,670	11,966
Oceania:				
Australia	100	500	1,344	4,982
New Zealand	100	189	397	1,586

[1] Subquota areas:

Antigua	583
Bahamas	762
Barbados	2,923
Bermuda	178
British Guiana	2,827
British Honduras	2,686
British Virgin Islands	886
Grenada	952
Hong Kong	510
Jamaica	25,614
Malta	5,644
Montserrat	424
St. Christopher	1,043
St. Lucia	114
St. Vincent	496
Trinidad	2,931

[2] Whites.
[3] Chinese.

Mr. HART. Mr. President, an examination of the table illustrates that the bill is responsive to demonstrated immigration requirements, and provides increases to a number of countries whose present quotas are totally unrealistic and who previously have been dependent on the special short-term enactments of Congress.

It is my firm belief that this proposal is an equitable and completely practicable approach to immigration policy and practice.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be printed in full at this point in the RECORD and that it lay on the table for 1 week so that other Senators who wish to join in cosponsorship may have an opportunity to do so.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will be printed in the RECORD and will lie on the desk, as requested by the Senator from Michigan.

The bill (S. 3043) to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act, introduced by Mr. HART (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That paragraph (27) of section 101(a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act is amended—

(1) by amending subparagraph (A) to read as follows:

"(A) an immigrant who is the child, spouse, or parent of a citizen of the United States;";

(2) by amending subparagraph (C) to read as follows:

"(C) an immigrant who was born in Canada, the Republic of Mexico, the Republic of Cuba, the Republic of Haiti, the Dominican Republic, the Canal Zone, an independent country of Central or South America, or any of the adjacent islands which becomes an independent country, and the spouse or the child of any such immigrant, if accompanying or following to join him;";

(3) by striking "or" at the end of subparagraph (F);

(4) by striking the period at the end of subparagraph (G) and inserting in lieu thereof a semicolon and "or"; and

(5) by adding the following new subparagraph at the end thereof:

"(H) (i) an immigrant whose services are determined by the Secretary of Labor to be needed urgently in the United States because of the high education, technical training, specialized experience, or exceptional ability of such immigrant and to be substantially beneficial prospectively to the national economy, cultural interests, or welfare of the United States; and (ii) the spouse or the child of any such immigrant, if accompanying or following to join him within a period of one year after he is admitted to the United States for permanent residence.".

SEC. 2. Section 201 of the Immigration and Nationality Act is amended to read as follows:

"NUMERICAL LIMITATIONS; REFUGEE VISAS; ANNUAL QUOTAS; MINIMUM AND MAXIMUM QUOTAS

"SEC. 201. (a) The number of quota immigrants visas to be issued in any fiscal year, except for any such visas to be issued under subsection (e) of this section, shall not exceed two hundred and fifty thousand, of which number (1) fifty thousand immigrant visas shall be made available for issuance in each fiscal year, without regard to the quota of each quota area for such year and the limitations of subsection (c) (1) and (2) of this section, (A) to qualified quota immigrants in a country or area which is neither Communist nor Communist-dominated, who because of persecution, fear of persecution, or military operations are out of their usual place of abode and unable to return thereto, and who have not been firmly resettled, and (B) to the spouse or the child of any such immigrant, if accompanying or following to join him within a period of one year after he is admitted to the United States for permanent residence; (2) eighty thousand visas shall be allotted among the annual quotas of the separate quota areas on the basis of the proportion which the number of inhabitants in each quota area represents of the world population exclusive of those countries specified in section 101(a)(27)(C) of this Act; except that the maximum quota for any quota area allotted under this distribution shall be three thousand; and (3) one hundred and twenty thousand visas shall be allotted among the annual quotas of the separate quota areas on the basis of the proportion which the average annual number of quota and nonquota immigrants admitted to the United States from any such quota area during the period of fifteen consecutive years immediately prior to the effective date of the Immigration and Na-

tionality Act of 1962 represents of the average annual number of quota and nonquota immigrants admitted to the United States during such period: *Provided*, That the minimum annual quota under this Act for any quota area shall be two hundred, and the maximum annual quota under this Act for any quota area shall be 25,000: *Provided further*, That subject to the limitations of the maximum annual quota, in no case shall the annual quota for any quota area allotted under this subsection be less than the annual quota for such area as heretofore determined under the provisions of the Immigration and Nationality Act prior to the effective date of the Immigration and Nationality Act of 1962.

"(b) The determination of the annual quota of any quota area shall be made by the Secretary of State, the Secretary of Commerce, and the Attorney General, jointly. Such officials shall, jointly, report to the President the quota of each quota area, and the President shall proclaim and make known the quotas so reported. Such determination and report shall be made and such proclamation shall be issued as soon as practicable after the date of enactment of the Immigration and Nationality Act of 1962. Quotas proclaimed therein shall take effect on the first day of the fiscal year, or the next fiscal half year, next following the expiration of six months after the date of the proclamation, and until such date the existing quotas proclaimed immediately prior to the effective date of the Immigration Act of 1962 shall remain in effect. After the making of a proclamation under this subsection the quotas proclaimed therein shall continue with the same effect as if specifically stated herein and shall be final and conclusive for every purpose, except (1) insofar as it is made to appear to the satisfaction of such officials and proclaimed by the President, that an error of fact has occurred in such determination or in such proclamation, or (2) in the cases provided for in section 202(d).

"(c) Except as otherwise provided in subsections (a)(1) and (e) of this section, there shall be issued to quota immigrants chargeable to any quota of a quota area (1) no more immigrant visas in any fiscal year than the quota for such year for such quota area, and (2) in any calendar month of any fiscal year, no more immigrant visas than 10 per centum of the quota for such year for such quota area; except that during the last two months of any fiscal year immigrant visas may be issued without regard to the 10 per centum limitation contained herein.

"(d) Nothing in the Act shall prevent the issuance (without increasing the total number of quota immigrant visas which may be issued) of an immigrant visa to an immigrant as a quota immigrant even though he is a nonquota immigrant.

"(e) All quota numbers available in any fiscal year, but not actually used during such fiscal year, shall be assigned to a general pool and made available for distribution in the next following fiscal year for use by qualified quota immigrants of those quota areas which, at the close of the fiscal year immediately preceding the year of authorized distribution, had immigrants registered on quota waiting lists. Each such quota area shall be entitled to a number of the quota numbers assigned to the general pool for use during any fiscal year in the same proportion as the number of immigrants registered, at the close of the preceding fiscal year, on quota waiting lists of such quota area bears to the number of immigrants registered, at the close of the preceding fiscal year, on quota waiting lists of all such quota areas. In no case shall (1) more than 100,000 quota numbers be made available in any fiscal year for distribution from such pool, and (2) the quota numbers distributed to any quota area in any fiscal year from such pool be in excess of the annual quota for such quota area for such year under paragraphs (2) and (3) of subsection (a) of this section. Such quota numbers distributed among such quota areas in any fiscal year shall be made available within each quota area, first for the issuance of immigrant visas to the class specified in paragraph (1) of section 203(a), and second for the issuance of immigrant visas to the class specified in paragraph (2) of section 203(a).

"(f) In the issuance of immigrant visas under clause (1) of subsection (a) of this section, due consideration shall be given to equal distribution as determined by the registered demand."

SEC. 3. Section 202 of the Immigration and Nationality Act is amended to read as follows:

"DETERMINATION OF QUOTA TO WHICH AN IMMIGRANT IS CHARGEABLE

"SEC. 202. (a) Each independent country, self-governing dominion, mandated territory, and territory under the international trusteeship system of the United Nations, other than the United States and its outlying possessions and the countries specified in section 101(a)(27)(C), shall be treated as a separate quota area when approved by the Secretary of State. All other inhabited lands shall be attributed to a quota area specified by the Secretary of State. For the purposes of this Act, the annual quota to which an immigrant is chargeable shall be determined by birth within a quota area, or citizenship of a quota area acquired by such immigrant if he has been domiciled within such area for at least ten years immediately preceding his date of registration on a consular waiting list, except that—

"(1) an alien child, when accompanied by or following to join his alien parent or parents may be charged to the quota of such parent or of either such parent if such parent has received or would be qualified for an immigrant visa, if necessary to prevent the separation of the child from the parent or parents, and if the quota to which such parent has been or would be chargeable is not exhausted for that fiscal year;

"(2) if an alien is chargeable to a different quota from that of his spouse, whom he is accompanying or following to join, the quota to which such alien is chargeable may, if necessary to prevent the separation of husband and wife, be determined by the quota of the spouse, whom he is accompanying or following to join, if such spouse has received or would be qualified for an immigrant visa and if the quota to which such spouse has been or would be chargeable is not exhausted for that fiscal year;

"(3) an alien born in the United States shall be considered as having been born in ject, or if he is not a citizen or subject of the country of which he is a citizen or sub- any country then in the last foreign country in which he had his residence as determined by the consular officer;

"(4) an alien born within any quota area in which neither of his parents was born and in which neither of his parents had a residence at the time of such alien's birth may be charged to the quota area of either parent.

"(b) Any immigrant born in a colony or other component or dependent area of a governing country for which no separate or specific quota has been established, unless a nonquota immigrant as provided in section 101(a)(27) of this Act, shall be chargeable to the quota of the governing country.

"(c) The provision of an immigration quota for a quota area shall not constitute recognition by the United States of the political transfer of territory from one country to another, or recognition of a government not recognized by the United States.

"(d) After the determination of quotas has been made as provided in section 201, revision of the quotas shall be made by the Secretary of State, the Secretary of Commerce, and the Attorney General, jointly, (1) after each period of five years on the basis of the most current authoritative data, and (2) whenever necessary, to provide for any change of boundaries resulting in transfer of territory from one sovereignty to another, a change of administrative arrangements of a colony or other dependent area, or any other political change, requiring a change in the list of quota areas or of the territorial limits thereof. In the case of a revision of quotas after each period of five years, the Secretary of State, the Secretary of Commerce, and the Attorney General shall, jointly, report to the President the quota of each quota area, and the President shall proclaim and make known the quotas so reported. Such determination and report shall be made and such proclamation shall be issued as soon as practicable after the termination of each period of five years. Quotas proclaimed therein shall take effect on the first day of the fiscal year, or the next fiscal half year, next following the expiration of six months after the date of such proclamation, and until such date the existing quotas proclaimed under the immediately preceding proclamation shall remain in effect. After the making of a proclamation under this subsection the quotas proclaimed therein shall continue with the same effect as if specifically stated herein and shall be final and conclusive for every purpose, except (A) insofar as it is made to appear to the satisfaction of such officials and proclaimed by the President, that an error of fact has occurred in such determination or in such proclamation, or (B) in the cases provided for in this subsection. In the case of any change in the territorial limits of quota areas, not requiring a change in the quotas for such areas, the Secretary of State shall, upon recognition of such change, issue appropriate instructions to all consular offices concerning the change in the territorial limits of the quota areas involved. Whenever one or more colonies or other component or dependent areas overseas from the governing country, or one or more quota areas have been subject to a change of administrative arrangements, a change of boundaries, or any other political change, the annual quota of the newly established quota area or the number of visas authorized to be issued under section 202(b), notwithstanding any other provisions of this Act, shall not be less than the sum total of quotas in effect or number of visas authorized for the area immediately preceding the change of administrative arrangements, change of boundaries, or other political change."

SEC. 4. Section 203 of the Immigration and Nationality Act is amended to read as follows:

"ALLOCATION OF IMMIGRANT VISAS WITHIN QUOTAS

"SEC. 203. (a) Immigrant visas to quota immigrants under section 201(a) (2) or (3) shall be allotted in each fiscal year as follows:

"(1) The first 60 per centum of the quota of each quota area for such year, plus any portion of such quota not required for the issuance of immigrant visas to the class specified in paragraph (2), shall be made available for the issuance of immigrant visas first to qualified quota immigrants who are the spouse, children, or parents of an alien lawfully admitted for permanent residence; and any portion of the quota of each quota area for such year available to such immigrants but not required for the issuance of immigrant visas to such immigrants shall be

made available for the issuance of immigrant visas (A) to qualified quota immigrants who are the blood relatives of a citizen or of an alien lawfully admitted for permanent residence, through the third degree of consanguinity, and (B) to qualified quota immigrants who are the spouse or children (including adopted children) of any immigrant described in clause (A) if accompanying or following to join him within a period of one year after such immigrant is admitted to the United States for permanent residence.

"(2) The next 40 per centum of the quota for each quota area for such year, plus any portion of such quota not required for the issuance of immigrant visas to the classes specified in paragraph (1), shall be made available for the issuance of immigrant visas to other qualified quota immigrants chargeable to such quota.

"(b) Quota immigrant visas issued to aliens in the classes designated in paragraphs (1) and (2) of subsection (a) shall, in the case of each quota, be issued to qualified quota immigrants strictly in the chronological order in which such immigrants are registered in each class on quota waiting lists which shall be maintained for each class in accordance with regulations prescribed by the Secretary of State.

"(c) In determining the order for consideration of applications for quota immigrant visas under subsection (a), consideration shall be given first to applications under paragraph (1) and second to applications under paragraph (2).

"(d) Every immigrant shall be presumed to be a quota immigrant until he establishes to the satisfaction of the consular officer, at the time of application for a visa, and to the immigration officers, at the time of application for admission, that he is a nonquota immigrant. Every quota immigrant shall be presumed to be a quota immigrant under paragraph (2) of subsection (a) until he establishes to the satisfaction of the consular officer and the immigration officers that he is entitled to a quota status under paragraph (1) of such subsection."

SEC. 5. (a) The heading of section 204 of the Immigration and Nationality Act is amended by striking "or section 203(a)(1)(A)" and inserting in lieu thereof "101(a)(27)(H)(i)".

(b) The text of section 204 of such Act is amended by striking "section 203(a)(1)(A)" wherever it appears therein and inserting in lieu thereof "101(a)(27)(H)(i)".

SEC. 6. Section 205 of the Immigration and Nationality Act is amended to read as follows:

"PROCEDURE FOR GRANTING NONQUOTA OR QUOTA STATUS BY REASON OF RELATIONSHIP

"SEC. 205. (a) In the case of any alien claiming in his application for an immigrant visa to be entitled to a nonquota immigrant status under section 101(a)(27)(A), or to a quota immigrant status under section 203(a)(1), the consular officer shall not grant such status until he has been authorized to do so as provided in this section.

"(b) Any citizen of the United States claiming that any immigrant is his spouse, child, or parent and that such immigrant is entitled to a nonquota immigrant status under section 101(a)(27)(A), or any alien lawfully admitted for permanent residence claiming that any immigrant is his spouse, child, or parent and that such immigrant is entitled to a quota immigrant status under section 203(a)(1), or any citizen of the United States or any alien lawfully admitted for permanent residence claiming that any immigrant is his relative within the third degree of consanguinity and that such immigrant is entitled to a quota immigrant status under section 203(a)(1)(A), may file a petition with the Attorney General. No petition for nonquota immigrant status in behalf of a child as defined in section 101(b)(1)(F) shall be approved by the Attorney General unless the petitioner establishes to the satisfaction of the Attorney General that the petitioner and spouse will care for such child properly if he is admitted to the United States, and (i) in the case of a child adopted abroad, that the petitioner and spouse personally saw and observed the child prior to or during the adoption proceedings, and (ii) in the case of a child coming to the United States for adoption, that the petitioner and spouse have complied with the preadoption requirements, if any, of the State of such child's proposed residence. The petition shall be in such form and shall contain such information and be supported by such documentary evidence as the Attorney General may by regulations prescribe. The petition shall be made under oath administered by any individual having authority to administer oaths, if executed in the United States, but, if executed outside the United States, administered by an immigration officer or a consular officer.

"(c) After an investigation of the facts in each case the Attorney General shall, if he determines the facts stated in the petition are true and that the alien in respect of whom the petition is made is eligible for a nonquota immigrant status under section 101(a)(27)(A) or for a quota immigrant status under section 203(a)(1), approve the petition and forward one copy thereof to the Department of State. Not more than two such petitions may be approved for one petitioner in behalf of a child as defined in section 101(b)(1)(E) or (F) unless necessary to prevent the separation of brothers and sisters. The Secretary of State shall then authorize the consular officer concerned to grant the nonquota immigrant status, or quota immigrant status, as the case may be. Notwithstanding the provisions of this subsection, no petition shall be approved if the alien previously has been accorded, by reason of marriage determined by the Attorney General to have been entered into for the purpose of evading the immigration laws, a nonquota status under section 101(a)(27)(A) as the spouse of a citizen of the United States or of an alien lawfully admitted for permanent residence.

"(d) Nothing in this section shall be construed to entitle an immigrant, in respect of whom a petition under this section is approved, to enter the United States as a nonquota immigrant under section 101(a)(27)(A) if upon his arrival at a port of entry in the United States he is found not to be entitled to such classification, or to enter the United States as a quota immigrant under section 203(a)(1) if upon his arrival at a port of entry in the United States he is found not to be entitled to such classification."

SEC. 7. Section 212 (a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act is amended by striking, in paragraph (14), the following: "(i) those aliens described in the nonpreference category of section 203 (a) (4), (ii)".

SEC. 8. Section 201 of the table of contents of the Immigration and Nationality Act is amended to read as follows:

"Sec. 201. Numerical limitations; refugee visas; annual quotas; minimum and maximum quotas."

SEC. 9. Section 204 of the table of contents of the Immigration and Nationality Act is amended to read as follows:

"Sec. 204. Procedure for granting immigrant status under section 101(a)(27)(F)(i) or 101(a)(27)(I)(i)."

SEC. 10. Section 205 of the table of contents of the Immigration and Nationality Act is amended to read as follows:

"Sec. 205. Procedure for granting nonquota or quota status by reason of relationship."

SEC. 11. This Act may be cited as the "Immigration and Nationality Act of 1962."

Mr. MANSFIELD subsequently said: Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the bill to amend the Immigration and Naturalization Act, introduced today by the Senator from Michigan [Mr. HART] be held at the desk for 1 week for additional cosponsors.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

RIGHT OF EMINENT DOMAIN TO CARRIERS OF COAL BY PIPELINE

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, by request, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to amend the Interstate Commerce Act to grant to any carrier of coal by pipeline, subject to any of the provisions of part 1 of the act, the right of eminent domain, and for other purposes. I ask unanimous consent that a letter from the President of the United States requesting the proposed legislation be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the letter will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 3044) to amend the Interstate Commerce Act to grant to any carrier of coal by pipeline, subject to any of the provisions of part 1 of the act, the right of eminent domain, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. MAGNUSON, by request, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Commerce.

The letter presented by Mr. MAGNUSON is as follows:

MARCH 20, 1962.

HON. LYNDON B. JOHNSON,
President of the U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: I am transmitting for the consideration of the Congress a draft bill to facilitate the construction of pipelines to transport coal slurry in interstate commerce. The proposed legislation grants the right of eminent domain to the builders of any carrier of coal by pipeline which is subject to any of the provisions of part 1 of the Interstate Commerce Act and which the Secretary of the Interior has found to be required by public convenience and necessity.

The coal resources of our Nation constitute one of our greatest assets. They launched our industrial development and they provide a great reservoir of energy. They can be a stimulus to our economic growth.

In recent years, however, many of our coal mine communities have suffered from reduced operations flowing from the decline in coal consumption. This new method of transportation offers possibilities for renewed vigor and hope for increased economic strength for the coal industry. If costs can be lowered in this fashion, all segments of the economy will benefit.

I understand that plans have already been made for a pipeline that will carry coal from the West Virginia coalfields to the eastern seaboard. However, unless a right-of-way can be obtained, these plans will be postponed and may ultimately have to be discontinued. The legislation will permit the prompt implementation of those plans.

Pipeline transportation of coal may also play an important role in the economies of areas other than West Virginia. It is being studied in the Rocky Mountain region for use in west coast markets. Already coal is being transported by a 100-mile long pipeline in Ohio. The technical problems are

being overcome; the economics of operation are known; private enterprise stands ready to invest the necessary capital. The power to acquire the right-of-way is needed. This legislation will grant to the carrier of coal by pipeline the same privilege of eminent domain that the carrier of natural gas already has.

I urge that favorable and prompt consideration be given to this legislation.

Sincerely,

JOHN F. KENNEDY.

OPERATION OF EXPERIMENTAL OIL-SHALE DEMONSTRATION FACILITY NEAR RIFLE, COLO.

Mr. MOSS. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to take possession of the experimental oil-shale demonstration facility near Rifle, Colo., and through contract or lease to a public or private organization to encourage the use of the plant for further research in the mining and utilization of oil shale. Because of a jurisdictional dispute between the Department of the Interior and the Department of the Navy, this facility is now standing idle, and the country is being deprived of the valuable information which could be developed there on the economic potential of our oil-shale reserves.

It has been estimated that the oil-shale deposits of Colorado, Utah, and Wyoming contain more than 1,100 billion barrels of petroleumlike material which can be converted into products similar to petroleum. They represent a tremendous supplemental source to the present supply of natural crude oil—and a source we may some day need.

It was recognized in World War II that this Nation did not have an inexhaustible supply of domestic petroleum reserves, and could not continue indefinitely to meet liquid fuel requirements. In 1944, therefore, the Congress passed the Synthetic Liquid Fuels Act—30 U.S.C. 321–325—which authorized the Bureau of Mines of the Department of the Interior to conduct research on and develop methods for producing liquid fuel from oil shale and coal. Since the oil-shale deposits in Wyoming, Colorado, and Utah are considered to have the greatest economic potential in the country, the Bureau of Mines located their oil-shale experimental station at Rifle, Colo., and their research center for laboratory studies in Laramie, Wyo.

A good background of technology for mining and producing shale oil and usable products was developed in the Rifle experimental plant between 1945 and 1955, but in 1955 the act and its extensions expired, and the mining phases of the work at Rifle were terminated. Research has been continued at the Laramie Laboratory by the Bureau of Mines under its regular appropriations.

With no agency authorized to encourage experimental work in oil shales at Rifle, the plant was placed in standby condition, where it now remains. There are other bills pending before the Senate which would break the jurisdictional void, but because they deal with other aspects of the oil-shale problem, they enter additional areas of controversy, and no action has taken on them. My bill is designed only to remove the Rifle plant from this jurisdictional void, and clear the way for the Department of the Interior, subject to the approval of the President, to make the Rifle facility available for further research in the mining of and the utilization of oil shale through contract or lease to public or private organizations. I believe we must move off dead center.

I am hopeful that once the installation is cleared, private industrial organizations will be interested in using it. Many of them cooperated with the Bureau of Mines when the experimental work at Rifle began, and are now conducting or sponsoring research and development on their own.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD information developed for me by the Department of the Interior, and specifically in most instances by the Bureau of Mines, on the technology of oil-shale mining and refining, on the uses and byproducts of oil shale, and on estimates of Green River oil-shale reserves, those with which the Rifle installation would deal. I believe this information will be invaluable in assessing the bill I am introducing.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the information will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 3049) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to take possession of the experimental oil-shale demonstration facility near Rifle, Colo., and through contract or lease to a public or private organization to encourage the use of the plant for further research in the mining and utilization of oil shale, introduced by Mr. Moss, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

The information presented by Mr. Moss is as follows:

TECHNOLOGY

MINING

Mining methods developed by the Bureau at its oil shale mine near Rifle, Colo., are applicable to cliff-face locations, which are numerous in the Colorado and Green River drainage areas. Experimental mining with commercial-size equipment was demonstrated on a 73-foot section of the mahogany zone. Preliminary to the mine development, physical tests were made on the rock to determine design factors. A specially instrumented test room, 80 by 200 feet, was mined out directly under the selected roofstone to confirm these data. The Bureau then devised a system of mining 60-foot rooms on three levels with 60-foot-square shale pillars to support the roof. The three levels were an advance heading 27 feet high followed by two 23-foot-high benches. The method later was modified to a 2-level system with a 39-foot advance heading and a 34-foot bench to achieve lower costs and a more uniform shale grade.

The wide rooms and high roof permitted the use of efficient mechanized, large-scale equipment. Several specialized machines were developed, including a mobile air compressor, multiple-percussion-drill heading and benching jumbos, and mobile units for loading blast holes and for scaling operations. Rotary drilling studies showed results superior to percussion drilling for vertical holes and indicated similar possibilities for horizontal drilling.

One induced and two unintentional roof falls demonstrated the need for caution in mining oil shale. The test room data indicated a progressive deterioration in the roof that can end in its failure. This condition may be aggravated in weathered areas (less than about 200 feet from the cliff face). The minimum roof life to date has been over 2 years, and in a normal commercial operation, a large unit area would be mined out in less than 60 days, and then closed off to entry.

Extensive information developed and reported by the Bureau serves as a basic foundation for oil-shale mining. The information has been applied directly by many companies in evaluating the economics of a possible oil-shale industry.

CRUSHING

The Bureau and several cooperating industrial companies made crushing tests on Green River oil shale using crushers of the jaw, gyratory, impact, and roll types. These experiments provided design data and defined some of the crushing problems. This shale is a tough, elastic material that tends to form slabs that present screening and handling problems. Some studies were made of fine grinding—to supply a thousand tons of minus three-sixteenth-inch shale to the Standard Oil Co. for the fluidized retort tests, which the Bureau did cooperatively with that firm.

RETORTING

Retorting of Green River oil shale was done experimentally by the Bureau staff at Rifle on N–T–U, Royster, gas-flow, Hayes, counterflow, and gas-combustion retorts. The entrained-solids retorts, and a thermal solution process studies were conducted at Laramie. The gas combustion process was the subject of an intensive development program at Rifle. This retort has a vertical, refractory-lined vessel into the top of which crushed shale is charged and moves downward as a bed by gravity. This proved to be the most promising of all the retorts investigated. In the gas combustion retort heat is furnished by internal combustion and is transferred by direct gas-to-solids heat exchange.

The novel combination of the functions of retorting, combustion, and heat exchange results in a high retorting rate and excellent thermal efficiencies. Two unique features of this process are the recovery of oil as a cooled mist and no requirement of water as a coolant. This is important in the water-scarce western oil shale areas. The process was studied in three sizes of pilot plants, the largest at rates slightly over 200 tons of shale per day, and the others 30 and 6 tons per day respectively.

Much was learned about equipment design, effects of process conditions, and internal mechanisms of retorting, combustion, and oil-mist formation. However, the work was not brought to completion and extensive additional work would be necessary to complete the development and have a process of large commercial size that would be reliable.

Other organizations also have studied retorting. The Socony Vacuum Oil Co. (now Socony Mobil) studied the application of the Thermofor catalytic cracking equipment to oil-shale retorting. Standard Oil Co. (New Jersey) conducted retorting tests on a modified two-vessel, fluid catalytic cracking pilot plant. In 1957–58 the Union Oil Co. of California erected a large pilot model of a continuous, underfed, countercurrent, internal combusion retort near Grand Valley, Colo. This company reported a throughput of 1,200 tons of shale per day. The Oil Shale

Corp. through the Denver Research Institute has conducted tests with the Aspeco process, devised in Sweden. Only limited technical data have been released by these companies.

Hundreds of other retorting processes have been patented, but few have reached a pilot-plant stage of development. Large quantities of shale were mined and crushed by the Union Oil Co. of California in its Grand Valley, Colo., project. Some of these crushing data have been made available.

Oil shale customarily is considered only as a petroleum supplement, but some research has been conducted on producing high British thermal unit gases by hydrogasification of its organic matter. This process would fit oil shale into that part of the energy use pattern now supplied largely from natural gas and currently accounting for about 30 percent of the total energy consumed in the United States.

As mining, crushing, and retorting oil shale make up about 60 percent of the cost of producing shale oil, consideration has been given to retorting the shale in place. Sinclair Oil and Gas Co. conducted a field test on such a process. In Sweden an electrothermal method has been in operation for many years

Numerous patents have been issued on other in situ methods. The Bureau of Mines has proposed a cooperative experiment with the Atomic Energy Commission and industry wherein a nuclear device would be used to fracture large tonnages of shale, and attempts would be made to produce shale oil by in situ combustion of the fractured shale.

Problems and costs involved in refining shale oil produced by thermal retorting encourage study of other methods for converting shale organic matter to oil of better quality. The Bureau of Mines is investigating the use of micro-organisms for obtaining beneficial changes in the organic matter and is participating in a cooperative experiment to determine the effects of nuclear and other radiations on the organic matter.

REFINING

Crude shale oil from retorts designed to obtain a maximum yield of oil contains only a small quantity of distillate in the gasoline-boiling range. However, fuel oils, both distillate and residual, can be prepared readily from this type of crude, although the distillate fuels usually require chemical or other treatment to meet specifications.

Gasoline and diesel fuel in satisfactory yield and quantity to meet specifications for such products were obtained by thermal cracking and low-temperature chemical treatment in the Bureau's experimental refinery at Rifle, Colo. Poor yields of gasoline were obtained by catalytic cracking in the laboratory because of the poisoning effect on the catalysts of shale oil nitrogen compounds.

Hydrogenation is a good process for removing the sulfur, nitrogen, and oxygen from the oil, saturating it, and producing excellent yields of jet, diesel, and distillate fuels of high quality. Hydogenated oils also are satisfactory charging stocks for catalytic cracking and reforming processes and may be suitable for use in manufacturing lubricants.

Waxes having properties similar to petroleum waxes can be separated from shale-oil fractions by conventional processes. Some treatment may be required to obtain products of desired specifications.

Asphalts prepared from shale oil differ from straight-run petroleum asphalts. However, satisfactory road-surfacing materials were prepared by reduction of cracked residuum and used with excellent results on roads at the Bureau's Rifle, Colo., installation.

Shale-oil pitch and coke were found to be suitable and additives to coking coal to improve the quality of blast furnace coke. These materials were of interest also to manufacturers of electrodes and carbon brushes.

USES

Shale oil will be utilized in much the same manner as petroleum, with the major portion consumed in producing heat and power. The present use pattern for petroleum, suggests the wide range of possible outlets for shale-oil products.

BYPRODUCTS

Because shale oil differs in composition from most petroleums, converting it to some products may result in byproducts not commonly obtained from petroleum, at least in as large quantities. Among these may be phenols, pyridines, and ammonia. Others, also commonly obtained from petroleum, may be hydrogen sulfide or sulfur, and olefinic and aromatic hydrocarbons.

In addition to byproducts from shale-oil processing, others will result from the retorting process. From internal-combustion retorts, large volumes of low British thermal unit gas will be obtained. Other retorts will produce gases rich in hydrogen, hydrocarbon gases, carbon dioxide, and hydrogen sulfide. Among the hydrocarbon gases, ethylene, propylene, and other olefins of interest to the petrochemical industry may be found. All retorting processes will discharge spent shale, which consists largely of the inorganic components of oil shale. This material may find uses in special situations.

RESERVES

Recent estimates of the Green River oil-shale reserves, the principal oil-shale deposits in the United States, are as follow: Continuous sections of these oil shales in Colorado that are at least 15 feet thick and average 15 gallons of oil a ton represent about 1 trillion barrels of oil in place; included in these 15-gallon-a-ton sections are richer sections averaging 25 gallons of oil a ton representing 400 billion barrels of oil in place; in Utah, the 25-gallon-a-ton sections, 15 or more feet thick, represent 120 billion barrels of oil in place, and those in Wyoming represent about 12 billion barrels of oil in place. It should be noted that the ultimate recovery of shale oil from the deposits may be less than the indicated potential reserve, depending upon the methods used in mining and processing.

By cooperative effort, extensive information has been obtained on the size and oil-yield potential of part of the Green River oil shales. This cooperation involved the determination of oil yields by the Bureau of Mines on about 60,000 oil-shale samples provided by companies engaged in evaluating their oil-shale properties or drilling for oil and gas. The Geological Survey of the Department of the Interior uses these data for resource evaluations. As a result, reliable information is available on the extent and thickness of oil-shale sections averaging 25 and 15 gallons of oil per ton in Garfield County, Colo., and along the eastern edge of Uintah County, Utah. Additional sampling and geologic data are needed to appraise the more deeply buried Green River oil shales in Uintah County, Utah; Rio Blanco County, Colo.; and Sweetwater County, Wyo. Similarly, additional studies are necessary to estimate the oil-yield potential of oil shales of other deposits in the United States.

EXPENDITURES

In the fiscal years 1945 to 1956, inclusive, the expenditure from Federal appropriations on the Rifle oil shale mining, crushing, retorting, and shale oil refining research and development studies was a total of $17.82 million. Expenses for maintenance and standby since cessation of work at the Rifle facilities from the beginning of fiscal year 1957 and estimated to the close of the current fiscal year (1962) amount to $739,000. Of this amount, $204,000 was funds supplied by the Navy Department in fiscal year 1957.

Since 1956, normal deterioration of the Bureau's installation at Rifle has occurred, and reconditioning would be required before any experimental program could be resumed. During the past few years much basic information about oil shale and shale oil has been acquired through the Bureau's laboratory-scale research at Laramie, Wyo., and modest technologic advances have been made through oil-shale research by industry, but no commercial application has been made to utilize the vast potential of the Nation's oil-shale resources. During the same period, considerable strides have been made in the petroleum refining and process industries on the science and technology upon which shale oil processing is most closely based.

CIVIL AIR PATROL IN ALASKA

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President, twice during the month of February 1960, I addressed to the attention of the Senate the problems of air safety, search, and rescue in Alaska. On the second of these two occasions I introduced legislation which would have given permanent legal status to the Air Rescue Service of the U.S. Air Force, assigning to it the responsibility of rendering assistance to persons who are in distress as the result of military and nonmilitary aircraft accidents.

This bill, S. 3122, of the 86th Congress failed of enactment. As a result, the announced plan of the Department of the Air Force to deactivate four of the six operational units of the Air Rescue Service was carried out. One of these four deactivated units, the 71st Air Rescue Squadron, was based in Alaska. The loss of its service to the military and civilian flying community in the 49th State was seen by the airminded population of Alaska as a serious threat to safety.

It was seen by some, however, as a challenge as well.

Meeting this challenge was the singular goal of the officers and men of the Alaska wing, Civil Air Patrol. The manner in which they have met it exemplifies the finest tradition of community service. The record shows that the CAP in Alaska, with unbelievable speed, moved to meet the unattended needs apparent after the withdrawal of official military rescue operations forces.

In 1959, the Civil Air Patrol in Alaska flew only 71 missions while the Air Force and other individuals flew 244. The following year—the year in which the 71st Air Rescue Squadron was deactivated—the CAP flew 191 missions while others flew 163. In 1961, the number of CAP missions soared to 239, nearly as many as the U.S. Air Force flew while its rescue squadron was fully operational. In the same year 232 missions were flown by the Air Force and others.

The CAP does receive Federal assistance. Surplus property is made available through the Department of Defense and the Government supplies fuel to these volunteers for Air Force authorized search and rescue flights. But much of the expense is borne by the members themselves with some additional financial aid by the State of Alaska. During 1961, CAP members raised $25,000 through special fundraising activities.

This amount was matched with an equal amount made available by the Legislature of Alaska. Dues paid by the members of the Alaska wing added $7,000 to the CAP treasury.

Mr. President, Alaskans may be justly proud to observe that the rescue missions flown by the Alaska Civil Air Patrol equalled about one-third of all the missions flown by CAP units nationally. And, as if these missions were not enough of an accomplishment, search and rescue is not the only area in which the members of the 32 local units of the Alaska wing have distinguished themselves.

The organization sponsored an aerospace workshop in 1961 with Air Force and State support; 82 adult students, representing 9 States and Newfoundland attended the 4-week school, receiving graduate credit from the University of Alaska. The course concerned current aerospace developments and included such topics as "Aircraft in Flight"; "Power for Aircraft"; "Airports"; "Airways and Electronics"; "Navigation and the Weather"; the "Problems of Airpower"; and the "Dawning Space Age."

Dr. Roland Spaulding, of New York University, directed the workshop and among distinguished guest lecturers was space expert, Dr. Wernher von Braun, Director of the George C. Marshall Space Flight Center at Huntsville, Ala.

In every possible way, the CAP is doing a vital job in the development of Alaska flight safety and Alaska community improvement. The 365 teenage boys and girls in the cadet program of the Alaska wing have performed every sort of community service. Cadets at Kotzebue even arranged for rubbish collection and disposal in the local community while the Elmendorf Air Force Base cadets helped to construct a demonstration fallout shelter in downtown Anchorage. These and other services—far too numerous to mention—have flowed from CAP training in community responsibility and citizenship.

Alaskans are not simply proud of the Alaska wing of the Civil Air Patrol. They are grateful as well to the 1,000 members of this Alaska organization which has dedicated itself to service and air safety in the 49th State, under the command of Col. James E. Carter.

I ask unanimous consent that there be printed, immediately following these remarks, a list of the men and women who command units of the Alaska wing, CAP, along with a letter written Wing Commander Carter by Alaska Gov. William Egan.

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

LIST OF MEN AND WOMEN WHO COMPOSE THE ALASKA WING OF THE CIVIL AIR PATROL

Alaska wing headquarters: Col. James E. Carter, commander; Lt. Col. Roman Malach, executive officer; Lt. Col. Robert Livesay, USAF liaison officer.

Alaska wing unit commanders: Ralph Warren, southeastern group; Clyde Lewis, Anchorage senior squadron; Sam Richards, Anchorage cadet squadron; R. Farnsworth, Bethel senior squadron; Marian Nilsson, Big Delta composite squadron; James Walker, Clear senior squadron; Francis Fallert, Copper Valley composite squadron; Victor Rhine, Cordova composite squadron; Anton Merly, eagle flight; Don DeFoe, Elmendorf cadet squadron; H. Hughes, Ben Eielson cadet squadron; Gordon Wear, Fairbanks composite squadron; Wil Russell, Galena, senior squadron; Charles Hilbish, Homer composite squadron; John Benson, Juneau cadet squadron; Glenn Kipp, Kenai composite squadron; Verlyn Geriene, Kodiak composite squadron; Harold Lie, Kotzebue composite squardon; John Spikes, Mount Edgecumbe composite squadron; M. Boslet, Northway senior squadron; R. Workman, Orion cadet squadron; Howard Luther, Palmer composite squadron; Roald Norheim, Petersburg senior squadron; Russ Painter, Seward composite squadron; Walter Trent, Sitka senior squadron; Frank Ryman, Yakutat senior squardon.

JUNEAU, ALASKA, *December 24, 1961.*

To: Commander of Civil Air Patrol, Alaska, Col. James E. Carter:

In no other State in the Nation is the mission of the Civil Air Patrol as important as it is in Alaska. Almost daily we read that the courageous men and women of the CAP have been on a mission of mercy, rescue, or service, sacrificing their time and energies for the good of someone in distress.

I want to extend to all of the men and women of the CAP the heartfelt thanks of all Alaskans and my personal best wishes for the holiday season.

WILLIAM A. EGAN,
Governor of Alaska.

THE TRADE EXPANSION PROGRAM

Mr. SMITH of Massachusetts. Mr. President, in considering the President's trade program, all of us in Congress are interested in its impact on our State and region. I am happy to say that for New England we are beginning to get hard answers to this question.

The New England Council for Economic Development has for several months been conducting a study on the impact of foreign trade on New England. The council includes in its membership almost all of the important industries in our region. The council has always been most zealous in protecting and enhancing our region's interest.

The council, made up of practical businessmen, can certainly not be considered idealistic or unaware of the practical realities of day-to-day business. For these reasons, I think it is most significant that the research advisory committee of the New England council predicts that New England has more to gain than other regions from the expansion of exports contemplated by the President's program. The committee also concludes that the President's program will have little adverse effect on those New England industries, particularly vulnerable to import competition, because of the fact that their products are not on the dominant suppliers list.

The research advisory committee, after making case studies of representative New England firms in various fields, says:

The striking conclusion which emerges from our study is that parts of the woolen, footwear, and silverware industries in New England are not especially vulnerable to competition from imports. This is because a part of their business is a fashion and merchandising business, which present major difficulties to the foreign manufacturer.

Because of the importance of this report to our region, I ask unanimous consent to insert the most significant excerpts of this report in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

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

THE TRADE EXPANSION PROGRAM AND ITS MEANING FOR NEW ENGLAND

FOREWORD

The "Trade Expansion Program and Its Meaning for New England," written by Harold van B. Cleveland, represents an analysis of available data by a special foreign trade task force under the auspices of the New England Council's research advisory committee.

Last fall, the New England Council's executive vice president, Gardner A. Caverly, asked the research advisory committee to prepare a report on the impact of the European Economic Community and of the newly proposed foreign trade legislation on the New England economy. The chairman of the research advisory committee, Richard M. Alt, director of research, New England Mutual Life Insurance Co., asked the following members to serve with him on a special task force to fulfill this assignment: Harold van B. Cleveland, counsel, John Hancock Mutual Life Insurance Co.; Robert W. Eisenmenger, acting director of research, Federal Reserve Bank of Boston; Richard E. Ward, international economist, Federal Reserve Bank of Boston; and Rudolph W. Hardy, director of economic research, New England Council. In addition, Prof. Don D. Humphrey, of the Fletcher School of Law and Diplomacy, Tufts University, served as a consultant.

* * * * *

III. The economic impact of tariff reduction

If the United States and the Common Market make major tariff concessions to each other, what will the effect be on the national economy? What effect on the economy of New England?

A selective lowering of tariffs and an expansion of trade with Europe would be generally beneficial to U.S. industry and to the American consumer. The effect of tariffs and other artificial barriers to trade is to cause labor, capital, and management to be used less efficiently, thus reducing the Nation's real output and income. Likewise tariffs tend to limit the consumer's choice, causing him to accept a less desired and possibly inferior domestic product in place of the foreign product he might have bought if the tariff had not raised its price.

The productivity of each worker in the 65 principal U.S. exporting industries is 50 percent higher (measured in terms of value added per worker) than in the industries which face serious competition from imports and which are protected by high tariffs.[1] Wages in the exporting industries are also somewhat higher than in the highly protected industries, and the exporting industries are generally faster growing and technologically more progressive. The Nation's economy will therefore be substantially better off to the extent that employment in the exporting industries expands at the expense of employment in the protected industries as the result of a tariff agreement with the Common Market. The American consumer's range of choice will also be wider and he will get more for his money.

Of course, industrial efficiency and the satisfaction of consumers' wants are not the only considerations in making tariff policy. Some tariffs may be needed to protect industries important to national defense. Some may be needed, on a temporary basis at least, to avoid serious reduction of output and

[1] Beatrice N. Vaccara, "Employment and Output in Protected Manufacturing Industries" (Brookings Institution, Washington, D.C., 1960), p. 71.

employment in industries which face competition from imports and whose manpower is unable to find alternative employment. Yet there is no avoiding the fact that the main effect of tariffs is neither to strengthen national defense nor to prevent hardship, but to protect inefficiency.

Many American businessmen seem hardly aware of the existence and importance of export markets. Yet exports already play a large and growing role in our economy. Labor Department figures for 1960 show that 7.7 percent of all employees in manufacturing produce directly or indirectly for export.[2] Indeed, the majority of our industries share directly or indirectly in exports. Reductions in the Common Market tariff and increased European dollar earnings due to tariff concessions by the United States would therefore benefit a wide segment of American manufacturing.

From the figures we have been able to obtain, it appears that New England would share more than proportionately in these gains. The proportion of New England manufacturing employment which is engaged directly or indirectly in exports is larger (8.4 percent) than for the Nation as a whole (7.7 percent). Moreover, manufacturing is substantially more important in New England than in the country at large. Reduction of Common Market tariffs on manufactured goods would therefore increase wage payments, employment and production in New England at least as much as, and possibly more than, in the country as a whole. The following table shows some of these relationships.

Manufacturing employment directly and indirectly related to exports in 1960: United States and New England

	United States	Northeast	Northeast as percent of United States
Total manufacturing employment thousands	16,654.7	1,446.0	8.7
Manufacturing employment directly attributed to exports thousands	640.6	60.2	9.4
Percent of manufacturing employment directly attributed to exports	3.8	4.2	
Manufacturing employment indirectly attributed to exports thousands	647.0	60.8	9.4
Percent of manufacturing employment indirectly attributed to exports	3.9	4.2	

Source: U.S. Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics, "Domestic Employment Attributable to U.S. Exports, 1960" (January 1962), and Federal Reserve Bank of Boston, except the figures for indirect manufacturing employment in New England attributed to exports, which are the writer's estimates.

What industries would be primarily affected by increased export opportunities and by new competition from imports under the trade expansion program?

The central feature of the program and the first step in carrying it out, according to present indications, will be the negotiation with the Common Market of a general tariff reduction for products on the dominant supplier list. A hypothetical dominant supplier list based on 1960 trade figures appears on page 50. [Not printed in RECORD.] The table suggests that a general reduction of the Common Market tariff would benefit American exporters of aircraft, coal and coke, organic chemicals, metal working machinery, other industrial machinery, electric machinery, automobiles and trucks, office machinery, and medical and pharmaceutical products. These are products we already sell in large quantities to Western Europe and would doubtless sell in still larger quantities if the Common Market's tariffs were substantially reduced. New England industry is well represented in most of these categories.

A list of 57 New England exporting industries may be found in the table below. In 1958, these 57 industries employed some 330,000 persons in New England—nearly a quarter of New England's total employment in manufacturing.

Within the broad product categories of the dominant supplier list the particular things we produce more cheaply than Europe, or in which we produce superior products owing to technological leadership or more rapid product innovation, will be the chief beneficiaries of reductions in the Common Market's external tariff. Conversely, where our costs are higher, our European competitors will usually be the stronger in their own markets and, if the U.S. tariff is reduced sufficiently, in our markets as well.

Some of these items are in the product categories in which we are also strong exporters. The table on page 50 [not printed in RECORD] shows that our main imports from Western Europe in the dominant supplier categories were automobiles, paints and pigments, office machinery, agricultural machinery, industrial machinery, and electric machinery.

American wages are two to four times wages in Britain and western continental Europe. Nevertheless, our industries produce a wide range of manufactures at cost substantially below European costs. For labor costs are not determined by wage rates but by the relation between wages and the productivity of labor. And the average productivity of European labor is as much lower, proportionally, than the average productivity of American labor as European wages are lower than American wages.

In fact, this relationship appears to hold true among all the industrial countries, and the reason is not far to seek. For a country's general wage level is determined by the average productivity of its labor. Or to put it a little differently, the productivity of a nation's labor determines what wages employers can afford to pay.

It follows that no country has a general competitive advantage for all or most of its exports over other countries, however low its wage level. The argument which always crops up in tariff debates that a general reduction of tariffs would produce a flood of cheap imports of all kinds is thus without foundation in economic theory or experience.

The productivity of labor varies widely in all countries from industry to industry, and within industries from product to product. Wages, on the other hand, are more uniform. This is the main reason why the United States (or any other country) produces some goods (those in which its productivity is relatively high) more cheaply than foreign competitors, while other industries (those in which labor productivity is relatively low) are vulnerable to foreign competition unless protected by tariffs. If, then, one would assess the effect of tariff reduction, something must be said about the causes of differences in labor productivity among our own industries and in comparison with those of Western Europe.

The productivity of labor is, of course, affected by many things but above all by the amount of capital plant and equipment used, and by its technological level. In the high wage American economy, management has a strong incentive to substitute capital for labor and to introduce improved equipment as rapidly as it becomes available, in order to keep labor costs down. Firms which do this consistently generally have little to fear from imports and are usually strong competitors abroad.

Of course, all industries are not equally able to substitute capital for labor and to improve continually the technical level of their equipment. Some industries seem to have exhausted the possibilities of advance in production techniques. In others, markets may be static or declining or profits may be too low to make modernization feasible.

In general, however, our large markets make mass-production methods possible, which in turn makes possible the use of the more expensive, specialized, high-speed equipment which cuts labor costs per unit of output way down. Large markets which are also growing encourage the rapid replacement of older equipment with more advanced and productive machinery. Because we have the largest national market and the highest living standards in the world, we are therefore able to produce many products at costs lower than our European competitors. Automatic electrical household appliances are one among a great many examples. They are mass produced in this country at costs well below European costs. Automatic appliances are still a luxury in Europe and the market is too small to permit mass-production techniques.

The European market for some products, however, is large and growing fast. The Common Market already produces more bicycles, motorcycles and small cars than the United States. It will soon exceed the United States in total production of automobiles. Portable typewriters are produced in Italy and Switzerland on a volume basis. Thus, despite Europe's substantially lower income per capita, certain European manufacturers are already sold to mass markets and are produced by mass-production techniques.

Given Europe's lower wages, products of this kind can be sold at prices below American prices, as shown by increasing U.S. imports of the items mentioned. Tariff cuts would result in further increases. Japan, too, now produces a number of products on a volume basis, including radios and transistors, and sells them here in substantial quantities, and would sell more if our tariffs were lower.

As European incomes grow and as the Common Market creates a single continental market in place of several national markets, new opportunities to introduce volume-production techniques in Europe will appear. As this happens, the Common Market's competitive strength will increase in some lines. But at the same time, rising income means rising wages and rising labor costs in other lines, where productivity happens to be growing less rapidly than the average. This will open up new opportunities for U.S. exporters who are alert to them.

Thus, as Europe's income and wages continue to rise the character of our mutual trade will also change. It will consist less than at present of the exchange of mass-produced American products for labor-intensive European goods and more of the exchange of specialties between trading partners more nearly equal in technology. The composition of our trade with Western Europe in the dominant supplier categories, as shown in the table on page 50, suggests the extent to which this is true already.

The major part of the manufactured goods we import from Europe are still not mass produced, however. They are sold here at competitive prices (if the tariff is not too high) because the production methods used by competing producers in this country are not sufficiently labor saving as compared with European methods to offset lower European wages. Such tariff-protected industries as

[2] See U.S. Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics, "Domestic Employment Attributable to U.S. Exports" (January 1962), table 5.

textiles, footwear, canned seafood, leather products, wood products, cutlery and silverware (to name only products which compete with products of New England industries) are of this kind. In the main, however, these imports are not included in the dominant supplier list and may not therefore be the subject of tariff negotiations with the Common Market, at least for the present.

We import other goods because nothing really comparable is made here—Italian handicrafts and British sports cars, for example. In these cases no competing domestic producer is directly affected. Similarly, a large and growing part of U.S. exports consists of goods which are not produced in comparable quality abroad. These are mainly the result of technological leadership. The aircraft engine industry, which employs some 42,000 persons in New England, is a good example. American aircraft engines owe their competitive strength in foreign markets not to price but to technical excellence and advanced design. Many similar examples can be found in most of the dominant supplier categories. Reduction of European tariffs would mean an increase in many U.S. exports of this kind.

Here again it is our own mass markets and high consumption which help create export opportunities. Our larger domestic markets make it economical for manufacturers to install new and more productive kinds of industrial machinery, such as high-speed, automatic machine tools and electronic computers. New kinds of industrial equipment tend therefore to be developed first in the United States, which gives American manufacturers of such equipment a solid export lead as demand develops abroad.

Likewise, our consumer goods industries develop every year hundreds of new products, some of which find ready export markets. Another unique characteristic of American industry is the stress on continuing service to customers. American firms doing business abroad frequently find that they have a competitive edge over European rivals for this reason.

In sum, an agreement with the Common Market to reduce tariffs on dominant supplier products will tend to raise productivity and wages in American and New England manufacturing and to improve the variety and quality of our standards of living. Our mass-production industries and those which emphasize technological leadership and rapid product innovation will be particularly benefited.

New England, it appears, will benefit more than proportionally, because the New England economy has a somewhat larger stake than the Nation as a whole in exports of manufactures, and because of the stress on research and product innovation so characteristic of the newer New England industries. At the same time, most New England industries which are particularly vulnerable to imports and which are now protected by high tariffs would, it appears, be little affected by the trade expansion program, at least for the present, because their products are not on the dominant supplier list.

IV. The competitiveness of New England industries in foreign trade

In the preceding chapter, three broad categories of U.S. industries were distinguished in terms of their competitiveness in foreign trade. One was the older manufactures such as textiles and footwear, in which labor costs in this country run generally higher than abroad, so that these industries tend to be vulnerable to competition from imports. A second category includes mass-produced items which have cost advantages over foreign competitors because of our larger domestic markets.

A third category includes science-based industries and industries producing specialized producers goods for an advanced industrialized society, whose competitive strength in foreign trade comes from the technological lead of their products and not from any advantage in costs.

To help make these general economic categories come to life so far as New England is concerned, case studies have been made of representative New England firms in the first and third of these categories, which are generally considered to be typical of manufacturing in New England. Firms in the older industries—woolens, footwear and silverware (including stainless steelware)—were examined. Among the specialized producer goods industries, firms making machine tools, industrial instruments and textile machinery were chosen. Interviews were held with executives and the conclusions which follow were drawn in part from more extensive reports of these interviews.[3]

The striking conclusion which emerges from our study is that parts of the woolen, footwear, and silverware industries in New England are not especially vulnerable to competition from imports. This is because a part of their business is a fashion and merchandising business, which present major difficulties to the foreign manufacturer.

In producing for a fashion market, a manufacturer takes serious risks. Fashions change rapidly and what will sell is difficult to foresee. Thus a manufacturer of women's styled fabrics or shoes, for example, can produce in only relatively small lots and must keep inventories under careful control, or he will suffer inventory losses which will put him out of business. He must balance the manufacturing economies of longer production runs, plus the sales advantage of being able to deliver quickly from stock, against the risk of being caught with large stocks that cannot be sold.

The problem is serious enough for the domestic producer of fashion goods, but it is a good deal more serious for the competing foreign manufacturer because of his distance from the American market. Italian manufacturers of woolens for women's wear can make rapid deliveries, and their merchandizers in this country are usually skilled stylists.

Yet the greater distance from factory to market and the less intimate contact between the manufacturer and the distributor or retailer mean that the Italian manufacturer must produce in much smaller lots than his New England competitors. In consequence, Italian styled woolen fabrics are no cheaper than competing American fabrics despite much lower wages in Italy.

Apart from cost considerations, the foreign producer of style goods also faces a formidable merchandizing problem. For the interest of distributors and retailers must be retained and this requires not only consistent success in bringing out new designs but the offering of a wide line and a sustained level of advertising and selling. Foreign producers of style goods in the industries under consideration have been generally unable to meet these requirements.

The only way a foreign manufacturer of fashion goods can overcome these cost and merchandising problems is to produce to order for a large American merchandiser, such as a chain store or a large department store, which is close to the American market and is able to assume most of the inventory risks. This has proved practical to a limited extent in fashion shoes, but not in the other industries examined.

On the other hand, the staple (standardized), nonfashion items produced by the New England woolen, shoe and silverware industries are vulnerable to foreign competition and would doubtless be more so if our tariffs were lowered. Rubber and canvas footwear and women's flats, for example, are relatively standardized and are now imported in substantial quantities despite the tariff. The fashion risks and delivery timing problems are small in comparison with men's and women's fashion shoes. The product changes little from season to season, so that problems of design and merchandizing are minimized and the foreign manufacturer can produce in runs long enough to realize the cost advantage of the lower wages he pays, bringing his labor costs substantially below those of his American competitors.

The same is generally true in worsteds for men's wear, such as sharkskins, glens, and herringbones. (The foreign cost advantage in worsteds is more marked in the high quality worsteds than in the lower grades, because the labor content is higher.) Hence the New England worsted mills have been in trouble, while the mills making women's style fabrics have not. The woolen firm interviewed has concentrated most of its New England production on fabrics for women's wear, with the result that its employment in New England has expanded in recent years, although total employment in the New England woolen industry has been declining.

In the silverware business, the inexpensive grades of stainless steel flatware are the main staple. Unlike stainless flatware of higher quality, which is retailed in jewelry stores and department stores and is distinctly a fashion product, stainless flatware of the lower qualities is sold mainly to chain-stores, discount houses and mail-order houses, where design and marketing problems are at a minimum and the main consideration is price. In this market, Japanese competition has been strong. Indeed, in 1958 the Japanese captured 40 percent of the American market for these grades. (The Japanese industry is understood to have accepted in 1960 a voluntary quota equivalent to 30–35 percent of the American market.)

Lower labor costs are not the only reason for the competitive strength of foreign producers of worsteds, staple shoes and stainless flatware, however. The New England woolen manufacturer pays about $1.15 a pound for raw wool as compared with the 80 cents his foreign competitor pays, because of the high U.S. tariff on raw wool. The price of stainless steel in Japan is about $420 a ton, as compared with the American price of about $950 a ton, the difference being apparently due to differences in pricing policies. The Japanese practice of selling some articles abroad at prices below the Japanese domestic price is believed to be responsible for some part of Japan's competitive strength in worsteds and rubber and canvas shoes.

These specific points suggest a more general conclusion: there are many factors apart from comparative labor costs which must be considered before conclusions are drawn about the international competitive position of a New England industry.

Our study of New England firms making machine tools, textile machinery and industrial instruments shows how the exacting competitive requirements of the American market, particularly the constant demand for new, cost-saving machinery, lead to competitive success abroad in these highly technical capital goods industries.

The machine-tool company had until quite recently been producing standard machine

---

[3] The interviews were conducted through a research grant from the Federal Reserve Bank of Boston, and the interview reports were written by Mr. Raphael W. Hodgson, of the Arthur D. Little, Inc., of Boston. Mr. Hodgson also collaborated in the preparation of this chapter. The firms to be interviewed were selected in consultation with the research department of the Federal Reserve Bank of Boston.

tools. Three years ago the company decided to make a major change in its product line. The decision was dictated by the state of the American machine-tool market. With heavy excess capacity in the metalworking industries (which are the machine tool industry's customers), the only way a machine-tool company could expect to sell its products was to develop new machines that would cut the buyer's costs of production substantially.

The company therefore initiated a major research and development effort and brought out a class of automatic machine tools which have short setup times, making the machines very economical for use in production of short runs.

The high rate of innovation achieved is shown by the fact that 60 percent of the company's output in 1961 consisted of products introduced since January 1, 1959.

The company's change in business policy and product line has increased costs substantially. Research and development expense has doubled. Expenses of product engineering have increased 50 percent. Indirect shop and tooling costs have also increased substantially, because of the many new models. A great deal more sales engineering and customer service work is now necessary. But despite higher costs, the company now has a product line which is developing new business in this country and is so unique abroad that it has a promising export potential. It is also immune to foreign competition in the American market.

Competing European producers of machine tools offer standardized machines. Their costs are lower because they do little product development and run a steady production line, allowing a large backlog of orders to develop to make this possible. Their delivery times are therefore slow (1½ to 2 years). Their customer servicing is not good. And they are vulnerable to competition by American firms such as the one examined which are strong in product development and customer servicing and which offer more rapid delivery.

The same characteristics distinguish the New England textile machinery firm and the industrial instruments firm examined. Large expenditures on research and development leading to the rapid introduction of new products have been the basis of sales success both at home and abroad. The firms do not compete with their European competitors in terms of price. Sales emphasis is on the technical excellence and reliability of products, on sensitivity to the customer's special requirements, on rapid delivery and on superior servicing.

57 New England exporting industries [1]

Industry [2]	New England employment in 1958 (estimated)	Estimated exports as percent of domestic shipments [3]
Aircraft engines and parts	42,200	10
Shipbuilding and repairing	21,300	11
Fabricated plastics products n.e.c.	8,000+	6
Textile machinery	16,400	20
Ball and roller bearings	15,500	6
Machine tool accessories	14,000	6
Radio, TV communication equipment	13,200	10
Mechanical measuring devices	12,500	9
Metal cutting machine tools	12,100	18
Aircraft propellers and parts	10,300	8
Narrow fabrics	9,700	7
Valves and pipe fittings	9,600	9
Steam engines, turbines, turbogenerators and parts, and internal combustion engines n.e.c.	9,400	9
Electric measuring instruments	8,000	5
Typewriters	7,300	8
Special industry machinery n.e.c.	7,000	22
Abrasive products (part)	6,500	7

See footnotes at end of table.

57 New England exporting industries [1]—Con.

Industry [2]	New England employment in 1958 (estimated)	Estimated exports as percent of domestic shipments [3]
Electron tubes, transmitting	6,400	7
Hand and edge tools, except machine tools, and handsaws	6,300	10
Electron tubes, receiving type	5,800	5
General industrial machinery n.e.c.	5,700	9
Plastics materials (part)	5,700	6
Switchgear and switchboards	5,300	6
Electric housewares and fans	4,600	5
Office machines n.e.c.	4,400	9
Refrigeration machinery	4,200	7
Power transmission equipment	4,000	6
Scientific instruments	4,000	9
Photographic equipment	3,800	8
Paper industries machinery	3,600	18
Pumps and compressors	3,600	15
Food products machinery	3,100	16
Metalworking machinery n.e.c. (part)	2,800	26
Surgical appliances and supplies	2,800	6
Blowers and fans	2,600	5
Engine electrical equipment	2,400	6
Metal forming machine tools	2,200	25
Automatic temperature controls	2,200	9
Optical instruments and lenses	2,100	11
Sewing machines	2,100	27
Pulpmill products	2,000	15
Handsaws, saw blades, and accessories	1,900	8
Painting trades machinery	1,900	13
Boat building and repairing	1,900	11
Canned and cured seafoods	1,900	5
Surgical and medical instruments	1,800	22
Nonferrous metals, rolled, drawn, and extruded n.e.c.	1,700	7
Woodworking machinery	1,600	10
Medicinals and botanicals	1,500	9
Phonograph records	1,200	8
Industrial furnaces and ovens	1,000	13
Scales and balances	1,000	11
Measuring and dispensing pumps	900	7
Industrial trucks and tractors	900	12
Pens and mechanical pencils	600	13
Commercial laundry equipment	400	11
Animal and marine oil mill products	200	8
Total (57 industries)	330,000	

[1] An "exporting industry" is here defined as one whose national exports were equal in value of 5 percent or more of its total shipments in 1958, and which had 6 percent or more of total U.S. employment located in New England.

[2] Listed in order of size of employment in New England.

[3] These export ratios apply to the national industry rather than to the New England industry. Export ratios for New England industries are not available at this time.

NOTE.—Detail will not add to total because of rounding.

Source: Federal Reserve Bank of Boston.

ENROLLED BILLS PRESENTED

The Secretary of the Senate reported that on today, March 21, 1962, he presented to the President of the United States the following enrolled bills:

S. 1691. An act to provide that any juvenile who has been determined delinquent by a district court of the United States may be committed by the court to the custody of the Attorney General for observation and study;

S. 1756. An act for the relief of the city of Pasco, Wash.; and

S. 2165. An act for the relief of Jean L. Dunlop.

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. JACKSON:

Address delivered by Senator MUSKIE to a luncheon meeting of the Electronics Industries Association Seminar on the New Look in Defense Planning, March 13, 1962.

RECESS UNTIL 9 O'CLOCK A.M. TOMORROW

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, in line with the agreement entered into earlier today, I move that the Senate now stand in recess until 9 o'clock tomorrow morning.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock p.m.) the Senate took a recess, under the order previously entered, until tomorrow, Thursday, March 22, 1962, at 9 o'clock a.m.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate March 21 (legislative day of March 14), 1962:

U.S. DISTRICT JUDGE

George Templar, of Kansas, to be U.S. district judge for the district of Kansas. (A new position.)

IN THE ARMY

The following-named officers under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, section 3066, to be assigned to positions of importance and responsibility designated by the President under subsection (a) of section 3066, in rank as follows:

Lt. Gen. Barksdale Hamlett, XXXXXX Army of the United States (major general, U.S. Army), in the rank of general.

Lt. Gen. Paul Lamar Freeman, Jr., XXXXXX Army of the United States (major general, U.S. Army), in the rank of general.

The following-named officer under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, section 3066, to be assigned to a position of importance and responsibility designated by the President under subsection (a) of section 3066, in rank as follows:

Maj. Gen. Frank Schaffer Besson, Jr., XXXXXX U.S. Army, in the rank of lieutenant general.

The following-named officers for appointment in the Regular Army of the United States to the grades indicated, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, sections 3284, 3306 and 3307:

To be major generals

Lt. Gen. Hamilton Hawkins Howze, XXXXXX Army of the United States (brigadier general, U.S. Army).

Maj. Gen. Thomas Weldon Dunn, XXXXXX Army of the United States (brigadier general, U.S. Army).

Maj. Gen. James Lowell Richardson, Jr., XXXXXX, Army of the United States (brigadier general, U.S. Army).

Maj. Gen. Theodore William Parker, XXXXXX, Army of the United States (brigadier general, U.S. Army).

Maj. Gen. William White Dick, Jr., XXXXXX, Army of the United States (brigadier general, U.S. Army).

Maj. Gen. William Frew Train, XXXXXX Army of the United States (brigadier general, U.S. Army).

Maj. Gen. Francis Thomas Pachler, xxxxxx, Army of the United States (brigadier general, U.S. Army).

Maj. Gen. Tom Robert Stoughton, xxxxxx, Army of the United States (brigadier general, U.S. Army).

Maj. Gen. Charles Hartwell Bonesteel, 3d, xxxxxx, Army of the United States (brigadier general, U.S. Army).

Maj. Gen. Stephen Read Hanmer, xxxxxx, Army of the United States (brigadier general, U.S. Army).

Maj. Gen. Marshall Sylvester Carter, xxxxxx, Army of the United States (brigadier general, U.S. Army).

Maj. Gen. Tom Victor Stayton, xxxxxx, Army of the United States (brigadier general, U.S. Army).

Maj. Gen. Rush Blodget Lincoln, Jr., xxxxxx, Army of the United States (brigadier general, U.S. Army).

Maj. Gen. Horace Freeman Bigelow, xxxxxx, Army of the United States (brigadier general, U.S. Army).

Maj. Gen. Isaac Sewell Morris, xxxxxx, Army of the United States (brigadier general, U.S. Army).

Maj. Gen. Albert Watson, 2d, xxxxxx, Army of the United States (brigadier general, U.S. Army).

Lt. Gen. John Phillips Daley, xxxxxx, Army of the United States (brigadier general, U.S. Army).

Maj. Gen. Robert Hackett, xxxxxx, Army of the United States (brigadier general, U.S. Army).

Maj. Gen. Mervyn MacKay Magee, xxxxxx, Army of the United States (brigadier general, U.S. Army).

Maj. Gen. Gunnar Carl Carlson, xxxxxx, Army of the United States (brigadier general, U.S. Army).

Maj. Gen. Ernest Fred Easterbrook, xxxxxx, Army of the United States (brigadier general, U.S. Army).

Maj. Gen. Curtis James Herrick, xxxxxx, Army of the United States (brigadier general, U.S. Army).

Maj. Gen. Andrew Joseph Adams, xxxxxx, Army of the United States (brigadier general, U.S. Army).

Maj. Gen. Frank Hamilton Britton, xxxxxx, Army of the United States (brigadier general, U.S. Army).

Maj. Gen. James Karrick Woolnough, xxxxxx, Army of the United States (brigadier general, U.S. Army).

Maj. Gen. Robert Augur Hewitt, xxxxxx, Army of the United States (brigadier general, U.S. Army).

Maj. Gen. Dwight Benjamin Johnson, xxxxxx, Army of the United States (brigadier general, U.S. Army).

Maj. Gen. Harvey Herman Fischer, xxxxxx, Army of the United States (brigadier general, U.S. Army).

Maj. Gen. George Thigpen Duncan, xxxxxx, Army of the United States (brigadier general, U.S. Army).

Maj. Gen. John William Bowen, xxxxxx, Army of the United States (brigadier general, U.S. Army).

Maj. Gen. Ray Joseph Laux, xxxxxx, Army of the United States (brigadier general, U.S. Army).

Maj. Gen. Jean Evans Engler, xxxxxx, Army of the United States (brigadier general, U.S. Army).

Brig. Gen. John Joseph Davis, xxxxxx, U.S. Army.

Maj. Gen. George Wilson Power, xxxxxx, Army of the United States (brigadier general, U.S. Army).

Maj. Gen. Harrison Alan Gerhardt, xxxxxx, Army of the United States (brigadier general, U.S. Army).

Brig. Gen. Ashton Herbert Manhart, xxxxxx, U.S. Army.

Maj. Gen. Lawrence Joseph Lincoln, xxxxxx, Army of the United States (brigadier general, U.S. Army).

Maj. Gen. Theodore John Conway, xxxxxx, Army of the United States (brigadier general, U.S. Army).

Maj. Gen. Charles Henry Chase, xxxxxx, Army of the United States (brigadier general, U.S. Army).

Maj. Gen. Edgar Collins Doleman, xxxxxx, Army of the United States (brigadier general, U.S. Army).

To be major generals, Medical Corps

Maj. Gen. Joseph Hamilton McNinch, xxxxxx, Army of the United States (brigadier general, Medical Corps, U.S. Army).

Brig. Gen. James Hedges Forsee, xxxxxx, Medical Corps, U.S. Army.

To be brigadier generals, Medical Corps

Brig. Gen. George Merle Powell, xxxxxx, Army of the United States (colonel, Medical Corps, U.S. Army).

Brig. Gen. Howard William Doan, xxxxxx, Army of the United States (colonel, Medical Corps, U.S. Army).

Maj. Gen. James Leslie Snyder, xxxxxx, Army of the United States (colonel, Medical Corps, U.S. Army).

To be brigadier general, Dental Corps

Col. Charles Max Farber, xxxxxx, Dental Corps, U.S. Army.

IN THE MARINE CORPS

The following-named officers of the Marine Corps for permanent appointment to the grade of colonel:

Knapp, Horace E., Jr.
Demosthenes, Theodore A.
Stimson, Elwyn M.
Boyd, Clay A.
Low, Stanley D.
Carey, Roland E.
Kunz, Charles M.
Lundin, William M.
Myking, Brenten G.
Amerine, Richard R.
North, Royal E.
Roach, Maurice E.
Poggemeyer, Lewis E.
Caputo, Anthony
Bross, Robert W. L.
Grider, Robert Q.
Kramer, Vincent R.
Rhoades, Jack R.
Platt, Frank M., Jr.
Jensen, Oscar T., Jr.
Wagner, Laverne W.
Gunter, Howard G.
Hayes, Harold A., Jr.
Beck, Donald M.
Spiker, Theodore F.
Cave, Thomas F., Jr.
Ross, John F., Jr.
Siegel, Eugene A.
Olson, Harry C.
Bachhuber, Arthur J.
Morris, Warren
Stewart, Frank R., Jr.
Conger, Jack E.
Riley, Russell R.
Mueller, Elton
Cereghino, Alexander D.
Harris, Lawrence P.
Jones, Albert L.
Glick, Jacob E.
Callender, James M.
Williams, John E.
Hill, John T.
Stegemerten, Walter W.
Armstead, Robert C.
Raymond, Herbert D., Jr.
Richards, Robert M.
Woessner, Henry J., II
Casserly, Frank G.
Hedesh, Andrew
Carlson, Evans C.
Berteling, John B.
Railsback, Eldon H.
Cupp, James N.
Lund, Arnold A.
Sabatier, Henry S.
Warren, Joe L.

The following-named officers of the Marine Corps for permanent appointment to the grade of lieutenant colonel:

Wilson, Frank E.
Jones, States R., Jr.
Truesdale, Marion G.
Atkins, Wade W.
Sollom, Almond H.
Frankovic, Boris J.
Dressin, Sam A.
Rushlow, Bruce A.
Stanford, Norman R.
Beckett, John W., Jr.
Challacombe, Arthur D., Jr.
Wilkinson, John H.
Anderson, Roy L.
Johnson, Wayne
Tulipane, Thomas T.
Driftmier, John F.
Corman, Otis W.
Brown, Charles S.
Simmons, Robert L.
Farish, George B.
Gray, Roy C., Jr.
Daniels, Elmer R., Jr.
Miller, Edward J.
Bruce, Henry K.
Dyer, Phillip G.
Dewees, Raymond, Jr.
Hamm, Norman L.
Magill, James H.
Merchant, Clark E.
House, Charles A.
Melin, Ernest I.
Greenfield, Gaylord C.
McDaniel, James
Harmon, Lester G.
Morrison, Gene W.
Clapp, Archie J.
Rushlow, Ray D.
McBarron, Alden
Witt, William T., Jr.
McManus, John
Wilker, Dean
Mawyer, Ralph P.
Johnston, John C.
Vance, Johnnie C., Jr.
MacQuarrie, Warren L.
Dellamano, Albert F.
Hepler, Frank M.
Guss, William F.
Johnson, James K.
Ross, John D.
Feliton, James A.
Barber, William E.
Hemstad, Robert S.
Barnhill, Claude O., Jr.
Austen, Philip N.
Sevier, Charles B.
Leogue, John J.
Keller, Karl T.
Millenbine, Otis E.
Reed, Herbert C.
Sigler, William M., Jr.
Cass, Bevan G.
McGraw, Thomas F., Jr.
Swinford, David G.
Ewers, Norman G.
Kern, Richard H.
McGraw, William C., Jr.
Ezell, Dee E.
Rutledge, Rockwell M.
Flinn, Norman W., Jr.
Le Faivre, Edward N.
Adams, Harold W.
Pond, Darwin B., Jr.
McCaleb, Alfred F., Jr.
Payne, Ernest W.
Gould, William R.
Schmagel, Arthur O.
Ward, Richard A.
Quillian, Stone W.
Ray, Grady W.
Francke, Donald E.
Conroy, Donald
Jackson, Owen G., Jr.
Andres, Russell A.
Gribbin, Thomas A., II
Collins, George J.
Panska, Donald A.
Matthews, Merlin T.
Warren, Robert F.
Painter, Harry F.
McLaurin, John M., Jr.
Lees, Urban A.
Bolts, Lewis E.
Mileson, Donald F.
Robinson, Robert B.
McRay, Harold G.
Newport, Richard B.
Graham, Robert J.
McMahon, John F., Jr.
Atwater, William L., Jr.
Simlik, Wilbur F.
Derryberry, Donald G.
Holland, Dan C.
Hughes, Thomas H.
Durnford, Dewey F., Jr.
Beck, Noble L.
Corbett, Leroy V.
Bruce, James P.
Caswell, Dean
Mulvey, William H.
Panchision, Walter
Pritchett, Clarence H.
Petty, Douglas D., Jr.
Berge, James H., Jr.
Kew, George D.
Cronin, James T.
Pedersen, Poul F.
Jillisky, Leo R.
Jones, James R.
Estey, Ralph F.
Eubanks, Fred F., Jr.
Daigle, Adlin P.
Smith, James W.
Joslyn, William G.
Harp, Dene T.
Price, Elbert F.
Murphy, John J.
Parnell, Robert L., Jr.
Jensen, Harvey L.
Nichols, Thomas H., Jr.
Miner, Ross R.
Wosser, Joseph L., Jr.
Higgins, William B.
Doswell, James T., II
Harris, Donald R., Jr.
Hovatter, Eugenous M.
Bohn, Robert D.
Stawicki, Theodore A.
Airheart, William C.
Dodenhoff, George H.
Hughes, Orlin A. P.
Crossman, Ralph B.
Brooks, Donald H.
Mize, Charles D.
Doehler, William F.
Mobley, Warren L.
Leader, Samuel F.
Davis, Merle C.
Powell, J. B.
McKean, Edgar A.
Vroegindewey, Robert J.
Grimes, Doyle
Youngs, Clifford A.
Assad, Albert J.
McGuire, James L.

The following-named officers of the Marine Corps for permanent appointment to the grade of major:

Kirstein, Lee A.
Butner, John C., III
McCutchan, Robert C.
Spicer, Raymond B.
Dyroff, William F.
Fenton, Clayton C., Jr.
Downen, Robert E.
Dowd, John J., Jr.
Uskurait, Robert H.
Freeman, Thomas R.
Mosher, Charles M.
Rann, Louis A.
Peck, William H.
Draper, William H.
Westcott, Charles T.
Condra, James E.
Wilcox, Edward A.
Vance, Robert N.
Demas, John G.
VanMeter, Jo M.
Sims, John B.
Roland, Harold E., Jr.
Harris, Frank W., III
Bednarsky, Vincent H.
Kletzker, Robert L.
Rice, Knowlton P.
Vuillemot, Floyd L.
McCreight, James K.
Haigwood, Paul B.
McIntosh, John C.
Cummings, William M.
Meyers, George F.
Herod, Jack
Phelan, Don G.
Bodley, Charles H.
Larsen, Robert J.
Noble, Richard F.
Paris, Euclid P.
Calvert, Robert W.
Kelly, James P.
Nesbitt, Cleon E.
DeNormandie, Frank R.
Cummings, James M.
Taves, Alfred C.
Barr, James C.
Keller, Gene S.
Ammer, Henry G.
Fischer, Henry, Jr.
Smith, William L.
Benskin, George H., Jr.
Esslinger, Dean E.

Holicky, Joseph J.
Dzialo, Edward W.
Porter, Robert H., Jr.
Johnson, Tracy N.
Overmyer, Gerald D.
Hayes, James M.
Field, Francis J.
Gelzer, Edward D., Jr.
LaRouche, Charles R.
Johnson, Robert L.
Chambers, Franklin R.
Hoff, Frank X.
Lewandowski, Thaddeus F.
Wallace, Charles M., Jr.
Lahr, Robert J.
McMahon, Clare R.
Lynk, Edward H. P.
Reid, James H., Jr.
Hagarty, Patrick J.
Hargett, Ernest C.
Powell, David D.
Clark, Allen B.
Lewis, Elmer M., Jr.
Rodney, Glenn W.
Westphall, Howard A.
Butler, Jack H.
Cashman, James G.
Boyd, Clarence W., Jr.
McNeely, Robert L.
Breckinridge, James T.
Judge, Clark V.
Burroughs, Charles R.
Shea, James F., Jr.
Summers, Theodore
Walden, Denzil E.
Keith, John H., Jr.
Stewart, Howard D., II
Johnson, Russell E.
Dindinger, Jack W.
Mills, Neil B.
Jones, Edward H.
Wallace, William T.
Roothoff, John J.
Daane, Marion J.
Kirby, Edward K.
Duffy, LeRoy M.
Edwards, Paul M.
Silva, Donald A.
Rose, Maurice
Merrill, George A.
Poillon, Arthur J.
James, Curtis A., Jr.
Humphreys, Richard D.
Hicks, Norman W.
Sullivan, Charles H.
Harmon, Autrey B.
Smith, Robert A.
Hendricks, Clayton V.
McGuigan, John R.
Thomas, Robert J.
Dahl, Clarence G.
Smith, Richard E.
Kearney, Jack R.
Turpin, Charles A.
Parrish, Robert G.
Pottebaum, Linus F.
Winn, Robert D.
Kiser, Harrol
Dresbach, Earl C., Jr.
Dillard, Jack N.
Harris, Robert G.
Killian, Edwin W.
VanCantfort, Rollin F.
Larson, Harold V.
Morin, Donald E.
Stevens, Thomas J.
Miles, Jack L.
Parsons, Harold L.
Wood, Ralph C.
Spencer, Donald E.
Martin, Reginald G.
Rieder, Alvin R.
Yount, Vance L., Jr.
Alison, James C.
Goss, Joseph A.
Randolph, Richard J., Jr.
Johnston, Howard J.
Spaulding, Jack D.
Connolly, Martin F.
McNaughton, George C.
Young, Robert F., Jr.
Haney, James M.
Ebert, James R.
Harris, Howard H.
Easter, Edward V.
Boles, Jack F.
Jones, David G.
White, Jack D.
Green, Melvin K.
Badger, Guy O.
Kuhlmann, Fred D.
Blair, George G., II
Barrett, Roscoe L., Jr.
Estes, Donald E.
Ford, Truett W.
Fagan, William S.
Frye, Robert W.
Phillips, Jack B.
Bey, Robert T.
Keyes, Edward B., Jr.
Barrett, Wallace C.
Carr, Ira T.
Gumienny, Leo
Pineo, Ray D.
Hunter, Clyde W.
Baites, Lonnie P.
Russ, Donald M.
Darracott, Charles M.
Knight, Frederic S.
Kerrigan, William E.
Selvitelle, Benjamin B., Jr.
Bullard, Lyle W.
McLennan, Kenneth
Thomas, John C.
Linn, Joseph W.
Worley, Kermit M.
Owens, Thurman
Olson, Fredric O.
Holt, Thomas J.
Derning, Edmund G., Jr.
Warshawer, Alan J.
Michaud, John B.
Mader, John F.
Dixon, Frank L., Jr.
Thomas, Jay J., Jr.
Kleppsattel, Frederick M., Jr.
Schultz, Gerald F.
Critchett, Edward W.
Valdes, Edmund
May, Donald L.
Bollinger, William D.
Scharfen, John C.
Fees, Fred J., Jr.
McColm, Harry A., Jr.
Dant, James K.
Walton, Leo E., Jr.
Johnson, Robert T.
Buchanan, Fitzhugh L., Jr.
Meeker, Ermine L.
Wachter, John A.
Dlugos, Thomas S.
Showalter, Charles E.
Santee, Robert E.
Ambrosia, Eugene J.
Butler, Harrison M.
Mackey, Harold R.
Good, George F., III
Reid, Ernest R., Jr.
Shepherd, Lemuel C., III
Stephens, Reuel W., Jr.
Blagg, Russell E.
Eschholz, Theodore S.
Gover, Robert L., Jr.
Blough, Foster W.
Babe, George A.
Koler, Joseph, Jr.
Young, William F.
Bradley, Lawrence J.
Shanahan, Thomas C.
Coon, Elvin R., Jr.
Hillmer, Donald F.
VomOrde, Ewald A., Jr.
Foyle, Robert A.
Rump, William S.
VanZuyen, William M.
Lerond, Jack M.
Hall, Donald L.
Munn, Charles R., Jr.
Beverly, Arthur C.
Reese, Howard E.
Smith, Donald H.
McNicholas, Robert J.
Baeriswyl, Louis, Jr.
Taylor, Wilber F.
Taylor, Roma T., Jr.
Macklin, William H.
King, Charles F., Jr.
Pryor, Bertram H.
Kurowski, Anthony R.
Heffernan, Neal E.
Davis, Joseph L.
Hansen, Jack R.
DeLong, Earl R.
Snyder, Joris J.
Webb, Lewis R.
Miniclier, John F.
Langley, Charles F.
McClelland, William A.
Hickman, William T.
Horn, James A.
Barde, Robert E.
Flood, James H. A.
Runyan, Clair F.
Anderson, Robert V.
Selmyhr, Garlen L.
Magruder, Bruce, Jr.
Martin, Lee D.
Blyth, Charles W.
Yingling, James M.
Gately, William F., Jr.
Bentley, Loren D.
Barry, Richard S.
Scharnberg, George R.
Montague, Paul B.
Ludwig, Verle E.
Robinson, Dayton, Jr.
Bennett, Nalton M.
Stavridis, Paul G.
Barr, John F., Jr.
Owens, Owen L.
Wildey, Robert L.
Coffman, John W.
Wessel, Wallace
Fegley, James E.
Pearcy, Eddie E.
Stowers, Robert M.
Corn, Clifford D.
Grier, Samuel L.
Witkowski, Henry J.
Kessler, Paul
Keating, Weldon L.
Leidy, Alfred L.
McCain, Gene M.
Vrabel, Michael J.
Brent, Joseph M.
Miller, Richard R.
Barnard, John R.
Harris, William A.
Alexander, John C.
Elledge, Raymond J.
Tucker, Chester E.
Palmer, Kenny C.
Emma, Carl J.
Marusak, Andrew V., Jr.
Nilsen, George H.
O'Connell, John P.
Redman, Charles B.
Perrich, Robert J.
Carpenter, Stanley H.
Wilson, Harold B.
Stephenson, Charles R., III
Gilman, Donald E.
Blaha, Herbert J.
Patton, William C.
Moak, Stanley T.

The following-named officers of the Marine Corps for permanent appointment to the grade of captain:

Windsor, Billie W.
Maxwell, Glenn K.
Read, William A.
Cassedy, Logan
Matheson, John R.
Allweiler, Joseph O.
Werz, Francis J.
Myers, Donald A.
Schremp, George R., Jr.
Berglund, Warren T.
Gormley, John D.
Vey, Willis D.
Shoemake, Loyd R.
Carothers, James H., Jr.
Henson, William E.
Shaffer, Raymond A.
Harris, George C., Jr.
Phillips, Jimmie R.
Toms, Edward H.
Kain, Edward W.
Sanborn, Earle L., Jr.
Soper, Melvin A., Jr.
Rutherford, Robert J.
Spencer, Ralph B.
Stein, Alfred F.
Sloan, Richard E.
Gregory, Malcome G.
Corbet, Jimmy A.
White, Jean P.
Ison, Lee F.
Morgan, William H.
Turner, Charles F.
Rappe, J. C.
Backus, Edward E.
Hamby, Ronald L.
Eggleston, Joseph N.
Ledbetter, Archibald C.
Fauver, Ronald E.
Cook, Marcus H.
Kneale, Charles R.
Johnson, Herschel L., Jr.
Walters, Raymond D.
Himmer, Donald R.
Bradberry, Joe E.
Resnik, Edward D.
Welch, Homer L.
Clark, James E.
Rishel, Austin C.
Ritter, Otto W.
Nielsen, William J.
Adams, Sammy T.
Gambrel, James E.
Duncan, Billy R.
Cronk, Robert A.
McConnell, Warren M.
Simmons, Jack A.
Arquiette, John B.
Irons, Milton E.
Marques, Preston P., Jr.
Evans, Donald C.
Koppenhaver, Howard M.
Klein, Robert D.
Thurber, William M.
Sparks, John A.
Cantieny, John B.
Cox, Donald L., Jr.
Julian, Martin D.
Brindell, Charles R.
Palmer, Charles B.
Ryan, James, Jr.
Powers, William T.
Cook, Edward C.
Dunn, Walter F.
Friberg, James W.
Bomgardner, George I.
Jerabek, Milton H.
St.Clair, Fred W.
Bray, Richard P.
DesJardines, Lawrence J.
Hines, Jack D.
Bottorff, Harry J.
Lugger, Marvin H.
Carruthers, Robert E.
Harp, James J.
Glasgow, Harold G.
Cawthon, Walter C., Jr.
Fites, Malcolm V.
Studt, John C.
Hatch, Richard L.
VanSant, Frederick N.
Garrett, Donald J.
Duck, John E.
Helsher, Paul M.
Maxwell, Hurdle L.
Tighe, Paul J.
Kehoe, James P.
Eckert, John F., Jr.
Shuttleworth, James E.
Wonhof, Alan E.
Warren, Frank R.
Montague, James H.
Seiler, David F.
Fritschi, George W.
Smith, Bernard B., Jr.
Owen, Billy M.
Plamondon, Robert A.
Henry, Clark G.
Young, Dale E.
Daly, Daniel C.
Hauck, Walter R.
Tayntor, Charles E.
Gradl, Herbert M.
Miller, John H.
Realsen, Arvid W.
Coffin, James H.
Mann, Bennie H., Jr.
O'Brien, Charles H.
Harvey, Donald L.
Dunbaugh, Charles R.
Statzer, Merlin V.
Hutchinson, Robert N
Walker, Joe G., Jr.
Smilanich, William E., Jr.
Rhine, Wesley E.
Murphy, Donald L.
Drennan, Lawrence T., Jr.
Smith, Kenneth L.
Gragan, David E.
Dickey, David K.
Thompson, Robert B.
Salls, Carroll E.
Horne, Ivan F.
Poitevent, Walter O.
Fridell, John R.
Koelper, Donald E.
Guay, Robert P.
Fisher, Farris C.
Calder, James D.
Conrado, James S., Jr.
Challgren, Stanley A.
Solliday, Robert E.
Needham, Michael J.
Reilly, Donald J.
Courtney, Richard G.
Folck, Chester A.
Danielson, Donald C.
Raines, Thomas E.
Liddle, Chester A., Jr.
Parish, Lowell W.
Kelly, John F. J.
Slack, Gerald J.
Mann, John W.
Rainbolt, Richard E.
Beal, Don D.
Clark, Fred E., Jr.
Ratcliff, Percy D.
Dutton, Thomas A.
Barton, Willis W., Jr.
Holt, Ralph P.
MacDonald, Herman A., Jr.
Wahlfeld, Howard W.
Dockstader, Richard W.
Bell, George N.
Sanford, Herbert C.
Medis, James W.
Frisbie, H. Reed, Jr.
Smigay, Daniel B.
Stitt, Charles L.
Perez, Richard
Rapp, John M.
Cooke, Richard M.
Fennell, Patrick J., Jr.
Wagner, David H.
Daley, John J., Jr.
Hammel, Charles F.
Hieber, George A.
Jacobs, Merrill M.
St.Amour, Paul A. A.
Duff, John C.
Hendricks, Robert G., Jr.
Fritzlen, James W.
Pagano, Vincent B.
Morris, Loyd E., Jr.
Kent, Brian B.
Gallagher, John H.
Nelson, Robert C.
Murray, Francis R.
Forrey, Wilmer H.
Porter, George A.
Treble, Charles
Morgan, Donald C.
Rueckel, Frederick A.
Clatworthy, John
Whalen, Robert P.
Cavallo, Louis J.
Bartlett, Stephen W.
McAdams, Donald J.
Pitchford, Charles F.
Davidson, Darrell U.
Sayce, Donald H.
Twining, David S.
Craig, Winchell M., Jr.
Rowlands, Cledwyn P.
Campbell, John W.
Christy, Robert A.
Eagan, Arthur J.
Caudill, Curtis E.
Percy, Stephen
Layne, Donald Q.
Wells, Ullie C.
Jones, Robert W. G.
Smith, Joseph N.
Blair, John H.
Balius, David H.
Conlin, John C.
Burke, Edward J.
Simpson, Thomas H.
Leftwich, William G., Jr.
Johnson, Clifford H.
Truesdale, Bruce A.
Ferrington, George B., Jr.
Comfort, Clayton L.
Watson, LeRoy E.
Hearn, Thomas M.
Wiltsie, Russell E.
Stephens, Ray A.
Hoch, Louis A., Jr.
Smith, Kenneth E.
Williams, Robert G.
Pollard, Jack G.
Delcuze, Godfrey S.
Baker, Clarence M.
Bradley, William C.
Heering, David P.
Coyle, Thomas J.
Lee, Richard J., Jr.
Clark, Bernard E.
Sinclair, John E.
Boyd, Frank M.
Cain, Thomas L.
Rovegno, Donald C.
Sulik, Richard A.
Sullivan, William M.
Hutchins, Walter P.
Madden, Byron E.
Greer, Roger W.
Bowen, James T.
Darron, Robert R.
Kennedy, Thomas L.
Spurlock, David A.

Savoy, Ernest R.
Salzman, Frederick P., Jr.
Nelson, Ronald E.
Smith, Craig S.
Nugent, Thomas F. E.
Cockey, John M.
Greene, John W.
Houston, Stanley S.
Smith, Haywood R.
Haskins, Francis W.
Ayers, Thomas J.
Prebihalo, Robert G.
Foster, Richard M.
Pitcher, Bert R., Jr.
Miller, William S., Jr.
Starnes, Cullen G., Jr.
Jenks, Harry E., II
Christensen, Don R.
Ringler, Jack K.
Brown, Guy L.
Muhlig, John R., Jr.
Platea, Anthony P., Jr.
Pate, Gerald S.
Ganey, Thomas P.
O'Toole, John L.
Slack, Thomas W.
Blair, Richard R.
Bloom, Allan H.
Johnson, Mannon A., Jr.
Thompson, Robert H.
Boyd, Daniel Z.
Pfeifle, Richard C.
Smith, John H.
Cook, Walter T.
Haviland, Harold D.
Tyksinski, William A.
Maas, Bertram A.
Tiede, Herbert R.
Bujan, Charles D.
Selby, Donald F.
Poindexter, John E.
Vibberts, John L.
Martin, Robert W., Jr.
Swinney, James T.
Marts, Austin M.
Lawrence, Rodney O.
Hillyard, Gordon L.
Dresely, John W.
Rivard, Ronald I.
MacDonald, Robert E.
Jaksina, Stanley C.
Lockard, Edwin W.
White, Robert D.
Sullivan, William J.
Jacobson, Douglas T.
Dininger, Charles F., Jr.
Hansen, Gunnar O.
Deem, Richard G.
Andersen, Andrew E., Jr.
Roe, John M., Jr.
Simpson, William A.
Allen, Thomas H., Jr.
Andersen, Ernest J.
Bany, John B., Jr.
McDonald, Daniel V.
Teague, Charles E.
McCreight, Jack D.
Dorffeld, Charles E.
Eitel, Robert J.
Eleazer, William R.
Stanton, Thomas P.
Hyatt, John K., Jr.
Andersen, Eugene W.
Ryan, Philip J.
Walling, Robert P.
Burk, Thomas K., Jr.
Simpson, Donald R.
Zimolzak, Frank
Peterson, Bob K.
Durhan, John A., Jr.
Strain, Donald H.
Malovich, Arthur D.
Newman, Buel B., Jr.
Bird, Neale E.
McDermott, Arthur T.
Wolcott, Frank B., III
Rojo, Manuel, Jr.
Morris, Clark S.
Binney, Douglas C.
Duphiney, Randall W.
Alm, Richard A.
Emmons, Charles D.
Wood, Charles D.
Chace, Frank C., Jr.
Lippold, Orville V., Jr.
Litzenberger, Earle D.
Glidden, Thomas T.
Hamilton, John A.
Manhard, Albert H., Jr.
Kraynak, John P.
Cahill, John J.
Hower, Raymond R.
DeNora, John
Alves, Edward R., Jr.
Dumont, Thomas J.
Walker, James H.
Sullivan, Thomas L.
Goodin, James C.
Stoffelen, Peter L.
Paro, Eugene E., Jr.
Yelek, Don L.
O'Neill, John E.
Stiffler, Charles R.
Brekenridge, Floyd S., Jr.
Leisy, Robert R.
Martin, Richard L.
Orr, Arnold J.
Sears, Walter E., Jr.
Goodall, Robert L.
Eversole, Carl J.
Lunsford, William T.
Palmer, Richard L.
Nyland, William T.
Palmer, Robert P.
Eddy, James R.
Williams, Frank P., Jr.
D'Arco, Anthony J.
Mitchell, Frank H., Jr.
Beauchamp, Glen T.
Limbach, Walter R.
West, Frank K., Jr.
O'Connell, Patrick J.
Egger, Charles H. F.
Vidano, Albert J.
Crews, Duane D., Jr.
Brooks, Thomas D.
Mayer, Donald F.
Franklin, Quentin I.
Sheahan, Robert R.
Viers, Willard G., Jr.
Sherlock, John, Jr.
Jarman, Lewis W.
Connolly, James J.
Dunn, Hollis T.
Leavitt, Edward J.
Shauer, Walter H., Jr.
Rogers, Lane
Chaney, Earl D., Jr.
Zimmerman, Eugene H.
Merrill, Will A.
Flanagan, John H.
House, William E., Jr.
Somers, Allen H.
Palmer, Kenneth P.
Snead, Douglas L.
Bladergroen, Charles H.
Alber, John W.
McMonagle, James J.
Carpenter, Donald R.
Kittler, Simon J.
Lono, Luther A.
Ogden, Bruce F.
Donovan, Orval E.
Vandersluis, Jan P.
Bitner, Daniel S.
Walker, John B., Jr.
Bright, Ray E., Jr.
Skipper, Kenneth J.
Thatcher, John L.
Costello, Thomas L.
Gallagher, Edward W.
Brower, Joseph P.
Standish, Cameron
Hunter, Earl R.
Herron, David G.
Foster, David L.
Chester, John W., Jr.
Salter, Martin E., Jr.
Waters, George J.
Elam, David L.
Wood, Donald E.

The following-named officers of the Marine Corps for permanent appointment to the grade of first lieutenant, subject to qualifications therefor as provided by law:

Letchworth, Rodney R.
Mead, William H.

The following-named officers of the Marine Corps for temporary appointment to the grade of first lieutenant, subject to qualifications therefor as provided by law:

Lutton, John M., Jr.
Salmon, Lawrence R.
Slater, John H.
Sloan, Robert W.
Weaver, Robert F., Jr.
Stone, Alan C.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

WEDNESDAY, MARCH 21, 1962

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Isaiah 55: 7: *Let the wicked forsake his way, and the unrighteous man his thoughts; and let him return unto the Lord, and He will have mercy upon him; and to our God, for He will abundantly pardon.*

Almighty God, in this meditative season of the Christian year may we be filled with a mood that is befitting to its solemnity and significance.

Gird us with renewed strength and courage to rise above everything that defiles our character and darkens the window of hope and of aspiration.

Grant that there may be in our inmost being a passion for purity, a power to master every self-indulgent desire, and a prayer to pursue the more excellent way.

We pray that Thou wilt put Thine arms of love about the sorrowing and all whose heads are bowed low by the blows of adversity and who mourn in secret behind a smiling face.

Hear us in His name who is of all friends the nearest.

THE JOURNAL

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

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. McGown, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate disagrees to the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 167) entitled "An act to authorize the Attorney General to compel the production of documentary evidence required in civil investigations for the enforcement of the antitrust laws, and for other purposes," requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. EASTLAND, Mr. KEFAUVER, Mr. JOHNSTON, Mr. DIRKSEN, and Mr. HRUSKA to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

TULANE UNIVERSITY, NEW ORLEANS, LA.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H.R. 641) to provide for the free entry of an intermediate lens beta-ray spectrometer for the use of Tulane University, New Orleans, La., together with amendments of the Senate thereto and concur in the Senate amendments.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendments, as follows:

"SEC. 2. (a) Section 165 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to losses) is amended—

"(1) By redesignating subsection (h) as subsection (i), and

"(2) By inserting after subsection (g) a new subsection (h) as follows—

"'(h) DISASTER LOSSES.—Notwithstanding the provisions of subsection (a), any loss

"'(1) attributable to a disaster which occurs during the period following the close of the taxable year and on or before the time prescribed by law for filing the income tax return for the taxable year (determined without regard to any extension of time), and

"'(2) occurring in an area subsequently determined by the President of the United States to warrant assistance by the Federal Government under sections 1855–1855g of title 42,

at the election of the taxpayer, may be deducted for the taxable year immediately preceding the taxable year in which the disaster occurred. Such deduction shall not be in excess of so much of the loss as would have been deductible in the taxable year in which the casualty occurred. If an election is made under this subsection, the casualty resulting in the loss will be deemed to have occurred in the taxable year for which the deduction is claimed.'

"(b) The amendments made by this section shall be effective with respect to any disaster occurring after December 31, 1961.

Amend the title so as to read:

An Act to provide for the free entry of an intermediate lens beta-ray spectrometer for the use of Tulane University, New Orleans, Louisiana, and to amend section 165 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 with respect to treatment of casualty losses in areas designated by the President as disaster areas.

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

Mr. BAKER. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, will the chairman explain the bill?

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, as Members of the House will recall, H.R. 641 passed the House of Representatives unanimously on August 23, 1961. The purpose of the bill was to provide for the free entry of an intermediate lens beta-ray spectrometer for the use of Tulane University.

The Senate made no changes in the bill which would affect this purpose. However, the Senate did add an amendment, cosponsored by Senator BYRD, of Virginia, chairman of the Finance Committee, and Senator WILLIAMS, of Delaware, ranking member of the Senate Finance Committee, the purpose of which, as stated by Senator WILLIAMS, is to "allow those in any disaster area so declared by the President of the United States to charge off their casualty losses on the

preceding year's tax return when the disaster happens after January 1 and before the time prescribed by law for the filing of their income tax returns."

Mr. Speaker, in addition, permit me to suggest that I am asking the House to agree to this Senate amendment with the understanding that:

First. It applies only in the case of a *casualty loss* (a) attributable to a major disaster—within the meaning of section 2(a) of the act of September 30, 1950—and (b) sustained in an area for which the President directs Federal agencies to provide assistance for such major disaster under section 3 of such act.

Second. In the case of such a casualty loss, if the disaster occurred after the close of the taxpayer's taxable year and before the date prescribed by law for filing his return for such taxable year, the taxpayer may elect to treat such loss as sustained in the taxable year immediately preceding the taxable year in which the disaster occurred.

Third. In any such case, the amount which is allowable under section 165(a) of the 1954 code for such preceding taxable year with respect to such loss is to be the amount which would be allowable under such section 165(a) for the taxable year in which such loss is sustained.

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

Mr. BAKER. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, this matter was called to my attention some days ago by the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS]. I told him at the time that I thought such action as this was highly desirable.

I had occasion the other day to go to the Atlantic coast of New Jersey to take a look for myself at the damage that was done there. I was taken on an inspection tour by local officials. The only way we could get through was by a caterpillar-equipped vehicle. I must say that the damage done not only to public facilities but also to private homes and private businesses is just completely unbelievable unless you see it for yourself.

It does seem to me that this measure is only equitable and fair. It will not ultimately result in any loss of revenue to the Government but will be of immense help to people in the disaster area who have suffered very seriously from the terrific storm that struck them.

I might say also, Mr. Speaker, I understand there are other actions being considered in the Congress of the United States that would afford additional relief to these people. As I say, I have seen something of the situation at firsthand. I want to say at this point that anything reasonable that can be brought before the Congress to aid in this situation I shall be glad to move along as fast as I can.

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. CAHILL. Mr. Speaker, I rise to compliment and thank the distinguished minority leader, Mr. HALLECK, for the interest, sympathy, and understanding he has demonstrated for those affected by the tragic storm that struck with such fury along the New Jersey coast and brought such suffering and loss to the people of my State. When the gentleman from Indiana took time from his busy schedule to travel to New Jersey and spend his entire weekend viewing and evaluating the scene personally, he again demonstrated the deep concern and real interest he has as one of our national leaders in the general welfare of all of the people of this country. As a result of his personal interest and support the amendment passed in the other body will, I believe, receive unanimous approval in the House.

As one who has also personally viewed the destruction and who has personal knowledge of the great loss of life and of property resulting from this storm I join the gentleman from Indiana in supporting this amendment and urge its unanimous adoption by the House.

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman from Tennessee yield?

Mr. BAKER. I yield.

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, the bill of which I was the author was the vehicle for this amendment, which I am very happy to support. I come from an area which is occasionally subject to hurricanes and the damage resulting from them. I think this is a very fine amendment and one which will give some degree of relief to people who suffered a very great disaster. I hope the House will concur in the Senate amendment.

Mr. BAKER. Mr. Speaker, the minority members of the committee are agreed that we should concur in the Senate amendment.

Mr. McDOWELL. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the bill, H.R. 641, as amended, now before the House. The amendment as adopted by the Senate provides for an amendment to the Internal Revenue Code which would allow taxpayers in my State who have suffered severely from the recent coastal storm to take credit for this damage on their 1961 income tax returns rather than having to wait to take such tax credit a year from now. This will greatly aid in providing cash for the purpose of rebuilding for those who have lost their homes and businesses in this disaster.

The change as contemplated by this amendment will not result in any loss in revenue to the Federal Government.

Mr. HARDING. 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 Idaho?

There was no objection.

Mr. HARDING. Mr. Speaker, I represent a State which has just suffered an estimated $13,320,000 damage from floodwaters which swept through homes, businesses, and farms in southern Idaho last month.

Having personally witnessed the devastation wrought these people by elements over which they had no control, I can strongly endorse the tax aid amendment attached to H.R. 641 in the Senate Monday which would aid flood victims in their economic recovery.

The amendment makes it possible for those living where the President has declared it a disaster area to claim their losses on their current tax return rather than waiting to deduct the losses until the next year.

This would mean disaster victims would have available this additional tax revenue assistance at the time when they most desperately need it. Present tax law provides that such losses can be deducted only in the calendar year in which they occur, so persons hard hit financially by the Idaho flood would get no tax relief until 1963.

Those who have already filed their tax forms can send amended returns to take advantage of this change in the law if the amendment is adopted.

Since this amendment had the support of the Senate and was drafted in cooperation with the Treasury Department, I hope the House will take immediate action to grant this tax relief.

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

There was no objection.

The Senate amendments were concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PRODUCTION OF CERTAIN EVIDENCE

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (S. 167) to authorize the Attorney General to compel the production of documentary evidence required in civil investigations for the enforcement of the antitrust laws, and for other purposes, together with House amendments thereto, and agree to the conference requested by the Senate, and that conferees be appointed.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

The Chair hears none, and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. CELLER, RODINO, ROGERS of Colorado, McCULLOCH, and MEADER.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA UNEMPLOYMENT COMPENSATION ACT

Mr. JAMES C. DAVIS submitted a conference report and statement on the bill (H.R. 5968) to amend the District of Columbia Unemployment Compensation Act, as amended.

THE 150TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE ESTABLISHMENT OF THE MUNICIPALITY OF BLOOMFIELD (N.J.)

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of House Resolution 567.

The Clerk read as follows:

Whereas the year 1962 marks the one hundred and fiftieth anniversary of the establishment of the municipality of Bloomfield, which took place on March 23, 1812, through an act of the Legislature of the State of New Jersey; and

Whereas the town of Bloomfield was named for Joseph Bloomfield, who served his country as a Member of this House, as a brigadier general in the War of 1812, as a Governor of the State of New Jersey, and as a major in the Revolutionary War; and

Whereas, in observance of the sesquicentennial, the town of Bloomfield and its citizens are conducting ceremonies and other appropriate activities in the current year: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the House of Representatives extends its greetings and felicitations to the citizens and government of the town of Bloomfield, New Jersey, on the occasion of the one hundred and fiftieth anniversary of the establishment of the town of Bloomfield.

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

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, and I shall not object, the ranking member of the Committee on the Judiciary on our side of the aisle spoke to me this morning about this measure and indicated he is in favor of it.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, further reserving the right to object, this simply extends felicitations. It does not cost any money?

Mr. RODINO. It does not cost any money.

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

There was no objection.

The resolution was agreed to, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, a century and a half of progress and productivity is nothing to be ignored. Indeed, it must be hailed as a matter of foremost importance. That is why, throughout the State of New Jersey, tribute is being accorded the city of Bloomfield, on the occasion of its 150th anniversary—an event well worth the time and effort of everyone concerned.

About the year 1700 a sturdy race of people began to settle in the Bloomfield area. The lay of the land was inviting. There was a fertile plain covered with virgin forests and flanked by tillable uplands. Two small rivers watered the region, giving promise of numerous mill sites. All that was needed to turn the countryside into an outstanding community was hard work and perseverance. These the earliest settlers were more than willing to provide. They worked not only for themselves but for their descendants. They came to stay.

In short time the people of Bloomfield had erected for themselves a community to be proud of, not only in the economic sense but in a spiritual and patriotic sense as well. The settlement of that part of Bloomfield formerly called Watsesson Plain became in time the most important section of the town. The first major improvement thereabouts was a wooden highway, constructed for the purpose of overcoming the perils of the mud season. Here and there along the course of the road, log houses and frame Flemmish cottages were quickly erected. And when the growth in population and produce warranted mills in the neighborhood, they were built. The first sawmill went into business as early as 1702.

Copper mines were discovered in the area before long, and a small copper industry came into existence, attracting additional settlers.

During the Revolutionary War there were no battles fought on Watsesson Plain, but the section was able to supply forage and supplies to Washington's troops when they encamped at Newark, in 1776. There is a story that Washington came here once for a night's lodging, only to leave when he found that the traitor, Benedict Arnold, was quartered nearby.

Following the war, in 1796, it was decided in town meeting to adopt the town name of Bloomfield, in honor of Gen. Joseph Bloomfield, a Revolutionary hero destined later to serve as Governor of the State, and a Member of Congress.

Yet not until 16 years later was Bloomfield enabled to separate herself from Newark Township. When that was brought about by legislative fiat, in the year 1812, Bloomfield came into her own and promptly began to thrive, as one of the outstanding communities in Essex County.

In time the town was to be cut down in size, to make way for the creation of four new neighbors: the towns of Montclair, Belleville, Glen Ridge and Nutley—formed from an area of 20 square miles formerly part of the Bloomfield domain.

But this in no way prevented Bloomfield from thriving, even under conditions of reduced size. The fact is evident today, through the existence of a substantial community, some 50,000 strong, and industry on a grand scale.

Not only is Bloomfield the site of a Westinghouse plant, a division of American Machine & Foundry and a General Motors parts unit, but also factories manufacturing nationally known and used electrical appliances and equipment, aluminum products, cosmetics, candy, pharmaceuticals, porcelain enameling, precision tools, and a variety of other industrial and scientific components and instruments. In addition, numerous research laboratories seek ways today to make easier and healthier our living tomorrow.

Two Bloomfield banks, moreover, record deposits of more than $150 million—a million for each year of the existence of this thriving town.

Local educational facilities include the venerable Bloomfield College and Seminary, founded in 1810.

Indeed, there is little in the way of industrial, educational, spiritual, and patriotic tradition that is not somehow accorded a place in the annals of Bloomfield, N.J., a town to be proud of, on this, the 150th year of its memorable existence. For here, beyond question, is the kind of community that can truly be called the backbone of the American Republic. It is fitting and proper, therefore, Mr. Speaker, that the House of Representatives has on this day adopted House Resolution 567, extending greetings and felicitations to the citizens and government of the town of Bloomfield, N.J., on the occasion of the 150th anniversary of the establishment of their town.

COMMITTEE ON RULES

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Rules may have until midnight tonight to file a privileged report.

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

There was no objection.

AMENDING SECTION 9 OF THE McSWEENEY-McNARY FOREST RESEARCH ACT OF MAY 22, 1928

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced today for appropriate reference, a bill to amend section 9 of the McSweeney-McNary Forest Research Act of May 22, 1928. This bill would remove the annual limitation on appropriations for forest resurveys. Adequate control over amounts appropriated annually, as in the case of other forestry research of the Department, then may be maintained through the usual budgetary review and the annual appropriation process in Congress.

In 1949 the Congress provided an authorization of $1,500,000 annually for conducting resurveys of the Nation's forest land and timber resources. During the past 12 years the costs of conducting forest surveys, like most other costs, have risen materially. As a result, a change in the authorization for resurveys, as proposed in this bill, has become necessary.

The Forest Survey provides the only comprehensive source of information on one of our most important natural resources. It is a source of basic statistics on the area and condition of forest lands, the volume, quality and location of remaining timber resources, the growth of timber, losses to fire and other destructive agents, and the current timber cut and prospective trends in requirements for forest products.

Every forestry agency requires such up-to-date facts on timber resources and uses to determine the effectiveness of our forestry efforts and the need for forestry programs. Forest industries need survey information in reaching business decisions on such problems as plant location and wood procurement programs.

This bill is necessary to enable the Department of Agriculture to conduct the nationwide forest survey on an adequate basis. This work is an essential part of the total forestry research program that is needed to support our large and growing forest economy.

AUTHORIZING APPROPRIATIONS FOR AIRCRAFT, MISSILES, AND NAVAL VESSELS

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 562 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. 9751) to authorize appropriations during fiscal year 1963 for aircraft, missiles, and naval vessels for the Armed Forces, and for other purposes. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and shall continue not to exceed four hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and the ranking minority member of the Committee on Armed Services, the bill shall be read for amendment under the five-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I yield the customary 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 562 provides for the consideration of H.R. 9751, a bill to authorize appropriations during fiscal year 1963 for aircraft, missiles, and naval vessels for the Armed Forces, and for other purposes. The resolution provides for an open rule with 4 hours of general debate.

We believe that today our strategic retaliatory forces are fully capable of destroying the Soviet target system, even after absorbing an initial nuclear surprise attack.

However, we do not know how large a strategic retaliatory force and what combination of weapons system we will need over the next several years to continue to deter the Soviet Union; or, if deterrence fails, to be able to strike back decisively even after absorbing an initial nuclear attack.

The size and kind of forces the country will need in the future will be influenced, in large part, by the size and kind of long-range nuclear forces the Soviets could bring against us and our allies and by the effectiveness of their defensive system. Assuming that the Soviet Union will eventually build a large ICBM force, then we must concentrate our efforts on the kind of strategic offensive forces which will be able to ride out an all-out attack by nuclear-armed ICBM's in sufficient strength to strike back decisively.

Steps must also be taken to improve our defenses against the growing threat of submarine-launched missiles. The Soviet Union probably already has some missile-firing submarines, a few of which may be nuclear powered. This fleet may be expected to grow in numbers and in capability, and new measures will have to be devised to counter that threat.

Finally, there is the possibility farther out in the future of a satellite-borne threat. In fact, the problem of detecting, tracking, and identifying satellites is already with us.

Mr. Speaker, up until a few moments ago I had intended to address myself at some length on what I understood was to be the most controversial issue posed by this bill, namely, whether the provisions of the bill with reference to the so-called RS–70 bomber planes versus the executive department's opposition thereto would prevail. This has been heralded as a contest between the executive and legislative departments of our Government. However, I have learned since I have come upon the floor that this has been resolved; and that the Armed Services Committee, under the leadership of the very able chairman, has agreed, or possibly compromised would be a better word, with the executive department and an appropriate amendment will be offered to put into effect that agreement.

However, I do want to say, Mr. Speaker, that as members of the legislative branch of our Government, most of us applaud the distinguished chairman, Mr. VINSON, and his efforts to preserve the integrity of the Congress by maintaining its independence of the executive department. For, if I understand the Constitution, and I think I do, the Founding Fathers provided that the Congress as a legislative body had the privilege and the duty to raise and support armies, and otherwise provide for the armed defense of the country. While, on the other hand, the President was set up as the Commander in Chief of the Armed Forces.

Therefore, it is the judgment of this Member of the Congress that the Committee on Armed Services is unquestionably within its right in insisting that the moneys it authorizes for particular weapons should be expended by the executive department for that purpose. In this connection, I should like to emphasize here that we in the Congress and in the country generally are indebted to the great chairman of the Armed Services Committee of the House, the Honorable CARL VINSON, for the substantial contribution which he has made throughout the many years that he has been chairman of this important committee, to the defense of our country.

However, Mr. Speaker, I should also like to applaud another public servant, one whom I know only by reputation, the Honorable Robert S. McNamara, the Secretary of Defense, who has differed with our distinguished chairman in this case of the B–70's. I am sure that Mr. McNamara is a distinguished public servant. His phenomenal career in industry has demonstrated his ability. His unselfish sacrifice made by him in order to undertake the important post that he now holds demonstrates his patriotism and dedication to country.

Mr. Speaker, I would be foolish indeed to set myself up as an arbiter in what appeared to be a controversy between these two great Americans. I am no expert in this or any other field, but I do have certain convictions which I have repeatedly stated from this floor over a period of the past 15 years. These are that Russia wants neither war nor peace, but the Communists set out deliberately at the conclusion of World War II to destroy its chief potential enemy, the United States of America, not by force of arms but by the destruction of the value of our dollar, and thereby our economy. Then, in turn, when we are a bankrupt nation and the hungry bellies ensue, to take over through infiltration, subversion, and the other now-known Russian devices without even firing a Russian gun. Mr. Speaker, I repeat, I am more concerned about the fiscal stability of this country than I am fearful of a Russian invasion. Therefore, while we must maintain a reasonably adequate defense posture, we must at the same time see to it that our fiscal house is kept in order, lest we play into the hands of the Communists.

In this connection I recall that in 1949 we had a somewhat similar situation when the construction of a large number of B–36 bombers was under consideration. At that time, I had a rather extended colloquy with the distinguished chairman of the Armed Services Committee in which I made the same point that I am making here today. On that occasion I pointed out that the B–36 bombers would be obsolete before the last came over the assembly line. Of course, that prediction proved to be true. Finally, Mr. Speaker, I am happy that sober judgment has prevailed and the additional $2.5 billion will not be expended at this time. I repeat my apprehension of spending ourselves into bankruptcy, and in this connection I should like to again point out that we owe $300 billion, that we are still engaging in the modern but false liberals' pastime of spending ourselves into bankruptcy. In 24 of the past 26 years we have had an unbalanced budget. We have raised the debt limit $2 billion this year and will be called upon to raise it another $8 or $10 billion before this Congress adjourns. The interest alone on the national debt is now better than twice the amount which was required to run the whole Federal Government 30 years ago.

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

Mr. COLMER. I yield to my distinguished friend from Iowa, who always is alert to the situation which I am now discussing.

Mr. GROSS. The gentleman is very kind. I rose to commend the distinguished gentleman on the statement he is making. In view of the fact that this is a $13 billion authorization bill, Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present. We should have more Members present to hear the gentleman's very fine statement.

Mr. VINSON. Will not the gentleman wait until the rule is adopted, and then make his point of order?

Mr. GROSS. I would like the Members here to hear the gentleman's statement.

Mr. COLMER. I appreciate the gentleman's gesture. Under the assurance that I have said my little piece for the umpteenth time on the floor of the House, will the gentleman not withhold his motion a couple of more minutes?

Mr. GROSS. I defer to the wishes of the gentleman.

Mr. COLMER. The gentleman always is most gracious, and I thank him.

I am going to do just what I said I was going to do, I am going to cease this

useless dissertation here because nobody pays any attention to this type of reasoning. But you are going to have to pay attention to it in just a few more years. You had better wake up and pay some attention to it now while you have an opportunity.

We must not only be reasonable in the area of national defense but we must also be prudent in domestic expenditures. These new authorizations for more welfare programs must be stopped. As surely as we gather in this Chamber today, there is a day of reckoning ahead. We had better apply the brakes and reverse the trend now while there is possibly still time or else we shall become the serfs of the Communist masters—not through armed invasion but by our own lack of discretion and self-control.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, as the gentleman from Mississippi, my colleague on the Rules Committee, Mr. COLMER, explained, this resolution makes in order the consideration of the bill H.R. 9751, an open rule with 4 hours of debate, to authorize appropriations, for fiscal year 1963, "for aircraft, missiles, and naval vessels for the Armed Forces, and for other purposes." In other words, this is a military authorization bill.

This bill was reported unanimously by the Armed Services Committee, and this rule was also reported unanimously by the Rules Committee. There has been only one controversial provision in this bill, although there may be some discussion as to the total amount of funds involved. That provision appears in line 2 of page 2, where the bill reads:

> The Secretary of the Air Force is "directed to utilize authorization in an amount not less than $491,000,000 during fiscal year 1963 to proceed with production planning and long leadtime procurement for an RS–70 weapon system."

Since that time some changes have been made.

Yesterday was a beautiful day, a wonderful spring day. In fact, spring finally arrived, late yesterday evening about 9 o'clock. On yesterday two of the most distinguished Americans of our time met together and took a little stroll in the Rose Garden behind the White House down at 1600 Pennsylvania Avenue and discussed some of the provisions of this bill.

As a result, the Committee on Armed Services of the House, which has usually been unanimous in its actions, because of the great leadership it has had, agreed to accept an amendment to change the wording of line 2 on page 2, so as to eliminate the word "directed" and to substitute therefor the word "authorized." Somehow or other that little change seems to have taken most of the steam out of the R–70 controversy which has been brewing here on Capitol Hill during the last few days.

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROWN. I yield to the gentlewoman from New York.

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. I would like to ask the distinguished gentleman from Ohio if he would give me a ruling on what the word "authorized" actually means?

Mr. BROWN. My dear colleague, I am not sure I can give you a ruling that would be entirely official because there has been a great deal of discussion throughout the years as to what the word "authorized" really means, in connection with legislation, when the President is authorized to do something. But the usual conclusion is that the will of the Congress is expressed in using the word "authorized," and it also expresses the desire of the Congress. So if that particular interpretation of the word "authorized" is correct the very distinguished gentleman, the chairman of the House Committee on Armed Services, did not give up too much.

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. In other words, it means a pious hope—and sometimes—"Hope deferred, maketh the heart sick"; is that correct?

Mr. BROWN. It goes a little further than that. I would suggest, if you check the records, that while we authorize many expenditures, the money is not always appropriated, and even if so, the expenditures are not always made by the President. But usually when the word "authorized" is used in legislation, the Chief Executive accepts it as more or less expressing the desire and the will of the Congress, and quite often he goes along with that.

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. I thank the gentleman for the explanation.

Mr. BROWN. Of course, that is one of the things that makes life in our Nation's Capital interesting—they do change the use of the words and the rules of the game now and then to meet changing circumstances.

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

Mr. BROWN. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Georgia, the chairman of the Committee on Armed Services.

Mr. VINSON. In view of the statement of the gentleman from Ohio and the statement of the gentlewoman from New York [Mrs. ST. GEORGE], I want to say that the word "authorized" in this particular instance means more than ever before.

Mr. BROWN. As I pointed out, the gentleman from Georgia, the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Armed Services, usually has his way in the end.

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

Mr. BROWN. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON].

Mr. CANNON. The gentleman will recognize, I am certain, as all Members of the House understand, that the word "authorized," as used in this connotation, means "permitted"—and nothing more.

It does not direct; it does not commit the House to affirmative action so far as appropriations are concerned.

Chairman Nelson Dingley, of Maine, disposed of that question for all time when he rendered an opinion on January 17, 1896, in which he said:

> The House has the right to refuse to appropriate for any object which it may deem improper, although that object may be authorized by law.

Mr. BROWN. Now we have had two completely different opinions expressed by two of the deans of this House, by two of the most learned men in the House of Representatives, both of whom are chairmen of very, very important committees of the House of Representatives. So decide for yourselves, if you please, just what the word "authorized" means.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to say in conclusion, in connection with this bill, of course, it is only an authorization bill, that is true; but, yet, it is a very, very necessary piece of legislation. All of these items that are authorized in this bill will have to be considered later by the House Committee on Appropriations.

But, I wish to go just a bit further, if I may, although I am not going to get into this argument over the B–70's.

I have been around here for a long, long time, some 24 years; but I am still very much of a junior to both the gentleman from Georgia and the gentleman from Missouri. In the years I have been here, however, I have learned that there has never been in the history of this country—and I mean exactly what I say—there has never been any individual in this country who had as great a grasp or knowledge of military matters and our military needs as the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON], chairman of the Armed Services Committee. I believe this has been agreed to by a great many qualified observers, all over this country, as well as our greatest military experts, and others. He has been honored many, many times by many patriotic organizations for the contributions he has made to our national defense. Like the gentleman from Mississippi, I have not always agreed with everything the gentleman from Georgia has said, or done, yet I do recognize his great knowledge and his great ability; and I believe that his judgment is as sound as that of anyone who may move from civilian life into the swirl of governmental affairs down here and, in a few weeks, or a few months, or a few years, have suddenly become an expert.

I recall we had a witness from one of the departments before a committee on which I sat not long ago. I noted in the paper that he had been confirmed by the Senate a day or two before, but he was appearing before the committee as an expert because he was an Assistant Secretary in that department. I asked him when he took office. He said he had been sworn in that morning before he came to Capitol Hill. I mention that because sometimes I think we had better base our judgment upon knowledge and information gained by men in this Congress who, through long years of service, are often in a far better position to know and to judge the right thing to do than some of those who may serve a much shorter time in other capacities of Government.

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

Mr. BROWN. I yield.

Mr. FORD. May I say to the gentleman from Ohio that I join with him

wholeheartedly in the complimentary things he has said about the fine gentleman from Georgia. He is not only an expert in all aspects of the military, but also he is an exceedingly fine gentleman.

In the light of the previous discussion here regarding the word "authorized" and its definition, perhaps I can clarify it somewhat—or maybe muddy the waters.

Mr. BROWN. I am very happy to have the gentleman's contribution. I want to call the gentleman's attention to the fact that the gentleman from Ohio held a very flexible position regarding what the word "authorized" actually means.

Mr. FORD. We do have some history in this body in reference to the meaning of this word. Back on May 27, 1950, the distinguished gentleman from Georgia brought a proposal to the floor of the House. It was H.R. 7764, a bill to authorize the construction of modern naval vessels, and for other purposes. The bill in part—and I quote from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of that date, read:

"Be it enacted, by the Senate and House of Representatives in Congress assembled, That the President of the United States is hereby authorized and directed to undertake the construction of not to exceed 50,000 tons of modern naval vessels in the following categories:".

And the categories are subsequently set forth. The House of Representatives passed that bill. It went to the other body. In the meantime the then President, Mr. Truman, and his then Secretary of the Navy, Mr. Matthews, became concerned about the use of the word "directed" in an authorization bill. Apparently in conference the conferees on the part of the House agreed to the deletion of the word "directed."

When the conference report came back to the House on July 31, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON], when asked some questions by Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts, had the following to say:

Mr. Speaker, one Senate amendment strikes out the words "and directed."

The Senate did not like the word "direct."

Mr. VINSON went on to say, and I read again from the RECORD:

The words "authorization" and "authorize" and "direct" are practically the same thing.

I do not know whether the dictionary will agree with that interpretation or not, but we do have some legislative history on the meaning of the words "authorization," "authorized," and "directed." Personally I firmly believe that there is a distinct difference between the words "authorize" and "direct." I respectfully say they are not "practically the same thing" and any dictionary will agree with my observation.

Mr. BROWN. I thank the gentleman very much.

The gentleman from Michigan has indicated that the gentleman from Georgia is still of the same mind as he was back in 1950. The gentleman from Ohio is completely aware of the fact that we have authorized various Presidents, of all types, stripes, and breeds, to do many things that they have failed or refused to do. Of course I know of no particular method or means the Congress of the United States, as the legislative branch, has to compel or to force any President to expend any funds which may be authorized and appropriated. That situation has existed many times in the past, and nothing was ever done about it.

I presume that first of all, in connection with this bill, under the gentle direction of the gentleman from Missouri, [Mr. CANNON], chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, that committee will scan this measure very carefully and decide, in its own innate wisdom, what particular changes should be made in connection with the authorizations carried in this bill.

Finally, the other body will take a look at this legislation and probably add some more to it in the way of appropriations and authorizations. Then finally it will all go down to the White House and be signed into law, both this authorization bill and the appropriation bill. In the end usually the President, the bureaucrats, and the other officials who serve under him, will do what they please about it anyway. So perhaps this has all been more or less a tempest in a teapot.

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

The previous question was ordered.

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

The resolution was agreed to and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. 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. 42]

Andrews	Diggs	Passman
Ashley	Fogarty	Pfost
Ayres	Gary	Powell
Baring	Grant	Rains
Battin	Griffiths	Rivers, S.C.
Blatnik	Harrison, Va.	Roberts, Ala.
Blitch	Hoffman, Mich.	St. Germain
Boykin	Jones, Ala.	Sheppard
Buckley	King, Calif.	Spence
Collier	McMillan	Whitten
Cooley	Mason	Widnall
Dawson	Moulder	

The SPEAKER. On this rollcall, 398 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

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

AUTHORIZING APPROPRIATIONS FOR AIRCRAFT, MISSILES, AND NAVAL VESSELS

Mr. VINSON. 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. 9751) to authorize appropriations during fiscal year 1963 for aircraft, missiles, and naval vessels for the Armed Forces, and for other purposes.

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. 9751, with Mr. KARSTEN 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 Georgia [Mr. VINSON] will be recognized for 2 hours and the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ARENDS] for 2 hours.

The gentleman from Georgia is recognized.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will proceed.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, this bill authorizes appropriations for the procurement of missiles, aircraft, and naval vessels.

The committee's authority to legislate in this area is based upon section 412(b) of Public Law 86–149.

Pursuant to the authority granted by that law, the committee recommends a bill authorizing appropriations in the following amounts: Missiles, $4,052,182,000; aircraft, $6,034,390,000; and naval vessels, $2,979,200,000.

This is a grand total of $13,065,772,000.

The committee began its hearings on January 24 and concluded them on March 1.

The committee had before it every conceivable detail with respect to the programs. We looked at the inventory of each individual aircraft, missile, and ship—we compared the inventory to the requirements of the department—and we then studied each individual item of the 1963 program to see how it fitted into the whole picture.

With respect to each item, we know how many the department has—the individual cost of each item—we know who the manufacturers are—the capabilities of the particular missile, airplane, or ship—and every other thing of any importance whatsoever.

Of course, much—perhaps most—of the information is classified and I regret that it cannot be spread on the record.

AMENDMENTS

The committee made a total of six amendments to the bill. I will speak briefly about each of these at this time and refer to them again when dealing with the individual programs later in my remarks.

The first amendment added $55,290,000 for Army aircraft. For the most part, this amendment represents authority for more airplanes of the same kind which were in the program last year and which are in the program this year.

The other Army amendment adds $31,182,000 for missiles. The story here is virtually identical to that with re-

pect to airplanes. It is more of the same—trying to get the Army a little bit closer to its actual requirements.

In the case of the Navy, the committee made only one amendment. It reduced the Navy shipbuilding authorization by $2.8 million.

MILITARY STARTS

The larger and more important amendments to the bill were in the Air Force portion. There were three of them.

First, the committee added $10 million for a start on 100 additional Minuteman missiles. It is only a start, but it is an important step toward the kind of intercontinental ballistic missile position which the country must achieve.

The other two Air Force amendments relate to the B–70 bomber, or as it is called today, the RS–70—RS means reconnaissance strike.

The first of these amendments added $491 million for the RS–70 and the second of them amended existing law to place all aspects of the RS–70 within the provisions of section 412.

Now, those are the amendments. I will speak at length about the RS–70 at a later point in my remarks.

It is my intention now to speak about the individual military department programs as they are reflected in this bill.

ARMY

Let us look at the Army first.

The bill authorizes $273,790,000 for aircraft for the Army. A list of the aircraft to be bought and a description of each airplane appears on pages 17 and 18 of the report.

Briefly, the Army plans to buy three kinds of helicopters—the Chinook, the Iroquois, and observation helicopters of the Sioux and Raven types.

The bill authorizes also three kinds of fixed wing airplanes. The Caribou, the Mohawk, and the Seminole.

A glance of pages 17 and 18 of the report will give you a good picture of these aircraft.

And I might say that the aircraft used by the Army is, of course, the kind that is flown within the battlefield area.

There is no conflict or duplication at all here with the Air Force.

The Air Force provides the tactical support but the Army needs aircraft for surveillance and to enable the commanders to travel from unit to unit, to evacuate the wounded, and operate generally within the restricted battle area. The planes are also used to move a squad of soldiers from one place to another as the battle situation might dictate.

Today, there are about 22,000 people in Army aviation of which 7,000 are pilots. The Army has about 5,631 airplanes in its inventory.

In the field of missiles, the bill authorizes $589,482,000 for Army missiles.

These missiles are the Hawk, the Nike-Hercules, the Redeye, the Honest John, the Little John, the Pershing, and the Sergeant. And also some target missiles and some antitank missiles.

Of these, the Hawk, Nike-Hercules, Honest John, and Little John are operational.

And the Nike-Hercules, as you know, is the surface-to-air missile that defends many of the great metropolitan areas, industrial complexes, and military bases throughout the country.

Again, a glance at pages 17 and 19 of the report will give you the picture of these missiles.

NAVY-MARINE CORPS

For the Navy and Marine Corps, the bill authorizes $2,134,600,000 for aircraft.

The Navy and Marine Corps are buying the Skyhawk, the Intruder, the Vigilante, the Phantom, and a number of others all listed on page 20 and all described on pages 20, 21, and 22.

The bill authorizes missiles for the Navy in the amount of $930,400,000 and missiles for the Marine Corps in the amount of $22,300,000.

These missiles include the Sparrow, the Sidewinder, the Terrier, the Tartar, and a number of other missiles which are listed on page 20 and described on pages 22 and 23.

You will note from that list that Sparrow, Sidewinder, Terrier, Tartar, Talos, Bullpup, Polaris, and Hawk are operational.

NAVAL VESSELS

The bill provides $2,979,200,000 for the construction and conversion of naval vessels.

The program covers the construction of 37 new ships and the conversion of 35 other ships. The larger and more important areas of the shipbuilding program involve an aircraft carrier at a cost of $310 million—and I might say that this is a conventionally powered carrier.

Also, there is one guided missile frigate at a cost of $190 million—eight nuclear powered submarines of the attack kind at a cost of $510 million—and six Polaris submarines at a cost of $720 million.

These are the biggest, more important portions of the shipbuilding program but every one of the ships in the program is set out on pages 23, 24, and 25 of the report with a description of the ship and its cost.

AIR FORCE

For the Air Force, the bill authorizes $3,626 million for Air Force aircraft.

These aircraft include the KC–135 jet tanker—the F–105 fighter-bomber—the F–110 tactical fighter—and a number of other airplanes which are listed on page 26 and described on pages 26, 27, and 28.

In the field of missiles, the bill authorizes $2,510 million for Air Force missiles.

These include the Atlas, the Titan, the Minuteman, Bullpup, and others, which, again, are listed on page 26 and described on pages 29 and 30.

You will note that Atlas, Bullpup, Firebee, and Sidewinder are operational.

As you know, the ICBM's are the Atlas, which is operational today, the Titan, which will be operational in the very near future, and the Minuteman, which will be operational later on.

The Atlas and Titan are liquid fuel missiles while the Minuteman will use solid fuel.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I want to talk to the committee with reference to the amendment relating to the RS–70, heretofore referred to as the B–70. After this program gets underway it will be designated and known as RS–70.

Mr. Chairman, I want to announce at this point that it is my intention at the appropriate time, when the amendments are being considered, to offer an amendment by direction and by unanimous vote of those who were present at the Armed Services Committee this morning to delete from the bill the word "direct" and substitute the word "authorize." This may come as a surprise to many of you, but I do not think it will be a surprise to those of you who have followed the logical progress of this whole controversy.

Now, let us look at what lay behind the language "directed that the Secretary of the Air Force use the $491 million." It is a realistic and a natural conclusion of the whole matter.

It was simply this: I and the whole committee felt that we were getting out of the bomber business. How strongly we felt about this is clearly reflected in the committee report.

How could we change the course being followed by the Department of Defense? Merely authorizing the additional funds, as heretofore happened in the past, was not enough. This has been tried. Most of the time it has not worked. So some other course had to be found which would impress the Department of Defense that we meant what we said: that we were not going to stand idly by and see ourselves heading down the road that had nothing at the end but missiles. What course could we follow to see that this did not happen? It had to be something drastic, something unusual, something that had not been tried before. That "something" turned out to be a direction that the funds would be spent.

I realized that there were some constitutional questions involved, questions that had never been answered. But there seemed to be nothing else we could do. So we put in the word "direct." What happened? Exactly what could be expected to happen. A great controversy in the press, some taking one side and some taking the other, and none of this was lost on the Secretary of Defense. He saw we were going to get something done.

Mr. Chairman, from here on I am in the field of conjecture. But there can be little doubt that this is what happened: The Secretary of Defense was worried about two things: First he was worried about flying directly in the face of the Congress, because this was a war he could never win—even if he did win a battle now and again. This was his first worry. His second worry was that maybe he was wrong about the RS–70. Maybe he was going too slowly on this bomber. So, what could he do? He did not want to fly in the face of the Congress, and he had an honest concern that he was wrong about the bomber, and about the RS–70. He could do only one thing. He could only seek some compromise which would dispel both of these facts. And, what compromise could he make to take care of that? This had to be something firm and at the same time

well reasoned. It had to be something that an aroused Congress will accept.

Well, he arrived at the right answer—and I, for one, am very glad that he did. Because, we were engaged in a controversy that if allowed to go on could only result in a disruption of relations that would be harmful to both sides—and harmful to the country.

The kind of a fight that nobody wins.

What did he do? This is what he did. I am now going to read to you two letters. One is from Secretary McNamara and the other is from the President himself. This is what they say.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the Clerk be permitted to read these letters.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

THE SECRETARY OF DEFENSE,
Washington, March 20, 1962.

HON. CARL VINSON,
Chairman, Armed Services Committee,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: While the President is writing to you directly concerning the constitutional problems raised by the present language of H.R. 9751, I want you to know that we are anxious to work with you, your committee and the Congress in the spirit which a Government of divided powers such as ours must maintain in order to function successfully. Consequently we are initiating immediately a new study of the RS–70 program in the light of the recommendations and the representations of the Armed Services Committee. This study will give full consideration to the magnitude of the committee program and the depth with which the committee has emphasized this. Furthermore, if technological developments related to sideview radar, and associated data processing and display systems, advance more rapidly than we anticipated when the fiscal 1963 Defense budget was prepared, we will wish to take advantage of these advances by increasing our development expenditures; and we would then wish to expend whatever proportions of any increases voted by the Congress, these advances in radar technology would warrant.

Again let me express my continued friendship and admiration for you personally, and our gratitude for the work you are doing on behalf of our national defense.

Sincerely,

ROBERT S. MCNAMARA,
Secretary of Defense.

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington March 20, 1962.

HON. CARL VINSON,
Chairman, Armed Services Committee,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: With the profoundest respect for your leadership in national defense and congressional affairs, I must take this opportunity to urge your reconsideration of the language added by your committee to H.R. 9751. The amendment to which I refer states that the Secretary of the Air Force is "directed" to utilize not less than $491 million of this authorization (fiscal year 1963 funds for aircraft, missiles and naval vessels) to proceed with production planning and long leadtime procurement for an RS–70 weapons system. I would respectfully suggest that, in place of the word "directed," the word "authorized" would be more suitable to an authorizing bill (which is not an appropriation of funds) and more clearly in line with the spirit of the Constitution.

Each branch of the Government has a responsibility to "preserve, protect and defend" the Constitution and the clear separation of legislative and executive powers it requires. I must, therefore, insist upon the full powers and discretions essential to the faithful execution of my responsibilities as President and Commander in Chief, under article II, sections 2 and 3, of the Constitution.

Additionally implicit in the Constitution, of course, is the intent that a spirit of comity govern relations between the executive and legislative. And while this makes unwise if not impossible any legislative effort to "direct" the Executive on matters within the latter's jurisdiction, it also makes it incumbent upon the Executive to give every possible consideration in such matters to the views of the Congress. For that reason, Secretary McNamara has indicated to you in a separate letter his willingness to reexamine the RS–70 program and related technological possibilities.

Your devotion to our continued military effectiveness is admired and appreciated; and I look forward to working with you and receiving your counsel for many years to come.

Sincerely,

JOHN F. KENNEDY.

Mr. VINSON. Now, if my colleagues will bear with me while I make some observations as to what this letter of the Secretary says. Let me emphasize what the letter said:

Consequently we are initiating immediately a new study of the RS–70 program.

I ask my colleague to listen to these words:

In the light of the recommendations and the representations of the Armed Services Committee, this study will give full consideration to the magnitude of the committee program and the depth with which the committee has emphasized this. Furthermore, if technological developments * * * advance more rapidly than we anticipated * * * we will wish to take advantage of these advances by increasing our development expenditures; and we would then wish to expend whatever proportions of any increase voted by the Congress these advances in radar technology would warrant.

Now let us see what the President said. The President said:

It makes it incumbent upon the Executive to give every possible consideration in such matters to the views of the Congress. For that reason, Secretary McNamara has indicated to you in a separate letter his willingness to reexamine the RS–70 program and related technological possibilities.

Now what is the sum and substance of these letters? Well, the first thing they mean is that the Congress has made its point and has won the fight—or maybe I should not say "won the fight," but maybe I should just say we caused the Department of Defense to see the error of their ways. Reasonable people don't go bumping into each other and having difficulties that can be avoided. There is always room for a little give and take. That is what makes our kind of government work. We are not infallible, they are not infallible. There is room for differences. We are all headed for the same goal. We have just been disagreeing as to how we would get there. So here we are—reason and commonsense have won out. The committee has made its position crystal clear. The Department is now going to take a good, hard look at that position. It would be an unreasonable man, indeed, who would object to this kind of solution. We want an adequate Military Establishment with all of the things that such an establishment needs. We want bombers and, certainly, we have no objection to taking a good hard look at how we will get them. We would be in a pretty shaky position if we said, "Go ahead, spend this money and never mind any more thought on the subject, just spend these dollar bills."

Now the Department is going to turn their whole solution to the RS–70. They have gotten the message. They know that the Congress is not just talking. They know we mean business. So we can congratulate ourselves that although we had to raise a good ruckus and a good fuss, we got our point across. We are on the right road now. I might say this: We are going to watch this new study by the Department every step of the way from this point on. I advised the Committee on Armed Services this morning that periodically I was going to respectfully request these people who are dealing with this new study to come before the Committee on Armed Services and give a report on the progress of the study.

We are going to make sure that every advance developed by this study will be translated—and immediately translated—into the expenditure of funds for the most rapid development possible of the RS–70.

Let me say that I am completely satisfied with what we accomplished by the sensible approach that was taken yesterday in an hour and a half conference at the White House.

I mean every single word I am saying.

I feel that any reasonable man is willing to abide by the results of a thoroughly objective study such as that which is now going to be made by the Department—and with the full, personal support of the President.

The President is interested now.

He has injected himself right into the middle of this whole matter.

And another thing, the committee will get a full assurance that the group making this study will have not only scientists and representatives of the Secretary of Defense in it, but will have people from the Air Force, not only the technical ones but the policy ones; and not only civilians, but military people whose background and experience in the development and operation of bombers gives them special understanding of the problem that we are talking about.

Just what is the net effect of this whole action?

First. In the first place, this committee has expressed a complete unwillingness to place this Nation in a position where its sole method of warfare would be massive retaliation.

The committee's concept on this matter is preserved by this action.

Second. This committee had expressed its total unwillingness to junk manned bomber systems as a weapon in our future defense arsenal.

That position is respected in this action.

Third. There have been no indications that the Secretary of Defense was in the least concerned with the size of the

program which this committee approved or the depth of its conviction in approving that program.

The Secretary states in his letter that the study which he will promptly institute will take into full consideration not only the size of the program recommended by the committee but the depth of the committee's conviction in approving that program.

Fourth. The Secretary has publicly stated that he could not and would not spend any more money in fiscal 1963 for the development of the RS–70 than the $171 million which he requested.

He now states that if technological developments advance more rapidly than was anticipated when the fiscal 1963 defense budget was prepared, he will wish to take advantage of these advances by increasing development expenditures. He also states that, in that event, he would wish to expand whatever proportion of the increase voted by the Congress these advances in technology would warrant.

The foregoing represents the four major points which have been stressed by this committee. In view of the results which have been achieved and the assurances now given to the committee, I have no hesitancy in concluding that the committee's program remains intact and that the committee has achieved its objectives in a far more logical way than was provided in our initial approach.

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

Mr. VINSON. If the gentleman will withhold his question for a moment, for I wish now to talk about the justification of asking the Appropriations Committee to follow the modern version of what "authorized" means. The correct version was quoted by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. FORD] from a proceeding that took place some 12 years ago. But time changes everything, and so we will now accept the modern version.

I hope the committee will bear with me patiently here. This is very important. As I say, this is the turning point. You are either going to have bombers or you are not going to have bombers. Where does it lead you? It leads you down but one road, massive retaliation.

It would lead to defeat if intercontinental ballistic missiles were to be outlawed.

Mr. Chairman, now that is the picture of the whole aircraft, missiles, and naval vessels program for fiscal year 1963.

RS–70

Mr. Chairman, of course there will be differences of opinion between the Department of Defense and the Congress as to just exactly what should be done in particular areas of defense.

This is a healthy situation.

I do not believe that after the Armed Services Committee has held extended detailed hearings that we have only engaged in an exercise of self-improvement in the area of knowledge.

To me, knowledge is something to be used, not merely to be possessed.

Now, the committee was briefed in the greatest detail about the RS–70. We obtained the knowledge we wanted. And it is on the basis of the knowledge gained that we amended the bill in the fashion we did.

Last year, the Congress authorized $525 million for manned bombers. The Appropriations Committee found itself in complete agreement with this action and recommended an appropriation of $515 million against this authority. The Congress accepted this recommendation.

And the same thing is true of the B–70. Last year there were $220 million in the bill for the B–70 and the Congress raised this by $180 million to a total of $400 million.

I have mentioned the strong position taken by the Appropriations Committee last year in increasing by $180 million the amount requested by the Defense Department.

This was a courageous act. I congratulate the Appropriations Committee for adding this $180 million, and the Congress approved it. The Appropriations Committee has been the trailblazer in the field of the B–70. Indeed, I can say in a very real sense the Armed Services Committee is following the leadership which has been furnished by our great Appropriations Committee.

I think it might be well to review Congress' action last year in providing $525 million for manned bombers.

This is the history of it. As I said, the Armed Services Committee was very concerned that we are getting out of the bomber business entirely. With this in mind, the committee added $337 million for B–52 or B–58 or a mixture of both. And the bill passed the House this way.

The Senate committee felt that we should not designate what kind of airplanes—and that the amount should be $525 million which is, incidentally, just about the cost of one wing of B–52's.

In conference the House agreed to the Senate figure and the Senate language—and that is how the law came to read $525 million for manned bombers. And as I have said the Appropriations Committee appropriated $515 million.

Now, let us look at the money situation with respect to the B–70. The first funds were appropriated in 1955—7 years ago. And funds have been appropriated every year since that time for a total of over $1 billion to date.

All of the funds so far have been appropriated for a B–70 which was a bombing airplane exclusively.

These funds have been used and are being used for the three basic airplanes which, of course, could become either a B–70 or constitute steps toward the system which is now called the RS–70. These first three are experimental planes and constitute the basic structure of whatever plane finally would be decided on.

None of this money has been wasted. Nor will the additional $300 million, which will make a grand total of $1.3 billion, be wasted since proper experimental models will be provided.

However, the concept today is not to have a plane which is just a bomber, but to have an airplane which is a bomber and a lot of other things, too.

It will be used as a plane for observing, reporting, evaluating, and exercising on-the-spot judgment and action. It will have unusual communications equipment and a number of other facilities and capabilities which are classified.

So, this is a very different kind of airplane than the B–70 as it was first conceived—not different in appearance, but different in the great number of functions it can perform.

The $491 million added by the committee does one immediate thing: It is a major step toward three additional airplanes so that there will be a total of six.

But it does something perhaps even more important than that. It raises the level of progress so that instead of acquiring only three flying laboratories, we will be acquiring in addition something very close to a complete fighting machine. So close indeed that should the program be pursued completely, the second three airplanes would become an actual part of the inventory.

The Department of Defense feels that the present program of $1.3 billion will permit the exercise of an option as to whether to continue on after the third plane.

I have serious doubts as to whether this is actually so—because the present program has its sights set too low and the program will produce only basic prototype airplanes which will prove little more than that they can fly.

The committee's program more clearly preserves the exercise of an option since it will produce an airplane configured as a combat aircraft which is a very far thing, indeed, from a flying laboratory.

I would also like to say this. Mr. McNamara is quoted as saying that in view of the size of our existing forces, ICBM's, Polaris submarines, B–52's, and so forth:

> It does not appear wise at this time to make a final commitment to a $10 billion B–70 production program. To do so would in my opinion be a serious waste of the Nation's resources.

The committee's action is by no means a commitment to a $10 billion program.

It is designed, however, to give us an opportunity to decide what commitment should be made in the area of an advanced follow-on strategic bombing system.

I join Mr. McNamara in his objection to the waste of our Nation's resources. I do not join him in his belief that the B–70 should be pursued at the low level that it is today.

It is a human trait—to oversimplify issues. I think that is exactly what has happened here. The problem has been presented in black and white. Mr. McNamara says we are committed to $10 billion if we do anything at all, other than follow the present plan which is to build only three planes.

This is not the case at all. And I would like to set the record straight.

The actual issue that is presented to us is whether we should go along with a policy that would result, in the long run, in the extinction of bomber aircraft, or whether we should provide a reasonable option for the continuation of bomber aircraft as a part of our strategic force. This is the sole issue.

I cannot stress this point too much: The $491 million which the committee recommends is not directed toward production which would lead to a large number of aircraft.

What it would do is to provide development that will maintain a true option for a subsequent decision to go ahead with a full weapon system program.

To reach the $10 billion figure quoted by Mr. McNamara you would have to include cost of design, development, testing, and you would have to procure and operate a large number of these aircraft for an extended period of time.

Now, what happens if the $491 million is not made available? We will find ourselves at the end of fiscal year 1963 with a 3-year lag in engine deliveries, about a year lag in the important areas of honeycomb panels for the airframe, a real possibility that critical tools will be disposed of, the plant facilities being used for other purposes, and a concentrated skilled labor force scattered throughout the country in other jobs.

Now, that is what would happen if we do not raise the level of funding to $491 million.

But if we do grant this authority and these funds, we will permit the start of development of reconnaissance-strike subsystems, we will permit the third airplane to change over from a B–70 type to an RS–70 type. The additional authority would also allow long leadtime commitments for the fourth, fifth, and sixth aircraft, and very importantly, permit a wide range of options in 1965.

Then in 1965, we will determine what course to follow—whether to produce airplanes or not—and we would be doing it on the basis of true factual knowledge.

These options range all the way from completion of the sixth aircraft to going ahead to a full weapon system development leading toward a force of actual fighting planes.

As is clear from what I have said, we are buying more than three additional airplanes. We are buying the critical element of time, perhaps as much as 3 years.

It is said that much of the equipment for the RS–70 still has to be developed.

This is true. There is no doubt about it. It is for this very reason that we need the larger program for the RS–70.

Why should we wait until the third plane is built before starting on the subsystems which need further developing. Let us save time which is so valuable to our Nation.

It is said that further research must be done on some of these elements before they are far enough along to initiate a development program aimed at actual operational use.

This is not the case. These elements are within the current state of the art.

For example, a very important part of the RS–70 is the "high resolution radar." Now, this radar, which concededly is a very complicated device, had its first working model made by the University of Michigan years ago. One company has even built and demonstrated in flight a system very similar to the one that would be used in the RS–70.

I can say, and this is important, that the quality of the radar picture obtained today is such that the radar operator can see and identify targets that cannot be seen at all with current systems.

We can all recall that very much the same arguments were made against the Polaris submarine years ago. If the Congress had not taken up for Admiral Rickover's ideas and supported him in his fight, we would have no Polaris submarines today.

What the committee has been trying to get across now for 2 years is simply this: We think it is dangerous to get out of the bomber business entirely.

Consider this: Where would we have been 5 years ago if we did not have bombers? Where would we be today if we did not have bombers? In all probability, we would have been attacked and would have been unable to strike back.

Today's B–47's, B–52's, and B–58's have kept the peace, have been the one weapon which has deterred an enemy from attacking us. There is no doubt about the accuracy of this statement.

This is no special plea for the RS–70. If it were some other advanced bomber, the committee would feel exactly the same way. The whole point of the committee's action is that we don't want to be entirely dependent on missiles—whether they be ICBM, IRBM, Polaris, or any other kind.

And the very simple reason for this is that it permits us only a single way to fight a war.

A missile cannot look at something and report back. It cannot turn around once it is shot off. It cannot do anything but go and explode its nuclear warhead.

Let me make my position clear.

The last B–52 and the last B–58 will come off the production line this year in August and October. We have over 1,200 bombers today. These bombers will wear out. If we do not start out on a new bomber, then the time will soon come when we will have no bombers.

A complicated weapon system such as the bomber cannot be bought off the shelf.

Perhaps some Members do not realize that from the beginning of a bomber to the time they are in the inventory covers a period of 10 years. It is this very consideration—the element of time—which could threaten our national security.

Now, let us look at the argument that in a few years the country will be bristling with intercontinental ballistic missiles—and for that reason, we would not need bombers.

What does this mean? It means that we have a massive deterrent which we do need, and a capability for massive retaliation which we may never need.

Our hands are tied. We have no flexibility. We can fight a nuclear war, but we cannot fight a general war in which nuclear weapons would not be used. It is all or nothing.

Now, just suppose that nuclear weapons are banned by international agreement. This would eliminate the intercontinental ballistic missile entirely because no one would ever use an ICBM to carry a mere high explosive warhead.

If this should come to pass—or if we engaged in a general war in which by mutual agreement nuclear weapons would not be used—as we did with respect to poison gas—then the side that has the bomber force is a winner by that very fact alone.

Perhaps the view of the Armed Services Committee is an overly conservative one—perhaps the bomber has lost its glamour—but if the committee is going to push hard on one side or another, it is going to be on the side of having too much rather than too little, having a strong conventional capability such as the bomber with a man's brain guiding it rather than an electronic device which purports to have all the answers but which cannot ask a question.

Today our bomber force is made up of B–47's, B–52's, and B–58's. The B–47's are already rather old airplanes. They will start to fade out of the force in the not too distant future. Then the B–52's will start to fade out. And finally the B–58's will go out, too.

I am logical when I say that when the only bombers we have are gone, then we will be out of the bomber business. And this is an absolute certainty if there is no new bomber coming along to take their place.

Let me say to you—the Soviet Union is by no means following this course. The Soviet Union is developing newer and faster bombers right today.

The Soviets have had three bombers in their inventory since 1954. They are known as the Badger, the Bison, and the Bear. Altogether the Soviets have over 1,000 medium and heavy bombers in operational units.

Most important is the fact that their long-range air arm is capable of delivering nuclear weapons to targets anywhere in the United States.

But have they stopped developing new bombers as we propose to do? The answer is "No."

They have a new supersonic heavy bomber, known as the Bounder. And another supersonic bomber—roughly comparable in size to our B–58 medium bomber—known as the Blinder. And I might mention that the Blinder most probably has the capability of our B–58 which last year set a record of 3 hours and 20 minutes from New York to Paris—about 3,700 miles.

It does not make much sense to me for us to go out of the bomber business while the enemy is getting more and better ones.

So, here we have a problem made up of two elements: One of the elements is a thing and the other element is a principle. I have already dealt with the thing, which is the RS–70, and as for the principle I will simply say this:

I ask you—What is Congress' function in defense? Is it a partner? Does it have a voice? Or is it just Mr. Moneybags, to give or to withhold funds?

That is not what the Constitution says; the Constitution grants the Congress the exclusive power to raise and support and make rules for our military forces. The language of the Constitution is clear.

Congress does not want to run the Department of Defense—Congress just

wants to sit at the table and get across an idea once in a while.

I say the country loses something if it loses the voice of Congress in Pentagon deliberations.

I simply do not like the idea of Congress being thought of as a kindly old uncle who complains but who finally, as everyone expects, gives in and raises his hand in blessing, and then rocks in his chair for another year, glancing down the avenue once in a while wondering whether he has done the right thing.

This is not the kind of picture that I have of the Congress.

I think of the Congress as an active participant in the direction of policy, and as a partner in the achievement of adequate defense for the Nation.

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

Mr. VINSON. With pleasure.

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Chairman, I should like to say that the gentleman from Georgia has just made a magnificent presentation dealing with the defense of the United States of America. I think that those of us who have had the privilege of serving with him for a short time or for a long time may feel very confident of the security of our country as long as he is directing the affairs of this great committee. I think the fact that his committee time and time again has supported him unanimously, the fact that the leadership of the House time and time again has supported him unanimously, speaks more eloquently than anyone can for his devotion to our country, for his understanding of its problems.

I read some time ago where some columnist had described the gentleman from Georgia as "the Fox." I think if it requires the knowledge and the cunning of a fox to succeed he will succeed; but I would rather think that he has the courage of a lion and the vision of an eagle; and I commend the speech that he has just made.

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

Mr. VINSON. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. GAVIN. It is quite evident how much interest they had in this bomber when they only asked for $171 million and we had to add $320 million to bring it to $491 million to get prototypes of this RS–70. Why is it necessary for you as chairman of the Committee on Armed Services to go to the Secretary of Defense and to the President of the United States to get them to acquiesce in this, and to permit the Department of the Air Force to proceed with the development of this development program which, in my estimation, is the most important matter that this committee can consider here today?

Mr. VINSON. Let me suggest to my distinguished colleague, the gentleman knows when it is necessary to act, the Committee on Armed Services acts. We felt it was necessary in this instance to act. We did not think $171 million was sufficient so we added $491 million.

Mr. GAVIN. Well, when we run out of the $491 million how are they going to get the money to expedite this project?

Mr. VINSON. The Congress will meet again next year and, if they can spend $491 million this year toward getting the three RS–70's we will be ready to give them more money—and we will get the planes.

Mr. GAVIN. Would the gentleman care to make an estimate of what the three RS–70's will cost?

Mr. VINSON. Yes. I think I should tell the House this. While this item is only for $491 million—to get these three additional planes in the next 3 years or so, it will cost a total of $1,200 million to $1,300 million. Now bear in mind we have already committed ourselves to spend $1,300 million and we get nothing but a prototype airplane that I classify as a flying laboratory. That is all you get for that money. But, if you add $1,300 million more, we will get a modern bomber of the kind and capability that the country and the world has never seen produced.

Mr. GAVIN. What has me disconcerted is the fact that your committee, and with you with 48 years of experience behind you, must go to the Secretary of Defense and the President of the United States, to get something done.

Mr. VINSON. I have tried to point out that the Department of Defense and the executive branch, with these letters in the RECORD, are going to have a little different viewpoint on things that the Congress wants done and on the determination of the Congress to get them done.

Mr. GAVIN. I think it is about time we took a determined stand. When the committee arrives at a conclusion that certain materiel or hardware is needed, they should pay more respect and attention to our conclusion. It is quite evident, Mr. Chairman, that after the committee had arrived at a decision, you still had to go down and talk to the Secretary of Defense and to the President. If you had not this RS–70 might not have been given any consideration.

This should not be necessary for a man who is concededly the greatest leader in the field of defense the Congress has ever seen. Here we have a man who represents to the country their own personal leader in the area of defense. CARL VINSON is elected by the people of the Sixth District of Georgia. So far as defense is concerned, he represents not only that district but the whole of the United States and every person in it. The word of this kind of man should be listened to just because he said it.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 10 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, as always, the distinguished gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON], the chairman of our Committee on Armed Services, has presented to you a complete explanation of the contents and purpose of this bill. I shall not take up your time merely to repeat the details he has so ably presented. As a matter of fact, neither he nor I could go into much more detail than embodied in the committee report itself without risking a breach of security.

I shall, however, risk repetition to what the chairman has said and what is set forth in our committee report solely to emphasize certain salient facts in connection with the defense measure now before us. I should like to make one or two observations which I hope will be persuasive with you in giving your full support to our Committee on Armed Services.

In the first place, we present this bill to you without a dissenting vote in our committee. Every single member of our committee has had the benefit of all the data available, secret and nonsecret, military and civilian, diplomatic and domestic, to enable him to arrive at sound conclusions. The bill before us is based on the knowledge and recommendations of our best military minds of all the services, and the recommendations of our brilliant Secretary of Defense.

The measure now before you represents the considered judgment of your Committee on Armed Services in the discharge of our constitutional responsibility for size and kind, in men and weapons, of a national defense we shall have. We present this to you as our conviction of what we must undertake in our defense planning and procurement that we may have a national defense second to none. We have such a defense today, and we intend to keep it that way.

When I say that this bill is the unanimous considered judgment of our Committee on Armed Services, there is another point I believe might justly be emphasized. Whenever, as in this bill, the committee departs from the recommendation of the Secretary of Defense the capacity of the committee to make such a military decision is inevitably brought into question. Who are we to be so presumptuous as to substitute our judgment for that of the Secretary of Defense who is advised by the Joint Chiefs of Staff?

There is no denying that we have an extremely able man serving as Secretary of Defense. He is a dedicated man of remarkable ability and limitless energy. As able and knowledgeable as he is, it is hardly possible that in the brief period of a little more than a year his capacity to evaluate our overall defense needs exceeds that of our own committee chairman who has been dealing with such matters for almost 48 years. Or go down the committee roster and reflect on how many Secretaries of Defense and Joint Chiefs of Staff members have appeared before the committee over the years.

Reflect on the number of military questions, in peacetime and in war, upon which the members of the Armed Services Committee have had to pass judgment. Reflect on the questions the committee has had to resolve when, as in this instance, there is a difference of opinion among the members of the Joint Chiefs of Staff themselves.

And so, Mr. Chairman, when I refer to the bill as reported by our committee as being the considered judgment of our Committee on Armed Services there is involved more than a few weeks of hearings and briefings. Into the decision made by the committee went the composite of years and years of hearings, briefings, and study of each and every phase of our national defense.

We do not claim that our committee judgment is infallible. By the same token, we do not believe that any such claim can be made for the Secretary of Defense nor for the Joint Chiefs of Staff. If military judgment were infallible we would not have had the case of Billy Mitchell as an object lesson. Nor would we have had in more recent years before World War II the controversy over the wisdom of constructing more battleships rather than carriers and aircraft, with the administration then insisting upon more "battlewagons," as battleships were called. If military judgment and executive judgment were infallible, we would not have had the construction of the carrier *Forrestal* stopped. And we would not have found ourselves so unprepared for the Korean war.

I am not trying to fix blame on any one, any President, or any Department of Defense Secretary. I am doubtless laboring my point. I am simply trying to emphasize that while our Committee on Armed Services can be wrong, it is not wrong—ipso facto—because the Secretary of Defense is always right and he, and he alone, can be right.

There is only one feature of the pending bill that is in issue. That is, as Chairman VINSON has pointed out, with respect to the B–70 bomber, now called the RS–70. This is a supersonic aircraft in the development stage. It is an aircraft that can be much more than a bomber. Fully equipped it will be capable of detection or reconnaissance to the extent almost unbelievable. At the same time this new plane will carry an enormous bombing power, so that it can not only report what our missiles may have missed but can also proceed to make its own strike on target. That is the meaning of the symbol RS—reconnaissance-strike—that we now call this advanced B–70 the RS–70. It does considerably more than drop bombs.

It is the considered judgment of our committee that if we are to maintain a national defense second to none in the foreseeable future, we must proceed with the development of the RS–70 weapon system program as a supplement to our missile program.

That was our decision last year, in which the Committee on Appropriations and the Congress as a whole concurred. For fiscal 1962 we authorized and appropriated additional funds for manned bombers and for a prosecution of the RS–70 weapons system program. The Committee on Appropriations itself added $180 million to the $220 million requested for the B–70 development program.

Those funds were impounded. The Secretary of Defense for reasons not convincing to me decided not to use the funds. Other Secretaries of Defense have impounded funds, and we find no satisfaction in having to say that subsequent developments vindicated the judgment of the Congress over that of the Defense Secretary.

You will recall how disturbed the American people and the Congress were to discover suddenly with the launching of "sputnik" by Russia how far behind we were in the development of missiles. It was an alarming awakening to learn that immediately following the end of the war, Russia proceeded with a missile program while we did practically nothing in this field. We can congratulate ourselves on the remarkable strides that have been made in the field in the last few years. We have since brought into being missiles of destructive power beyond imagination.

But it would be folly for us to put complete reliance on an arsenal of missiles as our deterrent force. It must be borne in mind that the ICBM's and other missiles carrying nuclear warheads is an untried weapon. Its component elements have been tested. We have every reason to believe our missiles will be operationally successful in actual combat. But we do not really know whether they will do all the things we believe they will.

When we launched Lieutenant Colonel Glenn into orbit we had every reason to believe from all the tests made that it would be a successful flight. But we did not actually know whether, and to what extent the flight would be successful until it was actually made. And were it not for the fact that it was a manned flight, with adjustments made by Colonel Glenn, the flight probably would not have succeeded.

But even assuming that our complete missile system to be everything we expect it to be under combat conditions, it must also be borne in mind that it has its limitations. Once the decision is made to launch a missile there is no turning back. On the launching an irrevocable, unchangeable military decision has been made. This type of weapon is indispensable in an all-out war, but it is of questionable value in any other type of warfare.

To place all our reliance on the ICBM's and a huge arsenal of such missile would be tantamount to the same mistake France made in placing all its reliance on the Maginot line. Our committee has always taken the position that we must have a balanced flexible defense establishment, one that can be effectively employed anywhere, everywhere, in whole or in part, to meet any emergency whenever and wherever it may arise. A bomber program in process is essential for this continued flexibility. A man operated bomber itself has the flexibility that the automation of missiles cannot possibly have. As we pointed out in our committee report last year, unlike missiles the bombers "can go part of the way and wait; it can go part way and turn around; it can proceed or not proceed in any fashion whatsoever since it is at all times under the intelligent control of a human being."

There is an old adage: "Do not put all your eggs in one basket." But that is what the Department of Defense would have us do by refusing to recognize the need for developing the RS–70. They contend we have on hand a great and powerful force of bombers. That is true. Surely we are not so unimaginative and so shortsighted that we intend to stop there.

We delayed until it was almost too late in developing a missile program. We cannot afford to delay proceeding with the development of the intricate RS–70 weapons system. A single year lost can never be regained in our determination to have a defense second to none now and in the years ahead. We are not proposing that we put RS–70's in our military inventory next year or the year after. We are not committing ourselves to any vast RS–70 procurement program. We are merely proposing that we proceed in an orderly manner with the development of such a program and to explore its great potentials.

There is a military adage that you should never plan an attack unless you plan a retreat, that you should always base your military strategy on alternatives that if plan A does not prove successful you can immediately adjust to plan B. If our missile weapons system does not work according to plan, what is our alternative? What perchance would be our situation if nuclear warfare should be outlawed just as poison gas was outlawed as an instrument of warfare? How prepared will we be for the day that no one would dare employ ICBM's?

What is our defense alternative? Will we have nothing more than a fleet of outmoded bombers which will be no match to the type of manned aircraft our enemies may have developed? We are far ahead of Russia in bomber know-how, both in operation and production technique. The only way for us to make certain we stay ahead for our own security and the peace of the world is to develop this unique RS–70. We must explore its potentials to keep ahead, we must always be developing. We must recognize the need for trial and error.

That, in substance, is the considered judgment of our Committee on Armed Services. We make that decision in the exercise of our responsibility under the Constitution as to the size and nature of the Armed Forces we shall have. That is our responsibility and we seek to discharge it. We have no intention to transgress upon the constitutional duties and responsibilities of our President, as Commander in Chief. We shall give him our fullest cooperation. We ask of him and of his Secretary of Defense that they cooperate with us.

It unfortunately took extraordinary action by our committee to get assurance from the President and the Secretary of Defense that they would give the Congress some recognition in what we consider necessary for our defense. While somewhat belatedly, we now have an expression from them that they will give attention to what we believe to be a weapon we may sorely need in this long cold war.

There are some who believe that our Committee on Armed Services has surrendered, that we have capitulated in not insisting upon the provision we originally proposed to incorporate in the bill. I, for one, have not capitulated nor have I surrendered. I, for one, shall insist that this President and every other President recognize the constitutional responsibility—a right as well as a duty—of the Congress to determine the size and nature of our Armed Forces.

The chairman says we have won our point in this respect. But why should it have been necessary to rally forces prepared to do battle on this constitutional principle at all?

If we have won, it is a paper victory. I shall await the translation of the assurances we now have into affirmative action. The President forced us to get ready to make a fight we should never be forced to make.

As to the great victory claimed by my chairman, future events will determine.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ARENDS. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Chairman, I arise in support of H.R. 9751. As has been mentioned by Chairman VINSON and my colleagues on the House Armed Services Committee, the purpose of the bill is to authorize appropriations in the amount of $13,065,772,000 for the procurement of aircraft missiles and naval vessels for our Armed Forces.

In discussing the bill, I wish to point out that the Military Construction Act of 1959 in section 412(B) states as follows:

> No funds may be appropriated after December 31, 1960, to or for the use of any Armed Forces of the United States for the procurement of aircraft, missiles, or naval vessels unless the appropriation of such funds has been authorized by legislation enacted after such date.

Mr. Chairman, the Committee on Armed Services of this House has conducted extensive hearings to determine the requirements of the military departments for new equipment under this provision. H.R. 9751 represents the unanimous opinion of this committee as to the program for fiscal year 1963 which should be pursued by the Department of Defense and funded by fiscal year 1963 appropriations.

The programs of the Navy Department and the Marine Corps coming within the purview of section 412 include aircraft, missiles and ships in the total amount of $6,066 million. For the fiscal year 1963, the Navy has requested procurement authority to permit the continuation of readiness to meet assigned responsibilities around the world, to apply the fruits of research and development to the fleets, and to compensate for obsolescence of older equipment.

The aircraft authorized by this bill for the Navy and Marine Corps total $2,134,600,000 and will provide a versatile combination of capabilities for conventional and nuclear attack, reconnaissance, air defense, antisubmarine warfare, early warning, and amphibious warfare. Aircraft procurement this year is about 16 percent higher than in fiscal year 1962 and will enable the purchase of 887 new aircraft and related equipment as compared with 803 aircraft for the previous year. Of this 887 aircraft, 863 will be combat types.

Fifteen different types of aircraft are being authorized. The most important of these is the F–4H Phantom, which recently joined the fleet. This remarkable carrier-based aircraft holds the world's speed record for combat aircraft and is also being bought by the Air Force. Admiral Anderson, the Chief of Naval Operations, has characterized the F–4H as the best all-around fighter aircraft in the world today.

Another high-performance aircraft in the Navy budget is the A–3J–3 Vigilante, which also is already augmenting our carrier attack capabilities. This aircraft is effective at very high altitudes or on treetop level missions, and is capable of more than twice the speed of sound.

The program also contains follow-on procurement of the A–4D–5 Skyhawk and the A–2F–1 Intruder carrier- or land-based attack aircraft, and the F–8U–2N Crusader all-weather fighter. These five aircraft comprise the bulk of combat procurement. Other aircraft for which continued procurement is authorized include the W–2F Hawkeye, an improved carrier aircraft for early-warning and fighter control; the P–3V–1 Orion, a long-legged antisubmarine warfare patrol aircraft; and the S–2F–3 Tracker, a versatile carrier-based ASW aircraft. The HSS–2 Sea King, and ASW helicopter, for which the Navy would be authorized additional numbers, set several world's speed records over the last year.

Further procurement of the HRB transport helicopter and introduction of an improved assault support helicopter are authorized for the Marine Corps. A utility helicopter, navigational trainer, and two tactical reconnaissance versions of aircraft now in production complete the aircraft program.

The Navy has requested authorization for missiles, drones, and related equipment, totaling $930,400,000, which is about 10 percent more than in the previous fiscal year. Continuation of procurement is authorized by the bill for the Sparrow III and Sidewinder air-to-air missiles and the air-to-surface Bullpup missile. Initial procurement of the air-to-surface Shrike, the Subroc, the underwater-launched ASW missile, and a training version of Bullpup, is provided. The program will continue to furnish the Terrier, Tartar, and Talos antiaircraft missiles to destroyers, cruisers, and carriers in the active fleet. The procurement of Polaris missiles is phased with the construction schedule of ballistic missile submarines.

Authorization is also provided for the funding of shipbuilding and conversion, in the amount of $2,982 million, an increase of about 1½ percent over the previous year. The 1963 construction program of 37 ships includes 6 fleet ballistic missile submarines, a conventionally powered attack aircraft carrier, 8 nuclear powered attack submarines and a nuclear powered frigate to be armed with the Typhon missile system.

The 6 additional Polaris submarines will raise the number of that type to a total authorized of 35; we are also authorizing long leadtime procurement for 6 additional SSBN's for a program of 41. The authorization for 8 more nuclear powered attack submarines will raise the total for that type to 38. The aircraft carrier will allow the Navy to maintain its carrier forces at the requisite level of modernity. Representing a new advance in an integrated antiair missile and radar system, the Typhon frigate will be in the first ship to be armed with this powerful equipment.

A conventionally powered carrier is provided rather than a nuclear powered one on several grounds of professional judgment. Firstly, it has been estimated that a nuclear powerplant would increase the construction, operation, and maintenance costs of a carrier to 30 to 50 percent. Such greater cost could more advantageously be allocated to other shipbuilding which the Navy very urgently needs. Secondly, nuclear power has been applied to surface ships for only a very short time so that broad experience with the operation and maintenance of a nuclear powered force is essentially very limited. With the technological progress being achieved in nuclear power, it would thus seem prudent to more closely observe the performance of the nuclear surface ships now in commission and to afford sufficient time for developments in the field of nuclear reactors to enable us to reduce cost and weight, and to increase efficiency. This does not mean that there is not every expectation of success in the operation of nuclear surface vessels, just as there has been with nuclear submarines, but simply a well founded decision to defer construction of additional nuclear powered carriers at this time.

Other ships in the program are four amphibious transport docks, an amphibious assault ship for Marine helicopter assault operations, five escort ships and three guided missile escort ships, and two new-design gunboats. There is also included a fast combat support ship, a tender for Polaris submarines, two oceanographic research ships, a surveying ship, and a roll-on roll-off cargo vessel.

The conversion of 35 ships is authorized, as against 22 conversions in fiscal year 1962. Twenty-four of the conversions in the current bill will continue the modernization of World War II destroyers to extend their lives as well as to improve their effectiveness. The other 11 conversions authorized will transform 2 old light aircraft carriers into a major communications relay ship and a command ship; will provide a mine countermeasures support ship, 2 fast ammunition ships, 2 jumbo or large oilers, and 2 technical research ships, in addition to a Polaris resupply ship and a Typhon guided missile development ship.

The provisions of H.R. 9751 reflect extremely thorough exploration into the detailed requirements of the Navy Department by our committee. I am convinced that the Secretary of Defense, the Secretary of the Navy, the Chief of Naval Operations, and the Commandant of the Marine Corps have exercised sound judgment in their recommendations to us. This bill will provide the Navy and Marine Corps, within the limits of funds which can reasonably be made available, with the best new aircraft, missiles, and ships, as well as the maximum degree of modernization of older vessels. In conclusion, this bill, H.R. 9751, is entitled to unanimous support because it concerns the security of

the Nation which depends solely upon an adequate national defense.

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

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

Mr. MAHON. As the gentleman well knows, I was among those who were disturbed by some of the language in the original bill, especially by the language designed to direct the expenditure of certain funds by the Secretary of the Air Force. I want to say that I am highly pleased with the way the Committee on Armed Services has resolved this matter in the settlement today. You have not surrendered, in my judgment. I think you have done a magnificent job in dealing with this matter and in finding a way to resolve differences. You have dramatized for the Congress, for the executive branch, and for the country a very vital and important matter.

I want to commend the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ARENDS], and I want to especially commend the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON], chairman of the committee, for the matchless way in which he has handled this very difficult situation. I think we are on the right road in the steps being taken today.

Mr. ARENDS. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PRICE.]

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Chairman, at the outset I want to assure my colleagues in the House that I am in full support of the position taken by our distinguished Chairman [Mr. VINSON] and the full Committee on Armed Services.

Mr. Chairman, Mr. VINSON and Mr. ARENDS have, and others will, cover the bill as reported by the Armed Services Committee, and will deal at length with the RS–70.

In the light of the Defense Department's attitude toward the RS–70, I would like to outline briefly just what the Soviet Union is doing in the field of manned bombers.

The U.S.S.R. has made phenomenal progress in creating air power needed to support the drive toward world domination. They have built a large and powerful tactical aviation organization and an effective military transport service. They have created an air defense system equal to any in the world, and, most important of all, they have created a long-range air arm which is capable of delivering nuclear weapons to targets anywhere in the United States.

Soviet long-range aviation is organized into long-range air armies, with the bulk of aircraft based in western U.S.S.R.; the remainder are based in the Soviet Far East. These long-range air armies have over 1,000 medium and heavy bombers in operational units.

When the Korean war ended in July 1953, long-range aviation consisted of a force of approximately 1,200 copies of our old B–29.

Since then the Soviets have demonstrated their ability to develop a modern, effective strategic bomber force with a nuclear capability. They began this demonstration with the June 1954 Moscow air show by displaying nine swept-wing jet bombers similar in performance to the U.S. B–47.

These aircraft, which we have designated Badger, have an estimated gross weight of 150,000 pounds, and a speed of about 500 knots. The Badger is powered by two turbojet engines, each developing an estimated 18,000 pounds of thrust. It has a radius of over 2,500 nautical miles with one refueling and with a 3,300-pound payload.

Also displayed in the 1954 air show was a large bomber comparable to the U.S. B–52. This aircraft, designated Bison, has four jet engines which are probably similar to those installed in Badger. It has an estimated weight of over 350,000 pounds, a wing span of 170 feet, and a radius of over 4,000 nautical miles with refueling and a maximum speed on the order of 500 knots. This aircraft, in spite of its size, can be accommodated by over 200 airfields within the U.S.S.R.

Another long-range bomber, the Bear, first appeared in April 1955. The Bear is powered by four turboprop engines, each developing approximately 12,000 equivalent shaft horsepower and turning counterrotating propellers. It is approximately midway in size between the Badger and the Bison. It has an estimated combat radius of around 4,200 nautical miles, and a maximum speed of approximately 495 knots.

Although the Bear, Bison, and Badger all appeared initially prior to 1956, modification of existing units and production of new aircraft has continued until very recently.

We have seen that resurgence of Soviet long-range aviation began with the dramatic demonstrations of new bombers in the 1954 air show. Now the operational equipment derived from the showpieces are obsolete. Just at the time that the developmental life was passing from the 1954 series of bombers there has begun a new resurgence. In the summer of 1961 was another spectacular demonstration of new Soviet bombers.

The display of Soviet military aviation at Moscow on July 9, 1961, indicates that the U.S.S.R. has again made major progress in the development of all types of aircraft despite Premier Khrushchev's statement on January 14, 1960, that, "We have been curtailing sharply production of bombers and other obsolescent equipment."

A new supersonic, heavy bomber research vehicle known as the Bounder was displayed in public for the first time, although it had been under development for a number of years. The Bounder is powered by four turbojet engines and is obviously a supersonic design with its highly swept delta wing configuration. It is about 200 feet long and has a wing span of about 80 feet.

The Soviets also displayed 10 new Blinder bombers. The Blinder is a supersonic aircraft roughly comparable in size to the U.S. B–58 medium bomber. The B–58, as you know, on May 26, 1961, set a record of 3 hours, 19 minutes, and 51 seconds from New York to Paris, a distance of 3,652.97 statute miles.

In addition to the previously mentioned conventionally powered aircraft, the Soviets are known to be interested in a nuclear powered bomber, a development in which I have always had a strong personal interest. I regret to say that my experience with the nuclear powered airplane is very much the same as that being experienced with respect to the RS–70. In my opinion the Defense Department is being equally shortsighted about both of them.

There is no doubt that Soviet long-range aviation crews regularly undergo extensive training and can navigate adequately to any point within their aircrafts' range under all weather conditions. Their bombing accuracies are undoubtedly compatible with requirements to place high-yield nuclear weapons on target from all altitudes.

The Soviets are evidently continuing the design and development of new and advanced long-range bombers. They are thereby in a position to introduce into their operational units new models as well as improvements in existing designs during the next several years.

So that is what the Soviets are doing. But in the face of the rapid advance that the Soviets are making, our Defense Department apparently proposes to let the bomber die on the vine. I support my chairman, Mr. VINSON, and the Armed Services Committee wholeheartedly in urging that the House exercise its constitutional right to insist that the unimaginative, shortsighted, and dangerous direction in which the Defense Department is leading us with respect to manned bombers be reversed—and reversed by an affirmative vote on H.R. 9751 as reported with authorization for $491 million for the RS–70 program in lieu of the $171 million requested by the Defense Department.

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

Mr. PRICE. Yes, I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. OSMERS. Mr. Chairman, I want to say that I am in full support of the bill.

Mr. Chairman, the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Armed Services, Mr. VINSON, has made an excellent and complete statement with respect to the need for the enactment of the H.R. 9751. He has also explained in great detail the reasons why it is of the greatest national defense importance for us to continue the development of the RS–70 weapons system at least for the coming fiscal year. The outstanding leader of the minority members of the committee, Mr. ARENDS, has also explained several important aspects of the measure before us.

We need the weapons authorized in this bill even though, in my opinion, an all-out nuclear war between the U.S.S.R. and the United States is extremely unlikely. Both nations have too much to lose and too little to gain from such a war. Only the development of a really effective antimissile missile would change this situation and the development of such a weapons system does not seem likely in the near future.

Within the next 5 or 10 years, however, Communist China can reasonably

be expected to acquire a nuclear-weapons capability. It is from Red China that the United States, and even the U.S.S.R., could expect such an attack. The heartless, cynical attitude toward human life that seems to motivate China's leaders, coupled with their failure to either develop their nation's economy or even feed its people, might well cause them to launch a nuclear attack. The powers-that-be in Peiping might reasonably figure they would gain more than they would lose considering their huge population and low state of development.

It is my earnest hope that the statements in the President's letter to Chairman VINSON about the RS–70 weapons system will not be forgotten by the President in the fiscal year ahead. Many of us are suspicious about the sincerity of the President with respect to any defense statement. The President's attitude on defense is likely to be affected by the great success with which he used the "big lie" technique in his 1960 campaign. All will recall how he charged that the Eisenhower administration had been derelict in permitting a missile gap to develop between Russia and the United States. It was probably the greatest single factor in his winning the election by a few thousand votes. There are those, of course, who will argue, with some cause, that phony promises made to Negro voters with respect to civil rights were the dominating factor in providing his 1960 narrow margin. It is important to the Nation that the RS–70 program be better remembered than the missile gap.

Mr. Chairman, because we are discussing national defense, it might be well to take a look at the so-called disarmament negotiations now going on at Geneva which may have great impact on our defense future. The scientific community that is associated with our missile and nuclear programs is almost unanimous with respect to the need for U.S. nuclear atmospheric testing at the earliest moment. There have been grave doubts that our Nation will ever obtain the scientific benefits expected from these tests simply because the President left the door open for cancellation of the tests at the very moment he announced them. There has been considerable evidence in the newspapers that leads one to believe that the Russians may succeed in talking us out of our much-needed test program by giving us empty promises of possible future inspection privileges. Such a result at Geneva would indeed be a national calamity.

While not directly related to this authorization bill, it seems appropriate while discussing defense to make comments about the callup of the Reserves last October. On the news ticker a few minutes ago, it was stated that plans are under consideration by the Secretary of Defense to release the reservists, called to active duty last fall, between August and September of this year. The reserve callup may have served a domestic political purpose last year when the administration wanted so much to pep up our citizens after the depressing Cuban fiasco and the unchallenged building of the Berlin wall. However, there was no proven need then, or now, for the Reserves called, and, neither adequate plans for effective training nor proper facilities were available for most of those who were called to duty. This is true of the Army in particular. The decision apparently was political, not military. Intransigent and stupid decisions at the highest level with regard to releasing those men, who were suffering great hardship, have caused distress for families in every area of the country.

The Department of Defense should permit those reservists who want to return to civilian life to do so now. Why wait until August or September? Vacancies created can be filled by volunteers and draftees where necessary.

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

Mr. PRICE. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. GRAY. Mr. Chairman, I congratulate the gentleman on a very forthright statement and associate myself with him in his remarks.

Mr. PRICE. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. BATES].

Mr. BATES. Mr. Chairman, if there is anything that really characterizes the world in which we live today it is change and transition. Time has been telescoped in the last 20 years as never before in the history of our country or, indeed, the history of the world.

I remember about 10 or 12 years ago we had a bill before our committee, under which a general was asking for more money. All of us became a little aggravated at the request of this particular general and a membor of the committee pointed his finger at him and said, "General, if we let you, you would fortify the moon."

Now, Mr. Chairman, how far are we really from that today? A concept, an idea, a hope of today becomes practically a reality of tomorrow. Those of us who work on the Committee on Armed Services are considering to a lesser extent what we have today, but instead most of our thoughts are projected 5 and 10 years hence as we move ahead at this tremendous pace. Associated with this is the question of things becoming obsolete even before they become a reality. There was a time, Mr. Chairman, when we could dip back into the archives or mothballs and withdraw from our fleet, for instance, ships that had been built 25 and 30 years before. That is what we did during World War II with the *Nevada* and the *Texas* and the *Arkansas* and the *Pennsylvania,* and all the destroyers that we gave to Great Britain likewise were ships that had been built during World War I. But those days are gone. We no longer have time on our side. We no longer have that great army of France upon which we once depended. No longer is England the Queen of the Waves. No longer is the Atlantic and the Pacific with the great protection to us that they once afforded us. Today we are within a half hour's time of potential destruction either for ourselves or for others. Time is of the essence and we must move with tremendous speed and dispatch. That, of course, Mr. Chairman, was the sum and substance of the controversy that arose with respect to the RS–70 which our committee considered at great length.

As we make this transition from that which is tried and proven and tested and move into a new field of missiles, where we have never actually fired a missile with a warhead along its full and complete course, there is some question in our minds, Mr. Chairman, even though military authorities assure us they have perfected these missiles. But as I remember, and as all of us here today remember, prior to World War II when we had the assurance that we would sink the Japanese fleet in 2 weeks and that day never came to pass as we well know. So our committee, properly concerned for the defense of this Nation. saw to it that we put into this bill an amount of money which might be necessary in the event that certain developments were forthcoming. We wanted to make certain, if those developments did come to pass, that the money would be available so that we could proceed full speed ahead with the RS–70. I think that decision on the part of the committee was a wise one. I support it wholeheartedly and I believe that the Secretary of Defense, prompted as he will be by members of the Committee on Armed Services, will see to it that until that day comes to pass when we can proceed with absolute certainty, at least this Nation will have a weapons system in the form of the RS–70 that can operate effectively against any enemy no matter where he might be found. So I am in accord, Mr. Chairman, with the action taken this morning on the part of our committee. We have indicated to the Pentagon and to the Secretary of Defense and to the President of the United States and to the world at large that as we wean ourselves away from the manned bombers and enter into the field of missiles, we want to make certain that at least we have in our inventory a bomber upon which we have depended so much in the past, until such time as we know absolutely and positively and definitely that these missiles will work without fail. We owe that much to our country and we cannot give our people less.

Mr. Chairman, there is one question I would like to bring up which has not been discussed by any of the preceding speakers.

That is the question of the future of the U.S. Navy. Today we have some 900 ships; 75 percent of our ships are of World War II vintage. When we consider that the life of the average naval vessel is only 20 to 25 years we must contrast it with the authorization in this bill today of but 37 new naval vessels. As we look ahead 5, 6, or 7 years we see mass obsolescence of our Navy. Because of that situation and the concern that has been expressed by myself and the chairman of the committee and others, we are undertaking an investigation of this whole subject that we shall pursue in the very near future. If we do not take action now, if we do not chart our course, if

we do not know exactly how many ships we need or the various sizes and types there will be a bill presented to this Congress and the American people in about 5 or 6 years that will approximate $25 billion. So we must set ourselves to the task for a normal buildup of the number of ships that might be needed and look forward and correct the situation.

The gentleman from Virginia [Mr. HARDY], is working hard on this.

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

Mr. BATES. I yield

Mr. HARDY. Let me commend the gentleman for his presentation of this most important subject. I would like to associate myself with his remarks. I feel certain that as our subcommittee begins to function under the chairmanship of the gentleman from South Carolina we will produce results that will show clearly what our Navy needs.

Mr. BATES. There is just one other thing, Mr. Chairman, that concerns me. As I said, we are living at a tremendous pace and in an age of transition. So we must do the things this committee feels need to be done to protect our own security. We place great reliance on our Navy, yet today we have no program for a buildup. In my own thinking I am sure that in the long run, if we ever have a long run, our form of government will win, but in a short run no one knows what will happen. I was gratified when the President of the United States indicated he would proceed with nuclear tests, because from the results of recent Russian tests it is clearly indicated that we must go ahead in that same field if we are to remain supreme. If the Russians should come up with a new breakthrough, some things that we did not have, we would be in a very difficult situation indeed. If they should develop, as we developed in the forties, a new type of atomic bomb, I know they would blackmail us immediately. There are many countries, so-called neutral and uncommitted countries, throughout the world who caution us against such a course of action as nuclear testing, but I want to say to them, Mr. Chairman, and to you that we should do the things that are necessary for our own protection. Let us hope that these other nations of the world will go along with us, but if they do not, Mr. Chairman, let us still do the things we must do for our own security.

Mr. HIESTAND. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. HIESTAND. Mr. Chairman, in the middle of this discussion of the constitutionality of this bill, I think we want to be sure and not lose sight of the tremendous importance of its substantive content—namely, the continuation and stepping up of the great B–70, now RS–70, program.

The Defense Department has announced that the B–52 and B–58 production will be phased out this year. Thus, unless we reactivate the RS–70, by 1964 we shall have no planned bomber program and will, in effect, be creating a bomber gap.

Now, Mr. Chairman, there are a great many reasons why we need manned aircraft. Although tremendous progress has been made in the development of missiles, we all must agree that they have not been successfully tried in actual warfare. Manned bombers have and their success is a matter of record.

But we must have better and faster manned bombers, certainly better and faster and more capable than the Soviets.

Now, the Soviets have delta-winged manned bombers of great size and capability. We have seen photographs of them as flown over Moscow in Soviet air displays. I believe we are substantially ahead of them with our B–52 operation, especially since we have kept it improved and up to the minute. But why be content when we know full well the great B–52 and probably the B–58 will be well on their way to obsolescence within 2 years? In fact, previous delays on the RS–70 may lead to a bomber gap in spite of any immediate action we take today.

Mr. Chairman, let us not repeat the missile gap folly and the procedure which created it, from 1946 to 1952. At that time despite the demands of the then General Eisenhower, we had practically no missile program. It required 5 or 6 years since 1952 to close that gap.

But when we start a program let it be one far in advance of anything today.

Let us bear in mind that although the proposed RS–70 program will be expensive, the important thing is it will cost potential enemies 10 times as much to devise a defense against such an advanced weapons system.

The Secretary of Defense declares that we shall need a breakthrough in radar and other electronic equipment and contends that this cannot occur for the next 2 or 3 years. But supposing it does take 3 years—need we sit on our heels waiting for it to happen, thereby setting our defenses back another 3 years? Of course not. We must prepare for the future today.

Why not take the expert advice of the professions, the military experts, who have made the military their life careers? They are practical men skilled in military science and tactics. They have scientists there who have worked on these problems for years. The theorists have their value, but the practical men whose careers are at stake have pleaded for this program for years.

Great progress was being made when the B–70 program was originally cut back from some 18 major subcontractors. Might not that breakthrough have already occurred if we had been pushing the project the past 3 years?

Mr. Chairman, this could well be the most important action this Congress will take this year. The whole safety, the entire defense of this Nation, depends upon it. It is vitally important, almost tragically so. Let us be sure and not lose sight of the value of this program in our discussion of rights of the Congress to make laws for all departments, including the executive. Here we can take a giant step forward—if we remain firm and back up our committee.

Mr. Chairman, I am heartily in support of the bill.

Mr. ROUDEBUSH. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROUDEBUSH. Mr. Chairman, this Nation's defensive posture is of extreme interest to all of us.

I think without exception every Member of this body wants to do everything possible and provide every means to assure the safety of our citizens—and to provide the military with weapons of retaliation in the event of nuclear war.

Therefore, I do not consider the proposition before this House today to have any partisan-political significance. Rather, any discussion results from two different opinions or ideas as to how we can best provide this safety and assurance to our Nation.

I submit to you here today that the investment requested by the Armed Services Committee to get the RS–70 program moving is most essential and certainly justified.

I feel that the decision we must make here today could well be the most important and the most decisive that Congress must make during this session. It affects the future security of our Nation.

Many of you know that I serve on the House Space Committee, and I feel I am familiar with our present level of excellence in missilery. With this in mind, I have carefully analyzed the potential of the so-called massive retaliation by missiles alone.

I have analyzed both the reliability and the failures of the long-range missile practice firings accomplished by the various agencies of our Government.

With what knowledge I have on this matter, I am completely unwilling to see this Nation depend solely on missiles for retaliation. I say this whether these missiles are borne by nuclear submarines—are launched by manned aircraft—launched from foreign lands by our troops or friendly allies—or are of the nature of the huge projectiles capable of interoceanic flight and guided by mechanical brains.

I am also unwilling for this Nation to be placed in a position of failing to compete in the field of manned bombers. I think we all know that the B–52 program is being phased out—and even with skybolt-type missiles, rapidly approaches obsolescence.

The B–52 first was placed in service in 1955—7 years ago. This aircraft, now rapidly facing obsolescence, forms the very backbone of the striking power of our SAC forces.

In my judgment, the RS–70 is the most awesome weapon ever conceived by any nation. It travels faster than a rifle bullet at an altitude of nearly 14 miles.

The RS–70 would provide us a striking force that is necessary in limited warfare, yet it would be a tremendous asset in case of massive retaliation.

Most nations still would have to rely on water transports to move large numbers of troops. The RS–70 could travel 5,000 miles while a troop transport traveled 50 miles or less at sea.

After leaving its base here in America, if orders were changed it could do a flyover and still return to base.

We have nothing which compares to it in our arsenal of weapons—and neither does any other nation.

I believe one of the best demonstrations of the capabilities of man was by John Glenn. I am sure one of the most valuable lessons coming from his flight is that there is no substitute for man's ability to make decisions and perform tasks under extreme conditions of speed and weightlessness.

A missile cannot think—nor can it change its mind after launch. It cannot even be safely destroyed in flight should a change in plans occur.

I hope that this tremendously important program will be approved.

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BRAY].

Mr. BRAY. Mr. Chairman, the issue before us today goes far beyond the RS–70 program. At stake is the future of the manned bomber in the American Air Force. Not only is the Secretary of Defense rapidly downgrading the RS–70 program, but he is "phasing out" all bombers.

Last year the Armed Services Committee, over the objections of the Department of Defense, included in the authorization bill one wing of B–52 bombers and one wing of B–58 bombers. The Department of Defense refused to allow these planes to be built and has now begun to close down all Air Force bomber production lines. By October, if the McNamara plan holds, all production on Air Force bombers will be finished. We are going out of the manned-bomber business.

Today we are well ahead of Russia in manned bombers and intercontinental ballistic missiles, but Russia is proceeding with the development of new and better bombers. If the Department of Defense persists in its present line of thinking and acting it will soon be the old story of the tortoise and the hare. We will be the hare and Russia will be the tortoise. As the bombers we have today gradually wear out and become obsolete, Russia will become superior to us in the air—the tortoise will pass the hare.

When this will happen I do not know. The time will surely come, however, unless our planning changes. We will be behind Russia in manned bombers. Some will say that we should buy bombers as needed. They fail to realize that we cannot go down to the hardware store and buy them. The bombers which we will have in 1966 and 1967 are the ones we plan today.

I do not claim to be an authority on the efficiency and capabilities of the RS–70, but I assure you that I have studied it carefully and have discussed it with the best authorities in the world. Its potential as a bomber and reconnaissance craft is enormous. Whether it will live up to all of the expectations of its designers, no one knows of a certainty, and the technical matters involved are too complex to adequately discuss on the floor. However, I do know that the RS–70 as planned unquestionably will be the finest bomber in the world in speed, altitude, range, carrying capacity, reconnaissance capability, and versatility. However it will not be in operation for several years. Its capabilities are well recognized by practically all authorities on aviation.

Do we want to be first or do we want to "phase out" of the entire bomber program? President Kennedy recently stated that he does not want America to depend altogether on massive retaliation. That is, he does not want the United States to be entirely dependent upon massive destruction alone to resist aggression. Yet today, if we follow the course that is being developed by the Department of Defense, we will have only two answers to aggression. We must say that we are helpless to resist or we must destroy our enemy by using nuclear warheads by means of intercontinental ballistic missiles. I want us to have another alternative—the ability to stamp out small "brush wars" without resorting to total destruction.

A good example of the importance of having strong conventional forces to take care of limited aggression occurred 4 years ago this July when President Eisenhower sent forces into Lebanon and stopped Communist aggression there. This operation did more for American prestige than any other incident in recent years, without the loss of an American life. Firing an intercontinental ballistic missile into Lebanon certainly would not have been considered by any responsible government, yet unless we had done something at that time the entire Middle East might now be lost to the Kremlin. Without a powerful air force and an ability to resist limited aggression by land, sea, and air, we could never have another Lebanon.

If we desire only to be strong in massive retaliation, the path now being followed by the Department of Defense would be the correct one. We are developing an intercontinental ballistic missile capability which together with the Polaris submarine can destroy Russia or any other country at will. I want us to have such a capability but I certainly do not want our defense strength to reach such a condition that we must totally rely on such a capability. While such massive retaliation may some day be necessary, we shudder to think of such a day coming. We can contemplate a situation arising, however, where strong bomber forces backed by strong conventional forces could stop limited aggression before it reached the point of our having to resort to full nuclear defense.

Last year I took the lead in the committee fight to restore the RS–70 program to the status that it had in the Eisenhower budget. President Kennedy, in the 1960 campaign, criticized Eisenhower three times for not pushing the RS–70 program, yet when Kennedy presented his budget to the Congress in February 1961, for fiscal year 1962 it was $138 million less than the amount submitted in the budget for fiscal year 1962 by President Eisenhower. We lost this fight in the committee, to restore the $138 million that Kennedy had deleted, by two votes, but after reconsideration the Congress finally did raise this amount. President Kennedy never used the additional money authorized.

There has been a growing belief in America, and one of its strongest proponents has been President Kennedy, that our defense should not be totally dependent upon nuclear bombs carried in intercontinental ballistic missiles. Yet, the course that the Department of Defense is pursuing is directly contrary to the goals announced by President Kennedy; that is, not to rely wholly on massive retaliation. Rather we should build up our conventional forces and maintain our superiority in manned bombers for possible conflicts in which massive retaliation with nuclear missiles certainly could not be used. This is why we insist upon the importance of the RS–70 program.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. HÉBERT].

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Chairman and Members of the Committee, there still seems to be some confusion as to exactly who won what and who lost what. I think it quite necessary that an effort be made to clear the atmosphere now and present to the committee exactly the situation in which we find ourselves.

The distinguished gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON], chairman of the Committee on Armed Services, has made the statement here in the well that today we make history. We certainly do make history, because for the first time this Congress has come to grips with the executive department as to each one's responsibility related to the other. The resolution is long overdue. It should have come to pass 12 years ago when the Congress authorized the building of the flush-deck carrier *United States* and the funds were refused by the Secretary of Defense. If we had come to grips with the problem then, we would not be discussing it here today. But, through the succeeding years the will of the Congress has been cast aside; the will of the Congress has not been adhered to, and nothing has been done about it until this present situation arose.

In past years the Congress has authorized the full strength of the Marine Corps to 200,000. It was not adhered to. It authorized funds for the modernization of our Army. It has not been adhered to. It authorized money for the extension of the B–52 program. It has not been adhered to. In other words, to put it in simple language that we all understand, this situation of the RS–70 is the straw that broke the camel's back, and some vigorous and direct action had to be taken, some vigorous and direct language had to be used, and that language was the word "direct" in the amendment offered to this bill by the committee.

Mr. Chairman, I think we should know some of the background. I think we should understand exactly the events

which have led up to this situation, and this exercise which I think has been a most healthy one, and one which I think will have its effects in future days to come. I want to say here right now that in the 22 years I have been here I have seen many Secretaries of Defense, and great ones, including Forrestal, Lovett, and Gates. I do not know of any one *individual* that I have seen come here with the genius for administration and the ability to act as an effective administrator as the present Secretary of Defense. In the field in which I am most knowledgeable—in the area of procurement—he has done things in the last year that we have been asking to be done at the Pentagon for certainly 12 or more years. He is a master administrator. He is a dedicated individual. He is perhaps the most unique man to occupy the Office of Secretary of Defense in the last two decades. But here let us pause and examine exactly what his qualifications are to make military decisions. If I operated a huge hospital, I would have the gentleman as my administrator, and he would do an excellent job. But if it came to operating on a patient, I would call on a doctor and follow his advice.

Mr. Chairman, the Committee on Armed Services did not come to this decision on the RS–70 program without the advice of high military authorities. We had a full and complete briefing by the Air Force. We had the benefit of the knowledge and experience of men who actually have worn the uniform, the men who know what the military needs. Backed up with that, we had the judgment and the wisdom of a committee which reflects its seniority in the 48 years during which the chairman, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON], has served in this House. I submit that in view of this experience we are in just as good or better position to judge or to make a judgment upon the needs of the military as related to an individual who came here shortly more than a year ago. Washington is a bad place for a man to attempt to play God, even if it be the Secretary of Defense. I think as a result of what has happened in this matter the Secretary of Defense has learned a lesson, and I hope he has. He has learned the lesson that this Congress does stand for something; that the Committee on Armed Services does have a responsibility and will not hesitate to discharge it. It has been a long time coming, but I congratulate Secretary McNamara on the position which he has now taken, though belatedly. I think all of us should know this because it is most important: This is the first time that the Secretary of Defense has given any indication of acknowledging that other people can make decisions and do not have to use an IBM machine to do it. It has been said of him, and I think in a critical though charitable vein, that he is as inscrutable as the sphinx, and twice as inflexible. That observation was before yesterday afternoon.

Mr. Chairman, I want to pay particular tribute to the President of the United States in this instance. When he came into this picture, he came into the picture with the knowledge that he had acquired through the years as a Member of this body, and as a Member of the other body. He came in with the full affection and understanding of the problems which we have here. In order to give an indication of how this whole thing has been misrepresented to the public, I will cite one instance, or two instances: Every time the Secretary of Defense has talked to the American people, and he has given his views on many occasions on the subject, the rejection of the RS–70 has always been referred to as "the President's program," and the press has picked it up and said "The President backs Mr. McNamara, the Secretary of Defense."

Now, actually what did the President say publicly, and that one time was in a news conference, when he said that he relied on Mr. McNamara, and had full confidence in him, but suggested there was some compromise available. That is all he said. That was the President's position. The President has never assumed responsibility for this program per se, but his name has been bandied about as though indicating that he was in full accord with the abandonment of the RS–70 program.

There is another facet to this controversy which I think you should know about. Unfortunately, those of us on the Committee on Armed Services have been unable to get our story over to the public because we are under the compulsion of security. We have had meeting after meeting under top secret direction. The last time Mr. McNamara appeared before us, his speech was stamped "Top Secret." We could not discuss that speech nor could we discuss the questions which were asked him, nor even now can we discuss what went on in that meeting. I think it would be very enlightening if you knew the colloquy, but we are still under the compulsion of security and secrecy. The presentation which Mr. McNamara made to us, every page of it, marked "Top Secret" was given out almost in toto the next day at a hurriedly called press conference in the Pentagon.

I think this is serious business when we cannot discuss these matters in public. As a matter of fact, and I think parenthetically, I should inform you of this rather amusing incident. A very articulate and able young colonel was testifying before us during the hearings that were in secret and his biography was stamped "Secret." We could ask him where he was born, and he could tell us within the confines of the committee room, but outside of that none of us could open our mouths if we were going to respect the stamp of secrecy.

So I think it quite necessary that everybody in this body should understand exactly what the situation is.

I compliment the distinguished ranking member of our committee, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ARENDS], who certainly made a very lucid explanation of the problem today. Of course, it is not necessary to add more laurels to the crown now worn by my distinguished chairman, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON]. He and I have differed on many occasions, as many of you know. But my devotion and affection and respect for him have never been diminished. I might almost paraphrase what the President has said, that he had confidence in his Secretary of Defense; I may say that I, too, have confidence in the Secretary of Defense; and not that I have less confidence in the Secretary of Defense, but I have more confidence in my chairman, the distinguished gentleman from Georgia.

So today this is not a battle won or lost, or something we should gloat over. This has been a constructive exercise. This has been an exercise which has focused the attention of the Nation on a serious problem of conflict in approach to problems.

The President wisely has pointed out his powers under the Constitution, but we, too, must point out that under article I, section 8, we have the responsibility and the backing of the Constitution to raise and maintain armies and navies, and to appropriate moneys for their upkeep; and also to make the rules and regulations for the control of those bodies.

The Department of Defense is much in the position, I think I would say, as that of a baseball manager; or perhaps I should say the Secretary of Defense is. He is in full command and charge on that field. But he has got to play according to the rules. He may not change the size of the ball or shorten the distance between the bases. Nor do I think he is in a very enviable position when he tells you, as the gentleman from Indiana has pointed out so well, that we are at the end of the road in bombers. It means that when the B–52 and the B–58 go out we have no other bombers on the drawing boards to replace these manned weapons. The Secretary of Defense gives out great figures. I cannot compete in his realm with numbers, statistics and figures, other than to approve them if they are on my side. But it is like the football coach who said that in 1967 he is going to have the greatest team he has ever had in history.

He will have reached his peak and he can defeat any team against him.

But, I submit, what will happen after 1967, if they have nobody on the bench to come up and fill the ranks of the seniors when they go out, and that is the situation in which we find ourselves in this particular instance, unless there is a weapons system, a manned bomber weapons system on the drawing boards and ready to replace the deficiencies in the inventory, at the end of 1967 we will be absolutely lost in the field of retaliation in this particular atmosphere. Up to this time the Secretary has been writing the obituary of the RS–70 in installments. Today, I hope his letter retracts those words and that he will begin to take a constructive and progressive view. His language is clear in his letter. There is absolutely no doubt in the world that this Committee on Armed Services has not capitulated. It has won a very distinct and very deserving victory in the interest of representative government and in the interest of

the American people. We have a responsibility to meet from here on out. I agree with the gentleman from Illinois in referring to that. This may be a paper victory. It can only be a paper victory, however, if we, in the Congress, allow it to become a paper victory.

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

Mr. HÉBERT. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. GAVIN. It must be remembered, we have to get ourselves elected every other year and when we express ourselves, we are expressing the sentiments of our people back home whom we are proud and honored to represent.

Mr. HÉBERT. I thank the gentleman. I think his remarks are well chosen because we do have a representative form of government, and here is being demonstrated one of the advantages of representative government. I think this point should be stressed right here, sir, that when the vote comes later today the resounding and solid vote of this House will reflect what the people of America believe when it comes to the RS–70 program. And I hope the Secretary of Defense will be impressed with the decision not of one lone man backed by dubious authorities on military weaponry, but the decision of millions of Americans reflected in the vote today of their constitutional representatives.

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. WILSON].

Mr. WILSON of California. Mr. Chairman, I am entering this controversy today not as a constitutional lawyer, but rather as an aviation historian. Progress in aviation has been a fascinating thing. Even within my lifetime, which incidentally is less than the 48 years that our distinguished Chairman, CARL VINSON, has served—even within my lifetime, the airplane has progressed from a flimsy, unpredictable, sputtering toy, literally nothing more than a box kite with a motor, into the greatest defensive weapon and deadliest instrument of war ever devised by man, and a magic carpet of worldwide transportation.

The airplane we know today did not just appear like magic. It is the result of generations of applied imagination and effort, from glider pioneers like John Montgomery and others to the scientists and engineers of today. Each new airplane, with its own improvements, added a building block to the structure we know today as the Air Force and as our commercial airline system.

Before World War I only the dreamers could visualize the airplane as anything more than an exhilarating experiment. The first airplane dogfight in battle was between pilots with pistols. But as airplanes became faster and more maneuverable, it was inevitable that they would be armed with machineguns and later rockets. The first load that a military airplane carried was an observer who spotted for artillery forces. Later on messages were carried by airplanes from headquarters to the frontlines. And, of course, inevitably the obvious advantage developed for using the airplane as a means of delivering destructive explosive power on the enemy. The first bombs were little more than glorified hand grenades, and from there, through progression, the means of dropping blockbusters and later nuclear bombs developed into the ultimate and awesome capability of the latest SAC aircraft, which today in the form of the mach II B–58 is capable of flying 1,200 miles per hour and flying from Los Angeles to New York and back to Los Angeles nonstop in a period of some 4 hours.

It is an ill wind that blows nobody some good. Certainly the greatest instrument of war has also resulted in the greatest instrument of peacetime transportation known to the world. The modern airlines today exist only because of the initial development of military aircraft. We would not have our network of airlines had it not been for the billions of dollars that have been poured into the development of military aircraft in the period since World War I. The first airmail and passengers were carried in surplus World War I airplanes. The workhorse of the airlines after World War II, the famous DC–3, was a direct outgrowth of a military airplane produced by Douglas. The modern jet transports produced by three leading companies, Convair, Boeing, and Douglas, had their design origination and early development based on the B–47 and later the B–52 bombers.

Progress in aviation has not always been easy. There have always been the doubters and the scoffers who were willing to tell why it could not be done. Many scientists and engineers at the time of the Wright brothers, using their slip sticks and their equivalents of Univac and IBM, whatever they were in those days, had it all figured out that it was physically impossible for man to fly. They could prove it with statistics. Yes, and there were plenty of doubters within the military, too. The Secretary of the Navy in 1912 made the statement "If you can demonstrate to me that the aeroplane is capable of taking off and flying out to a battleship, landing alongside and capable of being lifted aboard, then I shall believe it to be of some value to the military."

Our own distinguished chairman of the Armed Services Committee, participated in the 1920's in the investigation of the rather absurd proposal by Col. Billy Mitchell, that the airplane was capable of sinking a battleship. Perhaps that is one of the reasons why this distinguished gentleman believes so strongly in the RS–70.

Bombers, in particular, have always had to fight hard for their existence. I mentioned the Billy Mitchell controversy. In more recent times we have seen the B–36 controversy, when many people felt the long-range intercontinental bomber was unnecessary as long as other forces were available today. Well, I say, thank God for the visionaries and the experts of their day who provided us with the B–17 and the B–24 and the B–36 and the B–47 and the B–52 and the B–58. This country has been safer because of them and without them I think it is no overstatement to say we would not be here today as freshmen in a free nation.

These are the thoughts that have been running through the minds of many of us who serve on the Armed Service Committee today. This is the reason for the apprehension we indicated through our unanimous vote in favor of the continuation and extension of the B–70 or RS–70 program. These are the reasons why we reject completely the contention by the Secretary of Defense and his subordinates that we can phase out the bomber program and rely in the future on missiles for our defense. All of the Univac's and the IBM's in the Pentagon, had they been available back at the beginning of World War I and World War II, could not have predicted the fantastic development in uses and capabilities that grew out of these early aircraft. I submit to you that all of the Univac's and the IBM's and the thinking machines that are available to the modern Pentagon are incapable of predicting with infallibility the forces and materiel that might be necessary to protect this country in the future.

For the first time in our history we are laying down our tools that have helped to forge the greatest protective force and the greatest peacetime transportation force in history. No, my friends, I cannot believe that the people of this country are willing to legislate man out of the air. Yet in effect, that is what the throttling of the B–70-RS–70 program means. It means we have no faith in the future of aircraft. It means we are putting our entire reliance on the little black boxes that may be electronic marvels, but that even today have been known to blow a fuse.

Now I have no personal quarrel with the Secretary of Defense. I am willing to rate him as a genius, as many people have called him today. I think he is probably the closest equivalent to a real live flesh and blood thinking machine that modern industry has ever produced. Yet he would be one of the first to tell you that a computer is valueless if you do not have enough input. In other words, you have got to take all the factors into consideration when you press a button and ask a computer to make a decision for you. You have got to crank in all the possible variations and information into the machine before you can get an answer out the other end on a roll of printed tape. Until these thinking machines at the Pentagon get cranked into them the factors of unpredictable future needs and the supplemental benefits that derive from continued development of the aircraft, I am sure they are going to continue to get the answers that say we do not need airplanes for the future.

Certainly, the chairman of the Armed Services Committee, Mr. VINSON, our distinguished colleague from Georgia, has a sense of history. His championing of a stronger Navy, of nuclear-powered submarines, of a modernized expanded Air Force, are factors that are rather hard to crank into a Univac. As for me, I would rather put my faith in a hunch of CARL VINSON'S than in the

punches on all of Mr. McNamara's IBM cards. Yet today we see the Congress in conflict with the Secretary of Defense and with the President of the United States, a man who was highly touted during the 1960 campaign as having a sense of history. I think that Mr. Kennedy, the candidate, probably did have more of such a sense then than he has now. He was in favor of an expanded B–70 program at that time, before he started listening to the experts and their printed tapes. Listen to what he said on November 2, 1960, in my own hometown of San Diego. Here is what he said:

I endorse wholeheartedly the B–70 manned aircraft. We could not get the administration to release the funds until this week.

That does not exactly jibe with the recommendations he has been sending up to Congress through the Secretary of Defense, does it?

How about the Vice President; where does he stand? I have been reading a rather remarkable document. It is called the investigation of the preparedness program by the Preparedness Investigating Subcommittee of the Committee on Armed Services of the U.S. Senate, printed in 1960, the 2d session of the 86th Congress. LYNDON JOHNSON, the chairman of the subcommittee, conducted a sweeping investigation into the B–70 and he came out with some remarkable recommendations. In the first place, he proved that the B–70 would be of tremendous use to the military in limited war. He pointed out its efficiency for the rapid support of troops and the delivery of missiles and equipment. He pointed out, for example, that it would take 10 days for 25 turbojet airplanes to airlift 4,000 tons of cargo over a 3,500-nautical-mile range and this same job could be done, not in 10 days, but with the RS–70, or the transport equivalent of the RS–70, in 2½ days.

Can an IBM machine predict that some time in the future it may be important to get 4,000 tons of vital war material up to the frontlines of some remote fighting front of the future? You know it cannot. Well, let us just read for a minute what Mr. JOHNSON recommends to the Congress of the United States. These are the conclusions of the Senate Investigating Preparedness Subcommittee. I like the title of that "Preparedness." We need that.

First. The advent of the ICBM does not preclude the necessity for continued development and use of advanced, manned weapon systems.

Second. Manned weapon systems—such as the B–70—could strongly complement other strategic weapon systems.

Third. There is a need to develop a bomber beyond the capabilities of those presently in being, since a bomber-missile or mixed-forces concept is essential to our defense posture.

Fourth. There is a continuing requirement for a manned bomber with supersonic and intercontinental characteristics.

Fifth. The Nation possesses the necessary resources to build a B–70 type weapon system.

Sixth. The technology required to build a B–70 type weapon system is at hand and is not dependent upon technological breakthroughs.

Seventh. Successful development of a weapon system such as the B–70 program, could also advance the age of supersonic commercial and industrial transport and represent an essential link in the chain of continuous advances in controlled flight.

Eighth. Because of its size and basic configuration, the B–70 is suited to possible adaptation as a supersonic, nuclear-powered air vehicle.

Ninth. A B–70 type system, because of its planned altitude and speed capabilities, has potential application as a recoverable booster space system to perform recurring heavy payload orbital launches.

Tenth. Unless an operational supersonic bomber is developed now, there will be no replacement for the B–52 at the time at which it enters its period of obsolescence—mid-1960's—and experience has demonstrated that stretching out an essential military development program not only increases ultimate total cost but loses valuable time.

So here we have additional testimony indicating the value of the B–70. This, in effect, is the testimony of LYNDON JOHNSON, the chairman of the Senate Preparedness Subcommittee. Has Mr. JOHNSON changed his mind today? I don't believe he has.

I can easily understand a man changing his mind; I have done it many times myself. But normally when this happens, it is a question of the scales tipping slightly in one way under one set of circumstances, and tipping slightly the other way in another set of circumstances.

However, with respect to the B–70 this condition does not obtain at all. Nothing could be more precisely, directly or forcefully stated than the position of the Preparedness Subcommittee—Mr. JOHNSON, chairman—with respect to the B–70. This was no slight tipping of the scales in favor of this weapon system. This was an outright and aggressively stated recommendation—and one made without equivocation of any kind.

A person of Mr. JOHNSON's intelligence and obvious capability does not whimsically arrive at a particular conclusion. Nor does a person like Mr. JOHNSON capriciously change a decision on a fundamental issue.

Mr. JOHNSON does not speak out in this controversy over the B–70 today, but his voice is heard—loud and clear—in the decision of his subcommittee from whose report I have just read.

Mr. Chairman, I support the expanded program for the RS–70. I do so in the certainty that the RS–70 is not in itself the ultimate weapon of ultimate aircraft. It is another step forward in man's conquest of the air. It is just a prelude to such fantastic airplanes of the future—as Convair's proposed space plane, which will make even the RS–70 as old fashioned as the Jenny of World War I.

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. GUBSER].

Mr. GUBSER. Mr. Chairman, I would like to commend our chairman of the Committee on Armed Services, the Honorable CARL VINSON, for his vigorous leadership in a fight which is designed to gain the respect of the Congress which the Constitution intended.

The committee report states on page 7:

The role of Congress in determining national policy, defense or otherwise, has deteriorated over the years. In the place of joint formulation of national policy by the Congress and the President we have seen an acceptance of the principle that in some matters, defense in particular, government should be by "expert."

This is the greatest mistake that can befall a republic.

The German Reichstag made the mistake in 1933 and it did not get the chance to live to regret it.

In our republic we do not have a dictator of defense, we have a Secretary of Defense who holds no power except that which flows to him through the President.

Our entire system is based upon opposition to the concentration of absolute power in the hands of one man, regardless of his expertise, because, as the committee states, "expertise is not infallibility."

Experts are human and no human is infallible. So, we dare not trust one man with making the decision which determines whether we shall survive.

Men make mistakes. It was some man, an expert—I do not know which one—who decided to build the Edsel, and the stockholders of Ford Motor Company know it was a mistake.

I am greatly impressed with the outstanding ability of Secretary McNamara, but he is only a man and, as such, bears some human limitations.

It was Secretary McNamara, an expert, who opposed me as a novice, when, last year on the floor of this House, I proposed an amendment to authorize six more Polaris submarines. He was wrong, and has now admitted it by his action to do administratively what I tried to do legislatively.

It was a man who said on January 23, 1960, that "America had become second in missiles" and it was the same man who worried all through 1960 about the effect of this missile gap on our national prestige.

To many, authenticity and expertise is the automatic windfall of presidential candidacy, so many thousands of people believed that we were second in missiles. As one member of the Committee on Armed Services I repeatedly said the missile gap did not exist, but nobody listened—I was not an expert.

Here again is another case where an expert, a man, was wrong. It is now admitted that there never was a missile gap.

We cannot afford to ignore the time proven constitutional formula for cooperation between Congress and the Executive. Thanks to Chairman VINSON, this issue has now been spotlighted to the extent where the Executive can no longer ignore it. We have won all we could expect to win and more than could have been won without the com-

mittee amendment striking the word "directed." Admiral VINSON has won our battle for us.

This morning a question was asked in a session of the Committee on Armed Services as to whether the letters from the President and Secretary could be interpreted as an intention by the administration to request all necessary funding up to $491 million in fiscal year 1963 for the RS–70 program. The answer was affirmative and unequivocal.

With this battle the deterioration of the role of Congress is now at an end, and the American people will be the beneficiaries.

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

Mr. BECKER. Mr. Chairman, it would seem to me that after the executive meeting we had of the Armed Services Committee this morning we are now proceeding in what I would call an exercise in futility. A great many words are being expressed about what we are doing here today—who has won and who has lost; who has capitulated and who has not capitulated. We have made quite a reversal in the discussion made here today about why we are doing this, and the concession made by the Secretary of Defense in the fact that now he has conceded to make a study.

Well, anyone who heard the reading of the letter from the Secretary of Defense before our committee this morning in executive session and those who heard the reading of that letter on the floor of the House today know that this is an old legislative trick—that when you want to get rid of something, agree to a study. This is the surest way to brush something under the rug that you want to get rid of. This is all the Secretary of Defense agreed to do in his letter.

Mr. Chairman, studies have been going on for years in this program, and for these studies we have appropriated over $1.3 billion, and will agree to appropriate another $1.3 billion to complete the additional RS–70 planes.

Mr. Chairman, we have heard the statement of our good chairman, the very distinguished chairman of the Armed Services Committee, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON]. While we heard his statement today, I wonder how many read the statement in the report of the Armed Services Committee on the bill authorizing some $13 billion, and dealing specifically with the RS–70 program? Let me read one paragraph of that report. I think it is quite different than that which we are getting today in this exercise in futility:

> To any student of government, it is eminently clear that the role of the Congress in determining national policy, defense or otherwise, has deteriorated over the years. More and more the role of the Congress has come to be that of a sometimes querulous but essentially kindly uncle who complains while furiously puffing on his pipe but who finally, as everyone expects, gives in and hands over the allowance, grants the permission, or raises his hand in blessing, and then returns to his rocking chair for another year of somnolence broken only by an occasional anxious glance down the avenue and a muttered doubt as to whether he had done the right thing.

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

Mr. BECKER. I will be happy to yield to my colleague from Louisiana.

Mr. HÉBERT. May I say to the gentleman that the excerpt he just read from the report is probably one of the most accurate descriptions of the Congress today. There has been a change, however.

Mr. BECKER. I agree with the gentleman wholeheartedly. That is why I have used it here, in the light of what has been said in the previous statements before this House. Nothing could be clearer than this. Let me call attention to what we are doing in Congress, not only in the picture of our national defense, with which our committee is charged, and sits month in and month out in trying to design a program for the defense not only of the United States of America, but of the free world, we are again giving up our constitutional rights to provide a Military Establishment for this country.

In doing so let me bring this to the attention of the Members of the House. Are we doing differently than that which we are being asked to do? There is legislation proposed from the "Avenue" that is coming before the House to give up other constitutional powers this year in the fields of tariff and trade, and turn this over to the executive branch of the Government. This is the proposal of the administration. In article I, clause 3 of the Constitution, this is clearly empowered to the Congress of the United States.

Mr. Chairman, there is another piece of legislation to be considered this year wherein we are being asked to again give up our constitutional powers, and that is in the field of taxes wherein we are being asked to give the President and the executive branch of Government the right to lower taxes 5 percent, if he deems it advisable to do so.

Mr. Chairman, again in the same identical clause in the Constitution, these powers are spelled out to be the powers of Congress.

In another piece of legislation we are being asked to give the executive branch of the Government $1 billion to spend at will on public works, in the event the executive branch feels it is necessary and advisable. This again dilutes the power of Congress to authorize and appropriate for specific projects as we deem advisable.

I say to you, Mr. Chairman, that what we are doing here is not a matter of yielding, or a matter of being unwilling to compromise with the executive branch of the Government, but we are yielding to the so-called civilian experts of the executive branch of the Government, who are telling the Committee on Armed Services and telling our Military Establishment—our Air Force, who came before our committee with every intent and with every means at their command to impress upon us why the RS–70 is vitally necessary. We agreed with them unanimously because over the years we have come to understand what they were really trying to do.

Why do I go along with Curtis LeMay, this great general, with the great record, and his advisers in the Air Force? I will tell you why I do and why I am willing to; because, in the history of the United States of America it has been our military leaders who have led us to victory in every war. It has been our civilian experts who have put the world in the mess in which it is today. I say that our military leaders are men who are dedicated to the defense of this Nation and who have proven that beyond any shadow of doubt. That is why I am willing so many times to go along with their reasoning; because of their great experience and their great dedication.

I think Mr. McNamara is a great, a wonderful man. I have nothing against him as an individual or as a personality. But when Mr. McNamara goes before the American people day after day to try to get the press, the news media on his side, as against the will of the Congress of the United States, I say that is wrong. It does not comport with the intent of having three equal branches of Government, each equal in its powers under the Constitution. I do not believe that any Secretary of Defense is carrying out his duty as he should when he uses those methods. The President of the United States as an elected official has a duty, and I have no criticism of him when he takes any means at his command to prepare legislation on those things he desires, because he has that responsibility under the Constitution. But we who are the elected representatives of the people—and I close on this note—have to take this position. I say this to you, that when I go back home and see what is reflected in the mail that I receive, there is a great disturbance in the minds of the American people as to the effectiveness of the Congress today. What are we doing to offset the many things that are happening in our Nation and the world? I think today is a good example. In all conscience I must vote for this bill. I have no alternative than to provide for the national defense. I do so with a full appreciation of what is necessary. I can only hope, and express the fervent prayer, that the Secretary of Defense will wake up to the will of Congress. And as to our good chairman, I am sure he will do what he said he will do, see to it that we get regular reports of what this study is going to do, and not have the matter brushed under the rug. So many studies that we have asked for in the years that I have been a member of the committee I never heard of again. This may be just another one.

So I say, Mr. Chairman, that while I certainly must vote for this legislation, because I must vote for it as others do, I do so with a great reservation insofar as the great need of bombers is concerned, one which the Committee on Armed Services has marked for study year in and year out. We know that this is a vital, an essential part of the defense weapons system of this great country of ours.

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

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

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I have been waiting all afternoon to hear someone tell us, under this agreement that has been reported, how much of the $491 million is going to be spent for the purpose for which it is intended.

Mr. BECKER. You heard the letter of Mr. McNamara. He did not say he would spend any, but he said if the study proved that technological advances in certain fields in the way of a weapons system of the RS–70 proved in the course of the year essential or moving ahead, he would spend part or all of it that was deemed necessary.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Chairman, this bill, H.R. 9751, would authorize appropriations during the next fiscal year for aircraft, missiles, and naval vessels for the Armed Forces. The total amount of authorization is over $13 billion. It constitutes the largest single authorization bill to come before the Congress during this session. It involves nothing, except the defense and security of our country since it includes authorization for everything from missiles to revolvers; in short, all the military hardware and weapons which comprise our military deterrent.

It is no easy responsibility, to sit in judgment on matters which result in such a heavy burden on the American taxpayer, and yet to realize that these are decisions on which our very lives may depend. The Armed Services Committee has been in almost daily session, listening to posture briefings by our military chiefs, hearing highly classified intelligence estimates of the military capabilities of the Communist bloc, and considering all the evidence which must form a basis for our decisions.

Bills which are reported out of the Armed Services Committee are unique in that much of the basis for committee action is highly classified and cannot be discussed in open debate on the floor of the House. Therefore, the Congress must rely on the judgment of the committee, to a far greater extent than they rely on other committees; whose recommendations can be fully discussed during debate, and any particular bill amended, and so forth.

I can report to you that the recommendations of our committee on this particular bill were originally unanimous. Party affiliation did not enter into our decisions, as indeed it should not on matters affecting our Nation's defense.

The major controversy on this defense authorization bill occurs between the Armed Services Committee and the administration's Secretary of Defense; and then only on two of our major weapons systems. One involves the Minuteman intercontinental ballistic missile. As you may know, several counties in the Seventh Congressional District of Missouri are included in the Minuteman complex which has its headquarters at the Whiteman Air Force Base, Knobnoster, Mo. SAC has already contracted for the construction of underground firing sites, several of which will be located in our northern tier of counties.

Twelve squadrons totaling 600 hardened and well dispersed Minuteman missiles have been funded through fiscal year 1962. Funds for four more squadrons are included in the 1963 budget and are included in the bill approved by our committee. This represents $10 million more than the amount requested by our executive branch. It was the opinion of our committee that a larger force of Minuteman missiles should be initiated at this time in order that the ultimate number procured and placed will move us closer to the capability which our country must have in the years ahead. The first Minuteman missile was fired in February 1961 and was completely successful. Numerous tests since then have also been successful. In view of the rapid strides which Communist Russia has and is making in the field of missiles, the committee believed our Nation had no choice but to develop a strong deterrent capability in this area.

The other area of controversy involves the B–70 or RS–70 bomber. This supersonic bomber—or space capable platform—is still in the development stage and a high degree of secrecy is attached to its intended capabilities. The committee believed it has a very special place in our defense structure because it possesses the potential to do many things in the areas of reconnaissance, strike, and communications. Furthermore, unlike a missile, a bomber of this type give us greater flexibility. Once a missile is fired from its launching pad we have reached the point of no return. A nuclear explosion is as certain to follow as day follows night. A bomber with the capabilities of the B–70 would provide us with the option of waiting until the last possible second before making the fateful decision of whether to touch off a nuclear holocaust in the event of war. It can be recalled.

For the last 3 years, the Congress has authorized the expenditures necessary to produce three experimental types. But in each case the recommendations have not been carried out in full by the Secretary of Defense.

The bill finally, but not unanimously, voted out by the Armed Services Committee authorizes the Secretary to utilize an additional $491 million to proceed with production planning and long lead-time procurement of the B–70 weapons system. The debate taking place this week undoubtedly would have dealt with interpretation of the Constitution as to whether the Congress has the authority to so instruct the administrative branch of Government. This question was sold out by the leadership and chairman, and majority party, after a White House conference of 3:30 Tuesday afternoon. I am on record—May 23, 1961—as urging more and firmer policy of the Armed Services Committee to the chairman.

In respect to our ability to finance the additional B–70 authorization, I might point out that the foreign aid which we are now extending to Communist and so-called neutralist or nonalined countries, would finance our entire B–70 development program. I certainly believe that this expenditure of tax funds will serve a far better investment in our defense posture and for civilian flight development and progress than in supporting and building up those countries, who would be likely to side with the Communist bloc in the event of war. When the foreign aid bill comes up again this year, I certainly will vote in accordance with these beliefs and convictions.

In all fairness, I want to point out that our committee, as a whole, has the highest regard for Defense Secretary McNamara. I personally believe he is capable, and dedicated to carrying out the enormous responsibilities which are his. The areas of agreement between the Defense Secretary and our committee are far more numerous than the areas of disagreement. This is as it should be. I regret the issue was not joined and that in the interest of expediency, principle was forgotten. Perhaps only time will tell whether the vaunted courage of the Armed Services Committee has served our country well, protected it faithfully, and lived up to our constitutional responsibilities. Certainly, the proverbial "walk" in the White House rose garden, changed things abruptly. I find it difficult to yield by altering the House's "direction," and still support unwanted, and unneeded, further spending, even for defense; when we are already completely deterrent capable and annihilatory. It would seem more appropriate to strengthen the demands and will of our total people and defend them by expediting an antimissile missile, through not only the "whiz kids" and their ideas under control; but, also by utilizing the grizzled and tried and true knowledge and experience of our military leaders.

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CHAMBERLAIN].

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the bill before the House and to say that when the chairman in his statement today stated that the Members of the House would be surprised at the news he was going to bring, I assure you, I, too, was greatly surprised, when I heard this news just an hour or so before. But though I have reservation about what has been done to the RS–70 program, I can say in all good conscience, I do not disagree with the decision that has been made with respect to striking the directive words in this bill. But, as we heard in a colloquy earlier in the debate as to what the word "direct" might mean or "authorize," I think now we should turn our attention, as my colleague from New York has pointed out, to what the word "study" means. So often when we reach a dead end here with these problems, we throw the legislative machine into neutral

and stop for a study. When the Secretary of Defense says, "Consequently, we are initiating immediately a new study"—I would like to ask when he says, "Consequently, we—" who is we? Who is going to be the head of this study or is it going to be composed entirely of those in the Department of Defense that had a negative attitude toward this B–70 program? Are we going to call in some people from the Air Force who might believe there is some merit to the RS–70 and listen to what they have to say?

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

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. I am happy to yield to my colleague from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. I have an idea you will see the hiring of some kind of management or consulting firm to come up with the answer that the Secretary of Defense wants in this matter.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. I would not be surprised, nor would I be surprised if it took a couple of years. Are we going to have a stacked committee to study this problem? I think that is something we should inquire into and I want to serve notice on my chairman that I am going to be making some inquiries as to who will be making this study in the weeks and months ahead.

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

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. I yield to my colleague, the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. HÉBERT. I would refresh the gentleman's memory as to what the distinguished chairman of our Committee on Armed Services said originally when he was speaking as to who would be on the study committee and who would participate in the study. He said:

> And another thing, the committee will get a full assurance that the group making this study will have not only scientists and representatives of the Secretary of Defense in it, but will have people from the Air Force, not only the technical ones but the policy ones; and not only civilians, but military people whose background and experience in the development and operation of bombers gives them special understanding of the problem that we are talking about.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. I am glad that my colleague has pointed that out. I hope he will join me in making certain that a stacked committee is not created.

Mr. HÉBERT. I am sure, and the gentleman knows my record when it comes to matters of that kind and knows of my persistence in that respect that I will be on your side to see that that promise is carried out.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. There is one other thing that I want to point out. In the next paragraph in the Secretary's letter, he said:

> Furthermore, if technological developments advance more rapidly than we anticipate, we will wish to take advantage of these advances by increasing our development expenditures.

Which raises the question of which came first, the chicken or the egg?

I think it is the will of this Congress to spend more money right now to make certain that we do everything we can to bring about technological advancement and get this program going, and get this plane off the ground.

I would like to say in conclusion that I share wholeheartedly the statement that was made by my colleague from Louisiana, about the testimony of Secretary of Defense classified top secret, yet the morning papers have had much of the same information spread in the press reports. Having failed for 2 years to convince the committee, in top secret sessions, of the soundness of his position the Secretary of Defense elected to take this complex issue to the people in an apparent attempt to have it decided on the front pages of the newspapers with unclassified information. This every Member of Congress should resent.

While I question that any funds that may be appropriated in excess of budgetary recommendations will ever be spent, I certainly share the view of my distinguished chairman and my colleagues on your Armed Services Committee that the time has come to speak up and find out whether we do have any voice in determining the level of our national security programs. It is my hope that the vote on this issue will cause our able Secretary of Defense to reflect about the mutuality of our responsibilities to the Nation. I urge your support of the recommendations of your Armed Services Committee.

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. BENNETT].

Mr. BENNETT of Florida. Mr. Chairman, the Committee on Armed Services has wisely resolved the RS–70 legislative debate by providing for joint legislation and executive scrutiny of this development program. I was glad to hear the chairman of our committee announce that the research and development of this plane and its subsystems will have continuing periodic investigation by the committee to assure that progress is made in the maximum degree; so that when opportunities arise for pushing ahead to the prompt and possible final production that this will be done in fact.

Now I would like to turn to another aspect of this bill.

Aggression, of any magnitude, at any location, must be met with the proper force at the right time. Airlift helps to make this possible. Without it, our ability to meet aggression would be greatly reduced.

It was never more important that we do everything possible to reach our national objectives across the entire spectrum of conflict and international relations. Airlift has the power to support this country and free world aims to such an extent that it holds a unique position as a tool of national policy. A quick look at the past will show just how flexible airlift can be as a tool of national policy and just how important it is as a cornerstone of our strategy.

The Berlin airlift of 1948–49, Lebanon in 1956, and Taiwan in 1958 are three examples of how airlift supported our national effort in times of emergency. The recent deployment of forces to Europe is another more current example of the need and effectiveness of airlift.

Rapid airlift in proper quantities, using equipment designed for the job, can help stem possible aggression. Failing in this, it can put the forces in place and continue to support them as required. Timely airlift can often keep outbreaks of violence limited.

In my judgment, the case for airlift is made by just these examples, but there are more. Our strategic retaliatory force depends in part upon airlift support, as does our Mobile Strategic Army Corps and our Tactical Air Forces. The very mobility of these latter forces is given meaning only through the use of airlift.

The unique role which airlift plays today is best exemplified by the nature of U.S. support to the United Nations today. In the past 18 months, some 31,000 troops and 7,000 tons of cargo from 17 different U.N. member nations have been airlifted into the Congo in furtherance of the U.N.'s efforts to maintain order and provide for democratic development.

Now, if we can do all these things with today's forces, why is there still more needed? A brief review of today's force and its posture is perhaps the best way to seek an answer and identify some limitations.

Today, there are over 1,800 transport aircraft including some 230 of the Civil Reserve Air Fleet which are available to the Air Force during times of emergency. This is a sizable force, but one which has many demands made upon it, most of which can be met separately but which, taken together, create shortcomings in timeliness or method of delivery or mission accomplishment itself. In other words, there isn't enough airlift today to meet in quantity or quality all wartime airlift requirements. There are some requirements, such as missiles and certain Army equipment, which are heavier or larger than present aircraft are capable of airlifting and yet which require transportation by air. More importantly, the majority of the strategic airlift force is obsolescent and piston-type, operating in the 200 to 250 knot range. Also, the force is made up largely of converted passenger-type aircraft which lack flexibility because they can perform airlanded missions only and have no outsize cargo carrying capability. The latter is true of the entire CRAF fleet. In addition, the capability of the piston engine force is predicated on the existence of island bases en route to Europe and the Far East.

The Air Force has developed a program for airlift modernization both interim and long range which, when implemented, will reduce or eliminate most of the limitations I have just mentioned.

This Congress by its fiscal year 1962 authorizations enabled the program to continue when last year it authorized 93 C–130 aircraft, 15 additional C–135's and funds to proceed with a positive development and procurement program for the C–141—the most vital step to date toward a truly modern transport force. The items we see in this year's

budget request and which we are being asked to authorize represent the coming year's share of the total force, which will require 5 more years to build. This point bears emphasizing: The 16 C–141 aircraft to be authorized are merely the first increment and the 136 C–130 aircraft only a part of the total force of over 400 which modernize both the Tactical Air Command and Military Air Transport Service and provide a versatile aircraft for support of the Army. Each year some procurement of the C–141 aircraft will be requested until over 200 are bought and the program goal is attained. We must appreciate that the total objective force is required even though it is to be achieved by a year-by-year procurement program. Each year, in other words, we must be prepared to authorize 1 year's share of the ultimate force.

What are the objectives of the Air Force in projecting a force of the most modern transport aircraft the "state-of-the-art" can provide? Broadly speaking, they are to achieve complete flexibility in airlift forces so that support for all types of missions can be provided from any operating location and to permit the accomplishment of all the airlift requirements of cold, limited, and general war. Specifically, the aim is to relieve our dependence on island bases; to acquire the ability to deploy strategic Army forces up to several divisions, plus mobile strike forces anywhere in the world in the shortest possible time; and above all, to be able to undertake simultaneously airlift tasks of some magnitude to more than one theater of operations.

I am convinced by what I have seen of this program that the airlift force of the future will have impressive capabilities, distinguished by flexibility and versatility. It has my support and I am convinced it merits the continuing support of the Congress.

Before closing, I should allude to some requirements of the future which are not now a part of the airlift program I have just discussed, but which when presented to us will deserve our most thoughtful consideration.

I have reference to three items. First, a follow-on aircraft is required to replace the C–133 as an outsize cargo carrier capable of handling all missiles and space boosters now being planned or developed. The Air Force is currently preparing a specific operational requirement for this aircraft. Second, a light transport aircraft with true vertical or short-field takeoff and landing capabilities which will carry 8- to 10-ton payloads to provide support and combat zone mobility to the ground forces in the future. We can expect to see a specific operational requirement for this essential aircraft in the near future. The Army has already expressed its view in the form of a qualitative material requirement and the Joint Chiefs of Staff are now studying the matter. Last, and looking to the 1970's, we should expect to see a valid requirement expressed for a supersonic transport—1,500 miles per hour or faster. Technology will inevitably permit its development and future strategy will dictate its acquisition. One dramatic example should illustrate this: Today's battle group could be delivered in Europe with little warning, in less than 10 hours and with approximately 43 sorties.

Economic considerations alone will probably determine our position in this matter but we could ill afford on the one hand to see another nation develop this aircraft first and become the world's supplier and on the other to surrender our historical position in the forefront of aircraft development.

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

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Chairman, a good deal has been said on this controversy already and I shall address myself to just one or two points. Much has been said this afternoon as to who is winning and who is losing in the compromise that has been worked out by the committee. I think there is some confusion on this issue. In fact we are presented with two issues as I see it. The first is the constitutional issue, the question of whether the Congress has the right to direct the Executive to spend any particular sum of money. Many people have been interested in this particular issue and some perhaps have looked forward to a head-on clash between the Legislature and the Executive on this particular point. This clash has now of course been avoided by the action of the committee.

In this connection I am reminded of a story that a former Governor of the State of New York, Al Smith, used to like to tell, about a young man who was taking an examination to be a railroad crossing guard on the New York Central Railroad. He passed his written examination with flying colors, but when it came to the oral examination they asked him this: "Suppose there is a train coming from one direction on a one-track line and then you look the other way and you see another train coming in the opposite direction on the same line. You wave your lantern but the wind blows it out. You wave your red flag but the wind blows it away. What would you do then?" The young man looked up and said: "I would go and call my wife." The examiner said: "No, no, this is a serious matter. I do not think you understood the question. I will repeat it: " 'There are two trains on the same track coming from opposite directions; the wind blows your lantern out and tears your flag off the stick. What would you do?' " He said again, just as emphatically: "I would go call my wife." They asked him: "But why would you call your wife?" And he replied: "I'd call her to come and see the darnedest railroad wreck she'd ever seen."

Well perhaps this is what some folks had hoped to see here today.

But the real issue here is not the constitutional issue, the real issue is the progress of the B–70 or the RS–70 weapons system. Will it be expedited as rapidly as possible? And on this point I do not think there is any question but what the committee has won its point and that the Congress in adopting the legislation as proposed by our committee will also be winning its point.

Last week Defense Secretary McNamara appeared before our committee, as has been mentioned. Later on he held a press conference and presented publicly at least a great portion of the material he had presented to the committee.

The interesting thing about the Secretary's appearance and his subsequent press conference is that on the basis of the information he gave us the B–70 or the RS–70 was a complete waste of money and a completely worthless weapon system.

The Secretary is a brilliant man, as has already been testified to here earlier, but his testimony before the committee proved too much, because in his own budget there is set aside the sum of $171 million to promote an aircraft which he was trying to tell us last week, on the basis of his computers, was completely worthless and a complete waste of money. That $171 million was in the budget, of course, because the President of the United States and his officials in the Defense Department had already very wisely recognized that you cannot base the future of the Nation solely on what a computer tells you. Any computer has to have certain assumption, fed in to get started. The fact of the matter is that the Defense Department, in spite of Mr. McNamara's analysis, has been proceeding, but proceeding all too slowly in the judgment of our committee, toward the development of a new manned plane, a new manned bomber, in case the time should ever come when it might be needed.

So all that our committee was doing was to tell the Defense Department that it should proceed more rapidly on this advanced plane than the Secretary wanted to proceed. The point at issue is whether we are going to proceed at $171 million worth or whether we are going to proceed as rapidly as humanly possible to develop this new aircraft so that it might be ready even sooner in the event it is needed, that is, as the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. HÉBERT] said a moment ago, be ready when the seniors on the team have graduated, and when we are looking at the bench for somebody else to replace them to carry on the battle.

Our committee is not willing to put all our defense eggs into the missile basket. So we have insisted that the new generation, the mach 3 bomber, be prepared more rapidly. The result of the letters that have been read into the committee record this afternoon is to demonstrate that the President and Secretary of Defense are now both in complete accord with the committee, that money shall be spent on this system just as rapidly as it can be effectively used.

We are not asking here to spend $10 billion. We just want six of these planes instead of three. That is the real difference and that is the real measure of the concession that has been granted to us. It may well be that our country will never have to use the B–70. We did not

have to use the B–36, either, as you recall. We might not even have to use any of the money we are providing today in this great bill for missiles, tanks, guns, ships, and all the other things. But this committee is charged with the defense and the security of the Nation, and we would be doing less than our solemnly pledged duty if we did not do everything possible to guarantee our security in the years to come, when the decision will not rest on the IBM computers, but on a situation that we can only guess at today will be upon us.

I want to commend the chairman of our committee for the action he has taken. I fully support the amendment he will offer this afternoon, and I congratulate the members of the committee because I am sure we will all go along with an action that will not, it is true, result in any great railroad wreck, but will protect the security of our Nation as we believe it needs to be protected in the face of Communist challenges and aggression from abroad. I support the committee's position on this bill.

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

Mr. PIRNIE. Mr. Chairman, what constitutes adequate military preparedness for our Nation? The better informed one becomes as to the nature and scope of the threats to our security and the technological problems involved in modern weapons to meet these threats, the less inclined one should become to assert an arbitrary opinion. However, the Armed Services Committee has a direct responsibility to prepare and submit to this body measures which in its well-considered judgment support our Defense Establishment at the level of military preparedness the current world situation requires. Balancing factors of economic and military requirements, we have unanimously brought to the floor H.R. 9751. In it is embodied the results of weeks of briefings, hearings, and detailed presentations during which we have heard our leading military authorities, uniformed and civilian. The bill embodies all basic recommendations of the Department of Defense and adds a further important item which has become a subject of considerable controversy. It is vital to the Nation that the dispute be kept in perspective.

Our able Secretary of Defense early demonstrated a surprising grasp of the vast program he directs. Our committee has great respect for his sincerity, diligence, and ability. The bill before you gives him the tools he requested to do the job, but it goes beyond his request by authorizing additional funds for the development of the RS–70 weapons system—the reconnaissance version of the mach 3 bomber. The development of this aircraft was first authorized in 1955. Funds have been appropriated in each fiscal year since that date until now we have approximately $1 billion invested in the program. The Department of Defense recommended that a follow-on sum of $171 million be expended for the fiscal year 1963. The question before the committee and now before the House is whether instead of $171 million, the sum of $491 million be provided to expedite the prototype development of this unique weapons system. The Secretary of Defense has consistently maintained that the additional funds are not required, but in the opinion of our committee, the Air Force made a convincing case for the authorization of this additional sum.

Knowledge of the background of this difference in opinion is helpful. Last year the Congress voted funds for additional conventional bombers. That action was prompted by a conviction that the missile program has not proceeded to the point where complete reliance could be placed upon its capabilities to the exclusion of the manned bomber. Despite approval by the Congress, the Secretary of Defense declined to make use of the funds so appropriated, and the assembly lines on these bombers—our most advanced operational types—have ground to a halt. The best intelligence available makes clear that the Soviets have not taken similar action but instead are adding and developing new manned bomber strength.

It may well be, and we sincerely hope it to be so, that our program for 1963 will be effective without the addition we propose. We would like to feel that provision for 1,000 Atlas, Titan, and Minuteman intercontinental ballistic missiles, plus 41 submarines with over 650 Polaris missiles, plus our existing great bomber fleet would constitute sound protection for the Nation. Nevertheless, we believe that nothing has transpired to cause us to ignore the potential of the RS–70; that it is vital to our interests to develop and fly the best manned weapons system modern technology can devise. Time is of the essence. We must avail ourselves of the technical miracles which this flying laboratory will provide. Its survivability, its reconnaissance potential, and its weaponry will reflect scientific achievements yet to be placed in a flying configuration.

The sum of $491 million made available now will move this program faster and more efficiently. It would be false economy not to make full use of the latest advances in sophisticated communications and manned weaponry. A short time ago, Col. John Glenn indicated the significant advantages of man-directed systems. Furthermore, approval of the committee's action in this instance in no way constitutes an irrevocable commitment to a later multi-billion dollar production program—but only buys valuable leadtime should mass production be required. Whether its prototype performance and later developed counterweapons will dictate squadron procurement, time will tell, but if we are to have any bomber program, and I believe we should, it should proceed now and with all possible speed and efficiency.

Surely Congress was intended by the Constitution and is expected by our people to have more than a veto power over military programs. In this bill we are not trying to usurp prerogatives of the Executive, but are solemnly exercising our constitutional duty "to raise and maintain the armed force necessary for the preservation of our Nation." If Congress has a firm conviction that any affirmative action is necessary or desirable, it should give full expression to that conviction. This is our duty. Although we may change the language of the bill so as to eliminate the word "direct," our intent is clear and we have the assurance of the President and the Secretary of Defense that our concern will not be ignored. Our able chairman has detailed this measure. Our committee unanimously brought this bill to the floor. It represents our best judgment.

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. DORN].

Mr. DORN. Mr. Chairman, I am for this bill. I wish to thank the distinguished Committee on Armed Services of the House for the work it has done on the bill. I hope the RS–70 program can proceed as expeditiously as possible.

Mr. Chairman, it is with particular pleasure that I rise to support the distinguished, able, and farseeing chairman of the Armed Forces Committee, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON], and his great committee.

Mr. Chairman, when war comes to the United States, it will begin in the Far East. Red Communist China, seething with unrest and seeking a foreign scapegoat, will attack Quemoy and Matsu or Formosa. Red China will launch her overwhelming land juggernaut into South Korea or into South Vietnam, Burma, Thailand, or India. China may decide to attack all of these objectives simultaneously. In any case, the United States will be involved in war. The Far East is the key area of the world. The road to Paris is still the road through Peiping. The road to Latin America and the soft underbelly of the United States is the road from the Far East through the Near East and through Africa. Red China is anxious for war. Her population is increasing rapidly and in a few years will reach a billion people. She can afford to lose a half billion population to win a war. The United States cannot possibly win a ground war with the millions of Red Chinese soldiers.

Mr. Chairman, by 1970 the only deterrent to Red Chinese aggression could be a powerful RS–70 strategic bomber command. With the outbreak of war, a powerful RS–70 command might be our only means to stop such an avalanche of manpower pouring into southeast Asia. It is quite possible that in such a struggle Russia may remain neutral. She may deny Red China the use of her air defense forces. It will be many years before China will or can develop adequate defense against strategic bombing. In addition to a lack of technicians, China does not have the billions of dollars necessary to create the air defense necessary to even remotely challenge the RS–70. We must not fall into the fatal error of being hypnotized by the bombast of Khrushchev. We must not permit our whole attention to be attracted by him and his dazzling feats in space. All of this may just be designed to divert

our attention while the Red Chinese amass their forces to conquer southeast Asia. We must prepare for the almost certain war with China while at the same time be prepared for possible conflict with Russia.

I might remind the House that Herman Goering, commander and chief of the German Luftwaffe, boasted before the entire world that no bomb would fall on Berlin. He boasted that the antiaircraft defenses of Berlin and of Germany were impregnable and could not be pierced. Herman Goering based his fallacious belief on the calculations of a mathematical "quiz kid," Dr. Ludwig, who was serving on his staff. Dr. Ludwig had informed Goering that no bomber could get over Berlin as he could prove by slide rule, mathematical deductions, and computations that the bombers simply could not pass the antiaircraft batteries. I greatly fear that some of our "quiz kids" in America today have figured out on paper and by mathematics that they have all the answers against air attack. They may have, but we still need the RS–70 for insurance. The chances are your house will not burn; but it may; therefore you have fire insurance. During the initial period of our conquest of space, bases on the moon and on planets, we will need something to protect us while we get there. The answer is the RS–70.

Mr. Chairman, I was in this House when we passed a 70-group Air Force. The year was 1947. It was a bitter struggle, but this Congress looking ahead, looking to the future, appropriated money for a 70-group Air Force. It was a tragic mistake when the first Secretary of Defense and the President impounded the money and refused to carry out the wishes of the Congress and the American people. Three years later the bloody Red forces of North Korea crossed the 38th parallel and launched another world war. Again, we were tragically unprepared. We had to appropriate billions of additional dollars, and place new plans on the drawing board. We now had to build a 124-group Air Force. I have wished many times that this 70-group Air Force had been built promptly. Had this happened, I believe the Korean war would have been averted, 33,000 American lives saved, and billions of American dollars, not to mention the other hundreds of thousands killed and wounded in Korea.

Sometimes men are so close to their profession that they cannot see some of the simple, basic, elemental truisms. I believe this was true of many of our great military leaders following World War I when the great and incomparable Billy Mitchell was court-martialed for pointing out obvious facts about the future role of aircraft in war. Back through the history of this great Nation, many Members of Congress were ahead of the time and could see into the future with uncanny accuracy relating to future instrumentalities of war. One Member of this Congress expressed great shock when conferring with the President in the late thirties he noticed miniature battleships and cruisers on the President's desk. This Congressman trembled with fear for the future security of our country and told the President that airplanes could sink those battleships and cruisers. The President laughed and said impossible. A few years later, America learned the hard and tragic way early one Sunday morning, December 7, the place Pearl Harbor. The Congress was right in 1947; the experts and the executive branch were dead wrong. Billy Mitchell and many Congressmen were right; the experts and executive leaders were dead wrong. I believe today that we must conquer space. We cannot predict future military science and tactics on concepts of the past. We must prepare for war in space. We must master pushbutton warfare; but, Mr. Chairman, while we are preparing for this war of the future, we must be prepared for the war of the immediate future. We must be ready during this transitory period. We must bear in mind Red China and the Far East.

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. PIKE].

Mr. PIKE. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Louisiana for yielding me this time to speak on this highly important bill. No one knows better than our able and eloquent chairman, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON], that I do not like this bill. On the contrary, I dislike it thoroughly—for a most primitive reason. It is going to mean serious economic dislocation for the district I represent. A very major procurement which the so-called experts at the Pentagon were talking about speeding up as recently as last fall is being cut back by this legislation. So I do not like this bill one bit. But I respect this bill. I will offer no amendments seeking to continue production of a wonderful aircraft. The fight was made in the committee. Anyone who cares can find it in the hearings, but the fight was lost. The fight was not made on any political considerations or on any economic considerations or on any consideration other than what I believe would provide the best defense for America at the least cost to America. I lost. So, I rise in support of a bill that I do not like, a bill that may mean that I shall not survive to support next year's military appropriation bill. I do so glady because there is at issue in this bill a principle far more important than the survival of any number of freshmen Congressmen. The question is this: Can Congress only say that we have too much strength, or can it also say we have too little? Can it only pull up on the reins or can it apply the spurs? Those who say that Congress has no greater power than to say "no" occasionally base their position on one of two theories: First, is the constitutional question; and, second, there is the argument that no one should question the experts at the Pentagon.

Mr. Chairman, as to the first, there are better qualified constitutional lawyers than I among the Members to challenge the constitutional lawyers who apparently abound in the Pentagon. A reading of the language: "Congress shall have the power to raise and support armies" has, to this simple country lawyer, a fairly clear meaning. Raise means get the men—support means get them the equipment they need. It does not mean to tell them where, or how, or when to use it; that would be the responsibility of the Commander in Chief. But the constitutional issue is being bypassed, which brings us to the experts.

The experts in the Defense Department say they do not need the money and cannot spend the money to further the development of the RS–70 aircraft. The experts in the Air Force say they can use the money advantageously; not waste it, not squander it, not spend it uselessly, but spend it usefully toward the day when a new generation of manned strategic aircraft will come into being. If there is anything which the magnificent exploit of John Glenn taught me, it is that in the most advanced of systems, man is not yet obsolete.

As between the experts who will have to fly the plane and those who will simply watch it go by, I will cast my lot with those who are prepared to risk their lives in manning it. I have learned, to my sorrow, that no experts are infallible. This year's experts are next year's experts.

Two years ago, the experts called a plane being built in my own district the best fighter-bomber available. Today they are saying that a plane which has been available for 4 years was really better all along. It just took the experts 4 years to find out. So I am not overwhelmed by the word "expert." I am impressed by the fact that in a nation where we feel obliged to produce new models of every make car every year for the pleasure of our people, we have not produced a new strategic aircraft since the B–58 for the benefit of those who risk their lives daily to keep us free.

If we pass this bill and spend the money authorized we will still not have a new bomber until 1967 or 1968. By that time our newest bombers will be 6 or 7 years old. I hope that regardless of the semantics involved, the RS–70 project is pushed forward as rapidly as possible.

I urge the support of this bill, and state that I would have been happy to support it in its stronger language.

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Vermont [Mr. STAFFORD].

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I rise to urge the passage of H.R. 9751. I recognize that it authorizes the expenditure of an enormous sum—$13,065,772,000 for ships, planes, and aircraft for the fiscal year beginning July 1, 1962. I feel certain that all of us regret the necessity for devoting so much of our treasure, our energy, and our intelligence to the production of military hardware in the next 12 months. I am certain that there is no one in this body who would not prefer, if the safety of the country permitted it, that this money and these efforts be devoted to activi-

ties forwarding the peaceful advance of human society.

But the present state of the world precludes such action on our part and requires the action that we must take here today. The refusal of the Soviet Union to agree to any meaningful provisions for international disarmament make it necessary that we authorize the program this legislation encompasses.

In a word this bill represents a major part of the price of freedom during the next 12 months. Anything else, any reduction of the level of effort provided in this bill would make it impossible for us to reasonably guarantee so far as we can the security and freedom of our country and her ability to meet commitments to friendly nations.

The fiscal year 1963 request for total new obligational authority for the entire Department of Defense totals over $50 billion. Of this amount, the administration, as has been indicated to you, requested $12,481 million under section 412(b) of Public Law 86149. The committee, as my colleagues have already outlined in detail, has increased this request by $584,672,000 a very substantial sum of money even in these times and even for this great Nation.

I regret to find myself in a position of advocating that any aspect of this or any other budget recommendation be increased. I would rather be a party to a cutting of the budget recommendations. Indeed, we hope that cuts may be possible in other aspects of the Department of Defense allocation which will balance out this half billion dollar increase in the present bill.

As a matter of fact, unbalanced budgets and deficit spending represent, in my opinion, a threat to the future of this country which is second only to the danger of our encountering a military disaster should our deterrent power be allowed to lag. Accordingly, it is only because I am convinced that the safety of my country requires it that I can bring myself in the belief there is no alternative but to say that we must pass this bill with the additional $584 million included. The extra money will expedite the modernization and mobility of our Army. It will provide the necessary research, development, test and evaluation to enable us to substantially expedite the time when we can exercise the option to build a fleet of RS–70 aircraft, if that seems desirable.

Mr. Chairman, I urge the passage of the bill with these authorizations intact.

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. CLANCY].

Mr. CLANCY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 9751, which provides for the authorization of $13,065,772,000 for the procurement of aircraft, ships, and missiles. This amount is $584,672,000 more than was provided for in the bill that was originally presented to Congress. The greatest part of this addition, $491 million is for the RS–70 program.

The adoption of this legislation will assure the people of this Nation that we are intent upon maintaining a military posture that is more than sufficient to deter aggression on the part of the adversaries of freedom.

The adoption of this legislation will further insure that the United States has the capability of deterring the use of mass destruction weapons that our potential enemies possess at this time.

In evaluating and reappraising our defense posture, we are concerned with the threat to our security which exists as a result of the tremendous progress that has been made in the technology of mass destruction.

We must have in our military inventory sufficient weapons and force that will survive an initial massive nuclear attack and be capable of delivering a decisive counterblow. We have the capability of doing this today.

We should make every effort that can reasonably be made to strengthen these vital retaliatory forces that we now have at our command. This bill will contribute greatly to the defense posture that is necessary and one which we should maintain in the best interests of this Nation.

It is imperative, however, that we have a mixed striking force of proper proportions. It is for this reason that I wholeheartedly support the committee action with respect to the RS–70 program. The capabilities and tremendous value of manned bombers have been demonstrated time and time again, and we should not neglect the manned bomber program in the future.

I disagree with the administration that the RS–70 should not be carried forward at this time as a full scale weapon system development.

Military experts recognize important advantages in a mixed missile and bomber force. The principal advantage of the RS–70 is its ability to operate under positive control and to deliver a large number of nuclear weapons in a single sortie. It is highly maneuverable, can employ tactics, and does not have to fly over or into the target. It also possesses the advantage of having a human being aboard to exercise judgment consistent with changing environment.

It will have extraordinary reconnaissance aids which will permit the study of targets in detail and report the condition of same after an ICBM strike. It could then go in to finish a job. Its tremendous capabilities are vital to and will greatly complement our strategic military posture.

The budget that was submitted to us by President Eisenhower in January of 1961 provided that the then B–70 program be continued as a full weapons system development.

We shall continue to make every effort to have the present administration recommend the RS–70 development as a full weapons system. We sincerely hope that the study which is to be conducted by the Defense Department will result in an acceleration of the day in which the RS–70 becomes operational and part of our inventory.

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GROSS].

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I have listened attentively to all of the discussion this afternoon with the exception of about 5 minutes for a sandwich and a cup of coffee. I have heard repeatedly of a wonderful compromise that has been worked out on the bill by the House Armed Services Committee and how the House is winning its point. I guess I subscribe to and read too many newspapers. I had been reading for days about the struggle to the death between the colossus of the South and the colossus of the Northeast on the subject of the big bomber. But I found when I arrived on the House floor this noon that although the House Armed Services Committee had voted unanimously originally to direct the Secretary of Defense to spend $491 million for the RS–70 that this was not the last word. I learned that overnight the gentleman from Georgia had trod the primrose path to the White House and the signals had been changed. I am not aware of another all night twist party at the White House last night. At any rate I came to the House floor this noon and found that the word "direct" would no longer be used in this legislation to force the Secretary of Defense to spend $491 million for development of the RS–70 bomber.

I went to the dictionary a little while ago, for it was apparent the alleged compromise has been worked out on the basis of two words. I went to the dictionary to look up the difference between "direct" and "authorize." "Direct" is absolute; "authorize" is discretionary, as we all know in the House when we vote authorizations for appropriations. There is nothing mandatory upon the Appropriations Committee to provide the amount suggested in any authorization bill. One is absolute; the other is completely discretionary.

Then there was a letter from the President read into the RECORD this afternoon. Let me read just a few words from this letter from the President.

"I must, therefore, insist upon the full powers and discretions," and so on.

Is there anything mandatory about that? Of course there is. "I must insist upon the full powers of the executive branch of government," is what the President is saying in effect.

What kind of a compromise are we engaged in here this afternoon? What kind of fight is the Committee on Armed Services winning? What kind of fight is the House of Representatives winning, for this involves all of us?

Then I read the report accompanying this bill, and I found this:

To any student of government, it is eminently clear that the role of the Congress in determining national policy, defense or otherwise, has deteriorated over the years.

I agree with the distinguished gentleman from Georgia, the chairman of the Committee on Armed Services, that is absolutely true. You can scarcely turn a page of H.R. 8400, the foreign giveaway bill, last year, but what you find powers delegated to the executive branch

of the Government that ought to have been retained by Congress.

The concluding paragraph entitled, "Deterioration of the Role of Congress," reads:

> Perhaps this is the time, and the RS–70 is the occasion, to reverse this trend. Perhaps this is the time to reexamine the role and function of Congress and discover whether it is playing the part that the Founding Fathers ordained that it should.

Those are beautiful words, those are significant words. What now? Will you, before the afternoon is over, ask that these words be expunged from the report? I think that would be most fitting. I do not believe they belong in this report under any such compromise with the executive branch as is being suggested.

I say that Members of Congress and the public had been led to believe that here was a fight that would settle the question of separation of powers as between Congress and the executive branch of government.

I intend to support the bill for I believe this country must have incomparable defenses, but I deeply regret that this fight was started, for it is apparent now that it has been lost.

This is not a compromise; it is a defeat for the entire House of Representatives.

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. FORD].

Mr. FORD. Mr. Chairman, in all of the debate that I have listened to this afternoon I have not heard anybody quote the precise language which is in basic controversy, or was in basic controversy I should say, up until this morning.

This language on page 2 of H.R. 9751, which was in controversy, reads:

> For the Air Force, $3,626 million, of which the Secretary of the Air Force is directed to utilize authorization in an amount not less than $491 million during fiscal year 1963 to proceed with production planning and long leadtime procurement for an RS–70 weapon system.

I want to go on record, as I have in the past, as being unalterably opposed to that language. I do agree there was no harm in the Committee on Armed Services recommending an authorization of $491 million for the RS–70 program. Such a dollar authorization would not be objectionable. But I want it to be very clear that the language directing the Secretary of the Air Force, and in effect the Commander in Chief, is wrong for a number of reasons.

First, it would have invaded the responsibilities and the jurisdiction of the Commander in Chief, the President of the United States. This would have been, in my judgment, an unconstitutional invasion of the responsibilities of the Chief Executive. Secondly, the language would have usurped the appropriating authority of the Committee on Appropriations. Thirdly, this language would have created inflexibility in the management of the RS–70 program which undoubtedly would have led or conceivably would have led to harm and detriment to the program rather than helping and assisting it. Inflexibility in such a complicated weapon system would hamstring the responsible management in the Air Force.

May I say to my highly respected friend, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON], that if he is going to make a change in this committee amendment, to just change the word "directed" to "authorized" the result will be an awkward sentence.

Mr. VINSON. I grant you that is true. We are trying to make as little change as possible.

Mr. FORD. It is a very awkward sentence. If the gentleman makes that change, could the gentleman in his wisdom and good judgment revise the language of that sentence so we at least will have a decent-sounding sentence in any law?

Mr. VINSON. Well, I think in view of the letter from the President, when he uses a word, that is the word I adopt. Of course, there are different words we could adopt. We could just put a period after the figure and strike out the balance, but I do not want to do that, because I wanted the relationship of the RS–70 to the money figure to be reflected. It may not be exactly accurate from a grammatical standpoint, but nevertheless it is good enough from a legal standpoint, so I hope, therefore, that the gentleman will not be too technical and concur in the amendment.

Mr. FORD. I am always proud of the handiwork we do on the floor of the House and in committee, and I am very disappointed, I will say to my friend, when we do something that is awkward, that does not meet the standards that he and others establish in the drafting of legislation. If you just change the word "directed" to "authorized," it leaves a very awkward sentence.

Mr. VINSON. Well, that may be true. Let me read it: "of which the Secretary of the Air Force is authorized to utilize authorizations."

Mr. FORD. That does not sound very well.

Mr. VINSON. Well, that might not be exactly up to the latest and most proper phraseology, but nevertheless if I do it the other way, then I lose entirely the connection of the $491 million with the RS–70.

Mr. FORD. May I respectfully suggest that you write it this way: "of which the Secretary of the Air Force is authorized $491 million during fiscal year 1963 to proceed with the production, planning, and long-time procurement for RS–70 weapon systems."

Mr. VINSON. This question was raised in the committee this morning, and all that the gentleman says was under consideration. The thought of the committee was that we wanted to tie this in, that is, the $491 million, with the RS–70 program. I trust that the gentleman will go along with the committee. I cannot now change the committee amendment without calling the committee back and going into the matter further.

Mr. FORD. I will rely entirely on the wisdom of the chairman in conference to correct this very awkward sounding sentence.

Mr. VINSON. Yes; it might be corrected in conference, I will say, before it becomes law. I assure you there I will try to improve on the sentence.

Mr. FORD. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to take exception to some remarks made in the committee report. I earnestly request that members of the committee read this report, starting on page 3, under the heading "Manned Bombers" and running through page 9.

The committee report says in one heading on page 5: "Disregard of Congressional Will." On page 6 the committee cites 13 instances, beginning with fiscal year 1956, and running through fiscal year 1961, where the Executive has refused to do what the Congress has directed.

Mr. Chairman, I do not question the validity of those figures. But on the other hand I made a check to see how many times during this same 6-year period the Executive has followed the direction of the Congress on military matters. It is interesting to see, if one will look at the record, that during this same period of time the executive branch of the Government has followed the recommendations of the Congress 28 times in toto. In nine cases out of this same period of time the executive branch of the Government followed the recommendations of the Congress more than 50 percent. So, Mr. Chairman, the Chief Executive, whether it was former President Eisenhower, or President Kennedy, far more times has followed the recommendations of Congress on military matters than he has not. So, I am not convinced at all as to the validity of the statement made on page 6 of this committee report on the conclusion made therefrom.

Mr. Chairman, I must say that I agree in other portions with the committee report. Nothing is more obnoxious in my opinion than to have someone in the executive branch of the Government, whether he is in the Defense Department or the Department of Agriculture, place a halo over his head and decide on his own that all the wisdom in the world exists in his Department.

Mr. Chairman, this Congress does have a good record, and the facts which I recited before prove it. They have followed our recommendations, in toto, 28 times in this 5- or 6-year period. They have followed our recommendations substantially in nine more instances.

Mr. Chairman, I think that the Congress would have been unwise to approve the language "directs" because it would have caused trouble between two great committees, the Committee on Armed Services, and the Committee on Appropriations. I am very jealous of the prerogatives of my committee, the Committee on Appropriations. I am very anxious that the Committee on Armed Services exercise to the fullest its prerogatives. I do not want those of us who are members of the Committee on Appropriations drafting legislation on an appropriation bill. I opposed it in every instance that I can recall. On the other hand, I do not think it is the prerogative of the Com-

mittee on Armed Services to invade the jurisdiction of the Committee on Appropriations. This language, if it had been approved in its original form, would have been an invasion of the authority of the Appropriations Committee.

I am just as jealous that the Congress not invade the jurisdiction of the Chief Executive. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from New York [Mr. BECKER] earlier pointed out that President Kennedy has sought by one means or another to gain greater authority over the raising or lowering of taxes. The President currently wants some authority in a standby fashion to institute a vast public works program. I strongly disapprove of this authority in either of those cases, and I will not vote for them.

On the other hand, I do not want the Congress to usurp and take from the Chief Executive authority that is his. And so the amendment to this language, as originally proposed, is sound.

Now I should like to ask my good friend, the chairman of this committee, when he offers this amendment to change the language from "direct" to "authorize," whether or not he will agree that this part of the language in the committee report is also revised; and let me read it from page 9:

> Lest there be any doubt as to what the RS–70 amendment means let it be said that it means exactly what it says; i.e., that the Secretary of the Air Force, as an official of the executive branch, is directed, ordered, mandated, and required to utilize the full amount of the $491 million authority granted "to proceed with production planning and long leadtime procurement for an RS–70 weapon system."

Are you changing this when you change the language by the amendment?

Mr. VINSON. Of course, when you use the word "direct" that argument is sound and logical. When you use the word "authorize" it would not be applicable to the section the gentleman has just quoted.

Mr. FORD. I am delighted to hear the gentleman say that when you change the language from "direct" to "authorize" that this part of the committee report is no longer applicable.

Mr. VINSON. I trust the distinguished gentlemen of the Committee on Appropriations. I am pleased at the high compliment the gentleman paid the report. I do think it is a very fine report and I point with lasting pride to the reports of the Armed Services Committee. I trust there is enough of information in the report to cause him to continue to give his strong and loyal support to the RS–70 concept.

Mr. FORD. I do agree with the RS–70 concept. Our House subcommittee on military appropriations last year, as the gentleman may remember, did not accept President Kennedy's cutback in the program. We stuck with former President Eisenhower's dollar amount of $358 million.

Mr. VINSON. That is right.

Mr. FORD. I must say I have not passed judgment on whether we should have $171 million or $491 million for the fiscal year 1963. Our committee has not marked up our bill and it would be premature on my part to make any such decision at this point.

Mr. VINSON. Yes; but I was referring to the fact that in last year's debate, the gentleman so clearly pointed out the justification for a continued appropriation for the then B–70. I trust he will follow the same logical course this year with the RS–70. I think he was right then and I hope he will continue on the beaten path he has already laid out.

Mr. FORD. May I comment on this letter from Secretary McNamara to the chairman. This letter is a very carefully drawn letter. May I read it so there is no misapprehension on anybody's part who heard it earlier:

> This study will give full consideration to the magnitude of the committee program and the depth with which the committee has emphasized this.

Here is the real guts of the letter:

> Furthermore, if technological developments related to sideview radar, and associated data processing and display systems, advance more rapidly than we anticipatd when the fiscal 1963 Defense budget was prepared, we will wish to take advantage of these advances by increasing our development expenditures; and we would then wish to expend whatever proportions of any increase voted by the Congress these advances in radar technology would warrant.

There is not a scintilla of evidence in this letter that the Secretary of Defense is going to recommend the procurement of aircraft four, five, and six in either the B–70 or the RS–70 configuration. All he has said is we are taking a look to see whether in the radar and subsystem components program we should spend more money in fiscal year 1963.

All the testimony before our committee is to the effect that if there is an expanded program in this area, all they will spend is an additional $10 million to $30 million in fiscal year 1963. This they can easily get from the emergency fund or from the contingency fund, $30 million in the contingency fund and $150 million in the emergency fund.

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

Mr. FORD. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. COHELAN. The gentleman understands, however, that the Secretary intends to spend that money provided the breakthroughs in this radar area should come through. What is wrong with that?

Mr. FORD. Nothing is wrong with that, but some people got the impression and some people said to me after the letter was read that the Secretary, in effect, was saying that he was going to push with aircraft four, five, and six. He did not say that.

Mr. COHELAN. That is quite correct. The gentleman would not, certainly, as a member of the Appropriations Committee suggest that the House burn dollar bills just to get this program going.

Mr. FORD. Not at all. As a matter of fact, I think I am saying quite the contrary. I just want to clarify what this letter said.

I want to commend the committee for making the change, and I will support them despite the awkwardness of the sentence because I think we are now doing what this committee and this House ought to do at this time.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time.

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may require to the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. WICKERSHAM].

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Mr. Chairman, as a member of the House Armed Services Committee, I have, for a long period of time, urged the continuation of the research, development, and actual production of the B–70, and later, the RS–70 on a 24-hour-a-day, round-the-clock basis.

The passage of this measure means continued life, rather than an approaching death, not only to the RS–70 program and the manned bomber program, but the life of the Air Force itself. Also, a much longer life for our valuable SAC bases.

The overwhelming majority of the committee not only favored this measure but favored the continued production line of the B–52 until sufficient RS–70's are available to replace them.

The result of the agreement that has been reached means increased stature for Gen. Curtis LeMay and Secretary of the Air Force, Eugene Zuckert.

The enactment of this well-considered bill means more security and less insecurity for the free world.

Furthermore, it means that the President, in his wisdom, has remembered some of the lessons he learned while a U.S. Representative and as a Senator, and, consequently, has followed to a great degree, the wishes of the legislative branch—the Congress,

Our action here today, and the understanding that has been reached, will enhance the future of the Nike-Zeus production.

This measure will act as a further deterrent to the Communist world.

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may require to the gentleman from California [Mr. DOYLE].

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Chairman, I rise to express my approval of the proposed change of the text of the bill before the House by striking the word "direct" at line 2, page 2, from the text of the bill and substituting the word "authorize." This I believe is in accord with the actual situation as it exists under our constitutional form of government because the Commander in Chief, who is always the President of the United States, is the sole elective officer who can actually direct what shall be done with the money which we in Congress authorize to be expended. It is his constitutional responsibility to do that; it is our constitutional responsibility as the Armed Services Committee to authorize an amount, and which authorizing action by our Armed Services Committee must then go to the House Appropriations Committee.

I respectfully suggest that in my humble judgment the wording of the bill in line 2, page 2, would be in substantial contravention of the jurisdiction of the

House Appropriations Committee, unless the word "direct" is stricken. The very honorable, timely, and constructive adjustment made yesterday afternoon late by the President of the United States and the Secretary of Defense in conference with our distinguished Armed Services Committee chairman, the gentleman from Georgia, the Honorable CARL VINSON, all of whom met at the White House on yesterday, is very pleasing and inspiring to me. This is because this important incident in the history of our legislative and executive department responsibilities again gives crystal-clear evidence of the fact that our constitutional form of government can and does work efficiently and with utmost accord between these departments set up by our constitutional frameworkers when there is an actual emergency arising either by way of important differences of opinion, or by way of any other emergency which should be cooperatively understood and honorably adjusted.

Having sat all through this important debate from the very beginning until this minute in the debate, and with the closing of the debate within the next few minutes, it appears to me there will be a very sparse number of votes "nay." This is as I believe it should be; as it must be, and in the best interests of our national defense. Therefore, I shall vote to approve the bill on its merits and on the deletion of the word "direct" on its merits. I cordially compliment our distinguished committee chairman, the gentleman from Georgia, the Honorable CARL VINSON, who has served in this great legislative body for 48 years last past.

I repeat, I compliment all in connection with this timely adjustment of sincere and responsible differences of opinion. I believe my Armed Services Committee has achieved its purposes in maintaining its responsibilities in the premises and I honor the executive department of our Government for maintaining its constitutional responsibilities likewise.

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Chairman, I want to take this opportunity to offer my high compliments to our distinguished chairman, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON], for the wisdom and judgment he has once again demonstrated in the handling of this most complex and difficult problem.

Our country is blessed in these difficult times with outstanding leaders in every branch of our remarkable system of government. The President and his most brilliant and distinguished Secretary of Defense, Mr. Robert McNamara, have acted with discretion and restraint in keeping with their awesome responsibilities.

I congratulate all parties to this great public debate for their superb leadership.

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may require to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. BOLAND].

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks at this point.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Chairman, I am very pleased to hear from the distinguished chairman of the Armed Services Committee, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON], that an agreement has been reached with respect to the B–70 bomber, now known as the RS–70. Otherwise, I would be opposed to the Armed Services Committee's original recommendation, which, in effect directs the President of the United States to build the bomber. Here we get into a deep constitutional question.

President Kennedy has said that this aircraft is too costly, with a price tag conservatively estimated at over $10 billion, and it will be obsolete for military purposes before it is ready to fly.

Mr. Chairman, the Congress should not command nor should the Congress direct the President on how to arm the military forces for the missions the President decides are in the national interest. The President is the one person in government and in the Nation with all of the facts and intelligence at his fingertips. He is the man who has to make the big decisions on weapons. He is the man who knows whether or not it is worth the cost of billions of dollars for a weapon which may be obsolete before it is placed in the national arsenal. And the President is the man who has access to secret information which may be the cornerstone of his final decision.

I am sure my colleagues will agree with me that no President will gamble our national security and preservation to save dollars. Neither does any President want to embark on a crash program of bomber construction when he knows the weapon will be obsolete in a few years hence. Yet, the Armed Services Committee originally recommended in its report "that the Secretary of the Air Force, as an official of the executive branch, is directed, ordered, mandated, and required to utilize the full amount of the $491 million authority granted to proceed with production planning and long leadtime procurement for an RS–70 weapon system."

Mr. Chairman, I believe that Congress should carry out the intent of the Founding Fathers who drafted the Constitution, and that we limit our activity to the traditional and time-tested role of "advise and consent" and "to investigate and propose."

President Kennedy and Secretary of Defense McNamara, after taking office last year, approached the B–70 bomber controversy with an open mind. Their investigation showed that the B–70 never enjoyed the full support of President Eisenhower, his Secretary of Defense, his principal civilian advisers nor the Joint Chiefs of Staff as a corporate body. In fact, the only consistent supporter of the B–70 program was the Air Force. The secretaries and chiefs of the other services, whether under the Kennedy administration or the Eisenhower administration, never supported the B–70 for full weapon system development or procurement and, indeed, many vigorously opposed it. So, it is a matter of record that the B–70 has long been considered a very doubtful proposition, with the weight of competent scientific, technical and military opinion against it for many years.

President Kennedy and Secretary McNamara have not closed their minds to the B–70, or RS–70, problem. They feel that by continuing our XB–70 program of three prototype aircraft and by proceeding with the exploratory development of the key subsystems of the proposed RS–70 for which funds have been included in the 1963 budget, they will have open to them the option of producing and deploying an RS–70 system at a later time if the need for such a system should become apparent.

Mr. Chairman, since the key subsystems of the aircraft have yet to be developed, delaying the decision for 1 year would not postpone the real operational readiness of the first wing at all. But, President Kennedy and Secretary McNamara, after thoroughly reviewing all aspects of the problem, have decided that the RS–70 program will not add significantly to our strategic retaliatory capability in the period after 1967.

Therefore, I am extremely pleased that a compromise has been worked out and the original committee recommendation has been substituted.

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PUCINSKI].

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the bill H.R. 9751, as I understand it will be amended by the committee. I congratulate the chairman of the committee, the distinguished gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON], and the members of his committee for calling to the attention of the American people the tremendously important consequence of a successful development of the RS–70 weapons system. I think the American people owe this committee a debt of gratitude for bringing this subject to the attention of the entire Nation. But with equal conviction, Mr. Chairman, I think the President of the United States deserves a great deal of credit and the Nation owes him a debt of gratitude for proposing a compromise formula and a solution which, indeed, will move this important program forward. Earlier, Mr. Chairman, during debate today, some doubt was cast upon the wisdom of the compromise language which was agreed upon by the chairman of the Committee on Armed Services and the President. It is my judgment that President Kennedy and Chairman VINSON have demonstrated that reasonable men can reach reasonable agreements under the democratic processes in our Republic. The compromise proposed by President Kennedy will in no way deter or delay the successful development of the RS–70 program.

Earlier in debate, an effort was made to create the impression that Mr. Kennedy supported the RS–70 program as a candidate for the Presidency, but has now reversed his position. The President has not changed his position. The

President believes in the development of this RS–70 program. The question involved here is whether or not $491 million can be spent in this fiscal year. It was the judgment of the President's advisers that this money could not be spent at this time because the entire program is not sufficiently advanced to justify this large appropriation at the time and that, therefore, there was no sense in throwing the budget out of balance for fiscal 1963. For these reasons I think both these men have reached an excellent compromise which will actually speed up basic research and development in this program.

I believe, Mr. Chairman, that the long-range manned bomber is still our first line of defense. The Strategic Air Command has provided for our Nation and the entire free world, the greatest deterrent to war that we ever had. There is no question in my mind that if Mr. Khrushchev is twisting and turning today and starting all sorts of local provocations and has not touched off a third world war, it is only because he is mindful of the awesome strength, the defense, the retaliatory power that the United States has in its manned bombers in the Strategic Air Command. Let there be no mistake. Our manned bombers can obliterate the Soviet Union if Mr. Khrushchev is foolish enough to violate the peace at this time. No one knows this better than Mr. Khrushchev himself.

It was my honor to lead my bomber group in the first B–29 raid over Tokyo in World War II. It was also my privilege to serve under General LeMay who was commanding general of the 20th Global Air Force in World War II. I think that General LeMay is one of the greatest military leaders this country has ever produced. Millions of American soldiers were spared the horror of invading Japan's rocky shores because General LeMay helped bring the war in Japan to a successful conclusion with massive bombing raids under his personal leadership and supervision. The Defense Department will be wise in seeking his continued counsel. Like him, I believe we must go forward with this long range manned bomber program. We should make all the progress we can in missilry, but we cannot for one moment weaken our manned bomber program.

Reference has been made here today to Colonel Glenn and the fact that he stated right from this podium that if human beings had not been in the space vehicle he controlled, the mission might not have been successfully accomplished. Perhaps we should also recall another incident last year when we launched the spy-in-the-sky satellite, Tiros. It was designed to give us information about weather and to give us other information that we need about various parts of the world from a military standpoint. You will all recall that on that particular flight, somebody had forgotten to properly activate one of the lenses in that space capsule, and the mission failed to get the information it was designed to produce. Tiros failed because we relied exclusively on electronic devices.

This business of relying completely on the marvels of electronics is not, in my opinion, serving the best interests of this country. We will need human manpower for many years in our struggle for survival. And it is for this reason that I am glad the Committee today has brought before the House this subject. It is most important that research and development go ahead on a manned bomber that will have the flexibility, that will have the maneuverability that it is needed in our first line of defense. I am sure that every single American wants to have a strong Defense Establishment, not because it is an instrument of war but because it serves as the greatest bulwark for peace. There is no question in my mind but that Hitler would not have dared start World War II in 1939 if the United States and the rest of the free world had had anywhere near the retaliatory power that we have today. Therefore I think that every Member of Congress who has worked on this bill and who will support this legislation is indeed making one of the most profound contributions for the preservation of peace, because Khrushchev understands only one language, the language of strength.

An orderly development of the RS–70 program will make a most significant contribution to our defense network and help increase our retaliatory strength to new heights of perfection. For this reason, Mr. Speaker, I hope H.R. 9751 will be approved overwhelmingly with the amendment suggested by President Kennedy and accepted by Chairman VINSON.

Mr. ALFORD. Mr. Chairman, as I see it, the principal question confronting the House in debate here today is whether the RS–70 weapons system shall be produced as speedily as possible or whether we shall abandon perhaps our one most important weapon in the defense posture of the United States.

We hear great wails about economy every time the RS–70 is mentioned. And all of this at a time when we have thousands and thousands of well-trained men, called back into duty, who are spending their time policing up the grounds and engaged in other nonessential activities.

As a man of medicine, I know that when we are ill we consult a doctor. By the same token, I say that when we are considering the military might of this Nation we should consult military men who are in a position to know. We cannot hide behind the cloak of penny-pinching when the entire future of our country may be at stake.

For me, I need turn back only a few months to the inspiring and forthright testimony of our Air Force chiefs on the role of the RS–70. Hear well the words of Gen. Thomas D. White, then Air Force Chief of Staff, when he said:

> I am deeply concerned with the need to maintain a proper mix of manned and unmanned weapon systems in our future aerospace program. There is no question, for example, that this country's defense posture will be greatly improved by the phase-in of effective and reliable ballistic missiles. They are exceptional weapons. Nevertheless, they cannot perform all essential combat tasks.

Again, this is General White speaking:

> We will have to rely upon manned weapon systems to perform vital war functions which require on-the-spot, trained human judgment. * * * In any future war, there is almost certain probability that events will not unfold exactly as planned. Thus, there will be a tremendous premium on systems which can look, and find, and report, and attack, and return to attack again. We will always need systems which can search out and destroy mobile targets as well as fixed or rapidly developing targets whose positions are unknown or uncertain until observed.

What more powerful a recommendation for the RS–70 than that? What greater reason could we give for the House to issue a mandate that work on the RS–70 be pushed forward as rapidly as possible to completion?

Further consultation with military experts—with men who ought to know—reveals what a wondrous weapon the RS–70 actually will be. We learn that because of its design, this powerful weapon will be able to utilize existing military and civilian air fields. The aircraft will have intercontinental range which can be expanded to global capacity with the use of refueling tankers. The RS–70 will have all the guidance features of an intercontinental missile—and more. The navigation system can automatically navigate the aircraft to any point on earth. The digital computer provides a rapid solution to both the bombing and navigation equations. It can handle more than one target at a time and switch targets in a fraction of a second. The RS–70 will have the capability of carrying a multiple and varied weapon load. The flexibility of weapon loads offered by the RS–70 insures us the advantage of selection of the proper weapon for each target.

Are not these powerful arguments that should persuade anyone of the vital role of the RS–70 in our defense scheme?

The problems that confront the RS–70 today are nothing new. General White is the authority for this statement:

> Throughout our history, all bombers have had a hard life. Every system I can think of—the B–17, the B–29, the B–36, the B–47, and the B–52—have almost died on the vine, and yet I submit that each one of those systems has been the thing that has saved this Nation. I ask you to think where we would be today if we didn't have the B–52's and B–47's.

General White further declares that he is absolutely convinced that the same kind of situation is likely to confront us in the future. And he adds:

> Therefore, I say manned weapons systems are required from here on out in some proportion. That being the case, I would say that the B–70 is the necessity because it is the latest thing in the state of the art.

It is General White's expert opinion that a delay in producing the RS–70 is the difference between whether we ought to produce it or not. Just that time sensitive is this project. It is likewise the consensus of much military thinking that our enemy's potentialities for the future are such that it would be wise to

get the RS–70 weapons system into our inventory just as soon as possible.

This House cannot afford to let the RS–70 die on the vine. I repeat: we must issue a mandate that it be put into work fully and promptly.

It has been said by civilians in the Department of Defense that the financial resources are not adequate to provide us with sufficient ground forces, to modernize the weapons of the ground forces, to provide an adequate airlift, to implement the RS–70 program in the proper manner, or to embark full speed ahead on the development and production of an antimissile missile.

But, as I see it, instead of maintaining adequate ground forces and obtaining essential weapons, the United States has been devoting a great portion of its financial resources to foreign aid.

The cost of this great weapon is infinitesimal when contrasted with the billions upon billions of dollars we have squandered in lands scattered all around the globe. We say we want to hem in the Communists. There is no better way than to build the RS–70.

And it is my observation that Americans would be much more content to see their tax dollars being used for projects that will provide for our own safekeeping in time of need.

This, the military tells us, the RS–70 will do.

It has been estimated it will cost the Russians 40 billions of dollars to prepare a defense against the RS–70, if they wanted to tackle the job at all. This weapons system would give America a tremendous military show of might at any spot on the globe in less than 5 hours' time. And, more importantly, it will have a man at the controls.

I am persuaded that there will never be a thinking machine that could be substituted for the human mind in the accurate and flexible maneuvering of an air vehicle. We saw a near classic example of this in the recent space orbit by Colonel Glenn.

As a part of my remarks, Mr. Chairman, I wish to include a statement that was made by a professional soldier in whom I have the utmost confidence. This statement is by Brig. Gen. Bonner Fellers, U.S. Army, retired. General Fellers has had an outstanding career, including a tour of duty as chief of planning under Gen. Douglas MacArthur in the Pacific in 1943–44. General Fellers' statement is as follows:

The only effective free world military shield is U.S. nuclear striking power. This is the only decisive force which stands between freedom and slavery. It is the only military force which the Kremlin fears.

Despite these obvious facts, our 1963 defense budget fails to insure continuance of U.S. supremacy in nuclear capability. Instead of continuing superior nuclear striking power—a wholly inadequate conventional warfare capability is gradually to be substituted. This conventional warfare program is no threat whatsoever to the vast Red Army, submarine fleet, and air force. Here is the plan as reflected in the fiscal year 1963 defense budget:

The Minuteman missile production program is to be cut from 600 to 100 a year. The mobile (railway) Minuteman production is to be cut from 300 to 100. This reduces the total production from about 3,300 to 900.

The B–70 bomber program is being reduced to three—more likely to one—transport type aircraft with no usefulness as a weapon. The B–70 would be the most destructive and versatile weapon ever developed. In 5 hours it could find and destroy any target, anywhere. Traveling at 2,000 miles per hour and above 70,000 feet, its probability of penetrating enemy defenses is nine times that of the B–52.

It has been calculated that were a B–70 bomber force in existence, it would cost the Soviets $40 billion to build a defense against it.

No more B–52 bombers (the backbone of our present striking power) will be built after the current contract runs out in 1962.

No more B–58's are to be built.

The F–108 supersonic fighter production was canceled last year (1960). The F–106 now in production will be discontinued upon completion of the present small contract.

The F–100 was scheduled to be retired in 1965. Now it will be retained until 1970 and used for delivery of conventional bombs.

Funds for the Dynasoar X–15, which has already proved that it can orbit and then reenter the atmosphere under manual control—an advance over Russian development—have been cut from $185 to $65 million.

No more advanced aircraft are to be produced. Inferior subsonic aircraft will be substituted; 585 such craft are to be built. For arming them $500 million is to be spent annually on old-fashioned conventional bombs.

The atomic warhead production for Nike missiles is being cut back.

Air Force research and development for fiscal year 1963 is cut in half—a $2 billion cut.

Turning from nuclear to conventional warfare weapons could be suicidal for us. We and the free world are not equipped either to deter or to win a war against the Soviets with conventional weapons. On the other hand, we can build better planes; we have better trained crews to fly them; we are not committed to a vast land army as is Russia.

As a consequence, it is readily within our capability to create and maintain superior nuclear striking forces.

Despite these well-known facts, within 3 years, present Pentagon planning will provide almost no new U.S. aircraft or missile production. By then, and with our gradual shift from nuclear to conventional capability, we shall be at the mercy of the Kremlin.

Could it be that we are deliberately permitting our striking power to fall into second place? Will we next be told that since the Soviets have become stronger and have the power to destroy us, our only hope for survival is to join a world order?

Only the Congress can correct this alarming situation. All funds for the executive branch should be withheld until a sound defense program is instituted.

Mr. Chairman, this statement by General Fellers along with statements of distinguished general officers of our Air Force is why I am more persuaded than ever that we need the RS–70 and we need it now.

Mr. RANDALL. Mr. Chairman, the debate on H.R. 9751 being the bill to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 1963 for aircraft, missiles, and naval vessels was heralded earlier as certain to result in a collision between the legislative and executive branches of Government. Comment was heard that the President, as Commander, was in complete command over his forces and that he should not be likened to a general who has command but cannot dictate the precise weapons with which his forces will be armed. On the other hand, comment was heard that the Congress should not be restricted to simply a passive role or to supine acquiescence in programs handed to it by the Department of Defense. In preliminary considerations of this bill there were such comments heard as "Congress has deteriorated over the years." In news analyses printed in the press and elsewhere, the Constitution was quoted and particularly article I, section 8, wherein the Congress was granted powers relating to the armed services which all turned upon whether the Congress could direct the executive branch, and in this case the Secretary of the Air Force, to utilize an authorization in an amount of not less than $491 million during fiscal year 1962, to proceed with production planning and long leadtime procurement for the RS–70 weapon system.

But as is so often true of so much good legislation, a compromise was at the last moment agreed upon and the word "authorized" was substituted for the word "directed."

The final vote reflected the temper of the House and the complete agreement of every Member present and voting that the substitution of words was a wise choice. A collision was averted and a favorable result was reached. The final vote was 403 yeas, and the nays, 0. No one voted against the authorization bill on a rollcall vote.

The only reason we are asking that our comments be spread upon the RECORD is that in connection with an official trip to the Pacific Missile Range at Vandenberg Air Force Base during December, we visited the North American Aviation plant at Los Angeles and had the privilege of looking at the B–70 mockup, which is the principal component of what is now described as the RS–70 weapon system. There are many details which the Air Force would prefer not be commented upon, and some of course are strictly classified, but it can be said that when one leaves the great hangar where the mockup is housed, he has the impression that he has seen something almost unbelievable in terms of size and in terms of potential accomplishments.

We do not profess to know whether or not further development can quickly be accomplished in the necessary high resolution radar which would be required to provide capability as a post-attack weapon to recognize, seek out, and destroy any unknown enemy missiles after a nuclear exchange and which objectives would be completely out of eye range. Further, we do not profess to know whether or not additional money now could speed development of the RS–70 and have it ready earlier than the 1970 estimate. But we believe that the House exercised sound judgment in providing for the authorization and leaving it to the Air Force to determine in the year ahead if we have an adequate stock of ICBM's and Polaris-based missiles, and also, B–52's and B–58's, as to give us a powerful nuclear striking power. The determination has rightly

been left to the Department of Defense with authority to act, and not under a compelling directive, to determine whether or not we need this plane to send into enemy territory in the event some of our missiles are off target, or in any event, to determine if this weapon system is needed to go in and take a look after our missiles have been fired.

Finally, apart from the great cost which is being charged to the military, we learned from our visit to the North American plant at Los Angeles, and a personal inspection of the B–70 mockup, that much knowledge has been gained as a result of the research on this faster-than-sound bomber which will yield a dividend and have great value in the field of supersonic commercial aircraft for the future.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Chairman, we are once again addressing ourselves to the controversy that has arisen concerning the pace of development of the RS–70, the Air Forces' reconnaissance-strike superbomber. Until recently, this plane has been known as the B–70.

The issue at hand is the speed with which we propose to develop this new and revolutionary weapon.

I am acquainted with arguments presented by the administration, and I am still of the opinion that the development of the RS–70 could be accelerated in accordance with the recommendations of the Committee on Armed Forces. I will try to explain why I have taken this position.

Our Nation, and the free world, continues to be faced with a determined and aggressive adversary—the Communist monolith. The Communist leaders of the Soviet Union, and of Red China, have not abandoned their plans for world domination. They are determined to achieve this objective—by every means possible, particularly they propose to do this by gaining control of space.

Just last week, when Soviet Russia orbited its latest satellite, Khrushchev boasted that the Soviet's are developing—or have already developed—a global missile which can annihilate opposition on any continent.

Obviously, therefore, the race for the control of space is of utmost importance to our own security and the survival for our civilization.

In this race, the development of the RS–70 can play a very important part. It can enable us to achieve and maintain military superiority in one vital area.

The RS–70 is a new airplane which will operate higher and faster than any combat aircraft the world has ever known. It is expected to insure that the Air Force and the Strategic Air Command will have the proper military vehicle to carry out their combat responsibilities in the post-1965 time period.

Mr. Chairman, the opponents of the program recommended by the House Armed Services Committee argue that we cannot speed up the rate of development of the RS–70. Mr. Chairman, similar arguments were used on many occasions in the past with respect to many types of weapons. Arguments were and are used with respect to the development of missiles. And yet, when the chips were down, we proved that the development of our spacecraft could be accelerated beyond original estimates.

Everyone agrees that RS–70 will constitute an important addition to our defense posture. I believe that we can accelerate the development of this weapon if we put our minds to it. I will, therefore, support the recommendations of the House Armed Services Committee on this vital issue.

Mr. PETERSON. Mr. Chairman, on August 29, 1961, I directed attention to the abandonment and scrapping of the Bomarc manufacturing and deployment program after the program had been authorized and funded by Congress, and I urged military leaders to review our whole defense posture as it related to the Bomarc.

The production center of the Bomarc engine was established in my congressional district, Ogden, Utah, nearly 6 years ago at a Marquardt facility. Two years later the facility was doubled and a 184 acre test facility was established nearby on the shore of our Great Salt Lake.

The first Bomarc A missile was phased-out in 1960 and production was started on the new Bomarc B missile. A year later this missile was phased-out completely by the military.

Today we learn from the chairman of the Armed Services Committee that by June 1, 1962, the United States will have 12 squadrons of 50 Minuteman missiles each, or a total of 600; that the Defense Department asked for 4 more squadrons in fiscal 1963 at a cost of $2½ billion; that the committee felt this was not adequate and added another $10 million for a long-lead start on additional Minuteman missiles.

Today we also learn that by June 1962 the Navy will have 29 Polaris submarines missile equipped; that Defense officials asked to add 6 in 1963 and stated they plan to ask for another 6 in 1964 for a total of 41. The House Committee, according to the able chairman, feels there should be more.

Again today we learn Defense officials insist on plans to phase out manned bombers in favor of intercontinental ballistic missiles. The House committee questioned the reliability of the ICBM last year. Defense officials requested at that time $220 million for B–70's; the Congress gave them an additional $180 million, suggesting that the resulting increase in manned bombers was essential to the defense of this Nation until such time as the workability of the ICBM's got out of the textbooks and the laboratories. Defense officials did not carry out the mandate of the Congress in fiscal 1962. None of the additional funds was spent.

This year Defense officials requested $3.135 billion and the House committee in its wisdom increased that amount by $491 million; at first they directed and then by amendment authorized that this "be utilized in fiscal 1963 to proceed with production, planning and long-lead procurement for the RS–70 weapon system," which is the current nomenclature for the B–70 manned bomber.

As the chairman of the House committee has so cautiously pointed out to us: If our hopes are realized and nuclear weapons are outlawed by international agreement, we would be in an untenable position with no conventional defense capability.

I again urge review and reevaluation of the entire Bomarc program, particularly in light of the importance of manned bomber program to the defense of this Nation.

Mr. BASS of New Hampshire. Mr. Speaker, I am in opposition to the provision that the Secretary of the Air Force is directed to spend $491 million for the RS–70 bomber program.

My objection goes beyond the merits of the bomber program itself. But it is worth noting that when the B–70 program was considered last year by the Science and Astronautics Committee, of which I am a member, there were differences of opinion by experts on our national defense about the program—differences which still have not been resolved. As of now, the program has been modified and is now redesignated as the RS–70 program.

My objection is based on my concern for the separation of powers in our governmental system as specified in our Constitution.

This legislation proposes to direct the executive department to spend money which the President—right or wrongly—had decided not to spend. I do not believe Congress has the right to so direct the executive, nor should it presume to take that right.

The President of the United States is Commander in Chief. It is inconceivable to me that Congress should tell a Commander in Chief what weapons system to develop any more than it should attempt to tell a general in the field which weapons to fire. These are the rights and duties of the Executive. We in Congress should neither attempt to assume executive powers nor should we relieve the President of the responsibility for making the right decisions.

Throughout my 7 years in Congress, I have fought attempts by the President to usurp powers that belong in Congress. I have voted in favor of annual—rather than 5-year—appropriations for foreign aid and I have voted against many agriculture programs because, among other reasons, I believed that the action proposed by the administration would put too much power into the hands of the Executive. This argument works both ways. I believe that the legislation we are considering today would assume powers which properly belong to the President.

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time on this side.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time.

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Chairman, I ask that the Clerk read the bill.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That funds are hereby authorized to be appropriated during fiscal year 1963 for the use of the

Armed Forces of the United States for procurement of aircraft, missiles, and naval vessels, as authorized by law, in amounts as follows:

AIRCRAFT

For aircraft: For the Army, $218,500,000; for the Navy and the Marine Corps, $2,134,600,000; for the Air Force, $3,135,000,000.

MISSILES

For missiles: For the Army, $558,300,000; for the Navy, $930,400,000; for the Marine Corps, $22,300,000; for the Air Force, $2,500,000,000.

NAVAL VESSELS

For naval vessels: For the Navy, $2,982,000,000: *Provided*, That effective July 1, 1962, restrictions on the fund authorization contained in Public Law 87–53, approved June 21, 1961, for the procurement of aircraft, will no longer apply.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the committee amendments.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 1, line 8, strike "$218,500,000" and insert "$273,790,000".

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment: Page 1, line 10, strike "$3,135,000,000" and insert "$3,626,000,000", and add the following language: "of which the Secretary of the Air Force is directed to utilize authorization in an amount not less than $491,000,000 during fiscal year 1963 to proceed with production planning and long leadtime procurement for an RS–70 weapon system."

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment offered by Mr. VINSON: On page 2, line 2, strike out the word "directed" and insert in lieu thereof the word "authorized".

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment to the amendment.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The question now recurs on the committee amendment, as amended.

The committee amendment, as amended, was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment: On page 2, line 2, strike "$558,300,000" and insert "$589,482,000".

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment: Page 2, line 4, strike "$2,500,000,000" and insert "$2,510,000,000".

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 2, line 6, strike "$2,982,000,000," and insert "$2,979,200,000".

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment: Page 2, line 17, insert:

"SEC. 2. Section 412(b) of Public Law 86–149 is amended to read as follows:

"'(b) No funds may be appropriated after December 31, 1960, to or for the use of any armed force of the United States for the procurement of aircraft, missiles, or naval vessels, unless the appropriation of such funds has been authorized by legislation enacted after such date: *Provided, however*, That no funds may be appropriated after December 31, 1961, to or for the use of any armed force of the United States for research, development or procurement of the RS–70 weapon system unless the appropriation of such funds has been authorized by legislation enacted after such date.'"

The committee amendment was agreed to.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION BILL

Mr. Chairman, I have felt that the language originally incorporated in the pending military authorization bill, which directed the executive branch to utilize a $491 million authorization for the planning and production of the RS–70 aircraft was very unwise. The language raised serious constitutional questions and tended to bypass the regular procedures which call for direct action by the Congress on funds recommended by its Appropriations Committees before authorized programs can be executed.

I am very happy over the masterful way the gentlemen of the committee and their distinguished chairman have resolved this problem. It will now be possible for the matter to be handled in the usual orderly way, and in keeping with traditional procedures. The gentleman from Georgia has dramatized an interesting and important matter, yet he has done no disservice to relationships between congressional committees and between Congress and the executive branch.

ACTION REQUIRED BY APPROPRIATIONS COMMITTEE

The great Committee on Armed Services has brought to bear its best judgment, after many hearings and much deliberation, on the RS–70 airplane matter and on the many other important procurement matters pending in the President's budget.

I know that this great committee, and the House as well, will expect the Appropriations Committee to bring to bear its very best judgment also in determining what funds shall be recommended under the pending authorization bill for the RS–70 and other procurement items. It is, of course, impossible to predict today just what action the Appropriations Committee will take. The Subcommittee on Defense Appropriations is still conducting hearings on the various programs which are authorized in this bill and the other details involved in the regular annual appropriations.

The members of the Committee on Appropriations always do their best to handle defense appropriations to the best of their ability. I think our actions are usually reasonably satisfactory to the Committee on Armed Services, to the House, and to the country as a whole. I am glad to see this system of checks and balances, between the authorizing committee and the Appropriations Committee, preserved. This is good for the Congress and the country, and the course followed is in keeping with constitutional precedents.

COMMENDATION OF DEFENSE OFFICIALS

In the heat of controversy, we are often inclined to make critical remarks in haste that may not be fully justified.

I want to say, after long years of dealing with the civilian and military leaders of the Department of Defense, I have found them, on a whole, to be men of ability and dedication who seek to serve the best interest of the country and who seek to be cooperative, as a general rule, with Congress.

I think we have excellent leadership in the Pentagon, with Mr. Robert S. McNamara as Secretary of Defense; Mr. Elvis J. Stahr, Secretary of the Army; Mr. Fred Korth, Secretary of the Navy; and Mr. Eugene Zuckert, Secretary of the Air Force.

The Chairman, General Lemnitzer, and members of the Joint Chiefs of Staff are men of high quality and dedication. They are not men who agree on all subjects. It is a normal and wholesome situation in a free country such as ours.

COOPERATION BETWEEN CONGRESS AND DEFENSE DEPARTMENT

I have asked the members of the staff of the Appropriations Committee to help me assemble some information in regard to examples of cooperation by the Defense Department with Congress during the past few years. It is true that Defense officials and the President do not always comply to the letter with the recommendations of Congress in defense matters. However, as a general proposition, the President and officials in the Department of Defense do seek to carry out the will of Congress. There are some notable exceptions which have been referred to in the debate today, and I shall not dwell upon them. I should now like to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and recite some of the examples having to do with actions by the executive branch on specific recommendations of the Congress during recent years.

INFLUENCE OF CONGRESS ON DEFENSE PROGRAMS

Congress has exercised a strong influence on the character of Defense programs. Some of these influences can be summarized briefly:

In fiscal year 1956, Congress increased funds by $46.7 million for two purposes. The lesser increase was used, the major increase for the Marine Corps strength was not used.

In fiscal year 1957 Congress increased four specific programs by a total of about $930 million, all of which was used. This was the year in which the B–52 program was given a substantial boost, forming the character of our Strategic Air Forces as of today.

In fiscal year 1958, funds totaling $35.3 million were added for the Army National Guard and the VORTAC air navigation system, and were all utilized.

In fiscal year 1959 increases voted by Congress totaled $1.3 billion for 15 specific purposes. About $730 million was utilized, including $550 million of $609 million voted for Polaris. Funds were not used in 1959 for Army modernization, the Hound Dog missile, and tanker and airlift aircraft, but the De-

partment in later years fully adopted the policies urged by Congress.

In fiscal year 1960, $650 million was used out of congressional add-ons of $922 million. The principal items used were $140 million to support the strength of the Army Reserve and National Guard, $200 million for Army modernization, $137 for ASW, and $172 million for Atlas and Minuteman.

In fiscal year 1961, Congress voted $1.8 billion additional funds, of which $1.6 billion was used for such major programs as Polaris, Atlas, Minuteman, airlift aircraft, and satellite programs.

DETAILS BY FISCAL YEARS

The influence of Congress has been exerted not only in negative ways, that is by cutting funds, but also in positive ways, by adding funds for specific programs.

Let us look at the record, year by year.

FISCAL YEAR 1956

The Congress made two increases in that year: First, $250,000 for the promotion of rifle practice, which was utilized in full; second, $46.4 million for an increase in Marine Corps strength, which was not utilized.

There were two add-ons, one minor and one major. The minor one was used; the major one was not. And the position of Congress on the major matter did not prevail.

FISCAL YEAR 1957

The Congress increased the President's budget in four principal areas in that fiscal year:

First, $15 million for Army Reserve Forces military construction—utilized in full.

Second, $14 million to increase the strength of the Army National Guard and the number of its civilian technicians—utilized in full.

Third, $800 million to increase the procurement of Air Force heavy bombers, tankers, and other essential weapons—utilized in full.

Fourth, $100 million to expedite the Air Force's overall research and development program—utilized in full.

Thus, in fiscal year 1957, increases totaling almost $930 million were voted and all were utilized in full as desired by the Congress. This was the year where the Congress gave the B–52 program a big boost forward, thereby shaping the character of our Strategic Air Forces to this present day.

FISCAL YEAR 1958

In this year the Congress made two increases: First, $13.8 million for the Army National Guard, which was utilized in full; second, $21.5 million for the Air Force for transfer to the Civil Aeronautics Administration for VORTAC, which was also utilized in full.

Here again, the add-ons made by the Congress were fully utilized.

FISCAL YEAR 1959

In that fiscal year the Congress made a large number of increases, aggregating over $1.3 billion, of which about $730 million was actually applied as desired by the Congress.

First, $65 million for the OSD emergency fund to take care of breakthroughs in research and development—utilized in full.

Second, $99 million to increase the Army strength from 870,000 to 900,000—only about $19.1 million was utilized.

Third, $41 million to increase Army Reserve drill pay strength from 270,000 to 300,000—$27.7 million was utilized to achieve that goal.

Fourth, $55.7 million to increase Army National Guard drill pay strength from 360,000 to 400,000 and maintain the civilian technicians program—$38.6 million was utilized to meet that objective.

Fifth, $5 million to increase Army mapping—utilized in full.

Sixth, $37 million for Army modernization—not utilized in that year.

Seventh, $6 million for Army Reserve Forces military construction—not utilized in that year.

Eighth, $45.2 million to increase Marine Corps strength from 175,000 to 200,000—about $10.6 million was utilized.

Ninth, $609 million to increase the Polaris program—about $550 million was subsequently utilized. This includes about $241 million released in fiscal year 1959 to permit letting of contracts early in July 1959 for Polaris submarines 7, 8, and 9.

Tenth, $11 million to speed work on Regulus submarines—not utilized. This program was later terminated in favor of the Polaris.

Eleventh, $13 million for two destroyer escorts—utilized in full.

Twelfth, $48 million for Hound Dog—not utilized in that year.

Thirteenth, $90 million for Minuteman—although these particular funds were not utilized, the Air Force, through the reprograming of funds no longer required for other projects, did carry on a program in that year on the expanded scale desired by the Congress. The House Armed Services Committee report, while technically correct in showing this $90 million as not utilized, leads to the wrong conclusion.

Fourteenth, $55.6 million for KC–135 tankers—not utilized in that year.

Fifteenth, $140 million for airlift aircraft—not utilized in that year, although, here again, the program was increased through reprograming of other funds.

Thus, in fiscal year 1959, most of the increases were utilized in whole or in part for the purposes intended by the Congress. But it is interesting to note that although the Department did not choose to use some of these increases in 1959—such as for Army modernization, Hound Dog, KC–135 tankers and airlift aircraft—the Department in later years fully adopted the policies urged by the Congress and increased these programs very substantially. Moreover, the Congress, in that year, laid a very substantial foundation for our Polaris submarine program upon which the executive branch was able to build in later years.

FISCAL YEAR 1960

In that year the Congress added about $922 million, of which the Defense Department utilized almost $650 million.

First, $147.2 million was added to maintain the Army Reserve and National Guard at 300,000 and 400,000 drill pay strength, respectively—$140.2 million was utilized to accomplish that purpose.

Second, $43.1 million was added to provide a Marine Corps strength of 200,000—this sum was not utilized.

Third, $375 million was added for Nike-Zeus and/or Army modernization—$200 million was used for Army modernization.

Fourth, $137.3 million was added to increase the ASW capability—all of which was fully utilized.

Fifth, $35 million was provided for advanced procurement for a nuclear-powered carrier—none of this money was utilized.

Sixth, $85 million was added for Atlas—all of which was utilized for Atlas-Titan.

Seventh, $87 million was added for Minuteman—all was utilized.

Eighth, $12 million was added for Army National Guard construction—the funds were not utilized in that year.

Thus, in fiscal year 1960, most of the items added by the Congress were utilized in whole or in part and, here again, the executive branch eventually followed the direction pointed by the Congress and later increased the Marine Corps strength and Army procurement.

FISCAL YEAR 1961

In this year the Congress again made a number of important additions to the program, some of which were requested by the Department of Defense. The net increase totaled over $1.8 billion, of which over $1.6 billion was utilized.

First, $105 million was added to maintain the Army Reserve and Guard strength—all of which was utilized.

Second, $5 million was added to increase the Army National Guard technicians program—all utilized.

Third, $201,000 was added for the promotion of rifle practice—all utilized.

Fourth, $158 million was added for Army modernization—over $113 million was utilized.

Fifth, $382 million was added for Polaris—over $345 million was utilized.

Sixth, $105 million was added for ASW—all of which was utilized.

Seventh, $194 million was added for airlift aircraft—almost $172 million was utilized.

Eighth, $97 million was added for air defense aircraft—not utilized.

Ninth, $82.9 million was added for an airborne alert capability—all of which was utilized.

Tenth, $184.3 million was added for the B–70—all of which was utilized.

Eleventh, $83.8 million was added for Samos—utilized in full.

Twelfth, $26.2 million was added for Minuteman—utilized in full.

Thirteenth, $26.4 million was added for Midas—utilized in full.

Fourteenth, $35 million was added for Discoverer—utilized in full.

Fifteenth, $132 million was added for interceptor aircraft improvements—utilized in full.

Sixteenth, $131.9 million was added for Atlas—utilized in full.

Seventeenth, $34 million was added for Bmews—utilized in full.

Eighteenth, $16.2 million was added for the surveillance program—utilized in full.

Nineteenth, $15 million was added for the Gar-9 air-to-air rocket and ASG–18 fire control programs—utilized in full.

Twentieth, $20.4 million was added for Reserve and National Guard construction—almost all was utilized.

Here, again, was a year in which the Congress exerted a major influence on the pace and character of the defense program. The Polaris program was again accelerated, Army modernization was speeded up, the antisubmarine warfare effort considerably expanded, the airlift aircraft program was finally gotten off dead center, an airborne alert capability for our heavy bombers was firmly established, the reorientation of our air defense program was begun, and a sharp impetus was given to our military satellite programs. Even the B–70 program was moved forward in that year. It cannot be said with accuracy that the Congress has litttle or no influence on the defense program.

FISCAL YEAR 1962

This brings us to the current fiscal year. For this year the Congress provided a total of about $1 billion above the President's amended budget, of which the Department presently plans to use about $230 million. Increases were made in over 20 items, of which the Department plans to carry out all but three. These three, however, are the big ones—the B–12, the B–70, and the Dynasoar add-ons—totaling a little over $780 million.

The arguments, pro and con, on these three items are well known to all. But some of the Members may not realize that the Department is following the desires of the Congress on a number of other quite significant items. These include maintaining the Army Reserve and Guard strength at 300,000 and 400,000, respectively, to the extent possible under the present circumstances; substituting one nuclear-powered frigate for one conventionally powered frigate—this is an item of about $41 million; installing turbofan engines in 15 of the C–135's—an item of about $21 million; procurement of a long-range jet passenger transport—$7.8 million; a $7½-million increase in the development effort on special forces equipment; and, finally, an increase in Reserve Forces construction—an item of $16.1 million. And the year is not yet over.

It is important that we continue the spirit of good will and cooperation which exists between Congress and the executive branch in defense matters. There is room for improvement, but I would not want to minimize the fine spirit of cooperation which has been typical in the past.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I take this time to ask the question as to whether the funds appropriated for naval vessels may be used for renovation or whether this is entirely for new construction?

Mr. VINSON. I may say to the distinguished gentleman that the bill authorizes 37 new ships, and 35 conversions, all set out in the report and referred to in my remarks in a more limited way earlier. I will put in the RECORD at this point a complete breakdown of each one of the new ships and in addition the conversion of some 35 ships.

The matter referred to is as follows:

One attack aircraft carrier—CVA; cost, $310 million: This ship is the prime offensive unit in an attack carrier striking force—the Navy's major weapon for control of the seas.

The carrier provides a continuously ready modern airfield capable of operating all types of aircraft in any navigable waters of the world. These characteristics of versatility and mobility are unique to sea service forces and are equally applicable in general, limited, or cold war.

The carrier in this program will replace an old *Essex*-class carrier. This attack carrier will be an improved *Forrestal* and the eighth ship in this class.

One guided missile frigate—DLG(N); cost, $190 million: This guided missile frigate is the only nuclear-powered surface ship in this year's program. It is also the first ship to receive the new Typhon weapons system incorporating many significant improvements including greater target-handling capability, greater range, shorter reaction time, and almost complete immunity to countermeasures. The Typhon weapons system will provide this ship with an air-control, antiaircraft, and antimissile capability which hitherto have not been approached by any naval weapons system. In addition to the greatly improved weapons systems, this ship will have the extended range and endurance at sustained speed resulting from nuclear power.

Twenty-eight conventional and 2 nuclear-powered guided missile frigates have been authorized in previous programs, 10 of which have joined the fleet.

Eight nuclear-powered submarines—SS(N); cost, $509.9 million: These fleet attack submarines are designed for optimum operations against enemy submarines and surface ships.

They are essentially repeats of *Thresher* class included in previous programs.

These submarines will be the first to include the capability of firing the submerged launched rocket weapon, Subroc. This weapon is capable of carrying a nuclear warhead, and is designed to destroy submarines or ships.

Combined with previous new construction, these 8 will give the Navy a total of 40 nuclear-powered attack submarines, 16 of which have joined the fleet.

Six fleet ballistic missile submarines—SSB(N); cost, $720.3 million: These fleet ballistic missile submarines are a vital addition to our national deterrent forces. These six Polaris submarines are essentially the same as those in prior programs incorporating improvements which have been dictated by experience.

Twenty-nine fleet ballistic missile submarines have been authorized in previous programs. These 6 will give the Navy a total of 35, carrying 560 ballistic missiles. Six have joined the fleet.

Four amphibious transport, dock—LPD; cost, $181.6 million: These ships will increase the effectiveness of modern amphibious operations.

These ships each carry 930 troops, 2,500 tons of cargo and equipment, plus 6 helicopters and various combinations of landing craft.

Six of these ships have been previously authorized. The first two are scheduled to be commissioned this year.

One amphibious assault ship—LPH; cost, $60 million: The amphibious assault ship (LPH) in conjunction with the LPD is capable of combat loading, transporting, and landing a battalion landing team. This ship carries 2,000 troops and 30 HUS helicopters.

Four ships of this type have been approved in prior programs. One, *Iwo Jima*, has reported to the fleet.

Five escort ships—DE; cost, $128.3 million: These ships are all repeats of similar types contained in previous programs and are designed for effective performance in locating and destroying enemy submarines. These ships are fitted with the latest and best ASW weapons systems including Asroc, Dash, and homing torpedoes.

Twenty-four ocean escorts have been authorized in previous programs. Seventeen have joined the fleet.

Three guided missile escort ships—DEG; cost, $93.9 million: These 3 DEG's are similar in all respects to the escort ships except that the after 5-inch, 38-caliber gun mount has been replaced by a Tartar missile battery (16 missiles). Three of these ships were authorized in the 1962 program.

Two motor gunboats—PGM; cost, $4.1 million: These are the first of a new class specifically designed for operations in restricted waters, such as coastal patrol blockade and paramilitary warfare. The final armament is still to be decided; however, 20 tons have been reserved for this purpose.

One fast combat support ship—AOE; cost, $67 million: This is the second ship of this design combining the essential features of both the fleet oiler and ammunition ship. Having a top speed of 26 knots, this ship will be capable of staying with the fast task forces and providing most replenishment services on a one-stop basis. One has been authorized in previous programs.

One submarine tender—AS (FBM); cost, $73 million: This is the third new construction tender designed primarily to support the Polaris submarines. It will be equipped to provide logistic support for nine submarines and complete alongside services to three at any one time. These ships also have the capability to check out, maintain, and issue missiles and missile components. The first new construction tender will join the fleet later in the year.

Two oceanographic research ships—AGOR; cost, $8.8 million: These are relatively small ships of about 1,300 tons and are designed to conduct basic and applied oceanographic research in support of the national oceanographic program. They will be civilian manned. Five ships of this type have already been authorized. The first two are scheduled for completion during the fourth quarter of this year.

One surveying ship—AGS; cost, $9.4 million: This ship is about twice the size of the oceanographic research ship and will be equipped to conduct hydrographic surveys and collect other oceanographic, acoustic, and meteorological data under the direction of the Navy oceanographer. This is the first ship of its class. Like the preceding oceanographic research ship, it will be civilian manned.

One cargo ship—MSTS roll-on/roll-off; cost, $20 million: This Military Sea Transportation Service ship is similar to the very successful *Comet*, roll-on/roll-off ship now in regular service between New York and St. Nazaire. It is designed to transport and deliver wheeled and tracked vehicles, troop equipment, and general cargo. Its configuration of internal ramps will provide for quick loading or unloading. This is the first ship to be funded under this appropriation for Military Sea Transportation Service.

The Navy authorization also provides funds for 45 service and landing craft, the rehabilitation and modernization of 24 World War II destroyers and the conversion of 1 major communication relay ship, 1 command ship,

1 mine countermeasures support ship, 2 ammunition ships (FAST), 2 oilers (Jumbo), 2 technical research ships, 1 cargo ship (FBM), 1 guided missile ship, and 1 service craft, a floating drydock.

Mr. GROSS. Then the bill does provide for such conversion or renovation. The gentleman might be able to answer the question whether funds are provided in this bill——

Mr. VINSON. No; that comes before the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. GROSS. I mean funds authorized. Let me correct the statement.

Mr. VINSON. Yes, authorized.

Mr. GROSS. "Authorize." That is a good word around here today.

Mr. VINSON. That is right; it is a good word.

Mr. GROSS. Whether funds are authorized in this bill for the taking of a yacht out of mothballs, air conditioning the yacht, and giving it to Emperor Haile Selassie of Ethiopia; does the gentleman know?

Mr. VINSON. Well, I will say the distinguished gentleman from Texas developed that fact. All we are doing today is authorizing these things. He would not give his approval to anything that would be converted without having some military value to the country.

Mr. GROSS. Well, would the gentleman think that a yacht, an air-conditioned pleasure yacht, is intended to have military value?

Mr. VINSON. No; I do not know what the gentleman has reference to, but I can tell you that conversions in this bill are for military purposes.

Mr. GROSS. Well, then, can the gentleman tell me this: The bill provides for the construction of helicopters; is that right?

Mr. VINSON. In another part of the bill, yes.

Mr. GROSS. This bill authorizes funds for the construction of helicopters?

Mr. VINSON. That is right, and we are increasing it in that respect by raising the amount about $55 million.

Mr. GROSS. How many of these new helicopters will be assigned to the White House?

Mr. VINSON. Well, I do not know about that.

Mr. GROSS. Did the military not justify the construction of helicopters when they came before your committee?

Mr. VINSON. I cannot reveal the number involved.

Mr. GROSS. Someone here indicates there may be 10 new helicopters assigned to the White House. Now, my question is this: Will these helicopters continue to be used at the rate of two flights in 2 days to transport the First Lady, Mrs. Kennedy, to go fox hunting down in Virginia? Does the gentleman have any idea?

Mr. VINSON. The gentleman will have to do like I do in a press conference. I ask the questions and then I answer them. The gentleman will have to do the same thing.

Mr. GROSS. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I support H.R. 9751 and particularly appreciate the initiative of the Committee on Armed Services in seeking a speedup in development and production of the RS–70.

Under date of February 20, 1962, I wrote Secretary of Defense McNamara urging such a speedup, in the light of my own understanding of the need and justification for such a weapons development.

The Assistant Secretary of Defense who replied to my letter, on March 15, cited many of the arguments for proceeding slowly with the RS–70 program, and brought to my attention for the first time several factors of admitted importance in this matter.

Nonetheless, the reasons for expediting development and production of the RS–70 continue to outweigh, in my judgment, those reasons advanced for the Defense Department position, and I am greatly pleased by the Secretary's announced decision to reexamine the Department's conclusion in the light of congressional recommendations.

This bill is another major step forward in substantially strengthening our country's defense and I am confident it will be overwhelmingly approved, in further testimony, to the resolution and determination of the Congress and the American people to provide preparedness second to none in the world today.

A strong and prepared America continues to be the world's best guarantee of peace, and we add significantly to that guarantee by today's action.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the committee amendment is agreed to.

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there any further amendments? If not, under the rule the Committee rises.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. KARSTEN, 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. 9751) to authorize appropriations during fiscal year 1963 for aircraft, missiles, and naval vessels for the Armed Forces, and for other purposes, pursuant to House Resolution 562, he reported the bill back to the House with sundry amendments adopted by the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment? If not, the Chair will put them en gros.

The amendments were agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the 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.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays. The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 404, nays 0, not voting 32, as follows:

[Roll No. 43]

YEAS—404

Abbitt	Addonizio	Alger
Adair	Albert	Andersen, Minn.
Addabbo	Alford	Anderson, Ill.
Anfuso	Feighan	Lipscomb
Arends	Fenton	Loser
Ashbrook	Findley	McCulloch
Ashley	Finnegan	McDonough
Ashmore	Fino	McDowell
Aspinall	Fisher	McFall
Auchincloss	Flood	McIntire
Avery	Flynt	McMillan
Ayres	Ford	McSween
Bailey	Forrester	McVey
Baker	Fountain	Macdonald
Baldwin	Frazier	MacGregor
Baring	Frelinghuysen	Mack
Barrett	Friedel	Madden
Barry	Fulton	Magnuson
Bass, Tenn.	Gallagher	Mahon
Bates	Garland	Mailliard
Becker	Garmatz	Marshall
Beckworth	Gathings	Martin, Mass.
Beermann	Gavin	Martin, Nebr.
Belcher	Glaimo	Mathias
Bell	Gilbert	Matthews
Bennett, Fla.	Glenn	May
Berry	Gonzalez	Meader
Betts	Goodell	Merrow
Blatnik	Goodling	Michel
Blitch	Granahan	Miller, Clem
Boggs	Gray	Miller, George P.
Boland	Green, Oreg.	Miller, N.Y.
Bolling	Green, Pa.	Milliken
Bolton	Griffin	Mills
Bonner	Gross	Minshall
Bow	Gubser	Moeller
Brademas	Hagan, Ga.	Monagan
Bray	Hagen, Calif.	Montoya
Breeding	Haley	Moore
Brewster	Hall	Moorehead, Ohio
Bromwell	Halleck	Moorhead, Pa.
Brooks, Tex.	Halpern	Morgan
Broomfield	Hansen	Morris
Brown	Harding	Morrison
Broyhill	Hardy	Morse
Bruce	Harris	Mosher
Burke, Ky.	Harrison, Va.	Moss
Burke, Mass.	Harrison, Wyo.	Multer
Burleson	Harsha	Murphy
Byrne, Pa.	Harvey, Ind.	Murray
Byrnes, Wis.	Harvey, Mich.	Natcher
Cahill	Hays	Nedzi
Cannon	Healey	Nelsen
Carey	Hébert	Nix
Casey	Hechler	Norblad
Cederberg	Hemphill	Norrell
Celler	Henderson	Nygaard
Chamberlain	Herlong	O'Brien, Ill.
Chelf	Hiestand	O'Brien, N.Y.
Chenoweth	Hoeven	O'Hara, Ill.
Chiperfield	Hoffman, Ill.	O'Hara, Mich.
Church	Holifield	O'Konski
Clancy	Holland	Olsen
Clark	Horan	O'Neill
Coad	Hosmer	Osmers
Cohelan	Huddleston	Ostertag
Colmer	Hull	Passman
Conte	Ichord, Mo.	Patman
Cook	Inouye	Pelly
Corbett	Jarman	Perkins
Corman	Jennings	Peterson
Cramer	Joelson	Pfost
Cunningham	Johansen	Philbin
Curtin	Johnson, Calif.	Pike
Curtis, Mass.	Johnson, Md.	Pilcher
Curtis, Mo.	Johnson, Wis.	Pillion
Daddario	Jonas	Pirnie
Dague	Jones, Mo.	Poage
Daniels	Judd	Poff
Davis, John W.	Karsten	Powell
Davis, Tenn.	Karth	Price
Dawson	Kastenmeier	Pucinski
Delaney	Kearns	Purcell
Dent	Kee	Quie
Denton	Keith	Randall
Derounian	Kelly	Ray
Derwinski	Keogh	Reece
Devine	Kilburn	Reifel
Diggs	Kilgore	Reuss
Dingell	King, Calif.	Rhodes, Ariz.
Dole	King, N.Y.	Rhodes, Pa.
Dominick	King, Utah	Riehlman
Donohue	Kirwan	Rivers, Alaska
Dooley	Kitchin	Roberts, Tex.
Dorn	Kluczynski	Robison
Dowdy	Knox	Rodino
Doyle	Kornegay	Rogers, Colo.
Dulski	Kowalski	Rogers, Fla.
Durno	Kunkel	Rogers, Tex.
Dwyer	Kyl	Rooney
Edmondson	Laird	Roosevelt
Elliott	Landrum	Rosenthal
Ellsworth	Langen	Rostenkowski
Everett	Lankford	Roudebush
Evins	Latta	Roush
Fallon	Lennon	Rousselot
Farbstein	Lesinski	Rutherford
Fascell	Libonati	
	Lindsay	

Ryan, Mich.	Springer	Van Pelt
Ryan, N.Y.	Stafford	Van Zandt
St. George	Staggers	Vinson
St. Germain	Steed	Waggonner
Santangelo	Stephens	Wallhauser
Saund	Stratton	Walter
Saylor	Stubblefield	Watts
Schadeberg	Sullivan	Weaver
Scherer	Taber	Weis
Schneebeli	Taylor	Westland
Schweiker	Teague, Calif.	Whalley
Schwengel	Teague, Tex.	Wharton
Scott	Thomas	Whitener
Scranton	Thompson, La.	Wickersham
Seely-Brown	Thompson, N.J.	Widnall
Selden	Thompson, Tex.	Williams
Shelley	Thomson, Wis.	Willis
Sheppard	Thornberry	Wilson, Calif.
Shipley	Toll	Wilson, Ind.
Shriver	Tollefson	Winstead
Sibal	Trimble	Wright
Sikes	Tuck	Yates
Siler	Tupper	Young
Sisk	Udall, Morris K.	Younger
Slack	Ullman	Zablocki
Smith, Iowa	Utt	Zelenko
Smith, Va.	Vanik	

NAYS—0

NOT VOTING—32

Abernethy	Downing	Rivers, S.C.
Alexander	Fogarty	Roberts, Ala.
Andrews	Gary	Schenck
Bass, N.H.	Grant	Short
Battin	Griffiths	Smith, Calif.
Bennett, Mich.	Hoffman, Mich.	Smith, Miss.
Boykin	Jensen	Spence
Buckley	Jones, Ala.	Whitten
Collier	Lane	
Cooley	Mason	
Davis, James C.	Moulder	
	Rains	

So the bill was passed.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Mr. Cooley with Mr. Schenck.

Mr. Alexander with Mr. Hoffman of Michigan.

Mr. Spence with Mr. Bennett of Michigan.

Mr. James C. Davis with Mr. Collier.

Mr. Fogarty with Mr. Bass of New Hampshire.

Mr. Lane with Mr. Smith of California.

Mr. Downing with Mr. Short.

Mr. Abernethy with Mr. Mason.

Mr. Gary with Mr. Battin.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND REMARKS

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous censent that all Members 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 Georgia?

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. 5968) entitled "An act to amend the District of Columbia Unemployment Compensation Act, as amended."

SPENDING, DEFICITS, DEBT, AND TAXES

Mr. McSWEEN. 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 Louisiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. McSWEEN. Mr. Speaker, the President's foreign aid message of March 13 in which he asked Congress for $4.9 billion in foreign aid for next year has prompted me to rise to comment about our economic strength.

I am deeply concerned about the high rate of spending which causes budget deficits and inflation, an increasing national debt, and pressures for even more taxes. We will be obliged to borrow this money to spend on foreign aid.

Since World War II U.S. foreign aid has exceeded $101 billion and will rise above $106 billion next year. Net foreign aid, after allowing for loan repayments and foreign currency credits received for surplus farm products, totals $91 billion.

We pay interest of about $2.75 billion annually on this $91 billion portion of the national debt. So our actual total foreign aid cost for next year will be over $7.5 billion.

The enormity of the foreign aid tab is one of the reasons why I have never supported this program since I have been in Congress. While I certainly realize that some military assistance is essential to our security I feel strongly that we are squandering our national heritage at a rate beyond the danger point.

Our military might is vital to the free world, but this depends upon our solvency. Our fiscal situation is vulnerable. In the 15 fiscal years since World War II there have been 6 surplus years and 9 deficit years with a net deficit of $28 billion. The current fiscal year deficit will increase this figure to over $35 billion.

The Federal budget cannot be balanced in the foreseeable future unless the rate of increase in expenditures indicated by present proposals is curtailed. Nondefense expenditures have increased by 48 percent in the last 6 years until this year, while defense expenditures have increased only 15 percent.

I have been voting "no" on many bills having merit, not because I necessarily otherwise oppose these programs but because I am more concerned about our overall financial condition.

On February 20 I also voted against the bill to increase the national debt limit ceiling by $2 billion to $300 billion, although it passed 251 to 144. I understand there will be another proposal this year to increase the ceiling even higher.

I have concluded that the only way to reduce the debt is by a systematic and mandatory plan under which the budget must contain a specific item for an appropriation for debt retirement. I again call the House's attention to my bill, H.R. 6670, which would require as a start an annual 1 percent debt retirement appropriation. I find that the people back home are as concerned and disturbed about spending, deficits, debts, and taxes as I am.

PROGRAM FOR BALANCE OF THE WEEK

Mr. KYL. 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 Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. KYL. Mr. Speaker, I take this time to ask the distinguished majority leader what legislative matters are scheduled for the remainder of this week.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, in response to the inquiry of the gentleman, tomorrow the conference report on H.R. 5968, amendments to the District of Columbia Unemployment Compensation Act, will be called up; and the bill S. 2533, a bill to amend the requirements for participation in the 1962 feed grain program, will be on the calendar. I know of no other business for the balance of the week.

Mr. KYL. Could the gentleman inform the House at this time when we might expect to vote on the major revenue bill?

Mr. ALBERT. Well, if the gentleman will forbear, I think the bill will come up next week, but I would prefer to wait until tomorrow to announce the program.

Mr. KYL. I thank the gentleman.

THE AMERICAN PEOPLE ARE NOT GENERALLY AWARE THAT THEY HAVE TWO GOVERNMENTS—AN ELECTED GOVERNMENT AND A BANKERS' GOVERNMENT

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, the Committee for Economic Development in a widely distributed statement has said that the lack of proper teaching of economics in our high schools and colleges has resulted in an "economic illiteracy" that is a growing national concern.

If it were not for this widespread illiteracy the American people would not tolerate for very long the present arrangement whereby their economic livelihoods are regulated through the money and banking system.

As to some aspects of the influence of governmental policy over economic activity in this country the general public does have some information. Most people are aware that the Government's fiscal policies have a great influence over their economic lives. They know that the Government's tax and spending policies can stimulate economic activity or dampen economic activity, and the national income, the level of business

profits, and the number of jobs available are affected thereby.

FED EXERCISES DISCRETIONARY CONTROL OVER SUPPLY OF MONEY

The general public is not generally aware, however, that the Federal Reserve authorities have complete discretionary control over the supply of money and the prices which will be paid for the use of money and that they exercise this discretion also to influence the level of economic activity, the rate of investment, the rate of consumer spending, and the percentage of the labor force which shall remain unemployed. In a money economy such as ours, those authorities who control the money supply and interest rates have the upper hand in regulating the economy.

IN NO OTHER MAJOR INDUSTRIAL COUNTRY DOES THE EXECUTIVE HAVE SO LITTLE INFLUENCE OVER OPERATIONS OF CENTRAL BANK

In the United States today we have in effect two governments regulating levels of economic activity. We have the duly constituted Government carrying out laws enacted by the Congress and the President and reviewed by the judiciary. Then we have an independent, uncontrolled, and uncoordinated government in the Federal Reserve System, operating the money powers which are reserved to Congress by the Constitution.

In no other major industrial country in the world today does the duly constituted government—the Chief Executive—have so little say and so little influence over the operations of the Nation's central bank.

How did this second government come about? Did Congress ever give the Federal Reserve authority to exercise discretion over the supply of money which the Nation will have or the level of interest rates which will be paid for the use of money? Did Congress ever give the Federal Reserve authority to try to influence levels of economic activity—either to try to dampen booms or to stimulate economic activity in periods of recessions? The answer is "no."

FED HAS USURPED POWERS

When the Federal Reserve System was set up under the act of 1913 Congress intended that the Federal Reserve would provide a system whereby the supply of money would be automatically determined by the volume of economic activity taking place, not by any discretion on the part of the Federal Reserve authorities, either currently or on the basis of the Federal Reserve people's forecast as to what the trend in business activity will be.

True, the Federal Reserve Act has been amended many times, but in none of these amendments has the basic conception of an automatic, nondiscretionary money system been changed. You will not find in the statute anywhere any words giving the Federal Reserve any authority to try to regulate the rate of investment, the level of consumer spending, the number of jobs available, or anything else. The Federal Reserve people have simply usurped this power. The Congress may appropriate money and the President may carry out policies to try to stimulate economic activity and reduce the large percentage of unemployment in the country. But the Federal Reserve can, and does at times, veto these policy decisions by the Congress and the President, adopting monetary policies which undo everything the policies adopted by the Congress and the President are intended to do.

More recently, the Federal Reserve people have gone further and usurped certain executive powers in the field of foreign policy. Let me give two instances.

FED SPECULATING IN FOREIGN CURRENCIES; MEETS WITH FOREIGN CENTRAL BANKERS

Last year, the Treasury instituted the program of speculating in foreign currencies. The purpose is to stabilize the value of the dollar abroad and to use these foreign currencies to relieve pressures on the dollar in any foreign country where such pressures may develop.

Beginning early this year, the Federal Reserve announced that it also is instituting a program to do the same thing. I am not finding fault with the purpose of either of these programs. They are for a good purpose and they may be successful. But I do point out that the President and the Secretary of the Treasury have responsibility for the international economic and financial policies of the United States, not the Federal Reserve System. The Federal Reserve System has moved into the field to duplicate and possibly conflict with the Treasury's program without any authority for doing so.

Secondly, the Federal Reserve authorities now meet regularly with representatives of certain large central bankers of other countries and agree on what is called a coordination of monetary policies. In brief, our Federal Reserve representatives meet monthly at Basel, Switzerland, and in cooperation with other central bankers decide what the monetary policies of the principal industrial countries of the world are to be. So the central bankers of Western Europe have a voice, and a kind of vote, in deciding such questions as what the supply of money, the level of interest rates, and consequently the level of economic activity in the United States, shall be.

I do not know how much longer the American people will tolerate this condition of having two governments of the United States, one authorized and one unauthorized. It has always seemed to me that there should be some way to coordinate the policies of these two governments, rather than having each go its separate way. I strongly suspect that if the American people gain some of the economic wisdom which the Committee for Economic Development is proposing they gain, steps will then be taken either to coordinate these two governments, or to put one over the other with proper responsibility for achieving a coordinated policy.

U.S.-FLAG CARRIERS

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. JARMAN. Mr. Speaker, for years we have heard warnings that the U.S.-flag carriers are steadily being eased out of their position of preeminence in the field of aviation. Figures just released by the International Civil Aviation Organization, which are the latest available statistics, demonstrate alarmingly just how grave this situation actually is.

In 1946, just after the war, American-flag ships accounted for 60 percent of international airline traffic. By 1960—a scant 14 years later—foreign competition had taken such giant bites out of our share of international traffic that the morsel left for us had dwindled to an alarming 31.7 percent of the total. Latest figures just released show that in 1 year since, our share has again decreased by two whole percentage points—in just 1 year, mind you.

Down, down, down we go, not slowly and imperceivably, but in drastic, year by year, reductions so that soon, if the trend continues, we may be "also rans" in a field we pioneered, developed, and nurtured into a thriving multibillion-dollar enterprise.

No one can deny that once aviation, especially international aviation, got on its feet on a commercial basis, foreign competition was inevitable and we welcome it as a healthy stimulus. But we do ask not to be put at such disadvantage by lateral treaties and giveaway State Department policies so as to allow foreign carriers to overpower us and beat us over the head with American manufactured aircraft which they utilize to such prosperous advantage as they fly into, across, up and down, around, and out of our country on landing privileges we so gleefully grant them.

This, Mr. Speaker, is not necessarily the beginning of the end of our international air carriers. Given solid backing from their own Government, given more freedom to operate without homemade restrictions, our airlines can do the job according to the best tested American principles.

Indeed, Mr. Speaker, if our American-flag international carriers get the cooperation they need from their own Government—for more forceful representation in bilateral negotiations, for rapid consideration by the Civil Aeronautics Board of pending route cases, for a more sensible and tolerant appreciation of the gigantic task our oversea carriers perform—this could very well be the end of the beginning.

THE PEOPLE-TO-PEOPLE PROGRAM

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. ADDONIZIO. Mr. Speaker during these times of anxiety and stress, we are keenly aware of the need for an increase in the contacts and cooperation between and among peoples all over the world. In launching the people-to-people program in September 1956, President Eisenhower called upon private citizens "to get together and to leap governments—if necessary, to evade governments—to work out not one method but thousands of methods by which people can gradually learn a little bit more of each other." Communication between ordinary private citizens of the United States and those of countries abroad—particularly those peoples who are enslaved by Communist governments—grows steadily more important in this diminishing planet.

A remarkable 10-year-old friend of mine, Peter W. Rodino III, has perceived with the wisdom of the young the imperative need for developing the sense of world community. Peter knows that peace and disarmament are problems too vast and too final to be adequately managed by governments alone. He believes that men should be peaceful and cooperative for the good of all, and he has concluded that a little-people-to-little-people organization would be effective in promoting international understanding and friendship.

Peter, like his distinguished father, our esteemed colleague, possesses vision and dynamism. He promptly conceived a plan of action for carrying out his idea. In his own words:

> Maybe Mr. Khrushchev does not believe the ordinary people in America and other countries really want him to stop the bombing. Maybe if a lot of children wrote him, he would believe it. If he gets a fallout of letters, he might stop the fallout of bombs.

Congressman RODINO has described his son's progress this way:

> So Peter wrote to Mr. Khrushchev. He talked about it with his chums. They wrote, too. And, as the idea spread, other children from beyond our neighborhood heard about it, and now many of them are writing. Parent teacher associations, Boy Scout groups and veterans' organizations are encouraging still more children to write. It is beginning to take shape as a real children's crusade.

I would like to express my support for the idea and for the expanded program which Congressman RODINO suggested and I congratulate father and son for their efforts to help men learn to live together in peace and harmony.

Our children, and the children of all the other countries, will inherit the earth. No adult, regardless of his or her claims to wisdom, has a greater interest in peaceful cooperation and mutual welfare than any child. And no adult has a greater responsibility than that of encouraging children to help shape the world which one day they will control. Nothing could be more basic to human nature, regardless of the nature of the society into which one is fortunate or unfortunate enough to be born. Knowledge, of course, is power. The greater our children's knowledge of the world becomes, the greater will be their opportunities and abilities not just to resolve international problems but to work out the difficulties of domestic living as well. Perspective breeds vision, and vision builds a better world; the program initiated by Peter Rodino III already demonstrates vision and is encouraging about the prospects of the future.

In his address before the Congress, Colonel Glenn told the story of Faraday when the great inventor was asked about the benefits of electricity. "What good is a baby?" Faraday replied. The question of course is unanswerable, because there is no measure of human value; it is one of our ultimates. There is no measure of the value of young Peter Rodino, either; he has expressed the hopes of all mankind and he is the hope of all mankind. Let us express our thanks to him and our faith in the human race, by supporting the little-people-to-little-people idea and helping him to make of it a saving reality.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. WHITENER. Mr. Speaker, there has been much criticism of the State Department in recent years. The American people have been more critical of the Department and certain foreign policy decisions it has made during this decade than at any other period in modern times.

The diplomatic reverses we have had and the constant pressure being exerted by the Communist bloc have, I regret to say, caused many Americans to lose confidence in the Department of State. This, of course, is a deplorable situation and indirectly plays into the hands of our enemies.

It is my belief, Mr. Speaker, that much of the criticism leveled at the Department of State would be eliminated if each national administration had the authority to place within the Department policy-level employees who would be immediately responsive to the philosophy of such administration in international relations.

We live in an era of rapidly shifting and changing economic, political, and social trends. The Secretary of State should have within his Department people who reflect his views on all international problems. I do not believe it is fair for a Secretary of State to be criticized for decisions made by a bureaucracy that has existed within the Department for many years and over which he, as the responsible officer, has no effective means of control. Hundreds of State Department officials are carried over from one administration to the other, and although they may not be in agreement with certain policy decisions of the Secretary of State, there is not much the Secretary can do about it.

In order to give the Secretary of State the authority to create the kind of organization that will reflect his foreign policy decisions I have introduced a bill that would permit the Secretary to make such changes in policymaking personnel of the Department of State as he deems advisable.

In general, my bill will permit the Secretary to select the personnel of the Department of State without regard to the Foreign Service Act or the Classification Act of 1949. The Secretary would be permitted to employ persons within the Department of State at his own discretion whose compensation is in excess of $8,000 per annum.

I do not believe that the enactment of my bill would do violence to the general application of our civil service system. The State Department is now concerned with nearly every facet of American economic, social, and political life. In addition to the conduct of our political relations with foreign nations, the Department is engaged on a wide front in trade, cultural, and economic assistance programs.

The very nature of the work in which the Department is engaged requires a great degree of latitude and flexibility on the part of the Secretary of State in selecting personnel for his Department. In order to give the Secretary the means whereby he can fulfill his responsibility to the American people we should permit him to have the authority of selecting people who will faithfully translate his directives into action. It is my hope, Mr. Speaker, that my colleagues in the House will join me in the support of the bill which I have introduced.

ARCHBISHOP WILLIAM D. O'BRIEN

Mr. LIBONATI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. LIBONATI. Mr. Speaker, the calling to follow the churchly life of God's servants on earth was fully answered by Archbishop William D. O'Brien throughout his vocation. He rightfully belonged to it, embracing every one of its religious facets of knowledge and mastered in growing strength the splendor of Christian truths. It was through his efforts that the religious light of Christianity spread its doctrines over the masses living in the spiritual darkness of paganism.

Such a man was our archbishop, who walked in this new world to spread the gospel to the ignorant and untutored spiritually in the Western World. He answered the divine voice of Christ and carried his message into strange lands throughout the Northern Hemisphere. His brothers of the missions went everywhere in the United States and its possessions seeking to instill in others the acceptance of the teachings of the Savior. The religious of the home missions were the very heart and soul of Catholic education dedicated to bring "the Word" to mankind in fulfilling the request of Jesus Christ to the Apostles.

He was the backbone of the Catholic Church Extension Society movement for many years—as its leader since 1925. His was the severe responsibility of raising the alms to finance its operations. His love of this work imbued in others a burning desire to support its purposes—it was like a contagion, arisen from the threshold of his sacristy. Those who joined with him in this sacred mission knew that each was carrying out the most worthy of Christ's instructions for the sowing of the seed of Christianity.

If the human heart could be likened to Heaven, his many kind deeds had expanded its limitless capacity as a spaceful Heaven with no limit in harboring the increasing multitude of angels.

He fostered a larger Christian faith than that fixed by his worthy Catholic trust. He knew the future would reveal truths to us that would enlarge our understanding of the glories to come. He felt that all Christians would unite behind Christ's teachings; that the soul was our real self; that we would increase our religious knowledge of true divinity through our longings to attain the promise of heavenly grace in afterlife.

The archbishop, for many years, celebrated the Soldiers' Mass at Mount Carmel Cemetery, Hillside, Ill., on Memorial Day.

The veterans organizations assembled at the cemetery, marching together—unit after unit—to the mass site. The guard of honor, 4th degree Knights of Columbus, in uniformed attire, added dignity and luster to the military setting. The Youth Corps—Boy Scout Troops, Girl Scouts, the high school bands, and St. Phillip's Choir—under the direction of the Sisters religiose, contributed to this testimonial to patriotic and religious deliverance. The entire setting, typical of our patriotic American heritage, was realistically impressive.

Throughout these many years it was my privilege and honor, after the celebration of the holy memorial mass, to give the memorial address at the veterans memorial grave plot nearby.

The touching military ceremonies at the grave site, lowering of the colors, the resounding rifle shots breaking the absolute silence in honor of the dead and the scintillating notes of the bugler sounding "taps" at the graves, with the smothered echoes and soft lippings of the bugler in the distance, gave an eerie feeling of hollowness in one's entire being. And yet, the pride of being an American, to be able, with humility, to show deference and respect to the memory of the men who made possible the continuation of our way of life and the existence of the Republic.

And it stirred in one great pride in being an American and enjoying the protection of our institutions in a liberty-loving Nation whose leadership and strength protects all the liberty-loving nations of the world. These ceremonies meant so much to the archbishop. His patriotic devotion to his country was reflected in his every sermon throughout the years. His veneration of the honored dead gave an intense patriotic sparkle to his every word of praise. His feeling for their relatives and families in their saddened loss was cloaked in expressions of condolence and prayer. He asked that prayers be given for all the dead. That honor of the dead was like honoring themselves.

And now his death, on Monday, February 19, 1962, marks the passing of a great bishop in the life history of the Chicago diocese, covering almost a half century of activity in church affairs.

The people of the Central West loved this famous religionst. Regardless of faith, people contributed generously to the support of his missions. He was truly a great leader of humanitarian causes.

He grew up with the city of Chicago. For many years, since 1924, as pastor of St. John's Catholic Church, at 18th and Wentworth Avenue, he served his parishioners, among whom were numbered some of the early Catholic families of the Chicago archdiocese. He was born and raised on the near North Side, just across the Chicago River, north of the Loop. He enjoyed the respect and friendship of men both in high and low estate. He was a true Christian and loved mankind. He served the sinner and the respectable alike. He was a stickler for truth and could spot a phony at every turn. He was a loyal and understanding friend. The Roman Catholic Church and the people of the city of Chicago, State of Illinois, and the Nation, have lost a worthy bishop, a true servant of Christ and a compassionate religious leader of mankind.

The Members of the Congress from the State of Illinois lament the passing of a true Christian and a beloved leader, who preached and practiced the true values of Christian faith in mankind.

[From the Chicago Tribune, Feb. 20, 1962]

W. D. O'BRIEN, PRELATE, 83, DIES; RITES SET—EXTENSION UNIT HEAD SERVED 59 YEARS

Archbishop William D. O'Brien, 83, auxiliary archbishop of the Chicago Roman Catholic Archdiocese and president of the Catholic Church Extension Society of the United States, died yesterday in Little Company of Mary Hospital in San Pierre, Ind.

He entered the hospital January 30 after suffering a fall in the rectory of St. John's Church, 100 West 18th Street, where he lived. Associates said he became seriously ill Saturday night.

Funeral services for him will be held at 11 a.m. Saturday in Holy Name Cathedral.

Cardinal Albert G. Meyer, Roman Catholic archbishop of Chicago, in Rome for a Vatican conference, said: "His passing leaves all of us, particularly those of us close to home missions, with a sense of a great void. Because of his unique personality, he seems to be irreplaceable. For seemingly countless years, he symbolized the work of the home missions through a long priestly lifetime of devoted and dedicated service to the Catholic Church Extension Society."

DE PAUL PRESIDENT

Mayor Daley expressed his sorrow at the death of Archbishop O'Brien by saying: "The people of Chicago have lost a distinguished religious leader and a devoted Chicagoan, with the passing of Archbishop O'Brien. He was known throughout the world for his dedication to the service of his fellow man. His generosity, kindness, and enthusiasm made him loved by all."

The Very Reverend Comerford J. O'Malley, president of De Paul University, in a statement mourning the death of the archbishop, said: "His indefatigable labors were responsible for the building of hundreds of chapels throughout the United States and for bringing spiritual consolation to hundreds of thousands of persons. De Paul University appropriately considered him its most distinguished graduate."

Archbishop O'Brien's career linked some of the most important persons and events in the Chicago archdiocese's history.

Born on the near North Side, he attended the Kinzie School and the Brothers school of the cathedral. In 1899 he was one of a class of two members who received the first baccalaureate degrees conferred by St. Vincent's College, now De Paul University. Eleven years later De Paul granted him an honorary doctor of laws degree.

RISES THROUGH RANKS

The late Archbishop Quigley, for whom the archdiocese's preparatory seminaries are named, ordained Archbishop O'Brien in 1903 and named him assistant to the late Reverend Thomas Cox, founder of St. Basil's Parish, 1850 Garfield Boulevard.

Shortly after the Catholic Church Extension Society was organized in 1907 in Chicago, Archbishop O'Brien was made assistant to its founder, Msgr. Francis C. Kelley. As the society grew to become the largest home mission agency of the Roman Catholic Church in this country, he rose through its ranks to its presidency, which he assumed in 1925.

At his elevation to the dignity of papal chamberlain with the title of monsignor in 1924, he became the first priest to receive papal honors from the archdiocese's first cardinal, the late Cardinal George Mundelein.

The cardinal served as consecrator when Archbishop O'Brien was made a bishop in 1934 in his home parish, Holy Name Cathedral. In addition to being named an auxiliary bishop of the Chicago archdiocese, he was appointed titular bishop of Calinda, an ancient see, no longer in existence, that was believed to have been situated on the Indos River in Asia Minor.

ONLY ONE PASTORATE

During the celebration in 1953 of the 50th anniversary of his ordination, Pope Pius XII made Bishop O'Brien a titular archbishop, the first in this country of that rank who was not the head of a diocese.

The pastorate of St. John's Church was the only one he ever held. He was appointed to it in 1924 by Cardinal Mundelein.

Founded in 1859, the parish is one of the oldest in Chicago. The present church was built in 1877. Archbishop O'Brien often expressed pride in its architecture and history.

Although in recent years Archbishop O'Brien had relinquished the editorship of Extension magazine, the largest periodical of its kind in the country, and had given up other tasks as head of the society, he followed its activities closely and was in his office nearly every weekday until he entered the hospital.

Archbishop O'Brien is survived by a brother, Michael, of 5259 Sunnyside Avenue, and seven nephews and nieces, among them Sister Alice Rita, a teacher at Immaculata High School.

ARCHBISHOP O'BRIEN IS DEAD AT 83

The Most Reverend William D. O'Brien, president of the Catholic Church Extension Society and a near-legendary figure in the U.S. Roman Catholic hierarchy, died Monday at San Pierre, Ind.

The 83-year-old archbishop, who also served as auxiliary bishop of the Chicago archdiocese and pastor of St. John's Church at 18th and Clark, had been a patient for 3 weeks at the Little Company of Mary Hospital in San Pierre.

Until he was well past 80, the prelate had continued traveling throughout the United

States to dedicate the small chapels which the extension society erects for Catholic mission congregations.

A FAMED WIT

With a long memory for humorous incidents in the lives of his church colleagues and an Irish wit to help in the telling, he was a sought-after speaker for clergy dinners and other events which added to his travels.

Advancing age had curtailed his activities recently and he underwent surgery for an intestinal disorder February 17, 1961, at Mercy Hospital, 2537 South Prairie.

He was hospitalized at San Pierre after he injured his elbow in a fall 3 weeks ago in the rectory adjoining St. John Church, where he had been pastor since 1924.

The Indiana institution was chosen to prevent the aging prelate from dressing and walking home in defiance of his physicians, as he had done occasionally while a patient at Mercy Hospital.

MASS AT CATHEDRAL

Requiem Mass will be offered at 11 a.m., Saturday in Holy Name Cathedral, State and Superior. Entombment will be in the chapel vault for archbishops of the archdiocese at Mount Carmel Cemetery in Hillside. Some years ago, Archbishop O'Brien had selected for himself a crypt there next to that of Samuel Cardinal Stritch, with whom he had served the church.

Albert Cardinal Meyer, now in Rome to attend a meeting of the central preparatory commission for the Second Vatican Council next autumn, will return to offer the funeral mass Saturday. The sermon will be given by the Most Reverend William E. Cousins, archbishop of Milwaukee.

Cardinal Meyer, archbishop of the Roman Catholic archdiocese of Chicago, said Archbishop O'Brien "because of his unique personality seems to be irreplaceable."

"He would wish no eulogy for himself," the cardinal added, "but rather would have us place our own lives continuously in the focus of that faith which he himself kept so well and would have us bring into the lives of others."

GRAVESIDE RITES

Because a large number of bishops from throughout the Nation are expected to attend, graveside rites will be in the mausoleum of Queen of Heaven Cemetery, across the road from Mount Carmel Cemetery where the entombment will take place.

The archbishop's body will lie in state Wednesday in St. John's Church, where a requiem mass will be offered at 10:30 a.m. It will lie in state Thursday and Friday at Holy Name Cathedral.

Surviving are a brother, Michael O'Brien, of 5259 West Sunnyside, and seven nieces and nephews.

The achievements of Archbishop O'Brien caused his name to be known in almost every U.S. town and village that has a Roman Catholic altar.

In recognition of his work in behalf of struggling parishes and mission chapels, he received in 1953 a papal honor never before accorded an American priest.

Pope Pius XII elevated him to the personal rank of archbishop. It was the first time in the history of the Roman Catholic hierarchy in the United States that the title was given an auxiliary bishop without a diocese of his own.

Archbishop O'Brien was born on the near North Side 83 years ago. He was baptized at Holy Name Cathedral; as a youngster served there as altar boy. Later, he was ordained there and still later the cathedral was the scene of his elevation to the episcopate.

His mother died when he was an infant and he was reared by a foster mother. She was present in a wheel chair in the cathedral in 1934 when her foster son was consecrated a bishop. When Bishop O'Brien was elevated to archbishop, Samuel Cardinal Stritch recited his early struggles to gain an education.

In 1899 he was one of the first two graduates of St. Vincent's College, now De Paul University. He prepared for the priesthood at Kenrick Seminary, St. Louis, and was ordained in 1903.

DECISION OF 1907

Archbishop O'Brien's career in the church was shaped by a decision he made in 1907. He was at the time on a 2-week vacation from the church to which he had been assigned. He was interested in the work of the Catholic Church Extension Society of America, which had been organized in Chicago 2 years earlier to raise funds for chapel missions in sparsely settled areas.

He decided to spend his vacation working in the society's office. The impression the young priest made resulted in his appointment to the staff.

In 1926, Pope Pius XI named the then Monsignor O'Brien president of the society. Subsequently he was reappointed by papal direction six times to 5-year terms and was serving the post at the time of his death.

He was also editor in chief of Extension magazine, official publication of the society.

Archbishop O'Brien was widely known abroad. The village of Saint Angelo Lodigiano in Italy, where Mother St. Frances Cabrini was born, was in 1950 renamed "O'Brien Cabrini" in recognition of the archbishop's efforts to gain canonization for the Chicago nun.

And because of his association with the Scalabrini Fathers in Chicago, the order's educational institution at Milan bears the name "College Scalabrini-O'Brien."

When he was elevated to the episcopate he was named auxiliary bishop of the archdiocese of Chicago and titular bishop of long-vanished Calinda, once a city in Asia Minor.

(When a prelate becomes an assistant to an archbishop it is the custom to also give him title to a diocese of ancient times. Pope Pius XII later elevated him to titular archbishop of Calinda.)

[From the Chicago Tribune, Feb. 21, 1962]

MEYER COMING HOME TO LEAD O'BRIEN RITES—FUNERAL SERVICES TO BE HERE SATURDAY

(By Richard Philbrick)

Scores of Roman Catholic bishops and other church dignitaries from throughout the country will attend the funeral of Archbishop William D. O'Brien at 11 a.m. Saturday in Holy Name Cathedral.

Archbishop O'Brien, auxiliary Roman Catholic archbishop of Chicago and for 37 years president of the Catholic Church Extension Society, died Monday in Little Company of Mary Hospital, San Pierre, Ind. He was 83 years old.

CARDINAL TO OFFICIATE

Cardinal Albert G. Meyer, Roman Catholic archbishop of Chicago, will return from Rome, where he has been attending a Vatican meeting, to be celebrant at the mass. The sermon will be delivered by Archbishop William E. Cousins of Milwaukee, vice chancellor of the Church Extension Society and a former Chicago pastor.

A mass for the archbishop which the society's staff, clergy, and other close friends will attend, will be held at 10:30 a.m. today in the archbishop's parish, St. John's Catholic Church, 100 W. 18th Street. Msgr. Joseph B. Lux, a vice president of the society, will be celebrant. Archbishop O'Brien had been pastor of the church since 1924.

The wake for him will begin immediately afterward and continue until 9 o'clock tonight. It will be resumed tomorrow in the cathedral and will continue until time for the funeral.

OFFICERS OF MASS

Among the officers of the requiem mass will be Monsignor Lux and Msgr. Kenneth G. Stack, another society executive, assistants at the throne; Msgr. Patrick Molloy, pastor of St. Leo Catholic Church, archpriest at the throne; Msgr. William J. McNichols of the society staff, master of ceremonies; the Rev. John L. May, another staff member, deacon; and the archbishop's secretary, Msgr. Joseph Cusack, subdeacon.

Entombment will be in a crypt next to that of the late Cardinal Samuel A. Stritch in the chapel vault for archbishops of the archdiocese at Mount Carmel Cemetery, Hillside.

THE GRAVESIDE PLANS

Cardinal Meyer will preside at the graveside rites. They will be held in the mausoleum of Queen of Heaven Cemetery across the street from the place of interment.

Messages from hundreds of church leaders and Chicago civic officials yesterday paid tribute to the devotion and skill of Archbishop O'Brien in carrying out missionary work of the church.

Cardinal Meyer said of him that "he symbolized the work of the home missions through a long priestly lifetime of devoted and dedicated service * * *. To his brother bishops he was Extension."

[From the Chicago Daily News, Feb. 2, 1962]

ARCHBISHOP O'BRIEN REQUIEM OFFERED—CARDINAL MEYER TO GIVE SECOND MASS FOR SATURDAY

A solemn requiem mass was offered for Archbishop William D. O'Brien Wednesday at the altar of old St. John's Church where the archbishop has said mass and served as pastor since 1924.

Another solemn mass will be offered at 11 a.m. Saturday in Holy Name Cathedral by Albert Cardinal Meyer.

"I will go to the altar of God, to God the joy of my youth," Msgr. Joseph B. Lux intoned as he began the mass for his longtime associate.

The children's choir of St. Anthony's elementary school sang at the mass.

Also present were Archbishop O'Brien's brother, Michael, his seven nephews and nieces, the Most Reverend Cletus O'Donnell, auxiliary bishop and vicar general of the Chicago archdiocese, and about 75 children clad in the blue and white uniforms of the St. Teresa's Chinese Mission elementary school.

Archbishop O'Brien, who died Monday at the age of 83, was auxiliary bishop of Chicago and president of the Catholic Church Extension Society.

He will lie in state at St. John's, 100 West 18th Street, until Wednesday night when he will be moved to the Cathedral to lie in state until the mass Saturday.

Archbishop O'Brien will be interred, after the mass Saturday, in the chapel vault for archbishops at Mount Carmel Cemetery in Hillside.

[From the Register, Mar. 4, 1962]

ARCHBISHOP WAS HEART OF EXTENSION SOCIETY

CHICAGO.—The late Auxiliary Archbishop William D. O'Brien was "the living breathing heart that ceaselessly pumped energy into" the Catholic Church Extension Society of America, Archbishop William E. Cousins of Milwaukee declared at the pontifical requiem mass offered for Archbishop O'Brien in Holy Name Cathedral, where he was baptized, confirmed, ordained a priest, and consecrated a bishop.

Cardinal Albert Meyer, Archbishop of Chicago, flew home from Rome to officiate at the mass.

"His love for the home missions was not a sterile, unproductive thing," said Archbishop Cousins. "His enthusiasm for the cause generated a similar feeling in those with whom he associated."

BEGGAR FOR CHRIST

He never stepped out of his favorite character, that of "beggar for Christ," the Milwaukee prelate said.

A message of condolence was sent in behalf of Pope John XXIII by Cardinal Amleto Cicognani, Papal Secretary of State.

Pope John recalled Archbishop O'Brien's "many selfless years dedicated to intense apostolic activity in behalf of the home missions," and extended his sympathy and blessing to the people of the Chicago Archdiocese.

Cardinal Cicognani expressed his "personal condolences" and prayers "for one * * * who served the church so well and so devotedly for so long a time."

Archbishop O'Brien had been president of the Catholic Church Extension Society since 1925 and an active worker in its efforts since 1907.

The Catholic Church Extension Society assists rural and mission areas in the United States and its possessions with the building of churches, chapels, schools, convents, and other institutions.

"Humanly speaking," said Cardinal Meyer, "his passing leaves all of us, particularly those of us close to the cause of the home missions, with a sense of great void. Because of his unique personality, he seems to be irreplaceable. For seemingly countless years, he symbolized the work of the home missions through a long priestly life of devoted and dedicated service to the Catholic Church Extension Society. To his brother bishops, he was Extension."

Archbishop O'Brien died at the age of 83 in the Little Company of Mary Hospital in San Pierre, Ind.

THE UNHEALTHY AGED AND WHAT WE CAN DO ABOUT THEM

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. MULTER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, the Congress has been asked to consider a bill—H.R. 4222—which would provide health benefits for the aged under the social security system. There is no question in my mind that this is the proper approach to a problem that is growing worse daily and one which we must do something about now.

It is not surprising that approximately 70 percent of all of those polled in any single one of the many opinion surveys taken on this subject are in favor of some plan for assisting our aged population in paying for their medical expenses without losing their dignity and self respect. It is interesting to note that about the same percentage was also in favor of paying increased taxes, if necessary, to support such a program.

On February 5, 1962, the New Republic published an article by Christopher Jencks called "The Unhealthy Aged." In this article Mr. Jencks says:

In Aldous Huxley's brave new world geriatric problems were to be solved by putting the aged out of the way with pills when they reached 66. But timid old America is too soft-hearted for that; we may resent the aged as burdens on our pocketbooks and our consciences, but we find it easier to ignore these unproductive citizens than to liquidate them.

Ignoring the aged is, however, becoming increasingly difficult. In the good old days back around the turn of the century most people died of natural causes before reaching retirement or senility. Only 4 percent of the population was over 65, and most of these individuals lived either on farms where they could milk cows, watch babies, and tell tall tales, or else in immigrant ghettos where younger brothers, sisters, children, nephews, or even grandchildren felt obliged to take care of them.

But today the farm and the ghetto are vanishing. Young men move out of their parents' home when they marry, to settle in new neighborhoods in keeping with their youthful, middle-class, all-American self-portrait. Few want to carry their crochety and unadaptable parents up the social ladder on their backs. And if, as often happens, their climb ends in a suburb thousands of miles from their hometown, many find their parents unwilling to follow even if invited.

What happens to those superfluous and unwholesome individuals who outlive their economic usefulness? Those who will not, like the Eskimos, go out in the snow to die? Today they number 9 percent of the population—nearly 17 million individuals. About 2 million live on farms. Another 2 million or so live with younger relatives in the cities. For the great majority, however, these traditional accommodations are not available. Eight million old people are married and living with their husbands or wives. Nearly 4 million live alone or with nonrelatives. Half a million are institutionalized.

How do they support themselves? About 12 million are now covered to some extent by social security, providing benefits up to $30 a week. Several million have some kind of company pension—usually $15 to $25 a week. Several million receive public assistance. Several million still have jobs. Half have $1,000 or more salted away in the bank against an emergency. (It takes about $1,000 to get buried in most American cities.) All these arrangements, however, only produce a per capita weekly income of slightly over $20 among those over 65. Unfortunately, the Bureau of Labor Standards estimates that if a retired couple is to rent an apartment with hot water and a toilet that flushes, eat a balanced diet, pay typical medical bills, and meet other unavoidable expenses, they will need from $50 a week (in Houston) to $65 a week (in Chicago). Few retired couples have that much money, and still fewer widows have enough to keep going. As a result 5 million old people live in substandard housing—although many have the satisfaction of owning their own slum. More than 5 million are malnourished—although few are actually starving. An estimated 4 to 6 million have untreated medical symptoms—although few critically ill individuals are denied hospital care for lack of funds.

What can be done for these men and women, the unwanted byproducts of national health and affluence? Ideally, many should be given jobs as babysitters, custodians, apartment house switchboard operators, and at a dozen other inactive posts which would at once provide something to do and something approaching an adequate standard of living. But old people can't find jobs. Today even the young and healthy cannot find jobs unless they have skills and a future. The old usually have neither.

Alternatively, social security could be substantially increased. It is preposterous that a steelworker should take home $120 a week until he is 65 and then be suddenly reduced to $45 a week.

Mr. Jencks then asks us here in Congress if we are willing to allow these conditions to continue when the social security approach would solve most of these problems and predicts that passage of the King-Anderson bill will be most difficult. Because of the failure of Congress to act in this area, Mr. Jencks points out that social agencies and others concerned with the aged have attempted to provide at least medical care. It is not, however, available to the majority of these people.

Continuing, Mr. Jencks writes:

The average person over 65 spends 12 percent of his annual $1,000 income on doctors, dentists, drugs, and so forth. If he gets so sick that he has to go to the hospital, which he normally does at least once during his retirement, he will get an average bill of $700. That puts quite a hole in his savings. In fact, it liquidates his savings in almost half the cases, so that he must beg from relatives or borrow from banks. In about one case out of five, he (or more often, she) must go to public welfare or charity agencies for help.

Some people spread these costs out over the years by buying health insurance. But such insurance obviously cannot be cheap. Insurances companies are in business to help the stockholders, not the aged, and adequate hospitalization policies cost about $100 per person. Only about a third of the aged can afford such a policy. Another sixth have cheaper and less adequate coverage, which pays less than three-quarters of their hospital bills. Eight million people have no insurance, and of course these 8 million also have the most meager private resources.

If the 8 million uninsured turned to charity or public assistance, there would be relatively little cause for alarm. But they don't. The forms are long and complex, the welfare workers often unpleasant, the means test frequently unreasonable, and the charity wards crowded. Many who lack insurance simply don't see doctors or enter hospitals until it is too late to help them. Uninsured old people now get a third less care than those who are insured. The American Medical Association, however, endorses estimates that if hospital care were free the aged would eventually require nearly twice as much attention as they now get. To the American Medical Association this indicates that free care is impractical, but others understandably draw different conclusions. (There is much talk about unnecessary medical care, but not even the worst hypochondriac can be admitted to, or remain in, an American hospital unless a doctor certifies that he needs treatment there.)

What can be done? As already indicated, there are, broadly speaking, two alternatives. We can either try to create the kind of society in which the aged have enough money of their own to take care of themselves privately, like most younger people, or we can let their children take care of them through social security, general taxes, or charity. The American Medical Association, the private insurance companies, and most conservative legislators would like to see us work toward the day when every retired man and woman could afford private medical care. Unfortunately that day is not just around the corner. Adequate noncancellable hospital insurance, plus typical doctors', dentists', and druggists' bills are about $250 a year for those over 65. These individuals' income is now only $1,000 per year, and it is not rising as fast as the cost of medical care. It will be a very long time before most old people can afford to devote a quarter or more of their incomes to medical care. In the meantime a lot of our parents and grandparents will have suffered and died needlessly. Is the principle of private enterprise worth that much unnecessary grief? Doctors, inured over the years to pain and death, may think so. But those who see the aged primarily

as friends and relatives, rather than temperature charts, may feel otherwise.

The only way to avoid this suffering is to provide free insurance or free care for those who can't afford to pay. This is the aim of the Kerr-Mills Act, passed in 1960, which offers matching funds to States which provide free care to the "medically indigent." (Almost all States already provide free care to those completely indigent individuals who receive old-age assistance.) Unfortunately, only about half the 50 States have taken up the Kerr-Mills offer. And most of these States provide benefits only to the very, very poor, and inadequate benefits even to them. Furthermore, there are many old people who would rather suffer than turn to public assistance. The number of people whose diseases are still not being properly treated runs into millions.

The King-Anderson bill, currently supported by the administration, would be an extension of the Social Security Act. It would be financed initially by increasing the taxable wage from $4,800 to $5,000 (or $5,200 under revised estimates), and by raising the social security tax for both employers and employees by 0.25 percent. As medical costs climb, as poor people get used to seeing doctors and entering hospitals when sick, and as charitable organizations and local governments shift their support to other areas of need, the social security rate might have to be increased another 0.1 or 0.2 percent for both employers and employees. The bill would cover 80 percent of those now over 65, and 95 percent of those reaching 65 in the future. (Farmers, teachers, shopkeepers, and others who retired before social security was extended to their jobs would, for no very good reason, be excluded. Federal and local government employees, who are not covered by social security even today, are never expected to benefit.) The payments for hospital bills would be generous, although not generous enough to solve the problems of those with really catastrophic prolonged illnesses. (Unlimited coverage would probably increase the social security rate another 0.1 percent.)

IS THE KING-ANDERSON BILL SOCIALIZED MEDICINE?

If passed, the bill would increase the Federal share of the Nation's 22.5 billion annual medical bills from $4.9 billion to $6 billion, and would mean that the average hospital drew more than 20 percent of its income from the Federal Treasury. The Social Security Administration would acquire a voice in setting hospital and sometimes doctors' fees. But no change in the relationship between doctors and patients, their free choice of doctors and hospitals, or the control of the doctors over medical methods, is foreseeable. This may or may not be socialized medicine. The only certainty is that if socialized medicine, in this sense of the word, works as badly as the American Medical Association claims, it will never, as the American Medical Association fears, be extended to those under 65. If, on the other hand, the experiment cuts the mortality rate among the aged as low as it is in Canada and Scandinavia (the myth that America has the best medical care in the world applies, unfortunately, only to the rich), then perhaps the scheme will be extended.

After this discussion of the supposed socialistic tendencies of the social security approach, Mr. Jencks suggests that President Kennedy go on nationwide television and appeal to the public for support of this program. He discusses possible compromises that may come out of the Ways and Means Committee if that committee does report a bill this session:

Compromises have also been suggested, aimed at placating the American Medical Association, the big insurance companies, and the hospital administrators. The American Hospital Association has urged, for instance, that the social security tax be increased in order to buy everyone a Blue Cross policy.

"Yet even the passage of the King-Anderson bill would barely scratch the surface of the real problem: what can be done to make the years after 65 something more than a dreary anticlimax to the years before? Proponents of medical care should remember that the largest single medical problem confronting the aged is mental illness. What the aged need, more than any quantity of free surgery and drugs and beds, is a way of life which makes survival and health seem worthwhile."

A practical discussion of a practical program to provide medical assistance where it is most needed: among our aged and aging populations.

Mr. Jencks' defense of the proposed Health Insurance Benefits Act, to give the King-Anderson bill its proper name, evoked a response which was quite predictable.

On March 12, 1962, the New Republic published that response with Mr. Jencks' reply. The American Medical Association's vehement opposition to this bill has not lessened one bit even in the face of the obvious support of the American public.

I commend the American Medical Association president's comments on Mr. Jencks' article, and Mr. Jencks' reply, to the attention of our colleagues, Mr. Speaker, in the belief that if we give the widest possible publicity to this issue we will find that our constituents—the American people themselves and not the American Medical Association—will support the President and the leadership in the Congress. The March 12, 1962, article follows:

MEDICAL CARE FOR THE AGED

(By Leonard W. Larson, M.D.)

I would like to make a few comments about Mr. Christopher Jencks' February 5 article in the New Republic, "The Unhealthy Aged." The American Medical Association's opposition to using the social security system as a mechanism for supplying medical care to the aged is not based on any indifference to the health needs of our elder citizens. We believe that existing needs can be met, and met fully, without recourse to a program that could lower the high standards of American medicine and financially drain both the social security system and the wages of every working American.

As Mr. Jencks points out not all the aged are ill and not all the aged are indigent. We do not see great wisdom in a blanket increase of social security taxes to assist millions who need no assistance at all: Instead, we see political expediency. If the King-Anderson bill were passed the taxable wage base for every working American would be raised from $4,800 to $5,200. By 1963, social security taxes would total $403, a 39.9 percent increase over 1961's $288. By 1968, under existing provisions for social security increases, the annual bill would jump 76 percent to $507. And these figures are firm only if the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare's cost estimates hold true. HEW pegs the initial cost of King-Anderson legislation at a little over $1 billion annually; non-Government actuaries say it could easily cost twice as much.

Another factor ignored by proponents of the bill concerns some important changes in our population makeup. Now, 1 out of 12 persons is over 65; 10 years from now 1 out of 10 will be in this age group. Furthermore, Government population projections predict a serious imbalance in our labor force within the next decade. Today, about 57 percent of the population is between the ages of 20 and 64; but in 20 years only 43 percent will be in this age group.

Thus, there will be fewer working Americans paying taxes to social security to support a greater number of retired persons. By how much more will social security taxes have to be increased to cover existing benefits plus the additional financial drain for medical care? HEW and the administration have never told us. Instead, we are led to believe that the increases outlined now will suffice for future generations.

What, then, are alternatives to social security? One is the Kerr-Mills bill passed in September 1960 and now being implemented in 38 States. This legislation is designed to provide comprehensive medical coverage for all persons over 65, regardless of their social security status, who need help. Kerr-Mills supplies medical assistance through two channels. One is the medical assistance to the aged (MAA) program which provides help for those aged persons who can meet normal living expenses but have trouble with medical expenses. The second phase of the law provides Federal matching funds to States wishing to expand the scope of medical benefits for the aged already on the old age assistance rolls.

Another medical aid supplement is voluntary insurance. Over 53 percent of the elderly now have some type of health insurance, and by 1970 insurance actuaries estimate that 80 to 90 percent will be covered. Since Mr. Jencks' article went to press, the American Medical Association and the National Association of Blue Shield Plans announced a comprehensive, nationwide Blue Shield program of surgical and medical benefits for the aged. The program should be operative by this spring at an estimated $3.20 monthly premium. Other private insurance companies are also offering multi-benefit programs at moderate costs.

Mr. Jencks and the American Medical Association are in firm agreement on the most important facet of helping our senior citizens. As he points out, "What the aged need is a way of life which makes survival and health worthwhile." We need to find ways of making the aged's life more meaningful and more productive. We do not need to make them dependent on a paternalistic government for subsistence and care and we cannot afford to tie their health needs to a system traditionally controlled by politicians.

REPLY BY MR. JENCKS

Although Dr. Larson is in a better position than I to know what will and what will not lower the standards of American medicine, I have seen no evidence, and he offers none, that the passage of the King-Anderson bill would do what he predicts. I would not have thought that a physician's standards of competence would be influenced, one way or another, by how medical care is financed. Moreover, no one is proposing that doctors become state employees. Hospital bills of aged patients would be paid in much the same way under King-Anderson as they are paid under Blue Cross. And although organized medicine once frowned on Blue Cross, it does not now.

Neither do I see how the passage of the administration's bill would drain the social security system, since actuarial estimates by the Social Security Administration indicate that the proposed 0.5-percent increase in social security taxes and $4,800 to $5,200 increase in the social security tax base would make the program self-supporting. If the program costs more than anticipated, which it certainly might, further rises in social security taxes will be authorized, but the social security account will not be drained.

To say that passage of the King-Anderson bill would drain the wages of every working American also seems to me misleading. It is hospital bills themselves which drain pocketbooks. I believe that most Americans would rather have their wages drained $1 per week throughout their working lives, in what amounts to an obligatory savings plan, than have $500 to $1,500 at a time drained from their retirement-depleted bank accounts. I may be wrong in this judgment of the popular temper, but Dr. Gallup's inquiries support me.

Dr. Larson conveys the impression that the King-Anderson bill would cost much more than a dollar a week; he alludes to a social security rise from $288 to $403 per year. Most of this increase, however, has nothing to do with the King-Anderson bill; it will be caused by paying higher retirement and disability benefits to more people. Furthermore, only the 29 percent of the working population earning $100 or more per week will pay even a dollar per week for King-Anderson benefits; the more typical American wage earner, getting $70 per week, would pay only an additional $0.35 per week for coverage. And of course only half this contribution will come from the worker's wages; the other half will come from employers.

There is no doubt that the growing proportion of the population over 65 will increase the cost of social security as Dr. Larson says; indeed, much of the 76 percent increase between 1961 and 1968 mentioned by him stems from just such trends. Medical care for growing numbers of old people will be expensive. But it will be no more expensive to finance this care through the King-Anderson bill than privately—unless, of course, private care saves money by discouraging some people from seeking treatment they need. There is considerable evidence that this now happens, but I am sure Dr. Larson is as unhappy as I am about this kind of economy.

Although Dr. Larson says that the Kerr-Mills Act is now being implemented in 38 States, most of these States contemplate wholly inadequate programs. In some States, enabling legislation has not even passed the legislature; in some, no appropriation has been made to implement legislation; in some, the means test is so severe that only a few hundred people benefit; in some, benefits are so meager that beneficiaries still have to borrow from children or charity to pay hospital bills. Only in Massachusetts, New York, and Michigan does the Kerr-Mills legislation now approach adequacy, and it seems to me unlikely that more than a dozen States will ever match these three.

Although there are millions of old people who now buy private hospital insurance, it is an overstatement to say that they do not need coverage under King-Anderson. In the first place, the bill would provide broader and better coverage than the private insurance policies most elderly people can afford (especially because King-Anderson coverage could not be canceled when the beneficiary got sick). In the second place, even those who now have private policies which give them more protection than the King-Anderson bill proposes would in most cases be only too happy to cancel these policies, pay for hospital care through social security, and spend the saved income in other ways. (One way they might spend the money is on Blue Shield coverage for doctor's bills, referred to by Dr. Larson. The King-Anderson bill would, like Blue Cross, cover only hospital bills.) There are, of course, some retired people who really don't need any help if they become sick, people who have so much money that they do not find private insurance a burden. But even they will lose nothing by the passage of the bill, since they would buy hospital insurance anyway. The only real losers will be those few private insurance companies which now deal extensively with retired clients.

Private insurance will probably cover a growing percentage of the aged population if the King-Anderson proposal is killed. But unless social security payments increase sharply, or insurance salesmen begin to push policies paying only a fraction of hospital bills, the insurance industry seems to me unlikely to corral 90 (or even 80) percent of the over-65 market by 1970, as Dr. Larson predicts. If there were convincing evidence from either American or European experience that private insurance worked better than government insurance, it might be worthwhile to sacrifice the uninsurable and the impoverished for the general welfare. But I have been unable to find any proof that federally financed insurance (that is for military dependents and retired Federal employees) works any less satisfactorily than private insurance. Why should it be expected to work out badly in this case? Is a system controlled by politicians really less likely to meet public requirements than a system controlled by the directors of insurance companies? If so, an important new principle of political science has been discovered.

CHRISTOPHER JENCKS.

THIS RECORD I HAVE MADE— I STAND ON IT

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DOWDY] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. DOWDY. Mr. Speaker, for some time I have observed the "rating" of Members of Congress by certain organizations, particularly ADA and COPE. These radical leftwing groups condemn the voting records of myself and other Members of Congress.

I feel that the people of the United States should have an opportunity to see in one place, the example of a voting record which those self-appointed critics say is totally wrong. Any Member of Congress could do the same, but I will use only my own record. Each reader can judge for himself that my votes are in the interest of the people, and pause to consider just whose interests the ADA, and so forth, are really serving. It should be borne in mind that these radicals claim the following record to be 100 percent wrong:

I was House author of the bill to prevent sabotage of national defense communication facilities. This was on President Kennedy's 1961 must list, and became Public Law 87-306.

I cosponsored legislation, also on the must list and enacted, providing penalties for hijacking aircraft.

I authored one and cosponsored others of a series of anticrime and antiracketeering bills on the must list.

I have consistently fought for an invincible national defense, believing we should be fully prepared to repel any combination of enemies.

I have opposed all proposals which would disarm us, or weaken our defense posture.

I support the highway program, as aiding the defense effort.

I support the airport program, as aiding the defense effort.

I have opposed back-door financing, on the conviction that Congress should control the purse strings.

I supported the missile and antimissile missile programs, and the space program under the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, and appropriations therefor. Under these programs, our advanced system of missiles and space probings have rapidly progressed. I believe our national defense would be well served by the development of an antimissile missile, to intercept enemy missiles before they could reach us.

I voted to prevent the distribution of Communist propaganda through the U.S. postal system.

I consistently vote against giving assistance to Communist countries through foreign aid gifts, or otherwise.

I consistently vote against granting recognition to Red China.

I support the House Committee on Un-American Activities, and vote against every attempt to abolish it. I do not court popularity with the anti-anti-Communists.

I voted against packing the Rules Committee.

I supported extending unemployment compensation for the alleviation of need during the recessions.

I voted for the minimum wage bill passed by the House.

I voted for the improvements in the social security program, and to improve old-age assistance and disability programs.

I supported the resolution to impose sanctions on Castro's Cuba.

I supported the authorization for new missiles, aircraft, and naval vessels for the Armed Forces.

It was on my request that Congress appropriated the money for the comprehensive survey of the Trinity River for overall planning to fully develop the Trinity.

I continually and consistently oppose the surrender of congressional powers to the executive, as being detrimental to the interest of the people.

I oppose Federal control of education.

I support separation of church and state.

I support local control of local affairs; consequently, I oppose attempts to impose Federal controls over such affairs.

I oppose the foreign aid programs. It wastes our resources, and also does more harm than good. The excuses given for foreign aid are that it buys friends and that it buys peace. Peace cannot be bought, but can only be guaranteed by a strong defense capability. Friendship cannot be bought with gifts or bribes. The failure of foreign aid is evident; when we started the program, communism controlled about 6 percent of the world's population; now, after $135 billion of foreign aid, communism controls about 35 percent of the world's people—and many of those Communist-controlled countries are still receiving our gifts, and using them adversely to our interests. Furthermore, we have reached the point in our financial condition that we are now borrowing from foreign countries some of the money that we are giving to them.

I sponsor legislation to ban obscene and indecent literature, and several of my proposals dealing with mailing obscene matter have been enacted into law.

I support equal rights for women.

I voted for the resolution to veto the proposed Department of Urban Affairs; such a bureau would have established Federal control over all actions and decisions of every city, town, and hamlet in the United States. I support local controls.

I support permitting American farmers to produce as much as they can of the sugar we use, rather than paying a premium for imported sugar. It would take hundreds of thousands of acres out of the production of surplus crops in the United States.

I supported and voted for the appropriations for aircraft, missiles, and vessels for the Armed Forces.

I voted to repeal the transportation tax on people. Many folks do not have automobiles and must travel by bus or other public transportation. The 10 percent tax on the bus fare is a tax on poor people, and should be repealed.

I support and vote for the bills which would protect local and States' rights, as well as individual rights, from being overridden by the U.S. Supreme Court. The judiciary should not be permitted to legislate.

I am opposed to deficit spending, and vote against the annual, and often twice-annual increase in the national debt limit. Fiscal responsibility demands that the Government live within its income, yet year after year, the debt increases. A family could not get away with such extravagance—neither can a government.

I voted for the law to provide a program for the nationwide eradication of hog cholera.

I voted for the act to permit farmer participation in the development of farm programs.

I voted for the 2-year extension of the impacted area school act and the National Defense Education Act.

I voted to strengthen the Subversive Activities Control Act by requiring the registration of persons disseminating political propaganda as agents of a foreign principal.

I support and vote for bills to provide more equitable compensation, pensions, and hospital care for our veterans.

I support the REA, which has made electricity available to farm homes.

I support the FHA and the veterans' loan programs, so more people can own their homes.

I supported and voted for the Landrum-Griffin labor bill, after my amendment was adopted to limit the powers granted to Federal bureaucracy which would have been injurious to the honest rank-and-file union members.

This law protects union members and the general public from tyranny, exploitation, racketeering, and embezzlement by unscrupulous labor bosses who have bludgeoned their way into the union movement, and gives the members a voice in their union affairs. Since its enactment, exconvicts have been removed from positions of union leadership.

I supported and voted for the bill to establish rules of interpretation which would be binding on the U.S. Supreme Court in cases concerning questions of the effect of acts of Congress on State laws. This bill would have protected State laws from the whims of the members of the Supreme Court.

I voted for the bills to set aside the Mallory rule adopted by the U.S. Supreme Court, under which rule self-confessed murderers, rapists, and other offenders are set scot free to repeat their offenses.

I voted for the use of farm surplus foods to assist needy Americans. This is in line with my voting for the people, and my belief that we should take care of our own.

I voted for the program of disposal of our agricultural surplus through barter with foreign nations, trading it to them for something we could use, rather than giving it to them.

I oppose and vote against proposals to grant more powers and controls to Federal bureaucracy and centralized government.

I oppose and vote against proposals to give bureaucratic control over individuals and localities. Controls destroy the God-given freedoms which have made us a powerful and strong nation.

I voted for the bill to provide for the development and modernization of navigation and traffic control facilities to serve the needs of civil and military aviation.

I voted for the adjustments of the basic compensation of officers and employees of the Federal Government.

I voted to establish the Air Force Academy, and also strongly supported the effort made by some of us to have it located in Texas.

I voted for adjustments of basic pay for officers and enlisted members of the uniformed services.

I voted for the law to improve and strengthen the national transportation system.

I support and vote for the special milk program for children.

I support and vote for the school lunch program.

I voted for the bills to establish rules governing questions of the effect of acts of Congress on State laws, the purpose being to protect the rights of the several States to enact and enforce their own internal laws.

I voted for the bill to relieve farmers from excise taxes on gasoline and fuels used for farming purposes, in line with my policy of voting for the benefit of people.

I consistently vote for funds for expenses of the Committee on Un-American Activities, to further its efforts to protect our Nation from communism and subversion.

I vote for the bills to take the Government out of competition with people in business.

I support the bills to require uniformity of procurement practices in the armed services, to eliminate duplication, waste and exorbitant prices.

I voted for the brucellosis eradication program.

I support the bills to strengthen the antitrust laws, to preserve competition, and to secure equal opportunity of all persons to compete in trade or business.

I voted for the bill requiring an annual review of military personnel requirements.

I voted for the bill to return Texas title to the Tidelands, thus setting aside the effort of the Supreme Court to take from us the property we had dedicated to our Texas schools.

I supported and voted for the effort to amend the Trade Agreements Extension Act to provide adequate protection for American workers, miners, farmers and producers; again, I was voting for the people, and against special interests.

I voted for the act having for its purpose to preserve small business institutions and free, competitive enterprise.

I consistently vote to preserve the Walter-McCarran Act, in order to keep undesirable aliens from flooding our country, and taking American jobs.

I voted to keep the Texas national forests intact. Proceeds from timber sales help support school districts and county governments, making tax rates lower on individuals.

I voted to increase the personal and dependency exemptions for income tax purposes. The bill lost, but I followed my policy, and voted for the people.

I voted to authorize use of information intercepted in national security investigations in the trial of subversives.

I voted to increase the amount of earnings permitted without loss of social security benefits.

I voted for social security benefits for the disabled.

I voted for the provisions to permit men and women to elect to draw social security benefits at age 62.

I support strengthening the laws relating to espionage and sabotage.

I supported and voted for education and training benefits for veterans.

I supported and voted for the bill which repealed many of the so-called nuisance excise taxes. This was a vote for the people.

I voted for the bills to improve the Railroad Retirement Act.

I voted for the manpower and training bill, to relieve unemployment.

I voted for the bill to outlaw the Communist Party and to prohibit members of Communist organizations from serving in certain representative capacities.

I supported the bill to prohibit payments of Government annuities and pensions to any person convicted of an offense against the security of the United States. Alger Hiss was a prime reason for the act.

I opposed the creation of a Disarmament Agency while we are trying to build an invincible defense force. We should not be dissipating our energies and resources by creating conflicting forces in our Government.

I supported the grants to the States to provide assistance for construction of nursing homes and health services for the aged and chronically ill.

I supported the program to provide more trained teachers for deaf children.

I support the programs for soil, water, and other resources, conservation, and flood control.

I vote for the people, and against the alien philosophies, by whatever name their adherents call themselves, which are adverse to the interests of America.

I voted to guarantee the right of trial by jury in Federal courts.

I have responded to every community request for assistance in its economic development, and its dealings with the Federal Government.

I have aided thousands of individuals in the presentation of their claims and problems to departments of governments.

The above list could be multiplied, but will be concluded with a few general principles. I support a realistic foreign policy based on the interests of America, rather than trying to "buy" friends; I vote for economy in Government: for curbs on inflation; for military procurement by competitive bid to save billions of dollars for the taxpayers; I oppose unwise spending, high taxes, and a big public debt that mortgages our children's future.

I support the right to own property, even if it is just the clothes I wear. The disciples of the alien thought, which says I am 100 percent wrong, would deny any of us the right to own our property, little though it might be.

This record I have made. I stand on it.

WILLARD EDWARDS

Mr. KYL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DERWINSKI] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, on Saturday night, March 17, in the National Press Club, the "30" Club, an organization made up of former employees of the Washington Times-Herald and the International News Service, held its eighth annual reunion. As is usual at these reunions, the club, in cooperation with the Royal McBee Corp., made its annual award for excellent reporting. I am happy to report that the winner of the award this year is an outstanding Washington correspondent for the Chicago Tribune, Willard Edwards.

Mr. Edwards, who has covered Capitol Hill for more than 30 years and is well known by most of us in this body, joins a list of "30" Club winners which includes Bob Considine, of the Hearst Headliner Service; Edward T. Folliard, of the Washington Post; the late Ed Koterba of Scripps-Howard; and Richard Fryklund, of the Washington Evening Star.

Mr. Edwards long has been nationally famous and has won several journalistic citations for his coverage of communistic activities and espionage matters. His award this year is in recognition of his work in this field. Particularly cited were his articles on attempts by left-wing elements to influence thinking on the campus of Knox College in Galesburg, Ill., and his successful thwarting of that campaign. In addition, Mr. Edwards was cited for his clear and factual reporting in articles concerning the State and Defense Departments' censorship of anti-Communist statements by members of the military.

I have been informed that Mr. Edwards was chosen over more than 30 other nominees for this year's award. Certainly it is heartening at this time, when so many awards are based upon the so-called interpretive style of reporting, to find that an organization made up entirely of former working members of two great staffs—the Washington Times-Herald and International News Service—selected as the winner of their annual prize a man whose stories, although dealing with a highly controversial subject, were objective and accurate and contained no degree of "slanting." That these articles laid bare the deceit of the campaign to subvert our youth and clarified an otherwise murky picture on at least one American campus is, in my opinion, worthy of the highest commendation.

I am sure it is the hope of all patriotic Americans that Mr. Edwards and those of his colleagues who so long have worked to combat Communist subversion will continue their efforts in this direction.

THE STORY OF CONNECTICUT 65 PLAN—HEALTH CARE FOR THE AGED

Mr. KYL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CURTIS] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, in my remarks last week on health insurance for our people, I noted the startling success of the Connecticut 65 plan—see CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, March 5, 1962, page 3416 and earlier references, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 107, part 8, pages 10715–10717. This plan is a breakthrough in catastrophic insurance for people over 65 and is currently being studied by other States and groups throughout our country. I promised at that time to place in the RECORD an up-to-date report of the plan.

Mr. Speaker, I should like to point out at the outset the significance of the Connecticut 65 plan to the debate on medical care for the aged. The proponents of the King-Anderson bill have argued that the private sector cannot finance an adequate system of health insurance. By ignoring or minimizing the progress that is being made in private insurance they build up their case for utilizing the social security mechanism. I shall not at this time go into the arguments for and against the social security approach. I would refer my colleagues instead to the excellent statement of Robert A. Forsythe, former Assistant Secretary, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, placed in the RECORD by my colleague, ANCHER NELSEN—see daily CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, February 12, 1962, pages A1019–A1020. I shall, however, answer the charge that private insurance is incapable of meeting the health needs of our people. I ask only that we look at the record, especially at the breakthrough represented by Connecticut 65.

There are two distinct problems in providing health care for the aged: First, we have the immediate problem of that part of the population over 65. This group has had limited opportunity to benefit from the new forms of prepaid, noncancellable insurance which are becoming increasingly available to the public at large.

This group has a lower percentage of health insurance coverage compared with the total population. In 1952, 31 percent of those over 65 had coverage as against 59 percent for the total population. By 1959 the comparable figures were 53 percent versus 73 percent—a remarkable growth. I have commented previously on the rapid growth of the private sector—see CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, March 7, pages 3580–3581. The Kerr-Mills Act was passed to fill this gap. Given the growth of private insurance this part of our problem is steadily phasing out.

The second problem is to see that people over 65 in the future have health insurance, that is that we build up a permanent program of prepaid noncancellable health insurance fully paid up at age 65. The proponents of the King-Anderson bill have recognized that this is the only adequate long term solution to our problem of financing medical care. I would argue, however, that the private sector is better able to provide this form of insurance and that it is doing so. See CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, March 5, 1962, pages 3416–3426.

Connecticut 65 is aimed at solving the first problem—providing adequate insurance for the group over 65. It represents the cooperative venture of 32 participating companies to provide insurance against major—catastrophic—medical expenses for Connecticut residents 65 and over—without a physical examination—and at a low cost. The Connecticut 65 plan is designed to help people from becoming medically indigent. It pays so that the Kerr-Mills program will not have to pay.

The program has had an outstanding initial success. In the first open enrollment period—September 1 to September 30, 1961—22,000 individuals were enrolled in the program. This figure represents 20 percent of the real market—see below section IV statistics concerning Connecticut's aged population. A new open enrollment period is being planned. The average age of those insured is over 70. As of February 7, 1962, benefit payments had totaled about $160,000 with a substantial number of claims pending.

The following description of the plan, its chronology, presentation to the public, and statistics have been excerpted from the "Story of Connecticut 65 Extended Health Insurance," published by the Associated Connecticut Health Insurance Cos., 650 Main Street, Hartford 3, Conn. The complete memorandum and supporting exhibits may be obtained upon request:

THE STORY OF CONNECTICUT 65 EXTENDED HEALTH INSURANCE

FOREWORD

On November 14, 1961, the board of directors of the Health Insurance Association

of America adopted as policy a recommendation that its 285 member insurance companies make every effort to stimulate the adoption throughout the United States of plans comparable to the Connecticut 65 plan. Any such effort may be assisted by a basic understanding of the Connecticut 65 plan itself, the reasons behind its development, the problems encountered and how they were solved.

This memorandum is designed to answer these primary questions in summary form. The annexed exhibits, copies of actual key documents on which the plan is based and marketed, speak for themselves and should be valuable as guides to an understanding of the program.

It is also hoped that the memorandum will be helpful to newspaper editors, golden age groups, State insurance commissioners, Congressmen and State legislators, as well as other insurance companies, who have requested information about Connecticut 65.

It should be made clear at the outset that Connecticut 65 is but one more demonstration of the flexibility and ingenuity of the competitive voluntary health insurance business in its constant effort to meet public needs and demands. While it constituted a major breakthrough in major medical insurance for the elderly in 1961, the participating companies are confident that, with continued freedom to experiment, similar breakthroughs will occur frequently in the future.

I. SUMMARY OF THE PLAN

Connecticut 65 is the short name for Connecticut 65 extended health insurance. Its purpose is to make major medical insurance available without physical examination to individual elderly residents of the State. It is underwritten by 32 insurance companies authorized to write health insurance in the State of Connecticut. It is marketed through a voluntary unincorporated association called Associated Connecticut Health Insurance Cos., which originally consisted of 10 Connecticut-domiciled companies which were joined by 22 others domiciled elsewhere but writing health insurance in Connecticut.

Coverage is provided under a policy issued to a trustee bank, and is available to Connecticut residents age 65 or over. However, a Connecticut resident who moves away can maintain his coverage if he keeps up the premium. If one spouse is eligible and elects the coverage, the other is also eligible if not less than 55 years old and not working more than 30 hours a week. Coverage is available without physical examination or health questions, but to be eligible an applicant must not have been confined in a general, special, or convalescent hospital during the 31 days prior to his enrollment.

Much thought and study was given to the plan of benefits to be offered. Not only was the experience of the companies used for this purpose, but valuable suggestions were received from medical society officials and others.

The applicant has a choice of four optional plans:

Option 1 costs $10 a month and provides a lifetime major medical benefit limit of $10,000, of which no more than $5,000 may be used in a single year.

Option 2 costs $7.50 a month and provides a lifetime benefit limit of $5,000, with a $2,500 limit in a single year.

Option 3 costs $17 a month and provides the $10,000 major medical plus a plan of basic hospital and surgical benefits.

Option 4 costs $14.50 a month and provides the $5,000 major medical plus a plan of basic hospital and surgical benefits.

The basic hospital and surgical benefits of options 3 and 4 are designed to complement the major medical benefits and to be available only to those who do not have other basic benefits.

Basic benefits

The basic hospital-surgical benefits of options 3 and 4 pay hospital room and board charges up to $12 a day for a maximum of 31 days in each calendar year; other hospital charges up to $125 per calendar year; surgical charges up to the maximum under a schedule of surgical procedures with a maximum benefit of $360 in any one year.

Major medical benefits

The major medical benefits contain a deductible which is applied on a calendar-year basis. The deductible is a variable sum consisting of $100 plus the amount of benefits provided under Connecticut 65 basic, whether the insured had Connecticut 65 basic or not.

Major medical expenses are classified into type I and type II. Type I expenses are hospital expenses; type II expenses are covered medical expenses other than hospital expenses. After the deductible, the plan pays 100 percent of all type I covered expenses up to $250, and then 80 percent of the remainder. It pays 80 percent of the type II covered expenses.

Type I expenses, under the $10,000 plan (options 1 and 3), are hospital room and board charges up to $18 per day and charges for other hospital services and supplies; or, after 5 days in a general or special hospital, room and board in a convalescent hospital up to $10 a day, for as long as 90 days in a year.

Type II expenses under the same options include surgical fees up to one and two-thirds times the amount shown on the basic schedule; anesthesia fees up to 20 percent of the surgical fee allowance; charges for nursing by registered nurses in or out of the hospital up to $18 per day; doctors' calls up to $6; and the usual range of drugs, diagnostic services, and other medical services and supplies.

Under the lower $5,000 major medical plan, the specified limits on type I and type II expenses are somewhat less, but the principle is the same. For example, the limit on hospital room and board is $15 a day.

Detailed examples of how the benefits work out will be found on pages 8 to 10 of the "Answers to Your Questions" booklet in exhibit 8. A few examples will suffice. In one case, for total expenses of $1,587 for a heart attack, Connecticut 65 option 3 would have paid $1,216. In another case, for total expenses of $630 for gallbladder removal, benefits would have been $530. In a third case, for total expenses of $2,587 for lung cancer, benefits would have been $2,022.

II. BRIEF CHRONOLOGY OF CONNECTICUT 65

One of the most extraordinary things about the Connecticut 65 plan is that the idea was not even in being 11 months before the beginning of the enrollment period on September 1, 1961. Between October 1, 1960, and September 1, 1961, the idea became crystallized; permissive legislation was requested and enacted; 32 health insurance companies were participating in a newly formed voluntary association; and an intensive promotion campaign was underway.

In September 1960, it was obvious that, while at least three out of every four of Connecticut's elderly population were covered for basic protection against health care costs, nevertheless, many were unable to obtain major medical insurance to protect them against the cost of catastrophic illness.

In the first weeks of October 1960, an ad hoc committee of representatives from five Hartford insurance companies convened, and a working committee of six began frequent sessions that still continue. It was the consensus that the Connecticut companies represented should explore thoroughly the possibility of meeting needs in the major medical area for those 65 and over. The ad hoc committee directed the committee of six to develop the entire program in detail and report back by the end of the year 1960.

In November and December 1960, drafts of the Connecticut 65 plan itself, the necessary legislation, and the framework of a voluntary association had been completed, plus programs for all-important liaison with such as: legislators, doctors, nursing homes, hospitals, agents of all lines, newspaper editors, social welfare authorities, etc. Drafting and redrafting of the basic documents continued for months.

In January 1961, the initial announcement of the plan was made and legislation was introduced in the 1961 session of the Connecticut General Assembly. Meetings were held with representatives of agents' associations.

In March, the proposal was presented to the insurance committee of the general assembly in support of the permissive legislation. The Connecticut State Medical Society, the Connecticut Chamber of Commerce, the Connecticut Association of Insurance Agents, and the Connecticut Association of Life Underwriters all supported the bill at the hearing.

In April, the bill passed both houses of the general assembly. It was signed by the Governor on May 3, 1961, as Public Act 95 (exhibit 1). Also in May, 10 Connecticut companies accepted invitations to join the proposed Associated Connecticut Health Insurance Cos. Claims, policy forms, and promotion subcommittees were appointed, and an advertising agency and a direct-mail agency were retained.

In June and July 1961, the drafting and revision continued. The subscription agreement (exhibit 2) was signed by 10 Connecticut companies, which were soon joined in the next few months by 22 companies domiciled elsewhere but writing a substantial volume of health insurance in Connecticut. The policy forms and the enrollment booklet were filed with the Connecticut Insurance Department which was kept advised of developments.

The direct-mail campaign began August 18 and lasted until September 21. Education of agents through slide films and flip charts was under way. During this period, an agreement was also executed with a trustee bank as policyholder of the Connecticut 65 plan.

III. PRESENTATION TO THE PUBLIC, AND RESULTS

Early in April 1961, a subcommittee on promotion was formed, whose first duty was to determine the budgetary needs of a campaign to market Connecticut 65.

It was determined that a budget of $190,000 was indicated, and, upon authorization of this amount by the executive committee of the association, two separate firms were employed; one, an expert specializing in newspaper, radio, and TV advertising; and another, specializing in direct-mail advertising.

The advertising program comprised a series of full-page and half-page ads in all Connecticut daily and Sunday newspapers beginning August 20, 10 days prior to the beginning of the enrollment period, and continuing through the month of September. During this same period, 337 spot announcements were made over 36 Connecticut radio stations and 33 spot announcements per week were aired over the three Connecticut TV outlets.

This program developed 12,805 inquiries, of which 2,034 were converted into enrollments. It also brought in 1,463 direct enrollments through enrollment coupons which were an integral part of the advertising copy. The value of this program cannot be measured only by the immediate results attributed to it, since the communication problem involved demanded a very widespread impact upon the entire Connecticut citizenry, whether part of the actual market for Connecticut 65 or not.

The direct-mail program included promotions to agents, to employees, and policy-

holders of the participating companies, and to people of influence in business, professional, and civic circles. Heavy mailings were, of course, directed to two major prospect groups—those 65 or over and those 40 to 65, the latter representing the sons, daughters, and others concerned in the welfare of their elders.

Agents received a comprehensive promotional kit which included enrollment forms, sales aids, instructions, and reorder forms for all the materials furnished; 9,906 enrollments came in through agents.

Several of the large participating companies made mailings to their Connecticut employees and policyholders. Centers of influence mailings to doctors, lawyers, bankers, and State and municipal leaders included complete information about Connecticut 65 in booklets: 2,280 enrollments resulted from these combined activities.

A prospect mailing of 380,000 reached the primary market of those 65 and over and the secondary market of those 40 to 65.

As inquiries came in from these mailings and from the newspaper, radio and TV campaign, appropriate additional material was mailed to those inquiring, including enrollment forms. In all, some 600,000 pieces were mailed, developing 30,000 inquiries which resulted in 8,201 enrollments.

Backing up this intensive promotion was a continuous publicity campaign undertaken by the Insurance Information Office of Connecticut. This campaign started with newspaper releases in January 1961, when the original bill was introduced in the legislature, and continued through the legislative hearings. This was followed by pictures of the Governor signing the enabling bill into law, and news stories on all phases of the organization and progress of the program, including the final results.

The program was the subject of frequent favorable editorial comment in the Connecticut press. This was most welcome to the participating companies. The information office also arranged for many meetings with Connecticut State agents' associations, at which time the plan and the marketing program were presented graphically through liberal use of visual aids. These meetings were largely responsible for the interest and enthusiasm of the agents in endorsing and promoting the plan.

No opportunity for promotion was overlooked. The toll-free telephone number for inquiries at headquarters was Enterprise 6565. The appearance of the insurance policy itself, copies of which have been widely circulated, was given professional attention, as was that of the enrollment booklet. Even the enrollment form was revised to reflect suggestions made from the marketing point of view.

As stated elsewhere, all promotional releases and devices were reviewed by qualified advisers and cleared for conformance with all regulatory requirements. The development of a sympathetic working relationship between the promotion people on the one hand, and the underwriting and legal teams on the other, was essential to the development of a successful marketing procedure. Successive enrollment periods are contemplated, the first in 1962. This, too, will be marked by advertising and direct mail promotion commencing shortly before the enrollment period opens. It is not anticipated that this enrollment period will involve the large-scale operation believed to have been necessary initially, since the momentum gained during September is being maintained by a low-key advertising program to keep Connecticut 65 before the public.

Enrollment results

The first enrollment period was restricted to 1 month—September 1961. During that period the number actually enrolled was 21,850. This was a gratifying percentage of the real market among Connecticut's elderly, as the statistics in the next section will show.

At the headquarters of the Associated Connecticut Health Insurance Cos. in Hartford, by mail and telephone during September 1961, there were 45,122 inquiries processed.

Under Connecticut 65, the insured does not have to sign the enrollment form. All promotional material emphasized this fact. As a result, almost 30 percent of the 21,850 enrollees were enrolled by sons, daughters or others who felt morally or legally responsible for them.

Thirteen thousand seven hundred and seventy enrolled for option 1, $10,000 maximum, major medical only; 4,891 enrolled for option 2, $5,000 maximum, major medical only. Thus, 85 percent did not enroll for basic benefits. This confirmed the belief of the participating companies that a great preponderance of Connecticut's elder citizens already had basic medical and hospitalization protection.

Three thousand one hundred and eighty-one enrolled for one of the major medical options plus the Connecticut 65 basic benefits.

The average age of those enrolling was almost 75 years.

Fourteen thousand nine hundred and four of the enrollees were females.

The period of a fixed 1-month enrollment was selected and adhered to for two reasons. First, there was the obvious underwriting reason: To prevent antiselection by those who might otherwise defer enrollment until the time they knew they would be hospitalized. More important was the human foible of procrastination, with action spurred only by a categorical deadline. For example, on September 25, 5 days before the close of the enrollment on midnight of a Saturday, only 7,193 enrollments had been received. More enrollments were received during the last day of the enrollment period than during the first 3 weeks.

Almost 50 percent of the enrollment was received as the result of the activities by agents. The Connecticut Insurance Department permitted any resident Connecticut agent, licensed to write health insurance, to participate in the Connecticut 65 plan, whether or not the company with which he held a contract was a participating company in that plan. Commissions for agents ranged from $5 for the $5,000 major medical (option 2) to $10 for the larger major medical combined with basic (option 3). Thus, an agent could earn as much as $20 for a sale to a couple. Commissions are payable only at the inception of the coverage. However, it was the expressed intention of the Associated Connecticut Health Insurance Cos., if commissions on all policies not received through agents had exceeded advertising expenses, to allocate the difference among agents in proportion to their writings.

As far as marketing is concerned, our experience indicates that a short but intensive communications campaign is the proper approach, and that the promotional team should be organized early and be kept fully advised as to the development of the program. Representatives of the agency forces of the State should be brought into the picture as soon as practicable and their active support secured, not only for the purposes of seeking their endorsement of the necessary legislation, but also for communication of the program to the insuring public.

IV. STATISTICS CONCERNING CONNECTICUT'S AGED POPULATION

The companies developing the plan considered it feasible for other reasons, which included the economic standing of Connecticut's elderly population; the fact that three out of four already had some sort of basic health insurance; and the compact size of Connecticut.

Connecticut is a small State, 49th in area, any part of which can be reached in little over an hour's drive from Hartford.

Its population totals 2,535,000. Of this number, about 10 percent, or 242,615, are age 65 and over. The real market, however, for the plan was in reality far below this figure. For example, 25,000 of the elderly are confined to State and Veterans' Administration institutions. Fourteen thousand receive medical care and living payments through the old-age assistance program. Another 55,000 are still employed (with their wives, this total swells to some 92,000), and certainly a very large percentage of this group is covered under employer-sponsored group insurance programs. Furthermore, an increasing number of group plans are continuing major medical coverage for retired employees.

In addition, Connecticut has implemented the Federal Kerr-Mills program and, effective April 15, 1962, it is expected that there will be an additional 35,000 persons whose income and asset status makes them eligible for the payment of a considerable part of their medical-care expense through tax funds. After application of a $100 deductible under the Connecticut Kerr-Mills Act (Public Act 578, 1961), the actual claimants in any one year are expected to number some 11,000.

Thus, after eliminating those who may not have a need for coverage of the type provided under the Connecticut 65 program, the real market was about one-half the total of age 65 and over in the State. Therefore, the number enrolling during the initial 1-month enrollment period represents 20 percent of the real market.

Connecticut is also a wealthy State. Its average social security benefits are at the highest level in the country, and the income and assets, including home ownership, of its elderly population are also well above the national average.

The drafters of Connecticut 65 felt that this program could help many persons from becoming medically indigent under the Connecticut Kerr-Mills program. This in turn would lower tax costs of the State of Connecticut.

Consequently, there is no exclusion under the Connecticut 65 plan for expenses which otherwise would be payable under the Kerr-Mills program in the absence of this insurance. In other words, Connecticut 65 will pay so the Kerr-Mills program will not have to pay.

TARIFFS ON TAPIOCA

Mr. KYL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CURTIS] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, yesterday I introduced, together with the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. O'BRIEN], a bill relating to tariffs on tapioca. These bills are H.R. 10823 and H.R. 10833. An explanation of these bills follows:

PROBLEM TO WHICH LEGISLATION IS DIRECTED

Tapioca starch was placed on the free list under paragraph 1781 of the Tariff Act of 1930. It has been bound on the duty-free list by subsequent trade agreements. Tapioca starch was the only major starch which was not subjected to duty under the Tariff Act. All other competitive starches are dutiable. The United States is the only major starch producing country which does not impose a duty on tapioca starch.

It has been reported that the European Common Market will impose a 28-percent ad valorem duty on tapioca starch. Brazil, the negotiating country on whose behalf tapioca is presently bound free under the GATT agreement, imposes a duty of 80 percent ad valorem on both tapioca and corn starch. Thailand, the major producer of tapioca, imposes a duty of the equivalent of 4.75 U.S. cents per pound, or 27½ percent ad valorem, whichever is higher.

As a result increasingly large quantities of tapioca starch are being imported into the United States. These imports are replacing domestic corn, potato, and wheat starches in the major uses, the paper and textile fields. The domestic starch producers are in a vulnerable position because the United States has no tariff while the other major countries do have a tariff. Imports of tapioca in 1961 were approximately 307 million pounds as compared with approximately 65 million pounds per year in 1952, 1953, and 1954.

PROPOSED REMEDY

The proposed legislation would continue duty-free imports of tapioca in an amount equal to the average annual imports for the years 1958, 1959, and 1960. It would subject imports over these quotas to the statutory rate of duty of 1½ cents per pound, the lowest statutory rate applicable to the other competitive starches.

PROPOSED LEGISLATION DOES NOT CONFLICT WITH TRADE AGREEMENT PROGRAM

The proposed legislation does not seek an exemption from either the present or the proposed trade agreement program. The rate of duty imposed would be subject to any applicable trade agreement action. Instead, the proposed treatment is consistent with purpose of H.R. 9900. Tapioca starch is a tropical product under section 213 of that bill. The report of the Joint Economic Committee to the Congress points out that the United States has a strong interest in seeing that the underdeveloped countries have access to the Common Market as well as to the U.S. market. (See p. 16 of report.) The imposition of the proposed duty would make the imports of tapioca into the United States in excess of the quotas subject to dutiable treatment approximately the equivalent of that now imposed by the E.E.C. countries. These duties would be subject to trade agreement negotiation as are any other duties.

H.R. 10823

A bill to amend the Tariff Act of 1930 to provide quota limitations on imports of duty-free tapioca and to provide for a tariff on additional imports

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That Paragraph 1781, Tariff Act of 1930 (U.S.C., 1958 edition, Title 19, Sec. 1201, Par. 1781), is amended by substituting a colon for the period at the end thereof and inserting the following: "*Provided,* That the aggregate quantity of tapioca, tapioca flour, and cassava which may be entered, or withdrawn from warehouse, for consumption, free of duty, shall not exceed in any calendar year 228,260,266 pounds, of which not more than 167,674,115 pounds may have been imported from Thailand, not more than 51,217,502 pounds may have been imported from Brazil, and not more than 9,368,649 pounds in the aggregate may have been imported from Taiwan, France, Cuba, Federation of Malaya, French West Africa (Togoland), Argentina, Malagasy Republic, Hong Kong, India, Jamaica, Indonesia, Dominican Republic, Singapore, Philippine Republic, Paraguay, Netherlands, Uruguay, Kuwait, Mexico, French Equatorial Africa, Ecuador, Sweden, Colombia, West Germany, Guatemala, and Italy; That tapioca, tapioca flour, and cassava may not be imported free of duty from a country, island, or territory not one of the countries, islands, and territories specified above; That any tapioca, tapioca flour, and cassava not entitled to be entered, or withdrawn from warehouse, for consumption, free of duty, shall be dutiable at 1½ cents per pound: *And provided further,* That tapioca, tapioca flour, and cassava may not be imported if it was produced or processed in, or transshipped via, a country, island, or territory which has been determined under Section 5, Trade Agreements Extension Act of 1951 (U.S.C., 1958 edition, Title 19, Sec. 1362), to be a nation or area dominated or controlled by the foreign government or foreign organization controlling the world Communist movement; That, if any country, island or territory which has been assigned an exclusive duty-free quota herein is determined to be a nation or area dominated or controlled by the foreign government or foreign organization controlling the world Communist movement, the yearly duty-free quota assigned to such country, or so much thereof as remains unfilled when such determination is made, may not be filled by the remaining countries, islands, and territories, but any such country's, island's, or territory's quota shall be reinstated automatically at the beginning of the year next following any year in which it has been determined that such country, island, or territory is no longer a nation or area dominated or controlled by the foreign government or foreign organization controlling the world Communist movement."

SEC. 2. The amendments made by this Act shall be effective with respect to merchandise entered, or withdrawn from warehouse, for consumption, on or after January 1, 1962.

A REPORT ON THE ADMINISTRATION'S FARM BILL

Mr. KYL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. LATTA] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. LATTA. Mr. Speaker, the House Committee on Agriculture has now completed public hearings on H.R. 10010, formally cited as the "Food and Agriculture Act of 1962" but better known as the administration's farm bill. The opponents of this legislation are labeling it with a diversity of descriptive titles such as "The Farmers' Jail Act of 1962," "The Farmers' Strait-Jacket Act," "The Death Sentence for the Family Farmer," and so forth.

The Secretary of Agriculture refers to it as a supply-management bill. Call it what you will, I have come to the conclusion after listening to scores of witnesses before our committee that the farmers of the Nation and of the Fifth Congressional District of Ohio should be aware of its contents, should know of its mandatory features, and be advised of the sweeping authority sought by the Secretary of Agriculture. The bill is in keeping with the theory running rampant in Washington that it is now necessary for the benefit of the farmer to have a planned agricultural economy in America. Such a theory is so inconsistent with the free enterprise system that made America great that it is needless for me to say that I disagree with it.

Last year, in H.R. 6400, the administration requested virtual blank-check legislative authority to write its own programs for all agricultural commodities. This requested authority was not granted as Congress firmly believed that it still should exercise its constitutional authority of writing and passing legislation. This year's bill seeks supply-management control over only four—but major—commodity groups: feed grains—corn, oats, barley, grain sorghums—wheat, dairy products, and turkeys. Unlike last year's bill, H.R. 10010 makes no allusion that it is to "strengthen the family farm." In fact, it seems consistent with the thinking reported by the Wall Street Journal—December 18, 1961—to be found in the Secretary's 84-page confidential staff report that many farmers will have to "get off their farms" and that "the suspicion is bound to arise that this whole positive food policy for the United States is aimed more at luring the city vote than at capturing the Farm Belt."

TITLE I. LAND-USE ADJUSTMENT

This title permanently extends the ACP program and repeals present law calling for development of State ACP plans. Authorizes long-term—up to 15 years—agreements for land retirement, cropping, land uses and practices, including soil and water conservation, forestry, wildlife, and recreation development.

No limitations as in present law on distribution of funds to States, size of payments, acquisition of property rights, payments to producers, and so forth.

The title authorizes the Secretary to purchase, sell, lease, and acquire rights-of-way and easements over untold millions of acres of farmland for public purposes and "more economic uses." The Secretary has testified that under the bill whole farms could be removed from production and that some 50 to 60 million acres would not be needed for production over the next 18 years. The most important issue raised here involves the power of eminent domain by the Federal Government to condemn and seize land from farmers unwilling to sell. Also raised is the question of the disastrous effect large purchase of farmland by the Federal Government would have on local communities now hard pressed for school and other revenues.

TITLE II. AGRICULTURAL TRADE DEVELOPMENT

This title amends Public Law 480 to permit overseas donation of commodities administratively deemed to be in surplus although not in actual inventory of CCC. Amends Public Law 480 by transferring from the Secretary of Agriculture to the President the discretion as to which friendly foreign nations may participate in long-term dollar sales.

The most sweeping provision found in this title would commit the United States to an international food program directed by the United Nations. Under this bill, commodities to be furnished by us to the United Nations would be under the exclusive control of that body for disposal as it sees fit. It is interesting to note that it is reported that Secretary Freeman promised the Food and Agricultural Organization of the United Nations $40 million in funds and commodities for its first year of operation while attending its annual meeting in Rome,

Italy, last November. There are no reservations or safeguards in the bill for the United States to prevent the United Nations from disposing of this food in a manner inconsistent with our national policy.

TITLE III. MARKETING ORDERS

This title authorizes compulsory checkoffs for market research and promotion for milk after separate referenda. Authorizes quotas and allotments on individual producers of turkeys and turkey hatching eggs. It also authorizes the establishment of producer quotas and allotments under Federal milk marketing orders. Under present law, marketing orders apply only to processors.

Evidence shows that turkey production increased sharply in 1961—25 percent over 1960—as turkey producers sought to establish a historical record of production in anticipation of controls.

This section presents a serious threat to the successful operation of our present milk-marketing orders in Ohio as we would be forced to cut back production while other areas not covered by marketing orders would not be required to cut their production. However, section IV of the bill would make this section meaningless if it stays in the bill as it would apply allotments and quotas to all milk producers.

TITLE IV. COMMODITY PROGRAMS

This is the real bonecrusher in the bill. It deals with new programs for wheat, feed grains, and dairy products.

One basic fact has emerged from my examination of these proposed compulsory programs. They would make it extremely difficult for the small- and medium-sized family farmers to survive. They all impose strict control programs and grant broad discretionary powers to the Secretary of Agriculture in the areas of price support, diversion payments, and in establishing sharp cuts in production. They make no distinction between different areas of the country or the type product being produced. This is of vital importance to our Soft Red wheat farmers in Ohio who are producing a class of wheat having less than a 2-month carryover of surplus stocks. Some of them impose heavy fines and prison terms in Federal penitentiaries for farmers.

And finally, none of them give the small farmers any real opportunity to vote in the so-called referendums which decide their economic fate the same as it does the large producer.

WHEAT

The administration is apparently abandoning the idea of fixed or rigid price supports. It is interesting to note that the 1960 Democratic platform and Candidate Kennedy promised farmers supports at 90 percent of parity. It is, instead, requesting that the Congress give the Secretary of Agriculture wide latitude in fixing price supports. The bill requests authority for a three-price support system for wheat. That portion of a farmer's wheat crop determined by the Secretary of Agriculture to be for export would be supported from 0 to 90 percent of parity; that portion determined by the Secretary to be the farmer's share of the domestic market would be supported from 75 to 90 percent of parity; that portion of the farmer's crop determined by the Secretary to be his share of the wheat used for feed purposes would be supported at a price related to the world price and in relation to the feed value of wheat to other feed grains. The world price of Soft Red Winter wheat is now $1.64 per bushel on the east coast. What the farmer would lose through such a program would probably go to pay the untold thousands of additional personnel needed to administer such a program.

The consumer would dislike such a program as much as the farmer. Wheat would cost more for human consumption than it would if you were feeding it to the hogs.

The bill repeals the present 30-acre wheat-for-feed exemption and the present 55-million-acre national minimum wheat allotment. It would instead give the power to the Secretary of Agriculture to decide how much the Nation and each farmer could produce. The amount of land to be diverted from wheat production and the rate of payment for such diversion would be determined by the Secretary.

Those producers staying within their allotments, and not taking advantage of the 15-acre exemption, would be entitled to vote in wheat referendums. However, the choice in such a referendum would be between what the Secretary of Agriculture was offering and no supports whatsoever; plus the right contained in section 409 of the bill for the Secretary to dump up to 200 million bushels of Government wheat on the market in any one marketing year.

The penalty sections applicable to wheat farmers seem unduly severe. These penalties range from a $5,000 fine for failing to keep proper records or violating a Department of Agriculture regulation to 10 years in the Federal penitentiary and/or a $10,000 fine for forging or altering a wheat marketing certificate.

FEED GRAINS

The feed-grain provisions of the bill would impose compulsory acreage allotments and marketing quotas on all farmers who were fortunate enough to have been producing corn, oats, barley, or grain sorghums in 1959 and 1960. The unfeasibility of such a proposal has been twice recognized by the Congress. In 1954, Congress repealed marketing quotas on corn and in 1958, it repealed acreage allotments.

In order to be assured that such an unthinkable and unworkable proposal would be approved by the feed-grain farmers voting in a referendum, the bill for all practical purposes eliminates the small farmers operating under a so-called 25-acre exemption from participating in the referendum. Oh, sure, the supply-management advocates make the bill appear democratic by providing a vote for these small farmers if they agree in writing to commit themselves to stay within their allotment—which could be much less than 25 acres—in addition to taking a reduction as proposed by the Secretary plus subjecting themselves to the cross-compliance features of the bill. The small feed-grain farmers would be faced with the same situation which faced the small wheat farmer—do I vote or do I feed my family?

For those farmers voting in a referendum, there is no choice. The bill threatens those farmers who are permitted to vote by saying that should you decide not to take what the Secretary wants to give you, you will get no price supports whatsoever and the Government will dump up to 10 million tons—one-third billion bushels—of feed grains on the market in 1 year. Curiously enough, this dumping provision has now been called a protection by Mr. Freeman. I need not tell the farmers in my district how this kind of protection affected their corn prices last year and the protection given them in 1961 was considerably less than what he proposes to afford them each year under the terms of this bill.

DAIRY PRODUCTS

The bill would establish milk allotments and quotas for farmers—including those in milk deficit areas and in Federal milk-marketing order areas—based on their 1961 production—or such other 12-month period as the Secretary may deem appropriate. Allotments would be based on quarterly or monthly periods with adjustments for abnormal conditions and for deficient production areas. Farmers could sell or rent their dairy bases. However, if you did not produce milk in 1961, you are out of business unless you can purchase or rent one from another farmer. The Secretary could also purchase and cancel these bases. In addition to the criminal penalties, the bill would also set marketing quota penalties for overproduction up to $2.75 per hundredweight.

During his television debate with Senator HICKENLOOPER, of Iowa, recently, Secretary Freeman blamed the insertion of the provision in the dairy section to give prison sentences to dairy farmers for failing to keep records as desired by the Department on some unidentified overenthusiastic subordinates in the Department. Since the Secretary has attempted to avoid responsibility for this unsavory provision, many members of the committee are wondering why individuals with such uncontrollable enthusiasm for imposing jail sentences and the controls provided for in H.R. 10010 on the American farmer would be permitted to occupy positions of leadership in the Department.

Probably the most fantastic revelations by Department witnesses made before our committee on the dairy section was their uncertainty and indecisiveness on the vital details of such a proposal. For example, the committee has not heard as yet from the Department as to, first, the approximate level at which the Secretary would set dairy price supports should the bill be enacted—0 to 90 percent; second, the level of price supports if quotas were turned down—0 to 90 percent; third, the percentage of cut to be required from the 1961 base; fourth, the definition of a "deficit" area; fifth, the size of minimum allotments; and sixth, how dairy farmers would be permitted to buy milk bases from each other while simultaneously competing with the Government to purchase the same.

It remains a mystery to me as to who concocted such a proposal for the dairy farmers of America as virtually all dairy groups appearing before our committee opposed the sections of the bill applicable to them. One co-op group from New York State described the milk referendum "as meaningless as a Russian election."

TITLE V. GENERAL PROVISIONS

This title deals with a number of miscellaneous amendments to the Farmers Home Administration and the Rural Electrification Administration.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I wish to say that the American farmer has done nothing to call for the enactment of such punitive legislation. It is our duty to see that it is not enacted.

PUBLIC WELFARE AMENDMENTS OF 1962

Mr. KYL. 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. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. MACGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, all of us would like to see improvements in our public assistance programs. H.R. 10606, passed by the House on March 15, had the laudable aim of preventing and reducing dependency. Many of us could not support the bill, however, because of the last-minute addition of $140 million in funds which we do not have. There is no assurance that any of this money will reach a single welfare beneficiary. The increase goes to the States, not to those eligible for public assistance. The Kennedy administration did not suggest the increase and does not support it. No provision is made in the 1963 budget for the increased cost. There has been no showing of need or justification for the increase.

The following editorial in the New York Times of March 20 presents these and other observations on H.R. 10606:

CONGRESSIONAL OPENHANDEDNESS

In a sudden surge of beneficence the House of Representatives has voted to give President Kennedy $140 million more than he asked to liberalize welfare payments to the needy. The money will make available an additional $4.20 a month in Federal assistance for each of the 2.8 million persons now receiving aid to the aged, blind, and disabled under State-administered relief programs. Since the national average for most such payments is less than $70 a month, no valid complaint can be made that this will mean pampering those on the welfare rolls.

However, the manner in which the House donned the robe of Lady Bountiful does raise two objections. One is that there is no assurance that the extra funds will actually reach the needy.

The States will be free to use the money solely to reduce their own share of welfare costs. The second objection is that no similar provision is made for a blanket liberalization of Federal payments for aid to dependent children, the biggest program of all. The national average of these benefits is only a little over $30 a month, and in Mississippi the monthly rate comes to less than $10.

The fact that the new law will for the first time make it possible for the unemployed fathers of dependent youngsters to share in Federal assistance does not justify excluding children from the general increase in appropriations. To compound the unfairness, a "sleeper" provision in the House bill apparently will open the door wide for a return to such degrading practices as the distribution of relief through vouchers for food, rent, and other items. All this is at the opposite pole from the rehabilitation goal, which underlies the basic administration approach to a long-term solution of the welfare problem.

THE LIBERAL PAPERS

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. RYAN] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. RYAN of New York. Mr. Speaker, during the past week the Republicans launched a two-pronged attack on both the political and cultural fronts. The focal point of this spring offensive is a volume entitled "The Liberal Papers," published as a Doubleday anchor book on March 16. Politically, the attack took the form of little talks on the floor of Congress, all apparently based on the same set of excerpts from the book.

It is difficult to take this sound and fury seriously. Indeed, it would be best to ignore it if, as it appears on its face, it actually signified nothing. The manner of this attack does, however, raise a problem which calls for comment.

Unfortunately, our Republican colleagues have seen fit to open the discussion of the proposals made in "The Liberal Papers" on the level of personalities with innuendo and labeling.

There is talk, with an alarmingly reminiscent ring, of "Brutus," of "dangerous left advisers," of "a gathering storm" accompanied by "thunder from the left," of "appeasers," and even of "a subversive force," albeit a force that has been created by ignorance more than anything else.

It is regrettable that members of the Republican Party, itself bereft of program or policy for the 20th century, have mounted this kind of attack on a collection of essays which aims, as the gentleman from California, Congressman ROOSEVELT, says in his introduction:

To reopen the political forum and reinstitute the dialog of politics in our attempt to lead to new directions in public policy.

The gentleman from California [Mr. ROOSEVELT] was indeed farsighted, if overly optimistic, when he stated his hope that such controversy which might be attendant to the publication of "The Liberal Papers" will not be ad hominem but will be related directly to the arguments themselves.

At a time of such peril for ourselves and for the world, at a time when intelligent and serious analysis of the problems of foreign policy is needed as never before, and when the creative imagination of the American people is so vital to the solution of vexing problems, an attempt at serious discussion should not have been greeted in this fashion. I am not now considering the merits of the various policy suggestions which are set forth in the essays. I am talking about the proper atmosphere for free debate of the most crucial issues of American policy in the 1960's. Attempts such as those made last week to cast the discussion into the nether realms of innuendo and name calling can only indicate a contempt for the processes of rationality in discussion.

I believe that rational, dispassionate, free, and courageous discussion of the issues offers our best hope for developing effective policies. I eagerly await responsible criticism of the ideas expressed in this or any other book. Arguments must be met with arguments, not mere appeals to slogans; facts must be met with facts, not pious pronouncements of our virtue. Ideas are the most valuable natural resource of a democracy. They are a resource which should not be squandered through disrespect.

Mr. Speaker, the inquiring spirit of Americans will not be daunted by last week's attack.

THE SERVICES TO OLDER PERSONS ACT

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. YATES] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, I am reintroducing today the bill I filed in previous Congresses known as the "Services to Older Persons Act." It lays the foundation for an excellent cooperation between the States and the Federal Government for dealing with many of the problems of our senior citizens.

I have been working on this problem since 1951 when the plight of our older citizens first came to my attention. At that time I filed a bill for the appointment of a special committee to investigate the plight of our older citizens and to recommend steps which should be taken. Unfortunately, the House took no action on that bill. Subsequently, the investigation contemplated by that bill was in measure undertaken by a special Senate subcommittee under the chairmanship of the senior Senator from Michigan, Mr. MCNAMARA.

A significant forward step was taken in 1955, when a flagrant example of discrimination in employment because of age was brought to my attention. It was the case of a machinist in St. Louis, who was laid off from his work. In order to qualify for unemployment compensation he had to try to obtain employment. He learned of a job opening as a tax collector for the Federal Government and he made application for the job. He was turned down because he was 36 years of age. Yes, the Federal Government limited applications for the job of tax collector to those between the ages of 21 and 35. Here was a man 36 years of age and already too old to work for his Government.

As a result of this case, I offered an amendment to the appropriations bill coming out of the Appropriations Subcommittee of which I am a member; namely, the Independent Offices Appropriations Subcommittee, which prohibited the Civil Service Commission from using age as a qualification for Federal

employment. That amendment is the law today, and as a result, applicants for Federal employment are judged on the basis of their ability and their qualifications, not their age. It was hoped that this action by the Federal Government would spur private industry to take similar steps to eliminate discrimination in employment because of age.

With the passage of time, I gave up the idea of filing a resolution for the appointment of a Commission To Study the Problems of the Aging, because the problems had become too acute. We knew a little more about the problems as a result of the fine work that had been done in many of the States, and I felt that the time had come for action, rather than for continued investigation. And so in the 84th Congress, I filed H.R. 8863, which is the predecessor to the bill I am filing today, which provided for the establishment of a Bureau of Older Persons in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare; to authorize Federal grants to assist in the development and operation of studies and projects to help older persons; and for other purposes.

The time for action is now. Our modern society offers more years of life to most of us along with shorter hours of work and greater freedom to enjoy our rising standard of living. But to most of our people aged 65 and over these are hollow achievements.

The bill I have filed today, the Services to Older Persons Act, is specifically designed to stimulate the kind of action at the State and local level which will actually come to grips with the very many and very real problems older people face today.

Briefly, my bill provides Federal grants-in-aid to States, localities, and nonprofit organizations so that they can set up projects which will get action at the grassroots level. The declaration of policy contained in the bill suggests the broad scope of these problems, and the type of activity which could be authorized. Projects may be instituted which will help, as the bill states:

(1) to assure to older persons an equal opportunity with others to engage in gainful employment which they are physically and mentally able to perform;

(2) to enable older persons to achieve a retirement income sufficient for health and for participation in community life as self-respecting citizens;

(3) to provide older persons, so far as possible, with the opportunity of living in their own homes or, when this is not feasible, in suitable substitute private homes; and in the case of such persons who need care that cannot be given them in their own or other private homes, to provide them with the opportunity to live in institutions that are as homelike as possible and have high standards of care;

(4) older persons to receive adequate nutrition, preventive medicine, and medical care adapted to the conditions of their year;

(5) to rehabilitate and to restore to independent, useful lives in their homes, to the fullest extent possible, older persons who are chronically ill, physically disabled, mentally disturbed, or incapacitated for other reasons;

(6) to assist older persons to have access to social groups and to participate with those of other ages in recreational, educational, cultural, religious, and civic activities;

(7) to assure that older persons, in planning for retirement and in meeting the crises of their later years, will have the benefits of such services as counseling, information, vocational retraining, and social casework; and

(8) to relieve the problems of older persons through an increase of research on the various aspects of aging and the development of special courses in schools and departments of medicine, nursing, clinical psychology, and social work to train professional workers in the field of aging.

Mr. Speaker, for these purposes the bill authorizes an expenditure of $2 million on a one-third matching basis for a planning period so that States may explore and correlate their particular needs—a method which has proved its effectiveness in the Hill-Burton Hospital Construction Act, as well as in other similar legislation. And, for the following 4 years, it authorizes grants to the States for approved projects of $2 million for the first year, $3 million for the second, $4 million for the third, and $5 million for the fourth, with a flat grant of $25,000 to each State. The balance of the Federal funds will be distributed in accordance with a weighted formula based on per capita income and the percentage of people 65 and over within the State. This method is in recognition both of the need for such projects and the ability of the State to finance them. Also included in my proposal is an authorization of $500,000 per year for similar research by private nonprofit institutions. Finally, the bill calls for a National Conference on Problems of Older People at the end of the 5-year period to report on the experience of the community projects and to make appropriate recommendations.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that my bill provides the method which will encourage action where it is needed. It will encourage the kind of activities which are already in the planning stage in hundreds of communities throughout the country, but which cannot get off the ground because of a lack of sufficient funds. It will enable us to determine the kinds of projects which can truly benefit our senior citizens. It will provide an opportunity for the exchange of information between communities through the Federal Government. And it will recognize, finally, that although the current problems of our older people are in the first instance the concern of the States, they are national problems as well and problems that can only be given significant assistance by the Federal Government.

SOVIET UNION HARASSMENT OF ITS JEWISH CITIZENS CONTINUES

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. FARBSTEIN] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. FARBSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, recently I addressed this body about the apparent Government-sponsored program of harassment being conducted against Soviet citizens of the Jewish faith.

There have been, as many of us are now aware, a series of incidents which give ample evidence of the truth of these reports—ranging from the victimization of Jews in the Soviet Union's antispeculation campaign to the closing of synagogues in several cities.

Now come reports of the cruelest act of all—the denial of matzohs for Soviet Jewry for the observance of the Passover festival which begins April 18. The absence of matzohs, which are the very symbol of this ancient Jewish festival commemorating the deliverance of Jews from bondage, makes the celebration virtually meaningless.

I am further seriously disturbed by reports that not only will Russian state-operated bakeries be prohibited from baking matzohs for the Passover festival observance this year, but that the private baking of matzohs in Jewish homes will also be prohibited on the grounds that such baking would be regarded as an illegal form of free enterprise.

Mr. Speaker, this newest Soviet action in denying its Jewish citizens this vital symbol and necessary ingredient for the celebration of one of the most important holidays in the Jewish calendar, is another step in the process of "deculturization" to which I referred in my speech earlier this month. It is another clear demonstration that the Soviet Union is bent on the destruction of all things Jewish.

I call upon my colleagues to join me in supporting my request to the Secretary of State that he appeal to the Soviet Government, through the appropriate diplomatic channels both here and abroad, to allow the shipment of American-baked matzohs which five companies have generously indicated they will make available if the Soviet Government gives assurance that such a shipment will be permitted.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to Mr. SCHENCK (at the request of Mr. HALLECK), for March 22 and 23, 1962, on account of official business.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

Mr. RYAN, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. HEMPHILL (at the request of Mr. HECHLER), on Tuesday, March 27, for 1 hour.

Mr. YATES, today, for 10 minutes.

Mr. WHITENER (at the request of Mr. HECHLER), for 1 hour on March 27.

Mr. FARBSTEIN (at the request of Mr. ALBERT), for 10 minutes, today, to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mr. ROSENTHAL (at the request of Mr. ALBERT), for 30 minutes, on March 28.

Mr. SCHWENGEL (at the request of Mr. KYL), for 60 minutes, on March 28, 60 minutes on April 4, and 60 minutes on April 11.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL

RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mr. FINO.

Mr. PHILBIN and to include extraneous matter.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. KYL) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. SHRIVER.

Mr. LIPSCOMB.

Mrs. MAY.

Mr. GAVIN.

Mr. FULTON.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. ALBERT) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. DINGELL.

Mr. ANFUSO.

Mr. BREEDING.

Mr. MULTER.

Mr. MORRIS.

Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI.

Mr. ST. GERMAIN.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

Mr. BURLESON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled a bill of the House of the following title, which was thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.R. 641. An act to provide for the free entry of an intermediate lens beta-ray spectrometer for the use of Tulane University, New Orleans, La., and to amend section 165 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 with respect to treatment of casualty losses in areas designated by the President as disaster areas.

SENATE ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The SPEAKER announced his signature to an enrolled bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 2165. An act for the relief of Jean L. Dunlop.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 21 minutes p.m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, March 22, 1962, at 12 o'clock noon.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES OF FOREIGN CURRENCIES AND APPROPRIATED FUNDS INCURRED IN TRAVEL OUTSIDE THE UNITED STATES

Mr. BURLESON. Mr. Speaker, section 502(b) of the Mutual Security Act of 1954, as amended by section 401(a) of Public Law 86–472, approved May 14, 1960, and section 105 of Public Law 86–628, approved July 12, 1960, require the reporting of expenses incurred in connection with travel outside the United States, including both foreign currencies expended and dollar expenditures made from appropriated funds by Members, employees, and committees of the Congress.

The law requires the chairman of each committee to prepare a consolidated report of foreign currency and dollar expenditures from appropriated funds within the first 60 days that Congress is in session in each calendar year, covering expenditures for the previous calendar year. The consolidated report is to be forwarded to the Committee on House Administration which, in turn, shall print such report in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD within 10 legislative days after receipt. Accordingly, there are submitted herewith, within the prescribed time limit, the consolidated reports of the following committees of the House of Representatives: Government Operations, Science and Astronautics, Merchant Marine and Fisheries, Ways and Means, Judiciary, Public Works, Foreign Affairs, and House Administration.

Report of expenditure of foreign currencies and appropriated funds by the Committee on Government Operations, U.S. House of Representatives, expended between Jan. 1 and Dec. 31, 1961

RECAPITULATION

[U.S. dollars equivalent or U.S. currency]

Committee	Lodging	Meals	Transportation	Miscellaneous	Total
Full committee	$1,507.49	$1,321.53	$4,790.64	$555.90	$8,175.56
Executive and Legislative Reorganization Subcommittee	256.44	117.28	2,107.16	34.68	2,515.56
Military Operations Subcommittee	767.27	819.41	804.45	111.64	2,502.77
Foreign Operations and Monetary Affairs Subcommittee	1,595.72	1,569.34	9,507.59	2,335.70	15,008.35
Special Government Information Subcommittee	1,665.07	1,967.58	3,616.95	435.83	7,685.43
Grand total	5,791.99	5,795.14	20,826.79	3,473.75	35,887.67

RECAPITULATION

	Amount
Foreign currency (U.S. dollars equivalent)	$35,887.67
Appropriated funds:	
H. Res. 70, 87th Cong.	572.20
Government Department: Defense (MATS) TWA	399.40
Total	36,859.27

WILLIAM L. DAWSON,
Chairman, Committee on Government Operations.

FULL COMMITTEE

Name and country	Name of currency	Lodging		Meals		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Christine Ray Davis:											
Austria	Schilling	1,302.50	49.50	750	28.50	487.50	18.53	460.00	17.48	3,000	114.01
Denmark	Kroner	253.45	36.79	200	29.08	140	20.36	186.05	27.04	779	113.27
England	Pound	16–8	46.08	6–8	17.98	49–13	139.52	9–16	27.54	82–5	231.12
France	Franc	1,412.10	281.01	869.40	173.01	1,632	324.77	315	62.69	4,228.50	841.48
Germany	Deutsche mark	277.40	69.36	259.40	64.85	395	98.91	122	30.55	1,053.80	263.67
Italy	Lire	117,870	186.23	119,000	188.02	4,381	6.92	11,209	17.71	252,460	398.88
Spain	Peseta	2,856	46.45	1,850	30.25	617	10.06	577	9.41	5,900	96.17
Transportation [1]							856.00				856.00
James A. Lanigan:											
France	Franc	723.40	147.65	763.30	155.79	1,954.43	398.90	295.30	60.27	3,736.43	762.61
Germany	Deutsche mark	159.10	39.82	103	25.78	395	98.87	67.90	17.00	725	181.47
Denmark	Kroner	210	30.53	195.30	28.40	280.70	40.81	114	16.58	800	116.32
England	Pound	12–13–0	35.54	5–7–2	15.03	75–7–0	211.73	9–17–0	27.68	103–4–2	289.98
Austria	Schilling	1,219.50	47.44	807.50	31.41	492	19.13	711	27.66	3,230	125.64
Italy	Lire	37,720	60.92	63,410	102.41	47,710	77.05	20,760	33.53	169,600	273.91
Spain	Peseta	1,677	27.34	2,436	39.70	670	10.92	1,509	24.60	6,292	102.56
Transportation [1]							856.00				856.00

[1] Round-trip steamship transportation purchased by U.S. State Department before departure via United States Lines (SS *United States*) reading "New York-LeHavre, France, and return." Return portion of ticket turned in to Embassy in France and applied against return transportation via air.)

Report of expenditure of foreign currencies and appropriated funds by the Committee on Government Operations, U.S. House of Representatives, expended between Jan. 1 and Dec. 31, 1961—Continued

Name and country	Name of currency	Lodging		Meals		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Miles Q. Romney:											
France	Franc	786	156.41	662	131.74	1,761	350.44	109	21.69	3,318	660.28
Germany	Deutsche mark	175	43.82	131	32.80	407	101.91	107	26.79	820	205.32
Denmark	Kroner	210	30.53	197	28.64	84	12.21	74	10.76	565	82.14
England	Pound	12-14-0	35.69	7-9-0	20.93	23-5-0	65.33	4-18-0	13.77	48-6-0	135.72
Austria	Schilling	1,219	46.32	708	26.90	779	29.60	855	32.49	3,561	135.31
Italy	Lire	39,700	62.73	65,300	103.17	75,340	119.04	23,400	36.97	203,740	321.91
Spain	Peseta	1,677	27.33	2,892	47.14	4,149	67.63	840	13.69	9,558	155.79
Transportation [1]							856.00				856.00
Total			1,507.49		1,321.53		4,790.64		555.90		8,175.56

RECAPITULATION

Foreign currency (U.S. dollar equivalent)	$8,175.56
Appropriated funds: H. Res. 70, 87th Cong	471.00
Total	8,646.56

WILLIAM L. DAWSON,
Chairman, Committee on Government Operations.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON EXECUTIVE AND LEGISLATIVE REORGANIZATION

Name and country	Name of currency	Lodging		Meals		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Elmer W. Henderson:											
Senegal	Franc	4,220	17.58	1,700	7.08	175	0.77	80	0.33	6,175	25.76
Ghana	Ghana pound	20.8	57.10	11	30.80	3	8.40	1.12	3.14	36	99.44
Nigeria	Nigeria pound	36.12	102.30	13	36.40	33	92.40	4.8	11.44	87	242.54
Sudan	Sudan pound	5.200	14.50	1	2.90			1	2.90	7	20.30
Kenya	East African shilling.	194.70	27.16	120	16.80	21	2.94	39	5.46	374	52.36
Uganda	do	75.40	10.50	70	9.80	10	1.40	19	2.66	174	24.36
United Arab Republic	Egyptian pound.	12.14	27.30	6	13.50	3	6.75	3.85	8.75	25	56.30
Transportation [1]							1,994.50				1,994.50
Total			256.44		117.28		2,107.16		34.68		2,515.56

[1] Air transportation, Washington, D.C., to Dakar, Accra, Lagos, Khartoum Nairobi, Kampala, Cairo, and return via Pan American Airlines. Ticket purchased by U.S. Department of State out of counterpart funds.

RECAPITULATION

Foreign currency (U.S. dollar equivalent)	$2,515.56

SUBCOMMITTEE ON MILITARY OPERATIONS

Name and country	Name of currency	Lodging		Meals		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Hon. R. Walter Riehlman:											
England	Pound	8	22.48	13	36.53	5	14.05			26	73.06
Denmark	Kroner	288	41.88	100	14.54	105	15.27			493	71.69
Germany	Deutsche mark	106.15	26.58	205.15	51.37	292	73.12	200	50.08	803.30	201.15
Austria	Schilling	2103	79.91	1,019	38.72	640	24.32			3,762	142.95
Italy	Lire	107,642	170.07	90,800	143.46	10,650	16.83			209,092	330.36
Greece	Drachma	426	141.86	647	215.45	142	47.29			1,215	404.60
Egypt	Egyptian pound.	12.525	28.18	10.250	23.06	1.925	4.33			24.700	55.57
Lebanon	Lebanese pound.	63.90	21.28	51	16.98	17.10	5.69			132.00	43.95
Israel	Israeli pound	20.100	93.06	42.900	198.63	21.000	97.23			84.000	388.92
Jordan	Jordanian pound.			2.000	5.60	12.000	33.60			14.000	39.20
France	Franc	713.40	141.97	377.25	75.07	280	55.72	309.35	61.56	1.680	334.32
Total			767.27		819.41		804.45		111.64		2,502.77

RECAPITULATION

Foreign currency (U.S. dollar equivalent)	$2,502.77
Appropriated funds:	
H. Res. 70, 87th Cong	101.20
Government Department:	
Defense (MATS) TWA Oct. 16, 1961	96.00
Defense (MATS) TWA Dec. 18, 1961	151.70
Defense (MATS) TWA Dec. 22, 1961	151.70
Total	3,003.37

Report of expenditure of foreign currencies and appropriated funds by the Committee on Government Operations, U.S. House of Representatives, expended between Jan. 1 and Dec. 31, 1961—Continued

FOREIGN OPERATIONS AND MONETARY AFFAIRS SUBCOMMITTEE

Name and country	Name of currency	Lodging		Meals		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Hon. John Monagan:											
Brazil	Cruzeiro	12,200	36.63	3,980	11.95	18,285	54.91	12,163	36.53	46,628	140.02
Argentina	Peso	7,936	95.61	2,738	33.02	2,898	34.95	1,221	14.72	14,793	178.30
Chile	Escudo	61.80	58.80	9.92	9.44			27.77	26.42	99.49	94.66
Peru	Sol	2,300	85.82	938.00	35.00	607	22.64	102	3.80	3,947	147.26
Panama	Balboa								16.30		[1] 16.30
Venezuela	Bolivar								76.05		[1] 76.05
Curacao	Guilder								33.48		[1] 33.48
Puerto Rico	Dollar								53.31		[1] 53.31
Hon. George Meader:											
Brazil	Cruzeiro	12,200	36.63	15,614	46.89	18,285	54.91	13,543	40.67	59,642	179.10
Argentina	Peso	3,224	38.89	2,919	35.21	2,898	34.95	976	11.77	10,017	120.82
Chile	Escudo	61.80	58.80	31.24	29.72			24.77	23.57	117.81	112.09
Peru	Sol	1,841	68.69	1,364	50.89	607	22.64	67	2.50	3,879	144.72
Panama	Balboa								16.30		[1] 16.30
Venezuela	Bolivar								76.05		[1] 76.05
Curacao	Guilder								33.48		[1] 33.48
Puerto Rico	Dollar								53.31		[1] 53.31
Hon. Henry Reuss:											
Argentina	Peso	1,612	19.44	1,475	17.79	2,898	34.95	406	4.89	6,391	77.07
Chile	Escudo	61.80	58.80	23.46	22.32			28.92	27.52	114.18	108.64
Peru	Sol	1,841	68.69	1,455	54.29	607	22.64	296	11.04	4,199	156.66
Panama	Balboa								16.30		[1] 16.30
Venezuela	Bolivar								76.05		[1] 76.05
Curacao	Guilder								33.48		[1] 33.48
Puerto Rico	Dollar								53.31		[1] 53.31
John T. M. Reddan:											
Brazil	Cruzeiro	12,200	36.63	7,692	23.10	18,285	54.91	12,963	38.93	51,140	153.57
Argentina	Peso	2,728	32.90	3,214	38.76	2,898	34.95	1,126	13.58	9,966	120.19
Chile	Escudo	61.80	58.80	50.37	47.93			25.77	24.52	137.94	131.25
Peru	Sol	1,150	42.91	1,625	60.63	607	22.64	347	12.94	3,729	139.12
Panama	Balboa								16.30		[1] 16.30
Venezuela	Bolivar								76.05		[1] 76.05
Curacao	Guilder								33.48		[1] 33.48
Puerto Rico	Dollar								53.30		[1] 53.30
Lanham Connor (reporter):											
Brazil	Cruzeiro	12,200	36.63	7,264	21.81	18,285	54.91	12,408	37.26	50,157	150.61
Argentina	Peso	2,728	32.90	520	6.27	2,898	34.95	296	3.57	6,442	77.69
Chile	Escudo	61.80	58.80	78.23	74.43			26.17	24.90	166.20	158.13
Peru	Sol	690	25.74	1,339	49.96	607	22.64	212	7.91	2,848	106.25
Panama	Balboa								16.29		[1] 16.29
Venezuela	Bolivar								76.05		[1] 76.05
Curacao	Guilder								33.47		[1] 33.47
Puerto Rico	Dollar								53.30		[1] 53.30
Leslie Grant (ICA):											
Brazil	Cruzeiro	10,400	31.23	12,593	37.82	18,285	54.91	17,295	51.94	58,573	175.90
Argentina	Peso	3,224	38.89	2,200	26.53	2,898	34.95	261	3.14	8,583	103.51
Chile	Escudo	61.80	58.80	34	32.35			24.77	23.57	120.57	114.72
Peru	Sol	1,150	42.91	1,225	45.70	607	22.64	128	4.77	3,110	116.02
Panama	Balboa								16.29		[1] 16.29
Venezuela	Bolivar								76.05		[1] 76.05
Curacao	Guilder								33.47		[1] 33.47
Puerto Rico	Dollar								53.30		[1] 53.30
Frank Hill (Navy Department):											
Brazil	Cruzeiro	7,800	23.42	33,889	101.77	18,285	54.91	16,283	48.90	76,257	229.00
Argentina	Peso	3,224	38.89	2,836	34.20	2,898	34.95	366	4.41	9,324	112.45
Chile	Escudo	61.80	58.80	66.89	63.64			23.77	22.62	152.46	145.06
Peru	Sol	690	25.74	1,020	38.05	607	22.64	32	1.19	2,349	87.62
Panama	Balboa								16.29		[1] 16.29
Venezuela	Bolivar								76.05		[1] 76.05
Curacao	Guilder								33.47		[1] 33.47
Puerto Rico	Dollar								53.30		[1] 53.30
John Robinson (ICA):											
Brazil	Cruzeiro	12,200	36.63	12,823	38.51	18,285	54.91	16,593	49.83	59,901	179.88
Argentina	Peso	2,976	35.89	3,340	40.28	3,898	34.95	316	3.81	9,530	114.93
Chile	Escudo	61.80	58.80	87.34	83.10			35.92	34.18	185.06	176.08
Peru	Sol	1,074	40.07	1,958	73.05	607	22.64	481	17.94	4,120	153.70
Panama	Balboa								16.29		[1] 16.29
Venezuela	Bolivar								76.05		[1] 76.05
Curacao	Guilder								33.47		[1] 33.47
Puerto Rico	Dollar								53.30		[1] 53.30
Melvin Sinn (State Department):											
Brazil	Cruzeiro	10,400	31.23	44,180	132.67	18,285	54.91	18,336	55.06	91,201	273.87
Argentina	Peso	3,224	38.89	4,209	50.77	2,898	34.95	346	4.17	10,677	128.78
Chile	Escudo	61.80	58.80	52.28	49.74			26.77	24.99	140.35	133.53
Peru	Sol	660	24.62	1,387	51.75	607	22.64	162	6.04	2,816	105.05
Panama	Balboa								16.29		[1] 16.29
Venezuela	Bolivar								76.05		[1] 76.05
Curacao	Guilder								33.47		[1] 33.47
Puerto Rico	Dollar								53.30		[1] 53.30
Transportation [2]							8,550.00				8,550.00
Total			1,595.72		1,569.34		9,507.59		2,335.70		15,008.35

[1] Only summary figures available from Department of State.
[2] 9 round-trip airline tickets via Pan American Airways at $950 each.

RECAPITULATION

Foreign currency (U.S. dollar equivalent) $15,008.35

WILLIAM L. DAWSON,
Chairman, Committee on Government Operations.

Report of expenditure of foreign currencies and appropriated funds by the Committee on Government Operations, U.S. House of Representatives, expended between Jan. 1 and Dec. 31, 1961—Continued

SPECIAL SUBCOMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT INFORMATION

Name and country	Name of currency	Lodging		Meals		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Samuel J. Archibald:											
United Kingdom	Pound	27-2-6	76.58	23-4-1	65.00	42-10-0	119.00	2-3-5	6.07	95-0-0	266.65
France	Franc	841	171.66	821	167.73	290	59.15	236	48.15	2,118	446.69
Germany	Deutsche mark	224	53.23	423	100.70	316	75.25	37	8.80	1,000	237.98
Italy	Lire	71,371	114.93	105,756	170.30	22,511	36.25	10,836	17.45	210,474	338.93
Greece	Drachma	484	16.15	786	26.19			30	1.00	1,300	43.34
Egypt	Dollar							75	1.69	75	1.69
Philippines	Peso	60.48	18.90	66.08	20.65	26.78	8.37	10.06	3.14	163.40	51.06
Hong Kong	Dollar	285.00	50.00	408.12	71.60	145.06	25.45	20.80	3.65	858.98	150.70
Japan	Yen	40,320	112.00	51,318	142.55	17,352	48.20	5,130	14.25	114,120	317.00
Transportation [1]							934.80				934.80
Phineas Indritz:											
United Kingdom	Pound	25-6-0	70.84	15-3-4	42.47	8-3-8	22.91	2-5-0	6.30	50-18-0	142.50
France	Franc	700	142.57	708.20	144.24	89.20	18.17	366.58	74.66	1,863.98	379.64
Germany	Deutsche mark	185.25	46.43	160.55	40.24	153.50	38.47	69	17.29	568.30	142.43
Italy	Lire	48,889	78.73	52,190	84.04	22,000	35.43	22,995	37.03	146,074	235.23
Greece	Drachma	450	15.00	869	28.97	90	3.00	583	19.43	1,992	66.40
Egypt	Egyptian pound		.40		.90			.45	1.01	.85	1.91
Philippines	Peso	50.10	18.22	62.75	22.82	7.40	2.69	25.70	9.35	145.95	53.08
Hong Kong	Dollar	210	36.91	100.50	17.67	28.60	5.03	32.10	5.64	371.20	65.25
Japan	Yen	21,860	60.72	29,517	81.99	5,425	15.07	8,333	23.15	65,135	180.93
Transportation [1]							934.80				934.80
Jack Howard:											
United Kingdom	Pound	25-6-0	70.90	29-13-4	83.07	16-13-5	46.69	9-15-11	27.42	81-8-8	228.08
France	Franc	832.45	169.82	857.75	174.98	253.35	51.68	181.45	37.02	2,125	433.50
Germany	Deutsche mark	181.80	43.28	257.33	61.28	487.57	116.09	108.05	25.72	1,034.75	246.37
Italy	Lira	68,325	110.05	91,290	147.09	17,505	28.06	8,380	13.52	185,500	298.72
Greece	Drachma	377	12.53	621	20.70	123	4.10	78	2.60	1,199	39.93
Egypt	Egyptian pound.			.70	1.57			.35	.79	1.05	2.36
Philippines	Peso	50.10	15.60	74.60	23.37	28.20	8.81	10.40	3.25	163.30	51.03
Hong Kong	Dollar	255	44.74	295	51.75	59	10.35	38.00	6.66	647	113.50
Japan	Yen	41,500	115.28	63,300	175.71	12,360	34.33	7,500	20.79	124,660	346.11
Transportation [1]							934.80				934.80
Total			1,665.07		1,967.58		3,616.95		435.83		7,685.43

[1] Round-trip air transportation purchased by U.S. State Department before departure via Pan American Airways System, reading "Washington-New York-London, etc., and return."

RECAPITULATION

Foreign currency (U.S. dollar equivalent) $7,685.43

WILLIAM L. DAWSON,
Chairman, Committee on Government Operations.

Report of expenditure of foreign currencies and appropriated funds by the Committee on Science and Astronautics, expended between Jan. 1 and Dec. 31, 1961

Name and country	Name of currency	Lodging		Meals		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Geo. P. Miller:											
France	New franc	1,364	272.80	339.30	67.86			126.70	25.34	1,830	366.00
Switzerland	Franc	264	60.72	320.85	73.68	275.00	63.25	115.65	26.60	975	224.25
Netherlands	Guilder	350	91.00			283.00	73.58			633	164.58
Denmark	Krone	739.75	107.27	300.25	43.54	365.00	52.92	110.00	15.40	1,515	219.13
United Kingdom	Pound	105.3	294.42	47-6	132.44	7-8	20.72	5-9	15.26	165-6	462.84
Total			826.21		317.52		210.47		82.60		1,436.80
William K. VanPelt:											
France	New franc	859.5	171.90	668	133.60	220	44.00	232.5	46.50	1,980	396.00
Switzerland	Franc	314.75	50.66	220.25	50.66	300	69.00	200.0	46.00	1,035	216.32
Netherlands	Guilder	172.97	44.97	200	52.00	283	73.58	29.53	7.68	685.5	178.23
Denmark	Krone	612.85	88.86	610	88.45	365	52.92	242.15	35.11	1,830	265.34
United Kingdom	Pound	86	240.80	60	168.00	82.7	231.56	24	67.20	252.7	707.56
Total			597.19		492.71		471.06		202.49		1,763.45
C. F. Ducander:											
France	New franc	307.60	61.52	432.90	86.58			389.5	77.90	1120	226.00
Switzerland	Franc	144.60	33.26	263.70	60.65	275	63.25	151.70	34.89	835	192.05
Netherlands	Guilder	115.00	29.90	61.52	15.99	283	73.58	90.37	26.11	560	145.58
Denmark	Krone	311.60	46.18	410.60	59.54	365	52.92	147.80	21.31	1235	179.95
United Kingdom	Pound	39.0	109.20	33.3	92.82	58.7	164.56	57.7	160.58	137.4	527.16
Total			280.06		315.58		354.31		320.79		1,270.74
P. B. Yeager:											
France	New franc	620	124.00	480	96.00	110	22.00	450	90.00	1,660	332.00
Switzerland	Franc	201	46.23	150	34.50	275	63.25	259	59.57	885	203.55
Netherlands	Guilder	180	31.80	68	11.68	293	76.18	77	18.02	335	137.68
Denmark	Krone	412	59.74	178	25.81	365	52.92	145	21.02	735	159.49
United Kingdom	Pound	54.6	152.04	33.1	92.54	65.3	182.84	35.74	100.00	188.7	528.22
Total			413.81		260.53		397.19		289.41		1,360.94

Report of expenditure of foreign currencies and appropriated funds by the Committee on Science and Astronautics, expended between Jan. 1 and Dec. 31, 1961—Continued

Name and country	Name of currency	Lodging		Meals		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Victor L. Anfuso:											
Italy	Lire	328,552	529.00	304,290	490.00	201,825	325.00	24,840	40.00	859,507	1,384.00
Germany	Mark					4,248.95	1,064.90				1,064.90
Total			529.00		490.00		1,389.90		40.00		2,448.90
Olin E. Teague:											
New Zealand	Pound	6.0.0	16.80	12.0.0	33.60	2.0.0	5.60			20.0.0	56.00
Australia	do	16.0.0	36.00	12.0.0	27.00	4.0.0	8.90	3.0.0	6.75	35.0.0	78.65
Singapore	Dollar (Malayan).	75.00	25.00	90.00	30.00	30.00	10.00	5.00	1.67	200.00	66.67
Hong Kong	Dollar (Hong Kong).	225.00	39.82	250.00	44.27	100.00	17.69	25.00	4.42	600.00	106.20
Total			117.62		134.87		42.19		12.84		307.52
David S. King:											
United Kingdom	Pound	34.14.8	97.59	4.12.0	12.92	22.10	63.00	6.6.6	17.76	45.13.2	191.27
France	New franc	851.0	173.69	206.0	42.04	30.0	6.12	85.0	17.34	1,172.0	239.19
Total			271.28		54.96		69.12		35.10		430.46
Total			3,035.17		2,066.17		2,934.24		983.23		9,018.81

RECAPITULATION

	Amount
Foreign currency (U.S. dollar equivalent)	$9,018.81

GEORGE P. MILLER,
Chairman, Committee on Science and Astronautics.

MAR. 9, 1962.

Report of expenditure of foreign currencies and appropriated funds, Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, U.S. House of Representatives, expended between Jan. 1 and Dec. 31, 1961

Name and country	Name of currency	Lodging		Meals		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Edward A. Garmatz:											
England	Pound	81/13/6	228.70	15/7	43.80	16/10	46.70	27/2	77.10	140/12	396.30
Sweden	Kroner	434.85	86.97	510	102.00	80	16.00	65	13.00	1,089.85	217.97
West Germany	Deutsche mark	296.70	74.18	153	38.00	75	18.75	50	12.50	574.70	143.43
France	Franc	1,639.85	328.00	850	170.00	1,695	339.00	130	26.00	4,314.85	863.00
Italy	Lire	52,360	84.45	46,750	75.40	23,390	37.70	15,950	25.07	138,450	222.62
Belgium	Franc	3,600	72.00	1,860	37.20	2,000	40.00	1,100	22.00	8,560	171.20
Stanley R. Tupper:											
England	Pound	45/7/6	127.25	16/8	46.30	16/10	46.70	24/6	67.90	102/11/6	288.15
Sweden	Kroner	274.80	54.96	360	72.00	205	41.00	75	15.00	914.80	182.96
West Germany	Deutsche mark	227.70	56.93	165	41.25	155	38.75	50	12.50	597.70	149.43
France	Franc	1,050	210.00	810	162.00	300	60.00	125	25.00	2,285	457.00
Belgium	do	3,050	61.00	2,120	42.40	5,315	106.30	1,150	23.00	11,635	232.70
Milton W. Glenn:											
England	Pound	32/12/6	91.70	14/9	41.10	16/10	46.70	24	67.20	87/11/6	246.70
Sweden	Kroner	197.70	39.52	410	82.00	80	16.00	65	13.00	752.70	150.52
West Germany	Deutsche mark	124.20	31.05	180	45.00	199	49.75	40	10.00	543.20	135.80
France	Franc	576	115.20	875	175.00	300	60.00	100	20.00	1,851	370.20
Belgium	do	3,600	72.00	1,980	39.60	2,000	40.00	1,150	23.00	8,730	174.60
Thomas N. Downing:											
England	Pound	31/2/6	87.20	45	126.00	20/5	56.70	31/6	87.65	127/13/6	357.55
Sweden	Kroner	196.05	39.21	595	119.00	52	10.40	410	82.00	1,253.05	250.61
West Germany	Deutsche mark	82.80	20.70	132	33.00	75	18.75	267.20	66.80	557	139.25
Belgium	Franc	1,800	36.00	3,500	70.00	2,535	50.70	2,802.50	56.05	10,637.50	212.75
Bernard J. Zincke:											
England	Pound	45/7/6	127.40	14/4	40.90	16/10	46.70	36/10	102.90	113/11	317.90
Sweden	Kroner	271.65	54.33	415	83.00	82	16.40	65	13.00	833.65	166.73
West Germany	Deutsche mark	220.80	55.20	175	43.75	199	49.75	149	37.25	743.80	185.95
France	Franc	1,039.35	207.87	860	172.00	1,461	292.20	875	175.00	4,235.35	847.07
Italy	Lire	51,160	82.52	43,425	70.04	42,350	68.30	16,965	27.36	153,900	248.22
Belgium	Franc	1,800	36.00	1,990	39.80	2,000	40.00	1,100	22.00	6,890	137.80
John D. Dingell: France	do	722.80	144.56	475.40	95.08	126	25.20			1,324.20	264.84
Paul S. Bauer:											
France	do	1,152.25	230.45	1,050	210.00	75	15.00	410	82.00	2,687.25	537.45
Denmark	Kroner	1,363.35	194.76	1,150	157.85	100	14.29	515	73.57	3,083.35	440.47
Italy	Lire	49,190	79.32	51,120	82.45	10,500	16.94	20,010	32.27	1,308.20	210.98
John M. Drewry:											
England	Pound	37/6	104.30	31/2	87.20	10/6	28.70	5	14.00	83/14	234.20
France	Franc	660	132.00	675	135.00	96	19.20	127	25.40	1,558	311.60
Total			3,365.73		2,778.12		1,772.58		1,349.52		9,265.95

RECAPITULATION

	Amount
Foreign currency (U.S. dollar equivalent)	9,265.95
Appropriated funds	
Total	9,265.95

HERBERT C. BONNER,
Chairman, Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

MAR. 8, 1962.

Report of expenditure of foreign currencies and appropriated funds, Committee on Ways and Means, U.S. House of Representatives, expended between Jan. 1 and Dec. 31, 1961

Name and country	Name of currency	Lodging		Meals		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Hon. John W. Byrnes:											
France	Franc			60	12.15					60	12.15
Germany	Deutsche mark	180	45.62	135	35.41	582.14	145.90	30	7.14	927.14	234.07
Italy	Lire	50,700	81.12	35,300	58.23	62,481	100.61	7,000	11.20	155,481	251.16
Switzerland	Franc	239	54.30	121	30.16			50	11.55	410	96.01
Belgium	do					5,060	102.07			5,060	102.07
Hon. James B. Frazier, Jr.:											
Belgium	do			2,751	55.80	6,753	135.05	1,250	25.00	10,754	215.85
Denmark	Kroner	510	74.04	300	43.65			70	9.42	880	127.11
France	Franc			455	92.58			235	50.00	690	142.58
Hon. Cecil R. King:											
England	Pound	60	168.00	34	96.00			6	16.00	100	280.00
Germany	Deutsche mark	514	124.10	354	90.00	4,715	1,181.70	90	26.00	5,673	1,421.80
Italy	Lire	126,000	202.01	124,000	200.00	117,679	189.50	30,700	50.00	398,379	641.51
France	Franc	800	166.32	650	131.00	369	75.00	181	35.00	2,000	407.32
Switzerland	do	1,000	232.00	700	160.00	258	60.02	42	12.00	2,000	464.02
Hon. Herman T. Schneebeli:											
France	do	416	85.87	280	55.79	60	12.15			756	153.81
Italy	Lire	38,400	61.44	40,000	64.00	113,436	182.58			191,836	308.02
Switzerland	Franc	525	122.67	480	106.00	55	16.96			1,060	245.63
Germany	Deutsche mark	180	45.25	200	51.00	5,212	1,240.30			5,592	1,336.55
Hon. Al Ullman:											
Switzerland	Franc	146	33.58	130	29.90	170	39.10	71	16.23	517	118.81
Belgium	do	910	18.20	860	17.20	700	14.00	470	9.40	2,940	58.80
Denmark	Kroner	210	30.45	199	28.86	72	10.44	59	8.55	540	78.30
England	Pound	10	28.00	9.1	25.32	2.2	5.84	3.1	8.52	24.4	67.68
Germany	Deutsche mark					4,230	1,007.75			4,230	1,007.75
Hon. James B. Utt:											
Switzerland	Franc	146	33.58	108	24.84	160	36.80	84	19.32	498	114.54
Belgium	do	910	18.20	988	19.75	565	11.30	528	10.55	2,991	59.80
Germany	Deutsche mark	152	38.00	121	30.25	4,403	1,046.80	30	7.50	4,706	1,122.55
England	Pound	10	28.00	10.10	29.40	2.10	7.00	3.4	8.88	25.6	73.28
Alfred R. McCauley:											
Switzerland	Franc	120	27.60	120	27.60	164	37.72	89	20.47	493	113.39
Belgium	do	910	18.20	955	19.10	935	18.70	820	16.40	3,620	72.40
Denmark	Kroner	210	30.45	180	26.10	62	8.99	89	12.91	541	78.45
England	Pound	10	28.00	9	25.20	2.3	5.96	4.1	10.32	25.4	69.48
Germany	Deutsche mark					4,230	1,007.75			4,230	1,007.75
Total			1,795.00		1,585.29		6,699.99		402.36		10,482.64

RECAPITULATION

	Amount
Foreign currency (U.S. dollar equivalent)	$10,482.64
Appropriated funds	
Total	10,482.64

WILBUR D. MILLS,
Chairman, Committee on Ways and Means.

Report of expenditure of foreign currencies and appropriated funds, Committee on the Judiciary, U.S. House of Representatives, expended between Jan. 1 and Dec. 31, 1961

Name and country	Name of currency	Lodging		Meals		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Hon. Emanuel Celler: [1]											
Germany	Deutsche mark					4,387.80	[2] 1,099.70			4,387.80	1,099.70
Italy [3]	Lire	261,213	420.62	490,913	790.51	254,767	410.24	164,107	264.25	1,171,000	1,885.62
Herbert N. Maletz: [4]											
Germany	Deutsche mark	100	25.00	33.88	8.47	4,556.80	[2] 1,141.95	170.59	42.74	4,861.27	1,218.16
Italy	Lire	212,290	341.90	163,619	263.36	162,836	262.26	46,755	75.29	585,500	942.81
France	New franc	1,106.32	223.90	559.15	114.46	713.85	145.40	92.25	21.08	2,471.57	504.84
England	Pound sterling	37/6/8	104.68	18/13/0	52.37	1/1/0	2.94			57/8/0	159.99
Hon. Francis E. Walter:											
France	New franc	376.08	76.75	660.03	134.70	5,707.72	1,164.84	174.69	35.65	6,918.51	1,411.94
Switzerland	Swiss franc	369.53	85.54	400.72	92.76	272.16	63.00			1,042.41	241.30
United Kingdom	Pound sterling	84/11/9	236.84	93/3/3	260.86	46/4/4	129.40	22/5/0	62.30	246/4/4	689.40
Walter M. Besterman:											
France	New franc	359.91	73.45	679.38	138.65	5,707.72	1,674.84	171.50	35.00	6,918.51	1,411.94
Switzerland	Swiss franc	361.24	83.62	621.86	143.95	364.87	84.46	155.52	36.00	1,503.49	348.03
United Kingdom	Pound sterling	43/15/–	122.52	47/5/2	132.48			8/19/10	25.00	100/0/0	280.00
Italy	Lire	71,427.52	115.02	78,568	126.52	51,139	82.35			201,135	323.89
Hon. Michael A. Feighan:											
Argentina	Peso	5,306	64.05	7,432	90.00	4,119	49.60	1,727	20.43	18,584	224.08
Brazil	Cruzeiro	25,179	85.35	48,074	162.96	28,910	98.00	5,322	18.04	107,485	364.35
Hon. Peter W. Rodino:											
Italy [5]	Lira	199,640	322.00	187,240	302.00	95,480	154.00	28,220	45.30	510,580	823.30
England	Pound sterling	7/13/0	21.85	11/4/0	32.00	7/14/0	22.04	3/17/0	11.00	30/8/0	86.89
Switzerland [5]	Swiss franc	1,060	246.40	955	222.40	500	111.60	21	4.69	2,536	585.09
Germany	Deutsche mark					4,387.30	1,099.70			4,387.30	1,099.70
Hon. Byron G. Rogers:											
Switzerland	Swiss franc	530	123.20	425	98.60	104	24.00	86	20.00	1,135	265.80
Italy	Lira	21,310	33.90	25,100	40.58	179,647	289.00	1,075	11.40	179,400	374.88
Greece	Drachma	1,430	40.70	960	33.00	3,845	128.16	350	11.06	6,525	212.92
France	New franc	312	81.30	300	75.00			8,800	22.00	700	178.30

Footnotes at end of table.

Report of expenditure of foreign currencies and appropriated funds, Committee on the Judiciary, U.S. House of Representatives, expended between Jan. 1 and Dec. 31, 1961—Continued

Name and country	Name of currency	Lodging		Meals		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Hon. William C. Cramer:											
Austria	Schilling	2,791.65	108.54	4,713.45	183.26	2,739.95	106.53	1,131.68	44.00	11,376.73	442.33
Denmark	Danish kroner	298.94	43.45	400.96	58.28	196.90	28.62	103.20	15.00	1,000.00	145.35
France	New franc	1,295.61	264.41	1,160.96	236.93	1,119.26	228.42	416.01	84.90	3,991.83	814.66
Germany	Deutsche mark	297.20	74.30	458.12	114.53	143.20	35.80	104.00	26.00	1,002.52	250.63
Poland	Zloty	3,490.85	63.47	4,770.15	86.73	4,114.00	74.80	1,375.00	25.00	13,750.00	250.00
United Kingdom	Pound sterling	56/1/2	157.96	101/13/5	283.44	49/10/0	138.60	22/15/5	64.00	230.00	644.00
Hon. Basil L. Whitener:											
Germany	Deutsche mark					7,387.80	1,860.91			7,387.80	1,860.91
Hong Kong, British Crown Colony	Hong Kong dollar.	819	142.47	980	170.36			201	35.00	2,000	347.83
Japan	Yen	47,077	130.77	61,488	170.80	53,075	147.43	18,360	51.00	180,000	500.00
William H. Crabtree:											
Hong Kong, British Crown Colony	Hong Kong dollar.	362	62.92	477	82.84	209	36.54	121	21.00	1,169	203.30
Japan	Yen	13,032	36.20	15,936	44.27	6,732	18.70	7,200	20.00	42,900	119.17
Germany	Deutsche mark					7,291.84	1,818.60			7,291.84	1,818.60
Hon. Roland V. Libonati: [6]											
Italy [3]	Lire	304,290	490.00	372,600	600.00	90,045	145.00	149,040	240.00	915,975	1,475.00
Austria	Schilling	1,534	59.00	1,300	50.00	650	25.00	1,040	40.00	4,524	174.00
Denmark	Danish kroner	392	56.00	420	60.00	245	35.00	175	25.00	1,232	176.00
United Kingdom	Pound sterling	34.4	97.00	53.2	150.00	14.2	40.00	39	110.00	140.8	397.00
Germany	Deutsche mark					6,288	1,572.00			6,288	1,572.00
Cyril F. Brickfield: [7]											
France	New franc	490	98.00	265	53.00	360	72.00	325	65.00	1,440	288.00
Italy	Lire	170,775	275.00	82,593	133.00	404,892	652.00	139,725	225.00	797,985	1,285.00
Germany	Deutsche mark					4,400	[8] 1,100.00			4,400	1,100.00
Hon. J. Carlton Loser: [9]											
Italy	Lire	39,000	62.79	24,000	38.64			15,000	24.15	78,000	125.58
Switzerland	Swiss franc	196	45.60	140.50	32.70	20	4.66	30	6.90	386.50	89.86
France	New franc	450	90.00	210	42.00	200	40.00	55	11.00	915	183.00
England	Pound sterling	27/4/6	76.66	15	42.00	8	22.40	10	28.00	60/4/6	169.06
Hon. Arch A. Moore, Jr.:											
Germany	Deutsche mark					7,502.04	1,871.15			7,502.04	1,871.15
Hong Kong, British Crown Colony	Hong Kong dollar.	814	141.70	1,138	197.95	749	130.28	299	52.00	3,000	521.93
Japan	Yen	30,117	83.66	47,022	130.62	28,224	78.40	11,520	32.00	116,883	324.68
Hon. William T. Cahill:											
Egypt	Egyptian pound.	12.12	27.37	15.44	34.86	6.14	13.60			33.70	75.83
France	New franc					4,343.30	884.58			4,343.30	884.58
Israel	Pound	95.40	44.17	91.71	42.43	30.67	14.20	27.22	12.60	245.00	113.40
Italy	Lire	12,420	20.00	17,580	28.31	40,642	65.45			70,642	113.76
Lebanon	Lebanese pound.	53.15	17.60	60.86	20.15	52.55	17.40	18.44	6.10	185.00	61.25
Syria	Syrian pound	75.69	21.20	80.68	22.60	22.13	6.20			178.50	50.00
Turkey	Lira	291.60	32.40	336.15	37.35	185.85	20.65	86.40	9.60	900.00	100.00
United Kingdom	Pound sterling	11/19/–	33.48	7/1/–	19.72			2/–/–	5.60	21.00	58.80
Hon. Francis E. Walter:											
France	New franc	651.42	132.90	701.48	143.16	384.46	78.40	262.64	53.60	2,000.00	408.06
Germany	DM	531.76	132.94	894.24	223.56	4,699.40	1,174.85	174.00	43.50	6,299.40	1,574.85
Switzerland	Swiss franc	356.14	82.44	410.14	94.94	407.59	94.35	123.12	28.50	1,296.99	300.23
Walter M. Besterman:											
France	New franc	620.49	126.63	707.61	144.41	315.07	64.30	156.80	32.00	1,799.97	367.34
Germany	DM	517	129.25	809	202.25	4,699.40	1,174.85	174.00	43.50	6,199.40	1,549.85
Switzerland	Swiss franc	628.13	145.40	610.11	141.23	426.04	98.62	182.44	42.00	1,845.72	427.25
Total			6,534.27		7,431.95		21,717.77		2,283.18		37,967.17

[1] $370.49 personal check refunded to State Department.
[2] Unused portion of air ticket to be refunded to State Department.
[3] On special Presidential mission for celebration of 100th anniversary of unification of Italy.
[4] $186.40 personal check refunded to State Department.
[5] Funds expended for use of Representative Byron G. Rogers as well.
[6] $450.00 personal check refunded to State Department.
[7] $35.00 personal check refunded to State Department.
[8] Unused portion of air ticket to be refunded to State Department.
[9] $328.19 personal check refunded to State Department.

EMANUEL CELLER,
Chairman, Committee on the Judiciary.

MAR. 12, 1962.

Report of expenditure of foreign currencies and appropriated funds, Committee on Public Works, U.S. House of Representatives, expended between Jan. 1 and Dec. 31, 1961

Name and country	Name of currency	Lodging		Meals		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Frank M. Clark:											
Australia	Pound	26.5	59.05	16	36.00	41	92.25	80	180.00	163.5	367.30
Hong Kong	Dollar	105	18.00	130	22.60	130	22.50	700	121.80	1,065	184.90
Japan	Yen	4,680	13.00	5,760	16.00	5,400	15.00	9,199	25.56	25,039	69.56
Cambodia	Reil			1,112	32.00	1,845	53.00	1,545	44.18	4,502	129.18
Greece	Drachma	662	22.00	450	15.00	1,020	34.00	870	29.00	3,002	100.00
Italy	Lire	33,700	54.00	22,500	36.00	24,900	40.00	44,300	71.00	125,400	201.00
Singapore	Dollar			39.36	12.00	29.27	9.89			68.63	21.89
Thailand	Baht			315	15.00	262	12.55			577	27.55
Turkey	Lire	180	20.00	135	15.00	360	40.00	315	35.00	990	110.00
	Deutsche mark[1]					8,506.13	2,142.60			8,506.13	2,142.60
W. R. Hull, Jr.: Chile	Escudo	170	161.00	103	98.00	134	128.00	110	105.00	517	492.00
	Deutsche mark[1]					3,800	950.00			3,800	950.00

See footnote at end of table.

Report of expenditure of foreign currencies and appropriated funds, Committee on Public Works, U.S. House of Representatives, expended between Jan. 1 and Dec. 31, 1961—Continued

Name and country	Name of currency	Lodging		Meals		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Robert E. Jones, Jr.:											
Australia	Pound	26.5	59.05	16	36.00	31	69.75	41	92.25	114.5	257.05
Hong Kong	Dollar	110	19.30	90	15.60	200	34.80	380	66.00	780	135.70
Japan	Yen	4,680	13.00	6,480	18.00	4,320	12.00	9,146	25.40	24,626	68.40
	Deutsche mark[1]					8,506.13	2,142.60			8,506.13	2,142.60
Gracie Pfost: Belgium	Franc	3,462	69.25	1,600	32.00	2,515	50.30	702	14.05	8,280	165.60
Frank E. Smith:											
Australia	Pound	26.5	59.05	23	51.75	52	117.00	60	135.00	161.5	362.80
Hong Kong	Dollar	105	18.00	120	20.80	250	43.40	500	86.90	975	169.10
Japan	Yen	4,680	13.00	7,200	20.00	3,600	10.00	11,000	30.50	26,480	73.50
France	Franc			261	53.00	739	150.00			1,000	203.00
	Deutsche mark[1]					8,506.13	2,142.60			8,506.13	2,142.60
Richard J. Sullivan:											
Australia	Pound	73.10	114.25	14	31.50	68	153.00	90	202.50	245.10	501.25
Hong Kong	Dollar	300	52.00	400	69.00	1,800	260.00	880	153.00	3,380	534.00
Japan	Yen	7,200	20.00	32,400	90.00	7,214	20.00	31,753	88.50	78,567	218.50
	Deutsche mark[1]					8,506.13	2,142.60			8,506.13	2,142.60
Total			783.95		735.25		10,887.84		1,505.64		13,912.68

[1] Transportation paid in German currency.

RECAPITULATION

Foreign currency (U.S. dollar equivalent) $13,912.68

CHARLES A. BUCKLEY,
Chairman, Committee on Public Works.

MAR. 10, 1962.

Report of expenditure of foreign currencies and appropriated funds by the Committee on Foreign Affairs, U.S. House of Representatives, expended between Jan. 1 and Dec. 31, 1961

FULL COMMITTEE

Name and country	Name of currency	Lodging		Meals		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Hon. Thomas E. Morgan:											
France	Franc	1,572.72	320.31	943.70	192.20	276.92	56.40	335.50	68.33	3,128.84	637.24
Germany	Deutsche mark			62.64	15.70	11.18	2.80	26.18	6.56	100.00	25.06
Hon. Clement J. Zablocki:											
France	Franc	81.25	16.57	65.00	13.26	12.00	2.45	41.00	8.36	199.25	40.64
Poland	Zloty	2,740	49.50	5,600	101.50	4,300	78.50	5,610	102.00	18,150	331.50
Germany	Deutsche mark					4,698.4	1,174.60			4,698.4	1,174.60
Hon. Dante B. Fascell:											
Italy	Lire	97,114	156.39	84,418	135.93	63,815	102.76	37,875	60.99	283,222	456.07
Germany	Deutsche mark					4,179.53	1,047.50			4,179.53	1,047.50
Hon. Leonard Farbstein:											
France	Franc	1,248.60	254.29	568.01	115.69	171.85	35.00	67.74	13.80	2,056.20	418.78
Germany	Deutsche mark			60.85	15.25	9.20	2.31	29.95	7.50	100.00	25.06
United States	Dollar				2.25		528.00		3.00		533.25
Hon. D. S. Saund:											
Belgium	Franc			4,835.7	97.20	3,085.0	62.01	656.7	13.20	8,577.4	172.41
Germany	Deutsche mark	167.98	42.10	192.24	48.18	76.81	19.25	49.48	12.40	486.51	121.93
Switzerland	Franc	232.74	54.00	343.94	79.80	137.06	31.80	103.96	24.12	817.70	189.72
France	do	265.14	54.00	338.30	68.90	171.36	34.90	128.84	26.24	903.63	184.04
Hon. Cornelius E. Gallagher:											
France	Franc	475.23	96.90	489.15	99.74	157.89	32.20	399.86	81.58	1,522.13	310.42
Germany	Deutsche mark	182.10	45.64	228.00	57.00	12,781.13	3,200.55	512.00	128.00	13,703.23	3,431.19
Spain	Peseta	5,375.40	169.24	6,273.60	195.10	929.40	34.30	992.46	34.37	13,570.86	433.01
Italy	Lira	42,265.26	68.06	31,733.10	51.10	16,934.67	27.27	10,743.30	17.30	101,676.33	163.73
Hon. Robert B. Chiperfield:											
Japan	Yen	44,550	123.75	54,151	150.42	13,327	37.02	11,236	31.21	123,264	342.40
Taiwan	New Taiwan dollar.	1,200.0	30.00	172.8	43.20	794.0	19.85	43.6	10.90	4,158.0	103.95
Hong Kong	Hong Kong dollar.	150.00	26.31	269.10	47.21	119.70	21.00	111.36	19.50	650.16	114.02
Philippines	Peso	30.00	10.90	42.35	15.40	25.99	9.45	23.92	8.70	122.26	44.45
United States	Dollar		32.00				1,824.61				1,856.61
Hon. Frances P. Bolton: France	Franc	635.40	129.41	782.00	159.27	3,044.75	620.11	241.00	49.08	4,703.15	957.87
Hon. Chester E. Merrow:											
Germany	Deutsche mark	836.87	209.22	429.67	107.42	3,488.50	872.12	92.95	23.24	4,847.99	1,212.00
Denmark	Kroner	113.85	16.55	308.82	44.88	30.00	4.36	40.88	5.94	493.55	71.73
Austria	Schilling	993.60	38.63	536.05	20.84	45.00	1.75	152.40	5.93	1,727.05	67.15
Greece	Drachma	1,980	66.00	1,348.67	44.96	240.00	8.00	851.00	18.37	4,119.67	137.33
France	Franc	405.00	82.65	108.55	22.15			40.25	8.22	553.80	113.02
England	Pound	33.15.0	94.50	6.4.1	17.38	4.7.6	12.25	2.14.3	7.59	47.0.10	131.72
Laurence Curtis:											
France	Franc	446.40	90.92	410.97	83.70	2,969.40	604.77	81.02	16.50	3,907.79	795.89
Israel	Pound	43.92	20.80	36.85	17.06					81.77	37.86
Jordan	do	60.05	16.93							60.05	16.93
Lebanon	do	72.48	24.00	52.86	17.50	83.05	27.50	16.61	5.50	225.00	74.50

Report of expenditure of foreign currencies and appropriated funds by the Committee on Foreign Affairs, U.S. House of Representatives, expended between Jan. 1 and Dec. 31, 1961—Continued

Name and country	Name of currency	Lodging		Meals		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Hon. William S. Broomfield:											
Germany	Deutsche mark			138.00	34.50	11,655.34	2,918.59	207.96	51.99	12,001.30	3,005.08
France	Franc	197.45	40.30	151.75	30.97	69.10	14.10	63.70	13.00	482.00	98.37
Japan	Yen	16,000	44.45	28,757	79.88	14,400	40.00	15,559	43.22	74,716	207.55
Korea	Hwan	38,720	20.11	79,098	41.09	53,900	28.00	50,531	26.25	222,249	115.45
Taiwan	New Taiwan dollar.	812.4	20.31	1,061.6	26.54	301.6	7.54	293.6	7.34	2,469.2	61.73
Hong Kong	Hong Kong dollar.	270.00	47.37	376.03	65.97	256.50	45.00	272.06	47.73	1,174.59	206.07
Philippines	Peso	74.00	26.91	66.00	24.00	47.74	17.36	41.25	15.00	228.99	83.27
United States	Dollar				3.00		11.25		9.25		23.50
Hon. Robert R. Barry:											
France	Franc	521.93	106.30	380.53	77.50	9,276.95	1,889.40	92.06	18.75	10,271.47	2,091.95
Germany	Deutsche mark	113.03	28.33	25.94	6.50	4,031.50	1,010.40	33.12	8.30	4,203.59	1,053.53
Spain	Peseta	7,365	122.75	17,373	289.55	14,166	236.10	4,818	80.30	43,722	728.70
Lebanon	Pound	69.46	23.00	79.31	26.26	17.52	5.80	14.89	4.93	181.18	59.99
Pakistan	Rupee	209.95	44.48	281.03	59.54	39.65	8.40	35.87	7.60	566.50	120.02
India	do	141.60	30.00	187.62	39.75	237.98	50.42	37.76	8.00	604.96	128.17
Thailand	Baht	564.30	27.00	872.58	41.75	286.33	13.70	156.75	7.50	1,879.96	89.95
Hong Kong	Hong Kong dollar.	139.65	24.50	155.04	27.20	30.32	5.32	17.10	3.00	342.11	60.02
Taiwan	Taiwan dollar	560.0	14.00	648.0	16.20			78.8	1.97	1,286.8	32.17
Japan	Yen	18,180	50.50	15,552	43.20	5,346	14.85	4,122	11.45	43,200	120.00
United States	Dollar						292.00				292.00
Hon. J. Irving Whalley:											
France	Franc	1,116.00	227.29	562.29	114.52	165.00	33.60	390.15	79.46	2,233.44	454.87
Germany	Deutsche mark			59.05	14.80	16.00	4.01	24.94	6.25	100.00	25.06
Marian Czarnecki:											
France	Franc	81.25	16.57	65.00	13.26	10.00	2.04	14.50	3.00	170.75	34.87
Poland	Zloty	945	17.50	5,000	90.00	4,150	75.00	3,355	61.00	13,450	243.50
Germany	Deutsche mark					4,698.4	1,174.60			4,698.4	1,174.60
Irene Lewis: France	Franc	635.40	129.41	728.00	148.27	3,044.75	620.11	232.00	47.25	4,640.15	945.04
Total			3,400.65		3,394.44		19,052.98		1,380.97		27,229.04

RECAPITULATION

Foreign currency (U.S. dollar equivalent)	$24,523.68
Appropriated funds: H. Res. 60, H. Res. 61, 87th Cong	2,705.36
Total	27,229.04

THOMAS E. MORGAN,
Chairman, Committee on Foreign Affairs.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON FAR EAST AND THE PACIFIC

Name and country	Name of currency	Lodging		Meals		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Hon. J. L. Pilcher:											
Japan	Yen	12,080.00	33.54	24,061.00	66.85	3,160.00	8.78	3,230.00	8.98	42,531.00	118.15
Taiwan	New Taiwan dollar.	1,356.00	33.90	374.70	9.36			574.00	14.35	2,304.70	57.61
Hong Kong	Hong Kong dollar.	530.70	93.15	526.79	92.42	146.60	25.71	225.98	39.74	1,430.07	251.02
Vietnam	Piaster	3,103.00	42.52	1,559.00	21.35			1,465.50	20.08	6,127.50	83.95
Thailand	Baht	909.00	43.23	361.74	17.09	1,234.62	59.50	224.00	11.20	2,729.36	131.02
Pakistan	Rupee	85.80	18.76	22.20	4.72			111.00	23.62	219.00	47.10
India	do	143.60	30.55	89.30	19.53	58.80	14.64	104.00	22.13	395.70	87.15
Lebanon	Pound	137.10	45.70	156.50	38.16			52.00	17.33	345.60	101.19
Cyprus	do					.31	.86			.31	.86
Israel	do	150.73	69.77	77.57	35.91	134.53	62.28	94.65	43.82	457.48	211.78
Jordan	do			.89	2.48	3.00	8.40	.14	.39	4.03	11.27
Turkey	Lira	402.00	44.66	697.15	77.46			106.50	11.83	1,205.65	133.95
Spain	Peseta	2,862.00	47.70	6,733.00	102.21			1,470.00	24.50	11,065.00	174.41
Portugal	Escudo	1,190.40	41.64	1,252.60	43.82			435.25	15.25	2,878.25	100.71
Hon. Harris B. McDowell, Jr.:											
Japan	Yen	12,760.00	35.45	11,234.00	31.20	2,800.00	7.78	1,030.00	2.86	27,824.00	77.29
Taiwan	New Taiwan dollar.	1,360.00	34.00	1,109.90	27.75	200.00	5.00	334.00	8.35	3,003.90	75.10
Hong Kong	Hong Kong dollar.	437.40	76.74	1,570.30	275.49	535.35	93.92	572.22	100.39	3,115.27	546.54
Vietnam	Piaster	3,342.00	45.78	4,961.81	67.97			604.44	8.28	8,908.25	122.03
Thailand	Baht	909.00	43.23	2,115.80	105.79	1,871.20	93.56	988.80	49.44	5,884.80	292.02
Pakistan	Rupee	81.80	17.40	310.39	66.04	42.75	7.50	84.18	15.12	519.12	106.06
India	do	143.60	30.55	855.78	182.08	177.98	35.74	220.10	46.83	1,397.46	295.20
Lebanon	Pound	131.65	43.88	455.97	151.99	31.50	10.50	51.99	17.33	671.11	223.70
Israel	do	159.01	73.60	178.68	82.72	134.53	62.28	100.05	46.32	572.27	264.92
Cyprus	do					.31	.86			.31	.86
Jordan	do			7.32	20.48	3.00	8.40	3.71	10.39	14.03	39.27
Turkey	Lira	584.15	68.91	1,338.58	148.74	91.80	10.20	150.21	16.69	2,164.74	244.54
Spain	Peseta	2,874.00	47.90	5,658.00	94.30	606.00	10.10	1,441.80	24.03	10,579.80	176.33
Portugal	Escudo	1,353.00	47.35	3,433.97	120.49	635.55	22.30	966.15	33.90	6,388.67	224.04

Report of expenditure of foreign currencies and appropriated funds by the Committee on Foreign Affairs, U.S. House of Representatives, expended between Jan. 1 and Dec. 31, 1961—Continued

SUBCOMMITTEE ON FAR EAST AND THE PACIFIC—Continued

Name and country	Name of currency	Lodging		Meals		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Hon. Thomas F. Johnson:											
Japan	Yen	11,223	31.17	19,170	53.25	1,720	4.78	9,097	25.27	41,210	114.47
Taiwan	New Taiwan dollar.	1,605.50	40.10	1,834.80	45.87			1,614.80	40.37	5,055.10	126.34
Hong Kong	Hong Kong dollar.	456.20	80.04	1,138.69	199.77	303.30	53.21	900.37	157.96	2,798.56	490.98
Vietnam	Piaster	3,781.60	51.90	4,171.95	57.15	620.50	8.50	1,168.73	16.01	9,742.78	133.56
Thailand	Baht	909.00	43.23	1,364.20	68.21	1,234.62	59.50	1,116.60	55.83	4,624.42	226.77
Pakistan	Rupee	91.30	19.43	197.68	42.06			188.24	40.05	477.22	101.54
India	do	143.00	30.42	456.89	97.21	68.80	14.68	296.33	63.05	965.02	205.36
Lebanon	Pound	119.25	39.75	237.93	79.31	64.50	21.50	106.18	52.06	527.86	192.62
Cyprus	do					.31	.86			.31	.86
Israel	do	117.70	54.48	69.21	32.04	173.41	80.28	128.91	59.68	489.23	226.48
Jordan	do			.89	2.48	3.00	8.40	7.39	20.69	11.28	31.57
Turkey	Lira	602.45	66.94	891.90	99.10	103.50	11.50	215.19	23.91	1,813.04	201.45
Spain	Peseta	2,203	36.73	3,651	60.85	4,992	83.20	2,859	47.65	13,705	228.43
Italy	Lira	39,636	63.83	83,601	134.62	38,454	61.99	28,912	46.72	190,603	307.16
Switzerland	Franc	76.55	15.44	140.66	33.42	199.93	46.49	3.00	.86	420.14	96.21
Belgium	do	5,104	102.08	5,383	107.66	1,050	21.00	1,312	26.24	12,849	256.98
Germany	Deutsche mark	239.16	59.79	183.77	77.07	532.00	133.00	54.00	13.50	1,008.93	283.36
France	Franc	413.18	87.03	680.70	143.19	836.85	175.54	184.90	38.92	2,115.63	444.68
England	Pound	47.8.0	132.60	26.2.0	72.96	127.7.6	356.64	12.11.4	36.86	213.18.0	599.06
Hon. Walter H. Judd:											
Korea	Hwan	21,500	16.60							21,500	16.60
Japan	Yen	11,390	31.64	6,974	18.37	2,163	6.01	1,092	3.04	21,619	59.06
Taiwan	New Taiwan dollar.	1,326	33.15	80	2.00	10	.25	438	10.95	1,854	46.35
Hong Kong	Hong Kong dollar.	574.90	100.86	284.96	49.99	6,589.34	1,156.03	67.91	11.91	7,517.11	1,318.79
Thailand	Baht	909.00	43.23	311.74	14.59	1,167.94	56.16	64.00	3.20	2,456.68	117.18
Pakistan	Rupee	87.55	18.62	11.90	2.53	5.88	1.25	39.00	8.10	144.33	30.50
India	do	143.60	30.55	60.00	12.60	23.50	5.00	5.30	1.13	232.40	49.28
Israel	Pound	114.95	53.20	42.10	19.49	173.41	80.28	90.20	41.76	420.60	194.73
Jordan	do			.89	2.48	3.00	8.40	.14	.39	4.03	11.27
Turkey	Lira	281.00	31.22	365.90	40.66			66.00	7.33	712.90	79.21
Germany	Deutsche mark					7,625.08	1,906.27			7,625.08	1,906.27
Hon. E. Ross Adair:											
Japan	Yen	13,340	37.06	13,394	37.20	2,440	6.78	2,870	7.98	32,044	89.02
Taiwan	New Taiwan dollar.	1,290.00	32.25	456.20	11.40			574.00	14.35	2,320.20	58.00
Hong Kong	Hong Kong dollar.	473.60	83.06	434.58	76.25	146.60	25.71	225.98	39.64	1,280.76	224.66
Vietnam	Piaster	3,925.80	45.15	1,775.00	24.31			1,465.50	20.08	6,536.30	89.54
Thailand	Baht	909.00	43.23	361.74	17.09	1,234.62	59.50	224.00	11.20	2,729.36	131.02
Pakistan	Rupee	81.80	17.40	7.00	1.49			92.20	19.62	181.00	38.5
India	do	143.60	30.55	79.90	17.00	87.60	18.64	104.00	22.13	415.10	88.32
Lebanon	Pound	104.50	34.84	106.75	35.58			52.00	17.33	263.25	87.75
Cyprus	do					.31	.86			.31	.86
Israel	do	112.92	52.38	13.26	6.14	173.39	80.28	16.48	7.63	316.05	146.43
Jordan	do			.89	2.48	3.00	8.40	.14	.39	4.03	11.27
Turkey	Lira	433.50	48.17	596.15	68.23			106.50	11.83	1,136.15	128.23
Spain	Peseta	2,383.35	39.72	6,131.65	102.19			1,470.00	24.50	9,985.00	166.41
Portugal	Escudo	939.00	32.84	1,555.20	54.41			435.25	15.25	2,929.45	102.50
Germany	Deutsche mark					2,171.76	544.30			2,171.76	544.30
Albert C. F. Westphal, staff consultant:											
Japan	Yen	15,235	42.32	10,428	28.96			1,070	2.98	26,733	74.26
Taiwan	New Taiwan dollar.	412.50	10.32	501.00	12.51			407.00	10.18	1,320.50	33.01
Hong Kong	Hong Kong dollar.	390.30	68.47	493.00	86.49	75.84	13.31	65.00	11.40	1,024.14	179.67
Vietnam	Piaster	3,320.20	45.51	2,790.00	38.22			320.00	4.38	6,430.20	88.11
Thailand	Baht	891.03	42.73	813.74	40.69	580.65	27.91	50.00	2.50	2,335.42	113.83
Pakistan	Rupee	64.00	13.62	15.94	3.40			15.47	3.29	95.41	20.31
India	do	100.00	21.28	87.00	18.51	72.00	15.32	76.00	16.17	335.00	71.28
Lebanon	Pound	104.15	34.72	86.85	28.95			13.00	4.33	204.00	68.00
Cyprus	do					.16	.44			.16	.44
Israel	do	83.76	38.76	129.01	59.73	89.95	41.64	90.17	41.74	329.89	181.87
Jordan	do			.91	2.55	3.00	8.40	.09	.25	4.00	11.20
Turkey	Lira	477.00	53.00	527.50	58.61			41.00	4.56	1,045.50	116.17
Spain	Peseta	2,325.00	38.75	3,503.00	58.37	51.00	.85	1,091.00	18.18	5,970.00	116.15
Portugal	Escudo	950.50	33.27	2,250.70	78.76			300.00	10.50	3,501.20	122.53
Henry J. Sandri, State Department escort officer:											
Japan	Yen	14,250	39.59	5,673	15.75			2,285	6.34	22,208	61.68
Taiwan	New Taiwan dollar.	412.50	10.32	764.50	19.11			427.00	10.68	1,604.00	40.11
Hong Kong	Hong Kong dollar.	372.80	65.40	482.10	84.58	53.02	9.30	90.90	15.96	998.82	175.24
Vietnam	Piaster	2,801.20	38.37	818.60	12.01			678.00	9.29	4,297.80	59.67
Thailand	Baht	891.03	42.73	395.87	19.29	647.31	31.25	22.00	1.10	1,956.21	94.37
Pakistan	Rupee	60.00	12.77	53.19	11.33			15.55	3.31	128.74	27.41
India	do	100.00	21.28	25.38	5.40	72.00	15.32	36.02	7.66	233.40	49.66
Lebanon	Pound	100.90	33.63	70.90	23.64	27.30	9.10	24.00	8.00	223.10	74.37
Cyprus	do					.14	.43			.14	.43
Israel	do	75.74	35.05	29.57	13.69	89.95	41.65	86.66	40.13	281.92	130.52
Jordan	do			.89	2.50	3.00	8.40	.07	.20	3.96	11.10
Turkey	Lira	296.75	44.08	353.25	38.14	25.20	2.80	103.20	11.47	878.40	96.49
Spain	Peseta	2,111.0	35.18	2,188.0	36.46	186.0	3.10	1,251.0	20.85	5,736.0	95.59
Portugal	Escudo	853.50	29.87	618.75	21.69	102.60	3.60	410.85	14.40	1,985.70	69.56

Report of expenditure of foreign currencies and appropriated funds by the Committee on Foreign Affairs, U.S. House of Representatives, expended between Jan. 1 and Dec. 31, 1961—Continued

SUBCOMMITTEE ON FAR EAST AND THE PACIFIC—Continued

Name and country	Name of currency	Lodging		Meals		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Marvin Cox, USIA, escort officer:											
Japan	Yen	14,880	41.34	5,744	15.95	2,916	8.10	1,007	2.79	24,547	68.18
Taiwan	New Taiwan dollar.	436.50	10.92	646	16.15	44.00	1.10	437	10.92	1,563.50	39.09
Hong Kong	do	394.10	69.14	317.50	55.70	141.36	24.80	216.87	38.06	1,069.83	187.70
Vietnam	Piaster	2,893.20	39.62	1,115.00	15.28			1,003.00	13.74	5,011.20	68.64
Thailand	Baht	891.03	44.55	344.87	17.25	749.31	37.47	195.00	9.75	2,180.21	109.02
Pakistan	Rupee	79.25	16.86	8.44	1.80			169.24	36.00	256.93	54.66
India	do	100.00	21.28	125.00	26.60	77.00	16.42	92.00	19.56	394.00	83.86
Lebanon	Pound	125.00	41.83	82.25	27.42	3.30	1.10	43.25	14.42	254.30	84.77
Cyprus	do					.16	.43			.16	.43
Israel	do	73.09	33.83	41.54	19.23	95.14	44.05	94.93	43.96	304.70	141.07
Jordan	do			.89	2.50	3.00	8.40	.07	.20	3.96	11.10
Turkey	Lira	502.75	55.86	400.60	44.51	21.60	2.40	82.95	9.22	1,007.90	111.99
Spain	Peseta	472.25	7.87	4,970.75	82.85	426.00	7.10	960.00	16.00	6,829.00	113.82
Portugal	Escudo	1,651.00	57.79	1,705.36	59.69	98.57	3.45	476.00	16.66	3,930.93	137.59
James R. Ames, lieutenant colonel, USAF, Defense Department escort officer:											
Japan	Yen	15,110	41.96	9,290	25.81	720	2.00	1,385	23.08	26,505	92.85
Taiwan	New Taiwan dollar.	412.50	10.32	484.00	12.10			410.00	10.25	1,306.50	32.67
Hong Kong	Hong Kong dollar.	404.90	71.03	541.01	91.47	71.20	12.49	71.10	12.47	1,088.21	187.46
Vietnam	Piaster	2,904.80	39.79	1,635.00	22.40			340.00	4.66	4,879.00	66.85
Thailand	Baht	891.03	42.73	1,010.90	50.54	647.40	32.37	164.00	8.20	2,713.33	133.84
Pakistan	Rupee	60.00	12.77	33.19	7.06	5.00	1.06	30.55	6.50	128.74	27.39
India	do	100.00	21.28	228.50	48.62	77.00	16.25	75.00	15.96	480.50	102.11
Lebanon	Pound	96.25	32.08	113.30	37.77			31.50	10.50	241.50	80.35
Cyprus	do			.14	.43					.14	.43
Israel	do	80.81	37.40	25.98	12.02	89.95	41.64	83.16	38.49	279.90	129.55
Jordan	do			.89	2.50	3.00	8.40	.07	.20	3.96	11.10
Turkey	Lira	443.85	49.32	566.70	62.93			63.00	7.00	1,073.55	119.25
Spain	Peseta	2,074	34.57	3,954	65.90	1,290	4.83	1,690	28.17	8,008	133.47
Portugal	Escudo	992.50	34.74	1,216.60	42.69	30.00	1.05	300.00	10.52	2,539.10	89.00
Total			4,640.49		5,615.48		6,161.66		2,385.65		18,803.28

RECAPITULATION

Foreign currency (U.S. dollar equivalent) $18,803.28

J. L. PILCHER,
Ranking Majority Member, Subcommittee on Far East and the Pacific.

Report of expenditure of foreign currencies and appropriated funds by the Committee on Foreign Affairs, Subcommittee for Review of the Mutual Security Programs, U.S. House of Representatives, expended between Jan. 1 and Dec. 31, 1961

Name and country	Name of currency	Lodging		Meals		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Roy J. Bullock:											
Japan	Yen	18,467	51.29	14,307	39.74	3,083	8.56	1,333	3.71	37,190	103.30
Korea	Hwan	138,076	106.21	25,066	19.28	13,500	10.38	15,166	11.66	191,808	147.53
	U.S. dollar				103.55						103.55
Hong Kong	Hong Kong dollar.	208.00	36.55	179.00	30.82	15.00	2.63	33	5.84	435.00	75.84
Vietnam	Piaster	13,693	191.52	6,053	84.66	733	10.25	770	10.77	21,249	297.20
Thailand	Baht	297	14.24	106	5.11	20	.96	40	1.92	463	22.23
Turkey	Lira	2,547.98	283.11	386.68	42.96	156.66	17.40	40	4.48	3,131.32	347.95
	U.S. dollar				92.81						92.81
France	New franc	406.25	82.91	194.50	39.69	41.66	8.50	10	2.04	652.41	133.14
United States	Dollar						2,227.45	(1)	112.45		2,339.90
Robert F. Brandt:											
Japan	Yen	18,465	51.29	14,307	39.74	3,084	8.58	1,334	3.69	37,193	103.30
Korea	Hwan	138,077	106.21	25,067	19.28	13,500	10.39	15,167	11.67	191,811	147.55
	U.S. dollar				103.55						103.55
Hong Kong	Hong Kong dollar.	209	36.55	179	30.82	15.00	2.63	34.00	5.85	437.00	75.85
Vietnam	Piaster	13,694	191.52	6,054	84.66	734	10.26	770	10.77	21,252	297.21
Thailand	Baht	297	14.25	107	5.12	20	.96	40	1.92	464	22.25
Turkey	Lira	2,547.99	283.11	386.69	42.97	156.67	17.41	40	4.48	3,131.35	347.97
France	New franc	406.25	82.91	194.50	39.70	41.67	8.51	10.00	2.04	652.42	133.16
United States	Dollar						2,232.71	(1)	74.10		2,306.81
Harry C. Cromer:											
Japan	Yen	18,468	51.29	14,308	39.74	3,083	8.56	1,334	3.71	37,193	103.30
Korea	Hwan	138,077	106.21	25,067	19.28	13,500	10.39	15,167	11.67	191,811	147.55
	U.S. dollar				103.55						103.55
Hong Kong	Hong Kong dollar.	208.00	36.55	179.00	30.82	15.00	2.63	33	5.85	435.00	75.85
Vietnam	Piaster	13,693	191.52	6,053	84.66	733	10.25	777	10.77	21,249	297.20
Thailand	Baht	297	14.25	107	5.11	20	.96	40	1.92	464	22.24
Turkey	Lira	2,547.98	283.11	386.68	42.96	156.67	17.41	41	4.48	3,132.33	347.96
	U.S. dollar				92.82						92.82
France	New franc	406.25	82.91	194.50	39.69	41.67	8.50	10	2.04	652.42	133.14
United States	Dollar						2,227.45	(1)	113.80		2,341.25
Total			2,297.51		1,375.91		6,863.73		421.63		10,958.78

[1] Per diem.

Report of expenditure of foreign currencies and appropriated funds by the Committee on Foreign Affairs, Subcommittee for Review of the Mutual Security Programs, U.S. House of Representatives, expended between Jan. 1 and Dec. 31, 1961—Continued

RECAPITULATION

	Amount
Foreign currency (U.S. dollar equivalent)	$3,381.72
Appropriated funds: House resolution	7,577.06
Total	10,958.78

THOMAS E. MORGAN,
Chairman, Subcommittee for Review of the Mutual Security Programs.

Report of expenditure of foreign currencies and appropriated funds by the delegation, Canada-United States Interparliamentary Group, U.S. House of Representatives, expended between Jan. 1 and Dec. 31, 1961

Name and country	Name of currency	Lodging		Meals		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Broomfield, Hon. William S.: Canada	Dollar		64.26		19.55		2.50		19.45		105.76
Cunningham, Hon. Glenn: Canada	do		53.55		35.95		110.88		18.49		218.87
Curtis, Hon. Laurence: Canada	do		61.20		14.74				2.15		78.09
Donohue, Hon. Harold D.: Canada	do		55.08		17.07		33.00		21.74		126.89
Dulski, Hon. Thaddeus J.:											
Canada	do		56.61		27.02		17.49		4.39		105.51
United States	do		20.00		6.20				3.26		29.46
Gallagher, Hon. Cornelius:											
Canada	do		136.17		13.58				16.06		165.81
United States	do		26.00		5.40				4.62		36.02
Harvey, Hon. James: Canada	do		90.27								90.27
Kelly, Hon. Edna F.: Canada	do		64.26		15.06				17.99		97.31
Murphy, Hon. William T.:											
Canada	do		90.27						1.28		91.55
United States	do		14.00		2.50						16.50
Philbin, Hon. Philip J.: Canada	do		61.20		35.60		33.25		21.35		161.40
Stratton, Hon. Samuel S.: Canada	do		90.27		20.87				10.05		121.19
Tupper, Hon. Stanley R.:											
Canada	do		90.27		50.81		5.00		15.10		161.18
United States	do		24.00		11.00						35.00
Westphal, Albert C. F.:											
Canada	do		56.61		38.65				7.50		102.76
United States	do		16.00		3.15						19.15
O'Brien, Mary L.:											
Canada	do		67.32		3.87		1.20		9.27		81.66
United States	do		14.00		1.40						15.40
Delegation expenses (February 1961 meeting): Canada.	do								341.83		341.83
Delegation expenses (June 1961 meeting): United States.	do								2,881.90		2,881.90
Total			1,151.34		322.42		203.32		3,396.43		5,083.51

RECAPITULATION

	Amount
Appropriated funds: Public Law 86-42	$5,083.51

CORNELIUS E. GALLAGHER,
Chairman, House Delegation, Canada-United States Interparliamentary Group.

Report of expenditure of foreign currencies and appropriated funds by the delegation, Mexico-United States Interparliamentary Group, U.S. House of Representatives, expended between Jan. 1 and Dec. 31, 1961

Name and country	Name of currency	Lodging		Meals		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
D. S. Saund: Mexico	Dollar		77.96		82.08				26.08		186.12
J. T. Rutherford: Mexico	do		46.32		64.16		1.76		14.24		126.48
Joseph M. Montoya: Mexico	do		63.92		81.21		5.92		17.32		168.37
Robert N. C. Nix: Mexico	do		46.32		89.68		4.80		45.18		185.98
Harris B. McDowell, Jr.: Mexico	do		52.32		87.24		8.40		26.17		174.13
Daniel K. Inouye: Mexico	do		63.92		78.98		6.56		25.60		175.06
Walter Norblad: Mexico	do		63.92		90.56		7.92		25.85		188.25
William L. Springer: Mexico	do		63.92		57.77		5.12		20.08		136.89
Joel T. Broyhill: Mexico	do		63.92		81.51		4.88		21.19		171.50
Edward J. Derwinski: Mexico	do		63.92		69.88		5.20		10.08		159.08
Ancher Nelsen: Mexico	do		46.96		69.24		142.63		13.96		272.79
Albert C. F. Westphal: Mexico	do		46.32		62.44		5.76		22.84		137.36
Helen L. Hashagen: Mexico	do		46.32		46.83		3.50		10.16		106.81
Delegation expenses	do								599.35		599.35
Total			746.04		961.58		202.45		878.10		2,788.17

RECAPITULATION

	Amount
Appropriated funds: Public Law 86-420, 86th Cong	$2,788.17

D. S. SAUND,
Chairman, House Delegation, Mexico-United States Interparliamentary Group.

Report of expenditure of foreign currencies and appropriated funds by the delegation to 50th Conference, Interparliamentary Union, Brussels, Belgium, U.S. House of Representatives, expended between Jan. 1 and Dec. 31, 1961

Name and country	Name of currency	Lodging		Meals		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Harold D. Cooley: Belgium	U.S. dollar		74.93		58.73				28.06		161.72
Hale Boggs: Belgium	do		108.54		69.85				15.38		193.77
John W. Byrnes: Belgium	do		60.30		119.03		1.70		8.00		189.03
Hugh L. Carey: Belgium	do		108.54		245.87		5.50		48.61		408.52
Gerald R. Ford, Jr.: Belgium	do		108.54		200.72		2.80		15.27		327.33
James B. Frazier, Jr.: Belgium	do		120.60		143.21		5.10		25.65		294.56
Charles B. Hoeven: Belgium	do		120.60		267.72		9.10		28.65		426.07
Paul C. Jones: Belgium	do		117.56		94.57		3.85		10.90		226.88
Gordon L. McDonough: Belgium	do		120.60		155.15		6.50		9.98		292.23
Gracie Pfost: Belgium	do		63.32		112.48		3.15		30.15		209.10
Alexander Pirnie: Belgium	do		70.35		185.07		11.10		149.97		416.49
Katharine St. George: Belgium	do		241.20		46.23				28.46		315.89
D. S. Saund: Belgium	do		108.54		110.47		1.50		14.93		235.44
Christine S. Gallagher: Belgium	do		63.32		15.70				1.01		80.03
Total			1,486.94		1,824.80		50.30		415.02		3,777.06

RECAPITULATION

	Amount
Appropriated funds:	
Other Public Law 87-264	$3,777.06
Government department: Department of Defense	218.50
Total	3,995.56

Report of expenditure of foreign currencies and appropriated funds by the delegation to NATO Parliamentarians' Conference, U.S. House of Representatives, expended between Jan. 1 and Dec. 31, 1961

Name and country	Name of currency	Lodging		Meals		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Victor L. Anfuso:											
France	French franc	1,376.29	280.30	659.19	134.25	245.47	49.99	1,553.04	316.30	3,833.99	780.84
United States	Dollar						85.00				85.00
Leslie C. Arends:											
France	French franc	1,376.29	280.30	649.19	132.21	245.47	49.99	1,553.04	316.30	3,823.99	778.80
United States	Dollar						99.88				99.88
Clifford Davis:											
France	French franc	1,376.29	280.30	637.03	129.74	245.47	49.99	1,553.04	316.30	3,811.84	776.33
United States	Dollar		32.00				128.81				160.81
Samuel L. Devine:											
France	French franc	1,376.29	280.30	659.19	134.25	245.47	49.99	1,553.04	316.30	3,833.99	780.84
United States	Dollar		32.00				54.08				86.08
Wayne L. Hays:											
France [1]	French franc	2,256.29	459.53	835.71	170.20	245.47	49.99	1,678.04	341.76	5,015.51	1,021.48
	Dollar						2,302.11				2,302.11
United States [2]	do						689.95				689.95
Canada [1]	do		20.00		12.70						32.70
John V. Lindsay: France	French franc	1,376.29	280.30	618.11	125.89	245.47	49.99	1,553.04	316.30	3,792.91	772.48
Frank E. Smith:											
France	do	1,376.29	280.30	632.04	128.72	245.47	49.99	1,553.04	316.30	3,806.84	775.31
United States [2]	Dollar		76.75				234.72				311.47
Canada	do		15.00		6.00						21.00
Homer Thornberry:											
France	French franc	1,376.29	280.30	659.19	134.25	245.47	49.99	1,553.04	316.30	3,833.99	780.84
United States	Dollar						215.16				215.16
Jack Westland:											
France	French franc	1,376.29	280.30	626.11	127.51	245.47	49.99	1,553.04	316.30	3,800.91	774.10
United States	Dollar						341.47		3.00		344.47
Philip B. Billings:											
France	French franc	1,376.29	280.30	637.08	129.75	245.47	49.99	1,551.63	316.02	3,810.47	776.06
United States [2]	Dollar						473.14		132.00		605.14
Canada	do		15.00		5.75						20.75
Boyd Crawford: France	French franc	1,376.29	280.30	644.14	131.08	245.47	49.99	1,553.04	316.30	3,818.94	777.67
Whitney Ann Gordon: France	do	1,376.29	280.30	621.11	126.50	245.47	49.99	844.12	181.09	3,086.99	637.88
Mary Hrabik:											
France	do	1,376.29	280.30	628.17	127.94	245.47	49.99	753.04	154.39	3,002.97	612.65
United States	Dollar						55.00				55.00
Patricia E. Peak: France	French franc	1,376.29	280.30	616.06	125.55	245.47	49.99	836.12	170.29	3,078.94	626.13
Total			4,294.18		1,882.29		5,379.18		4,145.25		15,700.93

[1] Includes attending meeting as U.S. member, NATO Parliamentarians' Conference Standing Committee.
[2] Includes NATO Parliamentarians' visit, U.S. military bases.

RECAPITULATION

	Amount
Foreign currency (U.S. dollar equivalent)	$10,671.41
Appropriated funds: Public Law 689 of 84th Cong	5,029.52
Total	15,700.93

WAYNE L. HAYS,
Chairman, House Delegation to NATO Parliamentarians' Conference.

Report of expenditure of foreign currencies and appropriated funds by the Committee on House Administration, U.S. House of Representatives, expended between Jan. 1 and Dec. 31, 1962

Name and country	Name of currency	Lodging		Meals		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Hugh L. Carey:											
Belgium	Franc	3,299	65.80	3,355	67.20	12,611	254.17	1,893	38.00	21,158	425.17
France	do	335	67.05	265	53.06	610	122.04	195	39.02	1,405	281.17
Ireland	Pound	8	22.40	14	29.20	12	33.60	4	11.20	38	96.40
Italy	Lira	25,802	39.92	25,729	39.79	76,942	119.59	16,643	25.88	145,116	225.18
United Kingdom	Pound	16	45.60	13.5	38.00	44.5	126.00	8	22.40	82	232.00
Total			240.77		227.25		655.40		136.50		1,259.92

RECAPITULATION

	Amount
Foreign currency (U.S. dollar equivalent)	$1,259.92
Personal check to Treasury Department for reimbursement of nonofficial transportation	84.00
Personal check to Treasury Department for reimbursement of nonofficial expenditures	267.80
	351.80

This report supplements the report of the delegation to the 50th Interparliamentary Union Conference, Brussels, Belgium, and sets forth the expenditure of foreign currencies authorized for attendance to the Conference.

OMAR BURLESON,
Chairman, Committee on House Administration.

SUMMARY OF REPORTS OF HOUSE COMMITTEES ON TRAVEL OUTSIDE THE UNITED STATES IN 1961

The following committees of the House of Representatives have filed reports of expenditure of foreign currencies and appropriated funds during the calendar year 1961, which have been printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on the dates indicated:

Banking and Currency, January 23, 1962.
Post Office and Civil Service, January 23, 1962.
Veterans' Affairs, March 8, 1962.
Appropriations, March 8, 1962.
Rules, March 8, 1962.
Armed Services, March 8, 1962.
Government Operations, March 21, 1962.
Science and Astronautics, March 21, 1962.
Merchant Marine and Fisheries, March 21, 1962.
Ways and Means, March 21, 1962.
Judiciary, March 21, 1962.
Public Works, March 21, 1962.
Foreign Affairs, March 21, 1962.
House Administration, March 21, 1962.

The following committees, not having members or employees traveling outside the United States in 1961, are not required to report:

District of Columbia.
Interior and Insular Affairs.
Un-American Activities.
Select Committee on Small Business.
Select Committee on Export Control.

The following committees have expended funds for oversea travel, but have failed to report expenditures as required by law:

Agriculture.
Education and Labor.
Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1839. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on the audit of the Federal Crop Insurance Corporation for the fiscal year 1961 (H. Doc. No. 368); to the Committee on Government Operations and ordered to be printed.

1840. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on the audit of the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands, Department of the Interior, for the fiscal years 1957 through 1960; to the Committee on Government Operations.

1841. A letter from the Chairman, Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations, transmitting an information report relating to tax overlapping in the United States, 1961, pursuant to Public Law 380, 86th Congress; to the Committee on Government Operations.

1842. A letter from the Postmaster General, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to permit the Postmaster General to extend contract mail routes up to 100 miles during the contract term"; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

1843. A letter from the Secretary of the Air Force, transmitting the Air Force report entitled "Semiannual Research and Development Procurement Actions Report," covering the period from July 1 through December 31, 1961, pursuant to Public Law 557, 82d Congress; to the Committee on Armed Services.

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. JAMES C. DAVIS: Committee of conference. H.R. 5968. A bill to amend the District of Columbia Unemployment Compensation Act, as amended (Rept. No. 1474). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. RUTHERFORD: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H.R. 8484. A bill to authorize establishment of the Theodore Roosevelt Birthplace and Sagamore Hill National Historic Sites, N.Y., and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 1475). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. TRIMBLE: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 572. Resolution providing for the consideration of S. 2533, a bill to amend the requirements for participation in the 1962 feed grain program; without amendment (Rept. No. 1476). Referred to the House Calendar.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ADDONIZIO:

H.R. 10846. 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. ANDERSON of Illinois:

H.R. 10847. A bill making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1962, for payments to local educational agencies under Public Laws 815 and 874, 81st Congress; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. CAHILL:

H.R. 10848. A bill to amend the Small Business Act to make it clear that disaster loans in cases of flood or other catastrophe may be made with respect to property of any type (including summer homes as well as other residential property); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. CELLER:

H.R. 10849. A bill to amend chapter 13 of title 18 of the United States Code relating to civil rights; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FINO:

H.R. 10850. A bill to provide coverage under the old-age, survivors, and disability insurance system (subject to an election in the case of those currently serving) for all officers and employees of the United States and its instrumentalities; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HARRISON of Wyoming:

H.R. 10851. A bill to provide for the establishment of a regional office of the National Park Service at Cheyenne, Wyo.; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. KEOGH:

H.R. 10852. A bill to continue for a temporary period the existing suspension of duties on certain classifications of spun silk yarn; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MATTHEWS:

H.R. 10853. A bill to amend the act of May 22, 1928, relating to the comprehensive survey of timber and forest products required to be made by the Secretary of Agriculture; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. MONTOYA:

H.R. 10854. A bill to authorize the disposal of surplus property to State agencies regularly engaged in the operation of annual fairs and similar expositions; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. RIVERS of Alaska:

H.R. 10855. A bill to amend part IV of subtitle C of title 10, United States Code, to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to develop the South Barrow gasfield, Naval Petroleum Reserve No. 4, for the purpose of making gas available for sale to the native village of Barrow and to other communities and installations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. HALPERN:

H.R. 10856. 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. TEAGUE of Texas (by request):

H.R. 10857. A bill to amend chapter 31 of title 38, United States Code, to provide vocational rehabilitation for certain blinded veterans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. TRIMBLE:

H.R. 10858. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Army to construct Pine Mountain Dam on Lee Creek, Ark.; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. WHITENER:

H.R. 10859. A bill to enable the Secretary of State to make such changes in the higher ranking personnel of the Department of State as he deems advisable; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. PERKINS:

H.R. 10860. A bill to assist the States in providing necessary instruction for adults not proficient in basic educational skills through grants to States for pilot projects, improvement of State services, and programs of instruction, and through grants to institutions of higher learning for development of materials and methods of instruction and for training of teaching and supervisory personnel; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. BAKER:

H.R. 10861. A bill to assist in alleviating the effects of unemployment resulting from Federal tariff or trade policy by establishing a temporary program of supplementary grants for States which provide for liberalization of their unemployment compensation payments to persons unemployed because of Federal tariff or trade policy; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GLENN:

H.R. 10862. A bill to amend the Federal Trade Commission Act, to promote quality and price stabilization, to define and restrain certain unfair methods of distribution and to confirm, define, and equalize the rights of producers and resellers in the distribution of goods identified by distinguishing brands, names, or trademarks, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mrs. GRANAHAN:

H.R. 10863. A bill declaring Good Friday in each year to be a legal public holiday; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HARRIS:

H.R. 10864. A bill to amend the Interstate Commerce Act to grant to any carrier of coal by pipeline, subject to any of the provisions of part 1 of the act, the right of eminent domain, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 10865. A bill to amend the Federal Power Act; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 10866. A bill to amend the Natural Gas Act; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. McSWEEN:

H.R. 10867. A bill to support the price of soybeans; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H.R. 10868. A bill to provide for a survey of the ring levee around Simmesport, La.; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. GRAY:

H.R. 10869. A bill to authorize the modification of the flood-control project for the Saline River and tributaries, Illinois; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. YATES:

H.R. 10870. A bill to authorize Federal grants to assist in the development and operation of studies and projects to help older persons; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN:

H.J. Res. 669. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to disapproval and reduction of items in general appropriation bills; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MULTER:

H.J. Res. 670. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to abolish the requirement that a poll tax or other tax be paid as a qualification for voting in any election; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BROOMFIELD:

H.J. Res. 671. Joint resolution providing for the establishment of an annual Youth Appreciation Week; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SCHWENGEL:

H. Res. 570. Resolution amending the rules of the House of Representatives relating to the appointment of professional and clerical staffs of the committees of the House; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. POWELL:

H. Res. 571. Resolution authorizing the printing of additional copies of parts 1, 2, 3, and 7 of the hearings held before the Committee on Education and Labor on the impact of imports and exports; to the Committee on House Administration.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ADDONIZIO:

H.R. 10871. A bill for the relief of Giovanni Abbondandola; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BOGGS:

H.R. 10872. A bill relating to the transportation facilities operated by New Orleans Public Service Inc., a corporation organized under the laws of the State of Louisiana and operating in the city of New Orleans, La., and all the shares of whose common stock are owned by Middle South Utilities, Inc.; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mrs. BOLTON:

H.R. 10873. A bill for the relief of Lubomira Chodakiewicz; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CAREY:

H.R. 10874. A bill for the relief of Dr. Joseph Giovanniello; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GOODELL:

H.R. 10875. A bill for the relief of Sister Enrica (Pasqualina Filippo) and Sister Antonia (Ida Conforto); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HÉBERT:

H.R. 10876. A bill relating to the transportation facilities operated by New Orleans Public Service Inc., a corporation organized under the laws of the State of Louisiana and operating in the city of New Orleans, La., and all the shares of whose common stock are owned by Middle South Utilities, Inc.; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. MILLIKEN:

H.R. 10877. A bill for the relief of Dr. Julio S. Suarez; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. POWELL:

H.R. 10878. A bill for the relief of Nisir K. Sen; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. REECE:

H.R. 10879. A bill for the relief of James W. Bowery; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RIEHLMAN:

H.R. 10880. A bill for the relief of Dr. Chi Tien, Julia Lai-chu Cheng Tien, and Anita Tien; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SAUND:

H.R. 10881. A bill for the relief of Major Singh Sunga; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WILLIAMS:

H.R. 10882. A bill to provide for the conveyance of certain mineral rights to D. C. Smith, of Fayette, Miss.; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H.R. 10883. A bill to provide for the conveyance of all interests of the United States in certain land in Jefferson County, Miss., to the holders of record of the fee interest in such land; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mrs. GRANAHAN:

H. Res. 573. Resolution providing for sending the bill H.R. 10752, for the relief of the O'Brien Dieselectric Corp., to the Court of Claims; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII,

256. The SPEAKER presented a petition of Henry Stoner, Fort Wayne, Ind., relative to reapportionment in the U.S. House of Representatives, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

The Federal Power Commission

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 21, 1962

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, it appears that the change of administration and the appointment of new members to the Federal Power Commission has resulted in little more than new faces presiding over the gouging of the consumers in the Federal Power Commission charged with responsibility of protecting consumers from unreasonable price gouging at the hands of pipelines and producers. It is difficult to assign responsibility within the Federal Power Commission for the latest action, highly reeking of impropriety, by the membership of that agency. The so-called area-pricing decision of the Federal Power Commission was a sufficiently scandalous continuance of the long-established policies in that body to bring about a loud outcry on the part of consumers over the continued manifest unconcern for the consumer interest, and thorough disregard for sound regulation.

However, the Federal Power Commission has now reached either a new high or a new low in its record of disregard

for the consumer. The Chairman of the Federal Power Commission announced the appointment of a National Gas Advisory Council to hold its first meeting in Washington March 20 and 21. There is no section in the act establishing the Federal Power Commission authorizing establishment of a National Gas Advisory Council. Moreover, it is interesting to note that many of the backers of the infamous natural gas bills are listed as members of that body. Included in the agenda for the first meeting are a number of subjects vitally affecting gas prices and consumer interests, including: "Is there a basis in the public interest for allowing pipelines a higher rate of return on producing properties than on other properties?" "Is the 12-year supply requirement for pipelines reasonable?" "How does it affect pipelines and consumers?"

Also included prominently in the agenda are the questions:

"What are the effects of take-or-pay clauses on pipeline reserves and finances? Expansion programs?"

"What, if any, modifications are desirable in these clauses?"

"How would modification of take-or-pay clauses aid purchasers, producers, consumers?"

This smacks of ex parte communication on a grand scale sanctioned by the imprimatur of the Federal Power Commission. If the Federal Power Commission is to regulate in the public interest it should buckle down to the solution of its vast backlog of cases and to elimination of its huge reservoir of pipeline rate increases under bond. If that agency will devote itself to its responsibility under law it has more than enough to keep itself occupied.

The Irish Sweepstakes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL A. FINO
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 21, 1962

Mr. FINO. Mr. Speaker, while we in Congress continue to refuse to recognize and capitalize on the natural gambling spirit of the American people and while we keep our eyes closed and ignore the tremendous revenue-producing features of a national lottery, millions of dollars continue to leave our shores every year in support of foreign-run lotteries.

This week, Mr. Speaker, the official drawing for the Irish Sweepstakes will take place in Dublin, Ireland. Hundreds of thousands of American citizens across the country will be anxiously awaiting the results which, in some cases, will mean the happy fulfillment of a dream.

Ireland is one of the 50-odd foreign countries where lotteries are legal and proper and where the gambling urge of their inhabitants is tied in with the need for revenue. Last year, the total gross receipts from worldwide sale of Irish Sweepstakes tickets were a record high of $48,976,859—an increase of about $3 million over the year before. I would say that at least $40 million of this amount comes from the good old United States of America.

Mr. Speaker, we can shut off the flow of billions of dollars now siphoned off by the underworld in the United States and by foreign-run lotteries by adopting our own national lottery. A national lottery in this country would bring into the U.S. Treasury $10 billion a year in new revenue which could be used for a tax cut and reduction of our big national debt.

Charles W. Beckman: Good Citizen and Patriot

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES G. FULTON
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 21, 1962

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Speaker, Charles W. Beckman, burgess and mayor of the borough of Mount Oliver, Pa., for a quarter century died unexpectedly on October 31, 1961, at the age of 70, concluding a life devoted to his family, community, its people, and his country.

Mr. Beckman, son of Ernest and Sophia Beckman, was a lifelong resident of Mount Oliver where his grandparents had settled on a farm in the 1800's. He married Marie Elizabeth Sullivan in 1919 and had four children.

Like his father, he chose public life. He was elected burgess of the borough of Mount Oliver in 1934 and held the office continuously, with the exception of a 4-year period, until his death on the eve of his anticipated reelection for a seventh term which he had been importuned to seek through the persuasion of his friends. On several occasions, he was a Republican candidate for county and State offices. He held the unique distinction in Pennsylvania politics of twice being elected—in 1949 and 1953—to the office of burgess as a write-in and sticker candidate, defeating both Republican and Democratic opponents.

Mr. Beckman was widely known as a successful businessman, pioneer automobile dealer, real estate developer, sportsman and above all, he was known to his community as a friend in need.

Among his notable efforts during his long career of public service was his unflagging interest in promoting commercial aviation.

In the early days of this industry, fraught as it was with physical and financial hazards, he owned and operated commercial airplanes, which demonstrated his faith in this then new mode of transportation.

His recognized activities as a sportsman included both playing and promoting semiprofessional baseball and basketball, the training and owning of trotting and running horses, and the development of a national reputation as a pigeon fancier.

In an age of status symbolism, Charles Beckman was a man without pretensions—warmhearted, kind and generous and always considerate of the problems of less fortunate people.

Over the years he was the friend in need to hundreds of distressed families in Mount Oliver and other communities in the South Hills area of Pittsburgh. For a decade or more he was the unidentified "good Samaritan" of a community newspaper to whom families in distress wrote for and received help, particularly at the Thanksgiving and Christmas season.

Charles Beckman left to his family, his friends, and the community a legacy of public service and good will toward all men for new generations to emulate.

Address by Hon. Oren Harris

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL D. ROSTENKOWSKI
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 21, 1962

Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, I want to call the attention of the House to an address of Hon. OREN HARRIS, chairman, House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee, before the Chicago Western Railway Club at their annual executive night's dinner at the grand ballroom, Sherman Hotel, in Chicago, on March 19, 1962.

The message concerns an important component part of our Nation's progress and economy. For this reason, I am inserting into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the text of Congressman HARRIS' address and commend it to the attention of all my colleagues.

The address follows:

ADDRESS OF HON. OREN HARRIS, CHAIRMAN, HOUSE COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE, BEFORE THE WESTERN RAILWAY CLUB, CHICAGO, MARCH 19, 1962

Mr. President, ladies and gentlemen, it is a pleasure to be with you again tonight.

I recall most warmly my visit with you here 3 years ago last November. At that time Congress had recently completed its work on the Transportation Act of 1958 and I recall discussing with you three railroad problems which had been developed in the course of our hearings on that legislation dealing with surface transportation, namely, competition, ratemaking principles, and diversification.

Tonight we are just a month away from Lieutenant Colonel Glenn's epochal flight. All of us followed closely his descriptions of what the earth looked like from a great distance. Thus it has seemed appropriate in these times to engage in a look at our Nation's railroads as they might be viewed from afar off.

Several weeks ago in New York, in speaking to the Transportation Association of America, I presented some views relating to the transportation industry as a whole, and expressed the opinion that we had a strong privately owned and privately operated transportation system, and that while I recognized some signs of weakness here and there, the

present condition of the transportation industry could not be characterized as being in a crisis. There apparently has been some reaction to this talk, with some still adhering to a position of gloom and doom.

So, since I am here in Chicago before your Western Railway Club where most of our great railroads are represented, I intend tonight to be more specific and to speak more about individual railroads than railroads as a whole.

We have now had 3½ years' experience since the passage of the Transportation Act of 1958 and it is fitting to look at today's picture.

There are several puzzling aspects in the present railroad picture. I should like tonight to discuss two of them—each is provocative and challenging.

The first puzzlement is the very heterogeneous and opposite ways in which individual railroads have come out of the 1960–61 recession. Some railroads now have peak earnings. Others are abysmally bad.

However, in order to analyze correctly the trend in railroad earnings, it is necessary to take into account the effect in the last 10 years of the temporary tax savings resulting from accelerated amortization of emergency facilities. This is so because net railway operating income, the measure used in determining the results of a railroad's operation, includes Federal income taxes as well as operating revenues and expenses.

Since these certificates of accelerated amortization generally were last issued in 1955, their effect in increasing net railway operating income has about run out. Indeed, more than half the railroads serving Chicago already show a deficit in this account, and are paying higher taxes than they otherwise would, and by this year, or by 1963 all railroads will be in this situation. Thus, from this one feature alone, individual railroads would have shown a declining net railway operating income these past few years, even though all other things were equal, and they had identical revenues and expenses each year.

For example, in 1961, the Southern, Seaboard, and Norfolk & Western reported decreases from 1960 in net railway operating income. However, if the effect of these tax savings is eliminated, all three would show an increase. (I do not know, therefore, whether the current accounting treatment is exactly fair to the operating departments of the railroads.) During the past 10 years the temporary tax savings for individual railroads have averaged 10 to 20 percent of railway net operating income, and for many railroads has amounted to as much as 30 percent in a given year.

In going back through annual reports since 1948 of some of the major railroads in the country, I find that if the effect of accelerated tax amortization were eliminated we would have the following situation as to 1961 net railway operating income.

Atlantic Coast Line and Norfolk & Western, highest in these 14 years; Louisville & Nashville, and Union Pacific, highest since 1951 except for 1 year; Missouri Pacific, highest since 1952 except for 1 year; Southern Pacific, highest since 1953 (and perhaps earlier, as Moody's Manual for 1960 may not have given a correct estimate of 1961 tax savings); Frisco, and perhaps the Cottonbelt, highest since 1956; Burlington, Milwaukee, and Illinois Central, highest since 1956 except for 1 year; Wabash, highest since 1957; Southern, highest since 1957 except for 1 year; and Rio Grande, highest since 1958.

On the other hand, the Santa Fe, Chicago & Eastern Illinois, Rock Island, Gulf, Mobile & Ohio, and Pennsylvania merely were higher in 1961 than 1960; and the Baltimore & Ohio, Chesapeake & Ohio, Great Western, Great Northern, New York Central, Nickel Plate, and Northern Pacific were the poorest in the past 14 years.

I do not wish to say that this listing has been set forth in anywise to support a proposition that net railway operating income has been adequate these past 14 years whether or not we take into account this temporary tax savings feature, or that net railway operating income should not have grown commensurate with the growth of the country. Nor am I making any argument whether or not the accounting treatment by the railroads and the Interstate Commerce Commission should have been different and like that of other utilities under regulation should have provided for the creation of a reserve to equalize these temporary savings over the years in the future when they act in reverse. Nor has there been any failure by the railroads to disclose to their stockholders what President Marsh of the Santa Fe described in our 1958 hearings as a temporary inflation in earnings that does not represent the true situation.

I simply have offered this list to show that one of the puzzling features in the railroad picture today is that many railroads do not appear to be facing acute crisis, although it is all too clear that some are in trouble and others seem to be hurting.

The second puzzlement I wish to discuss is the condition of the eastern railroads.

For some time, naturally, I have been aware that the eastern railroads were not doing as well as those in the South and West. To some extent I suppose over the years my mind had attributed this to the fact that the East relatively had not been growing as rapidly as the South and the West.

More recently, however, I have had occasion to be brought face to face with the truth that whereas during the forties perhaps the East did not grow as rapidly as the rest of the country, this was not true during the fifties. I became well aware of this fact for as you may know, down in Arkansas, we have been experiencing a little problem of congressional redistricting. There is nothing that so clearly emphasizes to some of us the relatively changing population of the country as the change in the number of seats in the House of Representatives which each State has.

Thus, in the past months I have had reason to become somewhat familiar with the 1960 census which shows a nationwide population increase of 18½ percent over the 1950 census. I could not help noticing the drop in population experienced by our many large cities since the 1950 census. New York, Chicago, Philadelphia, Detroit, Washington, Baltimore, Cleveland, Boston, St. Louis, Pittsburgh, Buffalo—every one of these lost population in this decade. On the other hand, Los Angeles, Houston, Milwaukee, Dallas, New Orleans, Memphis, Denver, Atlanta, all grew substantially.

In 1950, there were 18 cities with a population of 500,000 or more. The Pennsylvania Railroad serves 11 of these. Every one lost population. The New York Central serves nine. Every one lost population.

In 1950, there were 32 cities with a population between 200,000 and 500,000, and 56 cities with a population between 100,000 and 200,000. The Pennsylvania served 23 of these. Eleven of these 23 lost population. The New York Central served 22 of these. Nine of these 22 lost population.

In total, the large cities over 100,000 served by each of these railroads lost population although the territory served by each of them grew around 16 percent in population during the decade. The net railway operating for each of these railroads for the years 1959, 1960, and 1961 averaged some 60 percent less than for the 10 previous years 1949, 1950, and 1951.

I commenced to wonder if there might be some correlation between railway earnings and the growth of cities served by the railroads. The territory served by the Southern Railway grew only at a rate of about one-half that of the territory served by the New York Central and the Pennsylvania, but its cities grew some 8½ percent. Southern's net railway operating income increased some 30 percent during the 10 years. The Missouri Pacific territory increased about the same as that of the aforementioned eastern railroads but the cities over 100,000 which it served grew 26 percent and its net railway operating income has remained fairly constant.

The Norfolk & Western and the Chesapeake & Ohio to some degree serve similar territory. The Chesapeake & Ohio's large cities lost population during the decade while the Norfolk & Western increased 17 percent. Net railway operating income of the Chesapeake & Ohio increased only 2 percent while that of the Norfolk & Western increased 78 percent.

The large cities served by the Illinois Central increased only some 2 percent while those of the Louisville & Nashville increased 8 percent. The Illinois Central net railway operating income is off 49 percent while that of the Louisville & Nashville is up slightly. The Southern Pacific and the Santa Fe both experienced great growth in the territories served by them. The large cities served by the Santa Fe increased only 20 percent while those served by the Southern Pacific increased 32 percent. Santa Fe earnings are off more than those of the Southern Pacific during the past 10 years.

I do not wish to state that there is a complete statistical correlation between the growth or decline of the large cities served by a railroad and its net earnings for too many assumptions or adjustments would have to be made relating to such matters as management, traffic composition, length of haul, number of industrial sidings, maintenance of property, et cetera, but it is clear that where the large cities are losing population (whether in the East, here, or in the West such as Chicago, Detroit, St. Louis, Cincinnati, Minneapolis, San Francisco, Oakland, or Portland) railroads are not doing so well.

It would seem that the railroads have a substantial stake in these large cities. It may be that the decline of the city, even though the metropolitan area grows, means loss of traffic to the railroad. This was suggested by an official of the Pennsylvania Railroad in connection with a discussion in 1957–58 of the Philadelphia commuter plan on the ground that its experience was that location of people and industry on the periphery of cities was not equally accompanied by railroad sidings and increased traffic. It may be that the tax situation in these declining cities is much different from that in one which is expanding. From whatever the cause, I would think it behooves railroad management to be most energetic in its attention to its urban centers.

Today we seem to be living in an age of "zations." To all of the "zations," including "centralization," we now are adding "urbanization." There can be no question about the country's trend from rural to urban population. We all are familiar with the tremendous growth of our large metropolitan areas. What apparently is being overlooked, however, is what has been happening to the principal city at the heart of these areas, what are the railroad's interests in this central city compared with its interests in the new cities which are springing up around it?

This is a puzzlement to the legislator who is confronted with the requirements of the modern age, for there seems great dissimilarity in the approach to the problem which is made by individual railroads.

Some seem energetically to be attempting to rebuild and vitalize their cities. I have noted with interest not only what is going

on in your city here as to the commuter traffic but such innovations as that of the water taxi which Mr. Heineman is putting on the Chicago River.

Others seem to take the position that this matter should be turned over completely for Federal treatment. Such position is most perplexing in the face of a situation where the cities, their citizens, and those who stand to gain or lose do not seem certain as to what they want to do about their own cities. This uncertainty is reflected in such treatises as those of the Committee for Economic Development which have titles like "Changing Economic Functions of the Central Cities" and "Metropolis Against Itself"; in Robert Moses' recent article in the Atlantic Monthly "Are Cities Dead?"; and in Lewis Mumford's book, "The City of History," to name a few.

Cinderella's character never recovered, one supposes, from the disastrous intervention of her fairy godmother. Having once discovered how far her problems could be solved by that wand, she, no doubt, stopped trying to solve them herself and adopted the slogan, "Leave it to grandmother."

I am not yet fully convinced that the time has arrived when the Federal wand should be waved to bail out the railroads from some of these local problems. Certain it is that the data I have given with respect to large city growth and railroad earnings would seem to suggest that a railroad's freight traffic is involved and that the railroad itself has an immense stake in maintaining the city's population and in facilitating transportation to the city from the suburbs.

This year marks the 75th anniversary of the passage of the Interstate Commerce Act. It is fitting that we note this anniversary, for under the regulation provided by this act, as amended, we have maintained in this country a system of railroads which have been privately operated. The tradition of this type of free enterprise seems to me to be worth keeping.

In this orbital age, all of our practices, our institutions, our laws, and our businesses naturally come under the necessity of continuous examination as to how best they serve the public interest. It is the duty of all of us to consider the extent to which regulation needs to be strengthened or relaxed best to meet the public convenience and necessity of our times and of the future.

I have attempted to outline for you tonight some of the perplexities which confront a legislator as he considers today's railroad picture and various legislative proposals. What the eventual answers to these, or to other matters may be, I do not know. I trust, however, that from groups like yourselves there will come the results of thoughtful consideration which will lead to the maintenance of a vital, growing, and adequate national railroad system.

It is encouraging to be here in Chicago where the railroads seems to be keenly alert to the situation. It is good to note the recent rundown in the Traffic World of what officials like Mr. Quinn of the Milwaukee, Mr. Heineman of the Northwestern, Mr. Murphy of the Burlington, our toastmaster, Mr. Johnson of the Rock Island, Mr. Marsh of the Santa Fe, Mr. Budd of the Great Northern, and others are doing to stimulate passenger business. It is good to note also that the Santa Fe now is proposing a petroleum products pipeline on its right-of-way from Anaheim to San Diego. This, like the products line of the Southern Pacific, is progress, even though this kind of progress and utilization of rights-of-way has been a long time coming. I have been tremendously impressed too, by Wayne A. Johnston's recent message to Illinois Central territory showing what his and other railroads have done to improve their efficiency so that today's railroads have "stronger muscles than ever."

So, finally, I close using Mr. Johnston's closing words: "I have always been an optimist about railroading."

Net railway operating income, 1951–60, 1960, and 1961, as reported and as adjusted to deduct temporary tax benefits arising from accelerated amortization of emergency facilities

[In thousands of dollars]

	Net railway operating income reported, 1951–60 average	Temporary tax benefits, 1951–60 average	Net railway operating income adjusted, 1951–60 average	Net railway operating income as reported		Net railway operating income as adjusted	
				1960	1961	1960	1961
New York Central	36,213	5,023	31,190	16,168	493	[1] 16,168	[1] 493
Pennsylvania	49,135	4,728	44,407	4,227	17,833	4,227	[1] 17,833
Baltimore & Ohio	34,648	3,683	30,965	15,107	[2] 17,411	13,387	----------
New York, Chicago & St. Louis	19,758	1,206	18,552	15,285	12,590	13,849	11,923
Wabash	10,751	1,782	8,969	6,006	6,701	5,721	7,568
Chesapeake & Ohio	61,011	8,809	52,202	48,405	37,793	40,605	33,043
Norfolk & Western	50,854	4,400	46,454	66,497	65,484	61,426	62,804
Illinois Central	26,064	2,399	23,665	13,722	16,880	13,018	17,258
Louisville & North	24,566	3,688	20,878	17,745	23,652	18,488	24,827
Gulf, Mobile & Ohio	7,727	736	6,931	3,304	4,770	3,515	5,080
Chicago & Eastern Illinois	3,251	621	2,630	304	372	173	1,400
Southern	38,881	3,239	35,652	36,108	35,771	34,228	35,154
Atlantic Coast Line	10,290	2,471	7,819	9,876	10,811	9,141	11,217
Seaboard Air Line	21,055	3,343	17,712	15,463	14,584	14,546	15,410
Chicago, Burlington & Quincy	25,226	3,563	21,663	16,632	18,918	14,846	18,649
Chicago, Rock Island & Pacific	18,134	2,194	15,940	8,341	10,191	8,624	10,986
Chicago Great Western	3,806	404	3,402	2,258	1,769	1,908	1,636
Missouri Pacific	34,542	3,359	31,883	30,941	30,964	30,744	32,212
St. Louis Southwestern	10,541	[3]	10,541	10,321	10,413	10,321	10,413
St. Louis-San Francisco	14,601	2,320	12,281	13,085	12,506	10,596	10,992
Atchison, Topeka & Santa Fe	64,207	6,504	57,703	43,744	49,116	40,826	48,825
Southern Pacific	54,908	10,724	44,184	49,375	53,103	42,944	45,436
Union Pacific	36,480	7,275	29,205	32,835	31,814	31,159	[1] 31,814
Denver & Rio Grande	13,236	842	12,394	12,979	11,129	10,864	11,240
Great Northern	25,477	2,642	22,835	18,435	16,762	17,060	16,242
Northern Pacific	15,949	1,292	14,657	10,116	8,586	9,771	8,387
Chicago, Milwaukee, St. Paul & Pacific	15,171	2,044	13,127	9,654	14,113	9,555	14,086

[1] Effect of temporary tax savings not shown in Moody's manuals.

[2] Deficit.

Temporary tax savings arising from accelerated amortization of emergency facilities in excess of recorded book depreciation

[Thousands of dollars]

	1951–60 average	1958	1959	1960	1961 [1]
New York Central	5,079	----------	----------	----------	----------
Pennsylvania	4,744	----------	----------	----------	----------
Baltimore & Ohio	3,683	2,766	2,014	1,720	45
New York Central & St. Louis	1,206	1,835	909	1,436	667
Wabash	1,782	2,111	1,794	295	[2] 867
Chesapeake & Ohio	8,809	9,000	7,916	7,800	4,750
Norfolk & Western	4,400	7,125	5,650	5,071	2,680
Illinois Central	2,399	2,910	1,967	704	[2] 378
Louisville & North	3,688	1,842	80	[2] 743	[2] 1,275
Gulf, Mobile & Ohio	736	275	249	289	[2] 310
Chicago & East Illinois	621	336	146	131	[2] 28
Southern	3,229	3,919	2,493	1,880	617
Atlantic Coast Line	2,471	1,305	234	735	[2] 406
Seaboard Air Line	3,343	2,547	1,777	917	[2] 876
Chicago, Burlington & Quincy	3,563	4,369	2,754	1,786	269
Chicago, Rock Island & Pacific	2,194	564	110	[2] 283	[2] 795
Chicago Great Western	404	488	346	350	160
Missouri Pacific	3,359	2,478	2,630	197	[2] 1,248
St. Louis Southwestern	[3]	[3]	[3]	[3]	[3]
St. Louis-San Francisco	2,320	3,526	2,653	2,489	1,514
Atchison, Topeka & Santa Fe	6,504	6,915	4,244	2,918	291
Southern Pacific	10,724	13,294	9,825	6,431	7,667
Union Pacific	7,275	9,606	5,383	1,676	[3]
Denver & Rio Grande Western	842	1,250	329	115	[2] 113
Great Northern	2,642	3,015	2,174	1,375	520
Northern Pacific	1,292	1,209	478	345	197
Chicago, Milwaukee, St. Paul & Pacific	2,044	2,248	786	99	27

[1] Estimated, Moody's Transportation Manual, 1960.

[2] Deficit.

[3] Data not given in Moody's Transportation Manual, 1960.

Comparison of change in population of cities (over 100,000 population in 1950) and territory served and of net railway operating income 1950–60

	Cities over 100,000			Change, 1910–60	Area population change, 1950–60	Adjusted net railway operating income [1]		Change
	Number, 1950	1950 census	1960 census			1949–51	1959–61	
	(Thousands)	(Thousands)	(Thousands)	Percent	Percent	(Thousands)	(Thousands)	Percent
Chicago & Eastern Illinois	3	4,607	4,442	−3.5	13.2	2,959	1,317	−55.5
Baltimore & Ohio	21	15,856	15,413	−2.8	13.0	32,617	7,326	−77.5
Wabash	11	8,482	8,279	−2.4	15.9	9,381	5,760	−38.6
New York Central	32	22,520	22,072	−2.0	16.1	35,672	[2] 13,558	−62.0
Pennsylvania	34	25,673	25,187	−1.9	16.3	50,300	[2] 17,298	−65.6
New York, Chicago & St. Louis	11	7,332	7,198	−1.8	17.9	20,149	14,172	−29.7
Chesapeake & Ohio	12	9,190	9,098	−1.0	12.3	39,388	40,227	+2.1
Chicago, Burlington & Quincy	9	6,724	6,679	−.67	13.5	28,700	16,738	−41.7
Chicago Great Western	7	5,470	5,455	−.27	13.1	3,140	2,250	−28.4
Gulf, Mobile & Ohio	9	6,575	6,682	−1.6	10.9	8,509	4,631	−44.6
Illinois Central	12	7,311	7,496	2.5	12.1	31,000	15,699	−49.4
Chicago, Milwaukee, St. Paul & Pacific	11	6,853	7,064	3.1	14.0	15,902	12,169	−23.5
Northern Pacific	7	2,086	2,163	3.7	14.4	17,680	10,750	−39.2
Great Northern	7	2,086	2,163	3.7	14.5	23,517	18,446	−21.6
Chicago, Rock Island & Pacific	16	8,477	9,021	6.4	12.1	18,506	10,448	−43.5
Louisville & Washington	13	4,147	4,487	8.2	6.1	20,567	20,794	+1.1
Southern	18	5,679	6,159	8.5	9.1	27,028	35,493	+31.3
Denver & Rio Grande Western	2	598	683	14.2	31.3	9,917	10,993	+10.8
St. Louis Southwestern	6	2,194	2,554	16.4	9.9	[3] 9,900	[3] 10,271	+3.7
Norfolk & Western	3	1,094	1,279	16.9	14.9	34,545	61,550	+78.2
Union Pacific	11	4,747	5,588	17.7	26.0	32,840	31,116	−5.2
St. Louis-San Francisco	10	3,472	4,143	19.3	10.2	13,567	10,800	−20.4
Atchison, Topeka & Santa Fe	21	10,948	13,188	20.5	27.2	68,989	48,322	−30.0
Central of Georgia	5	1,015	1,241	22.3	10.8	1,591	2,388	+50.0
Missouri Pacific	17	5,278	6,648	26.1	15.6	31,113	31,175	+.2
Atlantic West Line	8	1,658	2,112	27.4	18.4	8,444	9,870	+16.9
Seaboard Air Line	9	2,041	2,606	27.7	28.6	15,240	15,752	+3.3
Southern Pacific	18	6,928	9,122	31.9	36.3	51,443	43,906	−14.6

[1] Adjusted to eliminate effect of temporary tax savings arising from accelerated amortization of emergency facilities.

[2] Unadjusted, deductions for older projects terminated. There may be new projects now being covered.

[3] Unadjusted, data not shown in Moody's manuals.

Communist Political Propaganda

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CATHERINE MAY

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 21, 1962

Mrs. MAY. Mr. Speaker, for the benefit of my colleagues, I would like to include at this point in the RECORD an excerpt from a letter I have received from a constituent who has found himself to be on a mailing list to receive some of the propaganda material the Soviet Union and its satellites are shipping into this country and the U.S. postal service obligingly distributes at the cost of the taxpayers. My constituent received an envelope and brochure which is printed in Latvian. The origin of the brochure is attributed to a certain Committee for Sponsoring Repatriation and Cultural Ties With Countrymen Abroad.

The following is quoted from my constituent's letter of protest:

The contents of the brochure is a vicious, criminally inspired slander. If such material were mailed in the United States the sender would be subject to prosecution and would face a libel suit. The author is attacking six Latvian pastors two of whom reside in Canada and the other four in the United States. All six of them are called bloodthirsty murderers, Gestapo agents and the like using the entire assortment of the established Soviet jargon in names calling. It fits nicely into the whole array of personal attacks on former citizens of the Baltic countries launched after World War II and stepped up recently in an effort to discredit and cast a shadow upon them, to create distrust among immigrants from these countries, and to stir up resentment within American people against them. The reason is obvious—they are live witnesses of the Soviet atrocities committed in their countries against people and their church.

This body, Mr. Speaker, took strong action against the free and subsidized delivery of Communist propaganda at the time it passed the postal rate bill in January, and I was pleased to give my full support to this amendment. I am hopeful action will be finalized without delay.

The Public Welfare Amendments Bill of 1962

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FERNAND J. ST. GERMAIN

OF RHODE ISLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 21, 1962

Mr. ST. GERMAIN. Mr. Speaker, the public welfare amendments bill of 1962 which has passed the House and been sent to the Senate is a sound measure aimed at correcting present welfare abuses and helping people to get off the relief rolls.

This legislation is a 5-year extension of the program to aid dependent families throughout the country. The extensive provisions of the bill which grant aid to both parents in unemployed families, give the States considerable freedom in the expenditure of funds, provide programs for the support of children in foster homes and for day nursery care, afford work opportunities to welfare recipients, and allow the guardians of children of irresponsible parents to receive welfare funds in behalf of such children, will greatly contribute to our national well-being.

The Public Welfare Amendments of 1962 are vitally necessary for a number of reasons. First of all, while the number of needy recipients on old-age assistance has declined—largely due to the increased protection provided by the old-age survivors and disability insurance system—the adequacy of payments to those remaining on the rolls has diminished.

On the other hand, the program for aid to dependent children has shown a substantial increase over the past 22 years. In 1940, 41.6 percent of this type of assistance was given because of the death of a parent, and 30.3 percent was given because of the parent's absence from the home. However, by 1960, these figures had changed positions with 9.6 percent of the funds being used because of the death of a parent, and the large figure of 62.2 percent being expended because of a parent's absence from the home. This change has come about because of the variety and complexity of the social problems affecting many modern families. It takes a great deal more to solve these problems than simply sending a welfare check.

The need for more effective public welfare programs is brought about in great part by reason of hard-core unemployment in some areas which is the result of changes in the economic structure and industrial climate. Also, changes in the agricultural economy which have caused the migration of unskilled farmworkers to urban areas have had a pronounced effect.

It is an unfortunate fact that the number of illegitimate births is in-

creasing and that family breakup by reason of divorce, separation, and desertion is also on the rise. It has been shown that these situations can be helped by well-trained, qualified welfare personnel. This fact is further evidence of the value of the public welfare amendments of 1962.

For these and many other reasons, the bill recently passed by the House is sensible, realistic, and forward-looking legislation. It is a conscientious attempt in the direction of dealing more adequately with the great problems which face the United States in assisting all our people to become productive and worthwhile citizens.

Recreation Development at the Allegheny River Reservoir and the U.S. Forest Service

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEON H. GAVIN
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 21, 1962

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, in commenting on a recent resolution adopted by the Pennsylvania Federation of Sportsmen's Clubs, I released the following statement:

I have watched with much interest the gradual development of plans for the Allegheny Reservoir. As this project takes on more definite form, many collateral influences and benefits become a matter of deep concern to the public. Opportunities for outdoor recreation development are especially promising. It is doubtful if any section of the country has a greater public interest in hunting, fishing, and other forms of outdoor recreation. We have several public agencies that possess high competence in the field of recreation development. Each has its major areas of expertness.

In the case of the upper Allegheny region, the maximum returns from the valuable forest lands, now enhanced by a water impoundment of great significance, will require integration of many uses if the public interest is to be best served. The agency with specific competence in this field is the Forest Service.

I have observed the multiple use management program of the Allegheny National Forest for many years. Under this program, timber resources are supplying raw material for local industry. Thinning and weeding operations carried on in the forest provide pulpwood for nearby mills. Under this pattern of wise use, wildlife production is stimulated to provide the maximum opportunity for thousands of sportsmen who flock to this area each fall for healthful outdoor recreation. The dollar value of this use to the local economy is important. Other forms of outdoor recreation—camping, picnicking, swimming—have been developed on the national forest. Each of these uses is a facet of a planned area development.

The Allegheny National Forest is already set up for business. It has long-range plans for developing the upper Allegheny region. It has a staff of skilled people on the job. It is financed to move ahead promptly, and indeed it has already started to work on lands under its control. While other agencies are equipped to take on certain portions of the recreation development program, none is engaged in the multiple-use operation which characterizes the national forest. Any other approach would require setting up new headquarters and new administrative staffs, involving duplication. I hope the air will be cleared in the near future and the Allegheny National Forest can move ahead with its plans for full development of the shoreline resources associated with the Allegheny Reservoir.

John McCuish, Journalist, Politician, Civic Leader

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GARNER E. SHRIVER
OF KANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 21, 1962

Mr. SHRIVER. Mr. Speaker, it was with deep regret last week that those of us from Kansas learned of the sudden passing of John B. McCuish, of Newton, Kans., at the relatively early age of 55.

I counted John McCuish among my personal friends. He had been active in politics in Kansas for more than a quarter of a century. I respected his counsel and his friendship.

Mr. McCuish loved politics. He started at the precinct level and rose to a number of influential positions in the Republican Party including a brief tenure as Governor of his State. He served as Harvey County Central Committee chairman for several years, and was the first chairman of the Kansas Commission of Revenue and Taxation. He served as treasurer of the Republican State Committee two terms, and was a delegate to the party's national conventions in 1936 and 1948.

One of the early supporters of Dwight Eisenhower for the Presidency, he was director of the Eisenhower for President campaign in Kansas in 1952.

In 1954 Mr. McCuish was elected to serve as Lieutenant Governor of Kansas, and in January 1957, he became Governor for a period of 11 days permitting the then Governor to take a seat on the Kansas Supreme Court.

John McCuish served our Nation during World War II as a combat infantryman in the European theater. Following the war he spent 90 days in Japan on a War Department assignment supervising the establishment of the first weekly newspapers in smaller cities. Its purpose was to spur the growth of democracy in Japan. He was the only American newsman on the mission.

His journalistic talents extended to the publishing of weekly newspapers in Hillsboro, Kans., and his hometown of Newton, Kans.

Mr. McCuish also devoted himself to the many worthy civic causes within his community and State. At the time of his death, he was active in planning the preliminary steps toward building a new library in Newton.

He is survived by his beloved wife and lifetime partner, the former Cora Hedrick.

Under the leave to extend my remarks, I would like to include the following editorial published in John McCuish's hometown newspaper, the Newton Kansan, upon which he had served as a reporter:

JOHN B. MCCUISH

Harvey County lost the man who had been its top Republican leader for more than three decades with the death early Monday morning of John McCuish.

Mr. McCuish continued to guide the strategy of the GOP in Harvey County even as he became a State political figure and was well along the road to his eventual election to Lieutenant Governor and finally to become Governor for a short period after the resignation of Gov. Fred Hall early in 1957.

Friends say that the Newton man had one of the greatest number of acquaintances in and out of political circles as any political figure in the State. He included among those friends and acquaintances not only persons among the top figures in the State's political life, but also among the ordinary persons in all walks of life.

While he was actively engaged in State politics, he never forgot his hometown.

When worthy projects came to his attention he was ready to go to bat for them, and, on the human side, it can be noted that he also was ready to help Harvey "countyans" who sought his aid in solving their problems that arose with governmental units.

He kept up his interest in civic affairs to the last. He had been included during the last few days in the formation of a group that plans to "carry the ball" to secure authorization for a bond issue to finance construction of a new library here.

Anniversary of Byelorussian Independence

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. VICTOR L. ANFUSO
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 21, 1962

Mr. ANFUSO. Mr. Speaker, this Sunday, March 25, as every year on this date, Americans of Byelorussian origin and their kinsmen in other free countries will observe the 44th anniversary of the proclamation of independence of the Byelorussian Democratic Republic. On this eventful day 44 years ago the Byelorussians established a free republic with high hopes that their nation had at last gained its freedom and independence.

Unfortunately, their freedom was shortlived. A short time later it was destroyed by Moscow, and the Byelorussian people became one of the captive nations suffering under the tyrannical yoke of communism. Although the Byelorussian people have known no freedom in more than four decades, the spark of freedom and their desire for independence has never died out.

This quest for freedom must be kept alive and vibrant in the hearts of the Byelorussian people, just as we are endeavoring to keep it alive and give hope to all other captive nations of Eastern Europe. In these dark days of a world

yearning for true peace and freedom, it is urgent that all of these peoples must not despair or think that they have been forgotten by the rest of the world. To do so would be suicidal for them and a great loss for the free world.

We must continue to exert all possible pressure and to focus the spotlight of world attention on their desperate situation in order to encourage them and to help them survive their ordeal. In a showdown with communism, there is no doubt in my mind that these captive nations would render a great service to the cause of democracy.

I extend greetings on this day to all Americans of Byelorussian descent and join with them in prayer for the early liberation of their ancestral homeland and their kinsmen who live there.

Statement in Support of H.R. 10141 To Eliminate Discriminatory Literacy Tests as a Qualification for Voting

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 21, 1962

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, last week on March 14–15, the subcommittee of the Judiciary Committee which is chaired by my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER] held a hearing on my bill, H.R. 10141.

I commend to the attention of our colleagues my statement in support of this most important legislation:

STATEMENT IN SUPPORT OF H.R. 10141 BEFORE SUBCOMMITTEE 5 OF THE JUDICIARY COMMITTEE, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, MARCH 15, 1962

Mr. Chairman, I am very happy to have the opportunity to speak in support of my bill H.R. 10141, to protect the right to vote in Federal elections free from arbitrary discrimination by literacy tests or other means.

This is legislation that has been needed for many, many years. In modern America there is no justification whatever for the kind of discrimination practiced in some States of our Nation to effectively prevent citizens of those States from exercising their constitutional privilege and responsibility at the polling booths.

Our society, Mr. Chairman, is one that is absed on consent: the citizens give their consent to the various governments of the nation to make decisions affecting their welfare. These governments—local, State, and national—are in turn responsible to the citizens.

This system cannot be said to truly work, however, when the consent to govern is given by only a part of the citizens who are eligible under the Constitution.

Let us reflect for a moment about those citizens who do not vote. We have, first of all, a large number of citizens who cannot be adjudged competent to assume their responsibility in this regard because of their age. These are our children. They are no less affected by the decisions of government, but they do not, and rightly so, participate in the selection of their leaders. We then have the insane and those unfortunate enough to have lost their voting rights because of criminal acts.

This segment of our citizens, then, cannot exercise the right to vote for various good reasons.

What about the rest of our citizens—those over the age of 21 (or 18 in two States) who are not insane and who have not become criminals. As we all know these citizens are guaranteed the right to vote by the Constitution of the United States. Nothing should be allowed to prevent them from exercising that right. Unfortunately, some of them are denied that right by the imposition of discriminatory laws such as those we have under consideration here today.

This bill would protect the right to vote in Federal elections of those of our citizens who have been discriminated against by literacy tests.

There are a large number of citizens who do not come from an English-speaking background and who, therefore, have been excluded from voting; there are other Americans who have been excluded because of the color of their skin on the pretext that they are not literate.

This bill, however, will set an excellent standard by insisting that no one be prevented from voting who has achieved a sixth-grade education.

I cannot think of any more worthy piece of legislation presently before the Congress than this one, Mr. Chairman. Any bill which enfranchises people by removing arbitrary discriminatory provisions in the law deserves our wholehearted support and I trust that we will have the opportunity to act on it in the House in the very near future.

Thank you.

The Spirit of St. Patrick

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 21, 1962

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, throughout the whole world today, wherever the sons and daughters of Erin are, Irish hearts are happy and the world is gay in hailing the great patron saint of the Emerald Isle who brought the Christian God to Ireland.

There is an eternality about St. Patrick, because the influences of supreme faith, undaunted courage, and untiring work for his cause has shone down through the ages with a gleaming fervor that has thrown off shackles and brought unimagined glory and triumphs to the Irish people all over the world.

As the great Irish churchman and scholar, Bishop Philbin said:

St. Patrick's holiness was of no common measure. He not only transformed a people in the course of a few decades; he transformed them with a permanence that has endured until this day.

Such was the influence of his preaching that the faith he imparted to the Irish has ever since remained, not merely as a feature of their character, but as their characteristic feature—intense love of home, appreciation of the supernatural, emphasis on prayer and works of devotion, not only in devotional life, but in literature and folklore.

No other personality has so impressed itself on the Irish people and across all the divisions and controversies that history has imposed on the Irish, St. Patrick remains to this day their single undisputed center of unity.

More perhaps than any other race, the Irish owe their faith to God, not to the gradual influence of many workers and the play of many forces, but to one man. Through and through the Irish are Patrick's children.

St. Patrick braved many challenges and his life was full of hardships. Exiled, enslaved, disowned, condemned to the roughest life, he experienced famine and privation.

He was seized, beaten, and imprisoned and denied even the privilege of writing and speaking.

Such sufferings as Patrick underwent were to become the hallmark of Irish history, whose origin was in unyielding fidelity to faith.

For this offense, throughout the years, the Irish have been robbed of their homes and lands, denied livelihood in their own country, deprived of the protection of the law that is the right of every freeman.

Hardship, poverty, and hunger were inseparable from the profession and practice of the faith; the great famine was only the climax of many like experiences to which the race was subjected in centuries of persecution.

Exile has been a prominent part of Irish history, and it has spread Irish people all over the world, so that now there are vastly more people of the Irish race living abroad than in the homeland.

Through heartbreak and bitterness, the Irish people have cherished their traditions, including their love of native literature even when this love was degraded, suppressed, and denied. Suffering and hardship often have compensating graces, and the fact that the Irish have emerged unshaken in their allegiance notwithstanding agelong cruelties and persecutions, remains one of their greatest glories.

Irishmen and women thank the Lord with overflowing heart for the gift of steadfastness which Patrick gave to the Irish race. It is said that as a consequence of St. Patrick's inspiration Irish scholars kept the lamps of learning and knowledge burning in Europe throughout the Dark Ages. The work of Irish missionaries in the centuries immediately after St. Patrick is perhaps the most famous episode in Irish history but it is not the only one, and it may not have been the greatest, but it lives with us today, as we view this sick, disordered world, beckoning us to stand firm and indomitable in our unflinching determination to preserve our heritage of freedom under God.

We need a St. Patrick today to stir, arouse, and restore the faith of millions of people in our own Nation and throughout the world who are victims of modern materialism and paganistic philosophies and godless, dictatorial systems of government. We need the zeal of St. Patrick to protect the precious, free heritage of America in whose defense so many

great Irishmen paid the supreme sacrifice.

Here, today, in this blesed, free land, we need to summon the strength, the courage and tenacity of purpose of the Irish sages who signed the Declaration of Independence, the Irish heroes of the Revolutionary War and every other war in our history.

We need the voice of another St. Patrick throughout the land and throughout the world sounding a clarion call in the defense of liberty, that men everywhere may be free of the cruel chains which bind them to intolerable tyranny, that true freedom and brotherhood may dwell on this earth and all people may be spared the lash of the tyrant's whip.

This is the spirit of St. Patrick and his noble followers, this is the spirit of the great American patriots who fought to sustain our free institutions. This is the spirit we need in this land today, as we joyously celebrate the birthday of the great patron saint of Ireland.

Let us be thankful for the contributions of his sons and daughters on American soil and throughout the world who have fought and died for liberty.

Let us resolve to carry his banner of faith and courage wherever our great destiny may lead us in the quest of peace, freedom, and brothehood for all men.

Foreign Visitors

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. J. FLOYD BREEDING

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 21, 1962

Mr. BREEDING. Mr. Speaker, I believe my colleagues may be interested in learning what some of our foreign visitors think of their hosts here in the United States. I would like to revise and extend my remarks to include a letter which I have written to the Secretary of State bringing to his attention the accomplishments of my good friend, Mr. John McCormally, executive editor of the Hutchinson News, Hutchinson, Kans., in entertaining foreign visitors. I especially want to call to the attention of this great body the article written by Mr. Oscar S. Villadolid, staff reporter of the Phillippines Herald, after his visit to this country as a member of a SEATO journalists project. Mr. Villadolid was entertained by Mr. McCormally and Mr. Jack Harris, publisher of the Hutchinson News. He speaks in glowing terms of Mr. Harris and Mr. McCormally as being the type of Americans who could easily win Asians as friends to our cause. I indeed think these two gentlemen should be commended for their wonderful contribution in serving our Nation.

The letter and article follow:

MARCH 21, 1962.

The Honorable DEAN RUSK,
Secretary of State,
U.S. Department of State,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SECRETARY RUSK: I feel that one of my constituents, Mr. John McCormally, has made quite an outstanding contribution in furthering the cause of international understanding, and I would like to bring to your attention a summary of his achievements.

Mr. McCormally, who is executive editor of the Hutchinson News, of Hutchinson, Kans., has for several years been active as a host to foreign visitors coming here under the various exchange programs.

For most of these visitors, their trip to Hutchinson, which has a population of 38,000, is their only exposure to a smaller American community and to an agricultural area. Not only has Mr. McCormally's work given them a true, memorable picture of real, down-to-earth American life; at the same time it has provided their hosts, the people of my district, a fine opportunity to learn firsthand the personalities, feelings, and thinking of these important foreign visitors.

Having a large family and a moderate income, he does not entertain lavishly, but goes far beyond the perfunctory duties of an official host, in providing genuine American hospitality. His wife Peggy and their seven children play an important role. The guests are always invited to the McCormally home for at least one meal, and while there, have an opportunity to romp with the children, poke through the pantry, and in this informal atmosphere, ask all the intimate questions about grocery bills, family budgets, taxes, worries, and hopes which one must ask in order to learn about people in another land.

Other arrangements include visits with farmers, workers, teachers, students, and glimpses of the community's small industries, retail businesses, and cultural centers.

Mr. McCormally emphasizes that participation in the programs reflects the interests of his employer, Mr. John P. Harris, chairman of the board of Harris newspapers, a widely traveled student of world affairs, and a highly successful editor.

Mr. McCormally is a native Kansan, 39, a Marine veteran of World War II, a former Democratic member of the Kansas Legislature, a former Neiman fellow at Harvard, and has worked his way up from reporter to executive editor of the News in the past 10 years.

I understand that these visitors invariably list Hutchinson, Kans., as a high spot in their American tours. I am attaching a copy of one such report by Mr. Oscar Villadolid, of the Philippines Herald, in which he expresses first his reluctance and even fear at entering the heartland of our big country and then his delight at meeting the McCormally family and having an opportunity to become acquainted with typical, hardworking Americans—people who are vastly different from wealthy, sophisticated tourists who are virtually the only Americans traveling in the Philippines.

I am sure that Mr. McCormally is eager to continue his efforts and that you will be interested in his contributions and in their effects upon the people of my district.

Sincerely yours,

J. FLOYD BREEDING,
Member of Congress.

WINNING THE COLD WAR

(By Oscar S. Villadolid)

America may be dragging her feet in the cold war, but she is definitely making long, deliberate strides in trying to win the hearts of Asians through her $20.8 million cultural and educational exchange programs.

Though little known, sometimes even unheard of, in the awesome East-West power struggle, this battle for the minds of peoples has contributed immensely to a better understanding of America, and what she stands for. Yet, a great many politically minded Americans have, ironically, failed to place more emphasis on the very weapon that can someday make them win the cold war without firing a shot.

How is this? one may ask. What possible benefits can a gigantic cultural and educational exchange program secure that subtle military diplomacy or lavish economic aid cannot?

Not long ago, we winged our way into the American south, deep into the land that has become so well known to Asians as "Little Rock." When we left Washington, D.C., for the "notorious land," we were apprehensive, felt that, perhaps, it was not wise after all to have asked that we see the soft underbelly of the great United States. What was there to see than what had already been printed in Life and Look magazines, pictures of southern "whites" spitting at the faces of helpless "blacks" and inflicting on them physical harm merely because a few innocent colored schoolchildren wanted to take full advantage of an education which they are entitled to under the laws we mused. Being an Asian, and thus colored, there was really nothing much to think about, except of Little Rock all the way.

Looking back, the situation was not as bad, as hopeless and as reprehensible as it appeared 2 months ago. On the contrary, we left the South with the inevitable verdict that the conditions were much better than we had expected them to be. For the first time, we really began to appreciate what a complicated and ticklish problem school integration was in a southern community—too provincial in its prejudices and too raw in its emotions. Indeed, there was much to be desired in trying to uplift the standing of the Negroes; but, on the whole, we were impressed by the progress being made in this direction. We left the United States deeply convinced that a hard-working Asian could find his place under the sun in America, too.

This understanding of the true facts in the American South could not have come about without the Fulbrights and the Smith-Mundts, as they are popularly known here. So with an understanding of American life and government one goes home from a trip to the United States highly elated by the experiences of American civilization. One also gathers these impressions; America has a culture distinctly her own, her women are hard working despite all the kitchen aids and mechanical gadgets not available in the distant East, her family ties, with obvious exceptions, are still firm and her religious life strong. The so-called westerners are even hospitable people, and nowhere in the vastness of America did we sample a brand of hospitality as the kind dished out to us by the Texans.

Feeling the pulse of America this way does not only leave a lasting imprint in the minds of those who have been there but they may also help mature their thinking on matters affecting the United States. By no means will they be expected to act like puppets upon their return, subverting their convictions to new found ones, or laying aside their nationalistic aspirations for alien considerations. But, with the proper background of American life and government seen firsthand, they will act with acute deliberation and sobriety on delicate matters affecting the United States and the ideals which she stands for. Undoubtedly, these are tangible acquisitions which could greatly enhance closer and better understanding between Asians and Americans in this era when the peace is being delicately balanced through terror.

Unlike the disinterested group which has cast its lot with the pre-Sputnik type of diplomacy of "might makes right," there are, in the U.S. State Department in Washington, D.C., silent workers who firmly believe that the world's differences could be aptly bridged through cultural and educational exchanges.

With 10 years experience with international exchange programs, these officials

have incessantly tried to hammer home the point that military and economic strength are not the only two weapons that could shape a world of friends. And there can be no disagreement on this. For intellectual and social attainments, the knowledge of which can be spread only through the exchange of opinion-forming individuals, are very important, too, if not as vital as economic and military power.

Even in this part of the world, it is becoming increasingly clear that the two big powers, on whose hands the survival of the world depends, have locked themselves in a titanic struggle for global intellectual leadership. And while they are at it in an increasing and oftentimes disquieting momentum, the rest of the world's peoples—the committed and the uncommitted—are an interested audience.

What exactly is the U.S. State Department's role in this increasingly important playground of cultural and educational exchange programs? How has it fared during the 10 years since it launched the program?

Robert Dollison, one of the many soldiers in America's battle for the minds of peoples throughout the world, has given us a clear picture of the setup: 6,000 persons a year are involved in the program, two-thirds of whom are foreigners getting into the United States from 80 countries. Since the program was launched by the American Congress 10 years ago, 60,000 exchanges had taken place, 40,000 of whom are foreigners and the rest Americans who have gone abroad to various countries of cultural interest to them. These numbers include the two categories of the Department's current exchange activity—the Fulbright program for teachers, lecturers, research scholars and graduate students, and the Smith-Mundt leader specialist program for influential individuals and experts in particular fields.

State Department officials concede that the leader-specialist program, concentrating on the exchange of influential adults, is generally agreed to be a marked success. This is not surprising. For the opinion formers who have gone on 60-day visits to the United States, numbering more than 800, exert a lot of influence in their respective countries. These influential tourists, upon their return home, pour forth their impressions in speeches, books, articles, and personal discussions.

But one thing has been of utmost importance to this program: the recipients had gone to America and returned to their homeland content in the thought that they had been granted complete freedom to make their choice of places to see, to visit, and persons to talk with.

What, perhaps, has contributed greatly to the success of this leader-specialist program is the private sponsor system which could be found in more than 1,000 American communities, from the big cities of New York and Chicago to the rural districts of Tennessee and Kansas. This is one of the surprises of the great United States, where, to the eyes of an outsider, every American is too busy engaged in raising his standard of living to bother with people from the outside. But not every American is engaged in the rat race, a good number of them—businessmen, social workers, farmers, editors, publishers, and so forth—have been giving their precious time to the visitor who has come to the United States for the first time to discover America.

We discovered the real America this way. In Dallas, Tex., after a tiring day touring newspaper offices and TV stations, we were farmed out, by people who took care of our program of activities, into the homes of average Americans. Mr. and Mrs. Ray Johnson, a middle-aged couple with a son in the Armed Forces, took us in that evening. Time flew so fast that before we knew it it was already past midnight. There were still a lot of things to discuss about each other's country, but time was running out, and so were the 60 days for the trip that carried us through Washington, D.C.; New York; Knoxville, Tenn.; New Orleans; Dallas, Tex.; Kansas City; Hutchinson, Kans.; Chicago; Detroit; Buffalo; Niagara Falls; Quincy and Cambridge (Boston); Easton, Pa.; Seattle, Wash.; Minneapolis, Milwaukee, and San Francisco, Calif.

But the most pleasant experience we had in the big, vast United States was not in New York, Washington, D.C., or Chicago, but in a small town in Kansas with the funny name of Hutchinson. We had wanted to visit a small town and sample life in such a community when we made out our itinerary with the help of Mr. Melvin Bergheim, a programing expert of the Governmental Affairs Institute, in Washington, D.C., but little did we realize that it would afford us our most pleasant and memorable experience in America. What made our stay there most pleasant and worthwhile was the kind of hospitality John McCormally, his wife, and their four children afforded us. They are simple people, though John is the managing editor of the town's newspaper, the Hutchinson News (circulation 48,000), and a former Neiman fellow; but there was warmth and sincerity in the way they received us—like old friends separated by miles of ocean. And we got a kick out of eating hamburgers, salad, and French fried potatoes for lunch beside an old fireplace that barely kept the 36° cold out of the living room. His publisher, Jack Harris, was swell, too. He was the kind of American, soft spoken and understanding, that, we thought, could win Asians easily on the side of the United States.

Our concept of the typical American, as a sophisticated tourist with too much money to throw away while strutting around the Philippines—an impression shared by many—was effectively disproved by John and Jack and a number of other hardworking Americans we met in the United States. They impressed upon us the fact that a good many Americans are, after all, people, too, who share a genuine feeling with Asians and understand that they, also, have a role to play in shaping the course of the future. Their understanding of us and the problems we face made the world seem like a golf ball.

It was like, in Hutchinson, home in America.

Perhaps, the critics will argue that this is an isolated case; after all, no two individuals, as in nationalities, can be alike. But the widespread popularity in the Philippines of the Smith-Mundt and Fulbright grants seem to belie the critics. With the exception of a numbered few, visits to the United States on these grants have brought about a general feeling of enlightenment among the recipients on delicate subjects which, at one time, had seemed incomprehensible to them. As intellectual enlightenment is understanding, it would, therefore, not be difficult to expect that better and closer understanding between nations would follow.

Doubting Thomases who seem more disposed toward the old-type diplomacy that characterized Britannia when she ruled the waves may well profit from the experiences of Filipinos in cultural and educational exchange programs. The results are certainly more tangible, although they may not be proclaimed before the whole world with the same brazenness and intensity of a cannon's roar.

To the "have not" Asians, whose world has just started to emerge from the nightmare of poverty and isolationism, the fight is not by the number of guns, tanks, or planes, but by the amount of bread heaped into the empty breadbaskets of waiting millions. Knowledge, to them, will be the propelling force to achieve this end, not sporadic economic doleouts that oftentimes lead to a false sense of economic security and national stagnation. Of course, this approach to the ailing millions of Asians will entail a long process that will surely hurt the pocketbook, but it will represent more than a gesture of friendship; it is friendship for friendship's sake.

LIST OF RECENT FOREIGN VISITORS TO HUTCHINSON, KANS.

John McCormally, host: June 1957, Mr. Walter Pollak, editor and chief, "Oberoesterreichische Nachrichten," Linz, Austria; March 1958, Messrs. Olivera, Angeles, and Villadolid, Manila, P.I.; July 1958, Ali Khan Mansur, Lahore, Pakistan; October 1958, Ugger Sain, editor, the Hindustan Times, New Delhi, India; November 1958, Takeo Kayama, "Chubu Nippon Shimbuu," Tokyo; January 1959, Aatos Erkko, Finland; April 1959, Ramapillai N. Sivapirakasam, Ceylon; November 1959, Koh Jai-wook and Wohn Kyung-soo, of "Dong a Ilbo," Seoul, Korea.

June, July, 1960, J. A. Kelleher, the Dominion, Wellington, New Zealand; June 1961, Mohamed Isnaeni, Djakarta, member of Parliament and chief editor, Suluh, Indonesia; July 1961 (members of resident correspondent's tour, arranged by Governmental Affairs Institute and financed by the Ford Foundation)—George Celiz, Argentina; Heinz Ohnesorge, Germany; T. V. Parasuram, India; Antonio Barolini, Italy; Euchai Kimura, Japan; Bogdan Chylinski, Poland; Levon Keshishian, United Arab Republic; Miss Evelyn Irons, United Kingdom; Rudolf Stajduhar, Yugoslavia; Bert Van Velsen, the Netherlands; F. Demokan, Turkey.

The Interdependence of Political, Scientific and Military Planning

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. HENRY M. JACKSON

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, March 21, 1962

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, I believe a recent speech by Senator MUSKIE entitled "The Interdependence of Political, Scientific, and Military Planning," should be given further circulation. The Senator has commented on a number of the critical issues in the staffing and organization of the national security policy process following on his work as a member of the Subcommittee on National Policy Machinery of the Government Operations Committee. This speech was delivered to a meeting of the Electronics Industries Association seminar on March 13, 1962. I hope that Members of Congress will read Senator MUSKIE'S most helpful statement.

I ask unanimous consent to have the speech printed in the RECORD.

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

THE INTERDEPENDENCE OF POLITICAL, SCIENTIFIC, AND MILITARY PLANNING

(Remarks by U.S. Senator EDMUND S. MUSKIE, Democrat, of Maine, to a luncheon meeting of the Electronics Industries Association seminar on the New Look in Defense Planning, Statler-Hilton Hotel, Washington, D.C., March 13, 1962)

Two weeks ago, President Kennedy spoke to the Nation on his decision to resume nuclear weapons testing. No single issue, and no single decision illustrates more clearly

the dilemmas confronting the President and his policy advisers in coordinating political, scientific, and military planning. In retrospect the decision appears to have been inevitable. But in the preparation for that decision, nothing could be treated as inevitable except the paramount importance of the security of the free world.

The remarkable feature of that decision was the balance it achieved in giving proper weight to the three factors involved in our overall national security—domestic and foreign policy, scientific advancement, and military planning.

Politically, the President had to recognize the deep emotional biases on both sides of the issue inside the United States. There were those who would have us test, whatever the effects of such tests on health, national and world opinion, or long-term disarmament goals. There were those who would oppose all tests, whatever the effects of such a decision on our defensive capacity and the balance of power. There was a large group without opinions, but with vague and disquieting fears over what might happen if we should resume tests.

As the leader of the free world, the President had to take into account the attitude of our allies and friends and the reaction of the uncommitted nations. We could not have our policies determined by them, but neither, in the contest for men's minds, could we afford to ignore their opinions.

I do not need to detail the scientific and military requirements which enforced the need to resume the tests. This is an age when military technology holds the key to the balance of power, when the scientific advances of today forecast the potential strength of tomorrow, and when the force of weapons threatens broad scale devastation.

Until we have found the political and scientific means of controlling the development, possession, and use of weapons, we cannot avoid our responsibility for maintaining and expanding our defensive and offensive capacity. Our Secretary of State is, this week, testing whether or not such control is possible.

All of this implies a deep and lasting struggle, one in which the free nations and the Communist bloc are deeply involved, and one from which the uncommitted nations are trying desperately to escape. There is no visible end to the struggle. Although it resembles war in so many ways, the cold war does not offer the immediate and decisive choices which make war palatable to some and bearable to others. In the cold war there is the constant threat of intellectual frostbite, frozen attitudes, and apathy. A cold shower braces; but the penetrating cold of a long winter's night threatens to drain the resources of the hardiest among us.

How, in such a protracted struggle does a free society retain its vitality, provide for its defense, and give leadership against an implacable and resourceful foe?

Or, as Senator JACKSON put it in his final statement for the Subcommittee on National Policy Machinery: "Can free societies outplan, outperform, outlast—and if need be, outsacrifice—totalitarian systems? Can we recognize fresh problems in a changing world and respond in time with new plans for meeting them?"

In this forum, you are wrestling with the problem of coordinated planning. As manufacturers of electronic devices, you have banded together, in part, "to advance the defense of our country, the growth of our economy, the progress of technology, and all interests of the electronics industry compatible with the public welfare." This is a worthy objective.

It would be presumptuous of me to set myself up as an expert on military and technological planning. Even my service on the Government Operations Committee and the National Policy Machinery Subcommittee does not give me the authority to lecture you on the difficulties of coordinating the scientific and military aspects of our defense planning effort.

What I can do, as one versed in public policy, is to offer you an approach to the problem of coordinating and integrating specialized disciplines, which are increasingly interrelated on a policymaking level, which, in turn, is the domain of nonspecialists.

There are three ways in which we may approach the problem: structure, personnel, and public response.

The first question is that of structure. Do we need to set up special committees or to overhaul our Government in order to get the job done as it should be done?

Whenever freemen encounter a problem they form a committee or an association. This town is filled with committees, associations, organizations, societies, and study groups, in and out of government. Their rise and fall can be plotted and predicted according to the ebb and flow of crises in every field of human endeavor from aeronautical technology to the zoology of Afghanistan.

Such combinations of interested parties are inevitable. In a free society they are desirable. But in government the temptation to form a committee whenever an apparently new problem arises should be treated with great caution and restraint.

As Senator JACKSON said in his final statement on the deliberation of the National Policy Machinery Subcommittee:

"Properly managed, and chaired by officials with responsibility for decision and action, committees can be useful in helping make sure that voices that should be heard are heard. But a very high percentage of committees exact a heavy toll by diluting the authority of individual executives, obscuring responsibility for getting things done, and generally slowing decisionmaking."

Government by committee is no government at all, since it is the antithesis of the action on which forceful and effective government depends.

The other temptation in dealing with changing problems of a democracy in our present age is to engage in radical overhauling of the actual framework and structure of government.

The National Policy Machinery Subcommittee received many suggestions for governmental reorganization, ranging from the constitution of a supercabinet with a First Secretary to the proposed establishment of a Department of Science and Technology. The subcommittee rejected both suggestions, noting that "faulty machinery is rarely the real culprit when our policies are inconsistent or when they lack sustained forward momentum. The underlying cause is normally found elsewhere. It consists in the absence of a clear sense of direction and coherence of policy at the top of the Government." Organization is no substitute for leadership.

The subcommittee rejected the concept of a supercabinet and a First Secretary because, in its opinion, the results of such a reorganization would be to hamper the President in the exercise of his responsibilities. In addition, it would tend to cut him off from his principal policymakers and departmental advisers through the imposition of a new bureaucratic organization on one which in many respects is already swollen.

The plight of the National Security Council, as revealed in the subcommittee study, is instructive. The Council was established originally in 1947 to advise the President "with respect to the integration of domestic, foreign, and military policies relating to the national security so as to enable the military services and the other departments and agencies of the Government to cooperate more effectively in matters involving the national security."

Over the years, the Council developed a dual role, that of the Council itself acting as adviser to the President, and that of the Council system in which the Council staff and a complex interdepartmental committee substructure were designed to undergird the works of the Council. The Council system had become, in other words, an institution, another facet of bureaucracy.

As a result of the growth of the Council as an institution, much of its effectiveness had been diluted. It produced "policy papers," adjusted departmental differences at the staff level rather than defining and sharpening issues, and established a system which had burdened the members of the Council and hindered the implementation of policy.

The National Policy Machinery Subcommittee concluded that the organization of the Council should be loosened, that its function as a relatively small group of top advisers to the President be emphasized, and that the President rely heavily on a flexible staff of personal assistants.

Essentially, this is the approach which President Kennedy has taken. He has been criticised by some as being too "free wheeling" to his approach to the policymaking machinery. His method tends to disrupt and cut across traditional concepts of administrative procedure and neat lines of authority, but his approach does emphasize flexibility, the relentless probing and testing of ideas, the competition of new proposals, and the ultimate responsibility of the President.

President Truman had a sign on his desk: "The buck stops here." This is always true. The danger in establishing too elaborate a staff system around the executive is that the buck will be trimmed beyond recognition before it reaches the President for his decision.

The question of structure and coordination is not limited to the President and his advisers, it extends to the coordination of scientific and military development.

Earlier I alluded to the problem of science and technology and its relationship to the national security. This problem was of great concern to the subcommittee, as it is central to your deliberations as participants in scientific and technological development and productions.

As the subcommittee's January 1960 interim report put it:

"There is growing awareness that scientific, military, and political planning must go forward together. Some argue that our defense planners, particularly at top civilian levels, have as a group not appreciated fully enough the future military implications of crucial technical programs in the developmental state. It is also held that our research and developments effort too often suffers from a lack of adequate guidance concerning weapons systems of maximum utility. As a group, our foreign policy planners have also not concerned themselves enough with the future political consequences of weapon systems in the laboratory state. Similarly, it is argued that our research and development programs would benefit from clearer guidelines concerning projects which might best help further our foreign policy goals.

"How, without straightjacketing technological development, can State and Defense furnish those concerned with development more useful guidance concerning the paths of technological exploration which might best enable us to further our overall political and military objectives?"

One of the continuing recommendations for meeting this problem of coordination of scientific effort with foreign policy and military goals is the proposed establishment of a Department of Science and Technology. Such proposals ignore the fact that science is not a definable jurisdiction, it is a tool.

Furthermore scientists are professional experts, not necessarily possessing the broad perspective which is required at the level of departmental responsibility, especially if such a department were to encompass the whole realm of science.

In his testimony before the subcommittee, Mr. James Perkins, of the Carnegie Corp., warned:

"We are inclined to translate important special authority into authority in general. A specialist on atomic energy does not necessarily speak with equal authority on infrared devices or jet propulsion. Even less does he speak with authority on problems of strategic deterrence or on the probable outcome of the cold war.

"We are in some danger, it seems to me, of repeating the mistakes of the thirties when the fears of depression produced an overvaluation of the general skills of the economist."

The staff report of the subcommittee further noted that scientists "are not exempt from the human tendency to allow these beliefs to color their technical judgments, and to become ardent pleaders for special causes."

While we recognize the nature of science and the limitations of scientists, we must acknowledge the need for more effective means of advising the President and the Congress on scientific developments and their implications, and of integrating such developments with policy planning. Without adequate understanding there will be no intelligent action.

The President has a Special Assistant for Science and Technology and a Science Advisory Committee. They have been extremely useful to the President as professional experts and advisers within a flexible framework of authority.

The principal shortcomings of the present arrangement are the lack of sufficient staff, particularly for advance planning, and the fact that the President's advisers are not available to testify before Congress. They cannot provide the same service the Budget Bureau Director gives in overall policy briefings and specific testimony on the relationship of individual programs to the overall aims of the administration.

Serious consideration should be, and I understand is being, given to the subcommittee recommendation calling for the establishment of an Office of Science and Technology within the Executive Office of the President. Such an office, adequately staffed, would help the President look ahead in the field of scientific development; it would help coordinate the activities of the various Government agencies; and it would be available as a source of expert advice to the Congress.

In calling for such a staff, we should remember that the chief strength of the existing science arrangement in the President's Office is its flexibility. It would be essential that the new office follow a flexible mode of organization and operation. We are not looking for a new bureaucracy.

Such a step would supplement, but would not supplant, the need for more adequate recognition of scientific planning within the various departments. The administration has made substantial gains in this area, particularly in the Department of Defense through the Division of Defense Research and Engineering.

Ultimately, of course, our success in coordinating scientific development and national policy planning depends upon the recruitment of qualified personnel and the full utilization of the talent we have available to us. This is true not only at the operating level, but also at the policymaking level. Nowhere is the upgrading of personnel more important than in the Department of State.

The studies of the National Policy Machinery Subcommittee emphasized the prime importance of the Office of Secretary of State as the First Secretary to the President. The nature of his contribution will vary acording to his individual talent and the working relationship he is able to establish with the President. But whatever that relationship, the Secretary of State must bear the full burden of leadership across the full range of national security matters, as they relate to foreign policy.

Such leadership cannot be achieved if the Secretary is constantly preoccupied with what Dean Acheson has called the thundering present. This will require constant improvement in and upgrading of the Policy Planning Council, better executive management within the Department, and improved training programs for career personnel. The State Department must make a constant effort to outgrow antiquated concepts of its role, many of which date from the era of 19th century diplomacy.

The State Department's greatest single need remains imaginative and competent executive managements. Every shortcoming in this area cannot help but limit the effectiveness of the Secretary of State.

In addition, the Secretary of State must maintain close cooperation with the Secretary of Defense in foreign policy planning. Here again, we return to the imponderables of personal relationships supported by rational, competent, and imaginative departmental support.

Obviously the two Secretaries cannot achieve such cooperation, without full cooperation and understanding between the operating levels of the two departments. I have been pleased with the development of close rapport between the two departments in the past year. Such cooperation cannot be achieved through the establishment of more interdepartmental committees. Indeed, it may require fewer such organizations.

As in the case of the National Security Council the danger of the interdepartmental committee is that it will adjust all differences out of existence, without giving the Secretaries or the President the clearly defined issues and alternate policy proposals on which to base sound policy decisions.

Clear organization and effective support depend ultimately on good staff. What government needs above all is outstanding public service people. This is where we must concentrate our effort.

Better career training will aid greatly in such an effort. More effective use should be made of the National War College and the Foreign Service Institute in training civilian personnel within the respective departments and in providing educational opportunities for officials from other agencies and departments.

Further assets in the struggle for improved personnel would be easier interagency transfer, job exchange programs, and improved salary scales to help reduce turnover, particularly at upper levels. The problem of recruitment for topflight management personnel would be eased considerably with the updating and reform of our conflict of interest laws. Without violating the objectives of these antiquated statutes we can encourage the participation in public service of able men and women from the ranks of private business.

A revision of the conflict of interest statutes is now before Congress, but many of the critical issues are yet to be resolved. Change is desirable, but the changes we make must represent an improvement over present laws.

From what I have said it must be clear to you that I am offering no simple, well-ordered master plan for policy coordination and execution. This is not because I distrust or reject the concept of experimentation or reorganization in Government structure.

My approach is based on my belief that the structure of Government must adjust to changing requirements, changing as functions change but not changing functions.

The absence of theoretical perfection in structure leads to tension. But tension is the secret of great art. And, government, I submit, is an art.

One of the chief problems in the art of democratic government is that of informing and enlisting the support of the general public for national policy decisions. In our first great effort to make the structure of government conform to the functions it had to perform—the substitution of our Constitution for the Articles of Confederation—the Federalist papers performed yeoman service. Today the President utilizes the press, radio, and television to explain decisions and to exhort citizens.

Similarly, the members of his administration are exposed to the public view, and appear before the Members of Congress to justify the policies, programs, and actions of the administration.

The principal concern of the National Policy Machinery Subcommittee was the adequacy of the executive branch in meeting the demands of our age, but in the course of our studies it was evident that Congress has serious internal problems in dealing with the multitude of national policy questions. Congress is fragmented and it is difficult for individual Members and committees to grasp the full implication of national security decisions and programs.

The difficulties individual Members of Congress have in gaining a meaningful understanding of national security questions are mirrored and magnified in their constituents. One hundred years ago the average citizen could understand the ordnances of armies and navies without much strain. Tactics and grand strategy were comprehensible. Even the developments of military technology in World War I were within the grasp of the layman.

But with the development of radar, nuclear weapons, missiles, and spacecraft, to say nothing of the intricacies of biochemical warfare, even the above-average layman has found the scientists and the military programers moving beyond his imagination.

When the weapons are unbelievable, their implications are often incomprehensible. And yet, in a democracy, wise decisions can only be made on the basis of knowledge and understanding. We will gain very little by advancing our weapons technology, even with the best coordination between scientists and military personnel, and between military personnel and foreign policy experts, if Congress and the citizenry are not able to put such developments into the context of national security requirements.

The executive branch, through improved methods of presentation, better budget organization, and greater participation by the Secretaries of State and Defense in hearings before congressional committees, can aid Congress greatly in its responsibilities.

But Congress also must put its house in order. Congress should explore ways and means of coordinating consideration of authorizing legislation in the foreign policy and defense field, the appropriation and tax fields, and the scientific and defense and space fields. Consideration should be given also to the establishment of joint committees, wherever feasible, to oversee the work of our national security agencies and departments. The Joint Economic Committee and the Joint Atomic Energy Committee offer excellent precedent for action in this field.

Recently we had a pertinent, although limited, illustration of the inadequacy of the present committee system in dealing with national security questions. When the Senate received the nomination of John McCone to be Director of the Central Intelligence Agency, the nomination was referred to the Armed Services Committee. This was entirely proper, but it did not give the Committee on Foreign Relations an opportunity to examine Mr. McCone on important questions bearing on his Agency's activities as they relate to foreign policy.

The process in Congress, as in the executive branch, is one of constant adjustment to change, recognizing that the structure of our institutions must be modified to free us from the dead hand of the past, but also keeping in mind that the structure must never be allowed to overshadow the men who make and implement our policies. Furthermore, there must be a full and free flow of information from government to the people.

Can a democracy meet this challenge? I think it can. In World War II the totalitarian states assumed they could overwhelm us, but the free nations managed to overcome the greatest odds and inflict a devastating defeat on the Axis war machine. We cannot wait for such a holocaust to stir us to action, but we can continue to reshape our approach to policymaking and coordination as freemen, with an understanding of the dangers we face, but without fear.

In the words of Robert Lovett:

"While the challenges of the moment are most serious in the policymaking sense, I see no reason for black despair or for defeatist doubts as to what our system of government or this country can do. We can do whatever we have to do in order to survive and to meet any form of economic or political competition we are likely to face. All this we can do with one proviso: We must be willing to do our best."

Oil Imports

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS G. MORRIS
OF NEW MEXICO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 21, 1962

Mr. MORRIS. Mr. Speaker, the United States is the only major nation in the free world that is self-sufficient in petroleum. Adequate domestic oil supplies are vital to national security.

A worldwide surplus of low-cost foreign oil has resulted in increasing U.S. oil imports which threaten national security. Foreign oil comes into the United States at more than $1 per barrel or more than one-third under domestic prices.

As a result, U.S. oil imports have increased in relation to domestic production as shown by the following data from the U.S. Bureau of Mines:

	U.S. crude oil production (thousand barrels daily)	U.S. petroleum imports (thousand barrels daily)			Percent of U.S. production	
		Crude oil and products (excluding residual fuel)	Residual fuel oil	Total	Imports (excluding residual)	Total imports
1946	4,751	255	122	377	5.4	7.9
1956	7,151	991	445	1,436	13.9	20.1
1961	7,178	1,240	650	1,890	17.3	26.3

Mr. Speaker, increasing oil imports, decreasing U.S. exports of oil and oversea purchases of oil by U.S. Armed Forces have resulted in an unfavorable trade balance of about $1.25 billion in oil alone. This accounts for approximately one-third of the $3 to $4 billion adverse balance of payments that poses a critical problem.

Government studies have determined that excessive reliance on imports could result in higher costs or even unavailability of oil to consumers. A vigorous, expanding domestic industry has been, and will continue to be, our best assurance of sufficient oil and gas supplies at reasonable prices.

Since 1956, imports have been restricted—under a voluntary program in 1957 and 1958 and by mandatory Government controls during 1959–61. These restrictions have prevented complete chaos in the domestic industry by slowing down but not arresting the increase in imports.

In the last 5 years, free world countries outside the United States have increased production by more than 4 million barrels a day, or more than 50 percent, while crude production in the United States has remained virtually static.

Increasing imports have been a major factor in the continuing decline of the domestic producing industry. From 1956 to 1961, there was a decrease of more than 30 percent in the number of U.S. exploratory crews, rotary drilling rig activity, and the number of "wildcat" or exploratory wells drilled. Employment in the domestic industry has decreased by about 10 percent. Wages and the cost of materials have increased from 10 to 20 percent while oil prices have been reduced.

Three-fourths of the Nation's total energy requirements are supplied by oil and gas. The value of domestic petroleum production is almost $10 billion per year, exceeding the combined value of all other U.S. minerals. The domestic industry supplied 6 of the 7 billion barrels of oil needed by the United States and its allies to win World War II. The availability of domestic oil was the key factor in preventing war during the 1956–57 Suez crisis.

A substantial reduction in oil imports and a stabilization of imports in relation to domestic production are essential to the general welfare and national security.

Byelorussian Independence Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GLENARD P. LIPSCOMB
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 21, 1962

Mr. LIPSCOMB. Mr. Speaker, once again the anniversary of Byelorussian Independence Day is at hand. March 25 marks the date 44 years ago that this gifted and gallant people, after centuries of work and hope, realized their goal of independence.

Of ancient heritage, the Byelorussians have shared the miseries and misfortunes of other East European peoples. Being relatively less numerous—barely 10 million—than their powerful neighbors, they were long subjected to oppressive rule.

Their modern history is almost totally overshadowed because during nearly all that time their country—east of Poland and west of Moscow—was part of Russia's czarist empire.

But these sturdy descendants of their stout-hearted forebears, always aware of their own history as a nation, were never willing to forgo and forget their distinct identity. They have always yearned for their freedom and independence. For centuries they struggled for their national goal and patiently waited for the opportune moment. At last that moment came in 1918.

The Russian Revolution of 1917 resulted in the overthrow of their rulers and freedom for many subject peoples. With the Communists in control, it is obvious, however, that this freedom was destined to be tragically short-lived.

For the time being, freedom reigned from the Baltics to the Caucasus. Many national groups asserted their freedom and independence. The Byelorussians did this early in 1918, by proclaiming the establishment of the Byelorussian National Republic on March 25, 1918.

It was then hoped that these 10 million Byelorussians, having attained their independence in their historic homeland, would be allowed to enjoy their freedom in peace. Unfortunately that was not to be; they were destined to enjoy peace and freedom for only a short time, and then suffer even more under the tyrannical yoke and blood-stained hands of the Communists.

Early in 1921 Communist forces attacked and overran Byelorussia, putting an end to the Byelorussian National Republic. Since then, for 41 years the country has been part of the U.S.S.R., working for the benefit of its Soviet rulers.

The people, however, have not given up their hope for their freedom. Even in the face of the ruthless tyranny of communism they continue their struggle for liberty. It is the wish of many that these people may one day free themselves from Communist totalitarian tyranny and enjoy the blessings of freedom in their historic homeland.