

City where he now resides with his wife, Virginia, Mr. Jelesnik brought to Utah the old musical tradition of the "Pops concerts." His first concert was at the Liberty Park bandstand, overlooking the lake, on September 1, 1947. Since that date, these concerts have been repeated, much to the delight of music lovers. These concerts are presented free to the public and are sponsored annually by the city of Salt Lake and the parks department as a public service. For the past 10 years, Mr. Jelesnik directed, and still directs, the musical Pops concerts for the annual "Days of '47" celebration which commemorates the entry of the Mormon pioneers into the Salt Lake valley in 1847.

Every year during the Christmas holidays, Mr. Jelesnik assembles a group of entertainers for the annual Christmas cheer tour, which takes the performers

to every major hospital and the blind center in the area.

Although he made a good living as a musician during World War II, he devoted much of his time in entertaining our GI's in connection with the USO camp shows, both in the United States and overseas. While waiting to go overseas, Mr. Jelesnik performed in every Army and Navy hospital in the United States. In February 1944 he left to go overseas and performed under fire on the "foxhole circuit" in the Mediterranean theater of operations. He played in the frontlines in Italy. For the 145 performances he gave before a total of 56,640 soldiers there, Mr. Jelesnik received from the War Department his most treasured possession, the Civilian Service Award Ribbon.

Mr. Jelesnik and his variety artists also traveled over 35,000 miles to enter-

tain our soldiers in Korea, Japan, Philippine Islands, Okinawa, Guam, and Hawaii. Mr. Jelesnik's show, "Magic and Melody," was acclaimed as "one of the best, if not the best, entertainment units ever to play in Korea." For his tour of the Far East Command, Mr. Jelesnik received a Silver Medal Citation.

As a composer, Mr. Jelesnik holds an appointment to the American Society of Composers, Authors, and Publishers. It was through his untiring efforts on behalf of the community in which he lives that public musical tributes were given to two outstanding Utahans and world renowned musical figures, Mr. Otto Harbach and Mr. Harold Orlob. Indeed, Mr. Jelesnik is a source of great pride for all Utahans. His great ability, enhanced by his desire to serve, has made him an outstanding figure in the field of music and in his community.

SENATE

WEDNESDAY, APRIL 4, 1962

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

Rabbi Harry Z. Sky, of Temple Beth El, Portland, Maine, offered the following prayer:

Almighty Father, we stand at this moment at the crossroads of history—on one side, the looming shadow of destruction; on the other, the hopeful belief in a day colored by the fulfillment of the prophet's dream: No war shall be among you; no bloodshed shall disturb you. We ask that in these trying times we be aware of the destiny that lies within our hands. Though we may assemble to debate the future of this country, we are impelled to realize that its destiny is not only its own.

May we find within ourselves the courage, the faith, and the hope which these days of challenge require.

Let our fears—if fears we have—be still, And turn us to the future!

Not only for the glories which the years Shall bring us; not for lands from sea to sea,

And wealth, and power, and peace, though these shall be;

But for the distant peoples we shall bless,

And the hushed murmurs of a world's distress:

As we face this America which has been entrusted into our hands, may all of us, as citizens of the United States, ever realize that the vision of America is one that we, ourselves, will shape and fulfill.

To Thee, O God, we give thanks. These humble lips, which this day utter these words, bless Thee for having allowed us to live to see the day when a rabbi of a people long driven and persecuted has at last found for himself and his people a haven where no man threatens and no man denounces and no man destroys.

Bless these shores; bless its leaders; and may they ever have the faith and

the courage and the hope to fulfill the destiny that is America. May this be Thy will. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Tuesday, April 3, 1962, was dispensed with.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States submitting a nomination was communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

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, without amendment, the bill (S. 1934) for the relief of Mrs. Chow Chui Ha.

The message also announced that the House had passed the bill (S. 971) for the relief of Salvatore Briganti, with an amendment, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message further announced that the House had agreed to the concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 61) requesting the President to designate the week of March 25, 1962, as Voluntary Overseas Aid Week, with amendments, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message also announced that the House had passed the following bills, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 852. An act to amend chapter 3 of title 38, United States Code, to authorize the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to establish medical advisory panels to resolve conflicts of evidence in questions involving service connection of disabilities or deaths;

H.R. 1372. An act for the relief of Rocco Cambrea;

H.R. 1533. An act for the relief of Lee Kyong Ja;

H.R. 1650. An act for the relief of Irene Kemeny;

H.R. 1651. An act for the relief of Adela Gilcman;

H.R. 1700. An act for the relief of Jaime Abejuro;

H.R. 1811. An act to amend chapter 35 of title 38, United States Code, relating to war orphans' educational assistance, in order to permit eligible persons thereunder to attend foreign educational institutions under certain circumstances;

H.R. 3005. An act for the relief of Sister Mary Aurelia (Chiara Di Gesu);

H.R. 3825. An act for the relief of T. W. Holt & Co. and/or Holt Import & Export Co.;

H.R. 5234. An act to amend title 38, United States Code, to provide for the restoration of certain widows and children to the rolls upon annulment of their marriages or remarriages, and for other purposes;

H.R. 5689. An act for the relief of Felicja Saulevicz;

H.R. 6344. An act for the relief of Mon (Fred) Young;

H.R. 7876. An act relating to the effective date of the qualification of the joint pension plan for employees of Local Unions 645, 1507, and 1511, Brotherhood of Painters, Decorators and Paperhangers of America, as a qualified trust under section 401(a) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954;

H.R. 9285. An act for the relief of Helenita K. Stephenson;

H.R. 9445. An act for the relief of Miss Grace Smith, and others;

H.R. 10068. An act to amend section 742 of title 38, United States Code, to permit the exchange of 5-year term policies of U.S. Government life insurance to a special endowment at age 96 plan;

H.R. 10242. An act to amend Private Law 86-339; and

H.R. 10700. An act to amend the Peace Corps Act.

HOUSE BILLS REFERRED

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

H.R. 852. An act to amend chapter 3 of title 38, United States Code, to authorize the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to establish medical advisory panels to resolve conflicts of evidence in questions involving service connection of disabilities or deaths;

H.R. 5234. An act to amend title 38, United States Code, to provide for the restoration of certain widows and children to the rolls upon annulment of their marriages or remarriages, and for other purposes; and

H.R. 10068. An act to amend section 742 of title 38, United States Code, to permit the exchange of 5-year term policies of U.S.

Government life insurance to a special endowment at age 96 plan; to the Committee on Finance.

H.R. 1372. An act for the relief of Rocco Cambrea;

H.R. 1533. An act for the relief of Lee Kyong Ja;

H.R. 1650. An act for the relief of Irene Kemeny;

H.R. 1651. An act for the relief of Adela Glicman;

H.R. 1700. An act for the relief of Jaime Abejuro;

H.R. 3005. An act for the relief of Sister Mary Aurelia (Chiara Di Gesu);

H.R. 3825. An act for the relief of T. W. Holt & Co., and/or Holt Import & Export Co.;

H.R. 5689. An act for the relief of Felicja Saulevicz;

H.R. 6344. An act for the relief of Mon (Fred) Young;

H.R. 7876. An act relating to the effective date of the qualification of the joint pension plan for employees of Local Unions 645, 1507, and 1511, Brotherhood of Painters, Decorators, and Paperhangers of America as a qualified trust under section 401(a) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954;

H.R. 9285. An act for the relief of Helenita K. Stephenson;

H.R. 9445. An act for the relief of Miss Grace Smith, and others; and

H.R. 10242. An act to amend Private Law 86-339; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1811. An act to amend chapter 35 of title 38, United States Code, relating to war orphans' educational assistance, in order to permit eligible persons thereunder to attend foreign educational institutions under certain circumstances; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

H.R. 10700. An act to amend the Peace Corps Act; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

LIMITATION OF DEBATE DURING MORNING HOUR

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, statements during the morning hour were ordered limited to 3 minutes.

COMMITTEE MEETING DURING SENATE SESSION

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the permanent Subcommittee on Investigations of the Committee on Government Operations was authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business, to consider the nomination on the Executive Calendar.

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

EXECUTIVE MESSAGE REFERRED

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a message from the President of the United States submitting the nomination of Nicholas deB. Katzenbach, of Illinois, to be Deputy Attorney General, vice Byron R. White, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

The VICE PRESIDENT. If there be no reports of committees, the nomination on the Executive Calendar will be stated.

AMBASSADOR

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Robert F. Woodward, of Minnesota, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Spain.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the President be immediately notified of the confirmation of this nomination.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the President will be notified forthwith.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate resume the consideration of legislative business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate resumed the consideration of legislative business.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following communication and letters, which were referred as indicated:

ESTABLISHMENT OF A LAND CONSERVATION FUND

A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to provide for the establishment of a land conservation fund, and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

COORDINATION AND DEVELOPMENT OF FEDERAL AND STATE PROGRAMS RELATING TO OUTDOOR RECREATION

A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to promote the coordination and development of effective Federal and State programs relating to outdoor recreation, and to provide financial assistance to the States for outdoor recreation planning, and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

OFFICE BUILDING FOR HOUSING AND HOME FINANCE AGENCY

A letter from the Administrator, General Services Administration, Washington, D.C., transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to provide an office building for the Housing and Home Finance Agency (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Public Works.

MEN'S CLUB OF PELHAM URGES SUPPORT FOR NEW HAVEN RAILROAD—RESOLUTION

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, I recently received a resolution from the Men's Club of Pelham, N.Y., in support of every possible effort to maintain and strengthen the New York, New Haven & Hartford Railroad. Because many people of Pelham commute by train to New York City, the services of railroads, particularly the New Haven, are of vital importance. I share the concern of the members of this organization and hope that action will be forthcoming in the near future to alleviate the financial problems of the New Haven Railroad.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the text of the above-referred-to resolution.

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

RESOLUTION BY THE MEN'S CLUB OF PELHAM

The committee on civic affairs of the Men's Club of the town of Pelham with regard to the problem of railroad transportation from Pelham to the city of New York respectfully submits that the maintenance of adequate commuter transportation by rail from Pelham to New York is essential to the character of the town of Pelham and to the maintenance of property values therein and therefore urges the Men's Club of the town of Pelham to adopt the following resolution:

Resolved, That the Men's Club of the town of Pelham respectfully petition the elected officials of the villages, town, county, State, and Federal Government that whereas in the opinion of the members of this club commuter rail transportation in the metropolitan area of New York City, particularly with respect to the New York, New Haven & Hartford Railroad, must be maintained.

Therefore, the Men's Club of the town of Pelham respectfully urges upon the elected officials of all government bodies having jurisdiction that practical methods, including assistance by such governmental and municipal bodies, for the maintenance and improvement of the railroad commuter service, should be devised promptly and that these officials should act expeditiously to bring about such result in conjunction with effective and prompt material cooperation from railroad management and railroad labor; be it further

Resolved, That the Men's Club extend its support to activities directed toward studying the commuter transportation problem and the development of adequate remedies therefor, including cooperation on behalf of the Men's Club of Pelham with community and governmental bodies in adjacent areas; be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent to the President of the United States, the Senators from the State of New York, the Congressman from the 26th Congressional District, the Governor of the State of New York, the senator from the 30th senatorial district, the assemblymen from the 3d and 4th assembly districts of Westchester County, the county executive, the supervisor of the town of Pelham, and the mayors of North Pelham, Pelham, and Pelham Manor.

WILLIAM H. FROST, JR.,

Chairman, Civic Affairs Committee.

REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

The following report of a committee was submitted:

By Mr. ELLENDER, from the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, without amendment:

S. 3006. A bill to amend section 204 of the Agricultural Act of 1956 (Rept. No. 1324).

REPORT OF JOINT COMMITTEE ON REDUCTION OF NONESSENTIAL FEDERAL EXPENDITURES—FEDERAL EMPLOYMENT AND PAY

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. Mr. President, as chairman of the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonesential Federal Expenditures, I submit a report on Federal employment and pay for the month of February 1962. In accordance with the practice of several years' standing, I ask unanimous consent to have the report printed in the RECORD, together with a statement by me.

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

FEDERAL PERSONNEL IN EXECUTIVE BRANCH, FEBRUARY 1962 AND JANUARY 1962, AND PAY, JANUARY 1962 AND DECEMBER 1961

NOTE WITH REFERENCE TO PERSONAL SERVICE EXPENDITURE FIGURES

It should be noted that the latest expenditure figures for personal services shown in table I of this report are for the month of January 1962 and that they are compared

with personal service expenditure figures for the month of December 1961, whereas the latest employment figures covered in this report are for the month of February 1962 and are compared with the month of January 1962. This lag in personal service expenditure figures is necessary in order that actual expenditures may be reported.

Internal reorganizations in the Department of Defense were reflected in personnel figures for the Department published and documented in the additional report of this committee on "Federal Personnel and Pay"

for January 1962 and December 1961 (Committee Print No. 216 in this series). Changes in pay figure reporting following these internal reorganizations in the Department of Defense are reflected for the first time in this additional report.

PERSONNEL AND PAY SUMMARY

(See table I)

Information in monthly personnel reports for February 1962 submitted to the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures is summarized as follows:

Total and major categories	Civilian personnel in executive branch			Payroll (in thousands) in executive branch		
	In February numbered	In January numbered	Increase (+) or decrease (-)	In January was	In December was	Increase (+) or decrease (-)
Total ¹	2,436,868	2,428,691	+8,177	\$1,256,911	\$1,216,613	+\$40,298
Agencies exclusive of Department of Defense.....	1,375,969	1,368,628	+7,341	704,461	705,023	-562
Department of Defense.....	1,060,899	1,060,063	+836	552,450	511,590	+40,860
Inside the United States.....	2,271,858	2,264,196	+7,662			
Outside the United States.....	165,010	164,495	+515			
Industrial employment.....	568,426	566,698	+1,728			
Foreign nationals.....	169,620	169,544	+76	25,817	29,092	-3,275

¹ Exclusive of foreign nationals shown in the last line of this summary.

² Revised on basis of later information.

Table I breaks down the above figures on employment and pay by agencies.

Table II breaks down the above employment figures to show the number inside the United States by agencies.

Table III breaks down the above employment figures to show the number outside the United States by agencies.

Table IV breaks down the above employ-

ment figures to show the number in industrial-type activities by agencies.

Table V shows foreign nationals by agencies not included in tables I, II, III, and IV.

TABLE I.—Consolidated table of Federal personnel inside and outside the United States employed by the executive agencies during February 1962, and comparison with January 1962, and pay for January 1962, and comparison with December 1961

Department or agency	Personnel				Pay (in thousands)			
	February	January	Increase	Decrease	January	December	Increase	Decrease
Executive departments (except Department of Defense):								
Agriculture.....	91,910	91,312	598		\$45,994	\$41,842	\$4,152	
Commerce.....	28,923	28,563	360		17,683	16,230	1,453	
Health, Education, and Welfare.....	73,852	73,347	505		36,726	35,645	1,081	
Interior.....	54,308	54,026	282		30,467	28,340	2,127	
Justice.....	30,883	30,899		16	20,427	18,683	1,744	
Labor.....	8,138	8,089	49		4,665	4,234	431	
Post Office.....	579,606	580,433		827	284,332	316,866		\$32,534
State ²	39,223	39,011	212		19,350	18,322	1,028	
Treasury.....	84,911	80,763	4,148		46,871	42,745	4,126	
Executive Office of the President:								
White House Office.....	444	441	3		263	256	7	
Bureau of the Budget.....	459	455	4		393	361	32	
Council of Economic Advisers.....	46	43	3		45	37	8	
Executive Mansion and Grounds.....	74	72	2		38	34	4	
National Aeronautics and Space Council.....	16	16			16	11	5	
National Security Council.....	42	43		1	34	32	2	
Office of Emergency Planning.....	474	476		2	368	389		21
President's Commission on Campaign Costs.....	13	14		1	4	5		1
Independent agencies:								
Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental relations.....	26	25	1		16	14	2	
American Battle Monuments Commission.....	407	413		6	84	79	5	
Atomic Energy Commission.....	6,809	6,783	26		4,998	4,552	446	
Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System.....	603	603			399	373	26	
Civil Aeronautics Board.....	806	787	19		587	532	55	
Civil Service Commission.....	3,855	3,823	32		2,339	2,149	190	
Civil War Centennial Commission.....	6	6			6	4	2	
Commission of Fine Arts.....	6	6			5	4	1	
Commission on Civil Rights.....	60	56	4		36	30	6	
Export-Import Bank of Washington.....	262	257	5		183	170	13	
Farm Credit Administration.....	237	235	2		173	158	15	
Federal Aviation Agency.....	43,558	43,315	243		29,678	26,942	2,736	
Federal Coal Mine Safety Board of Review.....	7	7			4	4		
Federal Communications Commission.....	1,372	1,360	12		957	831	126	
Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation.....	1,262	1,274		12	845	755	90	
Federal Home Loan Bank Board.....	1,145	1,144	1		754	692	62	
Federal Maritime Commission.....	149	145	4		110	96	14	
Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service.....	357	355	2		315	288	27	
Federal Power Commission.....	897	898		1	646	583	63	
Federal Trade Commission.....	1,021	1,000	21		680	665	15	
Foreign Claims Settlement Commission.....	63	62	1		47	43	4	
General Accounting Office.....	4,725	4,728		3	3,031	2,792	239	
General Services Administration.....	30,725	30,685	40		15,113	13,804	1,309	
Government Printing Office.....	6,862	6,889		27	3,845	3,427	418	
Housing and Home Finance Agency.....	12,555	12,401	154		7,782	7,005	777	
Indian Claims Commission.....	20	20			21	16	5	
Interstate Commerce Commission.....	2,395	2,398		3	1,632	1,490	142	
James Madison Memorial Commission.....	1	1			1	1		
National Aeronautics and Space Administration.....	20,455	19,798	657		13,185	12,424	761	
National Capital Housing Authority.....	416	420		4	199	175	24	
National Capital Planning Commission.....	56	57		1	39	36	3	
National Capital Transportation Agency.....	87	81	6		54	46	8	

See footnotes at end of table.

TABLE I.—Consolidated table of Federal personnel inside and outside the United States employed by the executive agencies during February 1962, and comparison with January 1962, and pay for January 1962, and comparison with December 1961—Continued

Department or agency	Personnel				Pay (in thousands)			
	February	January	Increase	Decrease	January	December	Increase	Decrease
Independent agencies—Continued								
National Gallery of Art.....	314	308	6		\$135	\$127	\$8	
National Labor Relations Board.....	1,857	1,841	16		1,283	1,173	110	
National Mediation Board.....	143	139	4		124	126		\$2
National Science Foundation.....	787	786	1		494	478	16	
Outdoor Recreation Resources Review Commission.....	41	42		1	29	27	2	
Panama Canal.....	14,595	14,508	87		4,425	4,439		14
President's Committee on Equal Employment Opportunity.....	34	33	1		21	22		1
Railroad Retirement Board.....	2,101	2,116		15	1,164	1,053	111	
Renegotiation Board.....	191	203		12	193	198		5
St. Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation.....	159	154	5		103	91	12	
Securities and Exchange Commission.....	1,226	1,210	16		826	737	89	
Selective Service System.....	6,789	6,804		15	2,210	2,020	190	
Small Business Administration.....	2,968	2,923	45		1,864	1,698	166	
Smithsonian Institution.....	1,175	1,163	12		604	547	57	
Soldiers' Home.....	1,031	1,032		1	343	345		2
South Carolina, Georgia, Alabama, and Florida Water Study Commission.....	58	56	2		44	41	3	
Subversive Activities Control Board.....	27	27			23	21	2	
Tariff Commission.....	269	269			197	180	17	
Tax Court of the United States.....	148	149		1	113	106	7	
Tennessee Valley Authority.....	18,267	18,429		162	11,130	10,338	792	
Texas Water Study Commission.....	28	28			17	16	1	
U. S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency.....	74	63	11		42	31	11	
U. S. Information Agency.....	11,012	11,009	3		4,733	4,330	403	
Veterans' Administration.....	176,958	176,716	242		78,787	72,546	6,241	
Virgin Islands Corporation.....	1,190	585	605		117	121		4
Total, excluding Department of Defense.....	1,375,969	1,368,628	8,452	1,111	704,461	705,023	32,022	32,584
Net change, excluding Department of Defense.....			7,341				562	
Department of Defense:								
Office of the Secretary of Defense.....	1,784	1,801		17	1,393	2,218		825
Department of the Army.....	387,483	387,745		262	191,243	182,995	8,248	
Department of the Navy.....	351,424	351,508		84	196,097	181,547	14,550	
Department of the Air Force.....	307,136	308,866		270	157,442	144,830	12,612	
Defense Atomic Support Agency.....	2,057	2,050	7		1,041	1,041		
Defense Communications Agency.....	124	121	3		76	76		
Defense Intelligence Agency.....	154	107	47		50	50		
Defense Supply Agency.....	9,487	8,627	860		4,197	4,197		
Office of Civil Defense.....	1,130	1,117	13		829	829		
U. S. Court of Military Appeals.....	39	38	1		34	34		
Interdepartmental activities.....	31	35		4	19	19		
International military activities.....	50	48	2		29	29		
Total, Department of Defense.....	1,060,899	1,060,063	1,203	367	552,450	511,590	41,685	825
Net increase, Department of Defense.....			836				40,860	
Grand total, including Department of Defense.....	2,436,868	2,428,691	9,655	1,478	1,256,911	1,216,613	73,707	33,409
Net increase, including Department of Defense.....			8,177				40,298	

¹ February figure includes 123 seamen on the rolls of the Maritime Administration and their pay.

² February figure includes 15,135 employees of the Agency for International Development as compared with 14,982 in January, and their pay. These AID figures include employees who are paid from foreign currencies deposited by foreign governments in a trust fund for this purpose. The February figure includes 3,324 of these trust fund employees and the January figure includes 3,332.

³ February figure includes 493 employees of the Peace Corps as compared with 415 in January, and their pay.

⁴ Revised on basis of later information.

⁵ Includes 426 employees transferred from the Department of the Air Force.

⁶ Exclusive of personnel and pay of the Central Intelligence Agency and the National Security Agency.

TABLE II.—Federal personnel inside the United States employed by the executive agencies during February 1962, and comparison with January 1962

Department or agency	February	January	Increase	Decrease	Department or agency	February	January	Increase	Decrease
Executive departments (except Department of Defense):					Independent agencies—Continued				
Agriculture.....	90,813	90,234	579		Commission on Civil Rights.....	60	56	4	
Commerce ¹	28,319	27,953	366		Export-Import Bank of Washington.....	262	257	5	
Health, Education, and Welfare.....	73,348	72,842	506		Farm Credit Administration.....	237	235	2	
Interior.....	53,783	53,500	283		Federal Aviation Agency.....	42,593	42,363	230	
Justice.....	30,545	30,560		15	Federal Coal Mine Safety Board of Review.....	7	7		
Labor.....	8,054	8,007	47		Federal Communications Commission.....	1,369	1,357	12	
Post Office.....	578,206	579,031		825	Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation.....	1,260	1,272		12
State ²	9,926	9,839	87		Federal Home Loan Bank Board.....	1,145	1,144	1	
Treasury.....	84,306	80,173	4,133		Federal Maritime Commission.....	149	145	4	
Executive Office of the President:					Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service.....				
White House Office.....	444	441	3			357	355	2	
Bureau of the Budget.....	459	455	4		Federal Power Commission.....	897	898		1
Council of Economic Advisers.....	46	43	3		Federal Trade Commission.....	1,021	1,000	21	
Executive Mansion and Grounds.....	74	72	2		Foreign Claims Settlement Commission.....	59	58	1	
National Aeronautics and Space Council.....	16	16			General Accounting Office.....	4,658	4,664		6
National Security Council.....	42	43		1	General Services Administration.....	30,722	30,682	40	
Office of Emergency Planning.....	474	476		2	Government Printing Office.....	6,862	6,889		27
President's Commission on Campaign Costs.....	13	14		1	Housing and Home Finance Agency.....	12,383	12,233	150	
Independent agencies:					Indian Claims Commission.....				
Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations.....	26	25	1			20	20		
American Battle Monuments Commission.....	10	10			Interstate Commerce Commission.....	2,395	2,398		3
Atomic Energy Commission.....	6,778	6,752	26		James Madison Memorial Commission.....	1	1		
Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System.....	603	603			National Aeronautics and Space Administration.....	20,442	19,785	657	
Civil Aeronautics Board.....	805	786	19		National Capital Housing Authority.....	416	420		4
Civil Service Commission.....	3,853	3,821	32		National Capital Planning Commission.....	56	57		1
Civil War Centennial Commission.....	6	6			National Capital Transportation Agency.....	87	81	6	
Commission of Fine Arts.....	6	6			National Gallery of Art.....	314	308	6	
					National Labor Relations Board.....	1,824	1,808	16	
					National Mediation Board.....	143	139	4	
					National Science Foundation.....	777	779		2

See footnotes at end of table.

TABLE II.—Federal personnel inside the United States employed by the executive agencies during February 1962, and comparison with January 1962—Continued

Department or agency	February	January	Increase	Decrease	Department or agency	February	January	Increase	Decrease
Independent agencies—Continued					Independent agencies—Continued				
Outdoor Recreation Resources Review Commission.....	41	42		1	Veterans' Administration.....	175,932	175,679	253	-----
Panama Canal.....	159	158	1	-----	Total, excluding Department of Defense.	1,314,913	1,308,420	7,601	1,108
President's Commission on Equal Employment Opportunity.....	34	33	1	-----	Net increase, excluding Department of Defense.....			6,493	-----
Railroad Retirement Board.....	2,101	2,116	-----	15	Department of Defense:				
Renegotiation Board.....	191	203	-----	12	Office of the Secretary of Defense.....	1,738	1,757	-----	19
St. Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation.....	159	154	5	-----	Department of the Army.....	335,494	335,739	-----	245
Securities and Exchange Commission.....	1,226	1,210	16	-----	Department of the Navy.....	327,631	327,818	-----	187
Selective Service System.....	6,632	6,647	-----	15	Department of the Air Force.....	279,026	278,335	691	-----
Small Business Administration.....	2,926	2,884	42	-----	Defense Atomic Support Agency.....	2,057	2,050	7	-----
Smithsonian Institution.....	1,165	1,152	13	-----	Defense Communications Agency.....	118	115	3	-----
Soldiers' Home.....	1,031	1,032	-----	1	Defense Intelligence Agency.....	154	107	47	-----
South Carolina, Georgia, Alabama, and Florida Water Study Commission.....	58	56	2	-----	Defense Supply Agency.....	4,048	8,627	860	-----
Subversive Activities Control Board.....	27	27	-----	-----	Office of Civil Defense.....	1,130	1,117	13	-----
Tariff Commission.....	209	209	-----	-----	U.S. Court of Military Appeals.....	39	38	1	-----
Tax Court of the United States.....	148	149	-----	1	Interdepartmental activities.....	30	34	-----	4
Tennessee Valley Authority.....	18,260	18,423	-----	163	International military assistance.....	41	39	2	-----
Texas Water Study Commission.....	28	28	-----	-----	Total, Department of Defense.....	956,945	955,776	1,624	455
U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency.....	74	63	11	-----	Net increase, Department of Defense.....			1,169	-----
U.S. Information Agency.....	2,981	2,976	5	-----	Grand total, including Department of Defense.....	2,271,858	2,264,196	9,235	1,563
					Net increase, including Department of Defense.....			7,662	-----

¹ February figure includes 123 seamen on the rolls of the Maritime Administration. ² February figure includes 446 employees of the Peace Corps as compared with 369 in January. ³ February figure includes 2,366 employees of the Agency for International Development as compared with 2,332 in January. ⁴ Includes 426 employees transferred from the Department of the Air Force.

TABLE III.—Federal personnel outside the United States employed by the executive agencies during February 1962, and comparison with January 1962

Department or agency	February	January	Increase	Decrease	Department or agency	February	January	Increase	Decrease
Executive departments (except Department of Defense):					Independent agencies—Continued				
Agriculture.....	1,097	1,078	19	-----	Small Business Administration.....	42	39	3	-----
Commerce.....	604	610	-----	6	Smithsonian Institution.....	10	11	-----	1
Health, Education, and Welfare.....	504	505	-----	1	Tennessee Valley Authority.....	7	6	1	-----
Interior.....	525	526	-----	1	U.S. Information Agency.....	8,031	8,033	-----	2
Justice.....	338	339	-----	1	Veterans' Administration.....	1,026	1,037	-----	11
Labor.....	84	82	2	-----	Virgin Islands Corporation.....	1,190	585	605	-----
Post Office.....	1,400	1,402	-----	2	Total, excluding Department of Defense.	61,056	60,208	879	31
State ¹	29,297	29,172	125	-----	Net increase, excluding Department of Defense.....			848	-----
Treasury.....	605	590	15	-----	Department of Defense:				
Independent agencies:					Office of the Secretary of Defense.....	46	44	2	-----
American Battle Monuments Commission.....	397	403	-----	6	Department of the Army.....	51,989	52,006	-----	17
Atomic Energy Commission.....	31	31	-----	-----	Department of the Navy.....	23,793	23,690	103	-----
Civil Aeronautics Board.....	1	1	-----	-----	Department of the Air Force.....	28,110	28,531	-----	421
Civil Service Commission.....	2	2	-----	-----	Defense Communications Agency.....	6	6	-----	-----
Federal Aviation Agency.....	965	952	13	-----	Interdepartmental activities.....	1	1	-----	-----
Federal Communications Commission.....	3	3	-----	-----	International military assistance.....	9	9	-----	-----
Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation.....	4	4	-----	-----	Total, Department of Defense.....	103,954	104,287	105	438
Foreign Claims Settlement Commission.....	4	4	-----	-----	Net decrease, Department of Defense.....			333	-----
General Accounting Office.....	67	64	3	-----	Grand total, including Department of Defense.....	165,010	164,495	984	469
General Services Administration.....	3	3	-----	-----	Net increase, including Department of Defense.....			515	-----
Housing and Home Finance Agency.....	172	168	4	-----					
National Aeronautics and Space Administration.....	13	13	-----	-----					
National Labor Relations Board.....	33	33	-----	-----					
National Science Foundation.....	10	7	3	-----					
Panama Canal.....	14,436	14,350	86	-----					
Selective Service System.....	157	157	-----	-----					

¹ February figure includes 12,769 employees of the Agency for International Development as compared with 12,650 in January. These AID figures include employees who are paid from foreign currencies deposited by foreign governments in a trust fund for this purpose. The February figure includes 3,324 of these trust fund employees and the January figure includes 3,332. ² February figure includes 47 employees of the Peace Corps as compared with 46 in January.

TABLE IV.—Industrial employees of the Federal Government inside and outside the United States employed by the executive agencies during February 1962, and comparison with January 1962

Department or agency	February	January	Increase	Decrease	Department or agency	February	January	Increase	Decrease
Executive departments (except Department of Defense):					Independent agencies—Continued				
Agriculture.....	3,900	3,907	-----	7	Net increase, excluding Department of Defense.....			1,104	-----
Commerce.....	5,483	5,456	27	-----	Department of Defense:				
Interior.....	8,104	8,141	-----	37	Department of the Army:				
Post Office.....	256	252	4	-----	Inside the United States.....	¹ 139,850	² 139,981	-----	131
Treasury.....	5,150	5,155	-----	5	Outside the United States.....	¹ 4,450	² 4,456	-----	6
Independent agencies:					Department of the Navy:				
Atomic Energy Commission.....	247	246	1	-----	Inside the United States.....	204,770	204,903	-----	133
Federal Aviation Agency.....	1,875	1,884	-----	9	Outside the United States.....	454	459	-----	5
Federal Communications Commission.....	1,706	1,674	32	-----	Department of the Air Force:				
General Services Administration.....	6,862	6,889	-----	27	Inside the United States.....	139,209	138,319	890	-----
Government Printing Office.....	20,465	19,798	657	-----	Outside the United States.....	1,468	1,459	9	-----
National Aeronautics and Space Administration.....	7,511	7,466	45	-----	Total, Department of Defense.....	490,201	489,577	899	275
Panama Canal.....	126	126	-----	-----	Net increase, Department of Defense.....			624	-----
St. Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation.....	15,360	15,542	-----	182	Grand total, including Department of Defense.....	568,426	566,698	2,270	542
Tennessee Valley Authority.....	1,190	585	605	-----	Net increase, including Department of Defense.....			1,728	-----
Virgin Islands Corporation.....									
Total, excluding Department of Defense.....	78,225	77,121	1,371	267					

¹ Subject to revision.

² Revised on basis of later information.

TABLE V.—Foreign nationals working under U.S. agencies overseas, excluded from tables I through IV of this report, whose services are provided by contractual agreement between the United States and foreign governments, or because of the nature of their work or the source of funds from which they are paid, as of February 1962 and comparison with January 1962

Country	Total		Army		Navy		Air Force		National Aeronautics and Space Administration	
	February	January	February	January	February	January	February	January	February	January
Australia.....	1	1							1	1
Canada.....	36	37					36	37		
Crete.....	49	50					49	500		
England.....	3,709	3,322			81	72	3,628	3,250		
France.....	21,927	21,857	18,448	18,260	11	11	3,468	3,586		
Germany.....	80,851	80,785	68,028	67,904	85	85	12,738	12,796		
Greece.....	274	276					274	276		
Greenland.....	143	144					143	144		
Japan.....	53,035	53,491	18,728	19,057	14,354	14,517	19,953	19,917		
Korea.....	6,200	6,185	6,200	6,185						
Morocco.....	2,717	2,717			826	824	1,891	1,893		
Netherlands.....	52	55					52	55		
Norway.....	24	24					24	24		
Saudi Arabia.....	2	2					2	2		
Trinidad.....	600	598			600	598				
Total.....	169,620	169,544	111,404	111,406	15,957	16,107	42,258	42,030	1	1

¹ Revised on basis of later information.

STATEMENT BY SENATOR BYRD OF VIRGINIA

Executive agencies of the Federal Government reported civilian employment in the month of February totaling 2,436,868. This was a net increase of 8,177 compared with employment reported in the preceding month of January.

Civilian employment reported by the executive agencies of the Federal Government, by months in fiscal year 1962, which began July 1, 1961, follows:

Month	Employment	Increase	Decrease
1961—July.....	2,435,804	16,700	
August.....	2,445,078	9,274	
September.....	2,427,216		17,862
October.....	2,429,691	2,475	
November.....	2,437,709	8,018	
December.....	2,430,998		6,711
1962—January.....	2,428,691		2,307
February.....	2,436,868	8,177	

Total Federal employment in civilian agencies for the month of February was 1,375,969 an increase of 7,341 compared with the January total of 1,368,628. Total civilian employment in the military agencies in February was 1,060,899, an increase of 836 as compared with 1,060,063 in January.

Civilian agencies reporting larger increases were Treasury Department with 4,148, National Aeronautics and Space Administration with 657, Virgin Islands Corporation with 605, Agriculture Department with 598 and Department of Health, Education, and Welfare with 505. The largest decrease was reported by the Post Office Department with 827.

In the Department of Defense larger increases in civilian employment were reported by the Defense Supply Agency with 860 and the Department of the Air Force with 270. The larger decreases were reported by the Department of the Army with 262 and the Department of the Navy with 84.

Inside the United States civilian employment increased 7,662 and outside the United States civilian employment increased 515. Industrial employment by Federal agencies in February totaled 568,426, an increase of 1,728.

These figures are from reports certified by the agencies as compiled by the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures.

FOREIGN NATIONALS

The total of 2,436,868 civilian employees certified to the Committee by Federal agencies in their regular monthly personnel reports includes some foreign nationals employed in U.S. Government activities abroad, but in addition to these there were 169,620

foreign nationals working for U.S. agencies overseas during February who were not counted in the usual personnel reports. The

number in January was 169,544. A breakdown of this employment for February follows:

Country	Total	Army	Navy	Air Force	NASA
Australia.....	1				1
Canada.....	36			36	
Crete.....	49			49	
England.....	3,709		81	3,628	
France.....	21,927	18,448	11	3,468	
Germany.....	80,851	68,028	85	12,738	
Greece.....	274			274	
Greenland.....	143			143	
Japan.....	53,035	18,728	14,354	19,953	
Korea.....	6,200	6,200			
Morocco.....	2,717		826	1,891	
Netherlands.....	52			52	
Norway.....	24			24	
Saudi Arabia.....	2			2	
Trinidad.....	600		600		
Total.....	169,620	111,404	15,957	42,258	1

BILLS INTRODUCED

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

By Mr. GRUENING (for himself, Mr. CHAVEZ, Mr. MORSE, Mr. DWORSHAK, Mr. BENNETT, Mr. CANNON, Mr. MCGEE, Mr. LONG of Hawaii, Mrs. NEUBERGER, Mr. MOSS, Mr. BARTLETT, and Mr. HICKEY):

S. 3107. A bill to establish in the Office of the Secretary of the Department of the Interior a Board of Public Lands Appeals, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

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

By Mr. YARBOROUGH:

S. 3108. A bill to liberalize the provisions of title 38, United States Code, relating to automobiles for disabled veterans; and

S. 3109. A bill to amend chapter 17 of title 38, United States Code, in order to authorize hospital and medical care for peacetime veterans suffering from noncompensable service-connected disabilities; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

By Mr. EASTLAND:

S. 3110. A bill for the relief of Yeung Sing Li and Shee Lum Li; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. EASTLAND (by request):

S. 3111. A bill for the relief of Ernst Haeuserman; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ANDERSON (by request):

S. 3112. A bill to add certain lands to the Pike National Forest in Colorado and the

Carson National Forest and the Santa Fe National Forest in New Mexico, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

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

By Mr. GORE (for himself and Mr. KEFAUVER):

S. 3113. A bill to waive section 142, of title 28, United States Code, with respect to the U.S. District Court for the Eastern District of Tennessee holding court at Winchester, Tenn.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CARLSON:

S. 3114. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Army to pay fair value for improvements located on the railroad rights-of-way owned by bona fide lessees or permittees; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. BARTLETT:

S. 3115. A bill to authorize the admittance of the vessel, *City of New Orleans*, to American registry and to permit the use of such vessel in the coastwise trade; to the Committee on Commerce.

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

By Mr. SALTONSTALL:

S. 3116. A bill for the relief of M. Sgt. Benjamin A. Canini, U.S. Army; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ANDERSON (for himself, Mr. JACKSON, and Mr. MILLER):

S. 3117. A bill to promote the coordination and development of effective Federal and State programs relating to outdoor recreation, and to provide financial assistance

to the States for outdoor recreation planning, and for other purposes; and

S. 3118. A bill to provide for the establishment of a land conservation fund, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular affairs.

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

By Mr. HUMPHREY:

S. 3119. A bill to provide coverage under the Federal old-age, survivors, and disability insurance system for services performed outside of the United States by U.S. citizens in the employ of certain international organizations; to the Committee on Finance.

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

CONCURRENT RESOLUTION—PRINTING OF ADDITIONAL COPIES OF HEARING ON REVENUE ACT OF 1962

Mr. BYRD of Virginia, by request, submitted the following concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 68); which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration:

Resolved, That there be printed for the use of the Committee on Finance not to exceed 1,000 additional copies each of part one and all subsequent parts of hearings on the Revenue Act of 1962, held by that committee during the Eighty-seventh Congress.

A BILL TO CREATE A BOARD OF PUBLIC LANDS APPEALS IN THE OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, on behalf of myself and the senior Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], the senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], the senior Senator from Idaho [Mr. DWORSHAK], the senior Senator from Utah [Mr. BENNETT], the junior Senator from Nevada [Mr. CANNON], the senior Senator from Wyoming [Mr. MCGEE], the junior Senator from Hawaii [Mr. LONG], the junior Senator from Oregon [Mrs. NEUBERGER], the junior Senator from Utah [Mrs. MOSS], my colleague, the senior Senator from Alaska [Mr. BARTLETT], and the junior Senator from Wyoming [Mr. HICKEY], I introduce, and send to the desk a bill to establish in the Office of the Secretary of the Department of the Interior a Board of Public Lands Appeals.

In order to give other Senators an opportunity to join in sponsoring this measure, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks and that it be held at the desk until the close of business on April 10.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will be printed in the RECORD and held at the desk, as requested by the Senator from Alaska.

The bill (S. 3107) to establish in the Office of the Secretary of the Department of the Interior a Board of Public Lands Appeals, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. GRUENING (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, referred to the

Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD.

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, the bill seeks to provide for an objective review of decisions by the Bureau of Land Management and the Geological Survey in the Department of the Interior. It would establish directly in the Office of the Secretary a Board of Public Lands Appeals, consisting of three persons. This Board, or skilled hearing examiners employed by the Board, would hear appeals from decisions rendered by the Bureau of Land Management concerning the uses or claims to public lands under the jurisdiction of the Department of the Interior. Appellants would be given an opportunity for a hearing either before a member of the Board or before a hearing examiner employed by the Board. The hearing would be held at a location convenient to the appellant. The Board's activities would be governed by rules and regulations promulgated by the Secretary of the Interior, and would be in accord with the provisions of the Administrative Procedure Act. Final decisions of the Board would be appealable to the U.S. Court of Appeals for the circuit in which the land involved is situated.

While provision is made in the bill to have the Board's decisions be in accordance with the applicable regulations issued by the Secretary, a specific provision of the bill authorizes the Board to call to the attention of the Secretary of the Interior any inequitable, unjust, or unintended application of the law, so that he may have an opportunity to remedy the regulations issued.

As a Senator from a State having a large amount of land owned by the Federal Government—not only far more, actually, than that in any other State, but also far more percentagewise—I realize that the actions of the Bureau of Land Management and the Geological Survey, in the Department of the Interior, concerning the uses of or claims to such lands, vitally affect many of the citizens of my State.

The many letters of complaint from Alaskans, which I have received over the years, concerning arbitrary action by officials of these two Federal bureaus indicate the need for the establishment of procedures to insure an objective review of the decisions made.

The laws and regulations governing the use and disposition of the public lands should be interpreted and applied uniformly and equitably.

This can be accomplished only if the initial decision is subject to objective administrative review, with ultimate recourse to the courts.

The Secretary of the Interior has been entrusted with the management of the public lands, and has been instructed by the Congress to permit their use for certain purposes, and their disposition under certain conditions.

Those conditions have been implemented by regulations issued by the Secretary of the Interior. Their administration in the first instance has been delegated to the various land offices of

the Bureau of Public Lands throughout the Nation. Appeals from local decisions are appealable to the Director of the Bureau of Land Management here in Washington; thousands of miles away from the scene of the action and the location of the land. There is no right to a hearing; and, so far as an individual who appeals is concerned, he cannot afford the costs involved in such a hearing here in Washington.

From the decision by the Director of the Bureau of Land Management, a further appeal lies to the Secretary of the Department of the Interior. These appeals are handled by a special branch in the Office of the Solicitor of the Department. Here, again, there is no right to a hearing, and no practical machinery to bring the hearing to the place where the person who appeals lives.

Lack of an opportunity for a hearing is but one of the difficulties with the manner in which the Secretary of the Interior performs his functions with respect to the use and disposition of the public lands.

My second—and equally serious—objection to these operations is that there is no sharp division between the administrative power and the quasi-judicial power thus exercised in the name of the Secretary of the Interior.

Both the Associate Solicitor responsible for providing legal advice to the Bureau of Land Management and the Assistant Solicitor responsible for advising the Secretary of the Interior on the appeal from the decision of the Director of the Bureau of Land Management are responsible directly to the Solicitor.

Thus, the attorney advising on the initial decision and the attorney advising on the appeal are responsible to, and act under, the direction of the same individual, the Solicitor.

An individual appealing an adverse ruling must argue to an assistant solicitor, who is only a branch chief, that an individual standing higher in the bureaucratic scale—an associate solicitor and a division chief—was incorrect in his legal decision. That is certainly a most difficult case to argue. These two functions should be divided.

This is not the only Federal program in which this problem arises. It was one of the reasons for the enactment of the Administrative Procedure Act, which, however, exempted actions dealing with the public lands.

Such a procedure is, however, as much needed for public-land use and disposition as in the performance of many other functions of the executive branch.

An objective, impartial board along the lines of the one which we propose for the Department of the Interior could be established by administrative action. The Secretary of the Interior, although I have repeatedly urged him to do so, has not seen fit to act.

However, a board along the same lines has been functioning for many years in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. It was established by administrative action with respect to the old-age survivors and disability program under title II of the Social Security Act. Surely a decision as to entitlement

under that program is not necessarily more or less important than a decision as to whether a homesteader has complied with the provisions of the law, or a decision as to whether an applicant for an oil lease has similarly complied, or a decision as to whether an applicant for a grazing permit is entitled to it. A rebuffed and frustrated applicant for any of these public benefits should be entitled to an appeal to a tribunal which has in no way—either directly or indirectly—participated in the initial decision, or which can have its decision on appeal influenced by the maker of the original decision.

Those who seek, under the applicable provisions of the law, to use or obtain public lands should not be treated as though they were trying to deprive the Federal Government of something. The Congress has stated that the public lands may be used for certain purposes or may be disposed of under certain conditions. An applicant who complies with the conditions laid down should have his application granted. Applicants in Alaska, applicants in Oregon, applicants in Wyoming, or applicants in any of the other public land States are entitled to have those conditions interpreted uniformly and applied objectively.

I hope early hearings on my bill will be held, so that this much-needed administrative machinery can be established at the earliest possible moment.

EXHIBIT 1
S. 3107

A bill to establish in the Office of the Secretary of the Department of the Interior a Board of Public Lands Appeals, and for other purposes

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That there is hereby established in the Office of the Secretary of the Department of the Interior (hereinafter called the "Secretary") a Board of Public Lands Appeals (hereinafter called the "Board"), under the administrative control and supervision of a Chairman.

SEC. 2. The Board shall consist of a Chairman and two associate members, appointed without regard to the civil service and classification laws, and such other professional, administrative, clerical, and stenographic personnel as are necessary in conducting hearings and considering and disposing of appeals properly before the Board.

SEC. 3. Members of the Board (including the Chairman) shall be appointed by the Secretary, with the approval of the President, and shall receive compensation at the annual rate of \$_____.

SEC. 4. Any final decision of the Bureau of Land Management or the Geological Survey of the Department of the Interior concerning the uses of or claims to public lands under the jurisdiction of the Department of the Interior may be appealed to the Secretary, and the Board shall hear and determine such appeals on behalf of the Secretary. Final decisions on such appeals, after giving the appellant an opportunity for a hearing at a location convenient to the appellant, shall be made by vote of a majority of the Board on the basis of the entire record.

SEC. 5. An appeal under this Act may be filed with the Secretary only by an individual, partnership, corporation, or other organization or a State (or political subdivision thereof) materially affected by the appealed decision.

SEC. 6. The Secretary shall establish rules and regulations governing the Board's procedures and activities, which rules and regulations shall be in accord with the provisions of the Administrative Procedure Act (5 U.S.C. 1001-1011).

SEC. 7. Hearings may be held before the entire Board or before a single member thereof or before an employee of the Board designated by the Chairman to conduct such hearings.

SEC. 8. The Board shall be bound in its decisions by the applicable regulations issued by the Secretary: *Provided*, That, if the Board finds that, as applied to a particular case or group of cases, the regulations issued by the Secretary would lead to an inequitable, unjust, or unintended application of the law, it shall recommend to the Secretary appropriate and legally justifiable changes in such regulations and shall delay its decisions on affected appeals until the Secretary has considered the changes suggested and has made a decision as to whether or not to promulgate such changes in the regulation.

SEC. 9. Appeals from final decisions of the Board shall be to the United States Court of Appeals for the circuit in which the land involved is situated.

ADDITION OF CERTAIN LANDS TO CERTAIN NATIONAL FORESTS IN NEW MEXICO AND COLORADO

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, by request, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill which would add certain tracts of publicly owned lands of the United States to national forests in New Mexico and in Colorado.

The text of this measure was drafted by the Department of Agriculture and was submitted to the President of the Senate by the able Secretary of Agriculture, Hon. Orville L. Freeman. I ask unanimous consent that Secretary Freeman's letter transmitting the proposed legislation, and setting forth in detail just what lands and national forests are involved, be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

Mr. President, it is to be noted that the lands, totaling some 223,000 acres in the two States, which would be added to our national forest system, already are in public ownership. They are adjacent to or adjoin the forests to which they would be added, and now are protected and managed in conjunction with those forests. As pointed out by Secretary Freeman, their inclusion in them would simplify administration and make accounting and other managerial details easier and more effective.

The measure recommended by the Department of Agriculture would appear a step forward in the conservation and development of one of the Nation's great natural resources, our forest lands.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the letter will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 3112) to add certain lands to the Pike National Forest in Colorado and the Carson National Forest and the Santa Fe National Forest in New Mexico, introduced by Mr. ANDERSON, by request; was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

The letter presented by Mr. ANDERSON is as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
Washington, D.C., March 26, 1962.

HON. LYNDON B. JOHNSON,
President of the Senate.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: There is enclosed for the consideration of the Congress a draft bill, "To add certain lands to the Pike National Forest in Colorado and the Carson National Forest and the Santa Fe National Forest in New Mexico, and for other purposes."

We recommend that the draft bill be enacted.

The proposed legislation would encompass within the exterior boundaries of the Pike National Forest in Colorado about 18,100 acres and within the Carson and Santa Fe National Forests in New Mexico about 249,700 acres. These areas are now within land-utilization projects which for many years have been administered by this Department for land conservation and land utilization pursuant to title III of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act of July 22, 1937, as amended (7 U.S.C. 1010-1012), and in part for forest and range research purposes.

The recommended bill would give national-forest status to about 223,000 acres of Federal lands within the described areas. These Federal lands adjoin or are adjacent to the national forests to which they would be added and now are protected and managed in conjunction with them. A portion of the land in Colorado additionally constitutes a part of the Manitou Experimental Forest, a Forest Service research area which also includes nearby Pike National Forest lands.

The bill would add to the Pike National Forest parts of the Fountain Creek land-utilization project and two small parcels aggregating about 84 acres presently used for forest and range research. It would add to the Carson National Forest the Taos land-utilization project and the easterly portion of the Sebastian Martin grant which is a part of the northern New Mexico grant land-utilization project. Areas to be added to the Santa Fe National Forest are the Ojo de San Jose grant land-utilization project, the Juan de Galdon grant land-utilization project, the Polvadera grant, and the part of the Juan Jose Lobato grant which lies south of the Rio Chama River. The two areas last noted are parts of the northern New Mexico grant land-utilization project.

The lands to be added to the Pike National Forest are similar in their resources to lands already in the forest, and are in the headwaters of the South Platte River. They are well suited to multiple-use management for watershed, timber, forage and wildlife purposes, and some of them have material values for public recreation. Some currently form a part of the Manitou experimental forest.

The lands to be added to the Carson and Santa Fe National Forests lie in the upper Rio Grande watershed. Careful protection and management to restore and maintain adequate vegetative cover is essential to reduce soil erosion and enhance watershed capacity. They present the same multiple-use management problems and opportunities as do the nearby national forests and currently are managed in conjunction therewith.

All of the lands with which the draft bill deals have been administered by the Forest Service since about 1938, except those in the northern New Mexico grant land project which were assigned to it for management in 1954.

In eight States, mainly in the eastern United States, some 380,000 acres of land-utilization project lands suitable for national-forest purposes recently have been given national-forest status by Executive

orders. Since the addition of lands to national forests in Colorado and New Mexico is restricted by the limitations of the act of June 25, 1910 (36 Stat. 847, 848) and the act of June 15, 1926 (44 Stat. 745), the addition of the lands covered in the draft bill can be accomplished only by act of Congress.

Inclusion of these lands in the national-forest system would simplify administration. Accounting and other managerial details would be made easier and management generally made more effective.

A principal use of these lands is the grazing of domestic livestock by local people. Administration of this as well as other uses has been substantially in accordance with the policies applied to the national forests. Giving national-forest status to these lands will have no material effect upon the manner in which the grazing and other uses are permitted on them. The grazing permittees and other users can be assured that the addition of these lands to the national forests will not adversely affect them.

Enactment of the proposed bill would not affect the status of non-Federal lands in the areas, and would not add to the acreage of Federal lands. Local governments would continue to receive 25 percent of the receipts from the lands, for the benefit of public schools and public roads.

A similar letter is being sent to the Speaker of the House.

The Bureau of the Budget advises that there is no objection to the presentation of this proposed legislation from the standpoint of the administration's program.

Sincerely yours,

ORVILLE L. FREEMAN,

Secretary.

ADMITTANCE OF VESSEL "CITY OF NEW ORLEANS" TO AMERICAN REGISTRY

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill which would authorize the transfer to the U.S. flag with coastwise privileges a vessel presently under Liberian registry. The vessel is a fast rail car ferry of the most modern design built in Japan in 1959. She is presently laid up in Florida.

I have always been a staunch supporter and defender of our coastwise laws against the intrusion of foreign vessels, either by service or by transfer. The vessel which is the subject of this bill, however, in my judgment, can make a substantial contribution to the needs of the people in Alaska and to the defense of this country.

As my colleagues may know, the Canadian railroads have announced a plan whereby Alaska-bound shipments originating in the Midwest will traverse the continent by Canadian railroad and then from Prince Rupert to Alaska via foreign-flag vessel. This Canadian proposal holds out the hope to Alaskans of improved service and more important reduced costs. At the same time it has the disadvantage of depriving American railroads and American steamship companies of much needed traffic and revenue.

If the bill I am introducing today is successfully enacted, the vessel will be purchased by an American company and put into trade between the Pacific Northwest and Alaska. She is, I believe, the most modern vessel of her kind and will be able to take rail cars directly from American railroads and carry them in contact to Alaska.

Such a step will give to Alaskans American service at reduced cost and will not contribute to the unemployment or the loss of revenues in our country that would be occasioned by Canada dominating this traffic.

Mr. President, there can be no mistaking my primary concern that Alaskans should enjoy reduced freight costs, but as I said earlier, I am a supporter of the American merchant marine. If this bill is successfully enacted, it would provide not only a new lower cost for service but also make a substantial contribution to the trade and economic welfare of Alaska.

It will have the further advantage of providing an on-the-spot demonstration and a yardstick for evaluating the advantages of this type of unitized transportation. It will provide, in my judgment, therefore, a new form of transportation, an uplift to our defense capabilities, and we fervently hope a reduction in the freight costs that all Alaskans bear.

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

The bill (S. 3115) to authorize the admittance of the vessel, *City of New Orleans*, to American registry and to permit the use of such vessel in the coastwise trade, introduced by Mr. BARTLETT, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Commerce.

PROPOSED LEGISLATION RELATING TO PROGRAM FOR OUTDOOR RECREATION FACILITIES

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, for myself and on behalf of the Senator from Washington [Mr. JACKSON] and the Senator from Iowa [Mr. MILLER]—Senate Members of the Outdoor Recreation Resources Review Commission—I introduce for appropriate reference the two bills which have today been transmitted to Congress by the President and Secretary of Interior to implement major parts of the Commission's report.

I ask that the bills remain on the clerk's desk for 1 week to permit any Senators who desire to do so to join as cosponsors.

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

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, it is gratifying to those of us who served with the Commission during its 3-year study of our outdoor recreation resources that President Kennedy, Secretary of Interior Udall, Secretary of Agriculture Freeman, Secretary of the Army Stahr, and others involved in the executive branch of the Government have rolled up their sleeves and, in the 60 days since the Commission reported, made real progress toward putting into effect some of the major recommendations of that very fine, bipartisan group.

I wish to underline the bipartisan nature of this whole effort. It was my privilege to author the Outdoor Recreation Resources Commission bill in 1957. Senators from both parties joined me in that authorship, including Senators Murray, Watkins, Kuchel, Carroll, Barrett, Allott, Mundt, Morse, Neuberger, and Goldwater. A Democratic Con-

gress passed the bill in 1958. Republican President Dwight D. Eisenhower signed it and appointed the seven public members of the Commission, including Chairman Laurance Rockefeller, who served with four Senators and four Representatives—two from each party from each House. When President Kennedy was inaugurated, I suggested to him that he keep the public members appointed by his predecessor, and that was done. And now a Democratic administration is implementing the Commission's report with New Frontier vigor, and, if I may say it with a kindly and even affectionate meaning, with Old Guard support.

Several major steps toward carrying out the report already have been taken administratively.

The Review Commission found that water is a key element in recreation. People like to swim in it, fish in it, and to boat and ski on it. Other people, who have no desire to get wet, nonetheless like to camp, to picnic, to walk, and just to sit and meditate beside a body of water. The Commission recommended that we realize the full recreational potential of all-Federal reservoirs by acquiring contiguous land and by operating the lakes to serve recreational purposes to the fullest feasible extent.

The Secretaries of Interior and Army, who preside over the major construction agencies involved, a month ago announced agreement on policies to assure optimum development of recreational opportunities at Corps of Engineers and Reclamation dams.

The Secretary of Agriculture has, in the administration's agricultural proposals, requested authority he needs to assure that small reservoirs developed under the Small Watersheds Act, will provide maximum recreational opportunities.

The Commission recommended the establishment of a Federal Bureau of Recreation in the Department of the Interior to administer programs of aid to States in recreation planning and land acquisition, to provide the States with guidance and leadership, to encourage the coordination of the programs and policies of the 20 Federal agencies which have some involvement in recreation, and to develop and maintain a national recreation plan embodying the separate plans of the States and Federal departments.

With the approval of the President and his colleagues in the Cabinet, Secretary of the Interior Udall has established such a Bureau of Recreation. He has transferred to it existing functions and authorities in the Interior Department and is requesting Congress, through the bills I have just presented, to provide the additional authorities needed for the Bureau to function as the Outdoor Recreation Resources Review Commission recommended.

In establishing the new Bureau of Recreation in the Interior Department, Secretary Udall and Secretary of Agriculture Freeman have achieved a measure of cooperation between rival departments which some critics believed impossible.

The Outdoor Recreation Resources Review Commission debated for some time about recommending the creation of the Bureau of Recreation in the Interior Department. There were advocates of an independent agency. They felt that an independent bureau could achieve greater cooperation from the various departments and agencies involved. But the Commission concluded that it did not want to contribute to the multiplication of independent agencies and, for that and other reasons, recommended that the Bureau be in the Interior Department.

Secretary of the Interior Udall has, in my judgment, made a splendid selection of a Director for the new Bureau—Edward C. Crafts, a capable and energetic Assistant Chief of the Forest Service, and a highly respected career man in the Department of Agriculture. Mr. Crafts will take to the new Bureau of Recreation not only the assurance of great leadership, but also an assurance of cooperation among units of government long regarded as implacable rivals in the recreation field.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the Department of the Interior announcement of the establishment of the Bureau of Outdoor Recreation and the appointment of Mr. Crafts.

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

UDALL ESTABLISHES BUREAU OF OUTDOOR RECREATION IN INTERIOR DEPARTMENT

Carrying out President Kennedy's instructions regarding the coordination of Federal outdoor recreation programs, Secretary of the Interior Stewart L. Udall today signed an order establishing a Bureau of Outdoor Recreation in the Department.

President Kennedy has announced that Dr. Edward C. Crafts, of Chevy Chase, Md., is being appointed Director of the new Bureau. Dr. Crafts, a career Federal employee, is now serving as Assistant Chief of the Forest Service of the Department of Agriculture.

The Outdoor Recreation Resources Review Commission recommended the creation of the Bureau in its January 31 report, and President Kennedy in his special message on conservation, transmitted to Congress on March 1, said the recommendation would be adopted.

In the message, President Kennedy said: "This Bureau will carry out the planning functions already assigned to the Department of the Interior and will administer the program of Federal assistance to State agencies. This new Bureau will serve as the focal point within the Federal Government for the many activities related to outdoor recreation."

In the same message, the President called for legislation to establish a program of matching grants for the development of State plans for outdoor recreation.

Dr. Crafts is a forester with 29 years of Federal service. A native of Illinois, he attended Dartmouth College and holds B.F., M.F., and Ph. D. degrees from the University of Michigan. His career began in forest and range research for the forest service in Utah, Arizona, and New Mexico, and forest economics research in California.

During World War II, he moved to Washington to become coordinator of Forest Service projects in timber requirements and supplies for the War Production Board, Office of Price Administration, and other defense agencies. Later he became director of forest

economics research activities of the Forest Service.

Since 1950, he has been Assistant Chief of the Forest Service in charge of long-range program development, legislation, and congressional relations. He has also been on loan from the Forest Service, serving as administrative assistant to the Assistant Secretary of Agriculture for Federal-State relations.

Dr. Crafts is author of a number of articles, research, and technical notes, and directed the 5-year review of timber resources in the United States published in 1958 as "Timber Resources for America's Future."

He received the Distinguished Service Award of the Department of Agriculture in 1960. He is a fellow of the Society of American Foresters and a member of the American Forestry Association, Cosmos Club, Sigma Xi, Phi Kappa Phi, Phi Sigma, and Sigma Phi.

In 1949, he was adviser to the U.S. delegate to the Third World Forestry Congress sponsored by the FAO at Helsinki, Finland; and in 1960 served as chairman of the Economics Program Committee for the Fifth World Forestry Congress at Seattle, Wash.

Dr. Crafts is married and has a son who is a geologist, and a daughter now studying at the University of Michigan.

In recommending a new Bureau of Outdoor Recreation, the Outdoor Recreation Resources Review Commission—a blue-ribbon Commission composed of outstanding conservationists and Members of Congress—said:

"There are now more than 20 Federal agencies with programs involving some aspect of outdoor recreation. A similar multiplicity is found among State agencies. While the programs of these agencies are generally well planned in themselves, little thought is given to the overall development of outdoor recreation throughout the Nation.

"There is at present no focal point for coordination of recreation policy, planning, programs, or management. Overall responsibility for initiating and guiding a national effort in outdoor recreation has never been explicitly assigned. After consideration of all possibilities, the recommendation for a new bureau in the Department of the Interior is made as the most likely to be accepted."

Secretary Udall created the new Bureau under the authority conferred on him by Reorganization Plan No. 3, approved by the 82d Congress in 1950.

Besides administering the current State cooperative services under 1936 legislation and the proposed State assistance program on which legislation will soon be submitted, the new Bureau will assist the Secretary in carrying out his Federal outdoor recreation coordination responsibilities, sponsor and conduct recreation research, conduct recreation resource surveys, develop a nationwide recreation plan, and disseminate outdoor recreation information.

Secretary Udall said a nucleus organization is being formed and a number of the functions of the Park Service's Division of Recreation Resource Planning are being transferred to the new Bureau. The new Bureau will coordinate recreational planning, rather than carry out land-management functions of existing agencies.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, the two bills which I have sent to the desk are, first, a bill to clothe the new Bureau of Recreation with the legislative directives and authority it will need to promote effective State and Federal recreation programs, including a program of financial aid to the States in outdoor recreation planning; and, second, to establish a national land conservation

fund which will permit the acceleration of Federal acquisition of necessary lands for park, recreation, forest and certain fish and wildlife purposes, including lands around Federal reservoir projects.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks a brief analysis of the two measures and their text.

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

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, in introducing the land conservation fund measure, I want to repeat a little fact of history which I do not believe can be repeated too often. It has been demonstrated many times in our experience that we can obtain desirable things—the things we need—in this country at different price levels.

If we provide them early, they can be provided quite cheaply. If we wait until there are competing demands for them, the price is high.

We cited examples of this in the report on the wilderness bill.

In 1935, Secretary of the Interior Harold Ickes got a report on the availability of seashore recreation areas on the Atlantic and Gulf coasts. It recommended that the Federal Government acquire about 10 percent of all those coasts—400 miles—at an estimated cost of \$12 million. A dozen separate areas from Maine to Corpus Christi, Tex., was involved. Only one was acquired—the Cape Hatteras Seashore Recreation area. It was actually acquired because of a private gift of \$818,000 from the Mellon Foundation, which was matched by the State of North Carolina, the area purchased, and given to the Government.

The other areas have risen from 800 to 3,600 percent and more in value. Some are highly developed. All except a part of one of that original 12 areas—Padre Island off Texas—appears now to be priced beyond reach for public access.

We didn't acquire early, when the need was first apparent, so the price for seashore areas has gone up. It will go up more if we do not acquire needed shorelines now.

Last year we made provision for the acquisition of more than \$100 million in wet lands which are necessary to maintain even a sporting chance for our hunters to bag a duck or a goose or two in the fall hunting seasons.

The swamps and marshes all once belonged to the Government. If someone a century ago could have foreseen the migratory wildfowl situation today, it would have been possible to set aside swamps and wet lands without cost to the Government. The price has advanced steadily ever since.

The Outdoor Recreation Resources Review Commission has attempted to look ahead, not a century, but just four decades, to our outdoor recreation needs in the year 2000, and determine what we should be doing now to meet requirements a relatively few years ahead.

The Commission's projection of a threefold increase in outdoor recreation activity occasions four decades from now

has been subjected to only one criticism—that it is too conservative.

It is conservative compared to other projections. As such, it is an excellent index or inventory of minimum outdoor recreation resources the country is going to have to acquire by the year 2000, and it affords us an opportunity to meet those requirements now, before the price goes up.

We can still meet some of the need from the public lands, without cost to the Federal Government. The Public Lands Subcommittee held hearings last Thursday and Friday on a magnificent canyonlands area of 300,000 to 1 million acres in southeastern Utah still in public ownership which will make an outstanding national park. The shorelines bill, passed by the Senate and pending with the House, provides for the Forest Service to make a survey of the national forestlands for desirable waterfront recreation areas and they should locate many, for the forests have more than 10,000 lakes, 80,000 miles of streams, and some seashore. Some lands are going to have to be bought. Unfortunately, our public lands are mostly in the West and recreation needs are greatest in the congested eastern areas. The price for some of the seashore areas, like the Cape Cod seashore area this Congress has already authorized, are going to be pretty high. They will be much higher later on.

There is going to be considerable expense involved in meeting outdoor recreation requirements even now. The faster we move, however, the more economically the job can be done and the more assurance there is that the needs will be met at all. Many desirable areas are already developed and priced beyond reach. California is paying as high as \$7 million a mile for seashore now.

The cost factor is a major reason why I am gratified by the unity, cooperation between party members, between agencies of Government, and between State, local and Federal Governments in moving ahead with an outdoor recreation program.

I congratulate the administration on its prompt response to the Outdoor Recreation Resources Review Commission report, and I thank my colleagues for their cooperation.

The Interior and Insular Affairs Committee expects to consider measures bearing on a recreation program just as expeditiously as possible so the legislative branch can match the promptness of the executive branch.

EXHIBIT 1

SHORT ANALYSIS OF OUTDOOR RECREATION RESOURCES BILLS

1. A bill to promote the coordination and development of effective Federal and State programs relating to outdoor recreation, and to provide financial assistance to the States for outdoor recreation planning, and for other purposes.

Title I gives the Secretary of the Interior certain authority for research, coordination and planning of outdoor recreation programs substantially as recommended by the Outdoor Recreation Resources Review Commission. These would be carried out by the Bureau of Outdoor Recreation.

Title II authorizes appropriation of \$50 million for grants to States for 5-year pro-

grams to develop comprehensive statewide outdoor recreation plans.

2. A bill to establish a land conservation fund, and for other purposes.

In general, the bill provides special financial arrangements for accelerating Federal acquisition of lands for park, recreation, forest, and certain fish and wildlife purposes, including additional lands around Federal reservoir projects.

The four revenue sources assigned to the program are:

1. Proceeds from new recreation user charges established by the President at all Federal recreation areas.

2. Proceeds from the sale of surplus Federal nonmilitary lands.

3. The 2-cent-a-gallon tax on gasoline and motor fuels used in boats, now refundable;

4. The proceeds from an annual Federal tax on the use of recreation boats of \$5 for boats 14 to 16 feet, and \$2 for each additional foot in length.

These revenues will be deposited in a separate Treasury account. The President will transfer part to the general fund of the Treasury to help offset the cost of acquiring additional lands at Federal reservoirs for public recreation and fish and wildlife enhancement. The balance will be transferred to the land conservation fund.

The bill authorizes an 8-year advance appropriation of \$500 million to the land conservation fund. Any sums so advanced together with revenues transferred to the fund may be appropriated for land acquisition for parks and recreation areas, national forests, and special refuges to preserve species of fish and wildlife threatened with extinction. After 8 years, at least 50 percent of revenues to the fund will be used to repay advance appropriations.

S. 3117

A bill to promote the coordination and development of effective Federal and State programs relating to outdoor recreation, and to provide financial assistance to the States for outdoor recreation planning, and for other purposes

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Congress finds and declares that the general welfare of the Nation requires that all American people of present and future generations shall be assured the availability and accessibility of such quantity and quality of outdoor recreation resources as are necessary and desirable for the physical, spiritual, cultural, recreational, and scientific benefits which such outdoor recreation resources provide; and that timely and coordinated action is required by all levels of government on a nationwide basis to conserve, develop, and utilize such resources for the benefit of the American people.

SEC. 2. As used in this Act except as the context otherwise may require—

(a) The term "Secretary" means the Secretary of the Interior.

(b) The terms "State" and "United States" include the District of Columbia, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands, Guam, and American Samoa.

(c) The term "outdoor recreation resources" means land, waters, and associated resources in the United States, and interests therein, improvements thereon, and access thereto, including areas of historic significance and such forests, range lands, wetlands, fish and wildlife, and other natural resources as may serve other beneficial purposes, which provide, or may in the future provide, opportunities for outdoor recreation. The term "outdoor recreation" means the use and enjoyment of outdoor recreation resources.

TITLE I—RESEARCH, COORDINATION, AND PLANNING

SEC. 101. In order to carry out the purposes of this Act, the Secretary is authorized, after consultation with the heads of other Federal departments and agencies concerned, to:

(a) Prepare and maintain a continuing inventory and evaluation of the outdoor recreation needs and resources of the United States.

(b) Prepare a system for classification of outdoor recreation resources.

(c) Provide technical assistance to States and their political subdivisions with respect to programs relating to outdoor recreation.

(d) Encourage interstate and regional cooperation in the acquisition and development of outdoor recreation resources.

(e) Sponsor and engage in research relating to outdoor recreation, directly, or by contract, grant, or cooperative agreements without regard to the provisions of section 3648 of the Revised Statutes (31 U.S.C. 529) when in his judgment such payments are necessary to facilitate such research.

(f) Formulate and keep current an integrated nationwide outdoor recreation plan which shall take into consideration the plans of Federal agencies, States, and their political subdivisions, shall set forth the current and foreseeable availability of outdoor recreation resources and the needs and demands of the public for the use and enjoyment thereof, and shall identify critical outdoor recreation problems and propose steps for their solution, identifying desirable actions to be taken at each level of government and by private interests. The Secretary shall report at intervals of not more than five years on such plan to the President for transmittal to the Congress. When the plan is transmitted to the Congress, the Secretary shall transmit copies of the report to the Governors of the several States.

(g) Undertake such studies and assemble and publish such information concerning outdoor recreation, either directly or by contract, as he deems appropriate, and disseminate such information without regard to the provisions of section 321n of Title 39, United States Code.

(h) Establish education and interpretation programs in cooperation with educational institutions in order to assist and encourage public use of outdoor recreation resources.

(i) Request any Federal department or agency for (1) such information, data and reports, and (2) such advice and assistance, as may be necessary in carrying out the provisions of this title; and any department or agency which furnishes such advice or assistance may expend its own funds for such purposes, with or without reimbursement from the Secretary as may be agreed upon between the Secretary and the head of the department or agency.

SEC. 102. The complete files and records of the Outdoor Recreation Resources Review Commission shall be transferred to the Secretary on or before September 1, 1962.

TITLE II—PLANNING GRANTS TO STATES

SEC. 201. To assist the States in meeting their primary responsibilities to provide outdoor recreation opportunities to the populations they serve and to encourage comprehensive planning by the States, in cooperation with their political subdivisions, for effective outdoor recreation resource programs, there is authorized to be appropriated not to exceed \$50,000,000 for grants to States to assist them in the preparation of comprehensive statewide outdoor recreation plans, including the cost of training personnel for recreation planning and administrative responsibilities. Moneys appropriated hereunder shall be available until expended for payment to the States to assist each

State for a period of not more than five years in a planning program approved by the Secretary, in accordance with section 203, commencing not later than June 30, 1964.

Sec. 202. The sum authorized to be appropriated under section 201 shall be apportioned among the several States as follows: (1) one-fifth shall be divided equally among the several States; and (2) three-fifths shall be apportioned in the proportion which the population of each State bears to the total population of the United States. The remaining one-fifth of such sum shall be available for grants to States, without apportionment as hereinabove provided, in such amounts as in the opinion of the Secretary may be required to meet the needs for outdoor recreation planning.

Sec. 203. (a) In determining the adequacy of any planning program submitted by a State for approval under this title, the Secretary shall consider whether such program—

(1) Designates a State agency (hereinafter referred to as the "State agency") to administer the planning program.

(2) Provides for preparing and keeping up to date a comprehensive statewide outdoor recreation plan for assuring the availability and accessibility of outdoor recreation resources to its inhabitants in accordance with the purposes of this Act. The plan shall take into account relevant Federal resources and programs and shall be coordinated with any local, metropolitan, State or regional comprehensive plans, including those prepared with the aid of planning grants under section 701 of the Housing Act of 1954, as amended (40 U.S.C. 461); and it may consist entirely or in part of components of an interstate plan developed in cooperation with agencies of another State or States.

(3) Sets forth the procedures to be followed in carrying out such planning program, with adequate provision for coordination with all Federal, State and local agencies having responsibilities in such fields.

(4) Provides that the State agency will make such reports in such form and containing such information as the Secretary from time to time may require to carry out his functions under this title.

(5) Provides such accounting, budgeting and other fiscal methods and procedures as are necessary for the proper and efficient administration of the program, and provides that, upon request of properly authorized representatives of the Secretary, accounting and other fiscal records pertaining to such administration will be made available for inspection by such representatives.

(b) Upon approval of the State planning program, the Secretary shall pay to such State from appropriations available therefor up to 75 percent of the first year's cost of such State program; not more than 50 percent of the second year's cost of such program; and not more than 35 percent of the annual cost of such program during each of the subsequent 3 years: *Provided*, That in no case shall the total of such grants exceed the amount available to such State under section 202.

Sec. 204. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this Act. Nothing contained in this Act shall limit any authority of the Secretary under any other provision of law.

S. 3118

A bill to provide for the establishment of a Land Conservation Fund, and for other purposes

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That it is the purpose of this Act to provide for the timely and orderly acquisition of land resources for public outdoor recreation and other conservation uses.

SOURCES AND DISTRIBUTION OF REVENUES

SEC. 2. (a) The revenues realized from the sources listed below shall be set aside in a separate account in the Treasury of the United States:

(1) The proceeds from any fees established pursuant to section 5 and from any other similar fees as determined by the President, except as provided in section 9;

(2) the net proceeds (except so much thereof as may be set aside and obligated by authority of 40 U.S.C. 485) hereafter received from the disposal of real property, other than property of the Department of Defense, heretofore or hereafter disposed of under the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended;

(3) the proceeds from taxes paid on special motor fuels or gasoline used in motorboats as provided in section 6 of this Act;

(4) the revenue from the tax on use of certain boats imposed pursuant to section 7 of this Act.

(b) The President shall determine from time to time a division of the total amount in the separate account between those amounts to be transferred to the Land Conservation Fund established under section 3 of this Act and those amounts to be credited to the miscellaneous receipts of the Treasury, and the Secretary of the Treasury shall make such transfers and credits. In making such determination the President shall take into consideration the relative needs for funds (1) to help finance the acquisition of lands for the purposes specified in sections 3(b) and (2) to help offset the costs of acquisition of additional lands for public recreation and fish and wildlife enhancement at Federal and federally assisted reservoirs financed through project appropriations to water-resource agencies.

(c) The President shall allocate for each fiscal year revenues transferred into the Fund among the purposes specified in section 3(b).

(d) This section shall take effect on the first day of the first calendar quarter which begins more than sixty days after the date of enactment of this Act.

LAND CONSERVATION FUND

SEC. 3. (a) There is hereby established in the Treasury of the United States a separate fund to be known as the Land Conservation Fund (hereinafter referred to as the "Fund").

(b) The Fund shall be dedicated to the acquisition of lands or interests therein, except those associated with Federal and federally assisted reservoirs, (1) within the exterior boundaries of areas of the national park system, recreation areas, and other similar areas authorized to be administered by the Secretary of the Interior, subject to the limitations and conditions of such authorizations, (2) within the national forest system, and (3) for national refuges authorized to be established by the Secretary of the Interior which are necessary to preserve species of fish and wildlife threatened with extinction.

(c) The Fund shall be available only in such amounts as may be determined in appropriation Acts, and shall then be available until expended.

(d) The Secretary of the Interior shall keep such accounts as are necessary for the Fund as a whole.

ADVANCE APPROPRIATIONS AND REPAYMENT

SEC. 4. (a) In order to accelerate the conservation of the Nation's outdoor recreation resources, there is hereby authorized to be appropriated for the eight-year period beginning with fiscal year 1963 not to exceed \$500,000,000.

(b) Funds appropriated each fiscal year pursuant to this section shall be accounted for, added to, and used for the purposes of the Land Conservation Fund.

(c) Funds appropriated pursuant to this section shall be treated as an advance, without interest, to the Fund. Such appropriated funds shall be repaid, beginning with fiscal year 1971, to the general fund of the Treasury out of the Fund, and such repayment shall be made at least annually in amounts comprising at least 50 percent of the moneys received by the Fund under section 2: *Provided*, That in the event the full amount authorized by subsection (a) of this section is appropriated prior to the end of the aforesaid eight-year period, the repayment pursuant to this subsection shall begin with the next full fiscal year.

USER FEES

SEC. 5. (a) The President is authorized to establish entrance, admission and other recreation user fees at any land or water area administered by or under the authority of the National Park Service, the Bureau of Land Management, the Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife, the Bureau of Reclamation, the Forest Service, the Corps of Engineers, and the United States section of the International Boundary and Water Commission (United States and Mexico) and at any land or water area within a project constructed under the Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention Act, as amended, which is required to be open to the public. Any fees established shall be fair and equitable taking into consideration direct and indirect cost to the Government, benefit to the recipient, public policy or interest served, and other pertinent facts.

(b) The heads of departments and agencies are authorized to enforce the collection of any entrance, admission, and other recreation user fees established pursuant to subsection (a) of this section as to areas under their respective jurisdictions. Any violation of any rules and regulations pertaining to such fees shall be under the jurisdiction of the United States district court for each district in which the violation occurs, or by a United States Commissioner appointed by said court. Violations shall be subject to a fine of not more than \$100 or imprisonment for not exceeding 30 days or both.

SPECIAL MOTOR FUELS OR GASOLINE USED IN MOTORBOATS

SEC. 6. (a) SPECIAL MOTOR FUEL USED IN MOTORBOATS.—Section 4041(b) of the Internal Revenue Code (relating to special motor fuels) is amended by revising the flush material following paragraph (2) to read as follows:

"In the case of a liquid taxable under this subsection sold for use or used otherwise than as fuel for the propulsion of (A) a motorboat or (B) a highway vehicle (i) which (at the time of such sale or use) is registered or is required to be registered, for highway use under the laws of any State or foreign country, or (ii) which, in the case of a highway vehicle owned by the United States, is used on the highway, the tax imposed by paragraph (1) or by paragraph (2) shall be 2 cents a gallon. If a liquid on which tax was imposed by paragraph (1) at the rate of 2 cents a gallon by reason of the preceding sentence is used as a fuel for the propulsion of (A) a motorboat or (B) a highway vehicle (1) which (at the time of such use) is registered, or is required to be registered, for highway use under the laws of a State or foreign country, or (B) which, in the case of a highway vehicle owned by the United States, is used on the highway, a tax of 2 cents a gallon shall be imposed under paragraph (2)."

(b) CREDITS AND REFUNDS IN RESPECT OF SPECIAL MOTOR FUELS.—Subparagraph (J) of section 6416(b)(2) of the Internal Revenue Code (relating to credits and refunds on certain specified uses and resales) is amended to read as follows:

"(J) In the case of a liquid in respect of which tax was paid under section 4041(b)

(1) at the rate of 3 cents or 4 cents a gallon, used or resold for use otherwise than as a fuel for the propulsion of (i) a motorboat or (ii) a highway vehicle (a) which (at the time of such use or resale), is registered, or required to be registered, for highway use under the laws of any State or foreign country, or (b) which, in the case of a highway vehicle owned by the United States, is used on the highway; except that the amount of any overpayment by reason of this subparagraph shall not exceed an amount computed at the rate of 1 cent a gallon where tax was paid at the 3-cent rate or at the rate of 2 cents a gallon where tax was paid at the 4-cent rate."

(c) **GASOLINE USED IN MOTORBOATS.**—Subsection (a) of section 6421 of the Internal Revenue Code (relating to gasoline used for certain nonhighway purposes or by local transit systems) is amended to read as follows:

"(a) **NONHIGHWAY USES.**—If gasoline is used otherwise than as a fuel in (1) a motorboat or (2) a highway vehicle (A) which (at the time of such use) is registered, or is required to be registered, for highway use under the laws of any State or foreign country, or (B) which, in the case of a highway vehicle owned by the United States, is used on the highway, the Secretary or his delegate shall pay (without interest) to the ultimate purchaser of such gasoline an amount equal to 1 cent for each gallon of gasoline so used on which tax was paid at the rate of 3 cents a gallon and 2 cents for each gallon of gasoline so used on which tax was paid at the rate of 4 cents a gallon."

(d) **HIGHWAY TRUST FUND.**—Section 209 (f) of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1956 (relating to expenditures from Trust Fund) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraph:

"(5) **TRANSFERS FROM THE TRUST FUND FOR SPECIAL MOTOR FUELS AND GASOLINE USED IN MOTORBOATS.**—The Secretary of the Treasury shall pay from time to time from the Trust Fund into the separate account from which funds are transferred to the Land Conservation Fund amounts as determined by him equivalent to 50 percent of the taxes received under section 4041(b) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 with respect to special motor fuels used as fuel for the propulsion of motorboats and under section 4081 of such Code with respect to gasoline used as fuel in motorboats."

(e) **EFFECTIVE DATE.**—The amendments made by this section shall take effect on the first day of the first calendar quarter which begins more than 60 days after the date of the enactment of this Act.

TAX ON USE OF CERTAIN BOATS

SEC. 7. (a) **IMPOSITION OF TAX.**—Chapter 36 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to certain other excise taxes) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subchapter:

"SUBCHAPTER E.—TAX ON USE OF CERTAIN BOATS

"Sec. 4491. Imposition of tax.

"Sec. 4492. Definitions.

"Sec. 4493. Exemptions.

"Sec. 4494. Cross reference.

"SEC. 4491. IMPOSITION OF TAX.

"(a) **IMPOSITION OF TAX.**—A tax is hereby imposed on the use of any boat, with respect to each year in which such use occurs, at the following rates:

"(1) Overall length 14 feet or over but not over 16 feet, five dollars.

"(2) Overall length over 16 feet, five dollars, plus two dollars for each foot or fraction thereof in excess of 16 feet.

The over-all length of a boat shall be determined under methods set forth in regulations prescribed by the Secretary or his delegate.

"(b) **BY WHOM PAID.**—The tax imposed by this section shall be paid by the person who

is the owner of the boat, or, in case the boat is owned by the United States, by the agency or instrumentality of the United States operating such boat.

"(c) **PROBATION OF TAX.**—If in any year the first use of the boat is after July 31, the tax shall be reckoned proportionately from the first day of the month in which such use occurs to and including the 30th day of June following.

"(d) **ONE PAYMENT PER YEAR.**—If the tax imposed by this section is paid with respect to any boat for any year, no further tax shall be imposed by this section for such year with respect to such boat.

"(e) **WHEN TAX DUE.**—Every owner of a boat subject to the tax imposed by this section shall before use of the boat, or at such other times as the Secretary or his delegate may by regulations prescribe, pay the amount of tax applicable thereto.

"(f) **POSTING OF EVIDENCE OF PAYMENT OF TAX.**—The Secretary or his delegate may under regulations prescribed by him require any person liable for the tax imposed by this section on the use of a boat to place and keep conspicuously on such boat evidence of payment of such tax.

"SEC. 4492. DEFINITIONS.—

"For purposes of this subchapter—

"(a) **BOAT.**—The term 'boat' means any boat propelled by machinery, sail, motor, or any combination thereof, measuring fourteen feet or more in overall length, owned by a person who is a citizen or resident of the United States.

"(b) **USE.**—The term 'use' means use on waters in the United States, or within the three miles of the coast line of the United States.

"(c) **YEAR.**—The term 'year' means the one-year period beginning on July 1.

"SEC. 4493. EXEMPTIONS.—

"(a) **STATE AND LOCAL GOVERNMENTAL EXEMPTION.**—Under regulations prescribed by the Secretary or his delegate, no tax shall be imposed by section 4491 on the use of any boat by any State or any political subdivision of a State.

"(b) **EXEMPTION FOR UNITED STATES.**—The Secretary may authorize exemption from the tax imposed by section 4491 as to the use by the United States of any particular boat or class of boats, if he determines that the imposition of such tax with respect to such use will cause substantial burden or expense which can be avoided by granting tax exemption and that full benefit of such exemption, if granted, will accrue to the United States.

"(c) **BOATS USED FOR TRADE OR COMMERCIAL FISHING.**—Under regulations prescribed by the Secretary or his delegate, no tax shall be imposed by section 4491 on the use of any boat used chiefly for trade or for commercial fishing. For purposes of this exemption the term trade does not include the lease of a boat without an operator for pleasure or recreational purposes.

"(d) **CHARITABLE OR RELIGIOUS ORGANIZATION EXEMPTION.**—Under regulations prescribed by the Secretary or his delegate, no tax shall be imposed by section 4491 on the use of any boat without profit by any charitable or religious organization exclusively for furnishing aid, comfort, or relief to seamen or any boat used by the Boy Scouts of America chiefly for training scouts in seamanship.

"(e) **NONPROFIT EDUCATIONAL ORGANIZATION EXEMPTION.—**

"(1) **EXEMPTION.**—Under regulations prescribed by the Secretary or his delegate, no tax shall be imposed by section 4491 on the use of any boat used exclusively by a nonprofit educational organization.

"(2) **DEFINITION OF NONPROFIT EDUCATIONAL ORGANIZATION.**—For purposes of paragraph (1) of this subsection, the term 'nonprofit educational organization' means an educational organization described in sec-

tion 503(b)(2) which is exempt from income tax under section 501(a). The term also includes a school operated as an activity or an organization described in section 501(c)(3) which is exempt from income tax under section 501(a), if such school normally maintains a regular faculty and curriculum and normally has a regularly enrolled body of pupils or students in attendance at the place where its educational activities are regularly carried on."

"SEC. 4494. CROSS REFERENCE.

"For penalties and administrative provisions applicable to this subchapter, see subtitle F."

(b) **MODE OF COLLECTION OF TAX.**—Section 6302(b) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to discretion as to method of collecting tax) is amended by deleting "section 4481" and inserting in lieu thereof "sections 4481 or 4491".

(c) **TECHNICAL AMENDMENT.**—The table of subchapters for chapter 36 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 is amended by adding at the end thereof the following:

"SUBCHAPTER E. TAX ON USE OF CERTAIN BOATS."

(d) **PENALTY.**—Subchapter B of chapter 75 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 is amended—

(A) By striking out "Sec. 7275." in the last section of this subchapter and inserting in lieu thereof "Sec. 7276." and

(B) By inserting a new section after section 7274 to read as follows:

"SEC. 7275. FAILURE TO POST EVIDENCE OF PAYMENT OF TAX ON USE OF BOATS.

"Any person who shall fail to place and keep evidence denoting the payment of the tax on the use of a boat as provided in section 4491(f) shall be liable to a penalty equal to the amount of tax applicable to the use of such boat (unless such failure is shown to be due to reasonable cause). Where the failure to comply with the provisions of section 4491(f) shall be due to willful neglect or refusal, then the penalty shall be double the amount above prescribed."

(e) **EFFECTIVE DATE.**—This section shall take effect on the first day of the first calendar quarter which begins more than 60 days after the date of the enactment of this Act. The first use of a boat on or after such effective date shall be considered the first use for purposes of application of the tax on use of boats for the year beginning July 1 preceding such effective date.

NATIONAL FOREST SYSTEM

SEC. 8. In furtherance of the purposes of this Act, the Secretary of Agriculture is authorized to acquire lands and interests in lands within the national forest system for recreational purposes or any other purpose for which such system is authorized to be administered.

REPEALING CERTAIN LAWS

SEC. 9. This Act shall not be construed as repealing any provision of law which provides that States or local governments shall share in the income from Federal lands; but all Acts or parts of Acts which provide that any of the land or water areas designated in section 5(a) of this Act shall be open to the public without charge, or that the expenditure of funds in such areas is restricted if charges are made or collected, or that any revenue realized from recreation user charges as authorized by section 5 of this Act at such areas shall be paid into the miscellaneous receipts of the Treasury are repealed.

GENERAL PROVISIONS

SEC. 10. (a) The President may make such rules, regulations and orders as he deems necessary or appropriate to carry out the provisions of this Act.

(b) There are authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary for the administration of the provisions of this Act.

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

The bills, introduced by Mr. ANDERSON (for himself, Mr. JACKSON, and Mr. MILLER), were received, read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, as follows:

S. 3117. A bill to promote the coordination and development of effective Federal and State programs relating to outdoor recreation, and to provide financial assistance to the States for outdoor recreation planning, and for other purposes; and

S. 3118. A bill to provide for the establishment of a land conservation fund, and for other purposes.

SOCIAL SECURITY COVERAGE FOR U.S. CITIZENS EMPLOYED OUTSIDE OF THE UNITED STATES BY CERTAIN INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATIONS

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to provide coverage under the Federal old-age, survivors, and disability insurance system for services performed outside of the United States by U.S. citizens in the employ of certain international organizations.

Under present law U.S. citizens employed by international organizations for services performed outside of the United States are not covered by the Social Security Act.

In 1960, the Social Security Act was amended to cover U.S. citizens employed by international organizations if their work was performed within the United States. However, the 1960 amendments did not extend coverage to U.S. citizens who were living and working abroad for such organizations.

It seems to me only fitting and proper that such citizens should be eligible to qualify under the Social Security Act. I fail to see any valid argument for denying Social Security coverage to U.S. citizens who are working for international organizations abroad while we grant coverage to U.S. citizens working for the same organization here in the United States.

Under the terms of the bill which I introduce today, the Secretary of the Treasury would be authorized, at the request of any international organization—as defined in the International Organizations Immunities Act—to enter into an agreement to have the social security system extended to cover U.S. citizens employed overseas by such international organizations.

Coverage would be optional for those U.S. citizens working outside of the United States if they were employed by an international organization at the time it entered into an agreement with the Secretary of the Treasury.

Coverage would be compulsory for U.S. citizens who either (a) enter the employment of an international organization after an agreement with the Secretary of the Treasury has been filed; or (b) is working in the United States for an international organization at the time

an agreement is filed with the Secretary of the Treasury and later works for such organization abroad.

I am pleased to state that an identical bill has been introduced in the House of Representatives by the gentleman from Pennsylvania, FRANCIS E. WALTER. I consider it a privilege to join with him in offering this legislation, and I am hopeful that it will be favorably acted upon in this session of the Congress.

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

The bill (S. 3119) to provide coverage under the Federal old-age, survivors, and disability insurance system for services performed outside of the United States by U.S. citizens in the employ of certain international organizations, introduced by Mr. HUMPHREY, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Finance.

UNITED NATIONS BONDS PURCHASE—AMENDMENTS

Mr. PROUTY submitted an amendment, intended to be proposed by him, to the amendment in the nature of a substitute proposed by Mr. MANSFIELD (for himself and Mr. DIRKSEN) to the bill (S. 2768) to promote the foreign policy of the United States by authorizing the purchase of United Nations bonds and the appropriation of funds therefor, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

Mr. SCOTT submitted amendments, intended to be proposed by him, to the amendment (in the nature of a substitute) proposed by Mr. MANSFIELD (for himself and Mr. DIRKSEN) to Senate bill 2768, supra, which were ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

NOTICE OF HEARING ON S. 2970, TO AMEND THE SMALL BUSINESS ACT

Mr. PROXMIER. Mr. President, as chairman of the Subcommittee on Small Business of the Committee on Banking and Currency, I wish to announce that a hearing will be held on April 12, 1962, on the bill, S. 2970, to amend the Small Business Act with relation to the revolving fund.

The hearing will begin at 10 a.m., in room 5302, New Senate Office Building.

All persons who wish to appear and testify on this bill are requested to notify Mr. Matthew Hale, chief of staff, Senate Committee on Banking and Currency, room 5300, New Senate Office Building, telephone Capitol 4-3121, extension 3921, at the earliest possible date.

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

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

By Mr. JORDAN:

Address by Senator TALMADGE, delivered before the annual meeting of the American

Cotton Manufacturers Institute, at Palm Beach, Fla., on March 31, 1962.

By Mr. BURDICK:

Department of Agriculture press release relating to an address delivered by Secretary of Agriculture Orville L. Freeman, at the Farm Policy Conference in Brawley, Calif., early in March.

PRIZEFIGHTING

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I am in receipt of a letter from a distinguished retired Member of the Senate, Mr. O'Mahoney. It is an expression from an outstanding humanitarian, from a man of great personal courage and wisdom, whose life and work are now an inextricable part of the continuing record of the Senate. It is an expression of deep indignation and anger from a man of courage at the abuse of courage, the exploitation of courage in the prizefight ring, which just recently has led to the death of still another boxer, Benny Paret, in New York.

The former Senator from Wyoming calls for action in support of our distinguished colleague from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER] in his efforts to curb this commercialized brutality. I commend this letter from our former colleague to the attention of the Senate; and in order that it may be studied and pondered, I ask unanimous consent that it be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

U.S. SENATE,
Washington, D.C., April 3, 1962.
The Honorable MIKE MANSFIELD,
Majority Leader, U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MIKE: Emil Griffith, the new welterweight champion of the world, announced this morning, after he heard that Ben Paret, former welterweight champion, had died this morning at 2 o'clock, after having been beaten into unconsciousness 10 days ago in a New York prizefighting ring when he was hanging on the ropes, that he was sorry he had ever become a fighter.

This is an opportunity for the Congress of the United States to place on President Kennedy's desk a bill outlawing prizefighting. If the action is taken today by the Member of the Congress to introduce this legislation, the whole world can be aroused to the importance of our taking positive and immediate action to abolish those brutal tendencies in mankind which have led the whole world to the very brink of nuclear destruction.

Griffith's reaction was a natural and noble result of that prizefight, and if the American people are allowed to forget the brutality and the death of Paret it will be the responsibility of all our people when the next prizefighter dies as a result of this tolerated brutality we call the sport of prizefighting. It is not a sport. It is merely a moneymaking activity of those who maintain the prize ring and the scores of punch-drunk ex-fighters who have not been released by death as was Paret from their insensibility.

Senator KEFAUVER is now carrying on the necessary campaign to release the United States from the evils of this racket which will be restored if positive action is not taken at once. Let the Congress come to the assistance of KEFAUVER.

Sincerely yours,

Joe,
JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY.

A MONTANAN DISCUSSES THE PLIGHT OF THE FARMER

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, the administration's farm program is perhaps the most widely discussed issue in Montana at the present time. There are many forces at work. Constituent correspondence, both pro and con, has been extremely heavy.

The State of Montana is confronted with several unusual situations which are making it extremely difficult at this time to accept, without reservation, a farm program designed to meet national needs. Only a limited variety of crops can be grown in the State. Montana farmers are fortunate in growing varieties of hard wheat which are in demand, thus minimizing the surplus. The demand for feed grains, particularly barley, has rapidly reduced the store of feed grains in the area, already influenced by several drought years. These are but a few illustrations of the problems of the farmers of my State. They are concerned with how best their interests can be served, while at the same time they participate in a national farm program, required to control production and reduce surpluses.

Lee E. Schumacher, a farmer and rancher in Malta, Mont., has taken the time to put in writing his thoughts on the problems and misunderstandings about the farm situation. I found the article most reasonable and informative. I am certain that it will be of interest to my colleagues in the Senate.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have this short article printed at the conclusion of my remarks in the RECORD.

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

How long can 10 percent of the population afford to feed the 185 million people who live in the United States?

How long can that 10 percent—the farmers—continue to produce the foods and fibers needed to sustain an ever-growing population when they receive only 38 cents of every dollar spent for the food they produce?

Heaven help the farmer who desires only a bit of land where he can raise his family amid healthful surroundings; where he can improve the land and provide food for himself and his fellow man.

Every man's hand seems raised against him.

People of the small towns, whose very existence depends upon his farming or stockgrowing operations, condemn attempts to equalize his burdens.

In the cities the farmer is labeled a burden on the taxpayer, a freeloader, a grafter after more and more Government aid, an individual who apparently does not have the know-how to make a living and therefore must be pampered and aided by Government subsidies—a source of political ferment and turmoil.

How strange that "subsidy" has become a word associated entirely with the farm program. The subsidy is the oldest economic principle written into the laws of the United States, starting when the first Congress enacted tariff legislation in 1789. Before the railroads were built across the trackless Midwest, West, and Far West, the Government—between 1827 and 1866—granted 6½ million acres for canalways. Then came the rail-

roads with 183 million acres granted to them to encourage transcontinental rail service.

From 1933 through 1959, total cost of the farm program, which has raised such a storm of protest and—according to the accusations of an unthinking public—helped the farmer amass a fortune at the expense of the overburdened taxpayer, was \$6.9 billion. As if the farmer himself were not a taxpayer.

Compare this with World War II reconversion subsidies to industry totaling \$43.3 billion. And we hear very little against the U.S. mail subsidies of \$6.6 billion in only 12 years.

Out of every \$1,000 spent on subsidies over 50 years, the farmer received \$5. Is this helping the farmer get rich? The truth is that he is not getting rich from this, or any other source. He is in trouble about to go broke.

In 1960, the national farm income per capita was at \$986 as compared with \$2,280 for nonfarm workers. That means for every \$1 the farmer received in income, the nonfarmer got almost \$2.40.

Yet a large part of the national income is derived from the farm; 4 out of 10 jobs are related to agriculture; 10 million people are working because of the farmer—storing, transporting, processing, and merchandising the products that come from the farms of America. Six million others work to supply the farmer with the machines, tools, power, and other supplies he uses in production.

Certainly the farmer contributes to the welfare of the Nation through his efforts to make a living.

From the farmer's viewpoint, the high prices he pays for the means of production seem a subsidy to nonfarm producers; the low prices he receives seem a subsidy to every consumer of the abundant food and fiber he produces.

Year by year, the number of farmers in the United States dwindles simply because they cannot make a living.

The farm boy, whose education in agriculture began with the 4-H Club or the Future Farmers of America—both encouraged and aided by local, State, and the Federal Government—has scant hope to become a farmer unless he inherits or marries land.

How can these boys secure land and face a future of rising machinery costs, labor costs, maintenance, fertilizer, and fuel costs? Statistics show that he will receive 2.3 cents for the wheat and ½ cent for the other ingredients that went into a 1-pound loaf of bread; that he will get 11 cents for a quart of milk, and 27 cents for the fibers that went into a business shirt which sells for \$4.15.

The farm wages he can earn, the returns from his own farming offer little hope of either acquiring or paying for a farm. What then is the future for our farm boys? In a larger sense, what is the future of our American agriculture?

The farm problem has become a political football on a gridiron where the plight of the farmer, individually and collectively, has been forgotten in the larger question of who will win the national title—who will absorb whatever benefits might derive to the farmer in the form of more balanced programs.

We must call a halt to this political football game.

We can no longer delay reasonable action required to bring balance to our amazing agricultural productivity. How?

We must have reason. We must have concern. We must have awareness of the true position, the actual contributions, the dire need of our farmers for a balanced farm program. For a program that will enable farmers to gain a sound economic footing and take part in continuing national progress.

OSCAR AWARDS DUE FROM ACADEMY OF MOTION PICTURE ARTS AND SCIENCES

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, among the many colorful annual events which people of America celebrate and observe is the interest-packed selection of outstanding performers, writers, directors, and others who are recognized for their effectiveness in maintaining the unparalleled high standing of our motion picture industry.

Every spring, just as Washington stages its Cherry Blossom Festival, marking the arrival of a new season, Hollywood looks back on the film year which has passed, and reviews its accomplishments. The ultimate act of this industry self-appraisal is the presentation of the coveted Oscar Awards by the Academy of Motion Picture Arts and Sciences.

Our Hollywood-produced motion pictures have been for generations an effective medium of communication, as well as a source of refreshing entertainment and relaxation. In the worldwide struggle for men's minds, these films are even more valuable than in the past, because they portray American progress, accomplishments, institutions, environment, and aspirations. Hence, certainly many of those nominated for the academy trophies already have served as ambassadors of good will for our Nation.

The 34th annual presentation of these meaningful gold statuettes will be more than a gala social affair. The event when Hollywood honors its own leaders, occurring next Monday night, April 9, will be carried into millions of homes on the North American Continent through the combined radio and television facilities of the American Broadcasting Co. and the Canadian Broadcasting Co.

As always, it can be looked forward to for drama of its own unique type, pleasurable entertainment, and an illustration of how our film industry, in accord with traditional American adherence to private enterprise, serves a vast public need. I trust that my colleagues will watch and listen to the Hollywood festivities and will join in applauding the motion picture productions and personalities honored by all of our film colony.

THE SUBSTITUTE FOR THE UNITED NATIONS BOND ISSUE BILL

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, this morning I was somewhat disturbed when I read newspaper accounts purporting to give the position of the Senate Members of the Republican Party on the United Nations bond issue plan, particularly on the proposed substitute offered by the distinguished majority leader [Mr. MANSFIELD] and the distinguished minority leader [Mr. DIRKSEN]. I think anyone who reads the statements published today in the Washington Post and the New York Times would have the impression—regardless of whatever may have been intended—that the Senate Members of the Republican Party

oppose on a party basis the substitute offered by the majority leader and the minority leader.

This is borne out not only by the headline in the Washington Post which reads "GOP Opposes Compromise on U.N. Bond Plan," but also by the fact that both articles mentioned only those who spoke against the substitute or asked questions about it.

I do not know who gave the reports of the meeting, but I think, in all fairness, it should have been stated that there were a number who spoke in favor of the substitute, including our distinguished minority leader [Mr. DIRKSEN], the Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS], and myself, and others including the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN].

It is not so important to report who actually spoke in favor of or against the bill, but it was incorrect and wrong to give the impression to the country that the party as a whole opposes the substitute offered by the majority leader and the minority leader. It not only gives the incorrect impression about our party, but it gives to the country the idea that there is a substantial group in the U.S. Senate opposing the substitute.

I do not believe that is so. I believe, and I base the belief on talks with members of my own party, that if we vote 1 hour from now, or 5 minutes from now, on the substitute, a majority of Republicans would vote for it. We would support our leader. We would support the Senator from Vermont. I think that should be made clear.

I have no doubt, despite all the dire consequences that may have been predicted, that when the issue comes to a vote there will be a majority of Republican Senators who will vote for the substitute, supporting the U.N. Many of us have been for it all the time. I assume a large majority on the other side of the aisle will vote for it.

I speak because no vote was taken at our meeting in a party position; it was simply a discussion. I speak because I believe a majority on this side of the aisle will vote for the substitute.

I believe it is wrong to give the impression that a few members of our party, important as they are—and having the right to their own convictions—are leading all of us. They are not—and not on this issue.

We should get to a vote on this proposition and show to the country that a great majority in this body supports the substitute which has been worked out by the majority leader and the minority leader and the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN].

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

Mr. COOPER. I yield.

Mr. KUCHEL. I agree completely with what the Senator from Kentucky has said. The people of the United States are not going to turn their backs on the United Nations. The people of the United States are not going to push the United Nations over the brink into disintegration and decay. Neither is the U.S. Senate, and neither is the Democratic Party or the Republican Party as represented in the Senate.

The roll, when it is called, will demonstrate that we on this side of the aisle, acting as Americans, are going to support the United Nations, with some honorable defections, and I am sure there will be some honorable defections in the other party as well.

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

Mr. COOPER. I yield.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, I want to say that I am in accord with the fine remarks made by the distinguished Senator from Kentucky and the distinguished Senator from California. So far as I am concerned, I am ready to vote now on the substitute or any modification of it. We on this side of the aisle and a large majority on the other side of the aisle are certainly going to do what is necessary for the United Nations, at this time of crisis. This country should be firm in its position of leadership and in its insistence that other U.N. members also live up to their responsibilities.

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

Mr. COOPER. I yield.

Mr. BUSH. I wish to compliment the Senator from Kentucky for raising this issue. I had decided to support the committee report, but if a compromise is to be substituted for it, in the best judgment of those who have worked closely on it, I intend to support that.

The important consideration is not so much whether the rate of interest should be 2 or 3 or 4 percent, or whatever the country has to pay for the money if it borrows it. Some of the countries have to pay 7, 10, and 15 percent. I am not impressed that we should try to fix the rate of interest here. I am content to give that leeway to the administration. The same applies to the question of the maturity of the bonds, whether it be 5, 10, 15, 20, or 25 years. The important point is to establish within the United Nations a discipline that will require repayment for the bonds out of annual dues members will have to pay.

I agree with what the Senator from Kentucky has said.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. COOPER. I thank the Senators for what they have said. When the proper time comes I shall vote for the substitute as well as a majority of Republicans.

JOINT MEETING OF THE TWO HOUSES—ADDRESS BY HON. JOAO GOULART, PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES OF BRAZIL

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, in view of the fact that we shall shortly recess to go to the House of Representatives for a joint meeting to hear the address of the President of Brazil, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

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

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, with the proviso that the morning hour will be resumed after the Senate reconvenes, I move that the Senate stand in recess, subject to the call of the Chair.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 12 o'clock and 19 minutes p.m.) the Senate, preceded by its Sergeant at Arms (Joseph C. Duke), its Chief Clerk (Emery L. Frazier), and the Vice President, proceeded to the Hall of the House of Representatives for the purpose of attending the joint meeting to hear the address to be delivered by His Excellency, Joao Goulart, President of the United States of Brazil.

(For the address delivered by the President of Brazil, see the House proceedings of today's CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.)

RESUMPTION OF LEGISLATIVE SESSION

The joint meeting of the two Houses having been dissolved, the Senate returned to its Chamber at 1 o'clock and 16 minutes p.m., and was called to order by the Presiding Officer (Mr. MANSFIELD in the chair).

ADDRESS BY KENNETH HOLUM, ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR

Mr. MOSS. Mr. President, are we still in the morning hour?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Yes.

Mr. MOSS. Mr. President, Mr. Kenneth Holum, Assistant Secretary of the Department of the Interior, delivered a speech on March 27 before the Wisconsin Electric Cooperative at Madison, Wis. This speech, in part, dealt with the problem of the tie lines between the dams of the Colorado River storage project, which is of great concern to my State. I believe the statement of the Assistant Secretary will be of great interest to the Senate, and I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD at this point.

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

ADDRESS BY KENNETH HOLUM, ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF THE DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR, SCHEDULED BEFORE THE WISCONSIN ELECTRIC COOPERATIVE, MADISON, WIS., MARCH 27, 1962

A year ago I was unable to attend your annual meeting. I am pleased you invited me again. You and I are deeply interested in the success of our cooperatives because we are concerned about the welfare of people. We share a common concern with the affairs of our Government. We have important questions to discuss when we get together.

A year ago, when you held your annual meeting, the Kennedy administration was 3 months old. Already the President had announced new power and resource development policies responsive to the needs of the times and the American people. Those policies were being put into effect all down the line. We began moving the idling engine of Government out of neutral and into forward moving gear once again.

Fifteen months have now passed since the Kennedy administration came into office.

We have solid accomplishments to talk about. You have learned that it does make a difference who is President of the United States. It does make a difference who is Secretary of the Interior.

You wanted a President who not only believed in "preference" but would say so. You have one. You wanted a Secretary of the Interior who would help you work out your power supply problems, and who would protect the rights of preference customers. You have one.

In 15 months this administration has achieved significant accomplishments in the power and resource field. We have a good record. Because I am proud of it I would like to mention some of the highlights of that record. Let's take a quick look.

The Missouri Basin project: A year ago the Department of the Interior had already extended the supplemental power program 2 years, through the fall of 1965. This decision is saving basin preference customers millions of dollars. More important, it has given the rural electricians needed leadtime to develop plans for meeting the critical power shortage problem they face in 1965 and beyond efficiently and economically. For over a year the Department has participated in coordinated power supply studies with the Missouri River Basin rural electricians. We have proposed significant transmission pooling arrangements, not only to meet the needs of these systems in 1970, but for the foreseeable future.

Alabama Electric Cooperative: The Southeastern Power Administration has signed a contract with this G. & T. to provide Federal hydropower for peaking and standby to use with their proposed steam power. As a result the co-op has obtained an REA loan to put in a 50,000-kilowatt steam unit and expand its service to additional cooperatives in the area.

Parker-Davis power reallocations: Three weeks ago Secretary Udall announced reallocation of the power output of these dams on the lower Colorado. The allocation is designed to meet the needs of preference customers in the area. One older rural electric co-op formerly denied Parker-Davis hydropower will now be served. Two brand-new cooperatives were given allocations. These cooperatives could not be proven feasible without this Federal power.

Central Valley project: Substantial bloc of power will be available to preference customers when Trinity project is completed. We're expediting this work building the necessary transmission lines, and we have already asked the preference customers to tell us their needs.

Surprise Valley Cooperative in California: Three years ago the Bonneville Power Administration agreed to sell this co-op enough power for its Oregon customers. At that time Bonneville refused to serve the greater portion of the cooperatives' load which is south of the border in California. This decision has been reversed. We intend to work out arrangements so that total load will be served by Bonneville.

Colorado Ute Cooperative: The Bureau of Reclamation has worked out an arrangement with this system, similar to that which we have offered Missouri Basin preference customers. We've made our extensive transmission system and other facilities available to the co-op and will provide standby. With those arrangements available, Colorado Ute can install a large economic 150,000-kilowatt unit in an area where fuel costs are cheapest. They can, and will, deliver up to 100,000 kilowatts of this power to customers 750 miles away over the facilities made available by the Department of the Interior.

Southeastern Power Administration: Barkley Dam will soon be completed on the lower Cumberland River. We are studying the resources and needs of the area with great

care so as to accomplish maximum benefit from this project.

Passamaquoddy tidal project: A year ago, President Kennedy asked the Department of the Interior to review the report of the International Joint Commission on this proposed tidal project in the far northeast corner of the country. Our review to date indicates it may be economically sound to develop 1 million kilowatts of power as a peaking plant, utilizing extra high voltage transmission to load centers and axial flow turbines.

Pumped-back storage: This is the technique as you know, where you use off-peak energy to pump water to higher elevation for generation of power on peak when it is more valuable. Department-wide studies are being conducted to make certain that these resources are properly developed and the public interest protected. These studies may well result in substantial benefits for all power users.

Interconnection studies: Under the President's directive, the Department has initiated studies of extra high voltage interconnections between regions served by Federal power marketing agencies.

A five-man task force has completed its study and report on the proposed Pacific Northwest-Pacific Southwest intertie. The technical significance of the report itself has been extremely noteworthy because it establishes that direct current transmission makes possible and economic the transmission of energy between points 1,000 and 2,000 miles apart. The electric load in Chicago is within practical transmission distance of the cheap lignite fuels in the Dakotas.

Great public benefits will come from this interconnection. President Kennedy has asked for money in this year's budget to begin necessary planning.

Other important interconnection studies are also underway in the Department of the Interior. One nearing completion is between the Bureau of Reclamation system in the Missouri River Basin and that of the Southwestern Power Administration. Another just beginning is between the Bureau's Missouri River Basin system and Bonneville Power Administration.

These interconnections will give us an opportunity to take advantage of the seasonal diversities and load patterns existing between regions, and the difference in hydrology of rivers. The final result is certain to be better use of our resources and substantial benefit to the public.

Worthy of note is our decision to close the bus at Fort Peck. When the bus has been closed, the eastern and western divisions of the Missouri Basin project can be coordinated electrically.

While our efforts, and you have supported them, for Burns Creek in Idaho and the Hanford reactor powerplant in Washington have been frustrated so far, this administration deserves credit for its strong support of these good projects. I can assure you that we are not resigned to accepting the waste inherent in either decision.

The administration deserves credit for pushing the Fryingpan-Arkansas project, its reversal of the previous administration's foot-dragging policy on Auburn Dam in California, and others as well.

There are those who measure an administration's power program by the length and size of the transmission lines it builds. In 1954, under the first Eisenhower budget, the Bureau of Reclamation used \$32 million for transmission facilities. Under President Kennedy's 1963 budget the Bureau is scheduling expenditures of \$60 million for transmission facilities. The 1963 Kennedy budget asks \$35 million for transmission for Bonneville as contrasted with average appropriations of \$20 million between 1954 and 1962.

SPA will be building transmission facilities again. The President's 1963 budget asks

\$7,210,000 for this item. The highest appropriation for this purpose under the previous administration was \$1,480,000.

This is a partial list of forward-looking progressive programs in the field of electric energy that the Department of the Interior has instituted under the leadership of Secretary Udall.

Some of these decisions have nationwide significance. Others, like the transmission line under construction to Mission, S. Dak., solve a difficult local problem. All demonstrate that the administration is aware of the need for Federal leadership and participation if the Nation is to have the world's best electric system and one competent to meet the needs of the sixties.

The needs of your rural electric cooperatives and other preference customers, the needs of the Nation demand proper management of our water resources to meet the challenges of a growing population and expanding economy.

Certainly, the leadership which this administration has exerted in the electric power field the past 15 months, has encouraged the entire power industry to bring their systems up to date and make long overdue steps in long distance transmission.

This accelerated activity, by all segments of the industry, demonstrates the administration's effectiveness.

You are particularly interested in two substantial regional problems that require substantial attention from the Department. These are the Colorado River Basin and the Missouri River Basin.

You are familiar with the Colorado River storage project. I should like first of all to discuss the basic decisions which the Department recently announced concerning the project's transmission lines.

Last year the Department went to Congress and asked for money to build an all-Federal system. This request was made after the Department rejected power company proposals to wheel project storage power. Congress voted some \$13 million to begin work on these lines. This real victory was accomplished because the rural electric cooperatives and other consumer-oriented groups stood and worked shoulder to shoulder with the Department.

In the conference report issued by the committees of Congress, the Department was authorized to proceed on the entire system—unless and to the extent the Secretary found it practical and in the national interest to enter into agreements with the power companies.

Subsequently, the power companies again approached the Department to determine the possibilities of working out mutually beneficial arrangements. After these discussions, five of six major power companies submitted letters of intent related to interconnection and exchange agreements to the Bureau of Reclamation. They were accepted and announced by the Secretary on February 20.

From the beginning, the Department clearly established certain criteria that had to be accomplished. Because of our victory in Congress, we were able to deal from a position of strength.

Let me summarize what we set out to do and what we have accomplished:

1. We set out to provide Federal interconnection of the project powerplants. We have done this.
2. We set out to provide for Federal interconnection of the Federal systems. We have done this.
3. We set out to provide at least the same degree and kind of service to preference customers as under the all-Federal system, without adverse effects on power rates. We have bettered this by additional delivery points and greater reliability of service.

4. We set out to provide not less than the same amount of irrigation assistance as under the all-Federal plan. We have bettered this by \$77 million.

5. We set out to provide a transmission system in which service would be available on a common carrier basis. We have protected this in the arrangements with the companies to the same degree that capacity would have been available for this purpose under the all-Federal system.

The decisions we have made on the Colorado transmission lines are important in Wisconsin, and they are important in Montana. I am convinced that these were good decisions. You must make your own judgment. Make that judgment on the facts.

Remember there are great differences between the proposals the companies offered Secretary Seaton and those agreements which the Department recently announced.

Under the original company offer, the Federal Government would have built only about 33 percent of the proposed system. Most of the Federal hydroplants and transmission systems would have been interconnected by power company lines. The companies would have been in virtual complete control of the entire storage project.

Under agreements embodied in the companies' letters of intent, all the proposed Federal 230-kilovolt and 345-kilovolt lines will be constructed. The storage project dams and the Federal marketing areas will be interconnected with Federal lines. Instead of 33 percent, the Government will build 85 percent of the so-called all-Federal system.

All of the 1,200,000-kilowatt output of the dams will be delivered to preference customers at the same price, under the same conditions, and at more delivery points than under the all-Federal plan. No restrictions will be imposed on power sales to REA's and other preference customers by virtue of the interchange and wheeling agreements between the Bureau and the companies.

At this point you might say to me, "All this sounds good. But you are talking about what is contained in letters of intent and verbal understandings through negotiations. What about contracts?"

Formal contracts will be negotiated quickly. On February 20, Secretary Udall ordered completion of these contracts prior to the congressional appropriation hearings for the Bureau of Reclamation. He directed us to establish and maintain close liaison with preference customers throughout this period. We will write hard and fast contracts containing all the important points I have made. We have negotiated in good faith. I must assume the companies have as well. If, however, they do not agree to our basic criteria in the contracts, we will proceed with construction of a Federal system as previously planned.

The Department has made a sound decision from which the Government, the preference customers, and the people of the Colorado Basin will all profit.

Now let us turn our attention to the second region I mentioned—the Missouri River Basin—where in the eastern division we have important problems of power supply.

Considering anticipated load growth and installation of additional hydro facilities in Missouri River dams, we expect to run out of Federal power the fall of 1965. We have advised our customers. Despite this, in our view, we have a responsibility to work with our customers, to the end that they may obtain ample supplies of power to meet future needs at the lowest possible cost, and so that we may make maximum beneficial use of the federally owned facilities we administer.

The Federal transmission system, built to deliver Federal hydropower, will also deliver steam power. Everyone knows that substantial economies can be achieved if require-

ments can be pooled—permitting the construction of larger and more efficient units. These advantages are compounded if a source of cheap fuel is available. Dakota lignite, which may well be the largest supply of low-cost fuel in the Nation, should be used for this purpose.

Based on these conclusions we undertook joint studies with representatives of preference customers to analyze the transmission system and to work out plans for the most advantageous coordination of a steamplant with the Federal hydro system.

Due to navigation requirements, the Missouri River system has large quantities of energy during the summer months. Conversely, in order to conserve water and because of restrictions due to icing conditions, the quantities of energy available during the winter are limited. In addition, when the presently planned installations of hydro capacity are completed, a large block of capacity will be available for which there will not be ample energy through the year.

The river then may be said to have three kinds of power: (1) Firm, round-the-clock power, with capacity and energy to serve normal customers; (2) secondary energy, available mostly during the summer months; and (3) peaking capacity without energy, available during all of the year. Only those systems having generation can properly use secondary or peaking capacity.

The studies involving the coordination of steam and Federal hydro showed that by operating the steamplant at full load during the winter months, portions of the peaking capacity could be firmed up; that is, converted to firm power. This we consider to be a desirable objective.

In fact, the entire program seemed to offer great merit. In addition to obtaining increased quantities of firm power to serve future loads of the preference customers, it would result in development of the natural resources of North Dakota. Large quantities of low-cost power should be attractive to industry in an area of the country that urgently needs industrial development.

While these studies were continuing, 14 utilities operating within and outside the Bureau marketing area proposed an exchange arrangement. The utilities offered to deliver energy into the Bureau system during the winter (when there is lack of hydroenergy) and the Bureau would return this energy in the summer (when surpluses are available), thus firming up the peaking capacity of the Bureau. The Government, without additional investment, would have additional quantities of firm power for sale. The utilities would be making better use of their steamplants.

The Department has received another proposal designed to accomplish similar results from a group of cooperatives known as Basin Electric Cooperative. They plan to build a large steam generating plant in the lignite fields of North Dakota. Another group of cooperatives, the Lignite Power Cooperative group, is also addressing itself to this question.

At this point it is not clear to what extent the proposals are immediately or in the long run contradictory. Nor is it clear yet what the comparative costs will be.

Both proposals received have been referred to a special departmental team for study and evaluation. This is presently underway. They will be compared on their merits, their costs and overall results.

One point that has led to much misunderstanding should be clarified. Although we consider it desirable to convert peaking power and secondary energy to firm power and energy, it should not be assumed that the peaking power and the secondary power would have been wasted without the firming up arrangement. Peaking power was planned to be sold to those systems that were in a position to use it, and secondary hydro-

energy is and would be used to replace steam generation.

Firming up of Bureau hydropower does not represent a windfall to the Government. It does, however, provide the Government with the opportunity to be of greater service to the preference customers.

When the facts are in, the Department will make its decision on the facts and in accordance with its responsibilities under the law. We must consider the best interests of the United States, the preference customers, and the region.

Without attempting to belabor you with all of the complexities of a difficult problem, I should like to note that desirable economic and social objectives must be weighed as we face up to decisions. They should not be ignored by the people of the region.

A program that promotes the development of Dakota lignite coal is a program that strengthens the region and the Nation, because it promotes the development and use of an important energy resource that is almost completely undeveloped.

As we develop this resource, we will almost certainly provide opportunities for economic growth in an area of the Nation that urgently needs this opportunity.

Advocates of proposals that develop lignite coal may well wonder why we consider proposals that in effect require an area of potentially cheap fuel to continue its reliance on energy imported from higher cost fuel areas.

Economic growth and resource development are sound policy goals. Better and more complete use of resources is an equally worthy goal. Certainly, any proposal that makes better use of machines and equipment in place must be considered and evaluated.

I have no intention that this should be a complete discussion of the merits of the various proposals we must consider. I suggest only that each has merit and deserves your consideration just as it will have ours.

I do not presume to advise you on the affairs of your rural electric systems. That is your business. But I believe my experience in the cooperative movement and now as a Government official has given me a good opportunity to study first the relationship of preference customer to Government, and now of the Government to preference customer.

The Department of the Interior has responsibilities to Congress, to you as preference customers, and to the American people. You, as electric cooperators, have certain responsibilities to your consumers, your communities, and to your Federal marketing agencies.

I believe we each have an obligation to recognize these responsibilities in our negotiations and business relationships. The rural electric cooperatives have a great opportunity to work with appropriate agencies of Government in solving your chronic problems of long-range power supply. We in the Kennedy administration want to do our part. Approaching our problems from the standpoint of mutual respect and cooperation, we will meet the challenges of the electric age.

ADDRESS BY REPRESENTATIVE JESSICA McC. WEIS

Mr. KEATING. Madam President—
The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mrs. NEUBERGER in the chair). The Senator from New York is recognized.

Mr. KEATING. My distinguished and delightful successor in the House of Representatives, Representative JUDY WEIS, recently delivered an address entitled "Which Way Us?" which is significant and worthy of wide distribution.

Mrs. WEIS clearly depicts the challenge confronting the free people of the world, the challenge of international communism to the dignity of the individual. She regards the journey of Col. John Glenn as a solid demonstration of the accomplishments of our Nation and of our pride in our country and our system of free self-government.

As a final and key point, Mrs. WEIS expresses her deep personal concern about the structure of our Government and about what she refers to as the trend toward "Federal centralization." She places special emphasis on the importance of strong local and State government and of active participation of citizens at the State and local level.

Madam President, I think this is a most important address, and I am pleased today to ask unanimous consent that the full text of Mrs. WEIS' speech be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

WHICH WAY US?

(Address of Representative JESSICA WEIS, Rochester, N.Y., at the spring workshop of the Western Monroe County (N.Y.) Teachers Association, Greece Olympia High School, March 19, 1962)

It is a pleasure and real privilege for me to be here with you this morning as your workshop sessions get underway. I emphasize the word "privilege" because you, as professional educators, are performing an enormously important service to our community. If in this way, by sharing a few personal observations and insights with you, I can contribute in a small way to the work you are doing, I am extremely happy to do it. Our children represent this country's most vital natural resource and each of you is to be commended for the personal interest you are taking in cultivating and developing this precious resource of ours.

The theme of your workshop—"Which Way Us?"—invites a glance into the telescope of time. But it isn't necessary to spin fantasies or gaze into crystal balls any more. We don't have to. We have enormous evidence before us of a future—an almost immediate future—beyond anything known to man since the dawn of time.

This is a future of great responsibilities and challenges for education.

It is a future of undreamed of adventure in the world of exploration.

It is a future almost without limitation in the field of technology.

As President Kennedy put it just a week ago, "A new age of discovery is opening for the human race." I share this view. From all indications we are clearly on the threshold of a new era of unprecedented technological and economic development throughout the world.

As you may know, I am not a teacher, though I am proud to say that my son is a professor of English at Ohio Wesleyan University. I do not intend to stand here and tell you how to be teachers and educators. Yet it is impossible to be in politics—and particularly to be a Member of the U.S. House of Representatives—without being in a very real sense an educator and interpreter of the important matters that transpire in Washington.

We in the Congress are deeply concerned with the progress of education and scientific inquiry. We are also gravely concerned about national survival itself.

To maintain our position of leadership in the world—a responsibility we cannot and dare not neglect—we are confronted with

Federal budget expenditures for fiscal 1963 that total \$92.5 billion over the amount estimated for the present fiscal year, and next year's requests are likely to be higher still.

As a Member of Congress I am eager to have you teachers understand the farflung meaning for ourselves, for the pocketbook of every American, of a budget total so immense.

I am eager to have you communicate this to the classes of young people whom you teach. Because what is involved here is the financial stability of our country as well as its national treasure.

Of this enormous treasure, for which our people have worked so hard, more than \$52½ billion is estimated for the national defense alone. This is a savage bite out of our national budget. And our national budget is in turn an even more savage bite out of the American economy.

This budget I have just mentioned, which would have been shocking to our forebears—and some of its aspects are shocking to me today—is a budget that in its darkest pages reflects the cold war.

It reflects the struggle in which we are now caught—the struggle between a vicious, unconscionable, closed society, a tyrannical oligarchy, and an open and free society like our own. There is no denying the fact that hovering over our age is the threat of a war that can destroy civilization almost in the wink of an eye. This is a reality which we, and our children—your students—are going to have to face for a long time to come.

But at the same time there are other signs which represent a different future, a real glimmer of hope that out of our deep and disturbing troubles will come not disaster but a bright and wonderful tomorrow.

Our efforts to join with the European Common Market in a gigantic free world-free trade area represent one aspect of the promise which the future holds. The challenge of expanding world trade offers great opportunities for the future. So, too, do such undertakings as the Alliance for Progress, through which we hope to aid the nations of Latin America along the road to economic development and social reform.

Our extraordinary efforts in space, where we have been so proudly successful recently, is a perfect case in point as to what the future offers. This is an area of progress in which, as a member of the House Committee on Science and Astronautics, I have a deep and profound personal interest. My work on this committee leads me to believe that we stand today on the threshold of a world that will give mankind a future more exciting than has been envisioned in our wildest dreams.

Think of the potential in the simple statistic that one of our astronauts has just sped through space at the rate of 17,500 miles an hour.

Think of the technological meaning of a space ship that can endure the kind of punishment to which the *Friendship 7* was subjected.

Think what it will mean for communication, and for education, when the entire world is instantly linked—by radio, telephone and television—through a worldwide communications satellite system.

Think of the vast expanse of man's scientific knowledge, from Galileo and Copernicus to Einstein and our galaxy of top level scientists today, that rests behind our space efforts. We are spending literally billions of dollars for research on the very frontiers of scientific knowledge and there is simply no way of measuring the benefits which we will reap in the years ahead.

In terms of the cold war and our race with the Soviet Union we can pride ourselves in the fact that since Russia launched her Sputnik I the United States has launched 67 satellites of all kinds and Rus-

sia has launched only 14. In the scope and sophistication of our space probes, we are well ahead of the Russians and even in the area of rocket thrust, where they now hold an edge, I am convinced that we are licking the problem.

But this is not a football game where all that is involved is making the highest score. What is involved behind all of this—behind our struggle with communism, our space efforts, our attempts at economic cooperation and all the rest—are the deepest moral values of men.

For in the final analysis, what we are trying to demonstrate to the world is that, at its best, our American system of government, with its strong emphasis on limited government and democratic free choice, is the finest system yet devised by man. And so as we look to the future, we must always be certain that our roots remain deep and well nourished. Dramatic changes will be taking place all around us in this new era. We must be certain that they do not alter our basic values.

In a sense, the problem is exactly what Lt. Col. John H. Glenn, Jr., said it was when he spoke in his compelling and simple way, of patriotism. Pure, unadulterated, unashamed patriotism.

Many of you, perhaps, were in school the day he spoke to the joint meeting of Congress. It was on Monday, February 26, when he said:

"I am certainly glad to see that pride in our country and its accomplishments is not a thing of the past."

He said:

"I still get a hard-to-define feeling inside when the flag goes by—and I know that all of you do, too. Today as we rode up Pennsylvania Avenue from the White House and saw the tremendous outpouring of feeling on the part of so many thousands of our people I got this same feeling all over again. Let us hope that none of us ever loses it."

What John Glenn said at that joint congressional meeting is essentially what I am trying to say here this morning. If we ever think of patriotism as something old-fashioned or corny, if we ever lose our sense of pride in our country, in our traditions, in the human decency inherent in the Constitution of the United States, we shall have lost those qualities that have made America what she is.

We shall have lost our soul as a people.

I hope that today I can strengthen your urge to communicate the full meaning of faith in the American heritage to the children who have been put in your charge. For this is the real key to the true meaning of our tomorrow. Reading, writing and arithmetic—your skills—are, of course, the tools, the indispensable instruments, for conveying our accumulated knowledge to the children who will, in the last analysis, constitute this tomorrow. But in this education, all of us must play an important role—not only as teachers, but as parents, as legislators and as citizens. The great strength of democratic self-government is, in fact, that we are all both teachers and pupils, constantly teaching and learning from each other.

This leads me to a final point. It is one about which I have some hesitancy, lest I seem to be interjecting a partisan political issue into my remarks. As a matter of fact, in my opinion, this is an issue for both parties.

It is the issue of Federal centralization.

It is the issue of making Washington and the Capitol the center of all problems.

It is the issue of weakening the individual, the city and the State, by lading every issue, every problem, every situation, economic, legislative, financial, social, into the wide-open

may of the unwieldy, bureaucratically top-heavy, overburdened, and snowed-under Government in Washington, D.C.

Speaking as a Member of Congress, I want to emphasize that this is, for our democracy, one of the major problems of our time.

If the trend is allowed to continue, our freedoms will be slowly but surely abridged. Our republican form of government will be steadily eroded under cover of disarming slogans.

Both our vigor and our solvency will be sapped by benefits and services that in growing measure will be politically motivated.

The fundamentals of democracy will be lost to us—to all of us—and perhaps to the whole free world—unless we do more and more in our own communities for ourselves and give less and less to a central authority.

History keeps telling us that the piecemeal surrender of basic values leads to spiritual receivership. Not complete bankruptcy but receivership, because I think our people will always salvage something out of their historic assets.

It's a sort of Gresham's law for the values of democracy. Under that famous law, bad money drives out good money. In the political world, because of their greater immediate appeal, the bad values of government paternalism drive out good values of citizens' vigor. And under no circumstances can the good values remain unaffected.

The philosophy of the central authority is the philosophy of tyranny. Not overnight, while motives remain sincere and only moderately political. But gradually things do not work well, abuses creep in, and, contrary to the workings of a system resting mainly on self-reliance, mistakes are seldom corrected. Eventually they can only be smothered by more power, and the end result is likely to be the tyranny that no one wanted and few really thought would come.

Now I know those who feel differently about this, who view Washington as the only place to solve our new and complex problems. I would charge none of them with evil intentions. I say merely that they cannot control their own promotions. There is nothing so insidious in political life as gradualism.

It is so easy and self-satisfying to give things to people. But where do you stop?—particularly when you are virtually asking beneficiaries to organize politically for more and more.

Maybe I am fighting an uphill battle, but by my estimate of the American character I don't think so. Today is not too late. For me, as it must be for you, tyranny is tyranny, whether it is the tyranny of an oligarchy, the tyranny of a dictator, the tyranny of a rampant, irresponsible majority, or the tyranny—and I emphasize this—the tyranny of a bureaucracy.

Yet the fact of the matter is that we are endangering the democratic process and the essential bulwarks of our freedom by channeling so much of the powers of government into a vast, constantly inflating and complicated maze of bureaus in Washington.

It is this fact which explains all the heavy fat in a massive Federal budget that is in size beyond anything hitherto known to government anywhere in the world at any period in human history.

We are, of course, confronted today with many challenges—the challenge of communism, the challenge of harnessing the free world's vast economic potential, the challenge of space and of scientific exploration. But there is also this other challenge which I have been discussing and which is too often ignored—the challenge of retaining our basic values in a time of turbulent change and of finding ways of meeting our new needs adequately without involving ourselves in the fatal hazards inherent in big government.

Meeting this challenge will require great patience and understanding. What I would urge you as teachers today is the teaching of a sense of discipline and restraint and self-reliance as a part of the learning which you impart to the young minds of the country. The greatest achievements in advancing basic human freedoms have taken place in America. These we must never lose and from this path we must never stray.

There is on the horizon a wondrous tomorrow, for America and for the whole free world. But it will only be what we ourselves make of it. I know of no group of dedicated Americans more gifted for making a major contribution to this tomorrow than the teachers of the United States.

THE U.N. BOND ISSUE

Mr. JAVITS. Madam President, I did not happen to be on the floor this morning just before the recess for the joint meeting. I understand some of my colleagues, including Senators COOPER, KUCHEL, BUSH, and KEATING, had something to say about the Republican conference of yesterday and the attitude of Republicans toward the compromise proposal put forward by the Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD] and the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] on the United Nations loan.

First, I wish to identify myself with the above-mentioned four Senators, and I am sure there are others who take a similar position. I state again, as I did yesterday, that I support this compromise.

What is even more important is to point out that strong support of the U.N. originated with Republican Senator Arthur Vandenberg in 1945, that Senator Vandenberg founded the bipartisan foreign policy of our Nation, that the preservation of the U.N. is one of the key elements of that policy, and that President Eisenhower in September 1960 dedicated the power, the majesty, and the resources of the United States to backing our position in the U.N. President Kennedy has done the same thing.

One of the most vital aspects of our national policy is the bipartisan foreign policy, and I believe my party should support it.

When we get into the debate, I shall have something further to say about that, but for the moment I think it is sufficient to say that if the press has represented to the country—and I, too, have seen these headlines—that the GOP takes such-and-such an attitude with respect to the United Nations, then I think the record should be set as straight as possible by as many persons as possible.

I express the expectation, as my colleagues did this morning, that a substantial majority of Senators on this side of the aisle will be found, when the roll is finally called, in support of what it takes to keep the United Nations actively and effectively in business.

TV BROADCASTER PRAISES CATV SYSTEMS

Mr. SCOTT. Madam President, a few years ago there were several complaints made before the Senate Commerce Com-

mittee by television broadcasters against community television systems, commonly referred to as CATV systems. The areas where friction existed have largely disappeared, because local broadcasters and CATV operators have resolved their differences of their own free will.

My State of Pennsylvania has 204 CATV systems known to be in operation. This is almost three times as many as exist in any other State. At a meeting of the Pennsylvania CATV Association in Harrisburg last fall, I am told that there were about 14 broadcasters in attendance at all the meetings and they participated in the program. A good example of the fine relationship which exists between local broadcasters and CATV operators is the fact that the National Community Television Association, at its annual convention in San Francisco last June, awarded its coveted National Award for Distinguished Service to a broadcaster for the first time in its history. The distinguished recipient of the award was Mrs. Dorothy Muggford, promotion manager and CATV liaison for television station WNEP-TV, Wilkes-Barre-Scranton, channel 16, Scranton, Pa.

Another example of the cooperation and friendship existing between television broadcasters and CATV operators is the following article from *Tele-Log* of January 1962, which is the official publication of WGR-TV, channel 2 in Buffalo, N.Y. The article was sent to me by William Taylor, manager of PenNy TV, Inc., CATV systems serving Bradford, Olean, Clearfield, Allegany, and Eldred, Pa. The article is one of a series of monthly articles on CATV systems in that Pennsylvania area to appear in *Tele-Log*.

I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the *RECORD*.

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

CHANNEL 2 SALUTES CATV OWNERS WHO CARRY WGR-TV

Every day, CATV systems deal directly with the most important people in television—the viewing audience.

To assist in bringing television's benefits to more people is the challenging—and very personal—task of America's 800 community antenna systems. As an industry, they supply multichannel master antenna reception services for more than 700,000 TV homes (1 out of every 61 TV households in the Nation).

Between these viewers and CATV systems exists a personal relationship which is unique in television. Known frequently by first names, CATV subscribers are served as the neighbors, friends, and fellow townspeople of the CATV operator. Located in towns with an average population of only 9,120, the public faith and community support resulting from dependable service are the truly rewarding and enduring features of the CATV industry.

Channel 2 is proud to have many CATV systems located near the fringe of our coverage area using our facilities to make television possible to thousands of homes that would not otherwise receive this media.

Television programs are as free as the air that carries them—for most of us. Just mount an antenna on the roof, or the top of the set, and there, at the twist of a knob, are the shows.

But nearly a million families in the United States pay to see television. Their TV programs are "piped" into their homes just like the electricity, water or gas, and they are billed every month for the privilege of viewing.

They pay the price gladly, even though they see the same programs the rest of us do.

Why do people pay to receive television service? In many cases, it's the only way they can get TV at all; in others, the only way they can get a satisfactory picture, or more than one channel. Television service is delivered to these million homes by cable from master antennas which serve entire communities.

Community antenna television service (often abbreviated CATV) started back in 1949, when the first wave of TV fever was sweeping the Nation and Milton Berle and Howdy Doody were becoming household names.

Television at that time was far from a nationwide service. There were fewer than 100 stations, and viewing was largely limited to areas around big cities. People beyond the range of these TV stations wondered what the excitement was all about—and longed to get in on it.

Astoria, Oreg., was one of those cities beyond TV's range. The closest station was in Seattle, 125 miles away. And high mountains stopped the signals, whose effective range was then only 50 miles at the most. A group of local citizens decided to do something about it. Some of them were engineers. They knew that TV signals travel in a straight line from the transmitter. Unlike lower-frequency radio waves, they don't follow the contours of the earth. It was impossible to pick up a TV picture in Astoria, but from the top of a nearby mountain reception of a distant station should be possible. Why not put a single antenna on the mountain to catch the TV signals and pipe them down to the city's homes by coaxial cable? The theory proved practicable.

When cable television came to Astoria, other communities isolated from TV stations by distance or mountains decided to look into the community antenna idea, and CATV spread rapidly to many previously non-TV areas.

As the number of TV stations increased to more than 550, the number of community antenna systems also grew. Today, more than 800 communities in the United States and 200 in Canada are served by these cable systems. With an average of 3 viewers per home, some 3,300,000 people now watch programs "off the cable."

Often, even after a local TV station opens up, cable systems continue to attract new customers. This is because most community systems now offer their subscribers a wide choice of channels. Some have as many as seven, and even supply hi-fi background music on an additional channel. And most CATV systems guarantee perfect reception on each channel—no ghosts or snow. They also offer subscribers freedom from unsightly and troublesome roof antennas.

To bring TV signals into town—to keep them crystal sharp—today's community antenna systems use specially designed powerful receiving antennas, one for each channel, aimed precisely at the transmitting station. When the TV signal is fed into the cable for its trip to town, it is "boosted" by an amplifier, and it is re-amplified at about half-mile intervals. The operators of most CATV systems attach their cables to telephone poles (paying a rental to the phone company). The cables then branch off into customer homes and are attached to the subscriber's own TV set like any other antenna wire.

While most CATV systems use mountains or tall towers to enable them to "reach" a

TV signal, some towns are still too far from the nearest stations. In these cases, the operators of CATV systems often rent long-distance microwave service—of the type used to carry network programs from coast to coast—to bring in signals from the nearest stations (which still may be hundreds of miles away).

The average community antenna system has about 1,200 subscribers, and others some have more than 12,000 and others less than 100.

What do subscribers pay? The charge varies widely, usually from \$2 to \$6 a month, the average being about \$3.50. Many CATV systems also charge an installation fee for the original hookup, running anywhere from \$4 to \$200.

There are over 25 systems that carry channel 2 in New York, Pennsylvania, and Ontario, Canada, making it possible for additional thousands of people to watch channel 2.

NEED OF FACILITIES FOR HIGHER EDUCATION

Mr. MORSE. Madam President, recently, the Medford Mail-Tribune of Medford, Oreg., printed an editorial entitled "Two Quotations." It related to education, and the issue of whether there should be Federal financial support for elementary and secondary schools.

I ask unanimous consent that this editorial from the February 11 edition of the Medford Mail-Tribune be printed here in the RECORD.

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

TWO QUOTATIONS

Here are two quotations we ran across on the same day last week.

The first is from Frank Jenkins' column on Friday:

"Neither scholarships nor classrooms will necessarily produce more educated people. Only aptitude for learning and application to study on the part of the student can do that."

The other is from Senator WAYNE MORSE's weekly broadcast to the people of Oregon:

"The possibility of closing college doors to many qualified students is a very real one, because our teenage population is now approaching college age, and the facilities for higher education are just not large enough to accommodate them without rejecting large numbers of able and intelligent young men and women."

Both of the quoted statements are correct. They are not in conflict.

But Mr. Jenkins' statement (which preceded an extended dissertation on high taxes, costs, and so on, with little reference to need) is vastly incomplete.

Perhaps he had in mind James Garfield's statement:

"Give me a log hut, with only a simple bench, Mark Hopkins on one end and I on the other, and you may have all the buildings, apparatus and libraries without him."

This, of course, was a valid tribute to a great teacher. But it hardly accords with the realities of today's situation.

No, of course neither scholarships nor classrooms will make scholars out of dullards. But, without them, a great many potential scholars are going to remain, if not dullards, at least far below their potential. And that, in today's uneasy world, we cannot afford.

Both Mr. Jenkins and Senator MORSE were talking about Federal aid to education proposals. Senator MORSE is one of the chief sponsors. Mr. Jenkins fears that they will cost too much, take control of education

too far away from home, water down the tax dollar by collection and administrative costs, and distribute tax money to locations where it was not collected.

We believe that Senator MORSE, in his reading of the realities of the educational problems of today, is correct, and is doing his best to ameliorate the situation.

We believe that Mr. Jenkins, with his natural antipathy to high taxes and big government, is neglecting many facts and vastly oversimplifying the case—as he sometimes is prone to do.

Let us examine Mr. Jenkins' observations one by one:

Federal aid to education will cost too much. What is "too much" for an educated citizenry? Isn't it worth just about everything it costs? Isn't it worth at least as much as the amount Americans spend on tobacco and liquor each year? To us, the questions answer themselves.

Distant control of education. This is an understandable fear, and to the extent that certain minimum standards might well be set, is probably valid. But there are some areas where minimum standards should be set. For the rest, all Federal educational aid proposals leave day-to-day administration and curriculum selection strictly alone.

Watering down tax money. This is a phony, proven so. Costs of tax collection and administration on the Federal level are far less than they are on a local level.

Tax money to needy areas. This can be debated all day long, but the crux of it is whether this is all one nation or not, and whether children in poor States should be entitled to as good an education as those in rich States. We think they should be, and would be perfectly willing for some of our tax money to go to youngsters in Mississippi, as well as those in Oregon.

And that, as we see it, is the difference between Mr. Jenkins' views and Senator MORSE's views.—E.A.

MEANS FOR PROMOTION OF INTERNATIONAL GOOD WILL

Mr. MORSE. Madam President, in these troubled times of international stress, a free exchange of thoughts is more important than ever before. One of the surest ways to accomplish this mutually beneficial interchange are the visits, between countries, of people in all walks of life.

We have already begun to bask in the warmer rays of international good will created by Mrs. Kennedy's just completed trip abroad. We all remember the further interest in Pakistan generated here by the visit of the camel driver, Bashir Ahmed, at the invitation of our distinguished Vice President. And let me hasten to add—so that it does not appear that we swapped a visit with our First Lady for a camel driver, that President Ayub Khan of Pakistan left a strong impression with us, on his recent visit.

Recently we had the pleasure of having Dr. Erich Mende, leader of Germany's Free Democratic Party and member of the Bundestag, introduced to us from the floor.

Now we anticipate the visit of the leader of another of Germany's major political parties, Dr. Heinrich von Brentano, of the CDU. These visits transcend party politics both here and abroad.

Dr. Von Brentano, during his year as Foreign Minister of the Federal Republic of Germany, worked tirelessly along with Chancellor Adenauer, to bring the

new Germany into alliance with the free world.

During these days of Communist aggression on all fronts, the free world needs these friends and allies. It is a good and encouraging sign to see the leaders of other nations visit our Capital and help us in planning our destinies so that mankind can remain free.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Madam President, is there further morning business?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there further morning business? If not, morning business is closed.

UNITED NATIONS BONDS PURCHASE

Mr. MANSFIELD. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the unfinished business be laid before the Senate.

There being no objection, the Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 2768) to promote the foreign policy of the United States by authorizing the purchase of United Nations bonds and the appropriation of funds therefor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment in the nature of a substitute offered by the Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD], for himself and the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN].

Mr. RUSSELL obtained the floor.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Madam President, will the Senator yield to me, without losing his right to the floor?

Mr. RUSSELL. I am glad to yield to the leader at any time.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that further proceedings under the quorum call may be dispensed with.

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

Mr. RUSSELL. Madam President, I call up my amendment in the nature of a substitute. I desire to offer it as a substitute for the pending amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. It is proposed to strike out all after the enacting clause and to insert the following:

That the United Nations is hereby relieved of all liability for the repayment of obligations to the United States incurred prior to the date of enactment of this Act in connection with activities of the United Nations Emergency Force in the Middle East and the United Nations military operation in the Congo. The amount involved shall be credited on any assessments or amounts chargeable to the United States as a member of the United Nations to defray the costs of said operations.

SEC. 2. From and after the enactment of this Act, no official of the United States or any other person acting in behalf of the United States shall be authorized to permit the use of any military equipment or materiel belonging to the United States or to order the participation of any person serving in the Armed Forces of the United States in any military action instituted by the

United Nations unless and until such use or participation has been authorized by a joint resolution of the Congress of the United States if the Congress shall be in session. When the Congress is not in session, the President of the United States, by Executive order which shall be printed in the Federal Register, may loan military equipment or materiel not exceeding \$15,000,000 in value to the United Nations if the President finds and so declares that such loan is necessary and in the interests of the security of the United States.

Amend the title so as to read: "A bill to provide for the cancellation of certain indebtedness of the United Nations to the United States."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment in the nature of a substitute of the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] as a substitute for the amendment offered by the Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD] for himself and the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN].

Mr. RUSSELL. Madam President, I have examined very carefully the alleged compromise substitute that has been proposed for the committee bill. I have noted that it is sponsored by the leaders on both sides of the aisle. I realize that such sponsorship means that the so-called compromise substitute has very substantial support on both sides of the aisle. But to me the compromise is no more palatable than the original bill. In my opinion, it combines some new features that are worse than any that are contained in either the original bill or the so-called Aiken substitute. The compromise would abandon legislative responsibility. It would delegate to the President powers that were not delegated so completely in the original proposal and, overall, in my opinion it would give to the United Nations entirely too much money.

I have been urged to support the original legislative proposal or the substitute on the ground that the \$100 million involved is a very small sum of money. I still have a great deal of respect for \$100 million. I am well aware of the fact that it is not a large amount if it is measured against the amount that we appropriate for the defense of the United States. I am well aware that it is a relatively small amount when it is compared with the amount that the Congress appropriates each year, either for grants or for soft loans to other nations of the earth in what we euphemistically call our mutual assistance program. Because I think it carries too much money, and involves inherent danger to the future policy of this country, I am opposed to the substitute.

DISTORTED CRITICISM

As is often the case, in order to deter opposition and full and free discussion and examination of the measure, an effort has been made to paint any person who might question the wisdom of the proposal in any respect as being the enemy of the United Nations seeking to destroy the United Nations.

I was greatly impressed by the able and courageous speech of the majority leader, the Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD], in opening the debate on this question, when he expressed his be-

lief in what was, of course, the original reason for the creation of Congress—that men should be entitled to express fully and freely their views on issues that are vital to this country without being castigated as ignoramuses or charged with being inspired by some ulterior purpose.

I have a great deal more confidence in the integrity of one who freely concedes the right of disagreement than I have for those who would paint black motives with a broad brush on any person who does not agree with their position. I compliment the majority leader on the speech that he made. I think it is a landmark in this Congress. It measures up to the very best traditions of the Senate. I hope it will do something to clear the atmosphere and permit objective discussion of these questions without immediately impugning the character of those who do not agree with everything that is proposed from any source—the White House, the State Department, the United Nations, or even in either House of the Congress of the United States.

I can say with complete truthfulness that I do not favor the abolition of the United Nations. I am not out to destroy the United Nations, and I would not impair any of its functions as contemplated in its original charter.

Recent events have made our membership in that organization of considerably less value than was the case at the time of our original ratification of the United Nations Charter. I bitterly disapprove of the precipitate and callous use of overwhelming military force, as was done in the state of Katanga last year, before all efforts at mediation between the parties had been exhausted. When we think about the length of time—running over weeks and into months—that we met and discussed with elements of the Communist world events in Korea and in Vietnam, it appears shameful that an organization that was created for mediation, negotiation, and the peaceful settlement of disputes should launch a military attack after the very limited effort that had been made to settle peacefully the difficulties in that troubled area.

In spite of my condemnation of that attack, I would not destroy the United Nations through bankruptcy or through inability to meet its bills. The purpose of my amendment is to enable it to carry on, though not in as lush a fashion as is provided in the substitute to which I referred.

ROLE OF UNITED NATIONS

I would be less than frank if I did not say that I do not agree with many of my correspondents who have written me hailing the United Nations as "a great bulwark for the peace and security of the United States." I have received resolutions from groups of intelligent people saying that the United Nations is the last hope of peace and the maintenance of our security. I cannot accept that thesis. I regard the United Nations as a useful institution. It is a place where men representing the conflicting ideologies of government that exist in the world today may meet and

talk and seek the peaceful solution of problems.

I have been somewhat concerned that so many Americans in high places have made statements calculated to create in the minds of the American people such great faith in the United Nations that they would be willing to risk the future destiny of this country in the hands of the United Nations.

Madam President, anyone who undertakes to convince the American people today that we can safely depend on the United Nations as a bulwark against the enduring threat of world enslavement by communism is doing the people of this country a great disservice.

I hear comparisons made of the amount that we spend to support the United Nations and the cost of maintaining our Military Establishment. The inference is that we ought to abandon military spending and put that money in the United Nations.

If that day ever comes, we will indeed be undone in this country, and our identity as a great people will vanish.

I can honestly disclaim any desire to destroy the United Nations without being willing to surrender my even greater interest, and indeed my sworn duty as a Senator of the United States, to see that the people of the United States, so far as I can prevent it, are not misled into placing the perpetuity of our institutions and the maintenance of our freedoms in the hands of the United Nations and to rely upon it solely for our protection.

Despite the very eloquent remarks made in its support by those who envision the United Nations as having much more vitality than I attribute to it, I must say that I regard the United Nations as a very frail reed on which to rest in the hope of deterring aggression by any medium-size power, much less by a great power.

Madam President, while I do not wish to destroy the United Nations but wish to see it continue, and wish that it could have increased vitality and strength, I believe that we are a long way and many years, even decades, from the time when we can afford to put the protection of American institutions, and the individual rights and liberties that are enjoyed by the American citizens, in trusteeship to the United Nations.

As I have said, my principal concern about the proposed legislation is the amount of money that is involved. I am concerned because of the oftstated purpose, as restated no later than last week in an editorial in a newspaper in Washington, that the United Nations should have a substantial reserve of funds available in order that it might launch, without any delay whatever, the application of military sanctions such as it applied in the Congo.

I do not agree with that philosophy. I regard the attack that was made in the Congo, without exhausting mediation, as sheer aggression and unnecessary aggression. I disapprove of it. Whatever one can say about Russia suffering a defeat by that action, it was aggression, and military aggression, and the use of force which had the Soviet Union as its primary advocate in the United Nations.

I do not mean by that to say that the fact that the Soviet Union was leading the stampede to apply military force in Katanga influenced our position. I do say that our position was taken apparently out of the demand of some of the so-called newly emerging nations, such as Ghana, that the last white man had to be driven from the Congo or, indeed, from the soil of Africa, as some rulers in Africa demand, even if such person is a third or fourth generation citizen of the state in Africa in which he resides. I do not propose to put into the hands of Mr. U Thant, the Acting Secretary General, or anyone else serving as Secretary General of the United Nations, a large reserve of money in order that the machinery of the United Nations can again set in force an overwhelming military force against any other state or people of this earth before exhausting negotiation and mediation.

I opposed the war that ended in the conquest of Katanga. I oppose committing American boys and American equipment to that war, or tax money extracted from American citizens into any such reckless military attacks, without approval of Congress—approval that is expressly required and spelled out in what is called the United Nations Participation Act.

I am not trying to destroy the United Nations. I believe my amendment preserves it. It will avoid such precipitate and brutal action in the future. In addition, my amendment undertakes to preserve the law enacted by Congress in 1945, which stipulates the limitations of our participation in this organization.

From reports that have been circulating in the press about the alleged compromise, the distinguished Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] has apparently changed his view somewhat as to the necessary financial arrangements which must be made to keep the United Nations in operation.

However, on March 15 this distinguished Senator, in an able discussion of his original substitute, laid before us in detail the current financial situation of the United Nations. He pointed out and sustained with figures the assertion that the United Nations is not presently anywhere near the verge of bankruptcy as proponents of this proposed legislation have so stridently proclaimed.

He stated that on the 31st day of December the United Nations owed \$114 million. At that very time various members of the organization owed the United Nations about \$93 million on various assessments and obligations that they had not paid. However, the distinguished Senator from Vermont pointed out that on the 1st of January, \$142 million of ordinary operating assessments became due and owing to the United Nations.

The Senator informed us that his research indicated that about \$67 million will be needed to carry the Congo operations through to the 1st of July. He contended—and I agree—that it is a safe assumption that at least \$90 million of the large amounts owing the United Nations could be collected within a very short time and that this amount should be adequate to finance

the United Nations past the time when an opinion will have been rendered by the International Court of Justice at The Hague to determine whether the \$93 million of unpaid dues and assessments owing by 74 members of the United Nations are legal and binding.

The adoption of my substitute will release the United Nations from all of its indebtedness to the United States, its largest creditor. It has been exceedingly difficult to arrive at a precise figure of this indebtedness, but it is not less than \$31,826,000 and it may amount to more than \$40 million.

In addition, it will alleviate the financial crisis of the United Nations. So the U.N. evidently is adequately financed at the present time; unless they wish to start another military action, such as was launched in the case of Katanga.

The Senator from Vermont is one of the best informed men in the Congress on the question of international affairs and has represented us as a delegate at the United Nations, and he convinced me completely that the United Nations can maintain its financial integrity until the Court renders its opinion, even if Congress takes no action. It might just be a good lesson to some of our associates in the United Nations and prevent them from taking such precipitate action in the future.

I may say in passing that precipitate action by the United Nations and the abandonment of its declared role as mediator and peacemaker has been responsible for the largest part of its expenditures.

I would like to see it have time to plan and function as a peace-seeking body within the spirit of its charter rather than to look at a substantial bank balance largely extracted from the pockets of the American taxpayer and devise new military operations as a means of expending it.

My amendment is entirely adequate to bail out the United Nations and keep it from failing, but it does seek to deny that body the means of financing additional attacks against nations with Christian institutions of government and strongly opposed to communism such as that launched against Katanga.

My amendment also renews the provisions of the act of 1945 which would prevent this Nation's being brought into any armed conflict or war without the knowledge and approval of the Congress of the United States.

I have been amazed to see eminent lawyers quoted as saying that this provision is likely to be unconstitutional and an undue restraint upon Executive power. But, Madam President, my amendment contains no provisions which are new or startling, or radical, or unconstitutional. It states, in simpler terms that which has been on the statute books now for 17 years.

I refer to the United Nations Participation Act of 1945 as amended. Let me call the attention of the Senate to section 6 of this act. It reads:

The President is authorized to negotiate a special agreement or agreements with the Security Council which shall be subject to the approval of the Congress by appropriate

act or joint resolution, providing for the numbers and types of armed forces, their degree of readiness and general location, and the nature of facilities and assistance, including rights of passage, to be made available to the Security Council on its call for the purpose of maintaining international peace and security in accordance with article 43 of said charter. The President shall not be deemed to require the authorization of the Congress to make available to the Security Council on its call in order to take action under article 42 of said charter—

Let us remember that: No action of that kind can be taken unless there is an agreement with the United Nations that has been submitted to Congress—and pursuant to such special agreement or agreements the Armed Forces, facilities, or assistance provided for therein: *Provided*, That, except as authorized in section 7 of this Act, nothing herein contained shall be construed as an authorization to the President by the Congress to make available to the Security Council for such purpose Armed Forces, facilities, or assistance in addition to the forces, facilities, and assistance provided for in such special agreement or agreements.

Madam President, it is my interpretation of that provision that before one American boy in uniform may be deployed by the United Nations, and before any assistance may be given to the United Nations in keeping international peace by military force, this action must have been a part of such agreements made between this Government and the Security Council, and must have been ratified by the Congress of the United States.

Let us see what is provided by section 7, which I believe was added by an amendment in 1949:

Notwithstanding the provisions of any other law, the President, upon the request by the United Nations for cooperative action, and to the extent that he finds that it is consistent with the national interest to comply with such request, may authorize, in support of such activities of the United Nations as are specifically directed to the peaceful settlement of disputes and not involving the employment of armed forces contemplated by chapter VII of the United Nations Charter.

This section further provides that all Armed Forces of the United States furnished the United Nations upon its request must be noncombatants.

The act clearly provides that no combat equipment can be supplied pursuant to this act of Congress.

The assistance contemplated under section 7, passed as an amendment in 1949, relates solely to the peaceful settlement of disputes and does not relate to the use of armed forces as contemplated in chapter VII of the charter. This limitation is specifically stated in the first sentence of the section.

Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the complete United Nations Participation Act as amended, along with chapter VII of the U.N. Charter, be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

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

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. JACKSON. Madam President, will the Senator from Georgia yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. JACKSON. I was very much pleased with the remarks made earlier by the distinguished senior Senator from Georgia, in which he commended the position of the majority leader that we have the right of dissent on questions relating to the United Nations and other matters and to make, at the same time, a constructive contribution to the security of our country. Unfortunately, there are some who associate dissent with destruction.

Mr. RUSSELL. I so stated when I said that it now comes to pass that when some of us are in disagreement over any detail in certain areas, and when the role of Government is challenged on some matter, our words are criticized as those of an irresponsible individual who has no knowledge of the subject, or else as words of one who is undertaking to destroy the last best hope of peace on earth.

Madam President, for my part, I resent government by smear, which is getting to be all too frequent. I refer to attempts to intimidate Members of the Senate, to keep them from saying what they honestly believe—in other words, from living up to the oath they take on the rostrum in this Chamber when they are inducted into membership into this body.

I was glad to pay tribute to the distinguished Senator; and, Madam President, I ask that there be printed in the RECORD, at the conclusion of my remarks, the lead editorial published today in the Washington Star. The editorial deals with this aspect and other aspects of the very able speech delivered by the distinguished majority leader on the day when this measure was first presented to the Senate.

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

(See exhibit 2.)

Mr. JACKSON. Madam President, I wish to commend the distinguished Senator from Georgia for the constructive attitude he has taken on this matter, as well as for the constructive attitude he has taken on all other matters relating to the security of our country. I know of no Member of this body who is more competent to speak on the broad subject of national security than is the senior Senator from Georgia.

Mr. RUSSELL. I thank the distinguished Senator from Washington for his comment.

I may say that I regretted some of the criticism published in the press, directed to the very able speech on the United Nations which the distinguished Senator from Washington delivered before the National Press Club. I thought some of that criticism was in very poor taste and was based on very poor judgment.

Madam President, the assistance contemplated under section 7, which is the amendment of 1949, relates solely to the peaceful settlement of disputes, and does not relate to the use of armed forces as contemplated in chapter 7 of the charter; and this limitation is specifically stated.

Madam President, my amendment is very clear, and I do not see how there could possibly be any misunderstanding of it. The amendment simply reaffirms what already is the law of our land, and has been for 17 years; namely, the right of the Congress to be consulted before U.S. Armed Forces and U.S. materiel of war are committed to combat.

The amendment states that from and after its enactment, no official of the United States or any other person acting in behalf of the United States shall be authorized to permit the use of any military equipment or materiel belonging to the United States or to order the participation of any person serving in the Armed Forces of the United States in any military action instituted by the United Nations unless and until such use be authorized by Congress. The amendment also contains a provision that if Congress is not in session, the President is authorized to supply \$15 million worth of military equipment—which is a broadening of the authority the President already has under existing law.

This amendment cannot in any way weaken the United Nations. Instead, the amendment should strengthen it.

Mr. CAPEHART. Madam President, will the Senator from Georgia yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. CAPEHART. Do I correctly understand that the position of the Senator from Georgia is that his amendment does no more than restate what the charter and what the law have previously stated?

Mr. RUSSELL. Yes. If the Senator from Indiana was here when the Senate passed the United Nations Participation Act of 1945—from which I have read—he will remember that it states that no U.S. Armed Forces can be committed except pursuant to negotiations initiated by the President and approved by the Congress of the United States.

Mr. CAPEHART. Yes, I was here at that time; and I remember the debate on that subject.

Mr. RUSSELL. Madam President, later on I shall deal more at length with that matter; but at this time I merely state that when that matter was under debate in the Senate, the President was at Potsdam, Germany, for the negotiations there; and at that time the proponents of the bill, in order to succeed in having the Senate pass it, finally had President Truman send here a cablegram in which he stated that under no circumstances would he commit U.S. Armed Forces or U.S. materiel to the United Nations without the approval of the Congress; and that cablegram was read on the floor of the Senate, and practically concluded the debate.

Mr. CAPEHART. Yes, Madam President, I was in the Senate Chamber when that happened.

Is it the opinion of the able Senator from Georgia that violations of that law or of its intent have been occurring?

Mr. RUSSELL. Madam President, I am not a member of the Foreign Relations Committee, and therefore it has been with some trepidation that I have

ventured today into this field. Of course I do not know all the details. But I am of the opinion that if we have not violated that law, at least we have come very close, on more than one occasion, to violating it.

Mr. CAPEHART. Yes, I think there is no question about that.

Mr. RUSSELL. Under this law, the use in any manner whatever of any U.S. military personnel by the United Nations, except in a noncombatant capacity, without the approval of the Congress is completely illegal, ultra vires, and is specifically prohibited by law, in addition to being specifically prohibited by one of the provisions of the Constitution of the United States.

Of course, I know I sometimes irritate some of my friends by referring to that great document, because so many now regard it as outmoded and as being completely outworn and of no value today. But, Madam President, despite that, I remind them that the Constitution of the United States states that only the Congress shall have the power to declare war.

Madam President, if, when I suggest, as I am doing by means of this amendment, that we clarify this matter and restate the fact that the Congress is permitted to participate in these matters, it is said that such a suggestion is unconstitutional because it places limitations on the Commander in Chief, let me point out that those who say it is unconstitutional are about 17 years too late, insofar as this statute is concerned, and about 175 years too late insofar as the Constitution is concerned, for the original act placed no such limitations on the Commander in Chief; and, furthermore, the Commander in Chief then serving said he was perfectly willing to accept it. So my amendment does not contemplate any unconstitutional action.

Madam President, I believe this amendment will bring strength and vitality to the United Nations, because it will clarify the situations under which the United States may participate in keeping the peace around the world; and, as I stated a while ago, the amendment is, overall, in accord with article I, section 8, of the U.S. Constitution, which deals with the powers of Congress, and which declares in paragraph 11 that only Congress has the power to declare war, and provides in paragraph 16 that Congress has the power "to provide for governing such part" of the Armed Forces "as may be employed in the service of the United States."

Mr. LAUSCHE. Madam President, will the Senator from Georgia yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I am glad to yield.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I wish to state a hypothetical situation, and then ask the opinion of the distinguished Senator from Georgia about it.

Disregarding for the moment the limitations the Senator from Georgia has described as being in the law passed in 1945—

Mr. RUSSELL. And also in the law as it was amended in 1949; and the Senator from Ohio will find that that is exactly the law, and has not been re-

pealed. It has been shunted aside, but it has not been repealed.

Mr. LAUSCHE. My hypothetical question is this: Let us assume that a revolt were to occur in Cuba, and that Castro were to request a mission of United Nations troops to subdue the revolt. The question comes before the Security Council and our Government vetoes the proposal to send in troops. The issue then goes before the General Assembly, and the General Assembly, with 104 nations, by a majority vote determines that United Nations troops shall be sent into Cuba to subdue a revolt against the Communist government.

What would be the legal effect of that vote in the General Assembly contravening the vote in the Security Council, and followed by a mission intended to subdue the revolt?

Mr. RUSSELL. I feel, Madam President, that I am not the best qualified man in the Senate to answer that question; but, as was pointed out by the distinguished majority leader in the able address to which I referred, he stated that due to the unconscionable abuse by the Russians of the veto power vested in the permanent members of the Council, the powers of the General Assembly had been greatly broadened. While I believe, and I think I am correct, it takes a two-thirds vote rather than a majority vote in the General Assembly, in my opinion, under the procedures that have been used in the United Nations of late, the vote of two-thirds of the members of the General Assembly would commit the United Nations, if they found that it was necessary to preserve the world peace, to subdue the revolt to which the Senator has referred, despite the fact that this revolt might be supported by the hopes and prayers of at least 182½ million Americans.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I have been laboring with this issue because, by looking into the future, I envision that the General Assembly may determine to engage in certain relief and humanitarian projects. It may determine to send a mission of United Nations troops into a foreign country, with all the hazards and expense involved, and contrary to the possible judgment of the United States in the Security Council, the burden of financing those operations falling upon our Government, although we do not subscribe to what had been done.

Mr. RUSSELL. I share the Senator's views; and I shall deal with that subject in some detail before I conclude my remarks.

As I was stating, this amendment is designed to refresh the recollection of Members of the Senate and the House as to what is already the law. It just spells it out in a little more detail and gives the President power, which he does not have under the law, to use up to \$15 million in military equipment if the Congress is not in session.

It will preserve some of the powers of Congress which so many Members of this body seem so anxious to delegate to others.

We have gone so far from our act in 1949 in abdicating our powers and seek-

ing to flee from our sworn responsibilities that a simple restatement of something that is already the law in the United Nations Enabling Act, passed only 17 years ago, stirs up a great commotion in the press and in the Congress.

That is how far we have gone in 17 years by fleeing from our responsibilities and minimizing the position of the Senate and of the Congress of the United States in our scheme of government.

No wonder, Madam President, that the President can use so much equanimity to increase the powers of the executive and the judicial branches of the Government, when the Congress contributes so much to its own depreciation at every opportunity.

I am frank to say that my original opposition to forcing the taxpayers of the United States to pay the largest share of the costs of the military action in the Congo sprang from my conviction that that military action was launched prematurely, before it was necessary, and was carried out with unnecessary brutality after it was once initiated.

I also have a grave question as to the real motives of some of those who have been most active in pressing to have this action.

I fear, Madam President, we have not been very consistent in our approach to world problems. Both the President and the Secretary of State, and the preceding President and Secretary of State, and others in high position, have made many eloquent speeches, almost every time we have been visited by an official from one of the newly emerging nations, pointing out that this country is the child of a revolution, and therefore we have something in common with all newly emerging countries, and for that reason we are opposed to colonialism, even of the most benign type, practiced by our very best friends. Every visiting official has been met with that as a statement of policy.

CRUSH OF KATANGA

If that were a statement of policy to be consistently followed, it could be defended, but we have had no consistent foreign policy of our own in many areas. We permit ourselves to be influenced by the views of different rulers in other countries. Many of those countries are not friendly to the policies of the United States. While revolutions have been applauded in eloquent terms in every case except one, the idea was denounced and violently opposed in the case of Katanga. Despite our expressed dedication to the cause of revolution, and freedom of choice for people everywhere as to the kind of government they should have, we have made an exception in the case of Katanga. They were not permitted to have the revolution that we have supported in every other area, including some very bloody ones.

Not only were they not permitted to seek to control their own destiny, but the man who is the governor or president there, Tshombe, has even been denied the right to come to this country. We have permitted every other revolutionary to visit us. We have had committees for every other revolutionary. The one who led the forces in Angola, Africa, and

perpetrated some of the most brutal crimes I know of, was brought into this country by a committee, and no questions were asked about whether he had a Portuguese visa. We offered every other revolutionary a visit here except Tshombe. For some reason or other, a curse has been placed on him, and he has not been permitted to come here.

The little province of Katanga, with military forces numbering about 10,000—mostly poorly equipped natives with some few whites who were born in Katanga and a few hired soldiers—which happens to be Christian in religion, anti-Communist in political view, and friendly to the United States in its outward relations, was made the target for an all-out military attack which killed large numbers of its people and destroyed a great deal of property.

Why was that brought about? It was because they would not immediately accede to a resolution sponsored by Ghana and one or two other countries, which demanded that they invite into Katanga the chaos, the confusion, and the barbarism which was in other areas of the Congo, by driving out immediately all of the Belgians who were helping Tshombe in the administration of his government.

The destruction of Tshombe's forces and the crushing of the independence movement in Katanga has been hailed somehow, again and again, as a great victory for the United States over the cause of communism. I have had considerable difficulty in assimilating and understanding that claim, because Russia led the general stampede in the United Nations, demanding precipitate military action in Katanga. I do not think it is to our credit that we were caught up in the movement and carried along by the mob.

If the Russians suffered a great defeat there, as we were told, it was a defeat which they inflicted willingly upon themselves.

I have here the record of the United Nations Security Council for November 24. There it is set forth so clearly and man may read and understand that under the aegis of Mr. Valerien Zorin, the Soviet representative on the Security Council, who was acting as president at that time, the Council passed a resolution calling for the immediate use of force to integrate Katanga against its wishes, so that it might enjoy its share of all of the chaos, death, and destruction that the rest of the Congo had been enduring.

There was no statement in the resolution that the last possibilities for negotiations had been exhausted, even though the United Nations was supposed to be dedicated to mediation, to negotiation, and to peaceful settlement.

The representative of the United States did, rather halfheartedly, offer an amendment to include all elements in the Congo, including separatist Gizenga, who at that time was the hope of the Russians for Communist rule in the Congo, but that resolution was vetoed by the Russian delegate on the Security Council. Whereupon, without our delegate resorting to the veto until further

negotiations could be had, our country supported this Russian-inspired resolution which precipitated the military attack that destroyed Katanga.

This record of the United Nations demonstrates the point beyond any peradventure of doubt.

Indeed, Madam President, this action was so uncalled for that our delegate undertook to excuse himself. He said that he voted for the resolution very reluctantly, but that he did so in order that the Prime Minister of the Congo, Mr. Bomoko, might not be compelled to go home emptyhanded.

I submit, Madam President, that is a very poor excuse for launching military action by an organization created to preserve the peace. We have seen our people come back home emptyhanded several thousands of times from conferences all over the world. But to prevent Mr. Bomoko from going home without the means to bring about immediate settlement to an issue that at least should have been the subject of negotiations and mediation, why, our delegate joined in with the Russians and the rest of those supporting the resolution, and voted for it.

I wish to say, Madam President, that if what has occurred in the Congo, through the crushing of the freedom movement in Katanga, was a great defeat for the Communists, the Russians were not aware of it. They are not usually quite that stupid.

I am sure Members of the Senate are familiar with the letter which Mr. Zorin wrote to Mr. U Thant, the Acting Secretary General, in addition to the resolution, demanding that the attack be launched without delay. Of course, the puny forces of Katanga could not maintain themselves against the military might which was brought to bear against them. Included in those forces were some of the finest fighting men in the world. I refer to the Gurkhas.

GURKHA MERCENARIES

For a long number of years the Gurkhas have been the greatest mercenaries in all of military history. They furnish more fighting for a dollar than any other mercenaries have ever done.

I remember that in the dark days of World War II the allied attack up the boot of Italy was stalled at Monte Cassino and the Rapido River. We dumped bombs and artillery shells upon the abbey at Monte Cassino until it seemed that no creature could possibly be alive there. We then sent in an attack by one of the finest divisions in our army, the 36th Division, across the Rapido River. The Germans emerged from holes, set up machineguns, and mowed down our men by the hundreds.

The British then tried an attack. They sent in a crack aggregation. The same thing happened to them.

Finally a division of Gurkhas was brought up. With the craft of American Indians, they climbed the mountain at night and with their knives they slit the throats of every German sentry before the Germans knew anyone was around, and they slit the throats of most of the enemy who were there before the Germans were aware the Gurkhas were

upon them. They are great troops and great fighting men. They come from Nepal.

Madam President, when I was in India during World War II, during the early dark days in 1943, when I had the honor to lead the only congressional committee which went out, I met a colonel who told me a story in connection with the Gurkhas. He said that when Lord Mountbatten was trying to get together the forces of the Allies, in the India-Asia-China sector, they finally sent a representative to the maharaja, and asked him if, in addition to the other troops he had already supplied, he could supply two regiments of Gurkhas. That was to be in addition to the other Gurkhas, and these were to be used as paratroopers. The maharaja said he thought he could, but asked exactly what the men were supposed to do, to determine whether he should be paid more for them than he would be paid for ordinary kinds of fighting. The British officer said to him, "Well, the paratroopers are taken up in airplanes and dropped from the air on the enemy or behind his lines in order to divert attention from the front." "Well," the maharaja said, "how high is the airplane when these men are dropped out of it, or jump out of it?" The British officer said, "They are at least 500 feet high." The maharaja said "You understand you will have to pay for a lot of soldiers. A good many of them will get hurt jumping 500 feet." The British officer then said, "They will have to be at least 500 feet up, or the parachutes will not open." "Oh," the maharaja said, "I had not understood they were to have parachutes."

That is how tough the Gurkhas are as soldiers. It is no disgrace to be defeated by the Gurkhas.

U.N. DISCRIMINATIONS

It is notable that until now the United Nations has, as in that case, enforced its resolutions and edicts against the weak and the helpless, such as those in Katanga, with great speed and energy and, as I have stated, with unnecessary brutality. However, the United Nations can be as silent as a sphinx and can act like a sphinx looking the other way when a strong and powerful nation flouts the provisions of the Charter of the United Nations.

Without regard to any action that we may take in the way of pumping American tax dollars into the United Nations, it is eventually doomed to failure if it continues to follow a policy of one law for the weak and no law whatever for the strong and powerful.

I regret that we were associated in the tragedy of Katanga with the men who perpetrated and still defend the rape of Hungary and Poland by the armored divisions of Soviet Russia by joining them in voting for the immediate military action to subdue Katanga. When the Soviet tanks crushed the lives out of the Hungarians who were seeking to find a way to freedom on the streets of their capital city of Budapest, the United Nations contented itself with a slight slap on the wrist.

When the sanctimonious Mr. Nehru launched overwhelming military forces

against little Portuguese Goa without exhausting efforts at mediation or even the offices of the United Nations, not even a resolution of condemnation was forthcoming.

When Red China moved into Tibet and killed the people of that country, destroyed their religion, and forced them to come under Communist control, we expressed sympathy in the United Nations for the Tibetan people. But that was the extent of United Nations action when that hapless land was ravaged by the Communist Reds with all the savagery that was perpetrated by Genghis Khan.

Mr. Khrushchev has felt that he could safely flout the opinion of the United Nations and, indeed, the opinion of mankind everywhere. His most recent expression of contempt was the resumption of nuclear testing in the atmosphere, which was a clear breach of faith and implied agreement. Where, then, was the United Nations, even to give an expression of strong disapproval to his act?

In my view, in all candor, and it is a sincere view, and is not expressed in an effort to destroy the United Nations—if the United Nations is to be of any value to the human family on this globe, it must be prepared to denounce wrongdoing on the part of the strong, and it cannot content itself by launching military action against a weak and impotent state whose major sin was the desire to be free and independent.

There is little doubt that the fact that the United Nations used military action to crush Katanga without exhausting mediation was among the incidents that lent encouragement to Mr. Nehru in his military attack on Goa. Mr. Nehru at least had the justification of having supplied to the United Nations the fighting men I have described. They did the most effective fighting there, even though we are expected to defray a disproportionate cost of that expedition.

In addition, these incidents have a chain reaction. There is no question in my mind that the attack on Goa is encouraging Sukarno in his avowed intent to conquer by military action the Papuan inhabited Dutch New Guinea. He said he is willing to mediate, if the Dutch will announce in advance of the meeting that they agree with Sukarno. But such a surrender would be rather difficult for any people who have any self-respect.

Mr. Nehru is aware of the deference which everyone has been trying to show the newly emerging nations when he justified his military aggression against helpless Goa by the statement that the colored peoples of the earth all approved of what he had done. That statement immediately silenced everyone in official circles, as if colored peoples everywhere approved the idea that a little death and destruction through military aggression is a good thing.

Madam President, it is alarming to see the racial issue being drawn into almost every question under debate in the United Nations. I would have preferred to have some other Senator make that statement. It would have been more impressive than it is coming from me.

COLONIALISM

I am rather alarmed, even viewing the question objectively, to see our acquiescence in almost every proposal that is brought forward in the name of anti-colonialism, without regard to the probable effect of destroying established government, even though colonial, and granting independence to people who are not ready for it.

The early picture of colonialism was a very sordid one. It was a picture of exploitation and imposition. Some of the colonial powers in this enlightened age have striven earnestly and have spent large sums of money in an effort to prepare people for independence. Recently Belgium undertook to prepare Katanga for independence. It spent a good deal of money to build schools and otherwise to prepare the people for self-government.

But the pressure against colonialism became so great that the horrors of the Congo were perpetrated on account of the Belgians leaving before the natives were really ready. They were concluding the second stage of a three-stage program to provide for the independence of the Congo.

I fear that it is a little early for us to assume that the destruction of Katanga has assured the extirpation of communism from the Congo forever. Despite the original United Nations resolution, adopted on demand of Ghana, unless some steps are made to bring back to the Congo—and I mean to every part of the Congo—a large number of Belgian technicians in government, in industry, and, indeed, in the military forces there, we will see that the United States will be called upon for increasingly large sums of money from year to year, over a long period of years, to provide for military occupation by the United Nations, which will be necessary as it is undertaking to rule the country.

We have been a party to the destruction of Katanga, in which there was real peace and order after independence and the withdrawal of the Belgians from the Congo. A great many of the Belgians, in good faith, stayed to work for the Congo Government. A great many missionaries of several denominations stayed there. However, when they were subjected to the reign of terror and brutality, and rapine and murder, which followed, the Belgians were compelled to send in a couple of regiments of paratroopers to restore order and to get their people out. That is what originally brought the United Nations forces into that area. The Congolese demanded that the United Nations come in to put the Belgians out. The Belgians were anxious to get out if they could get assurances that order would be restored, the murder and rape be halted, and that no more homes or churches be burned. Belgians were being driven from the homes they had built at their own expense. Nuns were being raped and people who had any religion at all were being killed. The Belgians wanted to get out. They were very glad to get out and to be relieved of responsibility there.

As one Senator, I regret that we have forced upon this helpless state of Ka-

tanga, where there was law and order, the condition that exists in the rest of the Congo. It is undoubtedly true, from reports I have had from there, that much of the Congo is going back into the jungle and to the primitive civilization that existed before the Belgians came in.

I suppose we will be called upon from year to year to finance the greater part of the United Nations operations, to try to keep the Government alive and to maintain some semblance of civilized life around the larger cities.

Still reserving the right to be critical of the United Nations, even though, as I have said, I do not wish to destroy it, I shall now discuss the matter of the one vote by one state in the General Assembly.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Madam President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I have in my hand copies of resolutions adopted by the Security Council on January 13, 1960, dealing with the Congo; also the one adopted on July 22, 1960; also the one adopted on August 9, 1960. The premise for these resolutions I believe becomes very pertinent to the discussion advanced by the Senator from Georgia.

In the resolution of August 9, 1960, it is stated:

The Security Council—

Then there follow a number of subparagraphs recalling its resolution of July 22, 1960, and noting certain things. Then it finally states:

The Security Council reaffirms that the United Nations Force in the Congo will not be a party to or in any way intervene in or be used to influence the outcome of any internal conflict, constitutional or otherwise.

Mr. RUSSELL. They were repeating that up to the time the United Nations Force went into Katanga to put down what they called—they did not call those people revolutionists—

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mercenaries.

Mr. RUSSELL. No—separatists. If they had been called revolutionists, we would have approved of the resolution, and we would have commended it highly. However, they were called separatists, and therefore they met with our condemnation and destruction.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I agree with the Senator from Georgia.

Mr. RUSSELL. The Senator from Ohio knows that when they sent the troops into Katanga, where there had been law and order, at the outset on the demand of the ruler of Ghana, our representative said the purpose of going up there was not to kill Africans; that it was a peaceful mission. However, it did not turn out that way.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I agree that in practically every action that was taken it was reaffirmed that the United Nations troops were not in any manner to intervene or to be used to influence the outcome of any internal conflict.

Mr. RUSSELL. The Senator, of course, is correct. They stated that during the first fighting in Katanga. However, the hypocrisy of that position

was so great, some of them finally did say that Katanga had wealth, and therefore it had to be brought into the Congo to support the rest of the country. In resolution after resolution they reiterated that these troops were not sent there to participate in any internal conflict between the people of the Congo, as to the government, or the division of the Congo. As I said a few minutes ago, the troops were sent originally at the request of the Congolese Government to get the Belgians out. The Belgians wanted to get out. They left immediately on the arrival of the first United Nations troops, or as soon as there were enough troops there to prevent the whites from being killed and the towns from being burnt or destroyed. Of course, they were still eating the flesh of some of the United Nations soldiers in the outskirts near Stanleyville; but the Belgians did get out. The whole purpose was supposed to be to get the Belgians out. They reiterated again and again that they were not there to take sides between any of the contending elements in the Congo.

Of course the central government sent its army into Katanga. They tried to bring Katanga back into line. Tshombe and his forces kicked them clear across the river, and they disappeared as a fighting force. That is when the United Nations went in to do their fighting for them.

I have my own theory, which I shall develop later in my remarks, as to the real reason for the first movement of large numbers of United Nations troops into the place where there was no murder, no raping going on, and where everything was at peace. I have a theory for it that I shall give later.

Mr. LAUSCHE. It raises the interesting inquiry that if they can go into the Congo and interfere with a domestic revolt, does it not follow that they can go into any nation to settle what are supposed to be domestic upheavals, and which reflect a dissatisfaction with the incumbent government, or with the economy, or the welfare of the people?

Mr. RUSSELL. In my opinion it is certainly contrary to the principles of the United Nations and the purposes for which it was formed. I think it is a distortion of those purposes and principles.

SUPREME COURT

Madam President, as I said a moment ago, I wish to discuss the question of one state—one vote in the United Nations Assembly. Within the past week, the Supreme Court of the United States handed down a momentous decision. This decision undertakes to establish a national policy of permitting the Federal courts to redistrict and otherwise reapportion States in order to, as some of the press said in hailing the decision, "make one man's vote equal to any other's." It follows, of course, that if this is true within a State, the Federal courts have a right to redraw the lines of wards, and even precincts, within the cities of the States.

I readily admit that all of the apportionment laws prevailing in the 50 States do not appeal to my sense of fairness. Indeed, I have vigorously supported pro-

posed constitutional amendments to change the method of selecting members of the electoral college in the interests of fairplay, because it has seemed to me that that change would be in the interest of fairness and equality. However, I deem it unnecessary for me to state that, under my concept of the Constitution, the Federal courts do not have the right or authority to put a State or city in a receivership and substitute some petty auditor, receiver, or other appointee of the Federal court for duly elected Governors, legislators, and other State officials. Life tenure for Federal judges is the only fragmentary semblance of the long-discarded doctrine of the divine right of kings found in our Federal Constitution. Some of the Founding Fathers were opposed to life tenure by appointment, but even the most ardent advocates of life tenure by appointment for Federal judges in the first 100 years of this Nation's life would have hotly denounced any contention that a petty appointee of a Federal judge could oust the officials of States and rule the people through one-man edicts and ukases that the Supreme Court says have the force of law in the matter of exercising the right of suffrage.

However, I realize that this is not an appropriate time to discuss this decision in detail. I have referred to it merely to make clear to all the irony of the fact that nearly all of those who hail the Supreme Court's most recent blow at our constitutional system as a great contribution to fairness and equality are the very people who are editorializing daily their support of the rotten borough system of the General Assembly under which the United Nations asserts its claims to power and world authority.

Mr. TALMADGE. Madam President, will my colleague yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. TALMADGE. Is it not true that a majority of the votes in the United Nations does not represent as large a population as resides in the metropolitan area of Paris?

Mr. RUSSELL. I have not made that computation; but later I had intended to discuss that situation. I expect to give some comparative figures which I have calculated. However, I am pleased to know that my colleague from Georgia has made a study of this point.

Mr. TALMADGE. I have not explored that situation in detail, but I have read an article published in U.S. News & World Report, a publication which I believe my colleague will agree is a reliable journal, and the article asserted that a majority vote in the United Nations as it is presently constituted does not represent as large a population as resides in metropolitan Paris at the present time.

Mr. RUSSELL. I certainly do not challenge that contention. I accept my colleague's statement and thank him for it.

Madam President, our present administration, which hailed the Court decision as a great landmark in the progress of mankind, has as yet manifested no concern over the inequities and

unequal representation in the United Nations. Our President said at his press conference:

The right to fair representation and to have each vote count equally is basic.

It would seem to me that if this rule should be applied in such drastic fashion within the United States, we should at least make some suggestion as to a fairer representation and proportionate vote in the Assembly of the United Nations.

Mr. ERVIN. Madam President, will the Senator from Georgia yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. ERVIN. How can the Supreme Court of the United States possibly enforce a decision that a State must give representation in its legislature on the basis of population, unless the Supreme Court intends to assume the laying out of counties, the power to change the boundary lines of counties, and the power to prescribe election districts in the States, and to assume overall control of all election matters?

Mr. RUSSELL. I think the Senator from North Carolina is justified in assuming that all the propositions he has cited are embraced with the majority decision as handed down by the court. I had not intended to discuss that decision in detail at this time.

Mr. ERVIN. Can the decision possibly be enforced unless the Supreme Court assumes not only the laying out of county lines or the changing of county lines, but also control over the boundaries of election districts and school districts, and even the boundaries of the wards of municipalities?

Mr. RUSSELL. It seems to me that it would be necessary for the State or the city to be placed in receivership and then to let the court handle the question of redistricting.

Mr. ERVIN. Has not the Supreme Court, in handing down that decision, ignored State concepts dating back to the beginning of the Nation?

Mr. RUSSELL. I have already said so. The Court's decision constitutes one of the most severe blows leveled at our constitutional system.

Mr. ERVIN. Is it not true that for some years the Supreme Court has been handing down decisions which have had as their purpose the centralizing of power in Washington?

Mr. RUSSELL. There is no question about that being the trend. The Supreme Court has been doing that, and Congress, unfortunately and deplorably, has acquiesced in the action of the Supreme Court.

Mr. ERVIN. Has not the Supreme Court been placing itself in a position superior to that of the Federal Government itself?

Mr. RUSSELL. The Supreme Court has assumed powers that no other single branch of the Government has ever undertaken to exercise. It amends the Constitution by court order.

Mr. ERVIN. Did not the Supreme Court in the Watkins case undertake to tell Congress how its committees should function, so far as investigations were concerned?

Mr. RUSSELL. I think that is one of the cases which have gone far to

cause Congress to lose face as an equal and coordinate branch of the Government.

UNEQUAL REPRESENTATION IN U.N.

Madam President, I was discussing the Court decision in the light of inequities and unequal representation in the United Nations. It is all the more necessary to consider how the character and appearance of the United Nations have changed since it was first created. The U.N. now has more than twice as many members as it had originally, and it is generally agreed that there will be approximately 20 new members in the near future. The protection once afforded by a permanent seat on the Security Council and the veto power has been greatly diluted, if not nullified, by the greatly increased power lodged in the General Assembly. Of course, that situation grew out of the unconscionable abuse by the Soviet Union of the veto power.

The United Nations has carried to the World Court, for an advisory opinion, the question of whether member nations must pay assessments for extra operations of the United Nations. The new nations which have changed the character and complexion of the United Nations do not have, between them, as many people as the largest member nation.

Indeed, that is an understatement in the light of the statement made by my colleague from Georgia [Mr. TALMADGE]. I had not calculated it, but I know that two-thirds of them do not have as large a population as the single largest member nation.

However, by a two-thirds majority in the General Assembly, this body can change the basis of assessment and assess against the United States, on the grounds that we are the largest and wealthiest country on earth, assessments running into the billions of dollars to be expended on programs of which the majority of the people of the United States might bitterly disapprove.

This new group of so-called emerging nations were in a great hurry to bring military force to bear against Katanga. It is completely conceivable that they might order military action against some other nation that is friendly to us, opposed to Communism, and inclined to the principles of Christianity, as was Katanga. Even though such a nation might be not only one of our closest friends, but could also be an ally that we are bound by treaty to defend, the General Assembly would have the power to assess against us the greatest portion of the cost of carrying out a military attack on such a nation, if the General Assembly declared that necessary in order to maintain world peace, as was declared of the attack on Katanga.

These crusaders against disproportionate voting might well turn their attention to the General Assembly of the United Nations.

During the years I have served in this body, I have seen a great many tables and figures showing the alleged inequities which exist under some elective systems of States of the Union. Let us examine, for a moment, the disproportionate rep-

resentation in the General Assembly of the United Nations.

Only 3 members of the United Nations have populations exceeding 100 million people. The United States is one of those nations; yet, we have but one vote in the General Assembly. However, I am sure Senators will recall that before Russia would approve the Charter, Russia was wise enough to demand three votes in the General Assembly, and has them there today.

Our one vote represents a nation of 183 million people. Sitting with equal rights and equal power in the General Assembly is a representative, let us say, of Gabon. When a vote is had in the United Nations, each citizen of Gabon exercises 433 times the power that is exercised by the vote of a representative of the United States on behalf of one of its citizens. In other words, in the General Assembly the voting power of 433 Americans is equaled by that of 1 Gabonese.

A vote of Iceland in the United Nations, when considered from a standpoint of population, exceeds by 1,010 times the voice and the power of a citizen of the United States. Ghana's vote in the General Assembly represent 26 times the power per citizen of the vote of the United States.

In the case of Mali, it is 40 times greater.

The people of Togo have a voice in the General Assembly, per capita, which is 125 times as great as that possessed, per capita, by the people of the United States.

A citizen of Mauritania possesses there 231 times more power than a citizen of the United States.

In the case of Cyprus, it is 312 times greater than ours.

Luxembourg's vote is 554 times greater.

The vote of the Congo Republic is 218 times greater.

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Georgia yield for a question?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MUSKIE in the chair). Does the Senator from Georgia yield to the Senator from Texas?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. TOWER. I think the Senator from Georgia has raised an extremely interesting point. I should like to ask him this question: If it is fair for the Soviet Union to have three votes—for example, for Byelorussia to be allowed one vote—does not the Senator from Georgia think it would be eminently fair for the sovereign State of Georgia or for the sovereign State of Texas to be given voting representation in the United Nations?

Mr. RUSSELL. Naturally, I think the sovereign State of Georgia is as much entitled to such representation in the United Nations as are some of the states which are represented there today. Furthermore, based on the resources and the size of the sovereign State of Texas, she should be entitled to two votes there. [Laughter.]

Of course, Mr. President, I shall not say how many votes Texas would have there if her representation there were

based on the self-esteem of the people who live in Texas. [Laughter.]

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Georgia yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. COTTON. Does the Senator from Georgia have in mind the possibility that at some time the Supreme Court might start to find a way around the constitutional provision which gives my small but select State of New Hampshire as many Members in the U.S. Senate as the great State of Georgia or the great State of Texas has? Obviously, that constitutional provision does not measure up to the standard the Supreme Court has set in its last decision; and I am somewhat fearful that the Supreme Court might try to erode that power of the States.

Mr. RUSSELL. Of course, if the Supreme Court were to succeed in abrogating the constitutional provision that no State, without its consent, shall be deprived of its equal representation in the Senate, perhaps the Senator from New Hampshire and the Senator from Vermont might join in an effort to have one Member of the Senate elected from their two States.

Furthermore, based on the electoral college, Alaska, with her population of approximately 200,000, would certainly exercise about three or four times the power per citizen that a citizen of the State of New York would exercise.

Mr. President, as I have said, a majority of the United Nations are today smaller nations, and in many cases newer nations; and this majority will be greatly increased in the immediate future.

We are already paying a larger proportion, per capita, of the operating costs, as well as of the special assessments, of the United Nations, than is any other member.

There have been no cries of protest, no shouts of outraged indignation, from the great equalizers, who have heaped praise and admiration upon the so-called Supreme Court for its most recent blow at our constitutional system.

I may say that many of these people are advocates of world government of one sort or another; and when one comes in contact with a really dedicated advocate of world government, one finds that such an advocate does not consider any cost to the U.S. taxpayers or any element of disparity in the United Nations or elsewhere.

I have been here in the Senate when, in the course of debate, Senators have risen on the floor and have pointed out that States representing, let us say, 60 percent of the population of the United States had only 12 or 14 Members of this body—I forget the exact figure used. But, bad as that is, it is not as bad as the case which can be made against the General Assembly of the United Nations.

Mr. President, I feel that our country is making a great mistake in being guided so often by expediency, instead of adopting, in its foreign policy, a definite principle to guide us in the United Nations and, indeed, in our foreign policy generally throughout the world. To be guided by expediency is incompatible

with the role we should play as the greatest, most powerful, and most progressive civilization of the earth. Some of our representatives may feel that they are justified in abandoning their ideas of right and propriety in an effort to woo the votes of the newly emerging nations. Time and again we are told that people of color predominate numerically on this globe, and that at any cost we must maintain their friendship and their approval.

Mr. President, I desire to maintain the good will, the approval, and the friendship of every people of every race or creed throughout the world; but the shortcuts in which we have been participating, in proceeding in line with the spirit that the ends justify the means, will not, in the long run, serve our country well. Such a course will eventually subject us to blackmail in many forms that the American people will be unwilling to pay. Indeed, they are already paying blackmail in greater amounts than they should be called upon to pay.

STRANGE FOREIGN POLICY

We are living in a hectic and fast-moving world, Mr. President. Katanga may soon become a forgotten episode. But the fact that this great Nation has not had a specific foreign policy of its own, but can be bulldozed and blackmailed into supporting positions which, in our heart, we know to be wrong, will not be forgotten. It can only cause us to be looked upon with contempt and will eventually destroy our already decreasing prestige throughout the world.

Power is one element respected in every state and among every race and tribe upon this globe. If a nation has great power, but weakness of character to exercise it fairly and impartially, it will eventually lose the new friends for which we have sacrificed close friendships which have lasted over many decades and which have been sealed in blood in two world wars.

I have been very happy to see that so many men of wisdom and influence throughout this Nation are recognizing the need for a reexamination of the role of the United States in the United Nations. I repeat that I do not believe we should leave the United Nations or in any wise lessen our support of the original concept of this world organization. The United Nations was conceived originally as an instrument of negotiation and mediation for the settlement of differences on this earth by peaceful means, rather than by war. War was to be the last, final resort, after every other means had been exhausted. Every time the United States agrees to approve armed attacks instead of negotiation before all hope of peaceful settlement has been exhausted, we demean ourselves and weaken our influence throughout the globe.

I, of course, freely confess that we find ourselves in a new position within the United Nations. The fact that so many nations have been admitted to full membership before they were ready for self-government or before their economies were capable of supporting them has changed the whole complexion of this body. We have been, in a way,

responsible for this by our denunciation of colonialism and by our urging the colonial powers to leave areas before the people of those areas were prepared for self-government.

Instead of a democratic or republican form of government, we find that many of these lands have already lapsed into a dictatorship. Unfortunately, any discrimination that we have shown between rulers who are endeavoring to maintain representative government and those who have established absolute dictatorships seems to be in favor of the dictators.

It is very hard for me to accept and approve the glowing tributes to the great democracy which exists in Ghana, which are being used to justify the partiality that we have shown that country in pledging the American taxpayers' dollars in order to assure the creation of a project which will cost almost \$400 million in that nation. It is hard for our people to accept this when the press almost daily carries statements that the ruler of Ghana has filled the jails or driven into exile many of his political opponents and that he is exercising complete and dictatorial power in that land.

It is incomprehensible to me that those in charge of dispensing the billions of American tax dollars should have selected Ghana as the newly emerging country to provide a "showcase" of what the workings of democracy can do. The only democracy at work in Ghana today is that which is used by American taxpayers to raise the large sums that we are making available in our effort to set it apart from the rest of the world as an example of democracy.

I might amend that statement by saying I did see in the paper yesterday another slight token of democracy, when one of the members of the Cabinet in Ghana had finally induced his wife not to buy an \$8,600 gold-plated bed to bring into Ghana with her. That is another evidence, I suppose, of democracy.

As a practical matter, the democracy obtaining in Ghana now is almost of the same brand of democracy that was enjoyed by Russia under the rule of the late Josef Stalin. Indeed, Nkrumah has gone further than Stalin and permits himself to be deified. I understand they teach in school that he is God. Why we should lavish such attention and shower so many tax dollars upon this dictatorship is completely beyond me. There are many other newly emerging countries where the people still have a voice in their government, and opposition and criticism are tolerated, and where people make up their own minds, that we could have made the objects of our bounty.

For some mysterious reason, Nkrumah has exercised tremendous influence, both in the Communist countries and in the West.

While I do not have the facts to establish it by evidence, there is no doubt in my own mind that the original action of Connor Cruise O'Brien in moving the United Nations into Katanga, where there was peace and quiet, to drive out what few whites remained there to help Tshombe with his government, was done by O'Brien at the demand of Nkrumah.

I have a feeling he expected to be a beneficiary of the action by taking over the Congo and adding it to Ghana. He has had a great influence on our own African policy as it affects other nations, in addition to his capacity for extracting large sums of money from our representatives for Ghana herself.

I wonder if it will develop in the future that Katanga was sacrificed, not, in fact, for the welfare of the Congo, but as a part of a plan generated by the overweening ambitions of Nkrumah to extend his power over the substantial resources of that area as well as a start to become the strong man of all Africa.

It is very significant that the press has reported within the past few weeks that Connor Cruise O'Brien has gone to Ghana to become vice chancellor of the University of Ghana. It is unnecessary to ask why he was not rewarded with the chancellorship, because Nkrumah serves in that capacity, as he does in every other position of honor or power within that state.

Mr. President, there is another reason why the whole Ghanaian operation we are supporting appears to me to be fantastic, almost to the point of insanity.

It so happens that that country had an unusual and great advantage over many of the newly emerging nations, in that it was established with a substantial balance in its treasury. The British turned over to Nkrumah between \$550 and \$700 million at the time they divested themselves of all power of government and left Ghana. That is quite a large sum of money. If it had been properly used it could have served as the basis for economic development and for improving the health, the culture, and the welfare of the people of that nation.

Think how happy many of the other newly emerging states would have been to have had that amount of money in their treasuries to start with. Some of them could very likely have gone it alone with that amount of money, and would not have had to resort to blackmailing us into approving works projects, as Nkrumah blackmailed us in the case of the Volta development.

ALLIANCE FOR PROGRESS IN BRAZIL

I hesitate to mention this today, and I do so with all due deference to our distinguished visitor from Brazil, but I must assert that it is incomprehensible to me why Brazil has been selected to be the first and principal beneficiary of the \$20 billion Alliance for Progress program. I note in the press that the distinguished President has said here in Washington, D.C., that he is opposed to communism and to Castro. That, of course, is pleasing propaganda for the ears of the American people, but I cannot refrain from expressing my regret that some of that attitude was not reflected by votes and action at the Punta del Este Conference. Both there and in other meetings of the Organization of American States, Brazil has been very consistent in voting against every issue our Nation has espoused.

It seems to me that it would have been much more reassuring to our friends if we had selected some Latin American country which had been consistently

friendly to us as the first country to receive huge grants of funds extracted from the American taxpayers.

I also feel that it is my duty to point out that the Alliance for Progress program was sold to the Congress and to the American people as a cooperative venture designed to bring about internal reformation of the economic, social, and political systems of our sister states in this hemisphere, and that those who made such reforms were to be the beneficiaries of this program.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. TALMADGE in the chair). Does the Senator from Georgia yield to the Senator from Idaho?

Mr. RUSSELL. I have one more statement and then I shall yield.

I wish to modify my statement in regard to how the program was sold. It was sold to the American people on this theory. It is unnecessary to have any theory whatever to sell to the majority of the Congress any measure which has as its purpose transferring American tax dollars to foreign states. Members of Congress will vote for such a program without a theory.

I now yield to the Senator from Idaho.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Did the Senator from Georgia indicate the amount of money which has been allocated for aid to Brazil during the first year of the Alliance for Progress?

Mr. RUSSELL. I am sorry; I do not have that figure.

Mr. DWORSHAK. It is \$342 million.

Mr. RUSSELL. That is from the \$500 million which is available.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Does the Senator from Georgia think that \$342 million is an excessive amount to pay to one republic in South America?

Mr. RUSSELL. My friend from Idaho must forgive me for being old fashioned. I am one of those who still think we should consider our own interests, occasionally, in dealing with these questions. For my part, I say—and I say it with some regret, because the distinguished President of Brazil is in our country—that Brazil would have been at the bottom of the list to receive funds, so far as I am concerned.

I am more convinced of that since having read the address of the President of Brazil delivered an hour or so ago to this Congress. He says:

If the Alliance for Progress is to depend upon an effort by the Latin American countries to achieve global planning with absolute technical precision in the economic and social fields and to eliminate beforehand certain factors of instability, we can introduce hindrances capable of impairing the urgency of solutions which cannot be put off. Such difficulties will mount if the Alliance fails to reflect, principally, the spirit of reciprocal trust and respect between the countries which comprise it, in line with the purposes expressed by the eminent President Kennedy.

In this country we would say there is considerable gobbledygook in the statement. I gather that the President of Brazil feels that all the talk which we have been given about tax reform, reform of economic systems, political

systems, and perhaps other systems in South American countries does not amount to anything. So far as he is concerned, he does not intend to do anything about it.

I suppose he is doing that to assure that he will get the \$342 million instead of the \$120 million-odd I heard mentioned today.

It has been very noticeable that when a foreign country speaks out very sternly to us, we immediately brush aside any possible obstacles to get the money to them in a hurry.

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

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. DWORSHAK. We are debating in this body this week the question of whether the United Nations needs this unusual financial help from the United States. The Senator from Georgia and every other Senator who is acquainted with the facts knows that if the United Nations has been losing its prestige and if it has become more impotent in its activities throughout the world, it is essentially because we have not insisted upon self-help and full cooperation from all the countries signatory to the United Nations Charter. We have deliberately caused this weakness to develop.

We are now asked to provide some emergency relief.

I ask the Senator from Georgia if it is not that the same likely thing will happen in South America, where, as every Member of the Senate knows, there is a great threat of Communist infiltration?

The President outlined the Alliance for Progress program, which requires drastic reforms in land and tax policies. The Senator from Montana, the majority leader, was a member of a group of which I also was a member which, last fall, visited in Brazil. I am sure the Senator will verify what I say. We found absolutely no evidence of any intention to implement the self-help features which were a part of the Alliance-for Progress program.

Today we are asked to embark upon another alarming program. Inevitably weakness will develop, unless we insist upon cooperative features. The Alliance for Progress program is foredoomed to failure if softness is displayed by our Government. We did likewise with respect to the United Nations. We have done it throughout the years in our foreign aid program.

I ask the Senator if there is not a likelihood that the same situation will inevitably develop in South America? By pouring in our billions of dollars, we shall not actually strengthen and fortify those countries, but we shall weaken them, because we shall encourage them to rely more and more upon financial aid provided by the United States.

Mr. RUSSELL. Unless they carry out in good faith the reforms which were suggested by our President, the only effect of the program can be to make the rich richer and the poor poorer, and to engender more "buyers" of communism and unrest in those lands.

Mr. President, if we do not stand fast in requiring the recipients of these funds

to make the reforms which have been so eloquently outlined by President Kennedy, it will be the most prodigious waste of American tax money in all history to send money into the South American countries.

What has Brazil done to bring about the reforms which have been so eloquently outlined and which were supposed to be the standard of eligibility of a country to be a beneficiary? The Senator says that Brazil is to be the principal beneficiary. A large sum was involved. I do not remember exactly what the sum was.

It so happens that I was in a small Central American country when it was announced that Brazil was supposed to receive \$342 million of the \$500 million. I had an appointment to see the President that same morning.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a correction?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. DWORSHAK. The original plan was to provide only \$100 million for Brazil. How the amount increased from \$100 million to \$342 million I do not know.

Mr. RUSSELL. The amount involved was more than \$100 million. It was last fall. The President of that country has been one of the best friends this country has ever had. He has shown friendship in every possible way, even to the point of risking the security of his country by doing so. He said that some Cabinet members had just left his office and, after hearing of the huge amount given Brazil, had told him—and he was inclined to agree—that the only way to get any money out of the United States was to denounce us on every possible occasion and to vote against us in the OAS and in the United Nations at every opportunity. He said he had never done so, but Brazil had, and Brazil was the principal beneficiary under the plan.

The President said that the purpose of the program was to create an economic and political climate in which every citizen might have a better opportunity to improve his lot in life, and in which the free enterprise system might flourish. I have not heard about the economic changes that have been taking place in Brazil. I do not say that such changes have not taken place, but they have not been reported in the American press. I read the newspapers very carefully. It is quite clear that the President's suggestion that American capital might be brought in to help those people provide jobs has not been taken very seriously, nor is the private enterprise system regarded with any particular favor in Brazil.

In the past 2 weeks two Brazilian utilities financed by outside capital have been expropriated.

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

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Is it not possible that the current liberality being displayed by the administration in providing foreign aid for Brazil and other countries may be reflected in the fact that during the first 3 months of this year we lost approximately 280 million

gold dollars, and that during the last week in March, which is very recent, the loss of our gold dollars amounted to \$100 million, the largest loss in a single week in more than 20 years? Is it not possible that a deliberate effort is being made to sabotage the solidarity and security of our financial system by handing out dollars that we do not have at a time when our gold dollars are going out of the Treasury at a rate faster than they have flowed for several years, notwithstanding assurances from the President and spokesmen of the administration that they are on top of the problem and have stopped the outflow of gold?

Mr. RUSSELL. I cannot believe that any responsible official of our Government is deliberately sabotaging our economy, but I think we are taking some steps that are very unwise. I do not challenge the integrity and good faith of any of those who are handling the program. But I do say that it is completely unjustified to select a country like Brazil and to pour out to that country vast sums of money while it is expropriating private property belonging to citizens of this country and Canada and refusing to conform to the standards that have been laid down.

Mr. President, instead of constantly increasing our program of shipping our dollars abroad, it is time for us to exercise some discrimination and to consider the interest and welfare of the American people. Under the bankruptcy laws of this country, as they existed at the time I was practicing law—which was a good while ago—if the same rule were applied to the Federal Government as is applied to an individual, this country would be hopelessly insolvent and could be forced into involuntary bankruptcy.

We have given away our assets at a time when we do not have sufficient gold to meet the dollar credits in foreign hands, and to assure the gold reserve of our currency at the 25 percent required by law. It would be impossible for us to meet the demands of our creditors for gold if they were all presented simultaneously.

I realize that there are many who think that a large national debt such as the one we have is a good thing for the country, and therefore they have no concern about having it increased from year to year. I have also heard able men make a strong case to prove that gold is a wholly unnecessary commodity to help sustain a stable economy in this country.

For my part, I cannot accept either thesis. To me it is the height of folly to increase continually our foreign spending program, particularly to Communist countries or neutralists who have no use whatever for us. I cannot refrain from feeling that to increase foreign aid and other foreign spending from year to year will make inevitable a day of accounting; and even if it is postponed for several years, it will present to the next generation problems that will be well nigh insoluble. When our economy feels the full impact of the shortsighted policy that we have pursued for the past 10 or 12 years, our institutions will be shaken to their very

foundations; and, indeed, a complete change in our form of government could be brought about.

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

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. MILLER. I was very much interested in the comments of the Senator about the basic concepts of reform that should underlie our contributions to the Alliance for Progress. I ask the Senator whether in his opinion one of those reforms was not the practice of fiscal integrity by the government concerned.

Mr. RUSSELL. As I recall, that was one of the standards that was set. I do not remember all of them. I know that the general purpose was to bring about economic and political reform which would give the citizens of our sister republics a greater opportunity to enjoy some of the good things of modern-day life, and prevent the complete concentration of all the wealth of the country. I understand that unlimited resources are in the hands of a very small percentage of the people of some of those countries.

So far I have not seen any evidence of great enthusiasm on the part of many of those countries for making themselves eligible under the program. If we proceed to dump the money appropriated under the program into Brazil's lap at a time when the President of that country has said that there is doubt about whether it is wise even to attempt reform, we shall have killed any chance of inducing any reforms anywhere.

Mr. MILLER. What the Senator has said is also my understanding.

I should like to ask a further question of the Senator. In a program for the reformation of a government, so that it would practice fiscal integrity, reduce or minimize inflation, collect taxes adequately, and do the things that good businessmen do, would it not be relevant to inquire whether or not such a government was paying its bills to the United Nations?

Mr. RUSSELL. That would be one piece of evidence, at least.

Mr. MILLER. Would it not be relevant to inquire whether that nation had good intentions with respect to paying its bills under the Alliance for Progress program and with respect to repaying loans under the Alliance for Progress, and to ask for evidence of its attitude with respect to paying its bills to the United Nations? Would that question not be relevant?

Mr. RUSSELL. I think that would be evidence as to the stability and intention of a nation to discharge its part in a cooperative venture such as is envisioned by the Alliance for Progress.

Mr. MILLER. I thank the Senator.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, we defray almost one-half of all the expenses and assessments of the United Nations. Many other nations that are the recipients of our aid program are put in a position to pay their assessments because we have assumed the cost of so many of their domestic projects as to give them free money for this purpose.

I would be the first to oppose any suggestion that our country seek to impose

its will by force upon any people, particularly a weak and new state with all of the problems of establishing government and building a viable economy. I do believe, however, Mr. President, that we have made a great mistake, which is being repeated year after year, of not giving specific recognition in our aid program to those nations who respect us and who, through a community of interests or of aims for our respective peoples, support us in and out of season in the United Nations and in other associations of states to which we are a party. If a country proclaims itself as a neutralist, we apparently accept the statement without question, even though it may consistently oppose us in every field of international relations and show strong friendship for the Soviet and never see anything wrong with Soviet behavior. In my view, those who are quick to suspect the United States and to close their eyes to the many untoward actions of Soviet Russia, in my judgment, are not true neutralists, whatever they may call themselves.

If we do not adopt a policy of recognizing our friends before we recognize our enemies before our dollars are exhausted and the last bar of gold has been taken from Fort Knox, we will find ourselves standing alone at some future day when we are confronted with the dire peril to our institutions and our people being overrun or destroyed by the Soviet Union.

In my judgment it would be a very healthy development for this country to examine what goes on in many of these countries who have posted on their front door the sign "Neutralist." It would be even better and would enhance our position in the United Nations and in all other organizations if we would begin to initiate some selectivity in our foreign relations which favors our friends. Every other country on earth measures its relations with the world in concrete and concise terms of its own national interest.

The hour is late. In my opinion we have already wasted many billions of dollars, but it is not too late to reconsider the course we have pursued to date and to initiate a program of our own, conceived in America and directed to the promotion of our own enlightened self-interest.

Coming down to the immediate issue, I submit that the substitute I have proposed is adequate to see the United Nations through its present financial difficulties. It will not put the stamp of approval upon precipitate military action which resulted in the conquest of Katanga and the death or maiming of so many of the men, women, and children of that tortured state.

It will be notice to the nations of the world that we expect other peoples to contribute more, not only to the operating costs of the United Nations, but, when they are able to do so, also to the stability and the development of the emerging nations.

It will avoid the danger, which to me is very clear and real, of providing the United Nations with a financial reserve for any future military action at a time

when unstable forces are exercising undue influence in that body.

Above all, Mr. President, it restates the authority of the Congress of the United States to be consulted and to take action before our sons may be ordered to foreign lands to die in battle, perhaps, over issues that could be settled peaceably by a proper exercise of patience and persistence.

I believe it will help to restore our own self-respect and national dignity, and will help regain the respect of other nations of the earth. It will manifest our intention to continue to contribute to the peaceful settlement of disputes everywhere in the world, but will reaffirm our determination not to permit our sons, some of whom have been called into military service against their desires, to be used as gladiators in the arena of the whole world, unless such action has been found necessary in the manner prescribed by our Constitution.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I wish to commend the distinguished senior Senator from Georgia for the high caliber of his approach to the pending question, which is the matter of a \$100 million loan to the United Nations to see it through its temporary difficulties.

The Senator from Georgia has made a speech in the best traditions of the Senate, with respect to the proposal concerning the U.N. loan, which is now before us. He has made a distinct contribution to a deeper understanding of the real issues involved. He has stated again, as he has on many previous occasions, to my knowledge, that he is not an enemy of the United Nations and that he does not want to see it destroyed.

I am delighted by the emphasis he has placed on the peacekeeping functions of that body. By his pointing out the difficulties which are inherent in the one-vote, one-state formula, there may in time be a correction, especially if greater stress is laid on peaceful settlement. This Nation, the great majority of the Members of the Senate, and the people of this country feel the U.N. has a worthwhile place in the affairs of mankind. There may be the beginnings of a return to accompanying decisions with responsibilities if we accept the United Nations for what it was meant to be in the charter. I am sure the great majority in this body is behind the idea of the concept of the United Nations and recognize its great worthiness, despite the changes which have occurred since its inception.

Perhaps through discussions such as this on the United Nations, it may be possible to bring about a reexamination of the role and the responsibility of the Security Council in the light of its original form, and perhaps a reassessment of the preponderant role which the United Nations General Assembly has undertaken in recent years, and undertaken, I believe, at the behest and to a large extent on the basis of the urgings of our own country.

The distinguished senior Senator from Georgia deserves to be commended and complimented for facing up to the problem and making his views known. We are in disagreement, as we both un-

derstand, on many aspects of this problem, but at least the Senator from Georgia has exercised the right of every Senator to give voice to his own expressions, to lay them on the table, and to present them to the Senate for consideration, for debate, and for a final vote. So again, my congratulations and my commendations.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, if the Senator from Montana will indulge me, I should like to repeat one of the oldest Latin maxims taught me by my father. He said that it is always sweet to be praised by those who are themselves praised. I thank the Senator from Montana.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I thank the Senator from Georgia.

EXHIBIT 1

THE UNITED NATIONS PARTICIPATION ACT OF 1945, AS AMENDED

(Text of Public Law 264, 79th Congress (S. 1580), 59 Stat. 619, approved December 20, 1945, as amended by Public Law 341, 81st Congress (H.R. 4708), 63 Stat. 734, approved October 10, 1949)

An act to provide for the appointment of representatives of the United States in the organs and agencies of the United Nations, and to make other provision with respect to the participation of the United States in such organization

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act may be cited as the "United Nations Participation Act of 1945".

Sec. 2.¹ (a) The President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, shall appoint a representative and a deputy representative of the United States to the United Nations, both of whom shall have the rank and status of envoy extraordinary and ambassador plenipotentiary and shall hold office at the pleasure of the President. Such representative and deputy representative shall represent the United States in the Security Council of the United Nations and may serve ex officio as United States representative on any organ, commission, or other body of the United Nations other than specialized agencies of the United Nations, and shall perform such other functions in connection with the participation of the United States in the United Nations as the President may from time to time direct.

(b) The President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, shall appoint an additional deputy representative of the United States to the Security Council who shall hold office at the pleasure of the President. Such deputy representative shall represent the United States in the Security Council of the United Nations in the event of the absence or disability of both the representative and the deputy representative of the United States to the United Nations.

(c) The President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, shall designate from time to time to attend a specified session or specified sessions of the General Assembly of the United Nations not to exceed five representatives of the United States and such number of alternates as he may determine consistent with the rules of procedure of the General Assembly. One of the representatives shall be designated as the senior representative.

(d) The President may also appoint from time to time such other persons as he may deem necessary to represent the United States in the organs and agencies of the United Nations, but the representative of the United States in the Economic and Social Council

and in the Trusteeship Council of the United Nations shall be appointed only by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, except that the President may, without the advice and consent of the Senate, designate any officer of the United States to act, without additional compensation, as the representative of the United States in either such Council (A) at any specified session thereof where the position is vacant or in the absence or disability of the regular representative, or (B) in connection with a specified subject matter at any specified session of either such Council in lieu of the regular representative. The President may designate any officer of the Department of State, whose appointment is subject to confirmation by the Senate, to act, without additional compensation, for temporary periods as the representative of the United States in the Security Council of the United Nations in the absence or disability of the representative and deputy representatives appointed under section 2 (a) and (b) or in lieu of such representatives in connection with a specified subject matter. The advice and consent of the Senate shall be required for the appointment by the President of the representative of the United States in any commission that may be formed by the United Nations with respect to atomic energy or in any other commission of the United Nations to which the United States is entitled to appoint a representative.

(e) Nothing contained in this section shall preclude the President or the Secretary of State, at the direction of the President, from representing the United States at any meeting or session of any organ or agency of the United Nations.

(f) All persons appointed in pursuance of authority contained in this section shall receive compensation at rates determined by the President upon the basis of duties to be performed but not in excess of rates authorized by sections 411 and 412 of the Foreign Service Act of 1946 (Public Law 724, Seventy-ninth Congress) for chiefs of mission and Foreign Service officers occupying positions of equivalent importance, except that no Member of the Senate or House of Representatives or officer of the United States who is designated under subsections (c) and (d) of this section as a representative of the United States or as an alternate to attend any specified session or specified sessions of the General Assembly shall be entitled to receive such compensation.

Sec. 3.² The representatives provided for in section 2 hereof, when representing the United States in the respective organs and agencies of the United Nations, shall, at all times, act in accordance with the instructions of the President transmitted by the Secretary of State unless other means of transmission is directed by the President, and such representatives shall, in accordance with such instructions, cast any and all votes under the Charter of the United Nations.

Sec. 4.³ The President shall, from time to time as occasion may require, but not less than once each year, make reports to the Congress of the activities of the United Nations and of the participation of the United States therein. He shall make special current reports on decisions of the Security Council to take enforcement measures under the provisions of the Charter of the United Nations, and on the participation therein, under his instructions, of the representative of the United States.

Sec. 5.⁴ (a) Notwithstanding the provisions of any other law, whenever the United States is called upon by the Security Council to apply measures which said Council has decided, pursuant to article 41 of said Charter, are to be employed to give effect to

¹ 22 U.S.C. § 287a.

² 22 U.S.C. § 287b.

⁴ 22 U.S.C. § 287c.

¹ 22 U.S.C. § 287.

its decisions under said Charter, the President may, to the extent necessary to apply such measures, through any agency which he may designate, and under such orders, rules, and regulations as may be prescribed by him, investigate, regulate, or prohibit, in whole or in part, economic relations or rail, sea, air, postal, telegraphic, radio, and other means of communication between any foreign country or any national thereof or any person therein and the United States or any person subject to the jurisdiction thereof, or involving any property subject to the jurisdiction of the United States.

(b) Any person who willfully violates or evades or attempts to violate or evade any order, rule, or regulation issued by the President pursuant to paragraph (a) of this section shall, upon conviction, be fined not more than \$10,000 or, if a natural person, be imprisoned for not more than ten years, or both; and the officer, director, or agent of any corporation who knowingly participates in such violation or evasion shall be punished by a like fine, imprisonment, or both, and any property, funds, securities, papers, or other articles or documents, or any vessel, together with her tackle, apparel, furniture, and equipment, or vehicle, or aircraft, concerned in such violation shall be forfeited to the United States.

SEC. 6.² The President is authorized to negotiate a special agreement or agreements with the Security Council which shall be subject to the approval of the Congress by appropriate Act or joint resolution, providing for the numbers and types of armed forces, their degree of readiness and general location, and the nature of facilities and assistance, including rights of passage, to be made available to the Security Council on its call for the purpose of maintaining international peace and security in accordance with article 43 of said charter. The President shall not be deemed to require the authorization of the Congress to make available to the Security Council on its call in order to take action under article 42 of said charter and pursuant to such special agreement or agreements the armed forces, facilities, or assistance provided for therein: *Provided*, That, except as authorized in section 7 of this Act, nothing herein contained shall be construed as an authorization to the President by the Congress to make available to the Security Council for such purpose armed forces, facilities, or assistance in addition to the forces, facilities, and assistance provided for in such special agreement or agreements.

SEC. 7.³ (a) Notwithstanding the provisions of any other law, the President, upon the request by the United Nations for cooperative action, and to the extent that he finds that it is consistent with the national interest to comply with such request, may authorize, in support of such activities of the United Nations as are specifically directed to the peaceful settlement of disputes and not involving the employment of armed forces contemplated by chapter VII of the United Nations Charter—

(1) the detail to the United Nations, under such terms and conditions as the President shall determine, of personnel of the armed forces of the United States to serve as observers, guards, or in any noncombatant capacity, but in no event shall more than a total of one thousand of such personnel be so detailed at any one time: *Provided*, That while so detailed, such personnel shall be considered for all purposes as acting in the line of duty, including the receipt of pay and allowances as personnel of the armed forces of the United States, credit for longevity and retirement, and all other perquisites appertaining to such duty: *Provided further*, That upon authorization or approval

by the President, such personnel may accept directly from the United Nations (a) any or all of the allowances or perquisites to which they are entitled under the first provision hereof, and (b) extraordinary expenses and perquisites incident to such detail;

(2) the furnishing of facilities, services, or other assistance and the loan of the agreed fair share of the United States of any supplies and equipment to the United Nations by the National Military Establishment, under such terms and conditions as the President shall determine;

(3) the obligation, insofar as necessary to carry out the purposes of clauses (1) and (2) of this subsection, of any funds appropriated to the National Military Establishment or any department therein, the procurement of such personnel, supplies, equipment, facilities, services, or other assistance as may be made available in accordance with the request of the United Nations, and the replacement of such items, when necessary, where they are furnished from stocks.

(b) Whenever personnel or assistance is made available pursuant to the authority contained in subsection (a) (1) and (2) of this section, the President shall require reimbursement from the United Nations for the expense thereby incurred by the United States: *Provided*, That in exceptional circumstances, or when the President finds it to be in the national interest, he may waive, in whole or in part, the requirement of such reimbursement: *Provided further*, That when any such reimbursement is made, it shall be credited, at the option of the appropriate department of the National Military Establishment, either to the appropriation, fund, or account utilized in incurring the obligation, or to an appropriate appropriation, fund, or account currently available for the purposes for which expenditures were made.

(c) In addition to the authorization of appropriations to the Department of State contained in section 8 of this Act, there is hereby authorized to be appropriated to the National Military Establishment, or any department therein, such sums as may be necessary to reimburse such Establishment or department in the event that reimbursement from the United Nations is waived in whole or in part pursuant to authority contained in subsection (b) of this section.

(d) Nothing in this Act shall authorize the disclosure of any information or knowledge in any case in which such disclosure is prohibited by any other law of the United States.

SEC. 8.⁴ There is hereby authorized to be appropriated annually to the Department of State, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, such sums as may be necessary for the payment by the United States of its share of the expenses of the United Nations as apportioned by the General Assembly in accordance with article 17 of the Charter, and for all necessary salaries and expenses of the representatives provided for in section 2 hereof, and of their appropriate staffs, including personal services in the District of Columbia and elsewhere, without regard to the civil-service laws and the Classification Act of 1923, as amended; travel expenses without regard to the Standardized Government Travel Regulations, as amended, the Travel Expense Act of 1949, and section 10 of the Act of March 3, 1933, as amended, and, under such rules and regulations as the Secretary of State may prescribe, travel expenses of families and transportation of effects of United States representatives and other personnel in going to and returning from their post of duty; allowances for living quarters, including heat, fuel, and light, as authorized by the Act approved June 26, 1930 (5 U.S.C. 118a); cost-

of-living allowances for personnel stationed abroad under such rules and regulations as the Secretary of State may prescribe; communications services; stenographic reporting, translating, and other services, by contract; hire of passenger motor vehicles and other local transportation; rent of offices; printing and binding without regard to section 11 of the Act of March 1, 1919 (44 U.S.C. 111); allowances and expenses as provided in section 6 of the Act of July 30, 1946 (Public Law 565, Seventy-ninth Congress), and allowances and expenses equivalent to those provided in section 901(3) of the Foreign Service Act of 1946 (Public Law 724, Seventy-ninth Congress); the lease or rental (for periods not exceeding ten years) of living quarters for the use of the representative of the United States to the United Nations referred to in paragraph (a) of section 2 hereof, the cost of installation and use of telephones in the same manner as telephone service is provided for use of the Foreign Service pursuant to the Act of August 23, 1912, as amended (31 U.S.C. 679), and the allotment of funds, similar to the allotment authorized by section 902 of the Foreign Service Act of 1946, for unusual expenses incident to the operation and maintenance of such living quarters, to be accounted for in accordance with section 903 of said Act; and such other expenses as may be authorized by the Secretary of State; all without regard to section 3709 of the Revised Statutes, as amended (41 U.S.C. 5).

CHAPTER VII—ACTION WITH RESPECT TO THREATS TO THE PEACE, BREACHES OF THE PEACE, AND ACTS OF AGGRESSION

ARTICLE 39

The Security Council shall determine the existence of any threat to the peace, breach of the peace, or act of aggression and shall make recommendations, or decide what measures shall be taken in accordance with Articles 41 and 42, to maintain or restore international peace and security.

ARTICLE 40

In order to prevent an aggravation of the situation, the Security Council may, before making the recommendations or deciding upon the measures provided for in Article 39, call upon the parties concerned to comply with such provisional measures as it deems necessary or desirable. Such provisional measures shall be without prejudice to the rights, claims, or position of the parties concerned. The Security Council shall duly take account of failure to comply with such provisional measures.

ARTICLE 41

The Security Council may decide what measures not involving the use of armed force are to be employed to give effect to its decisions, and it may call upon the Members of the United Nations to apply such measures. These may include complete or partial interruption of economic relations and of rail, sea, air, postal, telegraphic, radio, and other means of communication, and the severance of diplomatic relations.

ARTICLE 42

Should the Security Council consider that measures provided for in Article 41 would be inadequate or have proved to be inadequate, it may take such action by air, sea, or land forces as may be necessary to maintain or restore international peace and security. Such action may include demonstrations, blockade, and other operations by air, sea, or land forces of Members of the United Nations.

ARTICLE 43

1. All Members of the United Nations, in order to contribute to the maintenance of international peace and security, undertake to make available to the Security Council, on its call and in accordance with a special

² 22 U.S.C. § 287d.

³ 22 U.S.C. § 287d-1.

⁴ 22 U.S.C. § 287e.

agreement or agreements, armed forces, assistance, and facilities, including rights of passage, necessary for the purpose of maintaining international peace and security.

2. Such agreement or agreements shall govern the numbers and types of forces, their degree of readiness and general location, and the nature of the facilities and assistance to be provided.

3. The agreement or agreements shall be negotiated as soon as possible on the initiative of the Security Council. They shall be concluded between the Security Council and Members or between the Security Council and groups of Members and shall be subject to ratification by the signatory states in accordance with their respective constitutional processes.

ARTICLE 44

When the Security Council has decided to use force it shall, before calling upon a Member not represented on it to provide armed forces in fulfillment of the obligations assumed under Article 43, invite that Member, if the Member so desires, to participate in the decisions of the Security Council concerning the employment of contingents of that Member's armed forces.

ARTICLE 45

In order to enable the United Nations to take urgent military measures, Members shall hold immediately available national air-force contingents for combined international enforcement action. The strength and degree of readiness of these contingents and plans for their combined action shall be determined, within the limits laid down in the special agreement or agreements referred to in Article 43, by the Security Council with the assistance of the Military Staff Committee.

ARTICLE 46

Plans for the application of armed force shall be made by the Security Council with the assistance of the Military Staff Committee.

ARTICLE 47

1. There shall be established a Military Staff Committee to advise and assist the Security Council on all questions relating to the Security Council's military requirements for the maintenance of international peace and security, the employment and command of forces placed at its disposal, the regulation of armaments, and possible disarmament.

2. The Military Staff Committee shall consist of the Chiefs of Staff of the permanent members of the Security Council or their representatives. Any Member of the United Nations not permanently represented on the Committee shall be invited by the Committee to be associated with it when the efficient discharge of the Committee's responsibilities requires the participation of that Member in its work.

3. The Military Staff Committee shall be responsible under the Security Council for the strategic direction of any armed forces placed at the disposal of the Security Council. Questions relating to the command of such forces shall be worked out subsequently.

4. The Military Staff Committee, with the authorization of the Security Council and after consultation with appropriate regional agencies, may establish regional subcommittees.

ARTICLE 48

1. The action required to carry out the decisions of the Security Council for the maintenance of international peace and security shall be taken by all the Members of the United Nations or by some of them, as the Security Council may determine.

2. Such decisions shall be carried out by the Members of the United Nations directly and through their action in the appropriate international agencies of which they are members.

ARTICLE 49

The Members of the United Nations shall join in affording mutual assistance in carrying out the measures decided upon by the Security Council.

ARTICLE 50

If preventive or enforcement measures against any state are taken by the Security Council, any other state, whether a Member of the United Nations or not, which finds itself confronted with special economic problems arising from the carrying out of those measures shall have the right to consult the Security Council with regard to a solution of those problems.

ARTICLE 51

Nothing in the present Charter shall impair the inherent right of individual or collective self-defense if an armed attack occurs against a Member of the United Nations, until the Security Council has taken the measures necessary to maintain international peace and security. Measures taken by Members in the exercise of this right of self-defense shall be immediately reported to the Security Council and shall not in any way affect the authority and responsibility of the Security Council under the present Charter to take at any time such action as it deems necessary in order to maintain or restore international peace and security.

EXHIBIT 2

[From the Washington Star, Apr. 4, 1962]

MR. MANSFIELD ON THE U.N.

As a good friend of the United Nations, Senate Majority Leader MIKE MANSFIELD now has spoken out in significant and somber terms against certain weaknesses of the world organization. What he has in mind most of all is not its financial difficulties, which surely are serious enough, but its internal structural and political distortions, which are potentially very grave.

Similar concern has been voiced in recent weeks by such other staunch friends of the U.N. as Senators HICKENLOOPER, of Iowa, AIKEN, of Vermont, and JACKSON, of Washington. Like Mr. MANSFIELD, and with good reason, they have asked stern questions about the wisdom and sanity of letting critical decisions be taken on the basis of "one-state-one-vote" procedure in a General Assembly of 104 nations, ranging in population from 175,000 in the smallest to 407 million in one of the largest. Many of these member states are new, relatively primitive, politically unsophisticated, and otherwise woefully inexperienced or backward. Yet, in terms of voting, they have as much weight in the Assembly as our own country or the U.S.S.R.

Further, these international newcomers like to throw that weight around—often in an insufferably self-righteous manner, and quite recklessly and absurdly in relation to ancient, highly civilized lands. This amounts to a major U.N. weakness that has led Mr. JACKSON, for example, to speak out as he has against the highly dubious wisdom, if not fatuousness, of our own Government's policy—a policy aimed at currying the favor of world opinion—of voting with the mass of the fledgling, immature nations against NATO allies like Portugal and Belgium on issues such as Angola and the Congo. Certainly, in Mr. MANSFIELD's words, this is one of the distortions that threaten to make the United Nations innocuous at best or lead to its extinction at worst. To quote him further:

"That outcome is not what successive Presidents and Secretaries of State—of both parties—have said is in the best interests of this Nation. They have all stressed the importance of a strong and vital United Nations."

"Yet the prospect for such an outcome is there, and it is looming larger. It will not

go away if we delude ourselves with the belief that it does not exist. It will not disappear if the Senator from Washington, the Senator from Iowa, and the Senator from Vermont are buried under an avalanche of highly unjustified criticism for having the temerity to discuss aspects of the problem.

"The possibility is ever present, under the one-state-one-vote formula, that we shall, at some time, find some involvement (in the U.N.) totally unacceptable. So we ask ourselves, What then? Do the lights then go out in the General Assembly, as they have already gone out in the Security Council? Do we then take the lead in putting them out?"

"This * * * is the deeper crisis in the United Nations. It is the crisis of a moribund Security Council where, under the charter, decisions could be coupled realistically with the real and proportionate responsibilities of the various nations. It is the crisis of a General Assembly which has been subtracting from its enormous potential of moral force as it has presumed to add to itself the functions of the Security Council * * * under procedures which invite disrespect."

Coming from the majority leader of the U.S. Senate, these are words of more than passing import. He continues to be a strong supporter of the U.N., but he obviously is full of misgivings about its drift, and this reflects a widespread feeling in America. Other member nations, particularly the new ones, would be well advised not to pooh-pooh the significance of that fact. It could turn out to be much bigger than they may imagine at the moment.

Mr. MUSKIE. Mr. President, the issue before us today goes far beyond the immediate question of the United Nations financial crisis. It goes beyond the specific method which may be adopted to empower the President to help overcome that crisis.

The underlying question is the place of the United Nations in our national policy, and the acceptance of responsibility for financial support of the United Nations by its members.

Last Sunday morning I had occasion to raise this question in a speech to the graduate student council of Catholic University. The title of my address was "The United Nations—Is It Worth It?" Commenting on the question of financial responsibility, I said:

The United Nations isn't worth it unless it is worth it to the other nations as well as to ourselves. * * * It is fundamental that the United Nations is not worth it unless there is a chance that it can work, and it won't work unless its members believe in it and are willing to contribute to its resources and to give it support.

Mr. President, the basic objective of the proposed bond issue was to get the extraordinary expenses of the United Nations into the regular budget where the members would be subject to the charter penalty for failure to pay. I am in fundamental agreement with that objective, because I believe it is essential that the members of the United Nations, who have accepted the obligations of the principles of the organization, must accept financial responsibility. Both the committee recommendation and the compromise proposal meet the objective.

We should also note that however the loan or bond issue is handled, the ultimate effect of the shift in extraordinary U.N. expenses to the regular budget will

reduce our proportion of the cost from 47.5 percent to 32.02 percent. This makes sense from our point of view and it makes sense from the point of view of the United Nations.

Mr. President, because of the questions which have been raised about the place of the United Nations in our national policy, and because my observations may serve a useful purpose in indicating the point-of-view of one Member of the Senate on this critical issue, I ask unanimous consent that the text of my remarks to the graduate student council, Catholic University, April 1, 1962, be printed in the RECORD at this point.

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

THE UNITED NATIONS—IS IT WORTH IT?

(Remarks by Hon. EDMUND S. MUSKIE, a Senator from Maine, to the Graduate Student Council, Catholic University, Washington, D.C., April 1, 1962)

The subject, in this form, was suggested to me by your program committee.

"The United Nations—Is It Worth It?"

My first response to the question in this form is another question: "Is it worth what?" Is there a cost, in connection with our association with the United Nations, with which we should be concerned.

Is the United Nations worth the financial support which we give to its regular budget? The regular budget for 1962 is a little over \$74 million of which we will be assessed 32.02 percent.

Is the United Nations worth the cost of supporting its peacemaking operations in the Congo? The alternative might have been a direct confrontation between the United States and the Soviet Union. The cost of these operations, since their beginning in July 1960, has averaged out at about \$10 million per month. Of this cost, the United States has contributed 47½ percent.

Is the United Nations worth the cost of supporting the United Nations Emergency Force in the Middle East? This operation has had the mission of stabilizing the situation in the Middle East since the Suez crisis and has had substantial success. This cost has been running at about \$20 million a year, of which the United States has contributed 45.98 percent.

Is the United Nations worth the cost of supporting the various voluntary programs? For example, there is the United Nations expanded technical assistance program and special fund, with a 1961 goal of \$150 million, and a United States share of 40 percent. Its purpose is to enlist the resources of other western nations to assist developing nations.

The United Nations Children's Fund, known as UNICEF, runs at about \$22 million a year, with a United States share of 44 percent.

When we are asked, "Is it worth it?" is it these sums of money with which the question is primarily concerned? Are they so large as to be burdensome, in and of themselves? Although they are large sums from the point of view of the taxpayer, they are not excessive in the context of our own Defense budget of about \$50 billion and our own foreign-aid program of \$4 to \$5 billion.

What, then, is behind the question? Does it refer to the effort in manpower and energy which might be used elsewhere, the frustrations and the disappointments with which the United Nations has been involved? I doubt that these have been of such a disproportionate order of magnitude when compared with the effort, frustrations, and disappointments which have been involved in other ventures designed to promote peace in the troubled postwar world.

"Is it worth it?" Is the questioner concerned with certain risks which may be involved in our association with the United Nations?

Senator HENRY JACKSON, of Washington, raised some questions along this line within the past 2 weeks which have stirred up controversy. He wonders whether or not the United Nations absorbs a disproportionate amount of the energies of our highest officials—often devoted to defensive actions, trying to defeat this or that ill-advised resolution, rather than on more constructive programs. He wonders whether or not the tendency to bring every issue to a vote tends to sharpen and even exaggerate points at issue and emphasize divisions of opinion rather than possibilities for agreement. He wonders whether or not the United Nations makes too much of talk and too little of deeds, thus "drumbeating every nerve-tingling issue." He wonders whether or not concern with the United Nations and its deliberations is given undue weight in our national policy formulation.

And so, Senator JACKSON raises three questions:

1. Do our present relations with the United Nations assist the wise definition of our vital interests and the establishment of sound policies?

2. Do we sometimes defer to the United Nations in the hope we may somehow escape the inescapable dilemmas of leadership?

3. Are we failing to make the most of the United Nations by encouraging it to attempt too much?

These are not unfriendly questions. They are entirely appropriate questions. It cannot be successfully denied that the United Nations has fallen short of perfection. Under these circumstances, any questions intelligently designed and motivated to increase the effectiveness of the United Nations should be applauded, not criticized. It should be borne in mind that, if the answers to the questions raised by Senator JACKSON were unfavorable to the status quo, we would not have proven that the United Nations has no value, but rather that its value would be enhanced if it were modified in some respects.

Is it worth it? The questioner may have had in mind the following: "In such an international organization isn't there an implicit diminution of our sovereignty, a dilution of our ability to defend ourselves and to insure our security which create an unacceptable danger to our vital interests?" The alternatives, of course, are isolationism or reliance upon the old power alliances, which themselves raise comparable questions of equal gravity.

I do not think we can really answer the question of the United Nations worth without giving some thought to the kind of world we would like to have and the obstacles on the road to achieving it.

The United Nations was born in 1942, when 26 nations signed the declaration which affirmed their union against the Axis Powers. The charter was signed by 50 nations in June of 1945 and went into force on October 24, 1945. There are now 104 members, not including Germany and Communist China, among others.

What were the aims of the charter nations?

Let us read the preamble of the United Nations Charter:

"We the peoples of the United Nations, determined to save succeeding generations from the scourge of war, which twice in our lifetime has brought untold sorrow to mankind, and to reaffirm faith in fundamental human rights, in the dignity and worth of the human person, in the equal rights of men and women of nations large and small; and

"To establish conditions under which justice and respect for the obligations aris-

ing from treaties and other sources of international law can be maintained; and

"To promote social progress and better standards of life in larger freedom; and

"For these ends to practice tolerance and live together in peace with one another as good neighbors; and

"To unite our strength to maintain international peace and security, and to insure, by the acceptance of principles and the institution of methods, that armed force shall not be used, save in the common interest; and

"To employ international machinery for the promotion of the economic and social advancement of all peoples,

"Have resolved to combine our efforts to accomplish these aims."

Is it worth it? Certainly these aims are worth it. The peoples of the charter nations believed in them with a purity and clarity refined in the crucible of a war from which they were emerging.

If all the peoples of the earth today were given an opportunity to reply in concert to a question raising the worthwhileness of these aims, they would answer with a thundering, "Yea".

The real question, in my judgment, is not, "Is it worth it?", but rather, "Can it do the job?" I think we have demonstrated that if, through the United Nations, we are pursuing the noble aims of that organization, and, however slight progress toward them may have been in the past, we have prospects for some progress in the future, then the United Nations is worth it. The financial costs are worth it. The risks are worth it. But the "if" is a big one.

Can it work?

The four basic purposes of the United Nations as stated in the charter are (1) to maintain international peace and security; (2) to develop friendly relations among nations, based on the principle of equal rights and self-determination of peoples; (3) to encourage the achievement of international cooperation in solving international problems of an economic, social, cultural, or humanitarian character; and (4) to serve as a center for harmonizing the actions of nations in the attainment of these common ends.

The most important of these objectives is the maintenance of international peace and security. But before we explore the performance and promise of the United Nations in that vital area, let us examine the record of the world organization in the other three categories of its purposes.

The development of friendly relations among nations is difficult to measure in objective terms. Like all human relationships, personal and collective, the relationships of nations are fluid. We cannot measure national interchanges in the same way we can chart the metabolism of an organism, the temperature of a furnace, or the orbit of a satellite.

But we can say, I think, that an organization of nations which has grown from 50 members in 1945 to 104 members, today, demonstrates a substantial trend toward self-determination. The fact that each of these nations, large or small, has an equal voice in the General Assembly—no matter how inconvenient such equality may be for us from time to time—is a remarkable achievement in a world dominated by monumental power struggles.

The growth of friendly relations depends to a large degree on the successes we may have in breaking the ancient barriers of ignorance, suspicion, poverty and disease. Outside the halls of the General Assembly and beyond the chambers of the Security Council, the United Nations has carried out the mundane tasks of eradicating disease, easing hunger, caring for the refugees, providing for the needs of children, stimulating education, encouraging economic and fiscal stability, aiding scientific cooperation, and pro-

viding vehicles for international conferences and programs on such varied subjects as labor and civil aviation. Its Human Rights Commission has been a moral force in encouraging the recognition of such rights in many areas of the world.

The alphabets of WHO (World Health Organization), UNICEF (United Nations Children's Fund), FAO (Food and Agriculture Organization), UNESCO (United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization), UNRRA (United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration), IRO (International Refugee Organization), SUNFED (Special United Nations Fund for Economic Development), ILO (International Labor Organization), and IMF (International Monetary Fund) represent a broad range of cooperative international ventures which would have been improbable if not impossible without the United Nations.

In my opinion, even if the United Nations had no other function than the stimulation of international cooperation in those areas of human need and interest unassociated with power politics, it would have a vital place in our world. In the long run, the relatively unpublicized work of the United Nations agencies in health, education, science, welfare, cultural interchange, economic development and adjustment, and human rights may be the most effective means of establishing true international understanding. Where men and women can work together for common goals which enhance the dignity of man they will learn the true meaning of brotherhood.

Increasingly, the United Nations is achieving its purpose of harmonizing the actions of nations in the attainment of these common ends, both through the cooperative agencies and organizations and the Economic and Social Council, and through the encouragement of such enterprises as the International Atomic Energy Agency and the International Geophysical Year.

It remains to be seen whether the United Nations will be able to harmonize the actions of the nations in the attainment of international peace and security.

Understandably, it is the peacekeeping or peacemaking machinery of the U.N. which carries the greatest burden of responsibility. It is in this area of activity that it is judged most severely.

The recent debate, apparently about to be resolved, over the proposed United Nations bond issue, highlights this fact. Part of the opposition to the bond issue is made up of those who oppose the United Nations per se. However, the chief participants in the debate, on both sides of the issue, have been those who believe in the United Nations but who disagree as to the best means for giving it necessary financial assistance at this time.

The chief criticism of the United Nations by those who have opposed the bond issue is that other nations are too ready to avoid their obligations to contribute, too ready to let Uncle Sam carry the load. They argue that the bond issue would encourage such nations to believe that Uncle Sam will bail them out always. It is argued by some of these critics that we should not enter into a long-term financing scheme until the United Nations is reorganized and payment of dues is made an absolute condition of membership.

On the other side of the question, the proponents for the bond issue argue that it would make support of such peacemaking operations as those in the Congo a part of the regular budget and thus bolster the principle of collective financial responsibility for United Nations operations; that repayment over 25 years would allow most members to pay without hardship.

Implicit, therefore, in all of these arguments, pro and con, is general agreement that the United Nations isn't worth it un-

less it is worth it to the other nations as well as to ourselves.

On this point, it is timely to refer to pertinent provisions of the United Nations Charter.

Article II of the Charter states:

"All members, in order to insure to all of them the rights and benefits resulting from membership, shall fulfill in good faith the obligations assumed by them in accordance with the present Charter."

The following provision is also found in Article II:

"All members shall give the United Nations every assistance in any action it takes in accordance with the present Charter."

Article IV, containing the requirements for membership, is also pertinent:

"Membership in the United Nations is open to all other peace-loving states which accept the obligations contained in the present Charter and, in the judgment of the organization, are able and willing to carry out these obligations."

All the present members of the United Nations, then, have accepted the obligations of the Charter, and have been found able and willing to carry out these obligations. Thus if the United Nations is worth it to them, there is no excuse for any failure on their part to support it.

In the very first session of the General Assembly in 1946 consideration was given to the question of assessing the costs of the organization. It was decided that, in general, costs should be shared on the basis of capacity to pay. The United States objected to the literal application of this standard for two reasons: (1) That because the equality of the sovereign members is recognized by equal votes in the General Assembly, no one state should pay a disproportionate share of the costs; and (2) it would not be good for one member to pay such a large share lest it have a predominating influence on the activities of the organization. And so, the General Assembly fixed a ceiling which started at 39.89 percent, which later dropped to 33.33 percent, and which is now 32.03 percent, on the amount which should be paid by any one member. It also fixed a floor of 0.04 percent.

Thus, it was recognized, at the very outset that the United Nations, if it is to succeed, must not be the financial ward of any one nation, and must be supported by all nations. However much we believe in its aims, we must recognize this principle as essential.

And so, it is fundamental that the United Nations is not worth it unless there is a chance that it can work, and it won't work unless its members believe in it and are willing to contribute to its resources and to give it support.

There are two other serious questions affecting the United Nations which ought to be considered by anyone interested in evaluating its future potential.

First, do we rely too heavily on the international organization in situations that affect our national interests? Is there a serious risk in entrusting the pursuit of important national interests to a mechanism the next twists and turns of which one cannot predict?

I doubt that these questions can be answered by a generalization. Only a case-by-case review of the crises, which have confronted the world since the United Nations was created, would give us a valid answer. I am sure that following such a review, it might be concluded that, in some instances, we have relied upon the United Nations too little, and in others, too much. I think it has been our general policy to use it as another tool, an important tool, in the arsenal for peace.

The United Nations Charter itself recognizes this—that in the world of reality in which we live, the Organization itself will not be, and should not be, the exclusive tool. The charter recognizes regional arrangements

such as NATO, and the Organization of Latin American States.

We have continued to use the normal channels of diplomacy and other approaches to nations with different points of view in an effort to accommodate those differences and to relieve tension.

To put all of our eggs in the United Nations basket would be a serious mistake. The United Nations cannot yet carry that kind of responsibility and it would be suicidal for us to entrust that kind of responsibility to it.

Therefore, it is highly appropriate that we review the charter and our experience under it, with a view to determining whether it is as effective a tool as present world conditions would permit.

And then there is the second question which I would raise, as I close. In a world dominated by the two superpowers is it reasonable to expect that an organization, which has no being outside of the members, can be an effective force for peace?

On this point I would like to suggest the following observations:

1. World opinion, whatever it is, does influence, and has demonstrably influenced, both of the superpowers. The United Nations is the best forum in existence for mobilizing such opinion.

2. The world constantly changes. New alignments of nations spring up. Old ones break down. Other forces, potential or actual, of a dimension to give the major powers pause, spring into being. Only a few illustrations are necessary to make the point. The European Common Market, with its rapidly accelerating economic force and its potential political cohesiveness, cannot be ignored by either of the superpowers. Red China, with its increasing independence of the Soviet Union, represents another change. The developing nations with their hundreds of millions of restless, yearning, underprivileged peoples, are an explosive force which can create havoc in the world if not directed into constructive channels.

3. Technological and scientific changes can shift the balance of power in the world overnight.

4. Internal changes, within the boundaries of the superpowers themselves, can affect the national goals and intentions.

And so, even the superpowers, as they face the uncertainties of the future, cannot regard themselves as self-sufficient. They cannot afford to be reckless. They must be concerned with the intentions, the growth, and the resources of nations other than themselves.

Is the United Nations worth it? Its aims, as stated in the preamble of the charter, certainly are.

There is no alternative means to seek those aims. If we were to abandon the United Nations we would have to create other similar means. We cannot isolate ourselves from the problems of the world. We cannot isolate ourselves from the impact of those who might seek to destroy us. We cannot isolate ourselves from the millions over the globe whose aspirations motivate them to break out of the prison of their present circumstances. Being of the world, we must be a part of it.

It is not easy to recall instances of United Nations successes. But there have been such. Most of them have related to its activities outside its peace machinery. Even with respect to the objective of maintaining the peace, in all fairness, I think it can be said that the world would be in a far worse state than it is but for the existence and the efforts of the United Nations Organization since 1945.

It is well to recall the frustrations and disappointments which plagued the Founding Fathers of our system of government in the years between the victory at Yorktown and the adoption of the Constitution. Those were the years when, for the first time

in the history of the world, freemen were given an opportunity to choose their form of government and to govern themselves.

Their first choice, the Articles of Confederation, was a poor one. For lack of proper authority in the Central Government, national problems were neglected. The Thirteen Colonies began to emerge, not as a single nation, but as 13 nations, jealous of each other, erecting trade barriers against each other, creating competing currencies, and contributing rapidly to a declining prestige abroad. On both sides of the Atlantic, serious questions were raised as to whether or not it was possible for freemen to govern themselves.

So strong did the doubts become that veterans of Washington's army pleaded with him to make himself king.

When the forefathers gathered in Philadelphia, their primary concern was to find a practicable means for freemen to consider common problems and to arrive at common decisions. Their second choice was a good one. And since that time, this country has survived and prospered and grown in influence throughout the world because the means have proven to be practicable.

I am not suggesting that a central world government is the answer. That is too easy a parallel to draw and a dangerous conclusion to reach. I am saying that we have demonstrated that a government of law, under which people of diverse background and problems may reach common decisions, is possible.

The fact that the United Nations has not proved to be a perfect instrument—and indeed it has been a very imperfect instrument—is not a reason to abandon it. Rather, we should continue to work at it as the Founding Fathers did at Philadelphia to define the means for meeting the objective.

Sovereign nations of different traditions, races, problems, resources, and goals must learn to live together under international law. Not only do I think this is not too much to hope for, but, on the contrary, unless there is some hope for it, there is no future for mankind.

Mr. HRUSKA obtained the floor.

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Nebraska yield to me, with the understanding that he will not lose the floor?

Mr. HRUSKA. I yield to the Senator from New Hampshire with that understanding.

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Nebraska for yielding to me for a brief statement. For reasons which I have explained to him, I desire to speak at this time concerning the subject which has been under discussion for several days.

Mr. President, I believe in making every necessary sacrifice and taking every action essential to the preservation of the United Nations. An association of the nations of the world to substitute law for war has been the dream and the hope of humanity beginning with The Hague peace conferences, continuing through the ill-fated League of Nations, and, after World War II, embodied in the United Nations. The questions presented by the President's proposal to purchase U.N. bonds and by the various substitute and alternative proposals advanced, have caused me deep concern and long and painful consideration.

The money involved, even though it must be borrowed by us, does not greatly disturb me. If it would help preserve the United Nations as an effective instru-

ment for peace, the financial expenditure is indeed almost trifling. There are other questions, however, that are not trifling.

The first is whether it will benefit the United Nations. The U.N. cannot be a potent force unless it commands the respect and support of at least the great majority of its members. Some 80-odd member nations are at present in arrears in their dues or assessments. Obviously the majority of these could pay them if they thought it worth while to do so. This does not indicate confidence in, or respect for, the United Nations. It will not restore such respect if the United States condones the apparent indifference of all these members by taking over, in even greater degree than our present large quota, the support of the U.N. Indeed, it will have, in my opinion, exactly the contrary effect and be a further blow to U.N. prestige. This might not be true if it were merely a loan on definite terms for a definite time. I would willingly vote for that. The method of issuing long-term bonds, with the United States buying the major portion of them, only too obviously means that we shall be assuming an increasing share of the burden as time goes on. We shall be financing projects, including actual warfare, that the United States and its representatives to the U.N. may or may not approve. It is fatuous to believe that the present bond issue would not be followed by others, because this one would merely tide over the present emergency. Furthermore, if the United States, as a long-term policy, assumes a disproportionate share of the cost of the United Nations, our enemies and ill-wishers will use it as an argument that the U.N. is our own instrument in international affairs. This would be a further blow to the influence of the U.N. Thus, my own chief concern and my own principal reason for doubting the wisdom of embarking on the bond-purchase method is for the welfare of the United Nations rather than our own.

As the various compromises and substitutes have been advanced and discussed, another grave objection developed in my mind. One feature of almost every suggestion is that Congress surrender to the President *carte blanche* authority to obligate the United States and pledge its credit, in most cases without definite restrictions as to amount, terms of repayment if any, and time. To be sure, under the Constitution the President has important and, in many cases, exclusive powers in dealing with foreign relations. The purse strings, however, are constitutionally in the hands of the people's Congress and should remain so. We must earnestly seek to preserve the U.N. as an international tribunal, but if, in our zeal to do so, we permit a world organization to undermine the fundamental separation of the executive and legislative branches of our Government, we are destroying our own freedoms. If we destroy the checks and balances that preserve the freedoms of our own Republic, there is little left for us to contribute to free government throughout the world.

At this point and in the confusion of proposals and counterproposals, I am not prepared to define exactly what steps I shall vote for or against, but it is my hope that I may have the opportunity to vote for some form of direct loan to the United Nations, the terms and limits of which will be clearly defined and which will not obligate us to assume disproportionate responsibilities in the future. I further hope that I may have the chance to vote for a form of assistance that clearly reflects the intention of Congress to retain its control over all such expenditures in the future.

I shall be most reluctant to vote for any measure that does not preserve these two elements.

The increasing pressure by our people that we give immediate and adequate aid to the United Nations at this time is, in my opinion, reassuring. It means that the people of the United States and Congress which reflects their will can be relied upon to take allwise and necessary measures to preserve the United Nations. Therefore, there is no need of our adopting a means which would abrogate the powers and responsibilities of Congress and surrender them to the Executive.

ALASKA STEAMSHIP RATES "UNJUST AND UNREASONABLE," FEDERAL MARITIME COMMISSION'S EXAMINER FINDS

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, I have on previous occasions taken the floor to call to the attention of the Senate the great burden borne by all Alaskans because of excessively high steamship rates. I have in the past pointed out the major role played by the Alaska Steamship Co. in the boosting of these rates.

It must be remembered that Alaska is not contiguous to the remainder of the United States. It is dependent upon water carriers for the receipt of the staples of life. And, over the years, dominant among these water carriers, has been the Alaska Steamship Co.

In April 1958 Alaska Steamship Co. rates were raised 15 percent.

In January 1960—less than 2 years later—the Alaska Steamship Co. sought to institute an additional 10-percent increase.

In the meantime, Alaska had been admitted to the Union, and as its elected representatives, the Alaskan congressional delegation protested vigorously. The Governor of the State, the Honorable William A. Egan, instructed the attorney general for the State, Ralph Moody, to contest the proposed increase before the then Maritime Board, which had responsibility for both regulating and promoting transportation by water carrier. The attorney general retained as the State's able local counsel, the Washington, D.C., firm of Chapman & Friedman.

A suspension of the effective date of the proposed rate increase was requested, but in vain. The rate increase was permitted by the Board to go into effect on January 10, 1960, although the Board did issue an order requiring the amount of

the increase to be kept in an escrow account to be returned to the shippers if the increase were not allowed.

During the course of the hearings before the hearing examiner it was brought to light that this escrow account was not established by the Alaska Steamship Co., but no action was instituted to establish such an account.

Yesterday, the hearing examiner issued his preliminary report. I am pleased to note that the hearing examiner has found that the increased rates of the Alaska Steamship Co. "have not been shown to be just and reasonable for the future." That is good. It shows progress. Alaska's history is of rate increase after rate increase for water transportation being granted automatically.

I am, however, disappointed, as no doubt Alaskans generally will be, that the hearing examiner found the "increased rates as specified are not shown to have been unjust, unreasonable, or otherwise unlawful during the pendency of this proceeding." I find it most difficult to follow this reasoning which concludes that the rates were not unjust, unreasonable, or otherwise unlawful in the past 2 years that they have been in effect but become such in the future. I shall await with great interest and much hope the action of the Maritime Commission in reviewing the hearing examiner's recommendation as to the higher rates charged in the past.

I am also at a loss to understand the reasoning by which the hearing examiner takes it upon itself to recommend to the Board that the order that the respondents shall keep account of all freight moneys received by reason of the increased rates and make refund of any increased charges in excess of those determined to be just, reasonable, and otherwise lawful should be vacated. In view of the fact that the Board originally refused to stay the rise in rates but attempted to soften the blow upon the people of Alaska by creating the escrow fund, the recommended nonaction in regard to these overpayments during the last 2 years is hard to understand.

I was pleased that in accordance with the statements which I have made in the past concerning the uses of funds derived from Alaska shipping could bear scrutiny to note that the examiner recommended:

Alaska Steam claims as operating expenses donations of \$39,620 in 1958 and \$10,500 in 1959 made to Skinner Foundation Trust. The latter was created about 1956 by the officers of Skinner Corp. to receive the charitable contributions of Alaska Steam and its affiliates, and to disburse the receipts for charitable purposes in the various cities where any of the corporations might be called upon for contributions to organizations such as the Salvation Army, United Good Neighbor Fund, Boy Scouts of America, American Cancer Society, and National Foundation for Infantile Paralysis. The trust was established to create a fund for charitable purposes from which contributions could be made annually without regard to the profit position of the particular participating companies in any one year, and to earn

income on any funds held between time of receipt and time of disbursement which would enhance the value of the contributions. While the contributions shown above by Alaska Steam, and similar contributions by its affiliates, are for a laudable purpose, they cannot be deemed to be operating expenses chargeable to the Alaskan trade, since to do so would impose upon the shipping public a double burden of meeting not only their own civic responsibilities but those of the contributors to Skinner Foundation Trust as well. The examiner, therefore, quite properly recommended that these donations must be disallowed as operating expenses.

The initial decision by the hearing examiner in this case is long and complicated and must be studied further carefully in order to examine all its implications and ramifications.

MRS. JELIZA PRENDIC MILENOVIC

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, I ask that the Chair lay before the Senate the message from the House of Representatives amending S. 270.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BURDICK in the chair) laid before the Senate the amendment of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 270) for the relief of Mrs. Jeliza Prendic Milenovic, which was, to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That the Attorney General is authorized and directed to cancel any outstanding orders and warrants of deportation, warrants of arrest, and bond, which may have issued in the case of Mrs. Jeliza Prendic Milenovic. From and after the date of the enactment of this Act, the said Mrs. Jeliza Prendic Milenovic shall not again be subject to deportation by reason of the same facts upon which such deportation proceedings were commenced or any such warrants and orders have issued.

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, on June 29, 1961, the Senate passed S. 270, to grant the status of permanent residence in the United States to the beneficiary.

On August 22, 1961, the House of Representatives passed S. 270, with an amendment to provide merely for the cancellation of outstanding deportation proceedings.

I move that the Senate concur in the House amendment to S. 270.

The motion was agreed to.

DESIGNATION OF WEEK OF MARCH 25, 1962, AS VOLUNTARY OVERSEAS AID WEEK

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, I ask that the Chair lay before the Senate the amendments of the House of Representatives to Senate Concurrent Resolution 61.

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the amendments of the House of Representatives to the concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 61) requesting the President to designate the week of March 25, 1962, as Voluntary Overseas Aid Week, which were, to strike out the preamble; on page 2, line 7, strike out "March 25, 1962," and insert "April 9, 1962," and to amend the title so as

to read: "Concurrent resolution requesting the President to designate the week of April 9, 1962, as Voluntary Overseas Aid Week."

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, on March 16, 1962, the Senate passed Senate Concurrent Resolution 61, requesting the President to issue a proclamation designating the week of March 25, 1962, as Voluntary Overseas Aid Week.

On April 2, the House of Representatives passed Senate Concurrent Resolution 61 with amendments, changing the date of Voluntary Overseas Aid Week from the week of March 25, 1962, to the week of April 9, 1962, and striking from the resolution the preamble.

I move that the Senate concur in the House amendments to Senate Concurrent Resolution 61.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Nebraska.

The motion was agreed to.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE—ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, one of its reading clerks, announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills and joint resolution, and they were signed by the Vice President:

S. 193. An act for the relief of Rev. Patrick Floyd;

S. 899. An act for the relief of Liu Shul Chen;

S. 1305. An act for the relief of Kazuo Ito and Satomi Ito;

S. 1520. An act for the relief of Mary Elizabeth Sidor Polkowska;

S. 1578. An act for the relief of Edward Yin Liang;

S. 1638. An act for the relief of Felix Laidina Mendoza;

S. 1841. An act for the relief of Maria Zambetoulla;

S. 1874. An act for the relief of Roland Fernando Mishutani;

S. 2018. An act for the relief of Robert B. Kasperek, Robert M. Kearny, Richard A. Stokes, J. R. Whitehouse, Jr., and Herbert A. Wolff, Jr.;

S. 2101. An act for the relief of Aida Mary Sorino Boccalery; and

H.J. Res. 441. Joint resolution to commemorate the 75th anniversary of the Interstate Commerce Commission.

UNITED NATIONS BONDS PURCHASE

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 2768) to promote the foreign policy of the United States by authorizing the purchase of United Nations bonds and the appropriation of funds therefor.

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, I wish to address myself to the pending business. How will this country extend financing to the United Nations? Will it be along the lines outlined in the proposed substitute, or in the manner indicated by the various amendments which have been printed and now lie on the desks of the Members of the Senate.

The issue is not whether the United Nations as an organization is worthy, whether it is discharging its mission, or whether it has failed therein. The issue

is not even whether the United Nations should receive financial help from the United States—for it is fairly well understood that such help will be forthcoming.

The question before us is the kind of help and the conditions under which it will be extended. The other subjects are worthy of consideration, but they should be debated at the proper time and place.

Earlier this afternoon the Senator from Georgia stated his criticism of the United Nations. He was constructive in nature. It was keen, and was quite perceptive in probing many of the activities of the United Nations. On March 20, the Senator from Washington [Mr. Jackson] delivered a splendid address to the National Press Club. On Monday of this week, the distinguished majority leader discussed the development of the United Nations and the place it has on today's scene.

All these analyses are to be encouraged, as they focus national attention on basic issues regarding the future of the U.N.

The issue now before us, however, is not whether financial help should be extended to the United Nations by the United States. From the expressions which have been made during the debate on the floor and from discussions elsewhere, it is clear that the overwhelming sentiment of the Members of the Senate is that the United States should give financial help to the United Nations.

The question that is before us now deals only with the terms and conditions under which that help shall be extended. It is on this question that I shall speak at this time.

First of all, the President's original proposal called for a \$100 million appropriation for the purchase of United Nations 25-year bonds which would pay 2 percent interest. As debate on that issue ensued, there was a counterproposal—which later came to be known as the Aiken-Hickenlooper substitute. It called for a 3-year loan of \$100 million at the average rate of interest currently being paid by the Government which probably would be near 3 percent.

During the time this counterproposal was being formulated, there was substantial, persistent, and very logical criticism of the President's original proposal. That criticism was well documented by Senators who were eminently qualified to speak as experts in the field of foreign relations. The points made by these Senators were well taken, and they found growing support.

Then, Mr. President, suddenly—almost overnight—there was the astonishing and almost electrifying announcement: "A compromise." We were told of a meeting of the minds between the defenders of the original proposal and supporters of the substitute. Since that time there has been a tendency to forget all the suggestions which were so well voiced and all the criticisms which were so soundly advanced. Now they are thrown aside.

Mr. President, it has already been stated several times here on the floor of the Senate—but I should like to repeat it—that what is called "a compromise"

is no compromise at all. It has been truly a surrender, a complete capitulation. The so-called "compromise" calls for authority to appropriate \$100 million to be loaned to the United Nations. No interest rate is specified; in fact, no interest is required. No term is specified. No maturity is specified. No requirement or limitation by way of repayment terms is made; nor is there any condition regarding the making of annual payments.

During the debate on the so-called "compromise," a bond was defined as a loan; and under the terms of the "compromise" the President is to be free—without any kind of restraint or limitation—to purchase up to the proposed maximum of \$100 million.

Mr. President, obviously the so-called "compromise" is no compromise at all. It would give the President more than he requested in the first place. The so-called "compromise" would concede everything for which the opposition contended. In effect, after the President asked for a white horse and was offered a black horse, the black horse was shot, and the President was given two white horses. Now, we hear that arrangement being called a "compromise."

Mr. President, so far as I am concerned, I will not support the so-called "compromise." I was convinced by the arguments made by the opponents of the proposed 25-year bond issue. When that proposal was first considered, they argued very well against it, and their arguments were persuasive.

No reasons are stated now why these objections are no longer to be considered applicable. In short, I still believe them to be sound. Certainly there should be guidelines and some reasonable limitations. Congress should not abdicate its responsibilities in making them clear.

The Senator from New Hampshire stated the case well when he said, just before I began these remarks, that of course the President is in charge of our foreign policy. It should be in the hands of one man, namely, the Chief Executive of our Nation. But, by the same token, the Constitution which defines the responsibility for handling foreign policy, also charges the Congress with the responsibility for producing revenue and for the appropriation thereof.

So I say, Mr. President, the Congress should not abdicate their responsibilities, particularly when the alternative invites such loose and risky handling of the people's money.

What are some of the objections which have been voiced to the purchase of \$100 million worth of these U.N. bonds?

Under the substitute proposed, a bond is considered as a loan. The President may buy these 25-year bonds, as originally proposed, and very likely will do so. Those bonds have been the subject of substantial criticism, as I have mentioned. Nowhere is it as well compiled as in the Senate Foreign Relations Committee Report No. 1277 on Senate bill 2768, on "Purchase of United Nations Bonds."

To get the full benefit of these reasons, I ask unanimous consent that they be set forth in the Record at this point,

starting with line 13 on page 6 to and including paragraph numbered 11 on page 7 of the report.

There being no objection, the excerpts were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Members who objected to approval of the 25-year bond proposal, however, made the following points:

1. Present and potential financial difficulties for the United Nations arise from the failure of many nations to pay assessments for peace and security operations which were undertaken with their political support. Thus, in the case of the Congo, some 70 states supported United Nations actions there, but 62 states have failed to make contributions to the costs of the Congo operation. If the United Nations is to get such operations on a sound financial basis, the sooner the better. Approval of the bond issue, rather than some short-term financial alternative, will discourage, rather than encourage, this result.

2. The answer to the United Nations financial difficulties must be found by promoting cash payments on their past assessments now from members who feel a sense of obligation to keep the United Nations operating as a multilateral organization.

3. A short-term loan, or a grant, would provide time for the United Nations to receive the advisory opinion of the World Court, determine the effect of that decision on collection of arrearages for the Middle East and Congo operations, and develop a means of keeping the United Nations operating on a cash basis.

4. Although the bond issue is said not to be a precedent, and the bond resolution so provides, there is clearly the danger that if the United States buys half of the \$200 million issue there will be a great temptation for this method of financing to become the practice in the United Nations. It is therefore better not to start down that road.

5. The bond issue simply postpones the day when United Nations members who have readily voted for the organization to undertake expensive operations become equally responsible about paying the bill. The bond issue tends to encourage the irresponsible nations to think they can continue shifting an undue burden to others. While it is true that 58 nations voted in favor of the bond resolution, 13 voted against it and 33 states abstained or were absent, indicating that perhaps as many as 46 states did not support the bond idea.

6. The rate of interest to be paid on the bonds, 2 percent, is too low, considering that interest rates in the United States on Government borrowings is in the neighborhood of 4 percent (which is a lower rate than prevails in most other countries).

7. If the United States buys half of the bond issue in order to "provide leadership" there is a serious hazard that too many other countries will wait to see whether that amount might not suffice.

8. It would be wise not to decide now whether the United States should buy bonds because the World Court has not rendered its opinion. There is the possibility that the Court opinion will not be favorable, in which event a far more substantial bond issue would undoubtedly be required. On the other hand, assuming that the Court will render an entirely favorable opinion, there are many states now in arrears which, when faced with such a Court decision, will be willing to pay their past debts and will be willing to put the Middle East and Congo operations back on a pay-as-you-go basis without resort to the use of the bond proceeds.

9. Rather than get bogged down in long-term indebtedness the United Nations should reconsider its decision of December 1961 in the light of the World Court decision ex-

pected in early summer. Meanwhile the United Nations could borrow on a short-term basis from the United States and other nations until it can come to agreement on a new assessment policy for peacekeeping operations.

10. Those who supported a substitute for the purchase of United Nations bonds pointed out that purchase of one-half of the total United Nations issue would involve a net cost to the United States of \$108,634,480. The following table is a summary of U.S. receipts and disbursements calculated on an annual basis.

U.S. receipts and disbursements on purchase of 1/2 of \$200,000,000 bond issue of the United Nations

	In	Out
Principal amount of U.S. purchase.....		\$100,000,000
3.9 percent interest on annual balances of U.S. borrowing for bond purchase.....		54,740,400
32 percent (U.S. share of U.N. regular budget) of United Nations 2-percent interest costs (\$86,144,000) on annual balances of entire bond issue.....		17,966,080
32 percent of United Nations repayments of principal.....		64,000,000
2 percent United Nations interest payments to United States on outstanding annual balances.....	\$28,072,000	
United Nations repayment of principal to United States.....	100,000,000	
Total.....	128,072,000	236,706,480
Net cost to United States.....		108,634,480

11. In lieu of the purchase of 25-year United Nations bonds, an amendment in the nature of a substitute was considered. That amendment would have authorized a 3-year loan to the United Nations of not to exceed \$100 million at a rate of interest substantially equal to the average rate of U.S. Treasury borrowings—currently about 3 percent. Adoption of this proposal, argued its proponents, would relieve the United Nations of its current financial difficulties and provide an adequate period of time to receive the opinion of the World Court and then determine what, if any, action might be required.

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, let us note that these points were made in a constructive spirit. They were made following hearings in the Foreign Relations Committee on this proposal. These objections and criticisms were made for the purpose of improving the situation.

The Aiken-Hickenlooper amendment, contained in paragraph 11 on page 7 of the committee report, was proposed by two Senators, who have served as delegates to the United Nations, are very friendly to that organization as they have recently stated and ably demonstrated, and have had long years of conscientious and notable service on the Foreign Relations Committee.

Neither they, nor those who act and speak on any such important and far reaching a measure as the one we are now considering, do so lightly or ill advisedly. In the report and on this floor they dealt telling blows to the idea of long-term bonds.

A principal objection to the purchase of the bonds is that it would tend to prevent the U.N. from continuing as a truly multilateral organization. Inevitably it would cause the organization to become constantly more dependent upon the beneficence of the United States. It was

stated on the floor in the debate, as found on page 4664 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

If we show a willingness to pick up the tab for every project for which the 104 members, or the majority of 104 members, of the United Nations see fit to appropriate, then we shall have a permanent job so long as the U.N. lasts, and we shall be expected to pay those costs indefinitely.

At another point in that same speech, it was said:

But the American people are fed up with supporting an organization which is willing to vote its convictions, but not willing to give token support to the action which it has voted.

The nonpayment record of the United Nations members has been recounted often in recent weeks. I will refer to it again briefly to make the point clearer in the present context.

Seventy members out of eighty-two then in the U.N. voted for the resolution endorsing U.N. action in the Congo and appealing to "all member governments for urgent voluntary contributions to a U.N. fund for the Congo."

Sixty-two of those nations have paid nothing toward the so-called voluntary contributions.

During the entire calendar year 1961, the United States was the only Nation which paid its voluntary contribution.

Out of the 99 members who were assessed for the Congo operation for the period covering January 1 to October 31 of 1961, only 25 have paid their assessment in full.

Also, in 1961 the United States donated another \$15 million, which was used to reduce by 80 percent the Congo assessments of 75 nations.

It is for this reason that it is well to note the language at page 6 of the report of the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations:

If the United Nations is to get such operations on a sound fiscal basis, the sooner the better. Approval of the bond issue, rather than some short-term financial alternative, will discourage, rather than encourage, this result.

The report also points out that "there will be a great temptation for this method of financing to become the practice in the U.N. It is better not to start down that road."

The bond issue—

The report at page 6 continues—

simply postpones the day when United Nations members who have readily voted for the organization to undertake expensive operations become equally responsible about paying the bill. The bond issue tends to encourage the irresponsible nations to think they can continue shifting an undue burden to others.

And I read further:

If the United States buys half of the bond issue in order to "provide leadership" there is a serious hazard that too many other countries will wait to see whether that amount might not suffice.

Mr. President, I quote quite extensively here in order to give the full tenor of the reasoning which has been advanced against long-term bonds. None of these reasons has any less application to the

situation now before us. These objections are just as inescapable now as they were before the formulation of a so-called "compromise." Yet, under this plan the President may still purchase the long-term bonds, and will be given more latitude than he would have had under the original proposal.

The question may well be asked as to whether the bond issue will encourage irresponsible nations to continue to shift their burdens to other nations.

And, Mr. President, it goes further than that, as developed in the following colloquy between the Senator from Kentucky and the Senator from Vermont, at page 4667 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for March 21:

Mr. MORROW. 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.

There we have the conclusions of two men who are experts in this field. Here is the Senator from Kentucky, who served as an Assistant Secretary of State with great credit, and the Senator from Vermont who has served not only as a delegate to the United Nations but who has also served so creditably through the years as a member of the Foreign Relations Committee.

The basis for the fears they express is still present. There is nothing new about the so-called compromise bill which would lessen them. In fact, the compromise would increase whatever apprehensions there were before.

It was said in the debate in later days, at page 5646:

This proposal gives the President a leverage over the financing of the U.N. which he could not have had under the original bill.

This proposal does indeed put great responsibility upon the President, but, in my opinion, that is where the responsibility belongs.

In short, the Executive is to be given unrestricted freedom of action, and that is exactly what the Congress must fully realize. It certainly is no argument for the bill—but rather a devastating argument against it.

Would the issuance of bonds solve the U.N.'s problem? The opponents did not think so, for at page 4666 of the RECORD it was stated:

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.

This objection is just as sound now as it was when those words were uttered on March 21.

The merits of a short-term loan, to give to the United Nations an opportunity to set its fiscal house in order, are as strong now as they were when the proposal was first advanced which virtually authorized the President to act without guidelines or conditions spelled out by the Congress and without any restriction or limitation whatsoever imposed upon the authorization.

In the original Presidential message on this subject, on January 30 of this year, these words are to be found:

I ask that the Congress act now to back the U.N. by authorizing the purchase of these bonds. Failure to act would serve the interests of the Soviet Union * * *.

Whatever else these words may mean, certainly they express a strange attitude on the part of those urging long-range financial assistance. They reveal as well a peculiar misconception of the basic reasons why a short-term loan was offered as an alternative to the proposal. In either respect, the interests of responsible legislation will not be advanced by such remarks.

The action which we are considering, is of considerable moment because it also contains the possibility of a precedent.

The request is made by the United Nations for \$200 million. Within 2 years, according to those who know the subject, the United Nations would be compelled to call upon some other method, or upon an extension of this method, for further financing. There is the Middle East operation. There is the Congo operation. There are other areas as to which a majority of the General Assembly might vote for an expenditure of funds. I have already read that proposition from the colloquy between the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. MORTON] and the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN].

It would be well to remember the precedent of the 4-year Marshall plan which was proposed in 1947. It was to be a 4-year plan, involving a few billions of dollars. As I remember the figure, it was to be approximately \$19 billion, plus perhaps \$2 or \$3 billion to be procured from the World Bank.

Now, 15 years and \$75 to \$100 billion later, there is a constant demand for even more billions for the foreign aid program, which is crushing the American taxpayer and thwarting our ability to function as an effective leader in the world and as a solvent, self-governing Republic.

We cannot say that it could not happen. It has happened. It happened once, and there is no reason why we should think that it is not likely to happen to the United Nations.

In that connection, I wish to say there have been a number of criticisms of the United Nations as such. It is my recollection that the Senator from Montana, the distinguished majority leader, in his remarks on Monday of this week pointed out that the United Nations has become quite distorted from its original concept. The Security Council was intended to serve as an arbiter, as a balance wheel, in handling situations which

might develop to threaten the peace of the world.

The General Assembly was not designed for that purpose.

Yet, as times goes on, we have found the General Assembly becoming more involved with such problems. In a desperate effort to prevent total war, it has become a marketplace for trading votes. As was said by the Senator from Montana, it appears to be a place strikingly similar to the steps of the county courthouse, where men engage in trivial politics.

Mr. President, unless we take great care, this trend is going to continue. There will be further trading of votes and further incursions upon the domain of the Security Council, in an effort to cause the United Nations, which has 104 members and 104 votes, to fulfill the declarations of its charter. This problem certainly should be approached with caution. Expedient solutions should be spurned.

Mr. President, the Senate should reject this specious compromise. We should act prudently in undertaking to extend financial assistance to the United Nations. There should be some guidelines and conditions. There should be an effort on our part to deal with realities and to look beyond the moment in formulating a plan to see the United Nations through its financial straits.

Several alternatives have been proposed which would give this direction. Earlier this afternoon the Senator from Georgia proposed one. There are various other substitutes and amendments pending. No doubt more will be offered.

The Senate has the responsibility of devising a plan that sets out the essential conditions which will insure the success of the loan. The situation calls for better treatment than the pending compromise if the United Nations is to be preserved as a strong, truly multi-lateral organization with an ability to make true progress toward its declared goal.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I know that the Senator from Texas [Mr. TOWER] desires to speak. Before he does so, however, I shall take only a few minutes to say that today there was delivered to me a letter from the President of the United States, copies of which have been made available for Senators and the press. I think it might be well to read the letter into the RECORD in order that we may have it before us, and in order that all Senators may have an opportunity to know its contents. It is addressed to me, and reads as follows:

APRIL 3, 1962.

HON. JOHN J. SPARKMAN,
United States Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR JOHN: In response to your inquiry concerning the Mansfield-Dirksen amendment introduced yesterday as a substitute for the U.N. bond issue bill (S. 2768 as reported by the Senate Foreign Relations Committee), I am glad to make clear my view that it is a wholly satisfactory substitute. It upholds Presidential responsibility in foreign affairs with just the right combination of discretionary authority and legislative guidelines; and I appreciate the good intentions of those Members—such as Senators

AIKEN and DIRKSEN—which led to this new version, and the good faith with which they have subscribed to it.

I want to assure the Members of the Senate that the funds made available under this measure will be promptly used, as necessary, in this or the next calendar year in the manner most likely to minimize the outlays of the United States, maximize the contributions of others and put the essential operations of the United Nations on a sound financial basis. The money will be loaned in such a way as to insure repayment of both principal and interest in annual installments; and, as stated in section 1 of the substitute, it shall be the intention of the executive as well as the legislative branch that the proceeds not be used to relieve other U.N. members of their obligations to make good on past assessments on which they are in arrears. I might add that it is equally clear that these proceeds are not to be used to pay the assessments of other members.

I am also in agreement with the intention stated in section 4 of the substitute that this Nation use its best efforts to strengthen the pattern of U.N. financing in such a way as to make unnecessary any future large-scale borrowing. Steps to be taken in pursuit of this goal would include efforts to improve the administration of fiscal affairs in the Secretariat and constituent agencies and bolster the existing fiscal office and officers. In addition, as a supplement to the present annual report to the Congress on United Nations affairs, I shall ask the Department of State to make a semiannual report setting forth all the fiscal operations of the United Nations, including but not limited to assessments, arrearages, and payments on the principal and interest of all U.N. loans, together with such other information as will indicate, among other things, the status and prospects of United Nations financing and the progress being made in fulfilling the objectives set forth in this section of the Mansfield-Dirksen substitute.

In conclusion, I want to stress again how harmful it would be to repudiate this arm of American foreign relations at this time—and how helpful the Mansfield-Dirksen substitute would be in demonstrating bipartisan unity in these matters. My personal congratulations to you for the fine job you have done in providing leadership on this measure.

Sincerely,

JOHN F. KENNEDY.

I believe that a careful reading and study of the letter will demonstrate that it answers a good many of the questions that Senators have been inclined to raise as to how the proposed authority would be used.

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

Mr. SPARKMAN. I yield.

Mr. HRUSKA. It was with great interest that I read the letter. I was hoping that the text of it would come to my attention before I made my remarks. It seems to me that this letter does not in any way obviate the necessity for the Senate to place in the bill some of the guidelines and standards to which I have referred in my principal remarks. I believe that it would be a sorry state of affairs, indeed, if 10 years from now the World Court should be called upon to construe the terms of a loan that had been made in 1962 on the basis of Senate bill 2768 and the letter read by the Senator from Alabama. The citation that would be presented to the Court at that time might be as follows:

The authority is Public Law X, which is the outgrowth of the bill S. 2768 and a let-

ter from the White House dated April 3, reading thus and so.

If the President has in mind insuring repayment of both the principal and interest in annual installments, that would be a good provision to insert in the bill. I am sure he would not object to its being inserted.

If this is the President's intention, surely it would do no harm to put the provision in the proposed legislation which we are now considering. Notwithstanding the letter, the arguments made for passing a measure containing standards and guidelines which reflect the composite judgment of the elected representatives of the people are sound, and such provisions should be included.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me, with the indulgence of the Senator from Texas?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I yield to the Senator from New York briefly. The Senator from Texas is waiting.

Mr. JAVITS. I, too, have read the letter. It goes a long way toward justifying the so-called compromise, and to answer the points which have been made against it.

First, the statement has been made that the amendment does not mean anything. The President has shown that under its provisions his hands would be free from the resolution of the United Nations with relation to bonds. The President has indicated that under the amendment he would have freedom of action. I hope very much that the amendment will be agreed to, and I hope that a majority of my party will vote for it and support the minority leader, the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] in that effort.

The letter shows that the President's hands are untied with relation to the specific terms of the original bill, which was specifically related to the U.N. resolution.

Second, the President has undertaken commitments which the amendment would require him to undertake. Those relate to the payment of the obligations, including assessments, of other members which might be in arrears.

He has done one additional thing, which a great many Senators who are for the U.N. have wanted done. He has undertaken to keep us apprised of the status of payments and arrearages in the U.N. The President has undertaken a specific obligation to that effect.

Therefore, I believe that the importance of the letter is that it accepts a number of the important conditions which are contained in the amendment. It is one thing to set down conditions for a President who does not have to observe them. It is another thing to ask him to do something. But it is a very different thing when he pledges himself to take the action desired. Two parties are required to make a contract. He is the other party. He has now made a commitment. So I think his action has demonstrated that the compromise submitted by the Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD] and the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] did, as we who are friends of the compromise bill believe, do something and, too, the President

has undertaken some very real obligations in deference to that position.

I hope very much that the letter will help any Senators who might be wavering on the question to decide to vote in favor of the Mansfield-Dirksen amendment.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I thank the Senator from New York.

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, I believe that many of the commitments included in the President's letter are couched in vague and ambiguous terms, and his letter in no way mitigates or ameliorates my reservations or opposition to the proposed substitute.

The President has proposed that the United States loan \$100 million to the United Nations.

The answer given the President is of tremendous importance. It extends far beyond the sum of money, although the initial expenditure may be only the beginning.

In the period 1946-61, the total United Nations budget amounted to \$3,430,990,000. Of this amount, the United States contributed \$1,617,093,000, or 47.13 percent. The precise financial details have been presented and reviewed in the course of this debate. I shall not rehash the figures, except to say that we have put in far more than any other single nation and nearly one-half the amount put in by all member nations, and the present financial crisis of the U.N. arises from U.N. operations in the Congo and the persistent refusal of some countries, including the Soviet Union, to pay their share of U.N. operational costs.

My remarks are not addressed to the final precedent that might be established if the President's proposal is accepted, although it is a bad one.

The U.N. raises the need for this loan because of a radical change in its character—a change in which the U.N. has become an instrument of war instead of the instrument of peace it was designed to be.

United Nations troops, with the backing of the United States, have apparently beaten Moise Tshombe, the President of the Katanga Province of the Congo.

Tshombe is friendly to the West. He seeks preservation of a capitalist economy. His area was the richest and most politically stable in the Belgian Congo.

It seemed a strange paradox that he should feel our wrath.

As a result, many bewildered people at home and abroad have asked what the U.N. has become.

I shall not try to repeat our explanation here in detail. Briefly, it is that the former Belgian Congo cannot exist without the comparatively well developed and rich Katanga Province. Therefore, although Tshombe is pro-Western, he must subordinate himself to Cyrille Adoula, an avowed neutralist and bitter critic in the past of the United States. The question might be asked: Why not make Adoula subordinate to Tshombe, since the latter is our friend, and since Katanga is the richest and strongest portion of the Congo?

Such a logical question would encounter, I am afraid, more doubletalk

and explanation reminiscent of the Orwellian phrases, "War is peace"; "slavery is freedom," and so on.

In any case, through force of arms, the U.N. has imposed a restive peace upon the Congo. An atmosphere of melancholy tranquillity seems to prevail there, which sullen tribal partisans may, in their frustration, turn into bloody violence with a vengeance at any moment. The American people are asked to pay a major portion of the cost of military operations that precipitated this atmosphere of rancor and uncertainty. The time has come to look at this strange situation and to seek to understand its significance.

For some time now, the people of this country have been apprehensive of developments in the U.N. Over the years the character of the organization has changed as new nations have been added to the original 51. The U.N. began under a handicap with the Soviet Union insisting upon the veto power in the Security Council over any proposal to which it objected. Even so, the United Nations has been portrayed to the world, and in particular to the people of the United States, as the best hope of world peace. How many happy illusions did we entertain in the embryo days of the U.N.

In the early days of the U.N., the United States clearly exercised tremendous influence within that body. The Soviet Union frequently used its veto power—99 times to be exact—to block proposals it did not like. It did so quite brazenly.

We have never used the veto, apparently because of our considerable awe of some nebulous thing called world opinion. Our actions in the U.N. and elsewhere often seem to be taken, not on the basis of what is best for the United States, or the free world, or our major allies, or the general enhancement of our geographic and strategic posture in the cold war, but on the basis of what the so-called uncommitted nation may think about us.

Curiously enough, the Soviet Union's use of the veto has not made that nation the pariah one might assume. Instead, by some strange process, the Russians seem to have steadily increased in influence and power in the U.N. and elsewhere in the world. Coincidentally, our power and influence at the U.N. and elsewhere has steadily declined.

How could this have happened when we have tried so hard to please? Our motives and conduct will stand the most intense scrutiny. We have given away and spent billions upon billions in an effort to win friends and influence people. Why then have our virtues and good intentions been so poorly rewarded?

In 1945 there were 51 U.N. members. In 1962 there are 104 U.N. members, there are 23 Asian nations, and 29 African nations, many of them newly emerged from colonial, protectorate, trusteeship, or mandate status.

Our stand against so-called colonialism, consistent and adamant, has brought many of these new countries into being. In most instances, the birth clearly is premature. The facility for

self-rule is not something easily come by, even for some of the most economically progressive, highly cultured, and civilized people with strong ethnic homogeneity and national aspirations. It is unthinkable that we should expect people who are for the most part illiterate and impoverished with no evolving tradition of self-rule to govern themselves wisely and well. We are deluding ourselves if we think a tribally oriented people can be easily welded into a unitary state. The folkways and mores of a society cannot be lightly or quickly overturned. The passionate desire for the privileges and immunities of autonomy are not enough. Nor should we be beguiled into mistaking the ambitions of a few tribal overlords or articulate native politicians and demagogues as the nationalistic aspirations of a whole people. But that has not deterred us from our role as midwife in these premature deliveries.

Much of the chaos in the Belgian Congo results because the country was not and is not ready for self-government. That does not prevent us from bringing pressure on Portugal to get out of its West African province of Angola. Even though Angola is more ready to run its own affairs than was the Congo, it still has a long way to go.

Aside from the moral aspects, there are other explanations for our attitude toward colonialism. We take the position that colonialism in Africa and Asia will end in any case; that there are forces loose in the world which mean its destruction.

Undoubtedly, old style colonialism in Asia and Africa is out of date. Undoubtedly also, many areas once dominated by European nations would have become independent regardless of what we said or did. Just the same, the situation in each African or Asian colony is different. This impetuous rush toward independence, willy-nilly, has pitfalls, and deep ones. We have already learned that in the Congo.

In some other countries, colonial rule has been replaced by dictatorship; other of the new nations are leaning toward communism. Some other African states, which were states before the U.N. came along, are feudal in nature, and in them the masses are exploited ruthlessly.

The definition of colonialism appears to be changing in some parts of the world.

Once it meant the domination and exploitation of a territory by an outside and alien power.

Now, to the U.N. and to the United States also, it apparently means the control of an Asian or African territory by a European or pro-Western government.

Last September almost 24 so-called uncommitted nations met at Belgrade in Yugoslavia. In addition to Yugoslavia, the countries represented were India, Indonesia, the United Arab Republic, Cambodia, Morocco, Tunisia, Afghanistan, Lebanon, Ethiopia, Burma, Iraq, Ceylon, Sudan, Nepal, Saudi Arabia, the Congo Republic, Yemen, Cyprus, Somali Republic, Ghana, Guinea, and Mali. Also represented was Communist Cuba, whose commitment against the United States has been restated over and

over again. All in all, we have given this group more than \$6 billion in aid, including more than \$2 billion to Yugoslavia. Over and over again our leaders here emphasized the importance of the so-called uncommitted nations. Their friendship, good will, and possible assistance were held to be of transcendent importance.

If the alignment of these countries should be decisive in the world struggle now going on, we are in a deplorable situation indeed. The countries showed the utmost consideration for the feeling of Soviet Russia. They failed to denounce the nuclear tests by Soviet Russia, tests which the Russians had been preparing for months while they talked disarmament. They did, however, say that the U.S. naval base at Guantanamo Bay "affects the sovereignty and integrity of Cuba." Nothing whatever was said about the domination by Soviet Russia of Eastern Europe, which is colonialism at its very worst, yet the allegedly neutral countries asserted that the claim of the Algerian rebels to the French-held Sahara Desert territory was a just one. Not only that—the uncommitted nations offered, if necessary, to help the rebels.

The countries meeting at Belgrade overlooked Red China's conquest of Tibet, but they demanded immediate evacuation of French armed forces from Tunisian soil.

There was no mention of India's refusal to permit a plebiscite in Kashmir. But the 24 insisted upon immediate freedom for Angola from Portugal.

Since the September meeting, Nehru, darling of the liberals and the apostle of peace, shocked his followers by attaching Goa, which had been Portuguese territory for almost 500 years. There was an outcry. This is dying down. More and more often we hear that Portuguese intransigence—whatever that means—forced Nehru into violence. Eventually, in the distorted looking glass of our liberals, the Portuguese may bear most of the blame.

As one justification for the U.N. loan, we are told that capitalism and democracy have won a tremendous victory in the Belgian Congo. With Tshombe, the pro-Westerner, beaten, there is relative calm. There have been no rape and murder headlines out of the Congo for weeks. This situation is presented as proof of the wisdom of our course. We are, however, jumping to some very hasty conclusions—as we have before, I might add. Our Congo policy is a gamble, a risky, complicated, and hazardous gamble and will continue to be so for an indefinite period.

The man we are backing, Cyrille Adoula, is at best a neutralist. He visited the United States not long ago and was received at the White House. But, since that time, he has announced that he will visit Moscow sometime this year. Moreover, at the U.N., he paid tribute to Lumumba, the slain Communist Congo leader. He also indicated he was ready to assist actively in the effort to drive, forcibly, the Portuguese out of Angola. In the past, he has criticized the West and the United States in terms

which causes one to wonder where he stands and what his future course will be.

One thing seems certain. We have assumed a responsibility in the Congo which will cost us heavily. Nevertheless, Adoula has become our ward, and the proposed \$100 million in a U.N. loan is just the beginning. He will cost us much more—if he does not turn against us and align himself openly with the Communists.

Why are we so hostile to Tshombe, the pro-Westerner, and so tender toward Adoula, the neutralist? If we look closely into this matter we find that Tshombe, being friendly to the West, has encountered the hostility of the other new African nations. "Africa for the African," they say.

Perhaps Tshombe naively felt that his friendship for the West would cause us to help him. He knows better now. He incurred the ill will of the Asian-African bloc which dominated the U.N. This bloc dictates not only to the U.N. but also to the United States. They wanted Tshombe whipped and, obediently, we helped to whip him.

Invariably in Africa, when East and West clash, the United States takes sides against the West. We have done so time after time. So has the U.N.

Tshombe is simply a case in point. The course is being doggedly and vigorously followed even though it has become foolish and reckless almost to the point of insanity. We seem to be bent on the creation of power vacuums which the Communists rush in to fill.

Our attitude in the United Nations, our doctrinaire hostility to what we term colonialism, is based in part on idealistic notions: the world is changing, and this change is felt everywhere; the exploitation of weaker peoples should cease.

Our policies show most clearly in our attitude toward the African Portuguese province of Angola. And the Angola affair illumines the bias of the U.N.

On March 15, 1961, Adlai Stevenson, U.S. Ambassador to the U.N., voted in the Security Council for a resolution calling for an inquiry into conditions in Angola. In so doing, we sided with Soviet Russia, Liberia, Ceylon, and the United Arab Republic. The resolution lost, since it required an affirmative vote of seven and Britain, France, Chile, Ecuador, and Nationalist China abstained.

There was surprise and even consternation to find us lined up with our mortal enemy, Russia, against Portugal, a NATO member and long-time friend and ally.

This was just the beginning. On March 15, an army of terrorists swarmed across the border from the Congo into northern Angola. They tortured, raped, butchered, and murdered without mercy. They killed between 1,000 and 1,500 men, women, and children in the space of a few hours. Many others were badly wounded. The brutality in Angola far exceed anything seen during the Mau Mau outrages in Kenya.

The Portuguese fought back—that is, after they recovered from the first wave of horror and shock. When I say "Portuguese," I do not mean simply Euro-

peans. I mean Africans as well, for the Portuguese have pursued a multiracial policy for generations. They drove the terrorists back.

Meanwhile, the attack on Portugal at the United Nations continued. On April 20, 1961, the General Assembly of the U.N. voted 73 to 2 for the establishment of a special committee to investigate conditions in Angola.

Before this subcommittee could make any move toward an inquiry, another resolution was introduced by Liberia in the Security Council. It called upon Portugal to "desist forthwith from repressive measures in Africa." It was approved by the Security Council, and for the third time in succession the United States voted with the Soviet Union against her ally, Portugal.

The vote to censure Portugal for "repressive measures" was, actually, a vote to censure the Portuguese for defending themselves and their wives and children. Arthur Krock, the distinguished columnist of the New York Times, aptly termed it a "form of lynch law." So it was. We showed a callous indifference toward the butchery of Portuguese women and children. We became badly upset and raised our voices in horrified protest when the Portuguese killed some of their assailants.

The vote can be explained only on the grounds that we had decided to back the Afro-Asian bloc at the U.N. under virtually any conditions short of outright subscription to the stated aims of Communist imperialism.

We have done so consistently since, voting on January 30, 1962, for a U.N. resolution calling upon Portugal to give Angola its independence.

One of the Angolan terrorist leaders is a man named Holden Roberto, who also has a number of aliases. He has been in and out of the United States for several years, having been in New York only a short time ago. The State Department will not permit Moise Tshombe to enter this country, but Roberto is welcome.

Roberto was quoted in a July 1961 issue of *Le Monde*, a Paris newspaper, as saying that the murder and torture of women and children during the March invasion were deliberate. The author of the article, one Pierre de Vos, says he commented to Roberto:

The insurgents are accused of the worst of horrors, and there is proof of tortures perpetrated upon Portuguese men, women and even children, in the areas around San Salvador do Kongo [in northern Angola]. Do you deny the fact of these massacres?

He continued that Holden Roberto said with no hesitation:

No, it's all true, and regret it more than I can say. But there is a reason behind all those horrors and the world has got to understand us.

There is no indication that Roberto has ever denied this interview. Nor has Roberto's record affected the support given him in this country by other groups and organizations. Yet, our own State Department lets this terrorist murderer come and go freely. Roberto's record has not affected his support by several American organizations. One of

the most vocal is the American Committee on Africa, of New York. This organization, which lists among its national committeemen, many prominent Americans, including Mrs. Franklin D. Roosevelt and Arthur Schlesinger, Jr., of the White House staff, apparently backs Roberto all the way.

When he was last in the United States, Roberto held a press conference under the auspices of the committee. In its annual report of May 31, 1961, the American committee calls this man, the man who ordered or at least acquiesced in the torture, murder, and rape of women and children, a "distinguished and eloquent leader."

It appears from its activities that the American Committee on Africa, which issues hate literature against the Portuguese, is the agent of a foreign power or powers. It supports the Angola terrorists with propaganda, and probably with funds also. Yet, the American Committee on Africa has never registered as a foreign agent. In fact, it has applied to the Bureau of Internal Revenue for tax-exempt status.

The Soviet Union has supported with great enthusiasm the move to dismember Portugal, a staunchly anti-Communist nation. The Russians, it might be pointed out, are not in the habit of supporting movements and causes which benefit the Western nations, and, in particular, the United States.

Brig. Gen. Frank Howley, retired, now vice president of New York University, visited Angola in May 1961. In an interview published in the *New York World-Telegram* on July 27, 1961, he said:

The current uprising against Portugal in Angola is a part of a Communist conspiracy to gain control of the rich African province.

Lord Home, British Foreign Secretary, has charged the Communists with the responsibility for the atrocities in Angola.

Communism thrives on chaos and confusion. The strategy of the Russians and Chinese is to create disruption in Africa wherever possible. This is necessary for a Communist takeover. That is why the U.N. policy toward Portugal and the United States policy toward Portugal are backed and approved by the Soviet Union.

Louis Lomax, a reputable Negro writer and journalist, in his book, "The Reluctant African," reported Tom Mboya, a prospective Prime Minister of Kenya, when the British colony becomes independent, as stating as follows:

The Europeans know they are finished in Kenya. Now all they want to know is if we're going to pay them for their land. The civil servants know they are done here. Now all they want to know is whether we are going to give them a pension. Every day they stop me on the streets and they ask me: "Mr. Mboya, are you going to take our land? Are we going to be compensated? Are we going to get pensions?"

I tell them: "Don't ask me to pay you. Tell your troubles to Macleod (the British Colonial Secretary). Let him pay you. As far as we are concerned, the Europeans have lived off the fat of the land. They have had their compensations and their pensions * * *"

Then the Europeans want to know if they can stay on in Kenya. I tell them: "Sure * * *." But if they stay on, they must get out of politics. We are going to have an all-black Parliament, and an all-black government. We are going to divide our land among our people. If the Europeans want to stay, they can stay on as squatters. If they want to work, they can work for us.

These bombastic and inflammatory statements are made, although Europeans and European developments are the economic heart of Kenya. Four-fifths of Kenya's exportable farm produce in 1960 was produced on farms owned by Afro-Europeans. Kenya is heavily dependent upon Afro-European civil servants, doctors, lawyers, and engineers. Mboya does not care about that. He wants African domination—and then he will no doubt turn to the United States for funds to repair the damage.

In supporting nationalism in Africa, our Government tries to pretend that the end of colonialism means, almost immediately, a new, freer and fuller life for the masses. The contrary is very likely to be true.

In his book, "Africa, Angry Young Giant," Smith Hempstone, author and journalist, points out:

Only the fuzziest thinkers among those Americans and Britons who interest themselves in African affairs can still equate the granting of political freedom to small groups of vociferous African nationalists with the extension of social and personal freedom to the masses of this tortured and ancient continent.

Our views seem to be that oppression and exploitation in Africa are not so bad after all, if African rulers are oppressing the African masses.

In the wake of the freedom wave sweeping Africa, there are some developments which should serve as object lessons. During the debate on Angola, spokesmen for Ghana and Guinea, both strongly oriented toward communism, charged that the United States was permitting NATO arms furnished Portugal to be used against the terrorists in Angola. In view of our support of anti-Portuguese elements over the world, this was most unkind. But, then, gratitude is not always forthcoming when it should be, as many individuals and nations have learned. Among them is Portugal, which let us use her almost invaluable bases in the Azores, and has given them to us for use since the war. Portugal also has been a friend in other ways. Our reward is to tell her she should be dismembered, truncated, and stripped of African provinces she has held for hundreds of years.

Statements by spokesmen for many of the new African nations about independence, constitute chauvinism and demagoguery. All the troubles of Africa are blamed upon the Afro-European. The lag in African development until colonialism is ignored; the development of Africa by European nations since, including Western education of most African leaders now shouting for freedom, are all overlooked.

The diversity of peoples in Africa—Bantu, Bushman, Hamite, Asian, Semite—are dismissed as no problem. No

importance is given the primitive state of millions of tribesmen, or their age-old feuds which will erupt as the Afro-Europeans are driven out. Even in Kenya, there are other tribes than Tom Mboya's Kikuyu, including the fierce Masai. The skills and financing needed to develop the resources of the new states are waved aside under the spell of nationalism, hatred of the Afro-European. Afro-Europeans are blamed for all the African's troubles, including malaria and leprosy.

There is little talk of responsibility or of the patience and discipline necessary for orderly advancement. Many of the leaders live on a lavish and profligate scale, despite the poverty of their peoples. The President of Ghana, Kwame Nkrumah, is restoring an ancient Danish castle on the coast as an official residence. Another Presidential palace is under construction, and he is adding two wings to his private residence—each wing being bigger than the original house. Meanwhile, several hundred of Nkrumah's political opponents are lying in jail, and Nkrumah flirts with communism.

On the West African Ivory Coast, President Felix Houphouët Boigny has just installed a new residence and Government center at a cost of \$16 million.

Although we are asked to vote a \$100 million United Nations bond issue to pay largely for United Nations expenses in the Congo, 40 of Cyrille Adoula's ministers last year voted themselves new homes, fine cars, and rather generous cash allowances.

The hierarchy in many African countries that live in large measure on our aid, live high, wide, and handsome. They travel with expensive retinues; they buy big embassies, embassies far out of line with their needs. The prodigality of many of their diplomats is a byword, and is at the expense of their masses—and of our own taxpayers. Yet, we back these governments to the hilt. If there are injustices in Africa, it does not seem to matter, just so long as it is Africans who are the oppressors.

The theory that the United Nations has preserved and is preserving world peace is, Mr. President, preposterous. War is proceeding all around the world: in Algeria, in Laos, in Vietnam. India has just concluded the conquest of Portuguese Goa. The United Nations did not prevent the Korean war; it could not deter Communist rape of Indochina, and Tibet, nor the crushing brutality of the Hungarian repression. It is helpless before the Berlin crisis. It is useless in disarmament proceedings. Its accomplishments are suspect. On the occasions when it claimed victories for peace, the United States manipulated the strings.

Now the United Nations itself goes on the warpath. The only question is, Where will it strike next? Will we support Adoula if he tries to drive the Portuguese out of Angola? On the basis of what we have done in the past, that is entirely possible. Day by day, its policies and purposes grow more perilous from the standpoint of our national security.

If the United Nations is to continue, we must insist that it become a responsible body. It must not be an agency which has one standard for Russian and Red Chinese colonialism, and another for colonialism involving the Western European countries. Other countries must pay their fair share of the costs. But there are no signs that the United Nations will become such an institution. It is rapidly on the way to becoming a liability to the United States, if it is not already a liability—and a big one, at that.

It is time this country regained its sanity. A policy of anticolonialism, if followed with commonsense, is a good one. We should give the new states all the help possible. In turn, they should recognize their responsibilities, their dependence on Western technical skills, education, and financing.

There are simply too many people in this world who think in terms of the privileges and immunities of citizenship and autonomy, and not in terms of the responsibility that is a concomitant of self-government.

Ventures such as the United Nations has undertaken in the Belgian Congo are ill advised and, if repeated, will destroy the U.N. completely. What do we have now that Adoula is temporarily in the ascendancy in that unfortunate country? Have we achieved victory, or do we have a heavy burden on our hands? Let me quote from an article by Albert J. Meyers in the U.S. News of February 26, 1962:

There are other signs of the Congo's inability to function as a going concern. One of the main highway bridges in town has been out of service since last April, when it was damaged by floodwater. No one seems able to repair it.

Away from the cities, there is an almost complete lack of security in the interior. Bands of Congolese "soldiers"—who actually are no more than irresponsible thugs—roam the countryside at will, pillaging, destroying, killing.

After almost 2 years of independence, the Congo still is a place of violence and slaughter where no man's life is worth much. By now, the murder and mutilation of priests, the rape of nuns and other forms of brutality seem almost commonplace after innumerable visits to the Congo. It's gotten so nothing really surprises me anymore.

Who's ahead? The Congo crisis still is a thing of major importance to the United States and the West. A monumental struggle between the United States and Russia is taking place here even though, at least on the surface, the United States appears to be well ahead.

Officially, the United Nations controls the Congo. But, actually, it does so only after a fashion. It is bogged down by the obstacles placed in its way by Afro-Asian and Communists at U.N. headquarters in New York. Here in the field, the U.N. seems unable to make real decisions that are necessary to get things done. The U.N. undoubtedly has forestalled complete chaos, and probably kept a hot war from breaking out. But it has not been able to solve the Congo's basic problems.

At stake is control of the Congo by either East or West, since the U.N. can't do it, and the Congolese control nothing.

Right now, the United States is in and the Russians are out. But the West-leaning government of Premier Cyrille Adoula has to solve many problems in order to survive.

I do not agree at all with all the assessment made by this distinguished journalist, but it points out that even an objective analyst, one who is not a partisan like myself regarding the U.N. notes that we do not really have a substantial upper hand in the Congo.

We should recognize, at the same time, that it will be a long while indeed before many of these new African nations become a real factor in the world power struggle. A vote in the General Assembly of the U.N. does not make Chad, Dahomey, Gabon, Somalia, Mauritania, and so forth strong countries. Our mouthing that we must help the African countries because they are uncommitted, our frenzied preoccupation with victory at the U.N., represents schizophrenia, self-hypnosis. Slogans and idealistic words do not conquer problems.

On the one hand, we are talking about achieving a rapprochement with the European Common Market as a means of strengthening ourselves against the common enemy. On the other, we are conducting ourselves at the U.N. in a fashion which would indicate that we want to sever our European connections, to destroy NATO, and to hazard our national destiny on winning and holding African and Asian nations, whose favor is fickle, and whose allegiance could mean very little after all.

Let us then reappraise our United Nations policies. We must not allow it to dictate our foreign policy. The responsibility for free world leadership is ours. We should not abdicate that leadership. Let us keep before us at all times the best interests of the United States of America, and its citizens. Let us be mindful of the aspirations for freedom by peoples everywhere. For if we fail, the era of freedom is over, and a long era of human slavery will begin.

Mr. HART. Mr. President, as those of us who have listened realize, there is one certain prediction we can make about an institution such as the United Nations, and that is, it is always going to be in serious difficulty.

The debate in the Senate these past few days relates to its financial difficulty, and I hope the discussions and our ultimate action will not serve the cause of those who would view the demise of the United Nations as a happy day.

We will always have those who scoff at the concept of international rule of law and do their best to snarl American cooperation with the United Nations. There is little hope that these isolationist tigers will ever change their stripes. But it seems to me that they do not represent the most immediate danger to the United Nations today.

What worries me more is the discouragement and apathy among those who once could be counted upon as United Nations supporters.

Certainly, all of us feel disappointments at times at the way things sometimes go, but one who asserts he is now totally discouraged must have started out with an exaggerated notion of what the United Nations reasonably could be expected to do.

It seems to me the achievements, the successes won by the United Nations,

ought to be more generally recognized; and I would include Korea among them, and would add the Congo and points intermediate.

In these areas it is my feeling that the United Nations has thwarted Soviet ambitions. For Soviet Russia to want to render the United Nations impotent or to destroy it can be understood. But this country and others in the field should resist this Soviet purpose by every means.

Of course, things do not always go our way in the United Nations. We vote "yea," and other nations vote "nay." We "go," and they will not "go." It is just part of the frustration that when man steps toward the moon, it is a Russian man first.

We have plenty of trouble just reconciling our own national interests and convictions with those of our allies. When we add to this the problem of coping with Soviet maneuvers in the United Nations, for some people it seems just too much.

But Soviet power, symbolized in the United Nations by its veto, would be a threat to us whether there was a United Nations or not. To confront that power in the form of a veto in the Security Council is better than to meet it in the shape of a jet in the Congo. This may oversimplify a difficult problem, but to me the point is basic and it suggests no course for us other than the fullest response to the present United Nations need.

Again, for the Soviet Union to try to rule or to ruin the United Nations makes sense. It would gain from civil wars in areas like the Congo or the Middle East or Korea. But neither the death of the United Nations nor the division of the Congo into small warring states would serve United States policy or the cause of world peace. Failure on our part to refuse financial help to the United Nations now or to condition it in such a fashion as to make it unworkable or needlessly cumbersome would be inexcusably shortsighted. History's verdict would be very harsh if this were our course. For this reason, among others, I hope we shall promptly enact a measure which does reflect our understanding of the kind of world in which we live and the need to maintain an effective organization of the nations in our most important assignment, the preservation of peace.

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 further proceedings under the quorum call be dispensed with.

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

UNANIMOUS-CONSENT AGREEMENT

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I wish to propound a unanimous-consent request.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. MANSFIELD. The distinguished minority leader and I have tried to clear this proposal with every Senator who is vitally interested or who will be in the chamber when the request is made.

I ask unanimous consent that debate be limited to 2 hours on amendments to the pending proposal; that 3 hours be allocated to the Russell amendment in the nature of a substitute; and that 6 hours be allocated to the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Montana?

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield? I should like to ask a question.

The Senator used the word "proposal." The "proposal" is an amendment offered by the majority leader and the minority leader, which is before the Senate; and the "substitute" is the amendment in the nature of a substitute offered by the Senator from Georgia. Will the Senator define, therefore, so that it may be clear what he means, the word "proposal"?

Mr. MANSFIELD. The "proposal" is the Dirksen-Mansfield amendment in the nature of a substitute to the bill, S. 2768, to authorize the purchase of United Nations bonds.

Mr. JAVITS. Do we correctly understand that if the unanimous-consent request is agreed to—and I certainly favor the unanimous-consent request—there will be 6 hours of debate on the bill; 2 hours of debate on every amendment to the bill, including the Mansfield-Dirksen amendment in the nature of a substitute; and 3 hours debate on the amendment in the nature of a substitute offered by the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL]?

As I understand the situation, that is the unanimous-consent request. The Senator has defined "proposal" to be the Dirksen-Mansfield amendment in the nature of a substitute. Therefore, the Senator may have in mind some other arrangement.

If I may repeat, the unanimous-consent request would provide, as I understand, 6 hours on the bill—not on the "proposal" but on the bill—

Mr. MANSFIELD. The Senator is correct.

Mr. JAVITS. Two hours on the Mansfield-Dirksen amendment in the nature of a substitute, or on any other amendment either on the desk or which may be offered, the time to be divided in the usual manner; and 3 hours on the Russell amendment in the nature of a substitute. Is that a correct understanding?

Mr. MANSFIELD. That is correct. The limitation would begin, if the unanimous-consent request is agreed to by the Senate, at the conclusion of the morning hour tomorrow.

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

The unanimous-consent agreement, as subsequently reduced to writing, is as follows:

UNANIMOUS-CONSENT AGREEMENT

Ordered, That, effective on Thursday, April 5, 1962, at the conclusion of routine

morning business, during the further consideration of the bill (S. 2768) to promote the foreign policy of the United States by authorizing the purchase of United Nations bonds and the appropriation of funds therefor, debate on the pending substitute proposed by Mr. RUSSELL (3-27-B) be limited to 3 hours, and that debate on any other amendment or substitute, motion, or appeal, except a motion to lay on the table, shall be limited to 2 hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the mover of any such amendment or motion and the majority leader: *Provided*, That in the event the majority leader is in favor of any such amendment or motion, the time in opposition thereto shall be controlled by the minority leader or some Senator designated by him: *Provided further*, That no amendment that is not germane to the provisions of the said bill shall be received.

Ordered further, That on the question of the final passage of the said bill debate shall be limited to 6 hours, to be equally divided and controlled, respectively, by the majority and minority leaders: *Provided*, That the said leaders, or either of them, may, from the time under their control on the passage of the said bill, allot additional time to any Senator during the consideration of any amendment, motion, or appeal.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, it is understood that the time limitation will begin at the conclusion of the morning hour tomorrow.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time limitation will begin at the conclusion of the morning hour tomorrow.

ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 11 A.M. TOMORROW

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate concludes its deliberations tonight, it stand in adjournment until 11 o'clock tomorrow morning.

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

SAVING THE UNITED NATIONS PEACE ROLE

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, in this morning's New York Times there is a most timely and excellent editorial in support of the United Nations financing measure which is now before the Senate.

I believe this editorial cites more cogently and concisely the case for the pending proposal than any argument heard today. Therefore, I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed in the RECORD at this point.

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

SAVING THE U.N.'S PEACE ROLE

The Senate is scheduled to vote today on the U.N. bond measure that will go far to determine the future role of both the United Nations and the United States in world affairs. The measure would empower President Kennedy to rescue the United Nations from financial bankruptcy.

The bond issue, to which 22 other nations have already subscribed more than \$50 million, is necessary to cover deficits incurred for military operations in the Middle East and the Congo. Its success still depends on congressional action, which will also decide whether the United Nations can continue to act as an executive peace enforcement agency or whether it must shrink to a mere debating

society, as the Russians desire. Congressional repudiation of the project would be a major blow to the prestige not only of the United Nations but also of the United States, thrusting additional burdens for free world defense upon us.

Despite all this, the measure faces a battle in the Senate because many Republicans refuse to follow their own leadership; and the action of the House is unpredictable. This opposition can be explained only by a strange blindness both to the financial aspect of the bond plan and to the role of the United Nations itself. It is true that the deficits are due to the refusal or failure of more than two-thirds of the members to pay their special assessments for the military operations. The question of their obligation to do so is now before the World Court. Meanwhile, the deficits must be met. The Republicans propose to meet them by a 3-year loan; but since the United Nations could not possibly repay such a sum in so short a time it would still be bankrupt at the end of that period. But the bonds would be repaid from the regular budget to which all members must contribute their allotted share or lose their vote and possibly their membership.

Behind the financial argument is a deeper feeling, akin to a new nationalism and isolationism and found in both parties, which looks askance at the United Nations and would disentangle the United States from it. Yet the U.N. has made possible the more or less peaceful liquidation of the Western colonial empires and it has also kept the big power blocs apart and thus helped avert another world war. If it had not been for the United Nations, American troops might now be fighting Soviet bloc troops in the Congo. A United Nations collapse as a peace enforcement agency or a retrenchment in American support for it could still bring this about. These are the practical considerations—as distinct from the groundless fears—that the Senate and House will have to keep in mind when voting on this crucial measure.

BROADCAST ON UNITED NATIONS BY PAULINE FREDERICK

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President recently I had the privilege of listening to a broadcast over the NBC Network entitled "Emphasis: United Nations," by Pauline Frederick.

Pauline Frederick is a very able and skilled commentator, and specializes in commentary on the work of the United Nations. The broadcast made on March 9 relates to the United Nations Organization pledge of loyalty, as well as to the high caliber of the employees of the United Nations.

I wrote to Pauline Frederick March 9, and I complimented her on the fine broadcast she had presented that day. I ask unanimous consent that the transcript of the broadcast and my letter be printed in the RECORD at this point.

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

EMPHASIS: UNITED NATIONS

This is Pauline Frederick.

Walk into the tall glass house here on the East River—the Secretariat—at night, or on a Saturday, Sunday, or holiday, and people are always working. Someone is doing research, someone is adding figures, someone is writing, many are getting caught up with details they never find time for in a 40-hour week. And, of course, the Secretary-General and his top advisors usually put in a lot of overtime.

As a matter of fact, all levels of jobs are represented by the extra-hour workers, and most of them toil voluntarily. Not only are

they not drawing double-time, or golden-time pay, but they are throwing the extra work into the hopper free.

Most other places on this island of Manhattan, bosses grumble about secretaries arriving just in time for the coffee-break and quitting on the dot of five.

No doubt some of these reports on the working habits of New Yorkers are exaggerated. But it is true that in most of Manhattan, after six in the evening and on weekends and holidays, office buildings are as empty as haunted houses.

But transfer some of these late-to-the-office, early-to-come home executives and employees, to jobs at the United Nations and drones probably would be transferred to beavers. The lights are never out in the glass house.

In the cafeteria one late evening I wondered, "Why," aloud. A man from the Netherlands sitting opposite, answered: "I suppose you Americans would say 'corny,' but working at the U.N. is more than a job. It gives purpose and reason for existence."

Who are these people who constitute the permanent work force of the U.N.? In the first 2 years the overwhelming majority was Americans. There was an understandable objection—a cry of unfair representation, so in 1947 the Assembly adopted a plan of recruitment to improve the geographical distribution of the staff. Working now at the Secretariat here in New York there are 3,226 persons from some 85 countries. These do not include more than 2,000 U.N. employees abroad.

Members of the organization pledge loyalty to the U.N. and are not permitted to receive instructions from member governments. This injunction is observed more in the breach by the Communists who always remain Communists.

Each employee received a guide for a standard of conduct which, among other things, lists service to the broad ideals of peace, economic and social progress, and the promotion of cooperative and friendly relations among nations of the world.

There is one particularly strict rule: Staff members may not accept "any honors, decoration, gifts, or marks of favor from any government or from any other source external to the Organization."

The code book concludes: "Integrity, international loyalty, independence and impartiality, and the subordination of private interests of the Organization are daily requirements."

In other words, those who work for the United Nations are expected to be true international civil servants.

MARCH 9, 1962.

PAULINE FREDERICK,
NBC News,
New York, N.Y.

DEAR MISS FREDERICK: First of all, I want to express my thanks and appreciation for the wonderful reporting that you do on United Nations activities. All of us who are concerned about the U.N. are indebted to you for your objective and responsible reports.

Second, I would like to have you send me a copy of your news broadcast for the morning of March 9 where you spoke of the dedication of the U.N. employees. You may recall you emphasized how many hours these employees worked, and you also called to our attention the code of conduct which is required of the U.N. employees.

Again my thanks.

Sincerely,

HUBERT H. HUMPHREY.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I take this opportunity to thank Pauline Frederick and NBC for the excellent coverage of United Nations activities over that net-work.

PROGRESS IN POLAND ON USE OF FOREIGN CURRENCIES FOR MEDICAL RESEARCH BUT DELAYS ELSEWHERE

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, it was with great pleasure that I have noted the agreement by the United States Government and Poland for the use of \$2 million in Polish zlotys for the support of cooperative medical research and medical information projects.

This agreement represents a significant milestone in the long history for the use of these so-called soft currencies for a variety of constructive purposes abroad.

It was just 4 years ago, on February 19, 1958, that I first sponsored an amendment to Public Law 480 to permit the use of American-owned foreign currencies for the support of scientific research overseas.

The need for such use had become increasingly evident in the course of my work as chairman of a Senate Government Operations Subcommittee on Reorganization and International Organizations.

On June 30, 1958, Congress approved Public Law 85-477, setting up section 104(k) to Public Law 480. This provision authorized use of foreign currencies owned or controlled by the United States to support scientific research—as well as scientific information activities abroad.

It was not until the 1961 and 1962 fiscal years that Congress actually appropriated funds to the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare for the purchase of foreign currencies for this purpose.

During these 2 years, progress has still been relatively slow. The new United States-Polish agreement represents, therefore, a considerable advance.

As a New York Times article of Monday, April 2, stated, the negotiation of the agreement with Poland has required patience, understanding, and skill. I commend both the American and the Polish authorities who have devoted themselves so fruitfully to this task.

SLOW PROGRESS ON OVERALL PROGRAM

Now, with regard to the \$1.6 million previously agreed upon for other projects elsewhere, important work is underway. The epidemiology of malnutrition is being studied in Pakistan; problems of hypertension in Israel; research on vegetable protein supplements against malnutrition in India; metabolic studies on anemia in Egypt; botanical-type studies for pharmaceutical research in Brazil.

In addition, since January, funds have been obligated for exceedingly important field trials of vaccine against cholera under the auspices of the SEATO Cholera Research Laboratory in Dacca, Pakistan.

The problem, however, is that so little use, relatively speaking, has thus far been made of what has come to be known as the Humphrey amendment.

I suggest to the National Institutes of Health, the U.S. Public Health Service, the National Science Foundation, the Department of Defense, and all other

departments engaged in medical research and scientific research that there be a well-balanced program of research, using the soft currencies available. Those currencies lose their value under inflation unless they are put to work. For the life of me I cannot understand why we take pride in hoarding those foreign currencies only to find out a year later that inflation has destroyed anywhere from 5 to 50 percent of their value. It seems to me that we would be better off to put them to work.

Here, we see that 3¼ years after an amendment reached the statute books, a mere trickle of funds is being used. It consists of \$1.6 million previously, supplemented now by \$1.2 million for NIH projects in Poland—and by \$800,000 for Bureau of State Services and National Library of Medicine projects in Poland.

Yet, hundreds upon hundreds of millions of dollars worth of these foreign currencies have been sitting and have been subject to erosion by inflation.

The delay is not due, by and large, to medical scientists.

On the contrary, American and foreign scientists have invariably been enthusiastic on behalf of carrying out section 104(k). Regrettably, however, in many of the developing countries, the Ministries of Finance have been reluctant to permit use of soft currencies for other than major economic projects—in contrast to use for social, health, and related projects.

Invariably, when a Ministry of Health has proposed a particular medical project in partnership with the United States, the former has been delayed or turned down by Treasury-type authorities in foreign countries.

Here, in our own country, the U.S. Bureau of the Budget has not always been sympathetic to fullest use of section 104(k); nor, in all frankness, has the Congress.

What is in my judgment an unnecessary restriction was imposed when Congress required specific appropriations for individual agency requests for foreign currencies.

Those are currencies that we already have, currencies that have accrued to us because of the sale of surplus agricultural commodities.

Meanwhile, however, in the executive branch, while NIH programed \$8.76 million in the 1961 and 1962 fiscal years, it actually processed only \$1.6 million.

The result is that in the 1963 HEW appropriation bill, the administration requested for the Public Health Service \$6.2 million less than the \$9 million which Congress appropriated last year.

PROGRESS IN REVERSE

In other words, only \$2.8 million is appropriated in the bill now pending before the Senate Appropriations Committee.

This, I say in all frankness, is not progress.

In other words, nearly \$2,800,000 is appropriated in the bill now pending before the Senate Appropriations Committee. This, I say in all frankness, is not progress. It is not even smart. Frankly, I think it indicates a kind of economic retrogression. It is progress in reverse.

It is going backward as regards section 104(k).

Let me make clear that the money is there. The question of appropriation is nothing but a bookkeeping arrangement. It merely keeps someone busy purchasing a pen when he might be a great deal better off if the authorities got busy and spent the money before it was eroded away by inflation. The money is there. It is in the account of the U.S. Government, and will only be wasted away by delay, lack of planning, and a lack of a sense of urgency.

NIH is now restudying the whole program, I understand, in the light of the scientific and administrative problems which have been encountered.

It is my personal hope that there will be a vast expansion in the use of these foreign currencies for international health activities. This will require the most sympathetic understanding within the legislative branch, within the executive branch, in the United States, and within the recipient foreign countries.

I digress to point out that we must negotiate with each foreign country. It is perfectly understandable that the ministry of public works in a foreign country would like to get available foreign currency for a new road. Anyone who has visited foreign countries knows full well that one of the major problems is the health problem. Some of those currencies could be used very well to combat disease. For example, in India they could be used to combat cholera. They could be used in many parts of Africa for a pure water supply. People in those governments would sometimes like to get the currencies for their particular problems. The trouble with the requests of the medical authorities and the ministry of health in those countries is that they generally end up at the bottom of the priority totem pole. I hope the authorities will get busy and give the problem more attention.

The United States-Polish agreement is an important step forward.

It is the type of step which I envisioned in 1958.

It is the type of action which scientists throughout Western Europe enthusiastically praised when I met with WHO authorities in Geneva and later with experts in France, the United Kingdom, Finland, Norway, and elsewhere.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of the New York Times article be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

AMERICANS TO HELP POLES IN SCIENCE RESEARCH PACT

(By Felix Belair, Jr.)

WASHINGTON, April 1.—The United States will finance a \$2 million medical research program by Polish and American scientists under a recently signed agreement with the Polish Government.

This, the first such undertaking with an Iron Curtain country, calls for collaboration by research scientists of both countries on 10 laboratory projects. These range from the functional organization of the brain to the causes of prenatal malformation in children.

The agreement between the U.S. Public Health Service and the Health and Social

Welfare Ministry of Poland came after nearly a year of negotiating. These discussions survived the crisis incident to construction of the Berlin wall and a deterioration in the political relations between the two countries.

Most of the research work will be done in Poland by Polish scientists. In addition to preparing for periodic reports on results, the agreement calls for visits to Poland by collaborating scientists of the National Institutes of Health.

AMERICANS TO VISIT POLAND

The American team will spend about a month each year working in Poland with selected authorities there checking their procedures and results. It is expected that these visits will be returned by Polish experts, who will do laboratory work at the National Institutes of Health in Bethesda, Md.

All 10 research projects involve problems in which the scientists of both countries have an intense mutual interest and in which investigations are already underway.

For the United States, the agreement also helps ease an acute shortage of qualified research scientists as well as giving an opportunity to contract for exacting laboratory work at bargain prices. All the Polish scientists assigned to the projects were well known to officials of the Public Health Service and the National Institutes.

Aside from any immediate results of the research, Polish science is expected to benefit from experience gained with American equipment and techniques. Medical research in this country would also be expected to benefit from Poland's rich heritage of scientific inquiry. In most of the laboratory projects covered by the agreement, for instance, investigators in the two countries have been seeking similar objectives from different approaches.

A possible uniting of the two could mean greater progress in less time.

A tough-minded American Ambassador, Jacob D. Beam, and a chance meeting of an American and Polish scientist were instrumental in bringing about the joint research program.

Ambassador Beam negotiated in 1960 an agreement for the use of U.S.-owned counterpart funds that grow out of the "sale" to Poland of American surplus farm products. The local currencies accumulated in this way are available for a variety of purposes, including the advancement of science in the country purchasing the surplus products.

Normally funds of this kind are not repaid to the U.S. Treasury. But Ambassador Beam had included in the Polish agreement a stipulation that any counterpart zlotys remaining unspent by the United States after 10 years had to be returned to this country in dollars. In this respect the agreement is the only one of its kind.

When Congress authorized the Public Health Service to use \$2,117,000 of the counterpart zlotys in Poland, the Warsaw government was eager to cooperate since all its foreign exchange is rationed for limited essential purchases.

In addition to their traditional pride of scientific achievement, the Polish scientists are expected to be as eager as the Government to show results from the present collaboration.

The basis for such cooperation had been laid long ago by the efforts of the Rockefeller Foundation in bringing young Poles to this country for training in American laboratories.

This rapport reached up to the institutional level through the chance meeting here 5 years ago of Dr. H. E. Rosvold, chief of neuropsychology at the National Institutes, with Dr. Jerzy Konorsky, professor of neurophysiology to the Nencki Institute of Experimental Biology in Warsaw.

WORKING ON SAME PROBLEM

Dr. Rosvold's facility in Polish led to a lively conversation in which it was discovered that both men were working on the same problem but from different approaches. Both wanted to know why animals developed definite behavior patterns following minor alteration of the brain structure or changes in the composition of brain cells.

Dr. Konorsky went back to Poland, but by regular correspondence exchanged theories and laboratory results with Dr. Rosvold. The latter then sent Dr. Mortimer M. Mishkin, his chief aid, to Warsaw to work with Dr. Konorsky. The basis of the collaboration to be made formal later, was firmly established.

But it took the patience and perseverance of Dr. Richard L. Masland, director of the National Institute of Neurological Diseases and Blindness, who headed an eight-member team of American negotiators, to complete the agreement. This was made with the Polish Ministry of Health and its advisory committee of 21 Polish scientists.

FERTILE STUDY GROUND

Poland is considered especially suitable by Public Health officials for conducting the laboratory investigations. Several factors contributed to this conclusion. For one thing Poland requires that an autopsy be made after every death.

For another, Poland, for reasons not known, has the world's highest incidence of stomach cancer. Thus, it should be possible to set up a sound cancer registry. The autopsy records also should provide accurate information about diseases of the blood vessels.

One 5-year project will investigate the "clinical and laboratory characteristics of muscle disease," including myasthenia gravis and muscular dystrophy. Another authorizes "neuropathological studies of all forms of encephalitis in Poland."

Through use of radioactive isotopes another project will investigate brain edema or swelling induced by capillary permeability, or leakage of substances through blood vessels supplying the brain.

Isotopes also will be used to study the frequency and duration of strokes, with a view to making earlier identification of incipient strokes and opening the way to therapy.

Another cancer study will concentrate on test tube or culture growth of cancerous body tissue.

One of the few 2-year projects will be devoted to histochemical research concerning arteries of the Circle of Willis.

This involves the circular bunch of arteries at the base of the brain and the still mysterious ways in which it provides and controls the amount of nourishment for the brain.

One of three projects for which covering agreements have not yet been signed by the Polish authorities concerns that country's war-stricken water supply system and the identification and control of chemical contaminants of the atmosphere.

The air pollution study would be carried out in the heavily industrialized Krakow area of Poland.

THE EMPLOYMENT CONTRACT IN THE STEEL INDUSTRY

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, the recently announced agreement on an employment contract in the steel industry constitutes a noteworthy example of effective collective bargaining in which public opinion strongly influenced the results achieved. This agreement, involving an industry so basic to our economy, will do much to promote orderly

progress in economic recovery under conditions of price stability. All who were involved in the negotiations merit commendation for demonstrated economic statesmanship in the public interest.

The role of the President of the United States in the stabilization of steel prices and then in steel wage contract negotiations was most significant. In my view, the action taken by President Kennedy in these regards constitutes one of his most outstanding performances in the public interest.

Last fall President Kennedy invoked the full weight of the prestige of the Presidency in an effort to avert a widely heralded general increase in the price of steel. An automatic wage increase was scheduled under an existing labor-management contract. The fact that this increase in wage cost was not followed by a general price increase represented a break in the pattern that has generally prevailed in recent years.

The degree to which the President's intervention may have influenced the steel companies in their decision can not be precisely measured. Unquestionably, however, the President, serving as the focal point for an expression of the national interest, effectively brought to bear upon steel company officials the concern of the American people about another inflationary increase in the price of steel.

A similar objective was sought by a number of my colleagues and myself who discussed on the floor of the Senate in August last year the adverse impact upon our economy which would be brought about by another increase in the price of steel. We endeavored to emphasize that the public interest—and the long-range interests of both the steel industry and its employees—would be best served by a hold-the-line policy with respect to steel prices and the negotiation of noninflationary labor-management contracts.

When the President appealed to steel industry officials last fall, he made it clear that he would urge restraint upon leaders of labor with respect to the contract provisions they might seek during negotiations for a contract to replace the one expiring on June 30, 1962. The President followed through on this pledge. His appeal, both to labor and to management last winter and, particularly, his intervention to bring about initiation of negotiations well in advance of contract expiration, has culminated in agreement upon what is generally considered a noninflationary contract a full 3 months before the present contract terminates.

I repeat, Mr. President, that President Kennedy's performance in this matter has been outstanding and extremely effective. But there is, of course, no guarantee that similar efforts on his part will be equally effective in the future. The prestige of the Office of the Presidency is tremendous. However, there is a limit to the number of times Presidential influence, standing alone, can with equal effect be used to resolve a problem that is recurring in nature. We must face the fact, Mr. President, that

the successful conclusion of steel negotiations this spring may have only postponed resolution of the underlying issue, for the urge for higher profits is ever with us, and a similar crisis over steel wages—and prices—comes up nearly every year. Each time the outcome affects the entire country.

The outcome of periodic labor-management negotiations in the steel industry affects such diverse matters as the future value of our savings and investments, the price of a new car, the interest rate on a home mortgage and the flow of gold overseas. Each round of these negotiations is a crucial event in the battle against the inflationary spiral which has plagued us since the end of World War II. When steelworkers demand and win a substantial wage increase this is generally used by management to justify higher steel prices. When stalemate results in long and costly strikes, the effect on our economy and on the national defense effort is of serious proportions.

Consequently, I suggest that now is an appropriate time to take a careful look at the ground rules under which these recurring negotiations are conducted to determine whether some improvement can be made for the sake of the public interest.

Mr. President, steel is the basic commodity upon which most of our industrial capability depends and its price is a bellwether of our economy. In the past 12 years there have been 11 increases in steel prices. Their effect was concretely demonstrated in a study made in 1959 by Dr. Otto Eckstein for the Joint Economic Committee of Congress. This analysis showed that 40 percent of the rise in the wholesale price index of all manufactured goods from 1947 to 1958 was chiefly due to the fact that steel prices rose faster and farther than all other commodity prices.

The evil consequences of inflation are a matter of public concern for many reasons. Individuals—particularly retired people—suffer severe hardship as the purchasing power of their savings and pensions shrinks. When every dollar earned buys less each year, the pressure for wage increases mounts, in turn aggravating inflation. Interest rates are pushed up and small businesses have trouble obtaining loans needed for growth. Furthermore, inflation seriously threatens our foreign trade. We have not yet been priced out of many foreign markets; but we are faced with the need to increase our exports, and that is hardly possible if our commodity prices keep rising.

Steel is one of several large American industries dominated by a Big Three or Big Four on one side and a powerful labor organization on the other. In such industries prices do not fluctuate in the classic response to supply and demand. They are arrived at by tacit agreement among the industry's leading companies and are known in modern economic parlance as administered prices.

How this system operates in the steel industry was closely studied in 1957 by the Subcommittee on Antitrust and Monopoly of the Senate Committee on the

Judiciary. At the conclusion of an extensive investigation, the committee urged the President to issue a call for voluntary restraint by labor and management.

The situation at the time was critical: consumer prices had risen 60 percent since World War II, industrial production had dropped 15 percent, and unemployment had risen to more than 5 million. However, President Eisenhower declined to intervene. Rather, he chose to heed the vocal demand that the Government should keep hands off and let the free forces of the marketplace shape the outcome. In September 1957 the index of finished steel prices showed an increase of nearly \$4.40 a ton over June. Yet in this same period the demand for steel was relatively low and there was much unemployment in the industry. At that time and in subsequent years the industry has operated at far less than its productive capacity.

Obviously steel prices are set, not by the normal equating of supply and demand, not by the forces of a free competitive market, but by the leaders of big steel. There has not, in fact, been any real price competition among domestic steel producers since the organization of the United States Steel Corp. The Gary dinners—at which price agreements were at one time formally announced—are no longer held. But an equally effective system now serves to establish base prices for many different categories of steel such as cold rolled sheets or hot rolled bars with agreed "extras" for differences in specification within each category.

A rise in steel prices automatically triggers markups in steel-using commodities and also creates a psychological climate which affects prices in other industries. Similarly the outcome of wage negotiations in steel sets a pattern for other fields. Our position in world markets is also sharply affected. From 1953 to 1958, for example, our share of world steel exports fell from 18 percent to 12 percent; during this period our steel export prices rose 20 percent more than those of our foreign competitors.

The traditional economic regulator in a free market economy is competitive pricing—a regulator not now operating in many industries, of which steel is the most important. In my view this situation is bad for our country's economic health. But admittedly it is not an easy problem to solve.

One remedy would be to restore competition to the steel industry through a more vigorous application of the antitrust laws. There is some doubt, however, that the Government can—on a long-range basis—retain the high-powered legal staff such a program would involve. Antitrust action can be helpful, but it is not a complete answer.

In addition, students of management and industrial engineering raise serious questions as to the desirability of atomizing an industry whose very bigness has important advantages of efficiency and productivity if they can be exploited in the public interest. In any case, restoring competition would be a task of many years which would afford no immediate relief.

The advantages of bigness are discussed by the distinguished economist, Gardiner Means, in his new book, "Pricing Power and the Public Interest." But Mr. Means also shows, by analyzing the testimony in the 1957 Senate hearings, that past steel-pricing policies have not been in the public interest, despite the claims of industry leaders. He then recommends a far-reaching and novel program—the creation of a new legal category midway between the monopoly industry and classical free enterprise. This new type of industry—of which steel is a prime example—he calls a collective enterprise. He proposes an incentive plan which would reward both the managers and workers in such industries for responsible behavior. It is based on a system of bonus payments earned through economically sound performance. In effect the managers of such enterprises would become trustees for the public rather than for their stockholders, and steel prices would be determined by sound economic criteria rather than by the quest for immediate high profits. Mr. Means has formulated in detail the legislative steps needed to put his proposal into effect. It is a challenging concept well worthy of close study. However, he concedes that—even if so novel an idea proved acceptable—it would take a decade or more to put it into operation.

Meanwhile, I believe that our Government—as the agent of our whole society—has an immediate and urgent duty to devise machinery which will serve to keep steel prices and wages within reasonable limits.

How can this be done?

I know of few people who favor a system of Government price and wage controls in peacetime, even for industries in which prices are now set by the arbitrary decisions of their leaders. But I believe it would be possible to use the great weight of public opinion to prevent steel prices and wages from getting too far out of line with prices and wages in more competitive sectors of the economy. To do this we need some new machinery to complement strong leadership by the President.

The goal should be not to set specific prices and wages, but to break up the price-wage-cost chain reaction in which every price rise is used to justify a wage increase, which in turn is followed automatically by yet another price boost. The need, as I see it, is for a two-way channel of communications whereby the public can be adequately informed on all aspects of prices, wages, and profits; and industry and labor leaders, in turn, can learn in no uncertain terms the judgment of the public on price and wage policies. Underpinning such a plan must be the Government's determination to use its legal powers to enforce and implement the judgment of society.

At present, we are not getting information which is too helpful—or even consistent from either labor or management. Both groups "inform" the public by flinging wildly contradictory accusations at one another. During the 1959 steel strike, for example, management proclaimed that employment costs had

risen, since 1941, almost 10 times faster than shipments per man-hour worked; to avoid bankruptcy they had no choice but to raise prices. Labor flatly asserted the opposite. Since 1955, they said, payroll costs—for all employees, not just production and maintenance workers—per ton of steel shipped rose by only \$9.31 a ton. Prices per ton rose by \$34.18, or almost four times as fast.

Each side rushed to saddle the other with responsibility for inflation. "It now costs you \$2.07 to buy what a dollar bought in 1940," management commiserated at the time of the strike, adding that "the major cause of this inflation has been the steady rise in employment costs." But labor maintained that the leaders of big steel could keep their pace-making prices down while continuing to take home more money than the average man dreams of. United States Steel, labor argued, could have cut its prices \$18 per ton in the first quarter of 1959 and still earned a net profit—after taxes—"equal to an annual rate of return of 6.8 percent on net worth."

Mr. President, making it possible, first, for the public to know what is going on in the steel industry and, second, for steel employers and employees to know what the public wants done about it is clearly a sizable job. It could, I think, best be undertaken by a quasi-public rather than a Government organization. Partisan politics would thus be kept out of the picture. The new body might be called a National Consumers Advisory Board. It should include representatives of the press, big and small business, labor organizations, academic institutions, religious groups, welfare organizations, service organizations and the like. It should be a permanent organization, chartered by the Federal Government with a permanent staff and secretariat paid from Government funds.

Local or regional problems could best be considered by boards also set up at those levels. But when a national problem arises, such as the price of steel or the wage level for the whole industry, the national board should operate with the advice of local and regional boards on anticipated local effects and sentiment. A major function of the boards at all levels would be, of course, to disseminate their views and findings in order to mobilize public support.

Since the activities of the national board would cut across many departmental lines, it should report directly to the President. Upon its recommendations the President might—as he did last September—use his influence to persuade the steel companies that it is not in the national interest to raise steel prices. Or he might use conclusions of the board to buttress an appeal for restraint, such as he urged upon labor leaders this year. The formal support of an alerted and informed public would, I believe, do much to promote the success of such efforts in the future.

Of course, public opinion not backed up by the power—or the likelihood—of action might not be sufficient to hold the wage and price line. If persuasion fails, the President has other tools available.

He has the antitrust laws. He may recommend legislative action.

But we ought carefully to forge and organize an additional tool, of the type I have described, which would enable the President to maximize the influence of public opinion which has just been demonstrated to be an effective instrument of national policy in labor-management relations. Thus we may avoid the necessity—or at least make less frequent the need—for more direct Government action.

The process here outlined is a half-way house, between price, and wage fixing by the Government, and allowing industry leaders a completely free hand. This compromise will not please devotees of the free market visualized by Adam Smith. But in fact such a market does not exist. We have long had a "mixed" economy. Government regulation of tariffs, transportation, and utility rates, minimum-wage laws, and farm-price supports, for example, already interfere with a so-called free market economy. So do non-Government actions such as arbitrary price fixing by industry leaders. Indeed, there has never been a time in the entire history of the Western World when the so-called free market operated as visualized by Adam Smith. There have always been public restraints—operating through agencies of Government as well as through nongovernmental agencies of society—on prices and pricing policies, and I am amazed at the number of academic economists who do not seem to realize this. Nor does my proposal fit into an authoritarian system where most decisions of importance are made by the Government. This is certainly not wanted by most Americans.

Other countries which share our political and social philosophy have used methods similar to the one I have suggested to keep prices and wages in line. Britain, for example, has adopted a pause in wage increases. The Netherlands has had, since World War II, a board which can legally veto negotiated wage settlements. Austria has a wage-price commission which has successfully resisted big increases in prices and wages, although the commission has no court-enforceable authority; it can only make recommendations. West Germany does not now have formal machinery of this sort, but the German employers' confederation favors establishment of a committee of economists to recommend wage-price policies. In the Scandinavian countries, although there is no formal machinery, there is close cooperation among government, employers, and union leaders in holding down prices, especially in export items.

Americans are a practical people. Pragmatism is our philosophy. I do not think we need to make the hard choice between a resumption of inflation and strict Government controls. But we may be forced to choose between these alternatives unless we find a way to curb private self-interest and to guard the public welfare.

Mr. President, I am drafting and will shortly introduce in the Senate a bill

to authorize the establishment of a National Consumers Advisory Board which would function generally as I have outlined in these remarks. In my opinion, this subject merits active consideration by the Senate and by the House of Representatives. I hope the successful conclusion of the recent negotiations in the steel industry will not operate to lull us into inaction. Indeed, we should take advantage of the time afforded by the new steel contract to devote deliberate consideration to effective measures to preserve free collective bargaining in a competitive private enterprise economy.

SERVING OF ALCOHOLIC BEVERAGES AT SOCIAL FUNCTIONS IN THE CAPITOL AND SENATE OFFICE BUILDINGS

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD an article written by Milton Berliner and published in the Washington Daily News of Tuesday, April 3, 1962, including also the statement which appears under a picture of the senior Senator from Oregon that is published along with the article. I may say humorously that I am sorry the picture cannot be reprinted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection, the article and title of the picture were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

J.F.K. TAKES A PEEK AT OLD STAMPING GROUND—"THAT'S THE WAY IT WAS WHEN I LEFT"

(By Milton Berliner)

President Kennedy just couldn't resist it. As he walked down the corridor alongside the Senate Chamber yesterday, he looked through a door and spotted Senator WAYNE MORSE, Democrat, of Oregon, in the midst of one of his famous late-afternoon harangues to an almost empty Chamber.

The President hesitated, pushed the door open a bit and walked into the Chamber four or five steps.

He leaned forward, pointed to Senator Morse and said something.

The Senator grinned and resumed his speech as President Kennedy turned and walked out the door.

HIS REMARK

When he emerged he was asked what he had said to Senator MORSE.

"I said, 'That's the way it was when I left the Senate,'" the President replied.

Just before he had paused to kid Senator Morse, President Kennedy had been a guest of honor at a party Majority Leader MIKE MANSFIELD, Democrat, of Montana, gave to mark the opening of the new Senate reception room.

The President chatted with Senators and Cabinet members there for 20 minutes but did not so much as glance at the table where the bar had been set up.

Someone attributed his abstinence to the fact that Minority Leader EVERETT DIRKSEN, Republican, of Illinois, had warned him when he arrived that Senator MORSE, at that very moment, was addressing the Senate on the evils of serving liquor in the Capitol.

HAD INVITATION

Senator MORSE, of course, had been invited to the party but he had told Senator MANSFIELD that he would not be seen anywhere that liquor was served.

And Senator MORSE told the Senate that such activity should "be stopped forthwith."

"Official action should be taken by Congress," he said. "Members should stand up and be counted—and let them answer back home."

Incidentally, a goodly number of Senators who did attend the reception drank nothing stronger than ginger ale.

PICTURE CAPTION

Senator WAYNE MORSE, Democrat, of Oregon, told the Senate yesterday he would not be seen where liquor was served. But back in 1960, when he was campaigning for the District's Democratic convention votes, he was happy, as this picture shows, to pose behind the bar of a local bistro.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I now read a letter I have written under date of April 4, 1962, to Mr. John O'Rourke, editor of the Washington Daily News:

APRIL 4, 1962.

Mr. JOHN O'ROURKE,
Editor, Washington Daily News,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. O'ROURKE: My attention has just been called to the story that appeared in the Washington Daily News of Tuesday, April 3, by Milton Berliner. Accompanying the story is a picture with the printed caption, "Senator WAYNE MORSE, Democrat, of Oregon, told the Senate yesterday he would not be seen where liquor was served. But back in 1960, when he was campaigning for the District's Democratic convention votes, he was happy, as this picture shows, to pose behind the bar of a local bistro."

Both Berliner's story and the caption under the picture are typical of the biased and slanted journalism of your paper. I have long since ceased to expect either fair or accurate reporting from Berliner when I happen to be the subject matter of his articles.

In my speech of April 2, I pointed out that a social policy "has been developing in the Senate with increasing frequency in recent years. I believe it ought to be stopped. I refer to official and semiformal and, I understand, sometimes unofficial use of the physical facilities in the Capitol and in the Senate Office Buildings. I do not know about the House, and I would not purport to advise the House.

"There is a growing social pattern of holding affairs in rooms in the Capitol and in the Senate Office Buildings at which hard liquor is served. In my opinion it cannot be justified. In the opinion of millions of American citizens it constitutes a desecration of public facilities in the Capitol and in the Senate Office Buildings. It ought to be stopped forthwith. At least I think that official action should be taken by Congress and that Members of Congress should be asked to stand up and be counted on the issue.

"I close my comments by saying that I will not knowingly attend such an affair; and if I find myself in such an affair, and hard liquor is being served, I will immediately absent myself from such an affair, because I do not think it is good public policy."

The picture of me which you published had no connection with my 1960 campaign in the District of Columbia. It was taken in a downtown restaurant where I stopped one morning for breakfast. While I was eating breakfast at the counter, the proprietor introduced himself to me and said that we was pleased to have me patronize his restaurant for breakfast. He then asked me if I would object to his taking my picture to add to his collection of pictures of public officials who from time to time have patronized his restaurant.

In the course of our conversation, I told him that when I was in college, I worked for a time behind a soda and sandwich counter in Madison, Wis. That caused him to sug-

gest that I stand behind his soda and restaurant counter for the picture, and as the picture shows, I placed my hand on the soda jerk.

Contrary to your caption of the picture, I was not standing behind a bar although I noticed after I was in the restaurant that there was next to the restaurant and soda counter a liquor bar, as is true of a very large percentage of the restaurants in Washington.

The obvious intent of your story and picture was to seek to leave the impression that my practices do not conform to my statements about the liquor issue. Such snide and yellow journalism explains in part the reason for the fact that journalists, as a profession, are held in such low esteem and rightly so, by so many people. People do not approve of trickery, be it manifested in journalism or any other human endeavor.

My protesting the use of Capitol and Senate Office Building facilities for affairs at which hard liquor is served is due no doubt, in part, to the fact that by conviction I am a teetotaler but also due to my many observations during my 18 years in the Senate that the high consumption of hard liquor in Washington, D.C., is a disgrace to the Nation.

Sincerely yours,

WAYNE MORSE.

Mr. President, tomorrow I shall submit a resolution for reference to the Committee on Rules and Administration. The resolution will propose that no facilities of the Capitol or Senate Office Buildings that is used for public purposes or for official or semiofficial affairs, or for any affair of a social or a semisocial nature conducted by any group under the sponsorship or auspices of a Senator, may be used if hard liquor is served at such affair. I wish to provide an opportunity for Senators to stand up and be counted on this issue. In my judgment, the people of the United States are entitled to have a yea-and-nay vote. I shall do my very best to try to obtain a yea-and-nay vote before this session of Congress adjourns.

I shall have more to say on this subject at a later time; but since I am speaking on the subject at this time, I wish to add this statement: I hold to the point of view that the high consumption of hard liquor in the United States is one of the curses of this country at the present time. In my 18 years as a Member of the Senate, I have seen public officials destroy themselves by permitting themselves to be victimized by alcoholism.

I believe that as public officials, so far as our public conduct is concerned with respect to the consumption of liquor, we have an obligation to set an example to the youth of the country. I think it is important that as public officials we not flaunt before the public the consumption of hard liquor.

Someone has asked me, "Will you take that position if you go to someone's cocktail party or social affair?" My answer is that that is quite different from a public affair.

Any hosts or hostesses of mine certainly have a right to conduct their social affairs in accordance with their pleasure; and at those affairs I have a right to limit myself to tomato juice or soft drinks of other natures, as a teetotaler. But, Mr. President, no one will

change my course of action because of the social habits of very dear friends of mine in regard to private affairs.

But in the case of affairs in the Capitol of the United States or in the Senate Office Buildings—which are public affairs—when they are using public facilities, then I am going to stand for my conviction in regard to this matter, because I think that is wrong.

Of course, I may be defeated. If I am defeated, and if my resolution is rejected, and if it is decided by the Senate that liquor may be served here, that decision will be the privilege of the Senate, and also its responsibility.

Mr. President, I am very greatly concerned about what I have observed in this town, during my 18 years of service in the Senate, as regards the liquor traffic. The statistics I have seen indicate that the District of Columbia has the highest per capita consumption of hard liquor of any area in the Nation. If I am in error about that, I wish the record to be corrected; but all the statistics submitted when this matter has been discussed before have borne out the observation I have just now made.

However, regardless of whether the per capita consumption of hard liquor in the District of Columbia is higher than in any other part of the country or not, it is certainly too high, in my judgment, for the good of the Nation; and I do not think that, as Senators, we should be setting an example of flaunting the consumption of hard liquor at Senate affairs conducted in the Capitol or in the Senate Office Buildings.

Of course it is up to the House of Representatives to decide what it wishes to do in regard to its affairs.

Mr. President, I am satisfied that I am speaking about a very delicate matter about which people have very deep feelings; and resentments can easily be stirred up, and many people will be inclined to take the position that one really has no right to seek to regulate the social habits of others. I do not intend to do that, Mr. President. But I do say, as a Senator, that in my judgment the people of this country, through their representatives, have a right to have this matter decided by formal action, so that the people of the Nation can then decide whether their representatives took formal action of which they approve. I think my colleagues will be surprised to discover the strong body of opinion in this country, even on the part of the social cocktail drinkers themselves, that will agree that it is one thing for them to give a private cocktail party, and it is quite another thing to make use of public facilities, as an official affair connected with the Senate of the United States, for a cocktail party.

But even if I do not prevail, at least I shall have put the Senate in a position where it will have to decide this matter officially; and of course I would take the position—and rightly so, I think—that inaction on my resolution would be subject to the interpretation that apparently the Senate wanted to continue a growing social trend which I have observed in recent years—namely,

to turn some of the Senate affairs in the Capitol and in the Senate Office Buildings into a social cocktail hour.

That was not true when I first came to the Senate, 18 years ago; I cannot remember that in the first years when I was here, there was any official or semiofficial affair in the Capitol or in the Senate Office Building at which hard liquor was served. I know of no good reason why this trend should develop.

Therefore, Mr. President, on tomorrow I shall submit my resolution; and I am advised by the Parliamentarian that such a resolution will be referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration, for appropriate action.

ENROLLED BILLS PRESENTED

The Secretary of the Senate reported that on today, April 4, 1962, he presented to the President of the United States the following enrolled bills:

- S. 193. An act for the relief of Rev. Patrick Floyd;
- S. 899. An act for the relief of Liu Shui Chen;
- S. 1305. An act for the relief of Kazuo Ito and Satomi Ito;
- S. 1520. An act for the relief of Mary Elizabeth Sidor Polkowska;
- S. 1578. An act for the relief of Edward Yin Liang;
- S. 1638. An act for the relief of Felix Ledina Mendoza;
- S. 1841. An act for the relief of Maria Zambetoulla;
- S. 1874. An act for the relief of Roland Fernando Mishutani;
- S. 2018. An act for the relief of Robert B. Kasperek, Robert M. Kearnym, Richard A. Stokes, J. R. Whitehouse, Jr., and Herbert A. Wolff, Jr.; and
- S. 2101. An act for the relief of Aida Mary Sorino Bocalery.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 11 A.M. TOMORROW

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, pursuant to the order previously entered, I now move that the Senate adjourn until tomorrow, at 11 a.m.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 6 o'clock and 4 minutes p.m.) the Senate adjourned, under the order previously entered, until tomorrow, Thursday, April 5, 1962, at 11 o'clock a.m.

NOMINATION

Executive nomination received by the Senate April 4, 1962:

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

Nicholas deB. Katzenbach, of Illinois, to be Deputy Attorney General, vice Byron R. White.

CONFIRMATION

Executive nomination confirmed by the Senate April 4, 1962:

AMBASSADOR

Robert F. Woodward, of Minnesota, a Foreign Service officer of the class of career minister, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Spain.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

WEDNESDAY, APRIL 4, 1962

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Hebrews 12: 2: *Looking unto Jesus the author and finisher of our faith.*

O Thou God of all wisdom, our President, our Speaker, and the Members of Congress know that daily they are challenged by many unsolved problems and many unsettled issues.

Grant that, cheered and encouraged by a vision of Thy nearness and greatness, they may bear clear and confident witness that they are striving to know Thy way and to do Thy will.

Show us how we may preserve and promote the moral and spiritual values and may we never be numbered among the cynics who would have us believe that all the higher ideals and aspirations are foolish and futile.

Help us to understand that our days and years, whether few or many, afford us the glorious opportunity for the culture of our souls, created in Thine own image and with a capacity to be like Thee in spirit. Hear us in the name of our blessed Lord. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

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

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. McGown, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment a joint resolution of the House of the following title:

H.J. Res. 441. Joint resolution to commemorate the 75th anniversary of the Interstate Commerce Commission.

The message also announced that Mr. MAGNUSON, chairman of the Committee on Commerce, had appointed the Senator from New York, Mr. KEATING, a member of the Board of Visitors to the Merchant Marine Academy in place of the Senator from New Jersey, Mr. CASE, resigned.

RECESS

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to order of the House of March 29, the Speaker declares a recess of the House subject to the call of the Chair.

Accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 3 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

JOINT MEETING OF THE HOUSE AND SENATE TO HEAR AN ADDRESS BY HIS EXCELLENCY JOAO GOULART, PRESIDENT OF THE REPUBLIC OF THE UNITED STATES OF BRAZIL

The SPEAKER of the House presided. The Doorkeeper announced the Vice President and Members of the U.S. Senate who entered the Hall of the House

of Representatives, the Vice President taking the chair at the right of the Speaker, and the Members of the Senate the seats reserved for them.

The SPEAKER. On the part of the House the Chair appoints as members of the committee to escort the President of Brazil into the Chamber: The gentleman from Oklahoma, Mr. ALBERT; the gentleman from Pennsylvania, Mr. MORGAN; the gentleman from Indiana, Mr. HALLECK; and the gentleman from Illinois, Mr. CHIPERFIELD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. On the part of the Senate the Chair appoints as members of the committee of escort the Senator from Montana, Mr. MANSFIELD; the Senator from Minnesota, Mr. HUMPHREY; the Senator from Arkansas, Mr. FULBRIGHT; the Senator from Alabama, Mr. SPARKMAN; the Senator from Oregon, Mr. MORSE; the Senator from Illinois, Mr. DIRKSEN; the Senator from California, Mr. KUCHEL; the Senator from Wisconsin, Mr. WILEY; the Senator from Iowa, Mr. HICKENLOOPER; and the Senator from Vermont, Mr. AIKEN.

The Doorkeeper announced the ambassadors, ministers, and chargés d'affaires of foreign governments.

The ambassadors, ministers, and chargés d'affaires of foreign governments entered the Hall of the House of Representatives and took seats reserved for them.

The Doorkeeper announced the Cabinet of the President of the United States.

The members of the Cabinet of the President of the United States entered the Hall of the House of Representatives and took the seats reserved for them in front of the Speaker's rostrum.

At 12 o'clock and 34 minutes p.m. the Doorkeeper announced the President of the Republic of the United States of Brazil.

The President of the Republic of the United States of Brazil, escorted by the committee of Senators and Representatives, entered the Hall of the House of Representatives, and stood at the Clerk's desk.

[Applause, the Members rising.]

The SPEAKER. Members of the Congress, it is a great pleasure, and I deem it a high privilege and honor, to present to you His Excellency, the President of the Republic of the United States of Brazil. [Applause, the Members rising].

ADDRESS BY HIS EXCELLENCY THE PRESIDENT OF THE REPUBLIC OF THE UNITED STATES OF BRAZIL

President GOULART. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Vice President, Senators, and Congressmen, I feel greatly honored to speak from this rostrum and transmit to the representatives of the American people the greetings of the Government and the people of Brazil. This is the second time that such a privileged opportunity has been accorded me by act of fate. The first occasion was in 1956 when, as Vice President of my country, I came here at the invitation of your own Vice President at that time, the distinguished Mr. Richard Nixon, and today I do so again in

compliance with another invitation, which I have had the honor of receiving from the eminent President of the United States, Mr. John Kennedy. The relations between our two countries go back to the era of our independence, and they have been intensified in more recent times, as we have fought side by side in the two World Wars, in defense of democracy and freedom. [Applause.]

Never have those relations been dimmed by attritions or by misunderstandings, even though at times we may have supported diverging views. [Applause.]

It is my deep conviction that good and well-defined relations between Brazil and the United States are both desirable and necessary. It seems to me essential, in terms of a democratic continental affirmation that there be always a perfect understanding between the two greatest nations on this hemisphere. [Applause.]

Brazil and the United States shaped their democratic conscience over the course of their struggles for independence, and ever since they have been engaged in a century-old effort to implant and perfect a form of representative government, based on the supremacy of a written constitution, on respect for the autonomy of states and on the guarantees of individual rights. [Applause.]

While this similarity in organization breeds identical sentiments as to the defense of legality and the preservation of public freedoms, there is, at the same time, between our two countries a profound diversity in socioeconomic conditions which has led us down different paths, at a different pace, to achieve identical objectives.

The Government and the people of Brazil have spared no sacrifices in order to overcome backwardness and underdevelopment. We are trying to establish a harmonious development throughout the country to correct regional imbalances and avoid state of destitution in certain areas and raise them to the level, for instance, of the State of São Paulo, where the per capita income is higher than that of some of the highly industrialized countries.

In the struggle for development and for our economic emancipation, we have suffered the influence of adverse factors, which we are determined to overcome. There are permanent imbalances in the system of trade relations between countries having an adverse economic development, with prejudicial reflexes on the economically weaker countries. We can eliminate or at least attenuate these imbalances, through conventions and agreements based on friendly arrangements and the adoption of realistic formulas.

The monetary inflation in Brazil, of which so much has been said both in our country and abroad, is not a local phenomenon; it coincided with the wartime economy, when the old economic-financial structure suffered the impact of abrupt changes in our allies' supply and demand.

During the war years the prices of our export products were frozen at levels that were much below their real value. When

normal trade conditions were reestablished, it became possible for the countries of Europe, and others whose economies had been ravaged by war, to eliminate inflation and restore prosperity. To this end they were favored during the period 1948-52 by the massive help received from the American economy which sustained, through loans and grants, not only the former Allies but also the former enemies, allowing them quickly to recover and even to surpass their previous levels of agricultural and industrial production. Once their industries were rebuilt, those countries began to trade under the particularly advantageous conditions under which the exporters of manufactured goods operate.

The Latin American countries, with their war-born inflation, remained devoid of any plan of international cooperation for the recovery of their agriculture and the development of their industries, depending exclusively upon the export of their primary products for the restoration of their trade. The story of the growing deterioration of the terms of trade of commodities with manufactured goods is well known to all. From year to year, the same number of bags of coffee or of cocoa or of cotton buys a lesser quantity of the same type of equipment or of manufactured products. While our primary products have remained exposed to a continuing fall in prices, the index of growth of our population has increased at such levels that Brazil is expected to possess 200 million inhabitants by the end of this century. Notwithstanding such adverse factors, Brazil has been maintaining a growing rhythm in the increase of its per capita income and of the national product. This notable effort for development is due above all to the unlimited reserves of energy and sense of patriotism of the Brazilian people.

It is true that we have secured appreciable bank loans at normal rates of interest and for regular terms, granted chiefly by financial agencies of the United States—and of this the Brazilian people is fully aware, as it is also aware that the eradication of the difficulties which we are now undergoing depends upon our work, our energy, and our sacrifice.

We feel, gentlemen of the Congress, that our destiny is in our own hands, and we keep our eyes open to find the adequate solutions for the development of Brazil. The political awareness of the leaders in government and of the people themselves is keenly awake to the fact that the fight for development is the fight of the people. In pursuance of this purpose, we are engaged in the realization and implementation of basic reforms, among which the agrarian reform is paramount. We recognize the importance of the foreign contribution to the process of our development.

I have repeatedly said that we nourish no prejudice against foreign capital and the technical collaboration of the more advanced countries. We desire this cooperation and will assure its full freedom within the legal limits established and under the inspiration of Brazilian

ideals. [Applause.] Only a short time ago I reaffirmed these very same concepts, in an address which I made to the American Chamber of Commerce in Rio de Janeiro where I was guest of honor at a reception organized on the occasion of my departure from Brazil.

As a country now in a phase of full expansion, Brazil offers broad possibilities to foreign private enterprise desirous to cooperate loyally for its development. In the matter of public utilities services, there are certain areas of friction which should be eliminated, all the more so because through a natural phenomenon, beside creating disagreements between the granting authority and the concessionary, they are not rarely a source of misunderstanding between friendly countries.

Brazil hailed with confidence the announcement of the new policy of the United States toward Latin America, as expressed by President Kennedy in the Alliance for Progress and having Operation Pan America, a Brazilian initiative, as one of its historic milestones. We see in the Alliance for Progress the formulation of a plan for global cooperation, which Latin America has awaited since the termination of the Second World War, and which, once carried out, should have for our hemisphere the proportions and significance which the Marshall plan had for the countries of Western Europe. [Applause.] The lack of initiative of this magnitude made it extremely difficult for the countries of the hemisphere to stabilize their economies. Thus, the Alliance for Progress has significantly been placed within the framework not only of its economic aspects but also of its social aspects as your Chief Executive emphasized in these highly significant words, "those who make peaceable revolution impossible will render violent revolution inevitable." I cannot conceal, however, my fears as to the difficulties in implementation. If the Alliance for Progress is to depend upon an effort by the Latin American countries to achieve global planning with absolute technical precision in the economic and social fields and to eliminate beforehand certain factors of instability, we can introduce hindrances capable of impairing the urgency of solutions which cannot be put off.

Such difficulties will mount if the Alliance fails to reflect, principally, the spirit of reciprocal trust and respect between the countries which comprise it, in line with the purposes expressed by the eminent President Kennedy. I wish to reaffirm the identification of my country with the democratic principles which unite the peoples of the West. Brazil forms no part of any politicomilitary bloc, but it abides by its freely assumed international commitments. Brazil's international action responds to no other objective than that of favoring, by all means in our power, the preservation and strengthening of peace. It is our belief that the ideological conflict between East and West cannot and must not be decided by military action, for in the event of a nuclear war, even if we managed to save our own lives, whether

in victory or in defeat our very reason for living would be obliterated. The end of the dangerous emulation in armaments in comity of relationships must be sought through negotiations.

Brazil believes that a noninimical contact between the democratic world and the socialist world can be beneficial to the knowledge and coordination of experience of all. It is our hope that these contacts will make it evident that representative democracy is the most perfect of all forms of government and the only one compatible with the protection of mankind and the preservation of human freedom. [Applause.]

Gentlemen of the Congress, I have used simple and direct language to express the thought of the Government and the people of Brazil on the more timely problems in our relations as good and longstanding friends. This is the same kind of language that two great Presidents—President Franklin Delano Roosevelt and President Getúlio Vargas—in times that were crucial for the history of mankind, when they found efficient and friendly forms of mutual understanding. I place my trust in God, and I feel certain that we can contribute to the peace and happiness of the world, eliminating economic slavery, despotism and fear, and guaranteeing popular freedoms and personal security within a democratic and representative political system.

Thank you, Mr. President.

[Applause, the Members rising.]

At 1 o'clock and 7 minutes p.m., the President of Brazil, accompanied by the committee of escort, retired from the Hall of the House of Representatives.

The Doorkeeper escorted the invited guests from the Chamber in the following order:

The members of the President's Cabinet.

The ambassadors, ministers, and chargés d'affaires of foreign governments.

JOINT MEETING DISSOLVED

The SPEAKER. The Chair declares the joint meeting of the two Houses now dissolved.

Accordingly, at 1 o'clock and 10 minutes p.m., the joint session of the two Houses was dissolved.

The Members of the Senate retired to their Chamber.

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker at 1 o'clock and 45 minutes p.m.

PROCEEDINGS HAD DURING RECESS

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the proceedings had during the recess of the House may be printed in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

PENNSYLVANIA HOME RULE ASSOCIATION, IN THE FACE OF AN ADVERSE REPORT BY THE DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE, DEFENDS MY BILL, H.R. 8612, PROVIDING FOR THE NATIONAL HOME RULE ROAD PROGRAM

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, since the introduction, on August 9, 1961, of H.R. 8612 at the request of my good friend and constituent, Mr. Thomas S. Stephenson, president, Pennsylvania Home Rule Association, Altoona, Pa., there has been widespread interest in the legislation. It has been described as the national home rule road program, because it proposes amendments to the Highway Revenue Act of 1956 which would channel all Federal gasoline and automotive excise taxes into the highway trust fund. These taxes would be used for road improvement purposes and would spur improvements on all classes of public highways.

On March 2, 1962, the U.S. Department of Commerce, through its Under Secretary, Edward Gudeman, advised Chairman WILBUR D. MILLS, of the House Committee on Ways and Means, of its opposition to H.R. 8612.

The position of the Department of Commerce reveals the Kennedy administration's attitude in opposing any further amendments to the Federal Highway Act of 1956. The letter from the Department of Commerce follows:

THE SECRETARY OF COMMERCE,
Washington, D.C.

Hon. WILBUR D. MILLS,
Chairman, Committee on Ways and Means,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: This is in further reply to your request for the views of the Department of Commerce concerning H.R. 8612, a bill "To amend the Highway Revenue Act of 1956, and for other purposes."

The proposed legislation, which would be cited as the "national home rule road program," would provide that the entire amount received from Federal gasoline and automotive excise taxes would be placed in the highway trust fund and used for road improvement purposes. It would be provided that all public highways would be eligible for Federal aid, with 60 percent of the Federal funds available in the highway trust fund to be used for improvement of the Federal-aid systems and 40 percent for improvement of State highways and local roads and streets not designated as a part of any Federal-aid system. With respect to the latter, 50 percent of such funds would be expended by the State on State highways not designated as part of the Federal-aid highway system and 50 percent would be allocated by the State to those of its political subdivisions having jurisdiction over local roads and streets. The bill also would remove the present matching requirements of Federal-aid highway legislation so that Federal-aid highway funds apportioned to each State would be expended by the State or political subdivisions thereof without

necessity for the States or their political subdivisions contributing funds toward highways constructed or improved under the legislation.

The Department of Commerce would be strongly opposed to the pending bill.

With respect to the provisions of the bill providing that all Federal gasoline and automotive excise taxes be placed in the highway trust fund, your attention is invited to the special message of the President concerning highways, dated February 28, 1961, which opposed transferring certain automotive excise taxes to the highway trust fund and recommended that financing of the highway program should be continued on a pay-as-you-go basis, supported by the user taxes specified in the Highway Revenue Act of 1956. These recommendations of the President were closely followed in the enactment of the Federal-aid Highway Act of 1961 under which additional revenues were provided to finance the completion of the Interstate System and the continuation of the program for improvement of the Federal-aid primary and secondary systems and their urban extensions.

If legislation such as H.R. 8612 were enacted, estimated revenues totaling over \$1.6 billion annually, now accruing to the general fund, would be transferred to the highway trust fund.

The remaining provisions of the bill are entirely inconsistent with the fundamental concepts of Federal-aid highway legislation as developed by the Congress over a period of 45 years. Experience during these many years of Federal-aid highway operations has demonstrated the desirability of providing for the improvement of designated Federal-aid systems. It is apparent that funds would be widely dispersed and that an uncoordinated pattern of improvement would result if there were no requirement for system improvement. In fact, the requirement for system improvement was first incorporated in the Federal Highway Act of 1921 and has remained unchanged in principle.

Under the provisions of H.R. 8612, however, 40 percent of the Federal-aid highway funds could be expended without regard to system development or continuity of route improvement. The Department of Commerce considers that the expenditure of public funds in this manner would be highly undesirable and could readily lead to misuse of Federal-aid highway funds. We firmly believe that the public would not be receiving the greatest possible benefit from its highway dollar under such provisions.

In connection with that portion of the bill which would remove the present matching requirements of Federal-aid highway legislation, it is stressed that, as a result, the volume of Federal-aid highway work which could be performed would be reduced substantially. Under the present law, the Federal-aid primary, secondary, and urban funds authorized to be appropriated by the Congress must be matched on a 50 percent Federal-50 percent State basis, and interstate funds must be matched on a 90 percent Federal-10 percent State basis. Under Federal-aid authorization levels for the fiscal year 1963, the program reduction resulting from a rescission of State matching requirements would amount to nearly \$1.2 billion annually.

Beyond this fact, there is to be considered the longstanding principle of Federal-State cooperation in the Federal-aid highway program. This Department believes it is essential that State or local funds contribute to the costs of projects financed from Federal-aid funds, except in certain special cases now authorized by law, as a means of insuring good highway administration. Prudent and efficient supervision of Federal-aid highway projects is much more likely to result at the State or local level if State or local funds are being expended together with the authorized Federal contribution.

The Department of Commerce believes that the provisions of H.R. 8612 are in direct conflict with the fundamental concepts which have been so recently supported by the Congress and the President in the enactment and approval of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1961 and strongly opposes the enactment of the proposed legislation.

The Bureau of the Budget advises that there would be no objection to the submission of this report from the standpoint of the administration's program.

Sincerely yours,

EDWARD GUEDEMAN,
Under Secretary of Commerce.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to call attention to the following letter which I received, dated March 28, from Mr. Thomas S. Stephenson, of the Pennsylvania Home Rule Association, Altoona, Pa., in which he takes issue with the negative position of the Department of Commerce regarding H.R. 8612.

PENNSYLVANIA HOME RULE
ASSOCIATION,

Altoona, Pa., March 28, 1962.

Hon. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT,
1104 New House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. VAN ZANDT: Thanks for your letter of March 12 requesting our views on objections raised by the Department of Commerce to your bill, H.R. 8612, to provide a national home rule road program.

In analyzing the objections raised by the Department of Commerce, it is obvious that the author of the Department's objections had distorted the provisions of the bill and ignored its objectives and, in particular, the benefits that would accrue to the people in every State and congressional district in the Nation by enactment of the measure.

The basic provisions of the bill would:

1. End the diversion of motor revenues.
2. Guarantee the motorists a balanced highway improvement program on all classes of public roads—Federal, State, and local.
3. Promote the civic welfare of every community in every congressional district in the Nation.
4. Help to restore national prosperity by providing employment for several hundred thousand men on the roads and streets and in the roadbuilding material, equipment, and allied industries.
5. Enhance real estate values in every community where road improvements are made.
6. Promote the building of new homes, stores, shopping centers, offices, and service stations, as such construction always follows road and street improvements. This would provide additional employment in the building and allied industries.
7. Provide additional employment in the factories and farms that would produce the food, clothing, household, and other necessities that would be bought by those employed in the program.

All the foregoing objectives could be attained by Congress by enacting H.R. 8612, because this bill requires that all Federal gasoline and excise taxes be placed in the highway trust fund to be used exclusively for road improvement purposes. Sixty percent of the trust fund, the same amount as is now used, would be allocated for improvements on the Federal-aid system. The other 40 percent would be allocated to the States, one-half to be used for State highway improvements and the other half to be allocated by the States to their political subdivisions on a 60-percent mileage and 40-percent population basis for the improvement of local roads which are not on the Federal-aid system.

The Department of Commerce objects to the use of the now diverted funds for the improvement of the State and local road systems that are not on the Federal-aid system.

Its spokesman said, "The Department of Commerce considers that the expenditure of public funds in this manner would be highly undesirable and could readily lead to misuse of Federal-aid highway funds. We firmly believe that the public would not be receiving the greatest possible benefit from its highway dollar under such provisions."

This statement obviously is intended to mislead the Members of Congress, since it is not in keeping with the facts or the record.

The Department's charge that State and local road officials would misuse Federal funds comes with poor grace, when its Federal-aid policies are being subjected to an investigation by the Blatnik committee of Congress, which already has exposed corruption, waste, and downright graft in the Federal-aid program. Here is a quote from disclosures as published in a national magazine:

"Minnesota Representative JOHN BLATNIK estimates a large slice of the \$41 billion highway bill is stolen by grafters."

Here is another from the same article:

"One investigator estimates a graft between 10 and 20 percent, a minimum of a \$100,000 take a mile, or \$4.1 billion for the whole network."

The foregoing are only samples of the findings of the investigators. Yet, the Department of Commerce spokesman is telling the Members of Congress that State and local officials might misuse Federal funds and the public would not be receiving the greatest possible benefit from its highway dollar.

The record shows that local officials and State highway officials give the motorists more highways for the dollar than they receive under the Federal-aid program. In fact, it is our opinion that the allocation of the \$1,700 million of diverted funds to State and local roads would result in a minimum of more than 60,000 miles of road improvements annually.

The Department spokesman had overlooked one important point in his loose statements: The funds allocated for the improvement of State and local roads and streets would be subject to the same rigid laws regulating the expenditure of State and local funds for highway improvements.

The highway officials of the various States are either elected or appointed. The local officials, in the counties and other political subdivisions that would receive a share of the funds, are elected by the people.

The Department of Commerce spokesman for the Federal-aid bureaucracy, in making such rash accusations against the honesty, integrity, and ability of State and local officials, discloses little regard for the intelligence of elected officials, and it appears that they have the same opinion of Members of Congress or they would not have resorted to so many distortions of the provisions of H.R. 8612.

The Federal highway bureaucracy is not adverse to spending an average of \$1 million per mile for the Interstate System, which is estimated by the Bureau of Public Roads to carry only 20 percent of the total highway traffic when it is completed in 1975. Yet, the same officials object to the proposal in H.R. 8612 to provide that the \$1,700 million of diverted funds be made available for improvements on the State and local systems, which now carry 34 percent of the total highway traffic, or 15 percent more than the Interstate System will carry when it is completed at a cost of \$41 billion.

Motorists throughout the country are becoming aroused over the deplorable condition of the public road system. They are finally becoming alerted to the diversion policy of the Federal Government, which is shortchanging them out of tens of thousands of miles of road improvements annually. They also are becoming aware that

the matching provisions likewise are robbing them of improvements on the State highway systems. Many of them long have been aware that they are not getting their money's worth and they are being irked more than ever by dispatches published in their newspapers disclosing that hundreds of millions of dollars that they pay in Federal automotive taxes are being used to build, yes, superhighways in foreign countries, when they cannot get the improvements they need on the State and local roads that are not on the Federal-aid system.

The following is a sample and is a quote from a recent newspaper dispatch: "Washington—The World Bank's first loan to Venezuela, \$45 million, will help to finance two express highways and cut transportation costs."

It is not hard to understand the feeling of the motorists when they read such reports and realize there are millions available for express highways in foreign countries, but no money for the roads used by American motorists who are paying the multi-billion-dollar tax bill.

The matching provisions of the Federal-aid policy are directly responsible for the deplorable condition of thousands of miles of State highways. The matching provisions penalize the districts that need help the most. They must either put up the matching money or lose the Federal aid their taxpayers help to pay. Rather than lose it, they must put up money that is needed for State highway improvements. This forces neglect of the State roads that are not on the Federal-aid system and will, if the present policy continues, cost the taxpayers additional billions of dollars for reconstruction through the forced neglect by the notorious matching provisions.

On the face of it, the matching provisions constitute a ridiculous policy. Why should the people of any State put up from 10 to 50 percent of the State highway funds to get back only part of the money their motorists pay into the Federal Government in automobile excise taxes?

The Federal Highway Bureau policymakers, of course, do not want the matching provisions eliminated and the allocation of Federal-aid funds made directly to the States. Not because less roads would be built, but because the matching provisions give them greater powers to control, not only the expenditure of Federal-aid moneys, but over \$1 billion of State funds, too.

These bureaucratic controls in Washington are ridiculous in that they violate the basic principles of States right and home rule. Why should State and local officials be controlled from Washington by the Federal highway bureaucracy? Certainly the local officials know their people's needs better than Federal highway officials who could not know anything about local road problems.

The Commerce Department spokesman places great stress on the charge that the allocation of Federal funds for State and local road improvements "would be widely dispersed and that an uncoordinated pattern of improvements would result if there were no requirement for system improvement."

This is a ridiculous assertion, in view of the fact that it would be impossible for any road officials to build all highways first. They must build, and have been building, the most important roads and adding to them as funds are available.

The Interstate System policy, controlled by the Bureau of Public Roads, has been the subject of public and congressional criticism for the widely scattered improvements on the Interstate System. No public road officials—Federal, State or local—can build a 10-mile stretch of highway, regardless of its importance, if there is only enough money

available to build 1 mile. But the Commerce Department, in its statement, is evidently trying to impress Congress by the inference that only State and local roads would be constructed on a scattered pattern.

The Department also places some stress on the argument that H.R. 8612 would change the Federal-aid highway setup. It doesn't change any part of the Federal-aid program, excepting the matching provisions. What it does provide for is that the 1,700 million collected in motor taxes and now diverted be allocated to the States and political subdivisions for the improvement of State and local roads not on the Federal-aid system.

In conclusion, we hope that the Committee on Ways and Means will take prompt action and report H.R. 8612 for a vote in Congress, and that the bill may be enacted at this session of Congress in time for the 1962 construction season, so that several hundred thousand men may be put to work on the greatest State and local road improvement program in the Nation's history.

Cordially yours,

PENNSYLVANIA HOME RULE
ASSOCIATION,

THOMAS S. STEPHENSON,

President.

Mr. Speaker, the proposal of the Pennsylvania Home Rule Association for a national home rule road program as embodied in my bill H.R. 8612 would mean, as Mr. Stephenson says in his letter, the creation of the greatest State and local road improvement program in the Nation's history. Therefore, it is hoped that the House Committee on Ways and Means will schedule hearings on H.R. 8612 so that the measure may be considered on its merits.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

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

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

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

A call of the House was ordered.

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

[Roll No. 58]

Addonizio	Ford	Rains
Alford	Gavin	Reece
Andrews	Grant	Reifel
Ashley	Green, Oreg.	Reuss
Auchincloss	Hansen	Rhodes, Ariz.
Avery	Harrison, Va.	Rivers, Alaska
Bailey	Hoffman, Mich.	Rivers, S.C.
Barry	Huddleston	Rogers, Colo.
Bolling	Inouye	Rogers, Tex.
Bonner	Jennings	St. George
Boykin	Jones, Ala.	Santangelo
Breeding	Kearns	Scott
Brewster	Kee	Scranton
Coad	McDowell	Selden
Cooley	McIntire	Smith, Miss.
Corbett	McMillan	Spence
Cunningham	Moorhead, Pa.	Stafford
Curtis, Mass.	Morrison	Thompson, N.J.
Dingell	Moulder	Tollefson
Dole	O'Brien, N.Y.	Whitten
Dowdy	O'Hara, Mich.	Wickersham
Evins	Passman	Wilson, Calif.
Finnegan	Patman	Wilson, Ind.
Flynt	Powell	Yates

The SPEAKER. Three hundred and fifty-eight Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

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

SECOND SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATION BILL, 1962

Mr. THOMAS. 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. 11038) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1962, and for other purposes; and pending the motion, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that general debate be limited to 2 hours, one-half of the time to be controlled by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. JENSEN] and one-half by myself.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. THOMAS].

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. 11038, with Mr. HARRIS in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, I will try to be brief so that Members desiring to do so may have time to express themselves on this bill.

Mr. Chairman, we bring to you today a bill of some 55 or 56 items covering about 25 agencies and bureaus. Bear in mind that this is the second supplemental appropriation for the fiscal year 1962, which ends on June 30, 1962, in other words, in about 2 months. We submit this supplemental bill to you for your consideration, asking you to give us your help. All the members of the subcommittee are here and we will endeavor, individually or collectively, to give you all the information you wish, knowing you are entitled to it. We want to cooperate with you. We well know that we are representing you in this matter.

As I stated, there are some 25 agencies and departments involved in this bill. In terms of appropriations it amounts to \$431 million. The bill has been reduced under the budget estimate about \$116 million.

The estimate calls for an increase in employment, in round figures, of 860 or 870 employees. Your committee recommends to you a reduction in the number of employees to about 500. May I ask our colleagues to refer to the committee report. It is not too long; it is concise and to the point. If you will look at the table you will note that most of the items have been reduced. There are some three or four items that have not been reduced. One of them is the Forest Service. It has been a tremendous year for fires involving some 8 or 10 of our Western Mountain States. It is the habit of the Congress to make a token appropriation of about \$5 million for fighting fires, and the remainder of the cost is covered at the end of the year in

the form of a deficiency. That is what this is, \$37 million. That money has been spent and, of course, we have our very able and genial friend from Iowa [Mr. JENSEN], who probably knows as much about this item, if not more, than all of the rest of us combined. He will be glad to explain it.

I think I should mention to you that in reading the bill you will find the phrase "Salaries and expenses," in about 15 or 16 items through roughly 25 percent of the bill. That is Bureau of the Budget nomenclature. In fact it does not represent additional jobs but is for what we call Wage Board pay increases. In round numbers there are about 15 of these items throughout the bill in practically one-quarter of all the agencies. I think I should go into a little detail about that.

You will recall that the Congress about 2 years ago, late in 1958, passed a law that made it mandatory—get that, mandatory—that these Wage Board pay increases be paid. Paid when?

Well, to make a long story short, it was about 60 days after they had accrued. So the Bureau of the Budget in its practice sets up most of these Wage Board increases in the form of a deficiency. If you will read the President's budget, regardless of who he is or which party he belongs to—it is the same procedure. You will note in the budgets a statement for 1959 or 1963 that Wage Board increases will be sent later in the form of a deficiency. So you have some 15 or 16 of those items in this bill.

Mr. Chairman, as I said, I do not want to take too much time. All of our colleagues on the committee are here, and we will endeavor individually or collectively to give you all the information that we have, and we will do it with great pleasure.

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

Mr. THOMAS. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. HALEY. I wonder if the distinguished gentleman from Texas will give us a little explanation of the amount of \$400,000 appearing on page 9 of the bill. It says the amount recommended includes \$400,000 for inauguration of an African medical program and for an African Administrative Service Center. Will the gentleman give us a little explanation of that?

Mr. THOMAS. Yes. The State Department is attempting to save money by setting up a little medical unit for our own people over there rather than having to fly them a thousand or 1,500 or 2,000 miles. I believe that our distinguished colleague from New York [Mr. ROONEY], and the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BOW], will give you the details you want on that.

Mr. HALEY. This is, then, for personnel employed in various agencies of the Government?

Mr. THOMAS. Yes; for our own people.

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

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

Mr. CELLER. The committee refused to grant an appropriation of \$330,000 to the Maritime Commission. The new Maritime Commission assumed all the regulatory powers and duties of the old Maritime Board. That involved violations of the Shipping Act, the protection of American flag carriers, bringing disciplinary proceedings against ship owners, the passing on rates, if unjust, only on in-board traffic, and examining conference reports.

In addition, by a new law which we passed, the Maritime Commission must screen all conferences, they must supervise all tariff filings. About 30,000 tariffs have been filed. Each tariff contains dozens of articles. They must prevent retaliation by one flag carrier against another, and retributions. They must determine whether rates, not only in-board but outboard, are fair and proper. They must check on the conferences and all actions under those conferences. They must license freight forwarders. There are a thousand applications pending abroad. They must conduct 240 hearings, and this is very important, which were the result of the workings of the Antitrust Subcommittee of the Committee on the Judiciary, where we unearthed 240 violations of the Shipping Act.

All of these burdens have been cast on the members of the new Maritime Commission, and it is quite essential that they have additional personnel beyond what they heretofore have had. They are willing to cut their requests from \$330,000 down to \$175,000. I have had a little chat with the gentleman from Texas, and I hope that after our sort of gentlemen's agreement, he will use all reasonable efforts to bring about some relief in that regard. Am I correct, sir?

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Chairman, may I say to our beloved colleague, and certainly the distinguished chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary, the gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER], that when he comes to this floor and gives us the benefit of his good judgment and his wisdom, I am going to listen to him. As he pointed out, his committee, the great Committee on the Judiciary of the House, put in many long hours on an overdue matter that should have been attended to a long time ago in the old Maritime Administration. As he has so well pointed out, the functions have been split up now between the Administration and the Commission. This Commission has one duty, as you well pointed out. You put that duty on them. To sum it all up, it is rates. By virtue of your good, strong statement, may I suggest to the gentleman that we will cooperate with him. Let this go to the Senate, because you only have about 2 months remaining in the fiscal year. Bear in mind, this is a deficiency appropriation. They have 153 employees now. We will go to the other side and we will ask your help. I think we will work out something that is satisfactory to my able and distinguished friend.

Mr. CELLER. Well, that is a very splendid answer, and the gentleman, as usual, is always kind and most reasonable.

Mr. THOMAS. I thank the gentleman.

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

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

Mr. GROSS. The gentleman is aware, I assume, that the Congress made an appropriation for the Seattle World's Fair.

Mr. THOMAS. Yes; \$9.9 million.

Mr. GROSS. Nine million nine hundred and seventy thousand.

Mr. THOMAS. That is correct.

Mr. GROSS. Does the gentleman not think that New York would be well served with about the same amount of money?

Mr. THOMAS. Well, we had a different estimate. We have a different crowd. We have 66 foreign countries already that have asked for space. After all, Seattle is a great city. I love the people. There are no finer people in the world. But, after all, you know, New York is about 10 or 15 times as big.

Mr. GROSS. Well, the gentleman does not believe in discrimination, does he?

Mr. THOMAS. Not if I can avoid it.

Mr. GROSS. Let me ask the gentleman this question.

Mr. THOMAS. You can ask me anything you want.

Mr. GROSS. I understand there is some \$25,616,000 in the bill for the United Nations.

Mr. THOMAS. Yes.

Mr. GROSS. I have been unable to learn, from reading the hearings, whether this is an assessment or whether this is supposed to be a contribution, voluntary or otherwise.

Mr. THOMAS. It is what we call a voluntary assessment. It is not a regular contribution.

Mr. GROSS. Is there really such a thing as a voluntary assessment?

Mr. THOMAS. Well, it depends on what emphasis you put on the word "voluntary." The U.N. is trying to get it out of the member nations. That is where the rub comes.

Mr. GROSS. On page 317 of your hearings, you list a scale of assessments.

Mr. THOMAS. Yes; set out in black and white, showing who is in default and who had paid and so forth and so on.

Mr. GROSS. On page 318 you list the United States-Congo account contribution statement as of December 31, 1961. Then following this comes uncollected contributions.

Mr. THOMAS. These are all listed there. Our part is \$153 million, if my memory serves me right.

Mr. GROSS. On page 319 there is listed a contribution as the result of the Congo ad hoc account.

What I want to know is specifically how this \$25,616,000 is to be listed. Is it a contribution? Is it an assessment or the result of an assessment and contribution, an ad hoc account, or what is it?

Mr. THOMAS. In the final analysis it is an assessment against everybody, and they are trying to get every nation to pay up. That is the long and short of it.

Mr. GROSS. At another place in the hearings I believe Mr. Cleveland called it a voluntary contribution.

Mr. THOMAS. Call it voluntary or involuntary, they are trying to get it out of everybody.

Mr. GROSS. I would like to arrive at some designation for this \$25 million. That is the best information you could get from the State Department?

Mr. THOMAS. If we put it up and the House votes it, it is going to be voluntary.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, will the distinguished gentleman yield?

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

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, I should like to point out that the amount carried in the pending bill, \$25,616,000, is exactly 32.02 percent of the Congo operation costs of \$80 million by way of a special assessment, covering the period from November 1, 1960, to June 30, 1962.

Now, in addition to this amount there was or will be a voluntary contribution by the United States to the Congo operations expenses in the sum of \$11,400,800 taken out, as I recall, of the foreign aid bill.

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

Mr. ROONEY. Yes, I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. And, would the gentleman say that the 32.02 percent, or 32.05 percent, whichever it is—

Mr. ROONEY. Thirty-two and two one-hundredths.

Mr. GROSS. Would the gentleman say that the 32.02 percent is by United Nations agreement, and is in conformance with the treaty?

Mr. ROONEY. It is an assessment, as the testimony, which I am sure the gentleman is familiar with—and again I commend him for reading the testimony with regard to all of these appropriation bills—indicates, if we do not pay the present amount contained in the bill, to wit, \$25 million-plus, we will lose our vote after it becomes in arrears for a period of 2 years. This, to me, indicates that it is not a voluntary assessment.

Mr. GROSS. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. ROONEY. Yes.

Mr. GROSS. But under article 19 of the Charter of the United Nations, if we paid any part of our assessment we would retain our vote for a good deal longer than 2 years?

Mr. ROONEY. I will agree that there is some abracadabra about this sort of thing, about paying part of it. I am one who is very disappointed that the Soviet Union and the satellites and a lot of other people up in New York in the United Nations are permitted to have use of their vote as they do without having to pay the arrears that they owe, as admitted in the hearings on this bill.

Mr. GROSS. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. ROONEY. I yield.

Mr. GROSS. I am sure the gentleman from New York is not saying that I

am using abracadabra in quoting the United Nations Charter?

Mr. ROONEY. No, and I never intended such, I assure the gentleman.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

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

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

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Chairman, I wish to point out that the regulatory duties of the Federal Maritime Commission have not been reduced. On the contrary, these duties have been greatly expanded by acts of Congress or its committees.

The Federal Maritime Commission's request for a supplemental appropriation of \$330,000, later reduced to a request for \$175,000, was denied on the grounds that most of the duties of the Commission had been transferred to another agency, the Maritime Administration—House Report No. 1548, page 4. This must be clarified. In 1961, under Reorganization Plan No. 7 of that year—House Document No. 187—all of the regulatory functions of the former Federal Maritime Board were transferred to the Federal Maritime Commission. All of the promotional functions of the former Maritime Administration and certain promotional functions of the Federal Maritime Board were transferred to the new Maritime Administration. However, the Commission, whose request has been denied, retained all the regulatory functions of its predecessor, the Federal Maritime Board.

According to the Federal Maritime Commission, after the reorganization plan, the new Federal Maritime Commission retained only \$1,266,000 of the original \$9,300,000 appropriation for the Maritime Administration and Federal Maritime Board. This \$1,266,000 was to cover salaries and expenses relating only to regulatory activities which had previously been conducted by the Board and were in the future to be carried out by the present Federal Maritime Commission.

This was supplemented by an additional amount of \$40,000 to cover only the salaries of two new Commissioners, the Commission having five members where the Board had only three.

Thus, the \$1,306,000 figure cited in the report on H.R. 11038, as I understand it, is money for only regulatory functions formerly carried out by the Federal Maritime Board.

The new Commission did not lose any of these regulatory functions. Indeed, it gained many more. Nor is this the case of an agency which is asking for money because it found new things to occupy its time under existing statutory authorization. This agency has a greater workload because Congress and congressional committees have directed it to undertake new responsibilities and to discharge present duties in a more effective manner. Thus, during the 1st session of the 87th Congress, the following events occurred:

First, Congress passed Public Law 87-346, the most extensive revision of the Shipping Act, the basic regulatory statute, since 1916. Public Law 87-346 requires the Commission to approve dual

rate contracts which meet certain standards. The Commission must screen these contracts to determine if they comply with detailed safeguards set up to protect the shipper. If the Commission does not have adequate staff to fulfill this duty, the whole basis upon which Congress approved Public Law 87-346 will be subverted and shippers will be harmed.

In addition, the new Commission has been given the duty of overseeing the filing of a multitude of additional tariff changes filed by common carriers in the foreign trade of the United States. Formerly, only tariff changes on outbound movements had to be filed. Now inbound and outbound rates must be filed. I understand that almost 30,000 separate changes are being filed pursuant to this requirement.

Finally, the Commission has obtained statutory authority, which its predecessor did not possess, to disapprove rate changes which are so unreasonably high or low as to be detrimental to the foreign commerce of the United States. This is very essential in order to protect American business against unreasonable rates, which in the past according to the Antitrust Subcommittee report, may have impeded the flow of American exports.

Second. Congress enacted Public Law 87-254 which requires licensing freight forwarders. I understand that 1,000 such forwarders have applied for licensing.

Third. The Antitrust Subcommittee completed a 3-year investigation in which 240 matters were referred to the Commission or its predecessor. These matters involved grave abuses of shipping laws, conference agreements, and other practices detrimental to our foreign commerce, which the Commission must examine.

Fourth. The Antitrust Subcommittee issued a 400-page report to the House—House Report No. 1419—containing many recommendations for more effective regulation and new studies in the public interest.

This report reveals a story of abuses, discriminations, and predatory practices whose primary effect has been to hurt American shippers, the American-flag merchant industry, and the public. At the root of the problem is the failure of the Federal Maritime Board to be an effective regulator. A whole chapter—chapter XI—is devoted to describing the problems of the Board and urging its successor, the Federal Maritime Commission, to greater efforts. Clearly a large part of this problem has been understaffing. Finally, the Antitrust Subcommittee report makes numerous conclusions which call upon the Commission to assume new responsibilities and make extensive studies to protect the American public against unreasonable rates and practices. Thus, Congress and, in particular, the House of Representatives and its committees, have made a tremendous effort and spent a great deal of time in trying to provide for more effective regulation of the ocean freight industry, which is exempt from the antitrust laws. All this work and effort will go up in smoke and the public will be

completely unprotected if the Commission does not have the resources to do the job. For all the legislation we have passed and the recommendations we have made basically depend upon an effective Commission.

If, as a result of the failure to obtain its minimal requirements, the Commission is unable to operate effectively then the newly amended Shipping Act will be flouted, as it has been in the past, and the design of Congress, as well as the efforts of the Antitrust Subcommittee to improve conditions in the industry, will be frustrated. Moreover, it has been shown that where the Commission does not have sufficient staff to enforce the law the bite of the Shipping Act falls primarily on U.S.-flag shipping lines, whose books and records are in this country, while foreign-flag lines are able to evade compliance with the act. This uneven administration of the act is highly detrimental to our merchant marine. Thus, in the interest of the U.S. merchant fleet and American shippers, I urge that the needed appropriation be made.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, at the outset of my remarks I must say that I am not at all satisfied with this bill, for the very simple reason that with the exception of four or five items in this bill, the other requests for funds from more than 20 agencies could very well be absorbed by the agencies with previously appropriated funds, funds that have not been obligated nor expended out of the fiscal year 1962 appropriations. I was very much opposed to the creation of a Deficiencies Committee in the first instance. However, it was created some 6 or 7 years ago.

I was not the only one who opposed the creation of the subcommittee. I speak authoritatively when I say that a great majority of the members of the Committee on Appropriations were opposed to it. But it was created. Here is the bad thing about it. The requests for supplemental funds come from the multitude of boards, commissions, and departments of Government, to the Congress through the Bureau of the Budget to this Subcommittee on Deficiency Appropriations. The regular subcommittees which hold hearings for days and weeks and months during every session of Congress and often when Congress is not in session, hence they know more about what these agencies of the Government should have in the way of appropriations than any single subcommittee can possibly know, because those members on those respective subcommittees, which number 13 in addition to this one, many of them have sat for years and years listening to the requests of these different departments and agencies of the Government which number in the neighborhood of 1,000, even though we have abolished a few hundred from 1953 to 1960 inclusive.

It is just ordinary, common business sense to have those regularly established subcommittees on appropriations hear and consider these great requests for supplemental funds instead of having those requests come to this special subcommittee.

The facts are that there are only four items or six at the most in this bill which by any stretch of the imagination should have supplemental funds at this time; the Maritime Commission, for which there is \$20 million in this bill. That is for subsidies under law to our great oceangoing liners, that we subsidize so that they can compete with foreign shipping companies. That item is mandatory. But even that item could wait until the regular committee acts.

Mr. ANDERSEN of Minnesota. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JENSEN. I yield.

Mr. ANDERSEN of Minnesota. I wish to back up the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. JENSEN] 100 percent in this matter. We have in this bill two items that have no more business than a flea in being here on what we call a deficiency bill. I refer to two of the three items having to do with agriculture.

Here we have \$2,500,000 for the extension of the screw worm eradication program, which the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTEN] and our subcommittee have dealt with for years. There is a brand new extension many of us have not had a chance to study. We are being bypassed entirely. This is the first I have heard of this. We have had gentlemen from the Department of Agriculture before us in the last month, and they never said a word about this new proposal. I think this ought to be stricken out of this bill, just to maintain at least the authority of the various subcommittees involved.

I resent a thing like this, and as far as I am concerned I intend to try to strike it. I feel that the gentleman is absolutely correct in this matter, if we are to have regular order in appropriations. After all a deficiency bill means deficiencies; it does not mean the beginning of new programs.

Mr. JENSEN. The gentleman has expressed my feelings and, I will say, the feelings of a great majority of the Committee on Appropriations. He has just cited a fair example of what is customary practice in this whole matter pertaining to the deficiency committee of the House.

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

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

Mr. JONAS. I asked the gentleman to yield while the subject raised by the gentleman from Minnesota is still fresh in our minds. I agree with what the gentleman from Iowa is saying and what the gentleman from Minnesota has just said. I am perfectly willing to strike the item. As a matter of fact, I did not think it ought to be in here, either, but we questioned the department witnesses very carefully and they assured us that the time to start working on this screw worm pest eradication is early in the spring, and that the severe winter suffered by the southwestern part of the country rendered the situation ideal to start on this program. They had diverted some funds from other programs, and they wanted to replenish those funds in this deficiency bill. The money in

this bill is to carry that program for the entire calendar year.

Mr. JENSEN. The gentleman is exactly right. There is no law or rule or regulation on the books of our Nation which would prohibit the Department of Agriculture from spending funds out of already appropriated funds for this purpose. If someone thinks up some new idea or there is a possibility that they can get an appropriation through the Congress by some hook or crook, they do not hesitate one minute to come to Congress and try to get it, and they generally get about what they want.

I must say in all fairness to the chairman of this committee, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. THOMAS], that I am certainly not critical of him, because no one could do a better job in chairing this committee than our able colleague from Texas. It is a most difficult committee to chair, this committee.

There is another fund here of \$25 million which I think we could justly appropriate now for disaster relief, an appropriation to the President for such catastrophes as floods, hurricanes, and windstorms—all acts of God—which must have immediate attention and ready funds.

With reference to grants to States for public assistance, we, the people of the United States, under law have agreed to pay social security payments in certain amounts. That fund has run out for 1962; they need \$80 million; that is a must.

Then we have another item here for \$80 million for research and development for the space agency and the space administration. It is a most difficult thing for any Member of the Congress to say that they shall not have all the funds they need since we have this world problem on our hands. I hope history will record that this is money well spent. However, we did strike out \$65 million which they asked for the purchase of land in Mississippi and, I think, some land in Texas and some land in Oklahoma, and a considerable amount of land on the periphery of the Cape Canaveral area. But, that was not authorized and we simply did not feel the committee should appropriate or initiate appropriations for anything that was not already authorized by law.

Mr. Chairman, I shall not take any more time except to say that by the time this bill clears the other body and is signed by the President, there will not be more than 2 months remaining of the fiscal year 1962. So time is not much of an element in the consideration of this matter. That is why I say we could strike almost everything out of this bill except the items I just mentioned without hurting anyone and without putting the brakes on any agency of government.

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

Mr. JENSEN. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. CONTE. First of all, I want to compliment my colleague, the gentleman from Iowa, for the comprehensive presentation he has made here today. I would ask my colleague to elaborate

a little further in regard to the \$2½ million item for the eradication of the screw worm. In reading the record, on page 7, of the second supplemental appropriation hearings, 1962, we find that this money is for the initiation of a program. I wonder why at this late date we have to put this money in this deficiency budget and why we cannot wait until Mr. ANDERSEN's committee reports the agricultural appropriation bill to the House and provide the money for that program in that bill?

Mr. JENSEN. I must point this out to the gentleman, that the infestation of the screw-worm fly is a great threat to the stock grazers of the United States. It is almost as bad a threat as the hoof-and-mouth disease which cost us millions upon millions of dollars to eradicate in Mexico to keep the disease out of the United States.

The thing I am more critical of than the appropriation at this time of \$2,500,000 is the fact that no member of the Department of Agriculture did not mention this matter to the Appropriations Subcommittee on Agriculture. Is that a correct statement? I ask the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. ANDERSEN of Minnesota. That is correct; and, as far as I know neither the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTEN] nor I were consulted in any way.

Mr. JENSEN. I must say that I would not like to see this item stricken from the bill now because we need to get at this job of eradicating that screw fly, unless the gentleman from Minnesota feels that his committee will provide the necessary funds.

Mr. CONTE. I can go along with the gentleman; I can see the need for the eradication of the screw worm, but I cannot see how putting \$2,500,000 in this deficiency bill is going to help that program.

Also I feel it has brought out that what they need here is personnel, about 80-some employees for assistance to eliminate the screw worm. The record shows they have some 90,500 employees in the Department of Agriculture. Why can they not transfer the 80 people needed in this program from other agencies of the Department of Agriculture?

Mr. JENSEN. That is exactly the thought that occurred to me and I asked that very question.

Mr. CONTE. Did the gentleman get an answer to it?

Mr. JENSEN. In this bill there were requested 857 additional employees over and above what they now have on the payroll. We left 509. Do you realize, my colleagues, that these 509 employees will cost the American taxpayers over \$3 million, in addition to the 2,500,000 people already on the payroll at a cost of \$16 billion annually? I ask how much more of this can the American taxpayers take?

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

Mr. JENSEN. I yield.

Mr. BOLAND. Does the gentleman know the request from the Department of Agriculture for this program was \$3 million. The committee cut it back to

\$2,500,000. We depend on the good judgment and the commonsense of the gentleman from Iowa in matters pertaining to the farm program.

I might say that this is not a new program. This initiates a new program in the southwestern part of the United States, but this is a program that has been carried on in the southeastern part of the United States for some time. The fact of the matter is that this is a program that ought to be started in the spring for that is the time when this insect pest can be controlled much better.

This committee put this item in the bill because the committee felt, and the testimony in the hearings will show, that this program will save millions of dollars. It is not a new program; it is a program that was initiated many years ago. We appropriated a deficiency a couple of years ago for the very same program for the people of the southeastern part of the United States, and we are doing it in this bill for the people in the Southwest.

Mr. JENSEN. I must say that the gentleman from Massachusetts has stated the situation correctly.

Mr. ANDERSEN of Minnesota. Let me read this telegram which appears on page 14 of the hearings, a telegram from the Honorable JOE KILGORE. Now JOE KILGORE is a very fine man. He wired the chairman of this subcommittee:

Attached herewith you will find telegrams from several Texas organizations expressing their interest in and support of the \$3 million supplemental appropriations request for the establishment of a screw worm eradication facility at Moore Field, Mission, Tex.

Why was not the gentleman from Mississippi or I or some member of the committee given some information relative to this? This is a new program for this part of the country, designed to expend \$9 million to create a barrier between Mexico and the United States.

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

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

Mr. THOMAS. I want to beg my able and distinguished friend's pardon on behalf of the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. JENSEN] and the other members of the subcommittee, including myself. We should have consulted the gentleman, and I humbly apologize, and I assure him that in the future we will do that. We thought it was an urgent item, because they want to get started before the fly hatches out in June and July. We cannot quibble with what the gentleman says. I humbly apologize, and I ask the gentleman's forgiveness at this time.

Mr. ANDERSEN of Minnesota. I forgive the gentleman, but I do not intend to let this item remain in the bill, if I can help it.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BOW].

Mr. BOW. Mr. Chairman, there are several items in this bill I would like to discuss with the committee. In going through the bill, the first one I come to is an item of the Department of Commerce which has to do with the New York World's Fair. I hope to attend the New

York World's Fair, and I hope to enjoy it. But I just wonder whether or not we have gone too far in this matter of fairs when this item comes before a Deficiency Subcommittee in the amount of \$25 million and the item has never been before a legislative committee. It is claimed to be authorized by the so-called Hays-Fulbright bill. Not one of these items that we have in here has ever been considered by a legislative committee. There are over \$10 million in the bill for a building which is going to cost about \$44 a square foot. There are hundreds of thousands of dollars in here for travel. Those are items we did not examine, and they have never been examined.

In this deficiency bill we are appropriating not for 1962 but appropriations to carry us through 1966. There is no deficiency or emergency in a situation which is asking for an appropriation through 1966. It is true this has been reduced to \$17 million, but we thought we owed it to you to bring to your attention that this is being appropriated without the consideration which we generally give to items of that size.

You will hear that New York has appropriated approximately \$30 million as its share to this fair, but may I point out to you that New York City and the fair are going to charge adults \$2, and there is an estimated income of about \$140 million that will be taken in. But so far as the Federal Government is concerned, with its \$25 million investment they are asking for, no taxes will be paid, there is no return to the Federal Government.

I think we should take a good look at this item.

May I point out to you also that before the day is over there is going to be another \$3 million item in a separate bill, so they tell me, to pay the policemen in New York City on an entirely different matter.

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

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

Mr. JONAS. The gentleman does not want to overlook the fact that after they build this \$10 million building there is \$100,000 in here to pay for tearing it down.

Mr. BOW. The gentleman is quite right. There is money to tear it down, and it is going to be occupied for a matter of 6 months out of each year for 2 years.

Now, I must move along here. I should like to call one other matter to the attention of the committee, and this comes under the GSA building of courtrooms. These 73 new judges that we authorized here last year have gotten to be pretty expensive, my colleagues. We have a situation in Boston, for instance, where we are doing some remodeling to put a judge on the bench, and it is going to cost us approximately \$1.1 million to get this courtroom in shape. There are two new judges in California, and I understand it is going to cost about \$1,360,000 to get these courtrooms in shape. In my own northern district of Ohio, in a court I am very familiar with, I was

very much surprised to find the remodeling job for that building to cost \$460,000. I say to you that these 73 new judges, that we needed in such a hurry here last year, have been very, very expensive to the American taxpayer.

I go now to the one question which the gentleman from Florida raised some question about, and that is in the State Department, which goes to the medical center in Africa. I have supported this program and will continue to support it. We have a very serious health condition in Africa so far as our people in the State Department are concerned. There have been deaths of officers; ambassadors have been flown out of there seriously ill because of the contagious diseases in the tropics and those areas, because of lack of sanitation. I think we owe it to them, and it will be much cheaper than flying them in military planes to Germany or back to the United States to get proper medical attention.

The one item which has been deleted in this bill which I want to discuss is a matter that seems to grow constantly, and that is the question of the \$64,000 which we deleted from this bill for the Public Affairs Division of the Department of State.

Mr. Chairman, I call to the attention of the committee the fact we have deleted \$64,000 from the State Department Division of Public Affairs.

The use of Federal funds for the purpose of influencing legislation before Congress is unlawful under section 1913 of title 18, United States Code. It would seem that the time is long past when we should initiate proceedings to stop this unauthorized and illegal expenditure of public moneys.

The practice within the State Department has increased in recent months. The use of funds to propagandize for the administration's trade plan is appalling.

The idea of selling a program to the public with the hope the public will sell it to Congress is perhaps as old as Congress itself. But when government takes over this lobbying job you have the dangerous and unwholesome attempt of thought control which would of course endanger the future of the Republic.

We discussed this at some length during our subcommittee hearings, and following is an excerpt of the record:

Mr. Bow. Mr. Chairman, I think this follows this part of the record: Mr. Rowan, you say you want the American people to know the administration policy and you are going to tax all the taxpayers to do that. You say with regard to reciprocal trade agreements you are going to get the administration's policy across. Who is going to pay to get the antiadministration policy to the American people?

Mr. ROWAN. Well, there are a great many critics of the policy who are managing to get that information out but we feel that it is a service to those who oppose this policy when we place before the critics of this policy the individuals who are advocating this program. If those who oppose this new program write us and say, "What are you up to? We have some doubts about it. Let us face the people who are advocating this." We feel the responsibility to put our people before them to answer questions.

Mr. Bow. Don't you think the stamp of the American Government carries a great

deal more weight than can be mustered by those who oppose it, and when you use taxpayers' funds in addition to the Government behind this, that it carries more weight? Do you think this is a proper function?

Mr. ROWAN. Congressman, I do not regard propaganda as a proper function, but we are not in the field of propaganda.

Mr. Bow. Are you telling both sides of this story?

Mr. ROWAN. We are trying fundamentally to explain what the administration's proposal is and why it is what it is.

Mr. Bow. But you are telling just one side of it, are you not, Mr. Rowan?

Mr. ROWAN. Admittedly, Congressman, we do not print pamphlets to argue against the administration's proposal.

Mr. Bow. Or if I made a speech against it you would not circulate my speech to the same group of people that you send Secretary Ball's speeches to, would you?

Mr. ROWAN. I must say if we got a request for one of your speeches I would make every effort to get it.

Mr. Bow. If you get a request, yes, but you don't get a request for all of these speeches that you send out of Secretary Ball's.

Mr. ROWAN. No, but we get a great many requests.

Mr. Bow. And you get lists you send them to. You would not send my speech out to that same list, would you?

Mr. ROWAN. Well, these are people who—

Mr. Bow. Answer my question, please, sir.

Mr. ROWAN. No; we would not send your speeches to people on that list.

Mr. Bow. The purpose of this drive you are making is to get your story across to the American people. You are hoping by reason of the American people reading this particular side of the story and reading your pamphlet that they in turn will bring pressure upon Congress to pass this legislation; is that not your very purpose of it?

Mr. ROWAN. Well, we hope that the American people will come to the conclusion that this is in the national interest, and in the process of democracy I guess they would make their views known to Congressmen.

Mr. Bow. That is one of the purposes of it, isn't it?

Mr. ROWAN. Well, it is not directly an effort to pressure Congressmen, but that is a purpose in effect.

Mr. Bow. It is one of the purposes, and it is what you are driving at?

Mr. ROWAN. Yes, that is correct.

Mr. Bow. That is true of the briefing conferences, the speaking engagements and the current documentation. The whole purpose of the \$64,000 you are asking for all falls into this category, doesn't it?

Mr. ROWAN. Yes, it all does.

It would seem to me that even though you might not concern yourself with the merits of pending legislation you should be interested in the subject of unlawful and improper activities of Federal agencies and their employees in the use of public funds, attempting to influence the Congress for or against pending legislation.

It is not unlawful or improper for officials or employees of the Federal Government to express opinions or to impart factual information if distinguished from propaganda.

I am sure some may ask how we may differentiate between information and propaganda; may I submit the following definitions:

Information: The act or process of communicating knowledge; to enlighten.

Propaganda: A plan for the propagation of a doctrine or a system of principles.

We find that Government propaganda is designed, in most instances, to make the individual believe he is thinking for himself. In fact, however, Government propaganda distorts facts, with such authority that the person is prejudiced or biased in the direction which Government propagandists wish to lead national thinking. It is the authority and the supposed objectivity of Government which leads people to accept, without question, the words released by Government officials and agencies. Propaganda in its crudest form appeals to emotion only. Government propaganda is frequently only slanted, but accomplishes the same result. An individual might be wary and critical of material coming from a special interest group. He knows such groups have an ax to grind, but he will consider as gospel truth, if the Government says the identical thing, because he thinks Government officials are impartial.

It seems to me, Mr. Chairman, that the State Department and many other agencies of Government, their personnel and their employees have gone beyond the limits of their proper duty of providing factual information to the people and the Congress and have engaged in propaganda supported by taxpayers' money to influence legislation now pending before the Congress.

I think it is time, Mr. Chairman, that the Congress take action against these illegal expenditures.

Mr. ALGER. Will the gentleman from Ohio yield?

Mr. BOW. I yield.

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Chairman, a State Department pamphlet called *Together We Grow Strong*, is being distributed widely showing U.S. dependence on world trade. The views are absolutely erroneous and distorted, calculated to support the President's trade bill. On page 9 entitled "Autos and imports," we are told that there would be no autos in the United States for long if we did not have 31 imported items: One of these is petroleum from Kuwait. Everyone knows we are not dependent for imported oil to make or use autos. So the State Department is not only propagandizing for the trade bill but is doing so fallaciously.

I think that the House will be shocked at the practices to be undertaken by State Department personnel according to this article from the *Seattle Post-Intelligencer* of March 13 written by David Sentner, the able chief of the Hearst Headline bureau here. I am sure that every Member of the House without exception will object to the processes outlined and their implications.

PALS OF CONGRESS

(By David Sentner)

The State Department isn't exactly muzzling its officials as to the good warp and woof in the administration's foreign policy.

Assistant Secretary for Public Relations, Frederick Dutton, who used to be in the White House, has issued a directive to State Department chiefs to be pals wally with Members of Congress. Dutton is now the

go-between via the State Department and Congress. Every Government agency has this type of lobbyist.

The new guide-your-Congressman system began working following a recent memo by Civil Service Commissioner John Macy which declared that it was the positive obligation of Government officials to make speeches before interested persons and groups explaining and defending administration policies.

Although Republicans in Congress charge this comes mighty close to violating the Hatch Act prohibiting political activities of Federal employees, CSC Chairman Macy insists this is only guidance for Government career men.

Dutton maintains State Department officials are merely engaged in education.

A SYSTEM

It is quite an educational system Dutton has worked up. In a recent unrecorded conference with bureau heads he suggested certain methods for merchandising to Congressmen the State Department view on such subjects as trade treaty and the marketing of U.N. bonds. These latter measures are facing tough sledding on Capitol Hill.

A further inside look into the Dutton educational system reveals the following curricula:

Speeches, articles, and news items should be prepared for a selected group of Senators and Congressmen who could be trusted to present them as their own ideas.

Under no circumstances was the Department to appear as the source for this material and any written transmittal must indicate it was requested and not pressed on the Member of Congress.

THEY TELL HIM

The Member of Congress used in this program would be told what to say and when to say it in order that the Department remain in full control of the handling and timing of the story.

Almost every Member of Congress has a regular newsletter he sends to his constituents. The writing style of the particular Congressman should be carefully studied and imitated in any item infiltrated into his newsletter.

Congressional liaison commander Dutton shows he is an excellent administrator as well as educator. He has established a central file of all congressional contacts by officers of the State Department.

Every officer has been instructed to fill out a card concerning any meeting or contact with a Member of Congress or a member of a congressional staff.

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

Mr. BOW. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. ARENDS. I might say that the gentleman could right now walk out in the foyer, read the ticker tape, and he will find out that this effort is being spearheaded, in part, by the President of the United States when today he had the chairman of the State ASC committees together at the White House and told them that although he knew it was against the law, they should be vocal in their support of the administration's farm proposal, as advocated by the Freeman-Cochrane proposal.

Mr. BOW. I think the gentleman is correct.

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

Mr. BOW. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I want to compliment the gentleman for bringing out this point. Some of us have been investigating the use of Government funds on these White House conferences that were held throughout the country last fall, and also the operation of this administration in the problem of health care for the aged.

Mr. Chairman, there are many areas involved, and I think this administration should review its actions in light of what the laws are, because there are some of us, at any rate, who are determined to put this out to the public.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Chairman, I want to say to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CURTIS] that I appreciate his comments. I am hoping that what we have said today may cause some of them to take a look at section 1938 of title 18, which provides for the criminal offense for doing this, and provides for removal from office of those who engage in this kind of practice. There is an admission now on the record that this is the very purpose of the use of this fund.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. If the gentleman will yield further, I might say that also the Civil Service Commission is involved because of the manner in which this administration has been having civil servants get into this kind of propaganda business. It is unfair to those people, and is also endangering their careers.

Mr. BOW. I appreciate the gentleman's remarks.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask my distinguished friend, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Bow], if he has forgotten the days when that great leader from Hollywood, Mr. Eric Johnston, had entertainment at Government expense down around the Statler and the Carlton Hotels in behalf of the foreign aid programs of President Eisenhower?

Mr. BOW. I would be delighted to yield to the gentleman, if the gentleman will yield to me another minute or two. I, too, can remember, and I was critical of it then. I remember also back in the days of the Truman administration when there were a number of times when Tom Clark, the Attorney General, was asked to bring action against those using these funds for that purpose. I remember that very well. So, this has been going on, but it is growing.

The thing that disturbs me is that it is not limited to an isolated case such as that of Eric Johnston. This is happening in every department of Government.

I would like to say that the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROONEY] asked me to refresh my memory. I have refreshed my memory, and recall that among those who were propagandizing back in the days when socialized medicine was under discussion was one Wilbur Cohen, who is back in a job today in the medical care program, and funds there are being used the same as in other areas.

Mr. ROONEY. Surely, the gentleman is not opposed to medical care for the aged?

Mr. BOW. I am certainly not opposed to such care. I am for the Bow bill.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to our distinguished colleague from Washington [Mr. TOLLEFSON].

Mr. TOLLEFSON. Mr. Chairman, I was not here earlier to hear the discussion with respect to an item in the bill having to do with appropriations for the Maritime Commission. It is my understanding, since I have entered the Chamber, that there is a general understanding that the funds which the Maritime Commission has asked for will probably be taken care of in the conference. I am not sure what kind of commitment the chairman of the subcommittee or the committee has made. With the understanding that the House conferees will not oppose these funds in conference I shall not offer an amendment to provide the funds in the House.

As one who opposed very strenuously Reorganization Plan No. 7 which created the new Maritime Commission, I want the record to show that I should hope that at least a part of the funds which the new Commission has asked for will be granted. One of the reasons I opposed the Reorganization Plan No. 7 was that it would require additional employees. As you recall, the plan had the following effect upon the old arrangement: It divided the functions into promotional functions and regulatory functions. The promotional functions were vested in the new Administrator and his assistant, and the regulatory functions were vested in a new five-man Commission.

It was obvious to me at the time—and this was not the only objection I had to the plan—that it would be absolutely necessary for the new Commission to have additional employees. The Congress created this new Commission and now it ought to permit it to function. Otherwise there would have been no point in setting it up. Although I was opposed to the plan I sincerely trust that somewhere along the line in this supplemental bill at least a portion of the funds which the new Commission has asked for will be given to them.

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

Mr. TOLLEFSON. I yield to the Chairman of my committee.

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Washington I am sure will recall that prior to the adoption of Reorganization Plan No. 7, in various committee hearings before a subcommittee of the House Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, it was brought out clearly from time to time that the Maritime Board was not enforcing the regulations that were on the statute books with respect to ocean and other waterborne commerce.

Mr. TOLLEFSON. The gentleman is correct when he indicates that the Board did not have sufficient employees to supervise and oversee the operations of the shipping lines.

Mr. BONNER. Since the adoption of Reorganization Plan No. 7 and just prior thereto, there were two additional acts put on the books that would require more personnel and more service from the new Maritime Commission.

Mr. TOLLEFSON. That is correct.

Mr. BONNER. That is, the licensing of freight forwarders and brokers; and other matters.

Mr. TOLLEFSON. And the dual rate bill.

Mr. BONNER. I am sure that this subcommittee will take that into consideration when they go to conference, unless the other body raises this amount to some extent when the bill is considered in the other body. I hope the subcommittee will do that, because it is meritorious.

Mr. TOLLEFSON. I thank the gentleman. The point I wanted to make is that the House adopted Reorganization Plan No. 7 and now they ought to implement it. I say that as one who opposed the plan, but as one who wants to see it function properly and adequately now that it is in effect.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. JONAS].

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Chairman, last year Congress appropriated \$86.6 billion and this sum was \$12 billion more than had been appropriated during the previous year. Then last year Congress, in acts other than on appropriation bills, authorized back-door spending in an amount of about \$19 billion. These sums do not include the \$9 billion which is an automatic charge upon the Treasury for the interest on the national debt. If you add all those items up it will come to about \$115 billion that Congress made available to the executive departments for spending during the fiscal year 1962. But ink was hardly dry on the regular bills before we had the first supplemental appropriation bill in August of 1961. That bill contained over \$1 billion in supplemental funds.

The bill you are considering today is labeled the second supplemental bill for 1962, but in fact it is the third, because you will recall back in January, before we had hardly gotten underway with this new session, we were met with a request for additional funds for the Veterans' Administration to take care of defaulted VA mortgages because foreclosures had increased by about 50 percent above the number estimated back last year when predictions about the strength of the economic recovery were a little more rosy than it turned out to be. We provided in that supplemental bill \$55 million for the Veterans' Administration for its education and training program for Korean veterans. Then we permitted a transfer of \$115 million from the VA direct loan fund to the loan guarantee fund in order to enable the Veterans' Administration to take up these defaulted mortgages.

You have before you today what I consider to be the third supplemental request for funds made in this fiscal year. But do not think it will be the last one, because there was sent to the Senate yesterday still another request for additional supplemental funds, and we will have that bill here before this session is over.

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

Mr. JONAS. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. YOUNGER. While the gentleman is talking about the transfer, I wonder

why there is an item in the bill for the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, when the Secretary, appearing before our Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, told us that we had appropriated \$102 million last year more than they could use and that amount was frozen. I understand they have released some \$15 million of that, but there is still some \$80-odd million remaining. Why did you not transfer that money rather than make new appropriations?

Mr. JONAS. Does the gentleman have reference to the National Defense Education Act, or what item?

Mr. YOUNGER. Any of the amount transferred. The Secretary says he had more money than he could use. Why did you not transfer that to items where the money is needed rather than appropriate new funds?

Mr. JONAS. The gentleman from California is giving some information we did not have. Each program stands on its own feet and the Budget Bureau did not request any transfers in this program.

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

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

Mr. THOMAS. I just want to echo what the gentleman from North Carolina has told our distinguished friend from California. Of course, the programs in this bill have their own appropriation. Had the Budget Bureau requested a transfer we certainly would have considered it, but it would have been subject to a point of order.

Mr. JONAS. When we talk in terms of millions and billions, and we are now approaching the trillion figure, I become lost as I am sure many other people do. We all have our favorite illustrations of what a billion dollars is, but I heard one the other day that I think I will repeat, albeit with some trepidation as I look about the floor and count the number of our lady colleagues presents: "If you had a million dollars and gave it to your wife with the authority to go out and spend \$1,000 a day, she would be back at the end of 3 years wanting more money. But if you gave her a billion dollars with the same authority, you would not see her again for 3,000 years." That is how much a billion dollars is.

I think the time has come when all of us ought to begin thinking about how much a billion dollars is. We not only owe nearly \$300 billion in direct interest-bearing obligations, but this debt is increasing daily. The daily statement of the U.S. Treasury for March 28, 1962, shows that the national debt, that is the part of the national debt which is subject to the debt ceiling, was \$297 billion on March 28, 1962, as contrasted with \$287 billion just a year ago. In other words, we have increased the interest-bearing national debt by more than \$9 billion in just 9 months. The interest on this national debt is \$9 billion a year and that takes 11 cents out of every dollar Uncle Sam receives in revenue. In other words, that leaves Uncle Sam with only 89 cents out of every dollar he receives to defray the cost of national defense and security and carry

on all of the other programs in which the Federal Government is engaged.

Frequently, when alarm is expressed over the mounting public debt and our tendency to continue spending more money than we have and to borrow money in order to pay current obligations and expenses, someone invariably says, "That is due to the fact that we must have a stepped-up national defense, and the increased spending in the Defense Establishment of this country is responsible for the increased spending." If that were true, I would say I am willing to bankrupt this country if it became necessary in order to protect and defend the citizens thereof and to maintain our security. But the facts show that that is just not true. I refer you again to this daily statement of the Treasury which shows the amount of cash withdrawals, that is the amount of money drawn out of the Treasury by the different departments and agencies of Government since this fiscal year began last July 1. This statement shows that cash withdrawals during the last 9 months exceeded cash withdrawals during the previous corresponding 9-month period by \$8.2 billion.

However, the amount of the increase in spending for the Department of Defense was only \$2.6 billion of that \$8½ billion. The agency which spent the next highest amount more than it spent in the preceding year was the Commodity Credit Corporation which withdrew from the Treasury of the United States \$1,297 million more during the last 9 months than it did during the corresponding 9 months in 1960-61. "Oh," somebody will say, "what about NASA and the Atomic Energy Commission and all of these other activities that are closely allied to national defense?"

This daily statement of the Treasury shows that the increase in withdrawals on the part of the AEC during this period was only \$80 million over the amount withdrawn in the preceding year. NASA withdrew \$400 million more than the preceding year; and HEW \$480 million. The rest can be charged up to purely civilian activities.

While I am alarmed over our dwindling gold supply, over the mounting national debt, and over our deliberate policy of deficit financing, it is quite evident that the responsible officials in the executive branch of the Government, as well as the majority of the Members of Congress, are not equally alarmed. If they were, surely steps would be taken to put our financial house in order. So perhaps I am wrong in my feeling of alarm over these trends. Perhaps the Government can spend the country into prosperity; perhaps there is no danger in our continuing loss of gold; perhaps the Government can continue to spend more money than it takes in and maintain a sound and stable currency; perhaps the Government need never pay its debts but can continue to borrow money to pay for current operations without running into trouble; perhaps inflation is, after all, a blessing, and cheap money will be good for the country. There must be room for arguments on these points because otherwise the wise men in the executive branch of the Gov-

ernment would stop sending programs to Congress calling for increased spending, for increased payrolls, and for additional borrowing. And other wise men in this House and in the other body would join together and put a stop to this sort of thing.

I make no pretense of being an economist. I was born and raised in a small town but from my youth up was taught that the way to get ahead in the world was to work hard, spend less than I made, pay my debts and put aside something for a rainy day. I have had some slight experience in business and out of that experience I know that any enterprise will go broke if it continues indefinitely to spend more than it takes in. I just have the old-fashioned idea that in this respect government is like a family and a business enterprise.

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

Mr. JONAS. I yield.

Mr. PILLION. Does the gentleman believe that the responsibility for the fiscal solvency of this Nation rests with the Executive and the Congress?

Mr. JONAS. I certainly do. I say that in the matter of fiscal responsibility primary responsibility rests upon the Executive, because he is the man who sends these programs up to us, whose agents argue for them before committees saying that the fate of the Nation depends upon these programs. Then the second and I believe at least equal responsibility rests upon the Congress because the Constitution vests Congress with the power of the purse. We can stop this wild spending whenever Congress decides to stop it.

Mr. PILLION. Does the gentleman agree that the Treasury Department is having great difficulty in selling bonds? That redemptions are taking place at a greater rate than the sale of bonds?

Mr. JONAS. I agree with the gentleman and refer him to the daily statement of the Treasury. It ought to be thoroughly read and digested by every American citizen every morning if he is interested in the solvency of the United States.

Mr. PILLION. I thank the gentleman and commend him for his fine statement.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. McVEY].

Mr. McVEY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to speak out of order.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. McVEY. Mr. Chairman, several months ago I requested available space transportation aboard a Military Air Transport Service plane to Greece in order to plead for the life of a young Kansan, Roger Ranney, 27 years of age, of Chanute, who is awaiting execution before a Greek firing squad. Ranney was convicted of allegedly murdering two Greek sailors whose bodies have never been found. As his Congressman, I had hoped to see the King and plead for his life.

I was refused transportation by Military Air Transport Service on one of their regularly scheduled flights because

I am not a member of the military Reserves; however, I have recently read that the First Lady's gift horse, Sardar, is being flown from Pakistan to the United States aboard a Military Air Transport Service plane.

Mr. Chairman, I merely want to inquire whether or not Sardar is a military reservist, or in the Reserve.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield the balance of the time on this side to the gentleman from Iowa. [Mr. GROSS].

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, a few moments ago there was some discussion of the use of Government employees to carry the torch for the New Frontier in speeches throughout this country. The gentleman from New York [Mr. ROONEY] called attention to the fact that something along this line was done under the Eisenhower administration.

I would like to remind the gentleman from New York and the Members of the House that about 4 years ago, when it was developed by the appropriations subcommittee headed by the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. ANDREWS] that \$400,000 had been spent for this purpose by the Eisenhower administration, largely in behalf of an extension of the so-called Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act, I came to the floor of the House and offered an amendment to cut the President's contingency or emergency fund from which the \$400,000 was taken for the purpose of carrying on this campaign. I regret to say that it was largely the votes of the gentlemen on your side of the aisle—there were votes from this side, too—but largely the votes from your side of the aisle that defeated my amendment to take \$400,000 from the Eisenhower fund. In this regard I play no favorites.

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

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

Mr. ROONEY. The gentleman is indicating that the amendment was overwhelmingly defeated. I do not get his point.

Mr. GROSS. I may say to the gentleman I cannot recall whether it was overwhelmingly defeated or just defeated, but it was defeated. The point is that when the Eisenhower administration engaged in the business of using Federal employees to influence legislation before Congress I tried to do something about it. I would like to say something else concerning this matter. I do not recall that a Republican Chairman of the Civil Service Commission ever issued an order calling on employees of the Federal Government to go out—some in violation of the Hatch Act, if there is such an act left—and carry the torch for the Eisenhower administration. I do not recall a Republican Chairman of the Civil Service Commission doing that. But it was not so long ago that Mr. Macy, present Chairman of the Civil Service Commission, a Democrat, issued such an order, and I say some of the activities under the New Frontier in this respect are illegal.

Now, getting to this bill. I was unavoidably absent on the telephone for a

few minutes, and I do not know whether there was any reference made to it or whether the \$100,000 requested for security equipment in the State Department, the money having been used last year, apparently by Chester Bowles and others for conferences attended by Chester Bowles and his wife and the foreign ambassadors and their wives, for parties and so-called conferences.

Can someone tell me whether the \$100,000, or whatever the amount is, is in this bill?

Mr. ROONEY. That amount, \$100,000, was appropriated last year in the regular bill for the State Department. The money was not used for security purposes. It was used for other purposes which were unbudgeted. As a result, the present committee handling this supplemental appropriation bill has seen fit to delete any funds for this purpose in the present bill.

Mr. GROSS. I am glad to hear that. If we are going to appropriate money for the State Department for security purposes and the money is being spent for the purpose of wining and dining and conferences, I am going to look with a jaundiced eye on State Department security appropriations in the future. I am pleased to hear that the committee has taken this money out of the bill.

On the last page of the bill I note \$210,000 for additional salaries and expenses, apparently for the Secret Service. I wonder if this is made necessary in whole or in part because of the traveling proclivities of this administration, including Mrs. Kennedy?

Mr. THOMAS. Do you want the story?

Mr. GROSS. Yes; I would like to have it.

Mr. THOMAS. No salaries are in this; it is all traveling expenses, and it was created by virtue of the fact that you have a very popular President of the United States, a very popular Vice President of the United States, with their two lovely wives, and a very beautiful little child by the name of Caroline.

Mr. GROSS. While the gentleman is on his feet, can the gentleman tell me whether Secret Service men ride in the helicopter that goes down into Virginia to take Mrs. Kennedy to ride to the hounds down there? Can the gentleman tell me about that?

Mr. THOMAS. I would not be a bit surprised. We have had some complaints from some people that they do not like the Secret Service following them everywhere they go, but we told them that after all that is the law and we expect them to carry out the law.

Mr. GROSS. Let me ask the gentleman this question. Is it true or is it not true that 15 Secret Service men were considered necessary to accompany Mrs. Kennedy on her recent trip to India and elsewhere?

Mr. THOMAS. I think that is the correct amount. They tell me it keeps these people jumping.

Mr. GROSS. I thought that probably would be the case.

On page 12 of the bill I note that there is a deficiency appropriation of \$100,000

for referees. Do I understand that these are referees in bankruptcy?

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

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

Mr. ROONEY. These are additional clerks for the referees in bankruptcy. There was before the committee a request for 60 additional clerks for the remainder of the current fiscal year. The committee realized that the work of these bankruptcy referees has increased each and every year since 1900 or 1901 and has allowed 30 of the 60 requested.

Mr. GROSS. As a matter of fact, you began in one of the numerous deficiency bills last year to beef up the offices of the referees in bankruptcy, is that not true?

Mr. ROONEY. That is all indicated in the written hearings, and I am glad the gentleman is familiar with it. We put the fact right on the table. We had no alternative. We had to get this bankruptcy work done. These are only lower grade people. These are not political jobs. They are lower grades.

Mr. GROSS. Yes, but it is to beef up the bankruptcy courts.

Mr. ROONEY. I would not say beef it up. If they asked for 60 and we allowed 30, we are skeletonizing their program.

Mr. GROSS. You are not skeletonizing bankruptcies, because your hearings show that since 1950 the number of persons going bankrupt has jumped—

Mr. ROONEY. That all occurred during the Eisenhower administration, if the gentleman will look at the record.

Mr. GROSS. Just a moment. For the last 10 years bankruptcies have increased 560 percent. In the 12 months ending June 30 of this year, during the Kennedy administration, an estimated 172,000 persons have filed for bankruptcy. Ninety percent of today's bankruptcies originated with individuals and not businesses, as was the case a decade ago, and bankruptcies are costing individuals and creditors up to \$5 billion a year. This in the name of Kennedy administration prosperity.

And, under the New Frontier, the rate is accelerating, is it not?

Mr. ROONEY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. Yes.

Mr. ROONEY. I am sure the gentleman vividly recalls year after year of the 8 years of the Eisenhower administration, how I stood down there in the well of the House and commented on the increases in bankruptcies from year to year during that period of time.

Mr. Chairman, I think the gentleman is entitled to make the observation he has made here today. I know none of us like to see bankruptcies increase. However, these are mostly small bankruptcies, all personal bankruptcies rather than business bankruptcies.

Mr. GROSS. Well, is the shock any less when some little fellow loses everything he has got, and is forced into bankruptcy?

Mr. ROONEY. No; I think these are all voluntary bankruptcies that the gentleman is referring to.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. Yes, I yield to my friend who hit the sawdust trail yesterday.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I voted against that bill last year, it is true, but there is an old spiritual that is often spoken down in my country which says: "The longer the light holds out to burn, the vilest sinner may return."

I wanted to ask the gentleman this: I just came in, and I wondered if the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GROSS] had made reference to an item here in the report, which is astonishing to me, of \$400,000 for the inauguration of an African medical program?

Mr. GROSS. No.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Do not tell me that that item escaped your eagle eye?

Mr. GROSS. You find quite a little discussion of this program in the hearings, I will say to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. It seems to me we are having enough trouble in this country with medical programs without going to Africa to find more.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield so I can answer the question of the distinguished chairman of the Rules Committee, the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH]?

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

Mr. ROONEY. I want to explain that this item of \$400,000, that part of this item of \$400,000, is to start an African health program for American personnel as the result of many serious illnesses which have required those suffering from these illnesses to be flown to Rhine Main in Germany and other places in Europe, perhaps, a couple of thousand miles away.

Mr. GROSS. I never saw one of these programs that somebody could not find a very cogent reason for it in debate.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I am just wondering why, if we have such bad health down there in Africa, we do not come home?

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I have one other question concerning this United Nations business. I find on page 308 of the hearings this statement, that the \$25,616,000 is requested for 2 months, from May 1, 1962, and on page 309 of the hearings, under "Computation of Estimates," I find the U.S. share of the \$80 million assessment is for the period of November 1, 1961, to June 30, 1962, \$25,616,000.

Now, which is it? Is it for 2 months or is it for the period from November 1, 1961, to June 30, 1962?

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

Mr. GROSS. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. ROONEY. It is for the period from November 1, 1961, to June 30, 1962.

Mr. GROSS. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to refer to page 268 of the hearings, and this highly enlightening colloquy that occurred:

Mr. ROONEY. Will the allowance of this \$210,000 add any personnel to the payroll?

Mr. ROWLEY. No, sir.

Mr. ROONEY. These are all expense moneys?

Mr. ROWLEY. Yes, sir, for the Presidential family.

Mr. ROONEY. How many people do you presently have traveling with the First Lady?

Mr. ROWLEY. I think approximately 15, sir.

Mr. ROONEY. I have no further questions, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Jonas?

Mr. JONAS. I have no questions.

Mr. THOMAS. Thank you very much.

Can you get by with \$200,000?

Mr. ROONEY. Say "Yes," fast.

Mr. ROWLEY. Yes, sir.

Mr. THOMAS. Thank you very much.

Then I went from the hearings to the bill and I found the \$210,000 still listed. The committee did not even take the \$10,000 out after they got Mr. Rowley to agree that it could.

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

Mr. GROSS. Sure, I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. ROONEY. That was in about 2 seconds that we saved \$10,000.

Mr. GROSS. No; you did not, because you have \$210,000 in the bill. You did not save a dime. Instead of saving \$10,000 for the taxpayers of this country, you let him off the hook.

Mr. GLENN. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to see that this supplemental appropriation bill for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1962, contains an item of \$25 million for disaster relief and assistance to the States and local governments under authorization of Public Law 875.

While I do not agree with the estimate that \$24,800,000 will be required for the allocations to the disaster areas as an overall amount, yet I am encouraged to believe that more will be forthcoming as the committee report states that this is an estimate for required allocations during the balance of the fiscal year. It is becoming more and more evident to both the State agencies and local governments how difficult it is to estimate the cost of the replacement and repair of public facilities. In New Jersey alone, it has been estimated that the total damage to all public facilities will eventually reach \$75 million. In fact, the New Jersey State Senate as recently as last week passed a resolution petitioning the Federal Government to allocate this amount of disaster funds for the State of New Jersey.

Even now, after the claims of some municipalities have been formalized and filed with the Department of Civilian Defense and Disaster Control, it has been discovered that some damage not known of in the preparation of the claim was omitted. I have been informed by the Office of Emergency Planning, acting on behalf of the President under the disaster relief program, that past experience has shown that the damage is never as great as originally estimated. I certainly hope that this is the case, but I would much rather have too much in the fund than too little.

I do hope that with the additional appropriation of \$25 million, added to the balance on hand of \$10,363,000 as of March 13, it will be sufficient to meet all claims. In any event, the door should be kept open for further assistance if need be.

SMALL PRODUCERS PROGRAM RECEIVES GREEN LIGHT

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Chairman, I take this time to express my deep appreciation to the Members of this body for their vote today in support of the full sum requested by President Kennedy to finance the first year's operation of the lead and zinc stabilization program for small producers.

With the \$4,880,000 thus provided, assuming the other body adds its approval, thousands of lead and zinc miners across the country are assured of employment during 1962. For many miners it will be the first work they have had since the mines began to close in this country several years ago. I know this will be the case in my own district in Oklahoma and in several adjoining counties in Missouri and Kansas.

Appreciation is particularly due the President and the Honorable Stewart Udall, Secretary of the Interior, and their fine assistants, who have worked hard to get this program underway at the earliest possible date.

The thanks of the miners also go to the gentleman from Ohio, MIKE KIRWAN, for his sympathetic and helping hand with this program, and to other distinguished members of the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee headed by the gentleman from Colorado, WAYNE ASPINALL. Thanks are also due to the able chairman of the subcommittee handling today's bill, the gentleman from Texas, ALBERT THOMAS, and other members of his subcommittee.

Mr. Chairman, this program by no means provides all the answers to the serious problems of our domestic lead and zinc industry, and no sponsor for it has made such a claim.

It is a long-awaited helping hand desperately needed by the small mine operators and the miners who work for them, and as such is sincerely appreciated as an interim measure while our Nation develops a long-range domestic minerals program.

Mr. SANTANGELO. Mr. Chairman, I am supporting this second supplemental appropriation bill of 1962, especially the appropriation of \$17 million of Federal contribution for the World's Fair in New York City which opens on April 22, 1964. I regret that the subcommittee felt that the \$25 million requested was not justified. The fair is dedicated to man's achievement on a shrinking globe in an expanded universe, his invention, discoveries, arts, skills and inspiration.

Interest in the New York World's Fair of 1964 is worldwide; 63 nations have expressed an interest as exhibitors. At least 11 nations have already signed a contract. Ten nations have selected sites, and contracts are in the hands of appropriate officials for signature.

An interesting and exciting development is the offer of His Holiness Pope John through His Eminence Francis

Cardinal Spellman, to lend to the Fair the statue of "The Pieta," by Michaelangelo, the greatest of the Italian sculptors. There are at least four great statues of the Pieta in Italy, but the one presently located in St. Peter's Church in Rome is incomparable. No marble work of art possesses the elegance, the simplicity and the grandeur as does this marble display of sorrow, depicting the Virgin Mary holding in her lap the body of her Son who sacrificed His life to redeem mankind.

I have gazed on this masterpiece many times and have always experienced a tingling sensation with every look. I would like to point out for future observers, inasmuch as guide books and few people are aware of this added feature, that on one breast of the Holy Mother there can be observed the face of a newborn babe and on the other breast the outline of a skeleton. The symbol is obvious to Catholics and those familiar with Christian doctrine. When one realizes that Michaelangelo wrought this masterpiece at the tender age of 23 years, one becomes aware that artists are gifted with mystical talent which perseverance and hard work can only dramatize. The more than 70 million people who are expected to visit the New York World's Fair have a wonderful treat in store for them and I am grateful to Pope John for generously offering to the American world, especially New Yorkers who cannot visit Rome, the chance to see what is in my opinion the world's greatest sculptural masterpiece.

The New York World's Exhibit of 1964 bids fair to surpass the features of Brussels, Moscow, and Seattle. I trust that this measure will be approved.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Chairman, I ask the Clerk to read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 2, line 1:

"TITLE I. DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

"AGRICULTURAL RESEARCH SERVICE

"Salaries and expenses

"For an additional amount for 'Salaries and expenses', for 'Plant and animal disease and pest control', \$2,500,000, to remain available until June 30, 1963: *Provided*, That the foregoing amount shall not be available for conduct of any screwworm eradication program that does not require minimum matching by State or local sources of at least 50 per centum of the expenses of production, irradiation, and release of the screwworm flies."

Mr. ANDERSEN of Minnesota. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. ANDERSEN of Minnesota: On page 2, strike out lines 3 to 12 inclusive.

Mr. ANDERSEN of Minnesota. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that I may proceed for an additional 5 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. ANDERSEN of Minnesota. Mr. Chairman, what I am discussing here today has to do with the basic integrity of the subcommittees dealing with appropriations. Mr. Chairman, I resent

the beginning of a \$9 million program—this is not just \$2.5 million—it is the beginning of a \$9 million program extending over the next 3 years, yet it is included in what is supposed to be an emergency or deficiency bill.

All of the Members here know that when they come before our Subcommittee on Appropriations for Agriculture, we give them courteous treatment; we listen to their requests. We do the best we can. I do not think there is a better chairman on any subcommittee on appropriations than the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTEN]. We are always courteous.

I am surprised that my good friend from Texas [Mr. THOMAS] becomes a party, unknowingly I am sure, to the start of a \$9 million program concerning which Dr. Popham and his associates had not even appeared to testify before our subcommittee.

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

Mr. ANDERSEN of Minnesota. I will be glad to listen to the gentleman.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Chairman, just wherein has this humble subcommittee committed any error? This item was sent over to the subcommittee from the Bureau of the Budget. This committee has been duly organized and set up to handle these items. We again humbly apologize to the gentleman.

Mr. ANDERSEN of Minnesota. Will the gentleman agree to my amendment? That would be the best apology that I know of.

Mr. THOMAS. We have a duty and a responsibility here, as the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. JENSEN] has explained. I am not a farmer. He lives in one of the great farming communities of the world, as does the gentleman from Minnesota. This screw-worm is fixing to hatch out in the spring. If you are going to have any relief, now is the time to have it; do not wait until June or July or August of this year. If you want to help the farmers, go on and help these people. After all, these are matching funds.

Mr. ANDERSEN of Minnesota. Has the gentleman finished, on my time?

Mr. THOMAS. I should be glad to yield the gentleman whatever time he wants, if I have that right.

Mr. ANDERSEN of Minnesota. I would have to get it by unanimous consent.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that I may proceed an additional 3 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. ANDERSEN of Minnesota. I yield. I want to show the gentleman where he is wrong in this particular instance.

Mr. THOMAS. The gentleman does not want to hurt part of Louisiana, all of Texas, all of Oklahoma, all of Arkansas, and all of New Mexico.

Mr. ANDERSEN of Minnesota. That is correct.

Mr. THOMAS. The gentleman talks about \$9 million. I do not know where he gets that figure. These are matching funds. There is only \$2½ million in here and if it were to go for 2 years, I do not see where it would come to over \$5 million.

Mr. ANDERSEN of Minnesota. Will the gentleman permit me to continue?

Mr. THOMAS. It is the gentleman's time. He yielded to me.

Mr. ANDERSEN of Minnesota. I just want to say how necessary it is to approach a situation of this kind through the subcommittee which really knows what this problem is all about.

Mr. THOMAS. Of course, you know your subject matter.

Mr. ANDERSEN of Minnesota. Let me answer the gentleman. If the gentleman will turn to page 3 of the hearings, he will see there that the Department of Agriculture has \$800,000 a year, right today, to do all this work of scattering sterile screw-worm flies throughout that area. Look at page 3 of the hearings. The gentleman did not know that. The gentleman admits that he did not know that.

Mr. THOMAS. I did not admit anything. Do not put words in my mouth.

Mr. ANDERSEN of Minnesota. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. THOMAS] does not even know that the Department of Agriculture wrote a letter to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTEN] and myself and asked permission to take \$800,000 of its present existing funds and proceed with the scattering of these sterile flies. Look at the bottom of page 3. No harm is done by doing that. The work is progressing. On page 9 the gentleman from Texas himself asked this question of Dr. Popham:

What is your best guess will be required over the 3-year period in which you think you can get the job done to do it like you have done it in the Southeast?

Dr. POPHAM. We think it would take approximately the same amount in the fiscal years 1964 and 1965.

Here it is only 2 months before July 1. They have \$800,000 available, and here you are coming in with a \$9 million program over the next 3 years. I realize you people did not have an opportunity to study the problem, but I am not objecting to that. I think it is irresponsible procedure to take away from the proper subcommittee its due authority. We have done everything we could to promote this great eradication work. We did it for the Southeast. If it comes to the feasibility of establishing an artificial barrier between Mexico and the United States, let us at least have the privilege in our subcommittee of having these folks come before us and tell us something about what they want done. But no, here we are being committed to an appropriation of \$2.5 million. I think the gentleman will agree with me it is a little bit unfair to our subcommittee, and I plead for the commonsense of the House to leave it to the jurisdiction of the proper subcommittee to take care of this very important work.

Mr. THOMAS. We certainly do not want to usurp any jurisdiction that the gentleman may have. We went to the

full committee and presented this item. My very able and distinguished friend was there, and he did not mention it.

Mr. ANDERSEN of Minnesota. I was not there; I am sorry.

Mr. THOMAS. It is a little bit embarrassing to the gentleman—

Mr. ANDERSEN of Minnesota. No; it is not embarrassing at all.

Mr. THOMAS. For a member of the committee to get up and raise that point after the action has been taken. We would have been glad to turn it over to you. As a matter of fact, we have more work to do now than we wanted.

Mr. ANDERSEN of Minnesota. The gentleman from Texas is a very able gentleman. He is a lovable gentleman, as he has often said to others. The gentleman from Minnesota and the gentleman from Mississippi were unable to be at that particular meeting that morning. Neither of us was advised in advance that that particular item would be in the bill. Right now I am attempting on behalf of the gentleman from Mississippi and my subcommittee to defend the integrity of my subcommittee.

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

Mr. ANDERSEN of Minnesota. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. ROONEY. It is not only unfortunate that the distinguished gentleman from Minnesota was not at the full committee meeting to raise the question, but insofar as his viewpoint is concerned, it is also unfortunate that he offered an amendment instead of making a point of order here in the Committee of the Whole today. I suspect a point of order might have been successful but it is now too late.

Mr. ANDERSEN of Minnesota. May I say to the gentleman from New York that the gentleman from Minnesota will always make his own decisions as to his procedure. I ask you, ladies and gentlemen, in the name of fairplay to remember that the Department has \$800,000 it is using now for this purpose. Remember, there are only about 2 months between now and July 1. Remember that my subcommittee on appropriations has not yet completed hearings. So in the name of fairplay, I hope this item will be stricken.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Chairman, we ask for a vote.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. ANDERSEN].

Mr. ANDERSEN of Minnesota. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the chairman appointed as tellers Mr. THOMAS and Mr. ANDERSEN of Minnesota.

The question was taken; and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 46, noes 66.

So the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

GENERAL ADMINISTRATION

Participation in New York World's Fair

For expenses necessary to provide for United States participation in the New York World's Fair, as authorized by the provisions of the Act of September 21, 1961 (75 Stat. 527), including compensation of a United States Commissioner, who shall be appointed

by the President, at a rate not to exceed \$19,500 per annum, and services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U.S.C. 55a), but at rates for individuals not to exceed \$75 per diem, \$17,000,000, to remain available until expended.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, President Kennedy himself in person at his office today suggested to all 150 members of State agricultural stabilization and conservation committees that they become active participants in politics in behalf of Secretary of Agriculture Freeman's farm program, presently pending in the Congress.

This is the way the wire services reported it:

President Kennedy today delicately suggested to members of the State agriculture stabilization and conservation committees that although they are prohibited by law from lobbying for specific farm legislation, they should not permit Members of Congress to be "lonesome."

We have long known that the political-minded former Governor of Minnesota, now serving as Secretary of Agriculture, has been making an organizational effort to convert the vast operations of his Department into a vast political machine in the rural areas.

It has long been known to us from the type of legislation Secretary Freeman has recommended that he aspires to have us delegate to him extraordinary powers to make him virtually czar of agriculture. If he had his way, he would make our farmers economic peasants under his control and political pawns for the Kennedy administration.

I never thought, however, that the President of the United States would in effect condone this action. I never thought that a President of the United States would tell employees that they should not allow a legal prohibition against lobbying for legislation to deter them in such effort.

This is indeed "government by propaganda" that has been ushered in by President Kennedy with his Madison Avenue technique. President Kennedy is attempting to persuade the independent American farmer to give up his birthright for a mess of Freeman-Cochrane pottage. This the American farmer will never do.

We regret that the President of all of us should in this manner stoop to conquer the free will of a free people.

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

Mr. ARENDS. I yield.

Mr. HOEVEN. I am reliably informed that the State agricultural stabilization and conservation committeemen from all over the United States were called in to Washington for the specific purpose of lobbying for the Freeman omnibus farm bill and that they did not pay their own expenses here on this trip.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. GROSS. Has the Clerk concluded reading page 3 of the bill?

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk has read page 3.

Mr. GROSS. A point of order, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. GROSS. I make a point of order against the following language beginning in line 16 and ending in line 18:

Including compensation of a United States Commissioner, who shall be appointed by the President, at a rate not to exceed \$19,500 per annum,

I make the point of order that this is legislation on an appropriation bill, and is so stated on page 9 of the report of the committee accompanying the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Texas wish to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Chairman, the point of order is good.

The agency states that this position would be considered in addition to the 10 persons authorized to be employed without regard to the provisions of the Classification Act.

The act itself sets up 10 positions. What makes it subject to a point of order is that the agency admits that it is not 1 of the 10 but is the 11th job and so it, as the 11th job, is subjected to a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman concedes the point of order. The point of order is sustained.

The gentleman from Texas concedes the point of order.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. Gross: On page 3, lines 20 and 21, strike out the figure "\$17,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof the figure "\$10,000,000".

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I shall not dwell on this subject for more than a minute or two.

As everyone knows, this \$17 million is an appropriation for the New York World's Fair. My amendment would reduce this amount to \$10 million, or just \$30,000 more than the \$9,970,000 allotted by the Congress to the Federal Government for support of the fair at Seattle, Wash. It is that simple. I see no reason why we should vote more money for New York City in the State of New York for a fair than we voted for Seattle, Wash.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. Chairman, we are not going to detain the Committee long. We will try to dispose of this amendment expeditiously. I do hope that the amendment offered by our distinguished and beloved friend from Iowa will be voted down.

There was a budget estimate for \$25 million. We combed it carefully; we reduced the amount to \$17 million. There are 66 foreign nations all expressing an interest in this fair. Innumerable citizens of the United States are interested. I am biased, I do not mind telling you, on behalf of the great State of Washington. We gave them \$9,900,000. New York is about 15 or 20 times larger. So

let us not try to put this on a comparative basis.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, will the distinguished gentleman yield?

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

Mr. ROONEY. I would like to point out the testimony on page 70 of the printed hearings in which General Potter, executive vice president of the New York World's Fair Corp., testified:

Mr. Jensen, I will say this: The U.S.S.R. is going to spend something like \$20 million on their exhibit.

This is at the New York World's Fair. Surely our Nation, our Federal Government, should be properly represented there. I am sure the Committee of the Whole will vote down the pending amendment and appropriate the \$17 million to get the construction and activities started.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. Gross].

The question was taken; and, on a division demanded by Mr. Gross, there were—ayes 35, noes 98.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I should like to call attention to the proposed \$10 million building that is to be built by the Federal Government at the New York World's Fair and the item of \$100,000 to tear it down at the end of 2 years.

At the time of the authorizing legislation for the Seattle Fair, I was a member of the House Foreign Affairs Committee and insisted that the U.S. structure be a general-type building so that it could be of use to the community later. There were proposed plans of a very advanced design that I strongly objected to and do in this New York proposal. This is a ghastly and economic waste.

I believe that same policy should be advanced here, and I would urge the New York World's Fair organization and our U.S. Department people to change their minds and not build a special type of building that will only be good for 2 years and then will cost \$100,000 to tear it down. I would strongly recommend the erection of a type of building that would be of permanent civic use, educational use, or health use in the local community.

Mr. TOLLEFSON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, with respect to the World's Fair in Seattle, it may be that the fair in New York will be more costly, may be bigger, but I want to assure the Members of the House that it will not be better, and I extend a personal invitation to all of you to come out and see Century 21 this summer. The fair starts April 21 and will run for at least 6 months. Come out and see the space needle, the monorail transportation system, the science exhibit, and above all the wonderful scenery out in God's country. You will see for yourselves that I do not speak idle words when I say the Century 21 will be the finest of all fairs.

The Clerk read as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE

Office of Education

Defense Educational Activities

For an additional amount for "Defense educational activities", for capital contributions to student loan funds, \$16,155,000.

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BOLAND: On page 6, after line 13, insert: "Payment to school districts. For an additional amount for payment to school districts, \$15,707,000."

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

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

Mr. THOMAS. May I say to our distinguished colleague that in my judgment this is perhaps the most popular item that comes before the House. Since we have been sitting here today our colleagues have come from both sides of the aisle requesting some relief along this line. May I ask my friend, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. BOLAND], does this only include maintenance and operation, or does it include any additional construction funds?

Mr. BOLAND. This is purely for operation and maintenance under Public Law 874.

Mr. THOMAS. If that is true, and there are no additional construction funds, may I respectfully suggest to the committee that it would be well to buy this amendment.

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

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

Mr. LAIRD. I understand that this is the \$15 million which the Department of HEW testified was needed for the impacted areas for fiscal 1962 to meet 100 percent of the entitlement. In the appropriation bill which passed the House just a week ago we included 100 percent entitlement for 1963. Now, the figure that is presently in the 1962 appropriation act was the estimate of the Department a year ago. Their estimate was supposed to take care of 100 percent of the entitlement. I cannot understand why the administration is willing to send up a supplemental budget request for items such as the New York World's Fair, which is an item that is not of a supplemental nature or a deficiency nature, not related to fiscal year 1962, but is unwilling to take care of the educational program which was adopted by this House with only 30 Members voting against. I did not support the formula used in this program as approved last year, but I think there has been a commitment made here, and I think the Kennedy administration has not lived up to its commitment which it made when President Kennedy signed this bill last year.

Mr. BOLAND. I appreciate the statement of the gentleman from Wisconsin. As he well understands, this is a problem which not only occurred during this

administration; it is a problem that occurred during the last administration. I appreciate the gentleman's support.

Mr. Chairman, this amendment will make up the deficiency of 8 percent in the fiscal year 1962 appropriation to implement Public Law 874. It deals with payments to federally impacted school districts for operation and maintenance. Local school districts and school committees have budgeted on the basis of 100 percent entitlement under Public Law 874. Failure of the Congress to provide these funds can and will have a serious effect on many communities. We ought to keep our commitment to them and we can do it by supporting this amendment.

Mr. SEELY-BROWN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOLAND. I yield to the gentleman from Connecticut.

Mr. SEELY-BROWN. Mr. Chairman, it is a pleasure and a duty for me to support the amendments which are offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. BOLAND] and by the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY] to the pending second supplemental appropriation bill, 1962, because they make possible an act of simple justice to the towns and school districts which are entitled to Federal assistance because of the impact upon their public schools of Government activities in the vicinity.

The amendment of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. BOLAND] will add \$15,707,000 to the funds available for disbursement under Public Law 874 for the 1962 fiscal year, and the amendment of the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY] will fulfill the same objective under Public Law 815.

In my district, Mr. Chairman, these two amendments are more important to the people of my district than anything else in this bill.

More than half of the towns in my district qualify for Federal assistance under Public Law 874, and nearly as many under Public Law 815. The children are there. The towns and school districts have to provide classrooms, teachers, and the requisite facilities for them, and more than a decade ago the Congress decided that they were entitled to be reimbursed for the extreme financial burden which has been placed upon them by the impact of Federal installations.

The towns and school districts, even as the Federal Government and other governments, are required to make up their budget for a year ahead. They are required to levy taxes to meet the requirements of the budget. They hire teachers by the year, the same as they have to buy fuel for the schoolhouses, buy other supplies and services to cover the entire year, and must have the money to pay for them.

Yet the administration persists in acting miserly toward these school districts, which number almost 4,000 across the country. The obligation is recognized, but we do not pay them what we owe. For no good reason that I can see, the entitlement for every district is cut down from the amount the law says they

should get, to some arbitrarily determined lesser amount.

If the time ever comes when this House believes the assistance provided under Public Law 874 and Public Law 815 of the 81st Congress no longer is desirable or necessary, we may be sure that the House will say so, clearly and unequivocally. Until that time, we should pay the towns and school districts 100 percent of what we say we owe them, not 92 percent, or 85 percent, or any other part of the whole amount.

Last week, Mr. Chairman, I was pleased to join with the other Members present, when we voted an appropriation bill which contained money which the committee had added, so that for fiscal 1963 the qualified towns and school districts will receive all of the funds which is due them under the formula for entitlement.

This was real progress. I am very glad we took the action which we did, and I congratulate the committee, and the Members of the House for passing the legislation.

Let us now be just as fair by passing these amendments which will provide 100 percent of the entitlements for 1962.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment to the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BOW to the amendment offered by Mr. BOLAND: Change the period to a colon and add the following: "Provided, That none of these funds may be paid to any State or local educational agency as a result of any child, in attendance at a school operated by such agency, who lives on non-Federal property."

Mr. BOW. Mr. Chairman, my amendment to the amendment I think is very clear. It would provide that the impact funds would be paid only in those areas where the children are living on Federal property and where you have a truly impact area. I know how unpopular it is to speak against the amendment of the gentleman from Massachusetts, but I think it is a matter that should be called to the attention of the committee each year, and I have done it. But I hope some day the legislative committee will correct this law so it will be a truly impacted areas bill.

Now, what we are voting on here today is not in the President's budget. I have seen Members here in this House in the last week walk down the aisle because it was the President's program. Today I am supporting the President of the United States, Mr. Kennedy, by voting against what he does not want. It is not in the budget. I am going to vote against it.

Mr. Chairman, let me say that a great deal of this money that we are going to appropriate is not for impacted areas, not for areas where the military has gone in or where the Federal Government has gone in, but a great portion of it is going across the river to Alexandria, up and down the river into Maryland and into areas that are not impacted such as Chevy Chase, where your employees' children go to school. They will receive a large part of this. If you ever had

Federal aid to education, this is it. Let me give you one glaring example:

Mr. Chairman, I wonder whether anyone in this House realizes that Public Law 874 costs the taxpayers of the United States \$501.04 because a United Airlines pilot with five school-age children, residing in Prince William County, Va., takes off and lands at Washington National Airport.

This is the extent to which Public Law 874 has been abused by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare in cooperation with the local school districts.

We are told that we must subsidize the schools because of the impact of children whose parents work on Federal reservations or for the Federal Government.

Did any of you know that the law was so all inclusive that it could subsidize the children of a man whose only connection with the Federal Government is that he lands a plane at Washington National Airport and perhaps carries an FAA inspector in the cockpit now and then? I doubt it.

If the same pilot moved to Arlington County it would cost us \$670.60 per year.

And may I say in passing that the pilots from whom I have learned these startling facts are bitterly opposed to the system. They are substantial property owners, longtime residents of their communities, some of them farm operators, whose income and tax contributions to the community and the State of Virginia probably are above average. They do not believe it is morally right for the county to collect a Federal subsidy because of their children, but it is collected nonetheless.

I cite this as the most shocking extension of Public Law 874 to come to my attention in years, and I have been opposing this program for many years, but it is really no more shocking than the fact that my secretary costs the Federal Government \$200.38 per year because he works in a Federal building and has two children in school in Virginia.

There is no doubt but that these men and thousands like them have had an impact on the Virginia and Maryland communities near Washington, but it has been a positive and worthwhile impact. They are contributing to the community; they own property and pay taxes; they patronize local merchants; and their impact is one of increasing prosperity for the community.

Mr. Chairman, if we amend this law and make it truly an impact areas law, then I would certainly go along with it, because there are such areas. But when we talk about economy and responsible fiscal programs, it seems to me that this is one at which we should take a good, hard look, instead of paying for the construction and granting Federal aid to education to the people in Maryland and Virginia and along the rivers, which are not impacted areas caused by an impact of military personnel, but people who own their homes the same as the hardware man who lives next door.

Mr. Chairman, I think this is the place where my amendment should be

adopted, and then it would make it a truly impact areas bill.

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

Mr. BOW. I am delighted to yield to the gentleman from West Virginia.

Mr. BAILEY. The situation that confronts us today has nothing to do with the continuation of this program. It is carrying out an obligation of the Congress last year when we put money in the budget to pay the several districts 100 cents on the dollar, and ended up by paying them 92 cents out of the dollar. This has nothing to do with the 1963 appropriation. It is just to make good a commitment of the Congress for this current fiscal year.

Mr. BOW. I admit that to the gentleman. We went \$58 million over the budget in 1963. In this program now we are being asked to go over the budget again—\$58 million in 1963 and an additional \$15 million now.

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

Mr. BOW. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. BAILEY. Let me remind the gentleman from Ohio that the Defense Department has engaged in and has launched several new defense projects. For instance, when this bill was passed and renewed, there was little known about Cape Canaveral. All of that work had an additional impact. So, what could the Department do except meet these emergencies as they came up in the hope that the Congress would do what it has done over the past fiscal year and give them some additional money?

Mr. BOW. I think if the amendment to the amendment is carried it will take care of that situation where we have an impact on Federal property.

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

Mr. BOW. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Chairman, I think all of us in the House appreciate the persuasiveness of the arguments of the gentleman from Ohio. I think he is right, but not in this particular instance. I think this is not the way to go about it. I think he makes a very good argument, but I think the time to take care of the problem which he points out is when this law comes up for extension. I think it expires in 1963 and we will have to vote an extension of the law at that time. Why not do it at that time?

Mr. BOW. Mr. Chairman, may I ask the gentleman this question? He will recall that this extension was brought up last year under suspension. There was no chance for the gentleman from Ohio to attempt to amend the bill. It was brought up under suspension and, of course, with the great popularity of the program, it passed. We could not amend it. I hope some day the legislative committee will give us a chance to amend it and make it a proper impacted-area law.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Bow].

Mr. Chairman, in 1958, Congress extended authority to make payments for

"A" category children under Public Laws 815 and 874 on a permanent basis, and extended the provisions authorizing payments for the other categories of Federal impact to June 30, 1963. The present administration recommended to the Congress for consideration last year a reduction in payments in both Public Laws 815 and 874 for "B" category children—primarily those children who live in a taxable home with a parent employed on Federal property—from the present 50 percent of the local contribution rate to 25 percent of that rate, and proposed some other amendments which would reduce the total cost of these programs. While I believe that some savings could be made by amendments which would restrict payments to those school districts where the need is not urgent, the Congress did not see fit to accept the recommendations of the administration. Instead, in the very last days of the session last year, Congress extended these expiring provisions without amendment for 2 additional years. At the same time, the appropriation made to carry out these acts was \$15,707,000 less than the amount necessary to pay full entitlements under Public Law 874, and \$7,092,000 short of meeting the estimated requirements under Public Law 815.

With the \$231 million currently available, the Office of Education can pay only 92 percent of the estimated entitlements of the eligible districts for current operating expenses under Public Law 874, and can approve only 87 percent of those eligible construction projects under Public Law 815, with the \$54,850,000 appropriated for this program. The total amount needed is \$247 million under Public Law 874, and \$61,942,000 under Public Law 815.

As I said before, I am in favor of some amendments which would reduce the cost of these two programs. At the same time I firmly believe that when the Congress has had an opportunity to act on amendments which would reduce the cost, but has not taken that action, school districts have a right to expect that the entitlements due them under the law will be paid. Furthermore, I believe that the Congress has a moral obligation under the situation which I have described to appropriate the full amounts necessary to pay 100 percent of the entitlements under these two programs.

When Congress extended these two laws without amendment the school districts expected that they would receive full entitlements and planned their budgets accordingly. Now when the appropriation is sufficient to pay only 92 percent of the costs, they have nowhere to turn to find this additional 8 percent. They must either try to find the money somewhere now and make it up in additional taxes next year, or drastically curtail their school programs. In my State of Rhode Island, for example, 22 federally impacted school districts will provide free public education for an estimated 2,000 "A" category children who live on Federal property with a parent employed on Federal property.

They also will provide free public education for 8,700 "B" category children the current school year. The estimated full entitlements for these 22 districts amounts to \$2,120,000. With the appropriation currently available they will receive \$169,653 less than this amount, or \$1,951,026. In order to make up this difference which they have counted on

in making their budgets these school districts will have to raise their tax rates, in one case as much as 1.28 mills.

The town of North Kingston, for example, is depending on Federal payments to make up almost 40 percent of its total budget. It will be short \$39,000 if full entitlements are not paid. This is equivalent to the full salary of an esti-

mated six teachers for 1 year. The town of Middletown school committee is entitled to approximately \$400,000 in a total operating budget of a little over \$1 million. It will be short \$34,000 if full entitlements are not paid. At this time of year, when the tax rate has been set, where will the school officials turn to make up this deficit?

Estimated increase in local tax rate if 3 percent and 19 percent reduction in Federal (Public Law 874) payments for fiscal years 1962 and 1963, respectively, are not restored for State of Rhode Island

Name of district	1961 assessed valuation ¹	1962 estimated ent. 100 percent	1962 estimated ent. 92 percent	Difference	Estimated increase in local tax rate (in mills) required to equal amount shown in col (5)	1963 estimated ent. 100 percent	1963 estimated ent. 81 percent	Difference	Estimated increase in local tax rate (in mills) required to equal amount of loss shown in col. (9)
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)
Newport school system.....	\$90,009,400	\$450,106	\$414,097	\$36,009	0.40	\$515,082	\$417,216	\$97,866	1.08
Town of Middletown School Commission.....	26,726,490	428,014	393,773	34,241	1.28	497,988	403,370	94,618	3.54
Town of Tiverton School Commission.....	23,168,109	23,417	21,544	1,873	.08	26,622	21,564	5,058	.21
Town of East Greenwich School Commission.....	20,868,772	44,888	41,297	3,591	.17	50,716	41,080	9,636	.46
Town of North Kingston School Commission.....	43,065,960	491,163	451,370	39,793	.91	573,605	464,620	108,985	2.49
Town of Portsmouth School Commission.....	22,786,460	152,453	140,257	12,196	.53	175,993	142,554	33,439	1.46
Town of Jamestown School Commission.....	17,500,000	24,252	22,312	1,940	.11	27,552	22,317	5,235	.29
Coventry School Department.....	43,648,787	94,604	87,036	7,568	.17	107,733	87,264	20,469	.46
Warwick School Commission.....	251,439,671	176,063	161,978	14,085	.05	199,591	161,669	37,922	.15
Town of Westerly School Commission.....	42,211,000	55,520	51,078	4,442	.10	63,057	51,707	11,350	.26
Town of Charlestown School Commission.....	5,922,252	7,488	6,889	599	.10	8,680	7,031	1,649	.27
Richmond School Commission (Shannaek).....	6,149,374	4,412	4,059	353	.05	5,178	4,194	984	.16
Town of Narragansett School Commission.....	25,453,435	13,635	12,544	1,091	.04	15,238	12,343	2,895	.11
Hopkinton School Department.....	9,904,742	16,528	15,206	1,322	.13	18,668	15,121	3,547	.35
West Greenwich School Department.....	3,900,200	3,088	2,841	247	.06	3,540	2,867	673	.17
Town of Warwick School Department.....	² 43,091,968	45,131	41,521	3,610	.08	51,327	41,575	9,752	.22
Town of Smithfield Department of Public Schools.....	31,254,190	8,593	7,906	687	.02	9,719	7,872	1,847	.05
Bristol School Commission.....	49,186,465	13,892	12,781	1,111	.02	15,775	12,778	2,997	.06
Exeter School Commission.....	9,360,231	6,903	6,351	552	.05	8,090	6,553	1,537	.16
South Kingston School Commission.....	40,903,269	44,374	40,824	3,550	.08	50,406	40,829	9,577	.23
Foster School Department.....	6,733,940	5,057	4,652	405	.06	5,749	4,657	1,092	.16
Charibo Reg. H.S.D., Richmond.....	16,838,355	11,098	10,210	883	.05	12,864	10,420	2,444	.14
Total.....		2,120,679	1,951,026	169,653					

¹ As shown in application of school district for fiscal year 1961.

² Assessed valuation 1958-59, 1959-60, or 1960-61 available in application from school district.

These school districts will find it impossible to obtain sufficient funds to carry out their school program as planned for the current school year. The same situation will exist in almost every other State. There is not a single one of the approximately 4,000 school districts in the United States eligible for payments under this law that will not be adversely affected by failure of this Congress to appropriate sufficient funds to pay full entitlements.

Under Public Law 815 the Office of Education has already processed and found eligible approximately 49 urgently needed construction projects requiring a little over \$7 million which have a priority of less than 10 and which cannot be met with the present appropriation. The additional appropriation for this program is required so that these school districts can start construction of school facilities to house federally connected children who have been sent to their districts for work on essential Federal projects. I believe it is incumbent on this Congress to appropriate the full amount needed under these two laws.

The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Bow] and the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. JONAS], both of whom oppose the appropriation for these two programs, come from congressional districts which have no federally impacted school districts. However, the State of Ohio, on the whole, has 137 school districts eligible for an estimated \$5,718,000 in fiscal year

1962. In North Carolina, 29 impacted school districts are eligible for \$5,473,000. If this additional appropriation is not made, the Ohio districts will lose \$387,200, and the 29 districts in North Carolina will lose \$187,800.

These districts will have no way this late in the year to make up this deficit.

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

Mr. FOGARTY. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. BROWN. Is it not a fact that a great many of these school districts that would be affected by the amendment offered by my beloved friend from Ohio [Mr. Bow] have already made commitments and that they have to pay these bills before July 1 and have no way of getting their money except through the enactment of this legislation, which was promised to them by the Congress of the United States?

Mr. FOGARTY. If the House votes for the Bow amendment, we are breaking a moral obligation to every school district that takes advantage of this appropriation.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, this is a program with which we are all familiar. We cannot add anything to our knowledge about it now. Mr. Chairman, I ask for a vote on the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all Members be permitted to

extend their remarks at this point in the RECORD on this subject.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. ST. GERMAIN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. ST. GERMAIN. Mr. Chairman, I rise to support the motion to include in the deficiency appropriations bill the necessary amounts to pay full entitlements to the federally impacted school districts.

I am aware of the problems of the school departments in my district. I believe it is incumbent on the Congress of the United States to pay full entitlement to those schools that qualify for payment under the law, which in my district are as follows:

	Entitlement	Amount scheduled	Deficiency increase
Newport.....	\$450,106	\$414,097	\$36,009
Middletown.....	428,014	393,773	34,241
Portsmouth.....	152,453	140,257	12,196
Jamestown.....	24,252	22,312	1,940
Tiverton.....	23,417	21,544	1,873

At this time I also wish to state my belief that this session of Congress should take steps to extend Public Laws 874-815; otherwise several of my school districts will be preparing next year's school budgets against a law that will run out part way through their fiscal years.

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. DOWNING] may extend his 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. DOWNING. Mr. Chairman, as the Representative from Virginia's First Congressional District, which, as you well know contains a heavy federally connected population, I am deeply interested in doing everything that can possibly be done to assure provision of the highest kind of education for the children of our Nation's Federal employees.

The public school superintendents in all districts have for many years been working diligently to raise public educational standards to an optimum level. Budget factors, of course, comprise a significant aspect of effort in this area. We all agree with high educational standards; some of us do not always agree on the budgetary levels necessary to achieve high educational standards.

However, school superintendents in my district face a particularly urgent budgeting difficulty because of the heavy federally connected population on the lower peninsula of Virginia. In several of my school districts, approximately 40 percent of the enrolled pupils have parents who are federally connected. You are, of course, very well aware that Federal property produces no tax revenue for a local school district. Consequently many of the school superintendents in my district face each budget preparation period with a possible built-in loss factor of approximately 40 percent. It is the express purpose of our Federal impacted aid program to assist localities to provide a high level of education for the children of federally connected parents. Congress has established a very strong precedent in support of the principle that the Federal Government has a direct obligation to assist local school districts prepare their annual budgets with Federal impacted relief payments in mind.

I can assure you, Mr. Chairman, that the school districts in my area, as well, I am sure, as the districts in other areas, operate on exceedingly tight budgets. Each one of the public school superintendents in my district has prepared his current fiscal year budget in the sincere expectation that his school district would receive a full impacted relief payment from the Federal Government. There is no way to reduce a tight school budget without very significantly hindering the educational process. I personally believe that it is important that all of our children—certainly the children of our fine force of civil servants and our military personnel—be given the best possible education in our public schools.

Obviously, the best will not be possible on a drastically reduced budget.

Therefore, I am personally very hopeful that it will be possible for us to provide for a 100-percent appropriation for Public Law 815 and Public Law 874. I believe that the Federal Government has incurred this obligation and I believe that our children's educational needs demand that we in the Congress help the Federal Government fulfill its full obligation. I have every faith and confidence in my colleagues, Mr. Chairman, and I fervently hope that they will join me in voting to restore the full Public Law 815-Public Law 874 appropriation for the current fiscal year.

Mr. BROYHILL. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment to restore the 8-percent deficiency in the appropriations for aid to impacted area schools for the current year.

It is indeed unfortunate that a degree of uncertainty as to what amount our school districts will receive from year to year under this law presents an additional problem to the communities in preparing their school budgets. Most certainly when limited funds are available to begin with it is practically impossible in some cases to provide sufficient funds for operating the school systems in the event Congress fails to act.

I fully realize that in normal congressional appropriation procedures it is also difficult to determine in advance how much is needed and the reluctance on the part of Congress to overappropriate funds for any program. Yet, since this program has met with substantial approval on the part of the Congress it seems that the communities should be able to plan their budgets on the basis that the Congress will meet their responsibility to fully fund the program.

I hope that this amendment will be adopted and believe that it will, since the record over the period of years is full of information justifying the necessity for and the fairness of this program.

I think attempt to exclude the Washington area schools from this program is so ridiculous that it should be overwhelmingly rejected by the membership and is not even worthy of comment.

Mr. ICHORD of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I rise to speak in favor of the amendment which will provide for a supplemental appropriation for the administration of Public Law 874 as I am deeply concerned about the failure of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare to meet 100 percent entitlement.

This failure of the Federal Government to meet an entire obligation which it has assumed places some of the school districts in my district in Missouri in a very precarious position as the 1962 school budget has already been approved. Many, many school districts all over the Nation are coming out on the short end.

We are committed to these districts, and we must fulfill our moral obligation by paying our bill in full. When full entitlement is not met, we are responsible for depriving the various school systems of some phase of educational need or advancement. At a time such as this,

when educational standards are unusually high and financing the same must be done on a bare minimum scale, the Federal Government can and must pay its bill in full.

My interest is to provide the best educational opportunities available for the youth of our Nation, and I greatly feel it is our duty to see that full entitlement is made available.

Mr. KING of Utah. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. BOLAND] to H.R. 11038, providing for a supplemental appropriation for the federally impacted school districts.

In the State of Utah there are eight school districts which annually receive Federal assistance under the so-called federally impacted area legislation, which assistance amounts to in excess of \$2 million.

In view of the fact that the current debate on Federal aid to education has called up the argument that all Federal aid to local school districts carries with it a threat to academic freedom, and in view of the fact that this argument strikes at the heart of the federally impacted area school program, I make the following observation. Two years ago I wrote a letter to the respective superintendents of each of the school districts in Utah receiving Federal aid under this program. Remember, Mr. Chairman, that this program had been in operation for some 10 years, and that much of this money had gone to pay teachers' salaries. In my letter I asked the question whether or not the receiving of Federal money had in any way interfered with the academic freedom of the recipient of that money, or of any teacher within that district. The answers which I received were unanimously in the negative. Not one single superintendent expressed himself that the Federal aid received was in any way destructive of the traditional academic freedom which is so characteristic of our educational system.

I feel that the RECORD should show clearly, therefore, Mr. Chairman, that as far as Utah is concerned, no one can argue in good faith that the federally impacted area school legislation constitutes a threat to our educational system. I support it, and urge all Members of the House to support the pending amendment.

Mr. MONTROYA. Mr. Chairman, I strongly endorse the amendment offered by the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts, and urge the support of my colleagues to restore 100 percent of the funds to which school districts are entitled.

The present situation places the Congress in the position of failing to fulfill a commitment made years ago and this failure is causing untold hardships on the schools of this Nation. It is one thing to tell a school district that you can expect a certain amount and then be certain that the school gets it. It is another to tell them to expect a certain amount of money and then fail to provide it. The school budgets for this year were made out long ago and expenses were programed on the basis that the Congress of the United States would meet

the responsibility it assumed. Expenditures during the year were predicated on this fact. Now, in entering the fourth quarter, our schools find themselves short of funds to complete the year. This is no small matter, Mr. Chairman, and when you take the effects on New Mexico and multiply them nationwide you have some idea of what is happening. New Mexico has 49 school districts who, as of this moment, are short \$517,556 in meeting obligations for the rest of this fiscal year. One school district alone is short over \$125,000 and this district is in an area where the Government has about 25,000 Government employees sending their children to school.

Mr. Chairman, the issue, it seems to me is simple. Either we are going to meet our obligations or we are not. Either we are going to approve legislation and provide necessary financing or we are not. Either we are going to support education or we are not.

There are many ways to economize, Mr. Chairman, but failing to fulfill a commitment is not one of them. Again, I strongly urge the support of my colleagues in approving this worthy amendment which will maintain the integrity of this body.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in vigorous support of the amendment to bring to 100 percent the entitlements for payments to our schools in federally impacted areas.

These schools have not come to us, hat in hand, asking for doles from the public Treasury. They are asking us, as honorable men, to live up to our obligations under Public Laws 815 and 874. These laws, in essence, call for in-lieu-of-taxes payments in areas where school costs have skyrocketed because of Federal installations. Because of the increased burden thus placed on local taxpayers, the Congress long ago determined that the Federal Government must assume its rightful share of the school tax burden. It is a matter of the Federal Government owing a debt to communities. Our schools are entitled to collect that debt.

The amendment which the gentleman has introduced is the same as my own bill, H.R. 10935, which would bring entitlement up to the full amount due for the current fiscal year. My fifth district is composed of a number of rapidly growing communities faced with sharp increases in capital outlays for new schools as a result of Federal installations. Mr. John Glenn, superintendent of the Bedford Public Schools in my district, tells me that the Bedford community is spending money for new schools at the rate of one new school every 2 years, and will continue at this rate over the next 4-year period at least. This is typical of those areas where Federal installations are accelerating the problems involved in the extremely rapid expansion of school population.

We have heard a great deal from the administration about the need for all-out Federal aid to education and school construction. That is not today's debate, but it makes me doubly astounded at the administration's cold shoulder to the current request that Congress ap-

propriate the full amount to which impacted school areas are already entitled under law.

I urge my colleagues to vote to bring up to 100 percent the entitlement the Federal Government owes our schools in impacted areas, and without which many of these schools will not be able to continue to operate to the benefit of our schoolchildren.

Mr. LANKFORD. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment offered by the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts on the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. There is no matter of more importance to the Fifth Congressional District of Maryland than the continued full operation of Public Laws 815 and 874.

Each year since I have been privileged to be a Member of Congress, it has been necessary for me to insist that the Federal Government honor its responsibilities to those communities that are impacted by Federal activities. The deficiency that will be provided for by Mr. BOLAND's amendment arose as a result of an incorrect estimate at the time the fiscal 1962 budget was submitted to the Congress by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

The public school educators in my district have expressed concern and disquiet over the operation of this program for some time. The issue before this body is, once again, quite simple: Does Congress legislate or do we sit back and allow our legislative responsibilities to be assumed by the Bureau of the Budget?

Our school administrators, relying upon Congress as they had every right to do, made their plans 1 year in advance for the succeeding school year. Traditionally, schoolteachers are evaluated on their teaching performance and new contracts are offered in the spring for the coming fall term. School budgets are made up at this time and uncertainties about Federal contributions continue to add greatly to the problems of our already burdened teachers and administrators.

I would like to read into the record at this point statements made by Mr. William S. Schmidt, Superintendent of Schools in Prince Georges County, which demonstrate quite clearly why I feel so deeply that Congress must not fail to live up to its responsibilities under Public Laws 815 and 874:

The U.S. Office of Education also reports that there is an insufficient appropriation to approve projects for building construction, and that this deficit amounts to \$7,092,000. Under the present funds which have been appropriated, the Office can only approve projects with a priority index of 10 or above. Any project with a priority of less than 10 must wait for approval of a deficiency appropriation.

We have just been advised by Mr. Lillywhite of the Office of Education that we have two projects pending approval, both of which fall below the priority index of 10.

You can well appreciate my concern for these funds for school construction when you realize that Prince Georges County is estimating an increase of 7,000 additional students for the 1962-63 school term. Any help or assistance which you can give to the passage of these deficiency appropriation bills would be greatly appreciated.

Similar problems of equal importance will be experienced by all other counties in the Fifth District of Maryland. Therefore, I am confident that we today will live up to our responsibilities by approving Congressman BOLAND's amendment.

Mr. MATHIAS. Mr. Chairman, I support the amendment of the gentleman from Massachusetts to add funds to permit the United States to honor its commitments to local school boards throughout the Nation. My own bill, H.R. 10807, is directed at doing the same thing.

I am strongly opposed to this amendment proposed by the gentleman from Ohio to limit the effect of the Boland amendment. If this proposal were to be adopted by this House I think we would be guilty of a breach of faith.

My own district has been mentioned in this debate as the recipient of funds under the impacted area program. This is true, and we believe that we earn every penny we receive. The facts support this conclusion.

By every standard, irrespective of whether the children reside on or off Federal real estate, the National Capital area is truly an impacted area. The activities of the Federal Government in this area creates strains on local budgets not present when commensurate activities are carried on by tax-paying private enterprise. Thus the impacted area program is entirely justified.

In the interest of fairness I would add a word as to the propriety of this amendment at this time. The fact that there is a deficiency in no way reflects upon the incumbent Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare. As a matter of fact, there has been a deficiency appropriation for this program in 10 out of the past 11 years. In some cases the amount has been more than double the sum contemplated by this amendment. The failure to predict the exact needs of the program with accuracy seems to have been a bipartisan problem.

I urge bipartisan support to resolve the difficulty and pay our honest debts.

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Chairman, I speak in favor of the gentleman's motion to add \$15 million to this bill presently before us for the impacted school districts in our Nation. To approve this will be to keep faith with these impacted school districts who have definitely planned to receive the total amount of their entitlement under our representation a year ago that they would receive such. Furthermore, there is a continuing need for these impacted school districts to receive the full amount of their entitlement.

It may be true, as the gentleman from Ohio said, that there are many places where there are children who do not live on Federal reservations; but, that does not justify in my mind denying the school districts wherein all or almost all of the children involved are children of necessary Federal employees but whose families live off of the reservation. Most of these families live off the Federal reservation because there are no places for them to live on the reservation. This is true in the great 23d Congressional District of California which I represent

and every one of the impacted school districts in my congressional district have communicated to me they must needs rely upon the receipt again of the balance of their entitlements which amounts to about 10 percent of the total amount which they were promised and upon which they have relied upon receipt thereof.

Before this day on occasions I have spoken to the distinguished gentleman from Texas [Mr. THOMAS] of this continuing need in my congressional district, and I appreciate him and his associate on the committee, the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. BOLAND] bringing this matter to the floor at this time. I believe the House will overwhelmingly vote for the gentleman's motion to include \$15 million additional in this bill. I certainly shall, and I urge every Member of this House to do it in the interest of good faith with these impacted school districts and on account of the very urgent continuing need for same.

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to support the amendment to include the sum of \$15,707,000 in the supplemental appropriation bill for the administration of Public Law 874 which relates to maintenance and operation of public schools in federally impacted areas.

The record shows that I have always been a consistent supporter of the programs embodied in Public Laws 874 and 815. This has been the case because I believe the Federal Government has a distinct responsibility to assist those school districts whose enrollments are increased as a result of Government contracts bringing production workers with their families into such areas. I feel, therefore, that the Federal Government should not forgo its responsibility by failing to provide appropriations in full for those who are entitled to benefits under the law.

I urge all Members of the House to join in supporting this amendment.

Mr. ROUSSELOT. Mr. Chairman, I wish to take this opportunity to express my support for the amendment to the second supplemental appropriation bill for 1962 proposed by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. BOLAND]. I deem it entirely appropriate that the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare be required to spend 100 percent of the sum appropriated by Congress for Public Law 815 and Public Law 874. School districts having to absorb children of Federal employees who do not pay local school taxes are entitled to the financial assistance which these laws provide.

I hasten to advise that while I definitely support this amendment I am reserving judgment on final passage of the bill itself.

Mr. HAGEN of California. Mr. Chairman, I vigorously support the amendment offered by the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. BOLAND] to appropriate sufficient funds to permit the payment of full entitlements to local school districts under Public Laws 815 and 874.

The Federal impactment program has been in existence since 1951, a period of more than 10 years. During this time

the affected school districts have prepared their annual budgets with the expectation that Federal aid provided for under Public Laws 815 and 874, as extended, would be forthcoming. If the supplemental appropriation now under consideration is not approved these school districts will undergo deficit financing and their operations will be seriously affected.

In the 14th California District, which I am privileged to represent, no less than 17 elementary, high school, and junior college districts are adversely affected by the reduced entitlements. The increased expenditures involved are entirely attributable to student population influxes due to Federal activity.

For my district, this Federal assistance is substantial. Figures provided by the Office of Education show that for the 1962 fiscal year, the 17 districts involved are eligible for entitlements totaling \$1,678,344 under Public Law 874 for operation and maintenance. The 8 percent deficiency will reduce this amount to \$1,544,071, leaving a total shortage of \$134,273 in operating funds.

It should be further noted that the impactment in the 14th Congressional District lies principally in three military installation complexes. I refer to the areas of Edwards Air Force Base, the Naval Ordnance Test Station at China Lake, and Naval Air Station, Lemoore. It goes without saying that the activities at these stations are making noteworthy contributions to our defense effort.

However, the existence of military bases takes land off the tax rolls and reduces the ad valorem tax base. It is for this reason that the assistance provided for in the impactment program is vitally needed.

The principle involved here has repeatedly been approved by the Congress. It was reiterated as recently as last year when the authority for the program was extended. We must recognize our moral obligation to appropriate the necessary funds.

At this time, I would like to include in the Record a list of the 17 local school districts in the 14th California District which have a stake in this appropriation. There follows the identity of the districts, followed by figures representing the full 1962 fiscal year entitlement under Public Law 874, the 92-percent allocation, and the amount of the shortage if the Boland amendment is not adopted:

China Lake Joint School District, \$444,230, \$408,692, \$35,538.

Southern Kern County Unified School District, Rosamond, \$33,287, \$30,624, \$2,663.

Muroc Unified School District, Edwards, \$505,918, \$465,445, \$40,473.

Three Rivers Unified School District, \$11,316, \$10,411, \$905.

Central Union Elementary School District, Lemoore, \$147,747, \$135,927, \$11,820.

Lemoore Union School District, \$16,479, \$15,161, \$1,318.

Indian Wells Valley Union School District, Ridgecrest, \$71,631, \$65,901, \$5,730.

Kern County Joint Union High School District, \$268,233, \$246,774, \$21,459.

Mojave Unified School District, \$18,715, \$17,217, \$1,498.

Lemoore Union High School District, \$55,542, \$51,098, \$4,444.

Hanford Elementary School District, \$40,932, \$37,657, \$3,275.

Island Union School District, \$1,587, \$1,460, \$127.

Reef-Sunset Union Elementary School District, \$3,581, \$3,294, \$287.

Hanford Joint Union High School District, \$13,878, \$12,767, \$1,111.

Armona Union School District, \$3,479, \$3,200, \$279.

Woodlake Union High School District, \$6,009, \$5,528, \$481.

Kern County Joint Junior College District, \$35,780, \$32,917, \$2,863.

Mr. Chairman, I urge that the Boland amendment be adopted.

Mr. MACDONALD. Mr. Chairman, I feel strongly that this proposed amendment should be adopted. Education is and should be the No. 1 concern of our Nation during these very difficult times of international stress and strain. I know that in 1961, in my own congressional district, cash payments made under the so-called impacted area bill amounted to \$443,248. If this amendment is adopted, it will mean that an additional \$34,659 will be allocated to my congressional district. This in no small measure should aid in keeping local taxes from climbing even higher than they are now. If this amendment is not adopted, the State of Massachusetts itself will lose over \$660,864.

It seems clear to me that there is no logical reason why the Federal Government should not continue to reimburse the local communities for the taxes lost to the municipalities from tax-free Federal installations. While I feel this measure is more in the nature of stop-gap legislation than a permanent solution to our educational problems, it certainly is a step in the right direction, and I hope that this amendment will be adopted by the House today.

Mr. HARSHA. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment by Mr. BOLAND and ask leave to revise and extend my remarks.

My colleagues, this is a justified and morally obligated amendment. I trust you will support it.

Our progress as a nation depends directly upon our advancement in education. Our hopes for economic growth require the greatest development of our youth's capabilities. A successful educational system, as you gentlemen know, requires adequate financing. The quality of the students depends in large measure on both the quality and the relative quantity of teachers and facilities. As one who is vitally interested in the education and welfare of our youth, I feel that this is an area wherein the Federal Government may enter as a matter of right and it certainly has a strong moral responsibility to meet its obligations in this field.

The school systems all over the country have drafted their budgets in contemplation of this anticipated appropriation. This Congress last year authorized this expenditure to the fullest yet only 92 percent of the sum authorized

by Congress was appropriated. Our obligation is to live up to this commitment and appropriate this balance due to the schools of our land. Without this money many of them will have to curtail their schedules. They would be incapable of continuing on a competitive basis with other school districts.

The world emphasis is on education, science, and knowledge. When we are striving to maintain our superiority over the rest of the world and when we are trying to make available for every talented young person the opportunity to receive an education, it certainly is inconsistent to cut off the means that would help make this goal attainable.

Again, gentlemen, failure of Congress to appropriate the full amount of funds set forth in this amendment will place us in an unconscionable position. I urge you to give your wholehearted support to this amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment to the amendment.

The amendment to the amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. BOLAND].

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATIONS AND
CONFERENCES

Contributions to international organizations

For an additional amount for "Contributions to international organizations," \$25,616,000.

Mr. BRUCE. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BRUCE: On page 14, strike out lines 13, 14, 15, and 16.

Mr. BRUCE. Mr. Chairman, it is with a certain amount of apprehension that I rise at this point because I do recognize the emotion that is involved in the hopes and aspirations of all of us in the organization known as the United Nations.

I do not believe, even though I am a freshman, that I can be accused of being a Johnny-come-lately on this question of the Congo, because on September 12 of last year I spoke to the House on the question of the Congo and had this to say:

I beg the members of the Foreign Relations Committee and the Foreign Affairs Committee of the House of Representatives—I beg anyone and everyone in this Chamber to lend their influence toward raising a cry that an investigation, not necessarily of subversion but of a repetition of failure of policy, be carried out right now in regard to the Congo. It cannot wait until next year. The time for action is now, not when it is too late. I beg my colleagues to listen—now.

That was on September 12 of last year. Again on January 25 of this year, I rose to warn of what was happening in the Congo. I must share the sentiments expressed by that outstanding columnist, William S. White, in an article in the Evening Star of December 11 when he said:

It is a terrible thing to have to say, when one's own country is involved. But there is a sick, lost feeling over what is being done

by the United Nations in the Congo, with the full support of the United States.

For the first time in his life, one correspondent cannot find it honestly possible to back his Government—under whatever party's control it might be—in a crisis abroad. Through no amount of effort can he make himself believe that what is going on is just, or in our national interest, or in the interest of the free world generally.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the proposed appropriation of \$25,616,000 to pay the U.S. contribution to the United Nations for its special assessment of the cost of military assistance in the Congo. I can think personally of no other description of this money—horrible though it may sound and offensive though it may be—than to say that it is blood money.

I have here for all of you to see some pictures of the horrors inflicted on this newly emerging nation by the so-called army of peace. I ask you to join me, if you can, and look at the body of this baby with its arm shattered at the shoulder.

Look at this face, a bloody pulp of what was once a human being in a hospital, a victim of indiscriminate mortar firing and bombing. I ask you to join me and look at this 87-year-old woman shot point blank in the neck by United Nations forces who broke into her apartment and shot her, unarmed. Look at the body of her son, unarmed, shot at point blank range.

I ask you to look at the ambulance with the Red Cross markings, the victim of "peace in the Congo."

Look at the body of the nurse who was in that ambulance.

Do you call this peace? You call this justice? You call this an example for emerging nations?

Gaze, if you can, on the body of Madame Vroonen, one of these Red Cross workers. Take a close look at it too.

Have we now become so cold and so callous even in this body, the House of Representatives, that we will not take the time to investigate properly and study what is being carried out in the name of peace? But, would we rather hide behind slogans of misguided policy and wash our hands before the multitude like Pontius Pilate?

You say, "You are excited"—I am. I sat in my office month after month after month and I listened to missionaries who were there on the scene, Protestant and Catholic—I have listened and spoken with doctors who were on the scene—they know what happened, they were there, they are not engaging in guesswork. Has any appropriate committee of this House taken the time to sit and listen to the eyewitness accounts of these people?

My staff and I, as I have said, spent endless hours doing just this.

Has our civilization reached the point of callousness where the clever use of words has dulled our conscience and rotted our moral fiber?

I come before this House not to argue—there is no point to argument and throwing names back and forth—but rather to plead for a renewed sense of responsibility.

The world is on fire, why add to the flame?

Have we adopted as our policy now the philosophy outlined by Columnist Max Lerner in the December 8, 1961, issue of the New York Post where he says, "Once the U.N. has decided, wrongly or rightly, that a certain political solution is necessary for peace, it seems to me it must be imposed."

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. BRUCE. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 5 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

Mr. ROUSH. Mr. Chairman, I object.

Mr. BRUCE. Mr. Chairman, I offer a preferential motion which is at the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. BRUCE moves that the Committee do now rise and report back to the House the bill, H.R. 11038, with the recommendation that the enacting clause be stricken.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes in support of his motion.

Mr. BRUCE. I ask my colleagues—can we ignore the words addressed to the civilized world on February 20, 1962, by the rector of the University of Elisabethville, J. Frenkiel, under the heading "I Protest and I Accuse," when he says:

Before the face of the civilized world, I protest against the atrocities committed in Katanga and particularly in Elisabethville in December 1961. They were far too numerous, and all classes of the population suffered from them. But I shall limit myself to the blows endured by the university. I am thinking of Mr. Derriks, a member of our Conseil Supérieur, and of his 87-year-old mother, savagely murdered in their own house. I am thinking of Professor Coureaux, whose assassination I have just related.

I protest against the sickening disappointment inflicted upon us by the U.N. organization. All people who feel respect for civilized values greeted the birth of that institution with enthusiasm, because its ideals of justice, progress, and peace were in harmony with their own aspirations. They are now constrained to acknowledge the vanity of their hopes. The U.N. now appears in our eyes as a nameless power, whose action is not dictated by any lofty ideal, but solely by orders issuing from certain pressure groups. Moreover, the amplitude and the character of that action depend mostly on men whom a capricious administration appoints to posts of responsibility for ridiculously short periods and haphazardly, irrespective of their qualifications and previous experience.

The lack of proportion characteristic of such action is only equaled by its incoherence.

At this point I will not refrain from paying homage to the clear-sightedness and understanding of several U.N. high officials on the spot. Unfortunately, their attitude is efficient only within the tight limits set by orders from above, and not infrequently results in their being transferred.

Because of this anonymity and incoherence, my protest would be vain if I only addressed the United Nations. My accusations, therefore, are directed against less nebulous objects.

I accuse all those who, perhaps unwittingly, have taken part in any way in the transformation of an international organization

for peace and justice into a blind and unmanageable war machine.

I accuse all those who have made it possible to introduce the horrors of modern war to the very heart of this African Continent, barely awakening to liberty and independence. They have brought to Africa the most despicable image of Western civilization, an image made up of indiscriminate mortar fire and murderous air bombing.

I accuse those who, in order to create that destructive power, have too often recruited, in various countries, gangs of men solely attracted by the hope of booty, rape, and murder. Under cover of a higher ideal, for which they do not care, they have introduced into this part of Africa people who, in normal times, should fill the prisons of their native countries.

Finally and most of all, I accuse those who, inspired by ideological motives or, what is even worse, by basely material interests, have supplied the funds and other means without which such misdeeds would never have been possible.

In this respect, I am deeply sorry to have to mention the Government of the United States of America, whom I do not confuse with the American people. As a sincere democrat, I am particularly distressed at feeling obliged to stigmatize the leaders of the great young Republic which I used to consider as the foundation and the bulwark of our rights and aspirations as free and civilized human beings.

But in the present circumstances, my distress must make room for my duty as a man who loves justice and freedom and as the responsible director of an institution whose task is just to safeguard and promote and bring to fruition the values of civilization.

Nobody would dream of denying that a cultural institution in Africa must survive, at any price, under whatever circumstances, because it is an indispensable factor of development in African countries. That is why it is the duty of the rector of the University of Ellsabethville to proclaim his indignation at the situation created in Katananga, so that this state of affairs may come to an end, and in order that such errors may never be committed again elsewhere in the world.

I may have offended some. If I have, I am sorry. But the time has come, now, not next week or next year, for us to once again act in the tradition of Americans, proud of our heritage, acting with meaning behind the words "peace" and "justice." When our constituents have the opportunity to view these pictures, and view them they will, can we justify the use of their hard-earned income dollars for the perpetration of such sickening and immoral policies? If we vote this money today, we compound the already present guilt and, in effect, we in this body become accessories to the crime that has been perpetrated on innocent people in the Congo.

We may call it justice; we may call it peace; we may call it progress. I call it barbarism; I call it criminal; I call it slaughter; I call it murder.

Every man must follow his own conscience, but let us be sure that it is not an escape from conscience—that we are not merely justifying our role by saying, "they did it; I didn't." The truth is that without our finance, without our complicity, without our approval, without our airlift, without our equipment, and without our policy support, this could never have happened. We can either vote this money today and

put our stamp of approval on what has happened, or we can withhold it for the time being and launch the most thorough, far-reaching investigation in the history of the U.S. Congress, both into our own State Department and into the operation of the United Nations, itself, so that before it is too late, we may revise our policy and regain our sanity.

For those who have been slaughtered in the Congo as a result of our actions, we can only say, "May God forgive us." But for the days that lie ahead, we must be willing, not to just shrug our shoulders and repeat these tragic errors, but to act with courage and responsibility, with honor and a sense of justice, with truth and a renewed dedication to the principles upon which our own Republic was founded.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on the pending amendment and all amendments thereto close in 5 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman rise in opposition to the preferential motion?

Mr. ROONEY. I do, Mr. Chairman, but I submit this consent request.

Mr. ANDERSEN of Minnesota. Mr. Chairman, I object.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the preferential motion.

Mr. Chairman, I oppose the pending amendment of the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BRUCE], and wish to point out that it is a dangerous amendment. It would come close to taking the United States out of the United Nations.

As I have previously explained, this \$25 million is to cover the U.S. part of the United Nations police expenses in the Congo. As of February 27, 1962, 16,919 troops from 21 countries were placed at the disposal of the United Nations in the Congo. There are those who are involved or concerned with the internal politics of the Congo—I am not—but I do know that to take the United Nations troops out of the Congo would mean leaving the Congo to the Soviet Union and permitting its agents to take over, and you may be sure they would do it in no time.

In the interest of the United States we merely want law and order in the Congo. We want the people to have a stable government, a stable democratic government. This money is currently owing by the United States and it must be paid. It has nothing to do with the bond issue. The period to be covered by the bond issue would not begin until this coming July 1. This, as I said previously, would cover the cost from November 1, last, to June 30, 1962.

I trust, Mr. Chairman, that when the committee exercises its good and calm judgment with regard to the pending amendment it will realize the innate danger connected with it. We must rely on the United Nations. This is to our advantage as Americans, and I believe 90 percent of the American public realizes that.

So, Mr. Chairman, I ask that the preferential motion and the amendment of the gentleman from Indiana be defeated.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the preferential motion offered by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BRUCE]. The motion was rejected.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Chairman, I move that all debate on the entire bill be concluded in 15 minutes, the last 3 minutes to be reserved to the committee.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, a point of order. The gentleman cannot reserve time to a committee under a motion.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Chairman, I move that all debate on the entire bill be concluded in 15 minutes.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, a point of order. You cannot close debate on the entire bill until the whole bill is read.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair may say to the gentleman from New York that there is an additional paragraph that has not been read. The gentleman from Texas, of course, may offer such a motion on the pending paragraph.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Chairman, I move that all debate on the pending paragraph and all amendments thereto be limited to 15 minutes.

The question was taken, and the Chairman announced that the ayes had it.

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chairman appointed as tellers Mr. THOMAS and Mr. LAIRD.

The Committee divided, and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 112, noes 74.

So the motion was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PUCINSKI].

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BRUCE] has made some very serious charges here before this body regarding atrocities in the Congo. He presented some photographs to substantiate his charges. I wonder if the gentleman would be good enough to tell the House the source of those photographs?

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

Mr. PUCINSKI. I shall be glad to yield.

Mr. BRUCE. I will be glad to tell the House the source of the photographs. One of them appeared in the regular public press. Others have been handed to me by sources from the Congo itself.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Would the gentleman like to identify those sources from the Congo?

Mr. BRUCE. I will be very glad to do so when the investigation which I have asked for is called, to present full evidence before the committee.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Would the gentleman at this time like to identify the sources from the Congo that provided the photographs which he presented to the House today?

Mr. BRUCE. I would be delighted to present them to the proper committee of this House.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Will the gentleman do it now?

Mr. BRUCE. I have answered the gentleman. I will give them to the committee when they call a hearing on this entire matter.

Mr. PUCINSKI. But the gentleman has tried to influence my judgment and the judgment of others on this amendment. I would like for the gentleman to identify the source of these photographs now. We are going to vote on this amendment, in just a few minutes. I am asking the gentleman to identify the source of those photographs so I can make a proper evaluation of the amendment.

Mr. BRUCE. They have been published in the public press, many of them.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Will the gentleman identify the sources from the Congo for this House now?

Mr. BRUCE. I have no idea who made the photographs, but can the gentleman deny the Red Cross ambulance?

Mr. PUCINSKI. I am not denying anything in the photograph. I have asked the gentleman for about the 10th time to tell this House what is the source of those photographs, who delivered them to the gentleman for presentation to the House?

Mr. BRUCE. They have been handed to me by various individuals, many individuals.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Will the gentleman name some of them?

Mr. BRUCE. I would be glad to do that before a proper committee of this House.

Mr. PUCINSKI. I have to make a judgment on this amendment now. I have seen these photographs. In order to make a proper judgment, I am asking the gentleman to give us the source of those photographs.

Mr. BRUCE. I have answered the gentleman.

Mr. TABER. Is the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PUCINSKI] the House of Representatives? Does the gentleman feel he can demand everything?

Mr. PUCINSKI. No, sir.

Mr. TABER. It looks like it.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Chairman, I had not yielded to the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER].

Mr. TABER. I would not think you would.

Mr. PUCINSKI. As one Member of this House, I am being asked to make a judgment on this amendment. So are the other Members here being asked to judge the merits of this amendment. The gentleman from Indiana has produced some atrocity picture to influence our judgment on the amendment. I certainly have a right to ask the gentleman from Indiana to identify the source of those photographs, where they come from, what sources in the Congo delivered them to the gentleman for presentation to this House. It is obvious from this colloquy that the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BRUCE] does not want to disclose to this House where those pictures came from.

Mr. BRUCE. I have told the gentleman that I will present them to any committee of this House that is inter-

ested in looking at them, and the source of them.

Mr. PUCINSKI. But it is quite obvious that this House is not going to know what is the source of those photographs before a judgment is made on this amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California [Mr. UTT].

Mr. UTT. Mr. Chairman, in view of the fact that the time has been limited it is impossible for me to cover the subject matter. I might say to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. THOMAS] that I was prepared yesterday when the bill was put off until today. This is the very last item on the agenda, and I am a little unhappy that there are so many people who do not want to hear the truth, so many people who want to cut off debate before there is an opportunity to go into the entire matter.

The gentleman from Indiana could have explained those pictures had you not cut off the debate, but not in the 1 minute that you are trying to get him to do that.

Mr. Chairman, I simply say that I was going to direct my remarks not to the Congo, although I associate myself with the remarks of the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BRUCE]. I would say that we have had many murders which have been committed by U.N. troops. However, I wish to direct the attention of this House to who runs the United Nations, who is giving the orders, and to whom this money is being turned over, and those to whom we are going to turn over the \$100 million bond money this year and each year thereafter as long as the U.N. has the power to put an assessment on the United States of America.

Mr. Chairman, I can tell you that the power of the United Nations has shifted from the Security Council to the General Assembly. That is what people are afraid of. Fifty-five nations with less total population than the county of Los Angeles and the county of Orange in southern California put together, have 55 votes, and we have no vote from California. That is why they are concerned. They can bypass the Security Council. The American veto is no good any more. The Russian veto is no good any more.

Mr. Chairman, the Congo operation was carried on in violation of article 43 of the United Nations Charter. They bypassed the Security Council where it could have been vetoed by any one of the five nations.

For that reason, Mr. Chairman, I hope to take a special order and go into the management of the United Nations as to the Secretariat and the Assistant Secretariat, and other Communists that are running that apparatus in the State of New York.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York [Mr. LINDSAY].

Mr. LINDSAY. Mr. Chairman, I voted against the motion to shut off debate because I think that as long as the issue has been raised it is important to have

it out and debate it. I think we should have more time. I know there are many from my side of the aisle who would like to take strong opposition to the amendment offered by our colleague from Indiana [Mr. BRUCE]. It is a very dangerous amendment.

Others may disagree, but in my opinion if you want to see the Congo awash in blood the way to do it is to lock out the United Nations. What we are doing in our support of the U.N. in its efforts in the Congo is maintaining the right of the policeman to be on the beat. That is all it is. Naturally, there are people who do not like the policeman who has got a stick in his hands and carries a gun; but the fact of the matter is that were it not for the United Nations the Congo would be a bloody pulp at the present time; and on top of that, the Soviet Union would be firmly entrenched. It was because of U.N. efforts that the Soviet Union was forced to withdraw with its tail between its legs. Those pictures, Mr. Chairman, are not the issue. The issue is the attack upon the integrity of the United Nations. We do not kid ourselves that the original high hopes that people had for the U.N. have been met. But times change and circumstances change. When the U.N. was founded it was thought of as an institution which would bring the great powers together. It has served a different role. It has become the one institution which has been able to keep the great powers apart—to keep them from each other's throats.

While attacking the Congo, the same voices attack the role of the United Nations in the Middle East. Were it not for that blue flag flying over no man's land between the Arab and Israeli land in the Middle East, I can assure you that that part of the world would be in explosion by now, triggering off a major war throughout the entire world.

So think carefully before hasty judgments are made on this amendment. In view of the fact that debate has been shut off, which I think is regrettable, all the more reason to vote down this amendment. If we want to have a free-for-all on the floor of the House of Representatives on the role of the United Nations, let us have it; but let us have it under proper circumstances in which the matter can be aired and all sides will have sufficient time to state their point of view.

I for one believe that a very solid case can be made to the effect that the United Nations today is serving a more important role than even its founders envisioned for it when it was first brought to birth in 1947.

Mr. CORMAN. Mr. Chairman, I do not wish to burden the RECORD at this point with a long and detailed refutation of the tirade against the United Nations operation in the Congo by the previous speaker. But I do urge those who read these remarks to keep in mind that few authorities, in or out of Government, in either political party concur with the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BRUCE] as to what has happened in the Congo in the last year.

The fact is that there is in the Congo today a stability and peace that was not known before the U.N. operation. I wish also to call attention to the fact that this peace and stability were gained without the loss of one American serviceman, although it was not without its cost in suffering and lives. If there had been no United Nations, I submit that the Congo today would be a Communist stronghold on the continent of Africa, or it would be a battleground for American and Communist fighting men.

Perhaps smaller in terms of dollars, but equally vital to the maintenance of a peaceful world, is the U.N. operation in the Middle East. Three years ago, I was privileged to tour this area, and to see firsthand the extremely precarious state of peace in this historic area of the world.

Today, as it has been since 1949, the U.N. special force is the only barrier between these suffering people and a clash of arms. The threat of war, never more than a gunshot away, still hovers over the Middle East. The U.N. troops there stand ready to discourage and resist armed aggression—but they cannot do so without our financial support. To turn our backs on this effort would be to turn our backs on the millions of innocent citizens of those troubled nations. Without our help and without the U.N. force, there can be no solution in the Middle East, save war, chaos, and Communist takeover—or a massive U.S. military commitment to prevent it.

Surely, this is a solution none of us can afford.

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the Bruce amendment striking out the \$25,616,000 this bill appropriates for an additional assessment by the United States to the United Nations in respect to financing the costs of the United Nations operations in the Congo.

As a member of the Special Appropriations Subcommittee on Deficiencies, I sat in on the hearings and listened to the testimony of the Honorable Harlan Cleveland, Assistant Secretary of State for International Organization Affairs, regarding this item. He explained quite clearly why this money should remain in this bill.

Mr. Chairman, the integrity of Congolese independence and American support of this independence is making it possible for a moderate government to develop and govern the whole of the Congo and to maintain law and order in the former Belgian colony. In order for a moderate, non-Communist government to develop in the Congo as a whole, that government has to be able to unify the Congo. This means bringing Katanga Province in as a part of the Congo. The only really modern issue in the Congo is unification. If the moderates in Léopoldville cannot unify the Congo then the radicals and the Communists will brush the moderates aside and take over the country. The Congolese have to solve this problem. But, it is in our interest to help them solve it. This is what we have been doing and this is why this appropriation is needed. No one likes a cop standing over them with a big billy club, some of the opponents to

United Nations intervention in the Congo will tell you. The United Nations troops are merely trying to help the Congolese maintain law and order. If the U.N. troops were not in the Congo, believe me, Communists troops would be policing the area and they would not be quite as gentle on the Congolese natives. I urge that the amendment be defeated.

Mr. ST. GERMAIN. Mr. Chairman, we should comment briefly on methods and procedures of drawings from the International Monetary Fund under this international monetary agreement. In the event that any one of the 10 eligible and participating countries may wish to draw from the resources of the Fund and have access to the funds provided by these new lending arrangements, the drawing or participant country would consult the Managing Director of the Fund and all of the 9 major participants. The Fund's policies and procedures, of course, continue to apply. Where the Fund's resources require supplementing by borrowing in order to meet a situation as determined by the Managing Director, he would, in consultation with the participants, propose the total amount to be borrowed and the amounts of each currency. The participants would then discuss among their membership the proposal of the Managing Director. While unanimity is always desirable on such proposals, in the event that this is not possible a voting procedure would decide the question of lending to the Fund. The country proposing to draw on the Fund would not be eligible to vote and a decision would be reached by two-thirds majority of the other voting participants and a three-fifths majority of their votes weighted according to lending commitments of each participant. However, a participant nation which itself has a balance-of-payments problem and is losing reserves would not be expected to lend to the Fund. In this manner the right of each participant to safeguard its own position is recognized. On the other hand, appropriate weight is given to collective judgment on the needs of the international monetary system.

Here again we should emphasize that the arrangements outlined are limited to the 10 member governments representing the major industrial nations of the free world and does not extend to the entire membership of the International Monetary Fund.

Any loans made to the Fund will carry a 5-year maturity, bearing interest at 1½ percent annually plus an initial transfer charge of one-half of 1 percent. Use of the Fund's resources by a participant government would be subject to the usual terms—3 to 5 years repayment, a service charge of one-half of 1 percent, and annual charges varying with the size of the drawing and its duration. A drawing participant is expected to make earlier repayment if its balance-of-payments position has improved, and if such repayment occurred, the Fund would also make advance repayment to lender nations. A participant which made loans to the Fund but later encountered a balance-of-payments need can be assured that it will be able to obtain prompt repayment from the Fund.

The new arrangements which will be effective for a period of 4 years—unless extended by the governments involved—become operative upon completion of the legislative and other requirements enabling formal adherence of at least seven participants with commitments totaling \$5.5 billion. Essentially the U.S. Congress and the parliaments of the nine other major industrial nations are involved in acceding to these international arrangements. H.R. 10162 proposes the authorization on behalf of the United States.

The international arrangements cannot become operative without the adherence of each participant with a commitment greater than \$500 million; thus favorable action on the part of the U.S. Congress through H.R. 10162 and our executive branch, as well as that of the governments of France, Germany, Italy, and the United Kingdom, are required to enable this advantageous step to be taken in the interest of the stability of international currencies.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Indiana.

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. Gross: Page 14, line 16, change the period to a comma and add the following: "but expenditures from this appropriation by the Department of State shall be limited to a sum not in excess of 32.02 per centum of the aggregate payments to the United Nations pursuant to the resolution (agenda item 55) adopted by the General Assembly thereof."

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that this is legislation on an appropriation bill.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Iowa wish to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, a point of order against this amendment is not good, because this is strictly a limitation. It does not go to the scope of this bill. It does not disturb any agreement or any treaty. This is in conformance with the intent and the purpose of this appropriation. I challenge the gentleman to show wherein this amendment is legislation on an appropriation bill.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from New York desire to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, does not the amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. Gross] call upon the executive department for extra duties; and does it not refer to outside matters?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will be glad to hear the gentleman.

Mr. ROONEY. I thought the Chair would help the gentleman to make his case.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment may be again read.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

The Clerk again read the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. HARRIS). The Chair is ready to rule.

The gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GROSS] offers an amendment to this paragraph, to which the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROONEY] has made the point of order that it is legislation on an appropriation bill. The Chair has carefully read the bill and observes that the very purpose of the amendment is a limitation. The Chair, therefore, overrules the point of order.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I must be very brief about this since time has been limited. This \$25,616,000 is a 32.02 percent contribution, assessment, call it whatever you want, I cannot get a definition of exactly what it is from the members of the committee themselves. This \$25,616,000 is 32.02 percent of the \$80 million that is supposed to be put together by all the member nations of the United Nations for the support of the so-called police force in the Congo.

What is more reasonable than to say—use any country you want to—if Finland, for instance, puts in \$100,000, we will put up our 32.02 percent out of the \$25,616,000; or if some other country puts up \$1 million, we will put up our 32.02 percent.

This is in conformance with the agreement adopted as Agenda Item 55 of the session of the United Nations shortly before Christmas last year. This is strictly in conformance with the resolution that was adopted at that time. Is there anything more fair than to say, "When you put up your money we will put up the 32.02 percent out of this \$25,616,000"?

I am surprised that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. THOMAS] would limit debate, as he has, on this bill at this time, in view of the fact that the House was through with business yesterday afternoon when this bill was previously scheduled to come up at about 2:30 or 3 o'clock. Why the rush today? I do not know whether you have bought yourselves some free time or not. You might be voting on this bill tomorrow.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas [Mr. THOMAS].

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, will the distinguished gentleman yield.

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

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, I ask that the pending amendment of the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GROSS] be voted down. It would hamstring the orderly procedures of the United Nations. The United Nations needs this money immediately to pay the expenses of these troops from 21 countries. They have to be paid. The bill is currently due. This total, as I have previously said, covers the period from November 1, 1961, last fall, to June 30. To do anything other than pay it would seriously interfere with our membership in the United Nations, the United Nations itself and its orderly procedures.

I ask that the pending amendment be voted down.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Chairman, I thank my distinguished friend from New York for his contribution and also thank my distinguished friend from Iowa. They are two very intelligent and very sincere

men. I also want to commend our distinguished friend, the gentleman from New York [Mr. LINDSAY], for the forthright statement he made.

I have no quibble with the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BRUCE], and certainly none with my friend, the very able and distinguished gentleman from California [Mr. UTT]. In fact, he sends out more mail through my district through the frank than I do; but I still have a great admiration for him. He is a most valuable Member. But I hope sometimes he will plow around my district and just apply his talents to the other districts. But let us be serious about this. This is a most serious subject. My friend, the distinguished gentleman from Iowa, under normal circumstances would not be too far wrong. But, my colleagues, I ask you to realize, as we all know, that this thing is teetering in the United Nations, and Khrushchev is doing his best to kill this. We know we have a very controversial item pending for some more funds, but let us not rock the boat at this time. Let me quote my friend, the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. LINDSAY], again, "Let us not rock this boat." We could be doing some very bad things here, if we do that.

So far as I am concerned, I will trust the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. ROONEY] and my beloved and levelheaded friend on the other side, the gentleman from Ohio, FRANK BOW—they represent this body on most of these matters.

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

Mr. THOMAS. I yield to my friend, the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. Do you mean what you say about this 32.2 percent as our contribution? That is the question involved here.

Mr. THOMAS. I wish my colleague would not put words in my mouth. I wish my colleague would permit me to speak for myself.

Mr. GROSS. Is this 32.02 percent just window dressing?

Mr. THOMAS. This is not window dressing. We know what the percentage of contribution is. We also know that some payments are in arrears and we know there are 17,000 troops over there now and we do not have a single one. These troops are all from smaller nations. Let us not rock this boat.

Mr. Chairman and my colleagues, I ask that this amendment be voted down.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GROSS].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. GROSS), there were—ayes 75, noes 127.

So the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk concluded the reading of the bill.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. HARRIS, 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. 11038) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1962, and for other purposes, had directed him to report the same back to the House with an amendment, with the recommendation that the amendment be agreed to and that the bill as amended do pass.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the bill and all amendments thereto to final passage.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

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

The SPEAKER. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. GROSS. I am, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman qualifies. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. GROSS moves to recommit the bill to the Committee on Appropriations with instructions to report the same back to the House forthwith with the following amendment: On page 14, line 16, change the period to a comma and add the following: "The expenditures from this appropriation by the Department of State shall be limited to a sum not in excess of 32.02 percent of the aggregate payments to the United Nations pursuant to the resolution (agenda item 55) adopted by the General Assembly thereof."

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken and there were—yeas 153, nays 235, not voting 48, as follows:

[Roll No. 59]

YEAS—153

Abbutt	Curtis, Mo.	Ichord, Mo.
Abernethy	Dague	Jensen
Adair	Davis,	Johansen
Alexander	James C.	Jonas
Alger	Davis, John W.	King, N.Y.
Andersen,	Derounian	Kitchin
Minn.	Derwinski	Knox
Anderson, Ill.	Devine	Kornegay
Arends	Dole	Kyl
Ashbrook	Dominick	Laird
Ashmore	Dorn	Landrum
Auchincloss	Downing	Langen
Baker	Durno	Latta
Battin	Fenton	Lennon
Becker	Findley	Lipscomb
Beermann	Fisher	McCulloch
Belcher	Flynt	McDonough
Bennett, Mich.	Forrester	McMillan
Berry	Fountain	McSween
Betts	Garland	McVey
Biltch	Gathings	MacGregor
Bonner	Goodling	Martin, Nabr.
Bow	Griffin	Martin, Nebr.
Bray	Gross	Mason
Bromwell	Hagan, Ga.	Matthews
Brown	Haley	May
Broyhill	Hall	Meador
Bruce	Harrison, Va.	Michel
Burleson	Harrison, Wyo.	Miller, N.Y.
Casey	Harsha	Minshall
Cederberg	Harvey, Ind.	Moore
Chamberlain	Hébert	Moorehead,
Chenoweth	Hemphill	Ohio
Clancy	Henderson	Murray
Collier	Hertong	Norblad
Colmer	Hiestand	O'Konski
Cramer	Hoeven	Passman
Cunningham	Hoffman, Ill.	Pelly
Curtin	Horan	Pilcher

Pillion
Poage
Poff
Ray
Rhodes, Ariz.
Rogers, Fla.
Roudebush
Roussot
St. George
Saylor
Schadeberg
Schenck
Scherer

Schneebell
Short
Shriver
Sikes
Siler
Smith, Calif.
Smith, Va.
Stephens
Taber
Taylor
Teague, Calif.
Thomson, Wis.
Tollefson

Tuck
Utt
Van Pelt
Waggoner
Weaver
Westland
Wharton
Whitener
Williams
Willis
Wilson, Calif.
Winstead
Younger

Morrow
Morrison
Moulder
Patman
Rains
Reece

Rivers, S.C.
Rogers, Colo.
Scott
Selden
Sheppard
Smith, Miss.

Spence
Thompson, La.
Vinson
Whitten
Wilson, Ind.

amend the Peace Corps Act, I was unable to be present because of my attendance at a White House luncheon in honor of the President of Brazil. Had I been present, I would have joined the overwhelming majority of my House colleagues in support of H.R. 10700.

Last year, when like legislation was before the Congress, I had my reservations concerning it. However, after several conferences with Director Robert Sargent Shriver, who had administered the program up to that time, I was convinced of his sincerity of purpose and his personal capabilities in directing the program. Accordingly, I gave it my support with the understanding that I would reserve final judgment until the end of the first year of its operation.

I have been most pleased with the project to date and with the fine leadership given to it by its director and its staff and the outstanding services that the Corpsmen themselves have given in other countries. I have no doubt but what this contribution to world relations will be one of the most constructive that this country will have. I am, of course, hopeful that it will not be overplayed or undersold, but that it will gain strength as the months come and go in the modesty of its approach and in immeasurable results that can and will be obtained.

PROHIBITING U.S. FOREIGN AID TO CERTAIN COUNTRIES

Mr. HIESTAND. 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 California?

There was no objection.

Mr. HIESTAND. Mr. Speaker, we all know of the old expression about "robbing Peter to pay Paul." In Latin America, it seems we may have to revise that old saw to: "Let's rob Peter to pay Peter."

In recent weeks we have heard much of the expropriation of American property in Brazil. Yet, we continue to talk about huge foreign aid moneys being funneled into that country. But for what purpose? To be used to seize American-owned properties? Or to be used for the betterment of the Brazilian people?

A Brazilian newspaper supplied one answer:

How can those in charge of the Alliance for Progress program justify to the American taxpayer the granting of long-term financing which in the final analysis will be used to pay for the expropriation of American investments in Brazil?

Brazilian officials are asking for plenty of U.S. dollars. These include Gov. Leonel Brizola of the Brazilian State of Rio Grande do Sul, who on February 15 expropriated the Companhia Telefonica Nacional, a subsidiary of the International Telephone & Telegraph Corp., whose headquarters are in New York City.

The settlement was \$400,000 in cruzeiros. This is absurd. Local appraisers

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Whitten for, with Mr. Kirwan against.
Mr. Wilson of Indiana for, with Mr. Corbett against.

Mrs. Reece for, with Mr. Barry against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Garmatz with Mr. Avery.
Mr. Cooley with Mr. Gavin.
Mr. Morrison with Mr. Kilburn.
Mr. Addonizio with Mr. Halleck.
Mr. Alford with Mr. Morrow.
Mr. Evins with Mr. Hoffman of Michigan.
Mr. Rogers of Colorado with Mr. Byrnes of Wisconsin.

Mr. Rains with Mr. Ford.
Mr. Thompson of Louisiana with Mr. McIntire.

Mr. PASSMAN, Mr. BERRY, Mr. WILSON of California, and Mr. SCHERER changed their vote from "nay" to "yea."

Mr. GUBSER and Mr. BELL changed their vote from "yea" to "nay."
The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

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

The yeas and nays were refused.

The bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks on the bill just passed.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, I also ask unanimous consent that all Members may extend their remarks immediately following the remarks of the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BRUCE].

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably detained on official business when the quorum call was made today and missed it by approximately 5 minutes. I wish the Record to show this fact.

THE PEACE CORPS ACT

Mr. ASPINALL. 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 Colorado?

There was no objection.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, yesterday, when the House took action to

NAYS—235

Addabbo
Albert
Anfuso
Ashley
Aspinall
Ayres
Bailey
Baldwin
Baring
Bass, N.H.
Bass, Tenn.
Bates
Beckworth
Bell
Bennett, Fla.
Blatnik
Boggs
Boland
Bolling
Bolton
Brademas
Breeding
Brewster
Brooks, Tex.
Broomfield
Buckley
Burke, Ky.
Burke, Mass.
Byrne, Pa.
Cahill
Cannon
Carey
Chelf
Chipperfield
Church
Clark
Coad
Cohelan
Conte
Cook
Corman
Curtis, Mass.
Daddario
Daniels
Dawson
Delaney
Dent
Denton
Diggs
Dingell
Donohue
Dooley
Doyle
Dulski
Dwyer
Edmondson
Ellitt
Ellsworth
Everett
Fallon
Farbstein
Feighan
Fino
Flood
Fogarty
Frazier
Frellinghuysen
Friedel
Fulton
Gallagher
Gary
Glaimo
Gilbert
Glenn
Gonzalez
Goodell
Granahan
Gray
Green, Oreg.

Green, Pa.
Griffiths
Grubser
Hagen, Calif.
Halpern
Hansen
Harding
Hardy
Harris
Harvey, Mich.
Hays
Healey
Hechler
Hollifield
Hosmer
Hull
Inouye
Jarman
Jennings
Joelson
Johnson, Calif.
Johnson, Wis.
Jones, Mo.
Judd
Karsten
Karth
Kastenmeier
Kearns
Keith
Kelly
Keogh
Kilgore
King, Calif.
King, Utah
Kluczynski
Kowalski
Kunkel
Lane
Lankford
Lesinski
Libonati
Lindsay
Loser
McDowell
McFall
Macdonald
Mack
Magnuson
Mahon
Malliard
Marshall
Mathias
Miller, Clem
Miller,
George P.
Milliken
Mills
Moeller
Monagan
Montoya
Moorhead, Pa.
Morgan
Morris
Morse
Mosher
Moss
Multer
Murphy
Natcher
Nedzi
Nelsen
Nix
Norrell
Nygaard
O'Brien, Ill.
O'Brien, N.Y.
O'Hara, Ill.
O'Hara, Mich.

Olsen
O'Neill
Osmer
Ostertag
Perkins
Peterson
Pfof
Philbin
Pike
Pirnie
Powell
Price
Pucinski
Purcell
Randall
Reifel
Reuss
Rhodes, Pa.
Riehlman
Rivers, Alaska
Roberts, Ala.
Roberts, Tex.
Robison
Rodino
Rogers, Tex.
Rooney
Roosevelt
Rosenthal
Rostenkowski
Roush
Rutherford
Ryan, Mich.
Ryan, N.Y.
St. Germain
Santangelo
Saund
Schweiker
Schwengel
Scranton
Seely-Brown
Shelley
Shipley
Sibal
Sisk
Slack
Smith, Iowa
Springer
Stafford
Staggers
Steed
Stratton
Stubblefield
Sullivan
Teague, Tex.
Thomas
Thompson, N.J.
Thompson, Tex.
Thornberry
Toll
Trimble
Tupper
Udall, Morris K.
Ullman
Vanik
Van Zandt
Wallhauser
Walter
Watts
Wels
Whalley
Wickersham
Widnall
Wright
Yates
Young
Zablocki
Zelenko

NOT VOTING—48

Addonizio
Alford
Andrews
Avery
Barrett
Barry
Boykin
Byrnes, Wis.
Celler
Cooley

Corbett
Davis, Tenn.
Dowdy
Evins
Fascell
Finnegan
Ford
Garmatz
Gavin
Grant

Halleck
Hoffman, Mich.
Huddleston
Johnson, Md.
Jones, Ala.
Kee
Kilburn
Kirwan
McIntire
Madden

2 years ago valued the property at approximately \$7 million.

This, of course, is not the only example. And predictably, other American companies are fearing similar seizures, precisely at a time when we are trying to stimulate foreign investment.

An important point to remember here is that seizure begets seizure. And can we honestly approve, by idly sitting by, the confiscation of American property? Of course not. Even worse, we are preparing to pat the seizers on the back and say, "Good job, fellow. Good job."

The time has come, Mr. Speaker, to firm up our backbone and our policy. The seizures in Brazil are currently capturing the limelight, but that is by no means the end of it all. If we sit idly by and watch confiscation of American property in Latin America—without ample and fair compensation—it will most certainly encourage similar seizures around the globe.

I am today introducing a bill—by no means the first—to put the issue squarely on the barrelhead. The bill would amend section 620 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 to prohibit assistance under that act to the government of any country which has not established equitable procedures for compensating U.S. citizens for loss of property by confiscation.

Now, when President Joao Goulart of Brazil is in Washington for a visit with President Kennedy, is the time for the United States to take a stand and serve notice that we are not the suckers so many of the world's people are beginning to think we are.

I wish to read a telegram to Secretary of State Rusk by the president of International Telephone & Telegraph Co.:

We are greatly disturbed by press reports that the U.S. Government is prepared to give its blessings to a plan devised by the Brazilian Government calling for the takeover and payment of utility properties over 15 years without any indication that the bonds or any other instrument will have any U.S. Government or equivalent financially acceptable guarantee of payment or protection against devaluation or inadequate interest rates at local levels. Without such guarantees or protection such instruments would be worth less than 50 cents on the dollar. We feel compelled to warn you of the incentive there would be to further expropriation or takeover throughout Latin America if such an inadequate payment plan should receive the blessing of the U.S. Government.

The effect would be so potentially disastrous to all other U.S.-owned property in Latin America that we can scarcely believe that the plan is being seriously contemplated. But as you know reports of the plan have been carried in the responsible press of the United States without refutation.

We are of the opinion that any plan if it is to have U.S. Government approval should contain the following essentials:

1. Seller must be permitted freedom to negotiate terms of sale including the same freedom to choose to reinvest or export the proceeds as is accorded local citizens.
2. Proceeds of sale should be in cash or if not—any bonds or instruments issued in connection with deferred payments must be readily marketable at par.
3. There must be maintenance of value on deferred local currency payments with interest at the going local rate and guarantees by the Government.

The acid test is that if the bonds or other instruments cannot be converted to cash at full value the company has not been paid. For these reasons we think it is dangerous to talk of a general plan for all of Latin America or for even one country, as problems vary not only between countries but within any one country depending upon the franchise, type of utility, historical background, etc. Any talk of general plans for takeovers or expropriations will lead to unwarranted assumptions in other countries which will be costly to U.S. investors not only in utilities but in other fields as well, particularly mining and petroleum.

We are sure you realize that present nationalist tendencies in several Latin American countries are such that little encouragement is required for confiscation or other takeover of foreign investments in cases where no problems have previously existed. Any approval by the U.S. Government of a general plan which provides for takeover of foreign property with little or no immediate payment could well precipitate by example irresistible nationalist demands for similar action throughout South America.

RETIREMENT OF W. T. "BILL" HEFFELFINGER

Mr. GARY. 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 Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. GARY. Mr. Speaker, the Federal Government has lost one of its outstanding civil servants with the retirement of W. T. "Bill" Heffelfinger as Fiscal Assistant Secretary of the Treasury. Bill Heffelfinger began his work at Treasury as a messenger in 1917 at the age of 14 and has now ended a genuinely great career with the Department after almost 45 years of continuous service. His experience, conscientiousness, grasp of financial matters and his integrity made him a valuable assistant for Secretaries of the Treasury of both political parties. And in his service for administration after administration he typified that which is best in our civil service system.

Secretary Dillon, in reluctantly accepting Bill Heffelfinger's decision to retire, told him:

Your contributions to the work of the Treasury, in the fiscal and many other areas, have been outstanding and in many ways unique during this period.

Under Secretary for Monetary Affairs Robert V. Roosa said:

Mr. Heffelfinger combines a knowledge of the entire range of government accounting systems with a deep understanding of the objectives of the fiscal process. Because of this particular ability, his counsel has prompted many of the innovations in Treasury policies and procedures over the past quarter century.

Bill Heffelfinger's fine work was well known to the Nation's banking community and in recent months he concentrated much of his attention on efforts designed to alleviate the Nation's critical international balance of payments problem.

He was a native of the District of Columbia who was educated at South-

eastern University. He was promoted to the position of Assistant to the Under Secretary of Treasury in 1940 and was named Fiscal Assistant Secretary in 1955.

In 1956 Bill Heffelfinger received the Career Service Award from the National Civil Service League, an honor bestowed on those who operate in the best traditions of the Federal service. It was an award well placed on a man who carries with him into retirement the respect and admiration of not only his fellow workers but also of the citizens he served.

As chairman of the Treasury-Post Office Appropriations Subcommittee it has been my privilege to observe the work of this dedicated Federal official over a period of years. I take this opportunity to give him the accolade which he has so richly merited and to express to him the gratitude and best wishes of myself and a grateful people for a job well done by a good and faithful servant.

STAFF MEMBERS OF HOUSE COMMITTEES

The SPEAKER. Under the previous order of the House the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. SCHWENDEL] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SCHWENDEL. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

THE DEMOCRATIC CHARGE THAT THE COAL INDUSTRY HAS NO FUTURE IN THE ECONOMY OF PENNSYLVANIA IS RIDICULOUS SINCE CURBING THE UNRESTRICTED FLOOD OF FOREIGN RESIDUAL OIL BY EXECUTIVE ORDER CAN RESTORE COAL TO ITS RIGHTFUL PLACE IN THE ECONOMY OF THE KEYSTONE STATE

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, Friday, March 23, the executive director and secretary-treasurer of the Central Pennsylvania Coal Producers Association revealed that the State of Pennsylvania has, for the first time in the annals of the Nation's coal industry, fallen into third place among the bituminous coal producing States. Robert T. Laing told a joint State government commission meeting at Huntingdon that bituminous coal output for Pennsylvania in 1961 fell to approximately 62 million tons and thus relinquished second place to Kentucky. It is a sad commentary on how the industry upon which Pennsylvania's industrial might was built has suffered under unrealistic policies on the part of the Federal Government. In retrospect, we realize that it was Pennsylvania's coal which fueled the fires for the entire Nation's industrial progress during the last century and well into the 1900's. Coal still accounts for almost a quarter of the total energy provided by fuels and waterpower, but the figure would be substantially higher if inequities that abound on the competitive fuels market were eliminated.

Coal began to replace wood as a source of heat more than 200 years ago. In 1763, during the siege of Fort Pitt by the Indians, Captain Ecuyer, the commandant, wrote that during a lull in the enemy's offensive, he led a party of 60 soldiers across the Monongahela River to get in a supply of coal. Gradually

coal was used more and more in the smelting trade. During the revolution anthracite was shipped to Carlyle for use by armorers.

Anthracite was introduced into blast furnaces for making iron about 1830 and soon began to replace charcoal in the pig iron industry. Meanwhile, bituminous coal's versatility was becoming recognized on the other side of the Alleghenys. During the early 1800's bituminous coal was used for domestic heating, brick-making, and blacksmithing. In 1808 a gristmill in Pittsburgh installed a steam engine, and 3 years later the first steamboat was built to operate on the Monongahela River. Ironworks arose at various junctures in the coalfields of western Pennsylvania. Glass plants and a variety of factories began to make their appearance. The Pittsburgh Gazette of November 7, 1833, listed 87 kinds of industries—including flour mills, gun factories, papermills, and rolling mills. Most of them used steam engines. Pennsylvania was moving faster than any other State on the way to industrial progress, and coal was the propelling force.

Bituminous coal production in Pennsylvania went over the million ton mark in 1845, and by 1880 had moved beyond 20 million tons annually. Meanwhile, the anthracite industry was developing even more rapidly, reaching an output of a million tons in 1837 and exceeding 20 million tons in 1872.

Mr. Speaker, these statistics may appear irrelevant to some of my colleagues, but they reflect very clearly the part that coal has played in the development of our State and our country.

Shortly after the turn of the century the bituminous coal mines of Pennsylvania began to produce upwards of 100 million tons per year, while anthracite's annual contribution averaged in excess of 60 million tons each year for the first half of this century. Trouble for these two great fuels industries began shortly after the conclusion of World War II. By now a new philosophy had been adopted by the Federal Government. Despite the great contributions of the men and boys from our mining communities to the cause of victory in Europe and Asia, their interests were subordinated to the desires of foreign flags by the time the shooting had stopped. In 1949 both the anthracite and bituminous coal industries in Pennsylvania were confronted with an economic menace which threatened to—and did—drive thousands of the working force of our State into the ranks of the unemployed.

Foreign residual oil had begun to take its deadly toll. Members of Congress who were serving in 1950 will recall hearings on both sides of the Capitol to determine just what impact alien oil would have on the domestic economy. I testified. So did many representatives of coal and railroad management and labor, as well as independent oil people. Here is a quotation from the testimony of Harry See, who represented the Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen:

In the last 3 years, from February 1947 to February 1950, the number of men employed by the railroads of America has declined

from 1,368,285 to 1,170,192, a decrease of 198,093. While we do not ascribe all of this enormous increase in railroad unemployment to any single cause, we cannot escape the obvious significance of an increase in oil imports of almost 400,000 barrels a day in the same 1947-50 period.

Frank Earnest, Jr., who was then president of the Anthracite Institute, made this observation:

It is axiomatic that in a given area a certain amount of energy is required to meet the needs for heat, light, and power. In this particular area (eastern seaboard) energy is supplied chiefly from bituminous coal, anthracite, oil, gas, and water power. If part of this area's energy requirements is to be supplied by oil from foreign sources, it follows that American labor formerly necessary to produce the energy must inevitably be reduced.

Here is a significant figure, Mr. Speaker. It was offered by Mr. Joseph T. Berta, who was president of the Pennsylvania Coal and Coke Corp. and is now president of the Pittston-Clinchfield Coal Sales Corp.:

My company, in January 1, 1947, employed 1613 men * * * January 1, 1949, 1605 * * *. As of May 10, this year, we have a total of 878 men. The other men are off the payroll.

I cite the residual oil record as a glaring instance of Federal policy that prevents the coal industry from obtaining a more equitable share of the national fuels market. Residual oil imports have increased fivefold since the first post-war year. The bituminous and anthracite coal industries have in consequence experienced tremendous losses. Output has dropped drastically. From 57 million tons in 1947, anthracite production slipped to less than 18 million tons in 1961. At the same time bituminous coal production was declining from 147 million tons to 62 million tons; thus the alarming situation which finds our State's industry in third place among the Nation's producers. I recognize, Mr. Speaker, that Kentucky has also had a fine record in its mining industry, yet the fact remains that the coal is available in Pennsylvania for use in the heavily populated and highly industrialized east coast markets. Our State has in the past two centuries produced more than 8¼ billion tons of bituminous coal and about 6 billion tons of anthracite, yet Pennsylvania has another 35 billion tons of mineable anthracite and bituminous coal reserves.

With this rich heritage, Pennsylvania stands ready to provide low cost heat and power for the industrial growth that must come with increasing population and higher standards of living. To permit a foreign fuel to deprive Pennsylvania's citizens of the opportunity to earn a livelihood while preparing for this economic upsurge of the future impinges upon the constitutional rights of those citizens. Last Thursday, March 22, Thomas Kennedy, president of the United Mine Workers of America, testified before the House Ways and Means Committee. After describing the cruel effects of excessive foreign residual oil shipments into this country, he said:

I wonder—indeed, every member of the United Mine Workers of America wonders—

if the benefits that accrue from residual imports are worth such social and economic decay.

We cannot as a nation stand this burden indefinitely. The consequences are too far reaching, the results too serious to contemplate. America must decide whether or not to plunge an entire section of the country into social and economic oblivion unheard of in our times.

It is a fateful decision to make, a decision which can decide the future of this Republic.

Yet, today coal miners suffer, coal communities languish, and the entire coal industry pauses as those charged with the responsibility of protecting and promoting the welfare of this Nation deliberate and consider their fate, whether that fate be to live and work as American citizens, or to descend the long road to economic destitution.

As we continually increase our imports of residual oil, we still talk of economic growth. Even as a foreign energy source strangles the domestic coal industry, and even our own oil industry, plans are being laid for the millennium that is to come.

But we must ask: Where will the impetus originate? Certainly not from the coal-producing regions of the country. Obviously not from the coal miner who must face the future with a great deal of apprehension. Nor can we look to the coal operators to invest further billions of dollars to make coal as efficient and as modern as it must be to serve the growing energy needs that any economic growth presupposes.

Instead, while we talk of growth we must look to the underlying sickness that pervades the energy industries of our Nation. We must take cognizance of the virtual destruction that faces coal and oil and associated industries.

For we cannot talk of economic growth while allowing entire basic industries to perish before unfair competition. We cannot speak of prosperity while at the same time fostering economic privation. It just cannot be done.

It behooves those who are charged with the economic future of this Nation to become aware of what has been happening to the basic coal industry of this Nation. As we talk of economic progress and as they plan for such progress, they must be prepared to protect that basic industry which is the source of all progress. Any other course would be sheer economic folly.

Mr. Speaker, the recent increase in residual oil quotas granted to importers by the White House is inimical to the welfare of the residents of Pennsylvania and other coal-producing States. It needs to be rescinded, for there was no basis whatsoever in granting this favor, which amounts to an additional \$35 million per year sales order, for the international oil crowd. There was no shortage of fuel. The importing companies have, in fact, been conducting a market campaign to widen their consumer area while contending that the volume of imports has been insufficient to meet demands of regular customers. Despite the fact that some imported oil is now being shipped inland as far west as the Harrisburg area, there has been ample supply on the seaboard itself. Let me insert the following comment from the March 15, 1962, issue of Platt's Oilgram:

Atlantic coast: Net reseller prices for heavy fuels are off in varying amounts at some eastern locations today reflecting discounts in effect and spot availability—see other story this issue.—[Not printed in the Record.]

Some heavy-fuel suppliers indicate they are meeting latest drop in prices (see March 14 Oilgram). Action is described as appraisal of product's easing trend, especially at reseller truck and barge levels. These adjustments, they conjecture, brought on relative changes at the cargo level.

At New York, many sources agree that spot lots of heavy fuel are more readily available now than they've ever been since the start of mandatory import restrictions. The day of premium offers for spot delivered cargoes is in the past. In fact, with the end of the current allocation period approaching, some suppliers still haven't used up their "tickets." Furthermore, there are indications that some "tickets" may be unused at the end of the allocation period.

Gasoline markets edged lower in portions of New England, Pennsylvania, and New York today—see other story this issue. [Not printed in the Record.] Distillate markets show little change. Resellers continue to satisfy only immediate needs. As a result, spot interest is dull.

No, Mr. Speaker, the recent increase in residual oil import quotas was as unnecessary as it was unfair. I recognize that the administration, at least as represented by its U.S. Senator from Pennsylvania, has written off a large segment of coal industry operations from all future activity. He made this statement on February 9:

Historically, this is an area built on coal and farming. It has a wonderful tradition and a proud history, and no one would be happier than I if the future of coal and farming in central Pennsylvania is as bright today as it was 100 years ago; but I suggest we must look stark facts in the face. That day is dead. It is gone. It's never going to come back and there's nothing we can do to resuscitate this. We can do something to shield the shorn lamb from the harsh cold wind. We can mitigate the plight of the family farmer. We can bolster, to some extent, the soft coal industry; but we are never going to be able to bring those occupations back to the proud state they occupied when this part of Pennsylvania was being built and became great. Rather we must look to new economic sources of wealth, create them if you will, to make this area a future worthy of its marvelous past.

If foreign oil is permitted to come in and wipe out the jobs of coal miners, railroaders, and the many other skilled and unskilled workers whose income is dependent upon the coal industry, then there is no question but that revival of mining in areas that are victimized by these imports may seem an insurmountable task. But I refuse to stand by and see the economy of our State surrendered. I would remind my friends who feel otherwise about the coal industry to study the statement made last week by The Honorable Thomas Kennedy, former Lieutenant Governor of the State of Pennsylvania. He said that residual oil imports are taking 3 million man-days of work from our coal miners each year and that the loss in wages amounts to \$73 million. If Pennsylvania were able to regain its share of this volume of business, it would enjoy an automatic economic upturn throughout coal communities, railroad centers, and in every business house where the employees of these and skilled industries do their trading.

I commend the president of the United Mine Workers for his forthright mes-

sage. I assure him that I for one will continue to do everything possible to give the coal industry of Pennsylvania its rightful opportunity to resume the economic role which it filled so effectively in days gone by.

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman from Iowa yield?

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

DEACTIVATION OF CERTAIN NATIONAL GUARD AND RESERVE DIVISIONS

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Speaker, the Department of Defense after consulting the President is pronouncing tonight at 6 o'clock the deactivation of four National Guard divisions and four Reserve divisions. This is a recommendation of the Department of Defense which will have to be considered by the House Armed Services Committee and also by the House Committee on Appropriations. The House will act on the appropriation bill for the Department of Defense on the Monday before Easter. It is my hope that the Congress will take action to see that the plans of the Department of Defense are not put into operation.

The Reserve divisions which have been affected and would be affected unless the Congress acts are the 103d Army Reserve Division, the 79th Army Reserve Division, the 49th Army Reserve Division, and the 96th Army Reserve Division.

The four National Guard divisions involved in the recommendations of the Department of Defense to be abolished are the 34th National Guard Division of Iowa and Nebraska, the 35th National Guard Division of Kansas and Missouri, the 51st National Guard Division of Florida and South Carolina, and the 43d National Guard Division of Connecticut, Rhode Island, and Vermont.

It is my hope that the Congress will take action to see that this program to abolish these divisions is halted and that both committees, the House Armed Services Committee and the Defense Appropriations Subcommittee, will take action to see that these plans as announced by the Secretary of Defense, Mr. McNamara, are not carried forward.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. I may say to the gentleman from Wisconsin that Subcommittee No. 3 of the House Committee on Armed Services, chaired by the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. HÉBERT]—I happen to be the ranking minority member of that committee—is planning to launch an investigation of the military Reserves on April 10. They have tried to do this on several occasions and the Congress has stopped them. If I know the membership of the Committee of the House Armed Services as a whole, we will reject this order also.

Mr. LAIRD. It is very difficult to explain to the members of the 32d National Guard Division and the 49th National Guard Division who have been called on active service who see these armed Reserves and National Guard divisions being ordered up and others abolished by the Department of Defense at this particular time. It is my hope your committee will go into this thoroughly, and I am sure the Defense Ap-

propriations Committee will do the same, so that this will not be carried forward.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, may I ask a question of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

I wonder how those who have been called up for active duty and taken from their families feel about the 51st Division in Florida, for instance, and these other reservists and other divisions now being proposed to be dismantled?

Are we to assume that the Berlin crisis is over with? Is this an indication that the great national emergency for which these thousands or hundreds of thousands of boys were called up no longer exists? What is the on-again-off-again advantage? This 51st Division in Florida has been on again, off again, in the last 5 or 6 years. It is one of the finest divisions in the United States. It gets the highest rating in training and in maneuvers of any division in the United States. The 51st Division has been on again, off again. How are we going to have any effective National Guard? How are we going to have a unified national defense policy? How are we going to convince the American people that there is a national emergency if we are taking people away from the guard and Reserve units? How would the gentleman interpret this action?

Mr. VAN ZANDT. In connection with the calling up of the Reserves and all the confusion that has developed since, according to Mr. Gilpatrick, a mistake was made when they called them up. This has resulted in confusion. Of course I cannot speak for the subcommittee as a whole, I can speak for myself. But may I say we intend to ask some very penetrating questions; first, why the call up of the Reserves; and, second, why are we abolishing these Army Reserve divisions and National Guard divisions? I think we are going to encounter the same thinking we encountered here in connection with the authorization of ships, planes, and missiles a few weeks ago. Now the Department of Defense thinks that missiles should now take over. We in the Armed Services Committee do not believe that missiles can take over, that we must have conventional strength, which means manpower.

Mr. CRAMER. According to statements made a while back, we were beefing up our conventional forces so that we could fight brush fires. The National Guard is as well trained and is as well equipped for doing this job as any outfit in the country.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Certainly in February and March of last year, the Secretary of Defense and others told the American people through statements made to the House Armed Services Committee that they had the greatest and most powerful war machine that dollars and cents could assemble to give security to the American people. Then, in a matter of weeks, they were asking for \$3.4 billion to beef up the military establishments.

Mr. CRAMER. I wonder if this is not also perhaps the beginning of an effort

to nationalize the entire Defense Establishment of this country, to take from the States, which I think is a serious matter, the only arm they have to handle emergencies within the States, and the need for trained personnel. I thoroughly favor the National Guards in the States.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. There has been an effort to do away with the Reserves, and this could be the first step.

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

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

Mr. GROSS. I thank the gentleman for yielding. I only want to say that I am sure that the Iowa delegation in Congress is very much interested in the outcome of the investigation being carried on by the Committee on Armed Services and will be interested tomorrow in voicing our protest and displeasure at the action which I understand has been taken by the President.

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

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

Mr. BROMWELL. I should like to add to the remarks of the gentleman from Iowa and call to the attention of the House the fact that two of the eight divisions mentioned by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. LAIRD], when he made this announcement, happen to be from the State of Iowa, the 34th National Guard and the 103d Reserve Division. This bears some scrutiny.

HOUSE RESOLUTION 570

Mr. SCHWENGEL. I want to associate myself with the remarks made about this sudden and apparently unwise decision by the administration and assure the House that at a future date I will have some further things to say about it.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I want to speak on something else that is also of great importance to this House and which has to do with increasing the effectiveness of this legislative body.

Mr. Speaker, on March 28, 1962, I took the floor of the House to explain the provisions of House Resolution 570 which I have introduced to increase the minority representation on the professional staffs of the committees of the House and subcommittees thereof. Since then, I have received expressions of encouragement and support from many of my colleagues and from the press. For example, in the Washington Post dated April 2, 1962, there appeared another of a series of thoughtful and perceptive articles supporting my position by the distinguished commentator, Mr. Roscoe Drummond. For the benefit of my colleagues, I will insert this column at this point in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

A NEEDED REFORM—MINORITY'S HOUSE RESOLUTION 570

(By Roscoe Drummond)

At last things are beginning to move a bit to reform the crippling anemic minority-party representation on the powerful staffs of the congressional committees.

A bill is now before the House of Representatives—House Resolution 570—designed to force reform if the Democrats will not cooperate voluntarily. It springs from the

initiative of Representative FRED SCHWENGEL, Republican, of Iowa, who has been in Congress long enough to know when something is wrong and not so long as to think nothing can be done.

SCHWENGEL makes a simple, reasonable, and workable proposal. He proposes that whenever the minority party members of a regular congressional committee are dissatisfied with the size of the professional staff available to them, they may, by majority vote, require and must be given 40 percent of the professional and clerical positions on the committee staff.

This is a good beginning. One special merit of House Resolution 570 is that it permits discriminating reform. Thus those few committees such as the House and Senate Foreign Relations Committees, which have a truly bipartisan or nonpartisan staff and where the minority is well satisfied with the arrangement, would not be affected.

It is encouraging to note that when SCHWENGEL took the floor of the House last week to advocate his bill, several Republicans who had not heretofore shown an active concern with this problem rose to be heard. They were not speaking just to persuade the Democrats that something needs to be done—or else; they were serving notice on their own leadership that if it doesn't take hold of this reform soon and put its energies behind it, there is going to be a party revolt.

"An intolerable situation," is the way SCHWENGEL describes the disproportionate staff available to the Democrats compared with that available to the Republicans on most committees.

It is revealing that when Representative SCHWENGEL began the debate on committee staffing last week, not a single Democrat rose to question or challenge his arguments.

Most of the letters I have received from Democratic chairmen of congressional committees, or their aids, show a similar disinterest in the merits of the issue. When the information provided me by Members of Congress cites only one minority employee on the professional staff, I am told with great satisfaction that the figure should have been two.

Surely the issue isn't whether the professional staff of a particular congressional committee stands 12 to 1 or 11 to 2 against the minority party.

The fact is that the imbalance is extreme. It is unjust and inequitable. It is harmful to the functioning of the two-party system. Unless the Democrats expect to control Congress forever, I should think they would be wise to accept staffing reform.

In my address last week, I limited my discussion to that portion of the resolution which deals with standing committees and the basic unfair division of the professional staffs which are so loaded against the minority party as to constitute a national scandal of the first magnitude. At the conclusion of my remarks, the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. KEARNS], the ranking Republican member of the House Labor Committee and an early battler for reforms, inserted into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a tabulation which showed that during the first session of the present Congress the various committees of the House had a total of 538 employees selected and appointed by the Democrats as against a total of 20 such employees selected and appointed by the Republicans.

My criticism is directed not at the competency of the professional staffs on these committees but at the present practice of long standing whereby the

majority party has had almost full authority to select employees of their own choosing, with a little effort at fairness by giving the minority a few staffers of their own. There was a time, perhaps, when this practice was a good one because control of the Congress fluctuated between the parties and, therefore, the employees were not likely to be all of one political preference. However, due to the long control of both Houses by the Democratic Party, I believe there is a political impairment which works to the advantage of the majority and the decided disadvantage of the minority. It is unrealistic and naive to believe that an employee hired by one party will not be loyal to that party which pays him his salary. The old adage "whose bread I eat, his song I sing," is as applicable today as it was in the ancient days of Greece and Rome.

The fact remains that committee staff employees are paid out of public funds appropriated by the Congress to enable each party through the committee system to perform its constitutional function in a representative form of government. This function necessarily means that each party often does represent a different point of view and is entitled to an adequate staff to develop different legislative programs and alternatives. It should be noted that these funds are not appropriated from the private purses or the campaign coffers of the party which happens to control Congress—in this case the Democratic Party. The present practice of the Democratic Congress in riding roughshod over the rights of the minority, does not serve the public interest. The long opposition to reform on a partisan basis, can only be attributed to the fact that my brethren on the other side of the aisle are aware that this is one way to keep us in perpetual minority and that is not in the public interest. This is so unfair and untenable a position that it smacks of what may be colloquially referred to as "dirty pool." The present system both in theory and practice is not unlike our Federal civil service system in the executive branch of the Government under the New Frontier. Both were originally based on the admirable principle that professional career employees ought to be free from the corrosive influences of politics and the spoils system. However, due to long control of the executive branch by the New Deal, the Fair Deal and now the New Frontier, our civil service laws have become little more than a legal way of freezing into permanent status a multitude of partisan Democrats. And now that this is done, there are disturbing reports in the press that the administration has every intention of using these career employees for partisan political purposes by permitting them, through civil service rulings, to propagandize the domestic policies of the New Frontier. Both situations are fast becoming intolerable and are matters which ought to engage the concern of both Houses of the Congress and both parties.

My resolution does not make it mandatory that there be a more equal division of staff employees where present

conditions are satisfactory to the minority members on the committees. After all, the minority whose members' rights and prerogatives are at stake, is the best judge of whether present conditions are satisfactory or not. Where a majority of the minority members of a standing committee are satisfied with the essential nonpartisan nature of the committee and its policy, for example, say, Foreign Affairs, there would probably be no changes needed. However, in other cases, a dissatisfied majority of the minority members of a standing committee could exercise their rights guaranteed by the rules of the House as amended by House Resolution 570. The question has been raised, What specifically could the minority do and do better if my resolution were passed?

While many Members of the Congress and many students of government might disagree or might lay more or less emphasis on the points I will suggest, I venture to point out that my experience indicates to me that there are many things that the minority staff could do and could do better if my resolution were adopted. Here are a few of them:

First. They could gather information on the history of the legislation before the committee. Oftentimes this would be very helpful and a very reliable guide for us to use as we prepared other answers to the problem or amendments to the bill under consideration.

Second. They could have adequate time to counsel with authorities and with people who would be affected adversely and otherwise by the new legislation.

Third. They could help the minority to find competent authorities to testify on the pros and cons of the legislation before the committee.

Fourth. They could help prepare questions designed to bring out valuable and pertinent information necessary to consider the legislation.

Fifth. When and if a bill is voted out of the committee and opposed by the minority, the minority should have competent and adequate help as well as plenty of time to write the minority reports so that the minority views could be thoroughly and adequately understood by all the Members of the House when the bill comes to the House floor. Oftentimes the minority is unable to use all of the time allotted to the minority because of inadequate staffs and research. Further, the minority staff could help members of the minority prepare the statements for the House floor which would be designed to more adequately bring out the shortcomings as viewed by the minority and present positive answers that the minority has found as a result of their own research.

Six. Oftentimes, when new legislation is introduced it is necessary to follow closely the effects of the legislation that has been passed with the view of finding the shortcomings, omissions, and impractical application of the legislation in certain instances with the view of being prepared through observation and study to present adequate and effective amendments in future sessions of the Congress.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I should like to discuss the section of my bill which would

become section 2, rule XI, clause 32, if adopted, and point out that essentially the same rule would apply to special or select committees and subcommittees which are truly bipartisan in fact as well as in theory.

However, again where a select or a special committee is bipartisan in theory but not in fact, as is the Special Subcommittee on the Federal Aid Highways program of which I am a member, then my resolution gives the minority a right under the rules to have assigned to them upon request one-half of the staff if needed to carry out the legitimate functions of the subcommittee as the minority sees it.

There is nothing new about my claim that the Highway Subcommittee is partisan in nature and denies the minority members equal voice in its policies and procedures. This subcommittee was stacked against the Republicans 13 to 6 when it was constituted in September 1959 and has paid little or no attention to the wishes of the Republican members until after a decision has been made.

During the last session of the present Congress, I introduced House Resolution 111 which was designed to correct this imbalance in membership along more nonpartisan lines, but this resolution was never reported out of the Rules Committee. In an attempt to make the subcommittee into a truly special or select committee I advocated in this resolution that the membership be composed of six members from each party, to be appointed by the Speaker, with the six members of the majority party to select a chairman and the six members of the minority party to select a vice chairman. As a model for my resolution I had adopted the best features of the Senate Select Committee on Improper Advantages in the Labor or Management Field which had four members from each party and for 3 years performed a notable and essentially nonpartisan service to the Congress and the American people in its investigations in this sensitive area. The rules of the select committee which I believe ought to be a model for all special or select committees and subcommittees, including my own, provide, in part, as follows:

1. The chairman shall have the authority to call meetings of the committee. This authority may be delegated by the chairman to any other member of the committee when necessary. The chairman, except with the permission of the vice chairman, shall not schedule any public hearing or series of public hearings outside the District of Columbia without giving at least 48 hours notice thereof to the members of the committee.

2. Should any four members of the committee request the chairman in writing to call a meeting of the committee, then, in the event the chairman should fail, neglect, or refuse to call such meeting within 5 days thereafter, such four members of the committee may call a meeting by filing a written notice thereof with the vice chairman of the committee, who shall promptly call a meeting of the committee, notifying each member of the committee in writing.

I believe it is a consensus of opinion of the minority side of our Highway Investigative Subcommittee—it is mine, at any rate—that with an adequate staff

we Republicans could make a more substantial contribution to the vital work of this subcommittee, and, without the adequate staff we are prevented from doing so. Take for example the recently concluded public hearings involving wrongdoing in the Federal aid highway program in the State of Massachusetts.

On March 9, 1962, our subcommittee concluded 18 days of public hearings which proved the existence of a number of criminal conspiracies among lawyers, some State officials, individual fee appraisers and some landowners, many of whom were political influence peddlers and fixers, to defraud the Commonwealth and therefore the Federal Government out of hundreds of thousands of dollars, and perhaps millions, by fraudulently inflating the value of right-of-way acquisitions for interstate highways which involved the participation of Federal funds to the extent of 90 percent. This investigation, conducted for about 2 years, was under the direction of the chairman and the majority on the subcommittee which could and did outvote or ignore the minority, when we demanded that the investigation be expanded to include other areas of outrageous scandals in the Federal Highway System in the State such as the use of consultant engineering fees for bribes and political kickbacks and the area of the performance of construction contracts. These two areas are already a matter of public record and known to anyone who reads the Massachusetts newspapers.

In one recent case alone, a contractor on a Federal aid project was overpaid, perhaps fraudulently at that, an amount estimated to be \$300,000. The hearing was limited to the acquisition of right-of-way and all of our protests to the contrary were set at naught. In fact even now, I know of nothing that has been done to develop these serious matters for a future public hearing. Minority contribution is neither invited nor welcome and by no stretch of the imagination can it be said that we are operating on a nonpartisan-and-nonpolitical basis. With one-half of the staff at our disposal, as my resolution provides, and with a vice chairman chosen by the minority with a right to call a public hearing where a timely demand is denied as provided in House Resolution 111 and the model rules of procedure referred to above, the minority could carry out its mandate if necessary by concluding these investigations and by calling a hearing. Under present circumstances, however, we are without the ways and means of doing a job which I believe is expected of us by both the Congress and the taxpayers of both the United States and the Commonwealth of Massachusetts.

The same can be said for many other less sensational but nonetheless important problems in the Federal aid highway program which are in need of exploration and some solution. I have, for a long time, repeatedly proposed that our highly competent investigatory staff be broadened to include competent highway engineers who could study some of the complicated and enormously costly engineering problems which confront us

and which, if solved, I believe would result in a savings to the taxpayer which could be estimated in the hundreds of millions of dollars. But here again without an adequate staff and without a voice in the policy and practice of our subcommittee, Republican protests amounts to little more than a futile exercise in rhetoric.

Mr. Speaker, I appeal to the reasonable and fairminded members of both parties to support my resolution and that it not be dismissed with the cynical observation that I am merely a member of the minority party which wants to share the wealth of the staff which the majority now controls and shows every sign of keeping, or to put it in other words, I am hollering because "it looks like my ox is being gored." This is decidedly not the case. I am insisting upon nothing more than what I believe to be the rights of my party who represent a point of view presumably shared by a substantial segment of the taxpayers who just barely missed electing a Republican President in the election of 1960 by less than a quarter of a million votes, even assuming such unlikely prospects as an honest vote count in Cook County, St. Louis, the Texas border country and other points on the compass east and west, north and south. The problem I am addressing myself to strikes at the very foundation of a representative form of government and the committee system of Congress necessarily is on trial. The tides of political fortune ebb and flow, Mr. Speaker, and we should not lose sight of the fact that today's majority most certainly will be tomorrow's minority. Therefore, I hope the Rules Committee will vote out this bill and that the House, regardless of political considerations, will pass my resolution and will thereby write a basic rule of fairness into the rules of this deliberative body which cannot later be ignored or circumvented.

Mr. Speaker, I include as part of my remarks a letter by the gentleman from Iowa, Mr. Jensen; a letter from Mr. Arthur L. Peterson, Director, Ohio Wesleyan University, the Ben A. Arneson Institute of Practical Politics, Delaware, Ohio; and a letter from Mr. William E. Miller, Republican National Committee:

WASHINGTON, D.C., April 3, 1962.

HON. FRED SCHWENDEL,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR FRED: I have your letter of March 28, relative to House Resolution 570, and the need to provide authority for the engaging of more minority staff personnel for House committees requiring them.

This is a proposition I have advocated for some time; however, I have always hoped it could be worked out through comity between the majority and minority sides of the committees, rather than through formal Chamber action.

Essentially I support the political spoils system, and am quite willing to concede the appointive plums to the winning side. But your arguments in your letter, and the testimony presented during your remarks and rejoinder colloquy on the floor March 29, are extremely persuasive.

I do feel that the minority should have at least a modest supply of help available to inquire into matters perhaps considered too delicate for the majority to probe into. No

person or group is overly energetic about exposing any weaknesses in its own system. Thus a majority party normally concentrates its efforts on promoting its philosophy.

The majority is entitled to that preferred position by virtue of winning elections. And the responsibility of leadership goes with them. But minority rights deserve some protection, and that is where your resolution comes in.

I don't know whether 40 percent is a realistic figure or not, but I would suspect it is a trifle ambitious. When you appear before the Rules Committee on behalf of your measure be prepared to compromise that ratio downward.

You have cited two blue-ribbon examples of overwhelming imbalance in committee staffing, Labor and Government Operations. These are traditionally among the most politically minded committees in the House, so it is no surprise that they are topheavy with majority appointees.

The same condition does not obtain on the Committee on Appropriations. Our clerks are selected objectively without regard to political label. As a minority member I can usually expect just as much help from the staff in finding out what I need to know as if I were on the majority. Any failure in this process is not because of a politically motivated unwillingness but mostly because even our large staff is not always sufficient to handle its voluminous work.

You are a member of the policy committee. I hope this proposition has been carefully considered by the policy members and the ranking members of all committees. Before you risk an adverse vote such as happened to a similar proposal in the Senate, please be certain there is no other "gentlemen's agreement" type solution which can be reached.

Any concessions you might win in arm's length discussions with the separate committee chairmen might represent a satisfactory gain, whereas if House Resolution 570 falls of passage you might find even the friendliest chairmen not amenable to awarding another position or two, to the minority.

These are my thoughts on the matter, FRED. You can use them any way you deem fit. When your resolution gets to the floor it will get my vote. My endorsement of your proposal in principle is total; any diminution of ardor is merely a recognition of the realities of Capitol Hill politics.

Sincerely yours,

BEN F. JENSEN.

REPUBLICAN NATIONAL COMMITTEE,
Washington, D.C., April 4, 1962.

HON. FRED SCHWENDEL,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR FRED: It is no secret that since the end of the Eisenhower administration, Republicans in the House of Representatives, and the Senate too, have been handicapped by grossly inadequate Republican representation on committee staffs.

This is a matter of extreme urgency because the condition is so serious it can undermine the very effectiveness of even routine functions of Republican Members of the House.

I am sure we all realize that under our two-party system this wide disparity between Republican and Democratic staff operations is not good for the Nation as a whole.

I would commend your own vigorous efforts to remedy the situation. At the same time I would express the hope that all our Republican colleagues in the House will give their thoughtful attention to your House Resolution 570 relative to the subject in question.

With kind regards,

Sincerely yours,

WILLIAM E. MILLER.

OHIO WESLEYAN UNIVERSITY,
BEN A. ARNESON INSTITUTE
OF PRACTICAL POLITICS,
Delaware, Ohio.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN SCHWENDEL: I read, with deep interest, your speech on the floor of the House of Representatives of March 28.

Your commitment to a strong two-party system and your willingness to patiently examine all possibilities in American politics which will lead to the strengthening of that system have earned you the respect of political scientists from coast to coast.

Too often the glamour of candidates and the excitement of major issues have obscured the importance of such details as congressional committee staffing.

But there is not an ex-legislator in the land who would for one moment underestimate the importance of staff research in terms of the development of alternative courses of action in a given field of legislation or in terms of the influence these substantive experts can and do have on policy development. When one party controls the resources of research alternate plans of action are often not developed and evidence contrary to that which is favorable to the majority position on any given committee never sees the light of day.

Your resolution (H. Res. 570) would benefit both major parties because it would guarantee both of them an opportunity to search out the facts upon which a responsible program and a responsible opposition must be based. Your plan, indeed, will in truth benefit representative government itself because it will help safeguard the presentation of the multiplicity of views on any given issue which represent the American consensus.

Pluralism has come to be regarded as one of the outstanding strengths of our way of life. But our pluralism depends on the expression of diverse views. Expression in the Congress, to be effective, must be based on sound research. And research, often, is only seriously attempted on the committee staff level. For all of these reasons it is my most earnest hope that the House of Representatives will give careful consideration to your thoughtful proposal as contained in House Resolution 570, and that this resolution will pass. We will all gain.

ARTHUR L. PETERSON, Director.

Mr. Speaker, this week a Mr. Jack Linge, of Parsons College, Fairfield, Iowa, and William Ashley, of State College, Cedar Falls, Iowa, through a program that brings young college students who have a special interest in government to Washington for a week of study and observation, have given thorough study and consideration to the provisions of this legislation. I am glad to say that they give enthusiastic support to this bill.

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

Mr. SCHWENDEL. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Florida.

Mr. CRAMER. I congratulate the gentleman for the interest he has shown in what I think is one of the major matters so far as our system of law is concerned in the legislative processes, and I think Mr. Drummond and I think you likewise are rendering a great national service in showing that on a party line basis the committee staffs are stacked, sometimes 90 to 95 percent, in some instances 100 percent, without minority representation. If, in fact, this is a two-party system body, then certainly if the job is going to be done in committees, both Republicans and Democrats should have enough of a working staff to get the

job done. The gentleman is aware of the running battle that has been going forward on the Special Investigating Committee on Federal Aid Highways. I know the gentleman is familiar with the fact that it took us 6 months when the committee was set up about 2½ years ago to get a single staff member, and that was accomplished only after lengthy protest. And then we ended up by getting 1 minority counsel and then a little while later we got 1 clerk, and that is where we are today—1 minority clerk and 1 counsel, and the majority has about 29 or 30 staff members, numerous counsel, numerous investigators, a budget for 2 years of nearly \$750,000, to carry on these investigations. Now, I think it is impossible, and I think the gentleman will agree, will he not, that it has been almost impossible for the minority to carry on its proper functions through this special investigating committee by being denied an adequate staff with which to do the job. Does not the gentleman agree with me? He is on that committee.

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Yes, I agree with the gentleman completely, and I am glad to have the gentleman join me in making those pertinent observations and calling attention to the very sad situation that prevails in that subcommittee or special committee that can do a great job; a much more important job and effective job, even though the gentleman will agree with me that we do have a very good committee staff at this time. But, we are not exploring all the areas or doing the job as completely as many of us think we should.

Mr. CRAMER. The gentleman is aware of the fact that on this committee, even though we have a minority counsel, that minority counsel is treated as a stepchild almost as much as the minority members.

Mr. SCHWENGEL. That is right.

Mr. CRAMER. If the gentleman will yield further, he is not permitted to see the files, he is not permitted to look at the investigative material, he is not permitted to consult with the majority staff on investigations underway and get any information from them. Of course, he does not have the power of subpoena. He has no tools with which to work. When it comes to making an investigation, the majority refuses to permit him to attend any of the investigative functions or participate in them. Therefore, that approach renders him almost useless from the standpoint of participating in the investigation.

Does the gentleman think that is the way to properly run the railroad?

Mr. SCHWENGEL. It certainly is not. Later on in my remarks I shall call attention to that again, and reveal my experience for whatever benefit it may be, and give the House the benefit of my thinking, and some further suggestions on that.

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

Mr. SCHWENGEL. I shall be glad to yield to the distinguished gentleman from Washington.

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, I think the gentleman from Iowa knows that the

gentleman from Washington is very much pleased by the interest that the gentleman from Iowa has shown in this problem. It so happens that the gentleman from Washington is on a committee where there is rarely any partisan difference. But the gentleman from Washington has been very much interested in trying to evaluate the continuing erosion of legislative powers and responsibilities under the Constitution to the executive branch. The gentleman from Washington has wanted to evaluate the various proposals that come over to the various committees and have them studied. The gentleman from Washington has been unable to find any clerical help on the various committees sufficient to give the gentleman the information that he needs in order to arrive at some conclusion as to what is going on.

Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Washington wants to commend the gentleman from Iowa and to say that he hopes the gentleman will persist, and to assure the gentleman that the gentleman from Washington will help him in any way he can.

Mr. SCHWENGEL. I thank the gentlemen very, very much. I want to say to the gentleman that he has brought up a very important point that has not been thought of by me as I have studied and researched into this very important area and I thank him very much.

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

Mr. SCHWENGEL. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I thank the gentleman. I hesitate to interrupt the gentleman from Iowa before he has had an opportunity, really, to present his own evidence. But I should like to commend the gentleman from Iowa for pointing up a problem which I think is deserving of consideration by all Members.

As the gentleman knows, I happen to serve on two committees. I know the value of a professional staff which does not have any partisan flavor at all, as a member of the House Committee on Foreign Affairs. I think that on some of the other standing committees of the House there is equally good staff representation, and there is no particular concern about the problem which we are discussing today. That is whether the minority does not deserve and should not be able to claim as a matter of right greater staff personnel than it is presently allowed.

Mr. Speaker, the reason I feel so strongly about this is because I also happen to be a member of the House Education and Labor Committee. As has already been said, with respect to that committee, the staff at present is roughly twice the size that it was just a year ago. I checked with the committee yesterday and found that they have 10 on their so-called permanent staff and 30 on their investigating staff. Unfortunately, the increase in the size of the committee staff has not resulted in any additional strength for the benefit of the minority members of the committee. Quite the contrary is the case. The present chairman of that committee as early as January 16, 1961, advised the minority that

unless long-distance calls were approved in writing by the chief clerk, they would be charged to the individual making the calls. He also advised the minority that if the chief clerk was not notified, the charges would then be doubled. The very next day the gentleman from New York [Mr. POWELL], advised that a copy of all telegrams and cablegrams must be filed with the chief clerk.

Needless to say I do not know if such a regulation could be enforced, and I doubt very much whether those suggestions were followed. However, in the months that followed serious trouble did develop. It began, I think, perhaps because certain rooms which the minority had had since 1949 were considered needed by the majority and a request was made for them; plus also a threat that if the rooms were not given up the minority staff would be reduced. The minority quite naturally refused to accede to this demand but because of that, or shortly thereafter, on October 16, the chairman advised that by October 31 last year the minority clerk would be released. This action was vigorously protested but one of our two experts then on the payroll on the Republican side was of necessity, not by the desire of the minority, transferred to the majority payroll in lieu of having his services terminated. I might add that he left the Hill since that time.

I say this because it does demonstrate that we face a very real problem of getting a job done. We are faced with the necessity of preparing minority reports, unfortunately, on some of the legislation which has been approved by the committee and at the moment we only have 2 individuals on our payroll as compared to a total of 40, and it has been up as high as 48, I believe, within the last 2-year period.

If we could look at that staff that is presently employed by our committee as a professional staff with no partisan flavor I would feel less disturbed about the situation than I do. But the fact of the matter is that not only has the staff been approximately doubled but, to the best of my knowledge, there is only one, or perhaps there are two members on the majority side who were employed by the committee as recently as the end of 1960. It is that situation, that kind of turnover, without any justification except, perhaps, that we have a new chairman, which worries me. And it is for that reason that I think the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. SCHWENGEL] is doing a fine job in calling attention to this problem.

I recognize that in some of these areas there may be reason to move slowly, not to jump to conclusions about the necessity for a 40-percent representation by the minority, or some other percentage. But I think, generally speaking, the gentleman's resolution would be salutary. I do not think it would necessitate the removal of good people who are working on a nonpartisan basis in such committees as the House Committee on Foreign Affairs, but where there is a problem I think it would do a good deal to rectify the situation.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Iowa for yielding.

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for his remarks and I want to point out lest somebody misunderstand the objective of this resolution, that the 40-percent representation that this calls for only happens when the majority and the minority both are in favor of that proposition, so this would not necessarily upset any arrangements and understandings in committees where they now have a completely bipartisan situation.

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

Mr. SCHWENGEL. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from New York.

Mr. LINDSAY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding. I should like to commend him for the job he has done on this important subject. I am pleased to have become a cosponsor of the gentleman's House resolution because I think it is skillfully drafted and its point is well taken, and if adopted by the House of Representatives would serve an extremely important purpose.

I am sure that our distinguished colleague from Missouri [Mr. CURTIS] would be on the floor if he possibly could, because he is deserving of high praise for his original leadership in this whole area of pointing out the importance of bringing about conditions under which minority opposition can function as a true minority opposition should function.

I think that one has to add to what the distinguished gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN] said on the extremely important point he made about the Committee on Education and Labor. The figures he gave and the situation that he describes are to me shocking. I add to that by pointing to my own committee, the Committee on the Judiciary, which has a somewhat comparable problem.

Before describing it, I hasten to say that the majority staff of that committee is of the highest possible caliber. They are top lawyers, good men, non-partisan. The fact of the matter remains, however, that they are a majority staff and they do the bidding of the majority side.

Subject to correction, I would guess there are approximately 15 professionals on the majority side, and at the moment there is only 1 on the minority side. There is room for two. As I understand the complexities of the accounting involved, we have only one at the present time. This is a very serious situation, because, although you cannot equate the two situations, there is something akin between the legislative and the judicial process in that truth is finally achieved by the process of debate and opposition.

Our system works on a committee system. Whether we like the committee system or not is beside the point; we have one, and this is how we operate. The only way the committee system can operate properly, as the gentleman from New Jersey pointed out and as the distinguished gentleman from Iowa [Mr. SCHWENGEL] has remarked, is if there is the process of professional examination of the issues as they come by. You do

not get that in our system in the absence of proper staff work. The committee members are too busy, they have too much to do. The problems are too complex and growing more complex every day and every week.

I sometimes think I am a student of the parliamentary system. Just a couple of weeks ago I was in England and had the thrill once again, as I always find it thrilling, to go through the House of Commons and the House of Lords and to examine their structures. They have the benches oppose each other, the majority on one side and the minority on the other. The ministers of Government, who are all Members of the House of Commons, sit on the front row. Across from them are their shadows, the full-time opposition, whose job is to oppose, and I say "oppose" in the broad sense, to question and to bring forward alternatives when it is necessary to do so. We do not have the parliamentary system. The only thing we do have is the committee structure. But if the committee structure is to operate in the basic interest of the United States it is absolutely essential that it be so constructed that the technique of arriving at the truth can be perfected. Right now it is not even close to being perfect because of the absence of the proper minority staff.

I might add also that on the Committee on the Judiciary, in the most important and powerful subcommittee of all, into which the distinguished chairman funnels most of the controversial legislation, the division between members is 2 to 1, whereas many of us think the division ought to be a higher ratio for the minority. So add to that the one minority counsel, the only one we have, with the majority having 15—we do not often have trouble about that, because we do not often have violent disagreements on the committee—but it is important that every subject that comes before the committee have the test of an opposition at least examining to see whether we have arrived at the best solution in the best interests of the country.

So I think the gentleman from Iowa is performing a great public service in what he is doing, and our friend from Missouri [Mr. CURTIS], in being a part of it, and all those who have expressed on the floor a desire to improve our system, as well as those who could not be here this evening to chip in. They are performing a very important service, one that becomes more important every day that goes by because of the complexities of the legislative process in this country today.

I thank the gentleman.

Mr. SCHWENGEL. I thank the gentleman for his kind remarks and his great contribution to the discussion we are having on this subject today.

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

Mr. SCHWENGEL. I am glad to yield to my colleague.

Mr. BOLLING. I know, because in my pleasant association with the gentleman from Iowa on the Civil War Centennial Commission, that the gentleman

from Iowa is a good historian, but I am sure he is aware that the 79th Congress passed the Legislative Reorganization Act which provided, in effect, for professional staffs on the various committees of the Congress.

I am sure he is also aware of the historic fact that the Congress that succeeded the 79th Congress was the 80th Congress and that most of the staffing that was done under that act was done in the 80th Congress, and that in a great many of the committees of the House today the same staffs still exist. The question that the gentleman's point of view raises in my mind is this: Is he, in effect, saying that the Legislative Reorganization Act was in error in its provision for a nonpartisan professional staff and is he, in effect, in his resolution retreating to the earlier method of having professional or nonprofessional partisan staffs? That would be my question. I am curious as to whether the gentleman is aware of that history and whether his purpose is to move back to the era before 1946 when the Legislative Reorganization Act was passed.

Mr. SCHWENGEL. I should like to say, first of all, it is a pleasure to serve with the gentleman on the Civil War Centennial Commission, and I can say of him that he is an apt student and is performing a fine service on that committee.

Now in answer to the gentleman's question, I want to assure the gentleman I have studied that act and studied the records and the discussions that were entered into at the time that legislation was passed. I think it was good legislation, but I am also convinced that our experience has indicated in certain instances people have gotten political and become biased and unfair. I think we have developed some evidence to show it is unfair and inequitable in many instances.

I want to point out, too, that my bill, if passed, will not upset the arrangements whereby we can have a truly bipartisan setup, and I have explored in those areas among the minority and have their assurance that they would not take advantage of the provision of this bill, if it were passed.

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

Mr. SCHWENGEL. I am glad to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. BOLLING. I do not wish to embarrass the gentleman. I am one of the relatively rare Democrats in this House who has had the pleasure of nominating a Republican for a position on a commission and the Republican is now in the well, of course. So I have no intention of embarrassing my friend. But, my friend is a very fair man and I know he would not suggest that this is the only occasion in congressional history that this situation has developed. He would be perfectly willing, I am sure, to admit that similar complaints were made in private and some in public in, I think, the 80th and the 83d Congresses.

Mr. SCHWENGEL. I think that is true, I agree, and the mistakes we made are mistakes that we, on the minority side, ought to admit. I admit there were

some mistakes, but I have a feeling, and after serious thought and a lot of research and study, that this legislation would improve the situation and improve the legislation that was adopted in the 79th Congress.

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

Mr. SCHWENGEL. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. The gentleman is very gracious in yielding so freely of his time, but I do think that this subject is of considerable interest to a number of us. This mention of the 83d Congress brings to my mind the fact that I have some statistics here about the size of the staff when the Republicans were in control of the 83d Congress, on the Committee on Education and Labor. There were at that time 10 employees, 2 of whom were assigned to the then minority, the Democrats. The total amount of funds appropriated or authorized for committee expenditures was the magnificent sum of \$50,000. I need not add over the 2-year period, currently our committee has had appropriated for its use \$633,000. I might say what disturbs me is not whether or not we should have professional staffs. Of course, we know the provisions of the reorganization act and the advisability of professional staffs is obvious to anyone who has had contact with the men and women who serve on or for such committees as the Committee on Foreign Affairs, the Committee on Ways and Means and the Committee on Appropriations.

Where you get into a controversial complex area such as is represented by both education and labor it seems to me obvious that you need not only to have quality personnel—and I am not arguing against the quality of the people who are presently employed by that committee—but you need adequate minority representation.

As an example of what I mean, let me say there have been a myriad of bills which would provide Federal aid to some aspect of education. A great many of those bills have been highly controversial. Those that have gotten beyond the subcommittee or at least by the full committee presumably will have committee reports prepared for the use of the membership. Under such circumstances I think it is essential that the members of the committee who are busy with other responsibilities have some good assistants, practical people who have had considerable background in the field of education and in the field of labor. I regret very much the necessity of our losing a very valuable man who had acquired knowledge and who had knowledge before he came to the House in the field of education, because of the arbitrary, in my opinion, effort on the part of the majority to increase still further its hold over the minority.

It seems to me, as the gentleman from New York [Mr. LINDSAY], has pointed out, that the legislative process is not going to function adequately unless a good basic groundwork is done in the committee, and when you have a controversial field the staff is bound to comply with the pressures or the suggestions

of the majority, and they will almost inevitably do just that. The tendency is to ignore or overlook the needs of the minority, and it is just that that we are attempting to point out, not attempting to set back the clock nor the provisions of the Reorganization Act or any such thing.

Mr. LINDSAY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for one further comment?

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

Mr. LINDSAY. I agree entirely with the statement of the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN]. What must be added in further answer to what the distinguished gentleman from Missouri asked and which was answered in part by the gentleman from New Jersey, is this: Face the facts. The fact is that in many cases the special staff has become the private property of the chairman or the ranking minority member. This is what has happened, and one useful purpose of the gentleman's reference is that it makes it abundantly clear that a minority staff—and I would suppose the same would be true of the majority staff—is the property of the whole minority and is to be of professional men working on the affairs of the committee as a whole. It does not have to answer solely and only to a single person. That is the fact we have to face up to.

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Yes, and I thank the gentleman for making his very pertinent observations in answer to the question the gentleman from Missouri raised a moment ago.

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

Mr. SCHWENGEL. I am very glad to yield to my distinguished and able colleague from Iowa.

Mr. BROMWELL. Mr. Speaker, I should like to congratulate the gentleman on this resolution and on the remarks which he has just made in support of it, and venture a brief observation. This resolution makes good common sense. This is, perhaps, in the long run, its strongest recommendation. I would not pose as an expert in the field of political science. I do believe, with every fiber of my being, that the genius of free institutions rests in diffusion of power. It seems obvious that the attrition of the staffs of our committee for the minority membership is but a portion of a great wave which has concentrated power in fewer and fewer hands in this country over the course of recent years, and as such it is to be regretted and deplored and opposed by such resolutions as this.

The Founding Fathers were wise and they saw to the diffusion of power by counterpoising it as in the system of checks and balances which characterizes the Government under the Constitution; in the adversary system of litigation; in the two-party system of Government which arose as a completely free institution. If power is to be counterpoised it must have the instruments of action.

More specifically, I think, Mr. Speaker, is this observation to the point. As one of the newer Members of this body I have been struck—and I can speak

freely—I have been struck by the difference in committee work which is manifested on the floor of this House. Some of the great committees in the House come in with finished committee work; fine, carefully planned legislation, oftentimes in a very technical area, but legislation which has obviously been carefully prepared and thoroughly digested. Whether the credit goes to the staffs, the membership, or the chairman, is difficult to say. I suppose in each case it is all three. But there are also committees of this House which bring in committee work—that is to say, legislation to the floor of this House—which represents quite the opposite and which usually comes a cropper in the well; legislation which is often criticized; and, Mr. Speaker, we all recall times when legislation has been virtually written on the floor of this House. Never does a debate take place but what ideas come forward which are worth listening to on both sides of every issue. Oftentimes ideas are presented apparently for the first time on the floor of this House which recommend themselves to thoughtful and reasonable people as worthy of consideration in the premises. But the votes are taken and the gavel falls, the legislative process rolls and it is too late to look into them. This is one of the functions of a minority, to look at the other side and to find desirable amendments and work them up.

I daresay it goes without saying that this cannot be done on the floor of this House, nor can it be done effectively by the minority committee members working on their own.

We have heard many, many statements made from this rostrum in the past month as to the extreme circumstances in which our great Nation finds itself these days. This is no time to be cavalier about minority representation; this is no time to applaud any jungle situation, no matter how it arises, which says, "I will gut you and you can gut me if you get the chance." The questions are too delicate, the welfare of too many people is at stake, to be anything but extremely cautious and extremely conscientious in the preparation of legislation.

I again want to commend the gentleman on this resolution and to wish him well.

Mr. SCHWENGEL. I thank the gentleman for his fine contribution and for his kind and gracious comment.

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to join with my colleague [Mr. SCHWENGEL] in his remarks concerning the need to remedy the present inadequate method of staffing House committees. I commend him upon the introduction of his resolution, House Resolution 570, which would correct the present discrimination against the minority and hope to introduce a companion bill.

We cannot maintain good government, proper representation of the people we represent when the minority party in Congress, whichever one it may be, is handicapped by lack of adequate and sufficient professional help on the committees. This matter should be of vital concern to both parties because the present imbalance wherein the committee

staffs are heavily weighted in favor of the majority party, could set a precedent that would be equally disadvantageous to the other party when the political climate changes as it is certain to do. This is a matter beyond party politics, however, because it strikes at the heart of the proper functioning of the committee system without which Congress itself would become ineffective.

There is a proper balance that can be achieved on the committee staffs and it is toward this end that I join with my colleague from Iowa.

There are many occasions and issues that are noncontroversial, nonpolitical, or bipartisan. It is possible that there will not always be the need for a percentage Democrat-Republican staff affiliation. There should be, however, a recognition that there are many political situations where in fairness there must be staff available for either party. Otherwise two-party government will suffer and merge into one party.

MEDICAL CARE FOR THE AGED

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LIBONATI). Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Bow] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, I welcome the interest shown in my proposal for medical care for the aged by those 25 or more colleagues who have now introduced the legislation.

This is convincing evidence of their sincere interest in the health problems of the aged, and of their desire to work out a solution that will be of benefit to everyone over age 65, utilizing the facilities of the voluntary health insurance organizations of the United States and of an existing Federal agency, in a manner consistent with the dignity and independence of each individual.

As the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CURTIS] pointed out several weeks ago in a speech in the RECORD, there are several hundred health insurance policies now available to people of age 65 and older, and 53 percent of all Americans in this age group have some form of health insurance protection.

I believe it is in the public interest to extend this protection to every elderly citizen who wishes it, and that it is proper for the Federal Government to assist and encourage them.

If my proposal is enacted, every elderly person, regardless of income or his prior medical history, can avail himself of one of the comprehensive medical care insurance programs outlined in the bill.

Benefits superior to those offered in any other legislation will be provided by H.R. 10981 through a system of medical care insurance certificates issued by the Treasury Department, and tax credits.

Regardless of his income, any American 65 or over can be assured payment of his hospitalization, surgeons fees, convalescent home treatment, nursing services, and other benefits.

Unlike other proposals, the Bow plan is completely voluntary. It does not require action by State legislatures. It contains no "means test." It is based

upon a completely confidential relationship between each individual and the Treasury Department, the health insurance carrier of his choice, his doctor and his hospital. It does not discriminate. It is a true free enterprise plan to help Americans take care of themselves.

HERE IS HOW IT WORKS

I propose that every American 65 or over file a Federal income tax return whether or not he owes any tax. A simple, easy-to-file return is proposed.

If an individual or a married couple owes no tax, the Treasury Department will give a medical care insurance certificate. The certificate may be used to obtain the kind of medical care insurance the citizen desires. The insurance carrier, in turn, will receive payment of the premium cost, up to \$125 for an individual, or \$250 for a couple, by presenting the certificate to the Treasury.

The two basic policies outlined in the bill will be available for this amount, regardless of any previous illness, on a guaranteed renewable basis.

If your Federal income tax is less than \$125—\$250 for a couple—the tax will be forgiven and a medical care insurance certificate will be issued to make up the difference between the amount saved on taxes and \$125—\$250 for a couple—so that the citizen may obtain health insurance. For example, I owe the Government \$50 income tax. My tax is forgiven and I receive a medical care insurance certificate worth \$75, so that I may take my \$50 and the certificate and obtain at least the basic medical care protection provided in my bill.

These provisions guarantee that every individual can have good medical attention with Government assistance—and he can have the medical attention of his own choice with benefits, including doctor's fees, far superior to any provided in any other bill.

INCENTIVES OFFERED

The Bow plan encourages those who can afford to do so to provide their own insurance protection, or to provide it for their elderly relatives, offering a \$125 tax credit, to be subtracted from the income tax an individual owes, to all who take advantage of this opportunity. For example, I owe the Federal Government \$275 in income tax. My wife and I—both 65—have health insurance. Two hundred and fifty dollars is our tax credit, and we pay the Government only \$25 income tax.

There is a growing trend in the United States toward the purchase of health insurance for retired employees by their former employers. The Bow plan encourages this practice by offering the same \$125 credit to the employer who provides health insurance for his retired employees.

CHOICE OF BASIC INSURANCE

The Bow bill outlines two basic medical care plans for the elderly.

One provides complete payment for hospitalization, surgeon's fees, convalescent home care, and nursing service within limits based upon the average needs of elderly people. This plan begins payments with the first dollar of

medical care cost, and is particularly helpful to those of very low income.

The other provides somewhat more extensive benefits with the patient sharing part of the expense after having paid a deductible.

Both policies are available on a guaranteed renewable basis to any person 65 or over without regard to any previous illness.

They are carefully prepared so that they can be offered by any insurance company, nonprofit insurance carrier, or group practice organization within the dollar limits set by the bill, though allowing little if any profit to the carrier.

I have been asked whether the bill supplants or is in conflict with the Kerr-Mills Act. It is not. To the extent that the insurance coverage provided to elderly people will pay for their hospitalization, surgical care and certain related expenses, the States and the Federal Government will be relieved of much of the expense they might incur under the Kerr-Mills Act. But there will be occasions when not all of an individual's medical expenses can be covered by insurance, and the Kerr-Mills Act, where it has been implemented, can continue to be helpful and will, in fact complement my plan.

ADVANTAGES OF THE BOW PLAN

The Bow bill has many advantages over the Kennedy administration proposal as introduced by Representative KING and Senator ANDERSON.

The Bow bill—H.R. 10981—would provide health care benefits to all persons 65 years of age or older whereas the King-Anderson bill would be available only to aged beneficiaries of the OASI program. The Bow bill would provide basic benefits under insurance policies which meet certain approved standards, for surgical benefits ranging at least up to \$300 whereas the King-Anderson bill would not cover the cost of any surgery. While the King-Anderson bill requires an aged person to pay the first \$90 of his hospital expenses, the Bow bill specifies first dollar coverage. Inasmuch as the Bow bill provides at least these distinct advantages over the King-Anderson bill in the basic health care area, and since most of the other basic benefit provisions of the two bills are essentially the same, the Bow bill should be preferred by the senior citizen and the average taxpayer.

The Kennedy-King-Anderson bill requires increases in the already burdensome social security tax on gross income. The Bow bill is financed within the general Federal budget, with the amount required offset in large part by the medical care deductions, nearly \$1 billion yearly, now being taken by taxpayers over 65.

SUMMARY

Several million elderly Americans need assistance to meet the cost of illness in old age. Others will welcome encouragement in obtaining better medical care insurance. My bill, unlike any other proposal, will take care of everyone, the only basic requirement being that each person file an income tax return.

My plans offer adequate and comprehensive protection.

My bill is the best solution to date of the problem of health care for the aged.

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

Mr. BOW. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. MAILLIARD. Mr. Speaker, the bill of which the gentleman is the original author came to my attention only a relatively few days ago and, from the study I have been able to give it in those few days, it looks to me like a good approach to the problems that have concerned me for a great many years, including the controversy in this body over the so-called Forand bill some years ago. Recognizing the need, as so many of us have for so many years, I want to join in praising the gentleman from Ohio in coming up with something that looks to me as if it would provide greater services to those who need this protection without the disadvantages that might accrue if we should go to another large Federal bureaucracy to operate this type of program.

Mr. BOW. I thank the gentleman from California for his contribution.

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

Mr. BOW. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. HARSHA. Mr. Speaker, I want to commend the gentleman for his foresight and I associate myself with his remarks. He has rendered a great service to this country. I know he has worked and studied long hours on this legislation. Much work has gone into developing the mechanics of this bill and you are to be heartily congratulated on authoring this legislation. It will prevent this country from falling into the devastating clutches of socialized medicine and I know that you, as I am, are interested in preserving that almost sacred patient-physician relationship and the high caliber of medical care and practice we now enjoy in this country.

I feel that by supporting this legislation once again we have demonstrated that we are interested in the welfare of this country and its senior citizens, that we are interested in the rights of individual citizens and the free-enterprise system without the intervention of the Federal Government.

This is a constructive, progressive piece of legislation that takes great strides toward helping the individual solve his problems through his own initiative. I again commend the gentleman and say that I am proud to be associated with the gentleman in this legislation.

I have carefully analyzed the Bow bill and am so firmly convinced that it is the answer, the proper answer and the truly American way of meeting this problem that I have introduced a companion bill, H.R. 11039.

This legislation provides a purely voluntary method of meeting the medical problems of our senior citizens.

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

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

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I want to commend the gentleman from Ohio for introducing this legislation. I think that he, after a lot of study and research, has found a practical solution to problems that must be dealt with.

I want to tell him also that I have read with interest the material he has sent to me and read the bill several times. I have taken the liberty of sending copies of the bill to interested people in my district, people in the labor movement and retired people who have some misgivings about several propositions before the Congress. I have reason to believe if we are to get some real support for this legislation—at least I am hopeful that this will happen—I am looking forward to further discussion of this. I sincerely hope that we will have a chance to discuss it on the floor when and if it is reported out of the committee.

I thank the gentleman.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. NELSEN] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. NELSEN. Mr. Speaker, during the last 2 weeks, we have been overwhelmed in my office with responses to my opinion poll, which was distributed throughout the Second District of Minnesota, and was also reproduced in a number of newspapers in the district. In addition to widespread mailings to people regardless of political affiliation, I urged the voters in my regular radio broadcasts to write in for copies of the questionnaire if for some reason they did not receive one.

The task of tabulating these returns is still going on, and will for a time. However, in view of the discussions now going on about medical care for the elderly, I have had a special check made on the responses to two questions, and I must say that the results are revealing of strong sentiment on the part of the voters in my district.

Here is the way the vote went:

First. Do you favor a medical care plan for the elderly under social security?

The vote was 14 percent in favor and 86 percent opposed.

Second. Or do you favor continuing development of private plans along with the present Federal-State system?

The vote was 84 percent in favor and 16 percent opposed.

I should add that many responses included additional comments, the burden of which was: We do not want a compulsory, nationwide system which will pay hospital bills for people whether they need help or not; any plan to be of any help should provide some sort of assistance with doctor bills as well as hospital bills, but we do not want a Government agency telling us how to do it; and we realize that with many people there is real need of help, and there must be some way to provide it.

As a result of such responses as these, and as a result of giving a good deal of thought and attention to the problem which we know exists, I, along with many

of my colleagues in the House, am introducing a bill which in my opinion is the best answer yet advanced to this problem.

I know that it will not meet with favor from bureaucrats because it does not create Government jobs, nor set up fancy Government machinery. Its strength is in simplicity, its workability, its direct approach to the problem while maintaining our excellent private insurance system and permitting our people to deal with their own problems.

Essential provisions of the bill are: a tax credit up to \$125 for the cost of premiums paid on an approved medical care plan—a credit which may be taken by the elderly person who buys the policy for himself or his wife, or by a relative who buys the insurance for the elderly person. In other words, the tax due would be reduced by the amount of premiums paid for medical care insurance for the elderly, up to \$125. And, in the situation where the person involved does not have a tax liability up to \$125, a medical care insurance certificate will be issued which may be used to pay premiums on such a policy.

This will give the people complete freedom of choice in selecting the nature and extent of insurance coverage, and will at the same time leave it to the individual to arrange for such protection. The proposed credit will provide suitable coverage under any one of the many excellent private plans now in effect, or others being developed.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. HIESTAND] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. HIESTAND. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing a bill dealing with a problem of paramount concern to all Americans. Under provisions of the bill, comprehensive medical care will be provided for every elderly American 65 or over.

I understand several of my Republican colleagues are introducing similar bills today. I am most gratified with these efforts and I sincerely hope that this Congress takes action in a sound manner with the problems of our elderly's medical cares.

The bill I am introducing today provides for voluntary participation. No action is required by State legislatures; no means test is necessary; there is no discrimination. It is a true free enterprise plan which allows Americans to take care of themselves.

I am convinced that the administration's medical care plan, tied to social security, is not best for America.

Under today's bill, benefits will be provided through a system of medical care insurance certificates, issued by the Treasury Department, and tax credits. For example, if a person's Federal income tax is less than \$125—\$250 per couple—the tax will be forgiven and a medical care insurance certificate will be issued to make up the difference between the amount saved on taxes and

\$125—\$250 for a couple—so that the citizen may obtain health insurance. The certificate may be used to obtain the kind of medical care insurance the citizen desires. The insurance carrier, upon presentation of the certificate to the Treasury Department, will then receive payment of the premium cost—up to \$125 per person.

It guarantees that every individual over 65 can have fine medical attention, including his choice of benefits such as doctor's fees.

The plan encourages those who can afford it to pay for their own insurance. A person could provide it for his elderly relative, offering a \$125 tax credit to be subtracted from the income tax an individual owes. A similar tax credit would be allowed an employer who provides health insurance for his retired employees.

Two fundamental medical care plans are outlined in the bill.

First. Providing full payment for hospitalization, surgeon's fees, convalescent home care and nursing service within limits based upon the average needs of the aged.

Second. Providing more extensive benefits with the patient sharing part of the expense.

The bill, contrary to the administration proposal, contains no pathways to socialized medicine or federally controlled medical care. The establishment of a huge, new Federal agency is not required. It depends solely on existing health insurance programs and an existing Federal agency.

We hope serious consideration is given to this proposal.

THE ONWARD MARCH OF PROGRESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LIBONATI). Under the previous order of the House, the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. STAGGERS] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Speaker, this is a call for action. The poet wrote of soldiers, but he might have been thinking of Americans:

In the great hour of destiny they stand
Each with his feuds, and jealousies, and
sorrows.
Soldiers are sworn to action.

And effective action requires unity and harmony, as well from the nation as from soldiers.

From the beginnings of the Republic, it has been the destiny of America to defend the general good of all peoples everywhere against the onslaughts of privilege and discrimination. The battle breaks out anew on a different front in succeeding ages. Advantage and favor, repulsed in one sector, find new approaches to selfish gain. If we hesitate but a moment, the common interests of common men sicken and are buried under the avalanche of renescent reaction.

The enemy of progress takes a different form in each new assault. One day he may assume the form of control of conscience and religion; the next he may attempt to exclude all from the control of government except the privileged;

again, he may take the guise of overwhelming and selfish economic power. But in all ages the battle is the same: It is the struggle of the good life for all against private avarice.

Progress in a great state involves the formulation of broad and comprehensive policies to combat general evils. Within the framework of these grand policies exists the possibility of many little policies to combat little evils. Such evils are little only in the sense that they affect only relatively small groups. We are inclined to give them precedence in our thinking because they seem to be the ones which impinge on our most vital problems. For them we are willing and eager to fight. And therein lies our danger. A battle is fought for major objectives. It little matters that we win a skirmish here and there if the great war goes against us. Win the whole war and you will find that the smaller matters adjust themselves to a changed environment.

Seek ye first the kingdom of God and His righteousness, and all these things shall be added unto you.

In this age, knowledge and science and empathy have advanced hand in hand far into what was once unknown and inscrutable. We have the necessary understanding and the necessary technology to reduce human misery in much of the world, particularly in the United States. It remains only to put technology and knowledge into operation against specific instances of inequity and maladjustment.

A great struggle requires a great leader. We have one. We chose him against what seemed insurmountable odds in 1960. He is today a world figure, intelligent, energetic, courageous, and untinged with greed for either power or wealth. Already, world opinion is hanging on his word and watching his every motion. He has brought into association with himself a group of men dedicated to the common good, men widely skilled and knowledgeable in every field of human thought and endeavor. Together, they have mapped out a plan for economic and social advancement which is hailed in all corners of the earth as the New Frontier. It is indeed a New Frontier of advancement into a kindlier and more just and richer life. It applies all our toil-won knowledge and experience to the solution of problems hitherto deemed insoluble—which were in fact insoluble because we lacked the resources to apply a practical solution. And still some of us dawdle in picayunish bickering over details of the program, while a hopeful and possibly a startled world is recognizing him as the looked-for preserver of posterity and the best hope of modern civilization.

The resurgent forces of inherent human greed seem to feel that the coming battle is the most crucial in all history. They must win this time, or else relinquish wide sections of the field to justice and compassion and succor for all men. There is inevitable a struggle unprecedented for ferocity and ruthlessness, both at home and abroad. Our opponents are assembling and grouping

every resource of money and weapon and guile.

I say to you, let us get enthusiastically and energetically behind our chosen leader. A solution of the major problems which beset our times, the problems arising from subversion of democracy, both internal and external; the problems arising from corruption in productive and in public life; the problems arising from our admitted efficiency in producing while we still remain naive in distributing; the problems arising from pockets of want and misery in our domestic economy, exaggerated by the similar problems, mountainous in size, which curse entire foreign societies. These are the solutions which demand priority in our political and social planning. Once these problems have been licked, we may look forward with confidence to an adjustment of the more local problems which exist primarily because of the presence of the major problems. This is no time for quibbling or delay. Let us align ourselves with forces that are moving ahead.

All our strength is in our union. All our danger is in discord.

ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON INTER-GOVERNMENTAL RELATIONS

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. FOUNTAIN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include an article.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. FOUNTAIN. Mr. Speaker, the Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations, on which the gentleman from New Jersey [Mrs. DWYER] and the gentleman from New York [Mr. KEOGH] and I have the honor to represent this House, is engaged in improving the relationships among the Federal, State, and local governments. It is with pleasure that I call my colleagues' attention to an appraisal of the Advisory Commission's accomplishments during its first 2 years of existence. Let me note, however, that it gives the Commission somewhat more credit than it deserves with regard to two particular points. Specifically, the idea that municipalities invest their idle funds to earn interest income did not originate with the Commission. Some local governments have been doing so for years. The Commission takes credit only for studying the problem, for identifying the States in which local units lack the authority to do so, and for drafting a simple statute which would meet the need. Secondly, the legislation authorizing the Internal Revenue Service to make its personnel training facilities available, on a reimbursement basis, to the tax enforcement staffs of State and local governments is not yet an accomplished fact. I am hopeful that it will receive the favorable consideration of the Congress in the near future.

Under unanimous consent, I include in the body of the RECORD a report on the work of the Advisory Commission on

Intergovernmental Relations which appeared in the Daily Bond Buyer, Monday, April 2, 1962.

The article follows:

WASHINGTON VIEWPOINT

(By John Gerrity)

WASHINGTON.—Should President Kennedy, an accredited practitioner of the art, ever want for a continuing case history of pragmatism in government, he need only take a 3-minute walk from his White House desk.

Less than a city block from the Executive Mansion, along the western fringe of Lafayette Park, the Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations holds forth, an almost incredible homogenizer of widely divergent and often conflicting interests between the States and local governments and the Federal Government.

IMPRESSIVE RECORD OF ACCOMPLISHMENT

Now entering its third full year of existence, this agency that is tiny by every Washington criterion, except accomplishment, is also unique by comparison with the hundreds of others that are here.

Indeed, the Commission has been unique in many ways from its very beginning. Not alone because it works on a shoestring budget, or because its membership is made up of representatives of all levels of government, and not just from the Federal level, or that it seems to thrive in an atmosphere where anything approaching anonymity verges on heresy.

UNIQUE LIMITATION VERSUS BROAD, MULTIPLE ALLEGIANCE

More significantly, from its start to this very day, its activities have been tempered by a constant awareness of the limitations implicit in the first word of its title—advisory.

It has no power to command, as others do; nor even to criticize. It is a creature of Congress. But it owes its allegiance—in terms of performance—not only to the Federal Government, but to the 50 States and to their 90,000 political subdivisions, 35,000 of which are cities and towns of all sizes and kinds.

It has no blunderbuss, nor even a rifle, to train on targets of ineptitude or ignorance; on the maladroit or the maldooers wherever they may be in any of these many governmental units.

ROLE AS INITIATOR IS CONFINED TO SUGGESTIONS

Thus, it cannot even take, or receive, credit when any of its suggestions are translated into action. For credit, when it is merited, must go to those who do what they have been advised to do.

It can act only as a catalyst to bring forth the best that is latent in the thousands of differing ambitions and aspirations that all who govern in scores of different ways must have for the governed.

Consequently, it must seek to bring together without foment or force thousands of Americans who are charged in one way or another with the custodianship of the affairs of other Americans—and who have little else besides that in common.

MEETING GROUND OF MAJOR AND MINOR OFFICIALS

Hard as it may be to believe, it is nonetheless true that today the Commission is the only forum in the Nation through which a school superintendent can speak to a Senator, or a councilman to a Cabinet member, and do so within the official imprimatur of the law of the land.

Without the Commission there would be no absolute means of communication if only because there is virtually no other encompassing organization and still less unity between other organizations.

Yet despite its seeming lack of power the Advisory Commission has recorded a remarkable record of achievement in its short life—

and this it has done, using mainly two effective weapons: The power of commonsense and the power of good example.

WEAPONS WIELDED WITH SUBTLETY AND SUCCESS

And by wielding these weapons with the deft subtlety that is the hallmark of the successful soft sell, it has managed to accomplish—and to get others to accomplish—a host of achievements that no amount of thunder and bombast could do. Thus, for example, it is understandable today that hundreds of American communities have come to accept as commonplace the fact that they can add to their community revenues the incomes derived from the investment of temporarily surplus tax receipts or moneys received from the sale of municipal bonds.

Yet the genesis of this happy state of affairs serves to illuminate the kind of function the Commission is able to render to its constituencies.

CIVIC PROJECT FUNDS HELD WELL IN ADVANCE

For years it had been common knowledge that a city or town, about to embark on some civic project customarily held well in advance a large portion of the funds necessary to finance that project.

It made little difference whether these funds flowed from bond sales, tax revenues, or, as in most cases, a combination of both.

They were on hand—often as much as 6 months to a year before they would have to be expended.

COMMISSION RAISES QUESTION OF INVESTMENT

Taking due note of the fact that this was a relatively common practice, the Commission raised what seems today a painfully simple question:

Why can't communities that have such funds on hand invest them in short-term obligations or as other investors do—and thereby earn not only additional income but add to the national cash flow?

The result was the expected. In a remarkably short time an analysis was made of the conditions that would have to be met to permit such short-term investing, safeguards to be ensured, and legislative means to do the job where required.

MOST STATES ADOPT INVESTMENT LAW

A model law—it took only a single page—was written. Today this law, with occasional minor changes to reflect parochial needs, is on the books of most States, and still more are expected to adopt it during the next legislative year.

Another illustration involves the universal problem of tax administration.

Few communities today, hard pressed as they are to find efficient personnel and often limited by tight budgets, can find the time or the means to train competent tax administrators.

Yet in more instances than not, the local tax office is but yards away or sometimes in the same building as are the Federal tax offices.

INTERNAL REVENUE SERVICE EXTENDS AID

To the Commission is seemed preposterous that the Internal Revenue Service, which helps scores of nations throughout the world to establish and maintain efficient modern tax administration systems, could not provide an identical service for American communities.

An inquiry produced the information that minor changes in the Federal statutes to permit local communities to employ Federal instructors, with the provision that any revenues earned by such activities would be netted against the service's expenses, would have to be made.

In almost a trice this was done—again with a single page from the Advisory Commission.

IMPROVEMENT IN LOCAL TAX WORK NOTED

Thus today, the quality of local tax administration is being rapidly improved, solely because the commission is intolerant of a

system which tends to block the interchange of assistance and information between the Federal and State Governments.

Another perennial problem involves the question of State aid to local communities. In the absence of any better criteria, most States base their contributions to localities on a loose assumption of need that is determined by the amount of property taxes each community may collect.

In other words, the flow of funds from the State capital is largely determined by what each potential recipient receives in property taxes.

DANGEROUS RESULTS FROM STATE PRACTICE

This common practice has produced a not too surprising result that has become dangerously widespread:

Many local jurisdictions, in order to acquire larger amounts from their respective State governments, have deliberately set about wrecking their local property tax structures and systems, purposely to shave the volume of tax receipts collected.

While the Commission is well aware of this practice, it obviously could bring about few corrections if it were to indulge in pious protests, or if it started a tub-thumping propaganda campaign. Activities such as these, if noticed at all, would stimulate little more than scorn.

COMMISSION SEEKS PROOF OF PRACTICES

Rather in its characteristic way, the Commission has set about building its case reasonably confident that, when the States are confronted with the proof they themselves really want, commonsense will dictate a speedy retreat from a behavior pattern that is only a cut above nonsensical today.

Consequently, at this very moment Dr. Frederick F. Bird, who earned an enviable reputation as a tax expert at Dun & Bradstreet, is surveying some 10 or a dozen States, quietly accumulating evidence of countless activities that run counter to the public weal.

When the research is done, Dr. Bird will write his paper, and all it will require then is just one State to follow his and the Commission's recommendation.

STATES TEND TO FOLLOW THE LEADER

Shortly thereafter, the parade toward better administration of a vital problem will begin, for the individual States, no less than any other group, are susceptible to the contagion of follow the leader.

Still another instance concerns the tragic abuse of the concept of Federal grants-in-aid to the States and local communities.

To be sure there have been literally hundreds of protests in the past from the outraged, the discriminated against, the payers and the payees—in short, virtually everyone.

CAUSE OF DIFFICULTIES GOES UNSOUGHT

But the end product of these accumulated complaints is as hard to find as the shadow of a past smile, mainly because no one had bothered to find out the basic cause of the difficulties.

For instance, surprising as it may be, the Federal Government today still supports programs for grants-in-aid begun as far back as 1879. Some of these programs are obsolete; some functions have been absorbed by larger activities of more recent date, and in some instances the aid program has long since ceased—but the money keeps rolling out.

However, the Commission which recently completed an exhaustive study of the good and the bad in grants-in-aid, has prepared a bill now before Congress, that is startling in its simplicity.

CONGRESS SHOULD BE RESPONSIBLE

Since Congress must approve each grant-in-aid whatever its purpose may be, the Commission reasoned that Congress should

also be responsible for reviewing its own acts.

Consequently, the current bill provides (and its passage is deemed likely) that every 4 years the appropriate committee must review and reexamine whatever specific programs it originated.

Moreover, the bill states that every grant-in-aid will end automatically after 5 years, unless Congress specifically extends its life.

TEN MAJOR PROJECTS ALREADY COMPLETED

These are but a few of the Commission's "quiet" accomplishments in its relatively short lifetime. In all, it has completed 10 major projects of a similar nature. Some are now being used; more will be utilized as the legislative machinery is forthcoming.

It has before it an ambitious program, covering 14 of the more common problems confronting a nation that is composed for the most part of city dwellers. They run the gamut from local problems in industry location to the disposal of surplus Federal land holdings; from taxation of all kinds to basic administration.

COMMISSION IS NOT A POWER SEEKER

Recently reconstituted with a new panel of members, the commission is not, as some might suppose, seeking new domains to conquer.

On the contrary, it has quite enough to do with those that already exist.

IF OUR REPRESENTATIVES DO NOT LOOK OUT FOR OUR NATIONAL INTERESTS, THE CITIZENS ARE HELPLESS

Mr. LATTI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentlewoman from Ohio [Mrs. BOLTON] may extend her remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, one of my constituents, Mrs. Harold C. Schofield, 2680 North Moreland Boulevard, Cleveland, Ohio, wrote me such a forceful letter recently that I feel impelled to share it with you. She urged that the Congress must talk strong and act strong and stand for something positive. Under leave to extend my remarks, I quote her message pertinent to all Members of this House:

Many of us also feel very strongly that powers to alter tariffs should not be given to any President. Certain rights and functions have been reserved by the Constitution to be exercised by Congress and those include treaty arrangements, tariffs, and specific appropriation of funds. These are duties and privileges of the House and Senate and should be delegated only by Constitutional amendment by vote of the States. I do not believe that the Constitution provides for the giving away of its own powers by Congress to a person or department of the Government simply by its own vote.

Perhaps I am wrong. If so I should be glad to be informed.

Gradually the power and prestige of the House is declining as it fails to maintain its prerogatives and passes its powers on to others, either by yielding to pressure to spend beyond our income and thus weakening our economy, or by allowing the President to spend large undesignated sums at his discretion.

If our representatives in Congress do not look out for the national interests, the citizens are helpless.

Your constituency is solidly behind you but are counting on you for positive action in these matters.

Very sincerely,

IRENE P. SCHOFIELD.
(Mrs. H. C.)

CONGRESS SHOULD UNDERTAKE INVESTIGATION OF STATE DEPARTMENT

Mr. LATTI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. ROUSSELOT] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. ROUSSELOT. Mr. Speaker, on several occasions I have publicly stated that I feel Congress should undertake an investigation of the State Department. Today, I introduced House Resolution 586 providing for an investigation of the Department. My resolution reads as follows:

H. RES. 586

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives in Congress assembled, That the Committee on Foreign Affairs, acting as a whole or by subcommittee, shall conduct a full and complete investigation and study of the personnel and policymaking practices, procedures, and methods of the Department of State, with a view to recommending such changes therein as may be required to implement more advantageously and rapidly the response of the United States to world developments, and to insure that the best interests of the United States are being served in its struggle with communism.

For the purpose of carrying out this resolution the committee or subcommittee is authorized to sit and act during the present Congress at such times and places within the United States, including any Commonwealth or possession thereof, or elsewhere, whether the House is in session, has recessed, or has adjourned, to hold such hearings, and to require, by subpoena or otherwise, the attendance and testimony of such witnesses and the production of such books, records, correspondence, memorandums, papers, and documents as it deems necessary. Subpoena may be issued under the signature of the chairman of the committee or any member of the committee designated by him, and may be served by any person designated by such chairman or member.

The committee shall report to the House as soon as practicable during the present Congress the results of its investigation and study, together with such recommendations as it deems advisable. Any such report which is made when the House is not in session shall be filed with the Clerk of the House.

The investigation which I contemplate would not be a witch hunt, as some people would claim. It would be a carefully planned inquiry into the role of the Department in developing and executing foreign policy and how the Department has performed in this all-important role.

At crucial periods in our battle against the international Communist conspiracy, the Department has promoted policies which manifest a serious lack of understanding of the nature and aims of communism.

We know that communism is the antithesis of a free, capitalistic society such

as ours. The Communist seeks to subvert and destroy every vestige of individual political and economic freedom. Yet, our State Department condones the giving of aid, military as well as economic, to Marshal Tito of Yugoslavia.

We know Communists are untrustworthy. They are completely amoral. To them the end justifies the means. Yet, our State Department continues to support the formation of coalition governments in the Congo, Laos, and South Vietnam with Communists or pro-Communists in key posts.

We know that Communists regard socialism as a transition stage toward the fulfillment of their primary goal, namely, total state control over the individual and the means of production and distribution. Yet, our State Department seems to support the belief that socialism can best solve the problems of emerging nations.

There are others in Congress who feel as I do. We are not alarmists. We only seek to find out what must be done to enable our State Department to represent the capitalist or American viewpoint more effectively.

Mr. Bryton Barron, former Chief of the Treaty Staff of the Department of State, is in the process of writing a book which he will title "The Untouchable State Department." In the first chapter of the book, Mr. Barron discusses the need for a congressional investigation of the Department. This chapter was copyrighted in 1962 by Bryton Barron. The text of the chapter follows:

THE UNTOUCHABLE STATE DEPARTMENT

(By Bryton Barron, author of "Inside the State Department")

CHAPTER I—THE CALL FOR AN INVESTIGATION

Whenever there is a discussion of the situation in the State Department, someone is sure to throw up his hands in despair and exclaim that nothing can be done about it because employees of the bureaucracy are "wired into" their jobs and cannot be removed. I propose therefore at the very outset of this writing to correct that impression.

To demonstrate the ease with which staff members of the State Department, even veteran civil service employees, can be ousted almost overnight—and without too much difficulty—when those in power really have a mind to do so, I might cite the case of two historians who were summarily ousted a few years back because they had embarrassed the Department by protesting (1) the suppression and mutilation of the record of secret diplomatic deals, and (2) the collapse of the promised housecleaning. But more to the point were precedents earlier set by Secretary Dulles in dealing with two key policy advisers.

Precedents for housecleaning

The precedents I suggest as a basis for necessary action relate to officers in the Foreign Service, which makes the cases the more noteworthy, since under the Wriston plan adopted for the Department, most of the policymaking positions in Washington—except, of course, the relatively few held by political appointees—are filled by Foreign Service officers, as are also the diplomatic posts overseas. It is likewise noteworthy that these rulings do not rest on loyalty and security grounds—which latter, even when warranted, are often difficult to establish.

Each was the case of an officer who had been involved in the China debacle and who

was ousted because he had, in brief, failed to measure up to proper standards of performance and judgment. Here, in other words, were precedents that should have been followed in succeeding years in view of the failure of other State Department advisers to exercise proper judgment, as reflected in the continuing disastrous trend of foreign policy. The first of these cases was that of John Carter Vincent, who was forced into retirement in March 1953. Mr. Dulles did not label the official as a "security risk" nor did he challenge Mr. Vincent's loyalty; instead the Secretary announced this simple conclusion: "Mr. Vincent's reporting of the facts, evaluation of the facts, and policy advice during the period under review show a failure to meet the standard which is demanded by a Foreign Service officer of his experience and responsibility at this critical time. I do not believe that he can usefully continue to serve the United States as a Foreign Service officer."

Similarly, in the case of John Patton Davies, Jr., who was fired in November 1954, the Secretary did not find the officer disloyal "in the sense of having any communistic affinity or consciously aiding or abetting any alien elements hostile to the United States," but Mr. Dulles went on to say that "Under the present Executive order on security, it is not enough that an employee be of complete and unswerving loyalty. He must be reliable, trustworthy, of good conduct and character." Mr. Dulles added: "The members of the Security Hearing Board unanimously found that Mr. Davies' lack of judgment, discretion, reliability raises a reasonable doubt that his continued employment in the Foreign Service of the United States is clearly consistent with the interests of national security. This is a conclusion which I am also compelled to reach as a result of my review of the case."

Secretary Dulles' action in these cases was a step in fulfillment of the 1952 pledge to the American people that "we shall eliminate from the State Department and from every Federal office all, wherever they may be found, who share responsibility for the needless predicaments and perils in which we find ourselves." His language in the two cases may have been milder than critics desired, but there can be no denying that his procedure was effective—it got the men out of the Department, which was the important thing.

Wrong elements in saddle

Unfortunately, the pressures from the men who remained around Mr. Dulles in the Department, as well as pressures from without, soon wore down his resolve. The housecleaning collapsed early in the Dulles period, and the forces and individuals that precipitated the original mess regained control in the State Department. The Nation paid dearly for this in the disastrous years that followed—in Cuba, Berlin, and Laos—and in the shocking record of later personnel actions by the Department. We find, for example, that Robert Strong, who, according to sworn testimony, sent out misleading reports from Formosa helpful to the Communists, was subsequently given a superior service award by the Department; that Victor Purse, who accepted a new automobile for his wife as a tip from a foreign monarch for services rendered in an official capacity, was similarly given, subsequently, a superior service award; that Roy Rubottom, who was in charge of this country's relations with Latin America during the period that a Red base was set up 90 miles from our shores and who, incidentally, telegraphed the Governor of California not to execute a convicted sex offender in that State because it might arouse a mob in some Latin American country, was subsequently given a choice ambassadorial post; that William Wieland, who, according to sworn testimony, was helpful to Castro in the takeover in Cuba, was not fired but was

instead given a promotion by the Department.

In a later chapter I tell of glaring cases in which our experts on foreign policy have, to use Mr. Dulles' words, failed to meet the standard properly demanded of men of their experience and responsibility at this critical time and should therefore have been removed from office. Why have they not been removed? Why have the architects of disastrous policies been retained, promoted, protected? The American people are entitled to know the answers to such questions.

Congressional action urged

Since successive Secretaries of State have failed to effect the housecleaning which Dulles started and then dropped, the public has no choice but to call on Congress to step in and make a full-fledged investigation of this and other aspects of the situation in the State Department.

Such an investigation by Congress was proposed by Representative RICHARD L. ROUDEBUSH in a House resolution which he submitted early in 1962, which would provide that the House Committee on Foreign Affairs "conduct a full and complete investigation and study of the policymaking procedures, methods of assessing foreign developments, and personnel practices, of the Department of State, with a view to making such recommendations as may be necessary in order to implement more advantageously and rapidly the response of the United States to world developments, and to insure that the best interests of the United States are being served in its struggle with communism." In recommending approval of his proposal, the Indiana Congressman declared:

"Mr. Speaker, millions of Americans are today worried, perplexed, and vitally concerned with the negative trend of the U.S. global struggle with the Communist conspiracy to enslave the world * * *"

"The responsibility for the American response to communism lies with our Department of State.

"There has been open and honest criticism from many segments of our population, questioning the wisdom of this Department in bringing the full American capability into action against our greatest foe in history.

"Limiting ourselves to recent developments only, we are reminded of the U.S. setbacks in Laos, Cuba, Berlin, Vietnam, and other trouble spots.

"There is also much concern about the granting of foreign aid to Communist countries which profess independence of Moscow.

"Americans are also disturbed about some aspects of American participation in United Nations activities which often reflect programs and policies detrimental to our interests.

"With these developments in mind, it appears that a close scrutiny of State Department planning and personnel is in order with the aim of insuring that the best interest of America is obtained at all times in the continuing struggle with our Communist enemies."

It is recognized, of course, that the submission of the resolution by Congressman ROUDEBUSH is no guarantee that the investigation will be conducted. The proposal may die in the Rules Committee; for partisan political reasons it may fail of approval in the House; even if approved by the House, it may suffer from lack of support in the committee which would be charged with the task. This last-mentioned danger is illustrated by the fate that has befallen the investigation by a Senate subcommittee into the censoring of anti-Communist warnings from the speeches of our military leaders. It is an open secret that several members of the Senate Armed Services Committee had little interest in Senator THURMOND's revelations and only voted for the investigation

because they dared not go on record against it in the face of the overwhelming demand from the grassroots. And when the Pentagon and the White House resorted to the Executive fifth amendment (the claim to Executive privilege) in order to prevent the Senators from interrogating the officials who had done the censoring, the subcommittee chairman accepted the White House gag with such alacrity that even the Washington Post chided him for it.

In the case of the House Foreign Affairs Committee, which would conduct the probe of the State Department under the terms of Congressman ROUDEBUSH's resolution, the voting record of the committee chairman, THOMAS E. MORGAN, of Pennsylvania, is in no wise encouraging. Neither is that of the chairman of the Subcommittee on State Department Organization and Foreign Operations, WAYNE L. HAYS, of Ohio, to which subcommittee the task might be referred. The CSA voting index shows both MORGAN and HAYS with zero ratings in support of measures of this type, while the ACA index gives them a mere 9 percent and 16 percent, respectively, in support of constitutional principles.

Fortunately the concern of the folks back home regarding the situation in the State Department has already been voiced by some of Congressman ROUDEBUSH's most distinguished colleagues.

Wrote Congressman H. R. Gross, of Iowa, in his report to his constituents on January 10, 1962:

"One of the most important items of business the new Congress should tackle immediately is to force a thorough shakeup and reorganization of the State Department.

"The desperate need for this action was made clear in connection with the Cuban invasion fiasco. But to the initiated in Washington the need has been abundantly clear for several years. Not only has the State Department failed time after time to properly assess foreign developments and thereby failed to make immediate and proper decisions, but it has repeatedly dictated to all other departments and agencies of Government.

"It is now known that the Federal Bureau of Investigation made available to the State Department in 1958, months before the revolutionary government in Cuba took over, a report which then branded Castro and his leading henchmen as disciples of Marx and Lenin.

"This report was buried in an office headed by William Wieland, director of Caribbean and Mexican Affairs. Neither Secretary of State Dulles, his successor, Christian Herter, nor the then President Eisenhower were made aware of the FBI report.

"But when the facts did become known, what happened to Wieland? Instead of being fired for burying a report which would have put Eisenhower and his Secretary of State on notice that Castro was a disciple of the Kremlin, Wieland, as is usual in the State Department, was promoted to another job in the same department with a substantial increase in pay.

"When Presidents and members of their Cabinets reward this kind of stupidity, incompetence and worse there is something rotten and it isn't, as the old saying goes, in Denmark."

Congressman BRUCE ALGER, of Texas, is similarly on record as follows:

"It's time to call the State Department to account. Much of our bungling in international affairs may be because we are slowly becoming the victims of a supergovernment known as the State Department. Many of our mistakes in foreign policy in recent years may be traced directly to decisions of the State Department, often made in defiance of known facts or in opposition to the administration in power. It is imperative that we find out now who is running the State Department and who is respon-

sible for its policies. Only a brief recitation of the failures of the State Department shows they resulted in the loss of China to the Reds, the slow, steady march of communism through Asia, the loss of Laos, and the loss of Cuba right on our doorstep. It is time we call a halt to bungling with a thorough investigation of the State Department and its personnel."

The grim realities which I sketched in my book, "Inside the State Department," are increasingly being recognized. Certain elements sought to suppress that book, but it has nonetheless continued in demand, and a fifth printing will shortly be necessary.

Mounting indignation

There are many indications of the mounting concern of the American public on this issue. A petition circulated from New York reads:

"For some years past our foreign policy has been against the best interests of the United States and has caused this country irreparable harm.

"China and Cuba are two outstanding examples. To quote Senators JAMES O. EASTLAND and THOMAS J. DODD, respectively, chairman and vice chairman of the Senate Subcommittee on Internal Security, in a statement in the press:

"Cuba was handed to Castro and the Communists by a combination of Americans in the same way that China was handed to the Communists."

"The responsibility for these decisions appears to rest with the State Department, principally with lower level officials.

"Who are these individuals? Are they merely innocent, misguided persons? Or are alien influences operating among them? At any rate the country is in dire danger.

"Representative DANIEL J. FLOOD, of Pennsylvania, said in an address delivered in June 1960:

"The condition clearly calls for a housecleaning of such elements in the Department of State, and their replacement with officials more conscious of their oath of office, which binds them to support and defend the Constitution of the United States against all enemies, foreign and domestic, as well as the just and indispensable rights and authority of the Congress."

"The time for a thorough investigation and for such a housecleaning is long past due. As American citizens we demand that it be made thoroughly and as promptly as possible."

Typical of the indications of public concern was a radio broadcast by Kent Courtney calling for "public hearings to determine who and what is wrong in our State Department." The commentator, who is publisher of the Independent American newspaper and national chairman of the Conservative Society of America, brought out that the State conventions of the American Legion in both California and Texas had called for an investigation of the State Department.

Along the same lines was a leading article some months back in the Reader's Digest, in which the writer said:

"Since the days when we were told that the Chinese Communists were mere agrarian reformers, too many men in the State Department have persisted in the dangerously wistful belief that if we don't annoy the Reds, they are bound to see how well meaning we are and will stop harassing us. Incredibly, this philosophy has infected the highest quarters of our Government. And all the while the Kremlin, teasing our naive desire to reach an understanding through the outworn traditions of polite negotiation, toys with us by hot and cold maneuvering as it inches forward toward total victory."

Dissatisfaction with the State Department is, incidentally, not confined to any one element in the body politic. Note, for example, how the weekly magazine, the

Reporter, chose to advertise its issue of March 15 of this year:

"The Reporter tells how General Clay took the Berlin situation firmly in hand—before his hands were tied by the State Department. It shows how most of his positive moves were undermined or countermanded * * * how the State Department's soft stand belies its hard words * * * how one disillusioned West Berliner summed up the city's attitude by suggesting that the United States next retaliatory tactic against new Communist harassment might be a hunger strike."

Indicative of the temper of the times is a sharply worded resolution of the American Coalition of Patriotic Societies which has come to hand as this is being written. The resolution calls for exhaustive inquiries of the type which Congressman ROUBUSH proposed for the State Department and asks that Congress "make known that no excuses, no evasions, no poor memories or pretended anonymity, no shielding by higher-ups to protect political party names, no sudden transfers to distant posts will be tolerated; and that any official, of whatever rank, who attempts to frustrate or hinder the Congress in the exercise of its constitutional powers to investigate will be subject to impeachment. The coalition, it should be added, coordinates the efforts of more than 100 patriotic, civic, and fraternal societies with millions of members in the aggregate.

Many of the Nation's great newspapers—and here I particularly call to mind the New York Daily News, the Chicago Tribune, the New Bedford Standard-Times, and the Brooklyn Tablet—have long given editorial support to efforts to clean up the State Department. Others are joining in the demand for an investigation, as is illustrated by the following from the Arizona Republic:

"It is necessary only to point out that time and again, for whatever reason, persons or groups in the State Department have been guilty of incompetence at best and treason at worst, in situations ranging from the misinformation about Mao Tse-tung's agrarian reformers to misinformation about Fidel Castro's agrarian reformers.

"We believe, therefore, the Government owes it to all Americans to discover why we have staggered from blunder to blunder, from defeat to defeat, and find who is responsible. Only in that way can the State Department regain the respect and support of the American Nation."

Surgical operation advised

The realization that steps must be taken to correct the situation in the State Department is reflected in recent issues of the Reader's Digest and the Saturday Evening Post. In an excellent article in the former for January 1962, Frank L. Kluckholm, a veteran journalist who served in an official capacity in the Department in the last administration, tells how the present setup is falling us in the cold war, concluding with these words: "We must shake up the system at the State Department and bring about some real reforms. Now." Senator THOMAS DODD, of Connecticut, is quoted in the article as follows: "I believe that the time has come for a critical review of this entire situation. Those responsible for briefing us into disaster after disaster should be dismissed or transferred to nonpolicymaking posts where their penchant for wrongheadedness can do no harm."

In the Saturday Evening Post for March 3, 1962, Stewart Alsop writes on "The Trouble With the State Department," which trouble he attributes to the system.

One of Mr. Alsop's most significant proposals, presented, so he tells us, after his having talked with the present Secretary of State, two former Secretaries of State, and dozens of other knowledgeable people both in and out of the Department, calls for

a "surgical operation." He reports that George Kennan, who, according to the accepted belief, is one of the two or three most brilliant men the State Department career service has produced, believes—now please note this—"that the State Department might well operate more effectively with half as many people." Mr. Alsop further reports that when Dean Rusk took over as Secretary of State, Dean Acheson suggested that former Secretary of Defense Robert Lovett and Acheson himself should perform a surgical operation on the bureaucracy, to cut the staff by 30 percent. Rusk, we are told, demurred.

This is of more than passing interest to me personally, as well as to the taxpayer, because when the administration changed hands in 1953, I spelled out a 50-percent cut, which I urged, in a memorandum to the incoming Under Secretary for Administration. Mr. Dulles was, in fact, committed to something of the kind, for his party platform had pledged that "we shall sever from the public payroll the hordes of loafers, incompetents and unnecessary employees who clutter the administration of foreign affairs."

The pledge not having been fulfilled, I renewed the recommendation when I testified before congressional appropriation committees following my retirement. Representatives of the bureaucracy loudly pooh-poohed the idea, and a witness for State, an appointed official who barely knew his way around the Department, denounced my proposal as "irresponsible"—the latter term being a favorite bureaucratic cuss word. Now we know not only that Dulles was pledged to a drastic cut but also that even George Kennan and Dean Acheson, both the idols of many in the Department, also favor a "surgical operation". Yet year after year the Department has requested increased funds for additional personnel, and the Congress year after year has acquiesced in the mounting payroll.

A few years ago when certain shortcomings of the Department were attributed by spokesmen to a cut in funds, with the blame thereby shifted to ROONEY (Congressman JOHN ROONEY, of Brooklyn, chairman of the House Appropriations Subcommittee which handles State Department requests), the retort from ROONEY was a boast of how generous he had been with the taxpayers' money. Said Mr. ROONEY:

"Take the Foreign Service Institute. In 1952 we gave it \$1,245,000; the next year the Republicans cut it to \$768,000. In 1955, when we got back in, we gave it more than \$2 million. Last year, \$4,679,000. Who's doing any slashing there? Holy cat.

"And while we're at it, let's take up that consulate matter; let's take a look at the appropriations for 'Salaries and expenses'—90 percent of the whole budget. In 1953, the Department got \$65,600,000. Last year they got \$98,088,000. You call that slashing?"

And while I am at it, let me bring the story of ROONEY's munificence more nearly up to date. In the hearings for the current fiscal year, it is revealed that the expenditures for "Salaries and expenses" for the year ending last June 30 had risen to \$121,496,183 out of a total grant of \$278,528,804. To think that Cordell Hull used to operate the Department on a mere \$17 million.

By December 31 of last year, the Department of State—which has already outgrown its new building, the largest office building in Washington—had a total on its payroll, at home and abroad, of almost 40,000 employees—39,084, to be exact. This figure, which includes the staff engaged in the foreign giveaway programs, was supplied by the Congressional Joint Committee on the Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures.

Quite understandably, the writer for the Saturday Evening Post put the need for a "surgical operation" at the head of the list of things to be done. He contends, however,

that in the absence of authorization from Congress, a general overhaul cannot be effected, because of present Foreign Service, civil service, and veterans' legislation. He argues that when the State Department is hit by a RIF—reduction in force—the good new people go, while the drones, as he terms them, protected by veterans' legislation and seniority, stay on.

A congressional investigating committee would do well to explore the considerations just mentioned and come up with appropriate legislative measures. But more imperative is the need for the removal, without further delay, of the John Carter Vincents and John Patton Davies of the present day, following the precedents set by the late John Foster Dulles, as outlined earlier. If any renewal of legislative authority is necessary in this connection, it should be provided forthwith.

The reporter for the Saturday Evening Post, evidently reflecting the views of Acheson, Kennan, and others of that school of thought, would go so far as to have top officials authorized to hire, fire, and promote as they pleased. The Dulles precedents were set without so broad a grant. Despite the admitted defects in the present machinery, there are still a goodly number of Americans who would hesitate to give a completely free hand to very many of the top officials of the Department in recent memory.

Watchdog committee essential

One sad lesson which the American people must surely have learned through the years from the Teapot Dome scandal, the Hiss case, the China debacle, and the Cuban disaster is that the executive branch of the Federal Government cannot be trusted to cleanse its stables. Pressure from Congress always becomes necessary to get the job done. Nor can the task be safely delegated to a single official, as has been repeatedly demonstrated in the failures in past attempts at housecleaning. John Foster Dulles made a start at it, but he soon yielded to pressures both inside and outside the Department; before long he was backing the very elements he was pledged to purge from the rolls. Donald B. Lourie, a successful businessman and former all-American quarterback, was given a post in 1953 specially created by Congress with a view to correcting the situation, but he encountered so much resistance that he chucked the job after a year and went back to private life. To Scott McLeod, who came into the Department with powerful backing on Capitol Hill, was given the task of eliminating security risks, but he, too, succumbed to pressures and eventually chose to "play with the team." Fresh hopes were raised when the son of Herbert Hoover was brought in as Under Secretary, but he was crowded out before he had accomplished anything. From this recital there is only one possible conclusion: Congress must set up a watchdog committee to follow developments and see that the housecleaning job really gets done.

Must get at the truth

If a full and complete investigation is to be conducted—and there is little point in having anything less than that—the congressional committee must have full access to pertinent documents, for only in that way can responsibility be fixed with certainty. It would be folly for some higher-up to assume a coverup role when, on interrogation, it developed, as it did when Under Secretary Ball appeared before the Senate investigators of the censoring of military men, that the higher-up official in reality knew nothing about what had been going on in his Department. The committee could hardly hope to get at the truth about the Cuban disaster, for example, by talking with Secretary Rusk; the William Wielands and the Roy Rubottoms must be quizzed.

The difficulty is heightened by the extent to which the policymakers have succeeded in suppressing official papers dealing with diplomatic activities. When Congress in 1953 ordered the publication of the full record of our foreign relations brought up to date, the Department promised to comply. This record was then some 17 years in arrears, so much so as to be worthless for current purposes. Some fragmentary collections of these papers had, to be sure, been released, as in the case of the infamous China white paper, but these heightened public suspicions. Today the situation is even worse, for now the record is further than ever in arrears. As a sop to critics, the Department has assembled and reprinted formal documents released on various occasions, but the basic purposes of our policy planners, which would show up in working papers, remain hidden.

When Donald Dozer and I revealed some years ago that the Department was deliberately dragging its feet in this matter, the coverup artists were violent in their denials, as was to be expected. Time has substantiated our charge. In the same connection I testified that the published record, as in the case of the Yalta papers, was being doctored. Department officials were emphatic in asserting that nothing whatever of importance had been omitted. Some time later, however, they got around to admitting that there might have been one or two little deletions—but nothing, absolutely nothing, of any importance. Among the deletions finally admitted were papers dealing with the problem of the Berlin corridor, which is hardly a subject of minor importance these days.

Papers on Teheran and Potsdam were finally brought out last year, but even this was not done until after a citizens' committee had taken the matter up directly with men on Capitol Hill and with President Eisenhower himself. But the truth about the China debacle is still hidden, and the record as a whole is now not 17 but a full 20 years in arrears and unavailable.

In the course of House appropriation hearings in 1960, some years after my revelations regarding the censoring of the official diplomatic record, Congressman FRANK BOW of Ohio interrogated a Department spokesman at some length to determine to what extent not only individuals within the Department but foreign governments as well can cause documents to be suppressed. The Congressman was forced to the unhappy conclusion that what is given out to the American people is limited to what the officials feel the public should be told.

I have always been glad that I left the Department under circumstances that permitted no doubt as to my opposition to developing trends in the bureaucracy. The circumstances validated my right to speak out in the years that have followed. After I testified before the House Appropriations Subcommittee to urge a housecleaning and a 50 percent cut in personnel, the bureaucracy and its fellow travelers struck back in an attempt to smear me. I had been "insubordinate," they said. The state of affairs in the Department being what it was, the assertion that I had revolted could, I believe, be taken as a compliment. I was "disgruntled," they said. Friends of recent years who know what a relief it was to me to leave the alien atmosphere of the bureaucracy can laugh at that one. The net result of the smear attack on me, as Bill Buckley pointed out in the National Review at the time, was that my book was sent into another printing and I received many additional requests to speak to interested groups across the land—and wonderful audiences they were.

Of my experiences in the Department, and likewise those of my colleague, Donald Dozer,

I think that Senator Jenner summed up the situation well when he wrote in this connection: "Every man in our Government who attempts to make it a policy to safeguard America and support the nations which wish to remain free, will encounter the unforgiving enmity of the group in high places who are determined to carry on, by revolution, by assembly line, the slow but unceasing construction of the world collectivist state."

The danger analyzed

Because of my having served so many years in the State Department, both before the days of Alger Hiss and thereafter, and because of my known opposition to communism, I often receive appeals for help in identifying the Red cell or cells which inquirers assume to be the source of our troubles there. This is something best left to the FBI. Scott McLeod, himself a former FBI agent, once stated that he had found not one Communist in the State Department in his years at the head of the security work there.

If in this we are referring to card-carrying Communists as such, then I feel that we tend to miss the issue, for our primary concern must be with the policymakers. Soft on communism many of the latter obviously are, but that is not to say that they are actually Communists at heart. But here let me say that I doubt that any Red agents straight from Moscow could possibly do more harm to America than has been done, and is being done, by these officials of the Department, unwittingly or otherwise, through the disastrous policies which they have devised, recommended, and promoted in recent years.

To carry this thought further I cannot do better than to quote from the Indianapolis News, where Stan Evans, who knows the Washington scene from his days on the staff of Human Events, conducts an able editorial column. The following statement is a classic on the subject:

"Subversion, as the recent defections from the National Security Agency demonstrate, is indeed a danger—much more so than the liberals would have us believe. But it is not the principal danger—and it is not what most anti-Communists refer to when they say the real problem is internal.

"The internal danger, instead, is liberalism itself. It is the complex of beliefs, slogans, and biases which substitutes disastrous illusions for the hard imperatives of realistic policy; which bemuses the American mind with reveries of world opinion and understanding with the Communists, and which pursues fantasies designed to win the cold war by giving billions of dollars to Communist nations. It is the mentality which has led America into the paths of weakness and delusion and which has handed the Kremlin one victory after another.

"It was the internal threat of liberalism, for example, which needlessly betrayed anti-Communist governments in Poland and Yugoslavia; which made fantastic concessions to Stalin at Yalta and Teheran; which told us Mao Tse-tung was an agrarian reformer, and consigned 600 million Chinese to the living death of communism; which portrayed Fidel Castro as a Latin George Washington and turned Cuba over to the Kremlin; which at this moment is helping undermine the anti-Communist regime of Moïse Tshombe in the Congo.

"In each of these episodes, a policy of minimal intelligence would have thwarted the objectives of the Communists. Instead, in each one the Communists won or are winning a major victory, thanks to our liberal-directed policy. * * *

"The United States today is by far the strongest nation in the world. If its strength is used intelligently, it has, even today, little to fear from communism. What it does have to fear is the likelihood that, under the

liberal stewardship, its strength will not be used, or will be used stupidly, or worst of all, will be used to defeat anti-Communists and aid pro-Communists (as has been the case in the Congo)."

Spotlight those responsible

In any investigation of the State Department too much time should not be spent with the top officials, for it is the men down the line, the area officials, the career men, who do the work and actually make policy. I have observed this fact under many Secretaries of State. Newspaper accounts tend to give an entirely false impression, and it takes sworn testimony, as in the hearings on the Cuban debacle, to bring out the realities of the situation. Said our former Ambassador to Cuba, Earl Smith, before the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee on August 30, 1960:

"I have learned from experience and observation that in our system the actions by the lower echelon and those who are influential in the lower echelon form our policy, and when those higher act upon them, the policies have already been determined by events."

Many veteran observers have testified likewise. Cordell Hull, who served as Secretary of State longer than any other man has ever done, wrote in his memoirs regarding the key role of the desk officer in the making of policy. John Foster Dulles was the one Secretary of State who was assumed to be an exception to the rule in this regard, but when one of the news magazines was permitted to have a reported stay with Mr. Dulles throughout a full working day in the Department, it was found that he was in constant consultation with his specialists, obviously guided by their recommendations.

Recently the following item appeared in U.S. News & World Report:

"On the question of who really runs the U.S. Government, a top-ranking Kennedy appointee remarked: 'Those of us with big titles sign the mail, but career officials of the civil service run the show.'"

In January 1949 John F. Kennedy, now President of the United States but then a Congressman from Massachusetts, declared with reference to the foreign policy at that time: "It is of the utmost importance that we search out and spotlight those who must bear the responsibility for our present predicament." The principle is as valid today as it was in 1949. The executive branch having failed to deal with the situation, the burden now rests with the Congress. Because of the uncertainties of congressional action, however, and because of the bias of much of the press and TV, one who knows about the mess at firsthand, as I do, owes it to his country to help shed light on the situation.

While it is not feasible within the covers of this one book to spotlight every one of the hundreds of policymakers on the payroll of the Secretary of State, one chapter, as previously stated, will survey a few of these careers. The reader will then be in a better position to say for himself whether men of the type indicated should be retained and promoted, as in the past, or dealt with as were John Carter Vincent and John Paton Davies.

Remember, they praised Alger Hiss

The general public—and Members of Congress as well—would be well advised not to take pronouncements from the bureaucracy at anything like face value. Recently Congressman JOHANSEN, of Michigan, declared that he was fed up and for many reasons, one being that he was "fed up with American officials deliberately lying to the Nation and the world—as, for example, denying in U.N. debate that we had intervened in Cuba and later admitting to the press that we had trained, financed and equipped the Cuban invaders." In a sub-

sequent chapter I enumerate a long series of similar instances in which our foreign-policy officials have deceived the American people.

Nor can the evaluation by diplomatic officials of their own colleagues be trusted. After all, did not a whole coterie of them testify to the spotless character of one Alger Hiss?

Extremists at the top

Having made clear that it is the career officials, rather than the political appointees upon whom the spotlight of an investigation needs to be turned, we can discuss the top officers and new men brought in with the recent change of administration without overplaying their role. According to the writer in the Saturday Evening Post, there were in the State, at the time he wrote, 74 officials in this group, the Kennedy appointees. As a former Rhodes scholar myself, the first thing that hit me as I went down the list was the frequency with which the names of other Rhodes scholars appeared on the list. First there is the Secretary of State himself, a former Rhodes man; and then we come to George C. McGhee, Under Secretary of State for Political Affairs; Harlan Cleveland, Assistant Secretary of State for International Organization Affairs; and Walt Whitman Rostow, Counselor and Chairman of the Policy Planning Council—all of them Rhodes men, with still others on down the list.

Quite frankly, this is too much of a good thing. Most of these particular officials are of the extreme left wing, ADA school of thought. Moreover, the recent utterances of Senator FULBRIGHT, the most widely known of Rhodes scholars, with his disparaging remarks about the Constitution, his belittling attacks on our military leaders, his readiness to surrender our sovereignty as a Nation, and his open advocacy of what constitutes a virtual dictatorship in the United States, have deeply shocked millions of good Americans who could think of no other explanation for such reasoning than the fact that FULBRIGHT had been trained at Oxford as a Rhodes scholar.

If it was Oxford men that Mr. Kennedy wanted, it might have been far more reassuring to the public if he had brought in, instead, two whose names come to mind, namely, Frank Holman and Alexander Dick. Holman is a former head of the American Bar Association and the man who authored the Bricker amendment and led the fight for its adoption. The other gentleman is a New York lawyer who led a group of Rhodes men in the fight to retain the Connally reservation. There, for a change, we would have men—both of them Rhodes scholars—who believe 100 percent in constitutional principles and the American way of life.

It may be, of course, that Mr. Kennedy thought that the presence of so many Rhodes men would kindle an "intellectual" air in what someone once termed "a den of thieves." But in sober truth it must be conceded that in the initial winning of a Rhodes scholarship, the way the system is operated, the facile type rather than the profound thinker has the advantage; and I do not recall that any of Kennedy's men in State won more than an ordinary degree at Oxford or made any great splash in doing so.

The official record of the first man on the list fails to inspire any particular confidence. Fulton Lewis has reminded us that Dean Rusk, as Assistant Secretary of State under Dean Acheson, 'parroted the line, just before the Korean war, that the Chinese Communists were 'agrarian reformers,' revolutionaries much like the American Founding Fathers."

Mr. Lewis also recalls that when the Korean conflict broke out, "Rusk was instrumental in keeping the United States from going all out to win the war. He vetoed the

Joint Chiefs' suggestion that battle-trained National Chinese troops be brought into the war, and helped persuade President Truman to prevent General MacArthur from going across the Yalu."

I recall first meeting Mr. Rusk when he came into the Department to take over the post formerly held by Alger Hiss. As chief of the treaty staff at the time, I was called in to advise the new official briefly on certain points. There was nothing on that or subsequent occasions to suggest that congressional investigators should be awed by Dean Rusk's views on current matters.

Another of the Rhodes men on the list of appointed officials, Harlan Cleveland has met with severe criticism on his role in the Congo matter.

Non-Rhodes men in the group of appointed officials include George Ball, the Under Secretary of State, and G. Mennen Williams, Assistant Secretary of State for African Affairs, who as Governor of Michigan led his State into virtual bankruptcy. Ball revealed his utter ignorance of what was going on in the Department in his initial testimony before the Stennis subcommittee. As for "Soapy," I doubt that anyone takes him seriously in his present role.

The turnover among political appointees to the Department is usually rapid, as in the case of Chester Bowles, who lasted only a few months in the No. 2 spot. Not infrequently the men with the high-sounding titles are bewildered by the bureaucratic maze and the ramifications and complexities of foreign policy. Dependent on their advisers at every turn, they are soon taken in by the clever operators in the Department—and, no change having been made at the working level, the policies continue much the same from one administration to the next.

Trouble traced to the system

Some observers attribute our troubles in the Department to certain aspects of the system, to the exclusion of factors which I have reviewed in the foregoing, such as the activities and influence of men like John Carter Vincent, John Paton Davies, and William Wieland. By the term "system," as employed in this particular sense, is meant the cumbersome bureaucratic machinery—the delays and uncertainties, the flood of memorandums and other papers, and the unending round of committee meetings—as well as the nice mixture of noncontroversialness and colorless semicompetence—which, as all agree, has rendered the Department seemingly incapable in recent years of rendering prompt and effective action.

The articles in the Reader's Digest and the Saturday Evening Post to which I have referred dwell at some length on depressing aspects of this system, which could be summed up in the question of the White House aid who could not get from the Department certain policy information he needed. "What the devil do these people do all day?"

It is a question which I have often been asked and one which I answered in my book, "Inside the State Department." I will have more to say regarding the system, particularly with respect to certain of its truly vicious aspects, in a later chapter. I do not share Kennan's view that nothing can be done to correct this situation. Cutting the staff down to a reasonable size would be a big step in that direction. The present cumbersome procedures came with the overstaffing. The Post writer admits as much when he says: "Ten or fifteen years ago, before the system really took hold, it required a day or two to get approval for routine negotiations. Now it often requires 6 to 8 weeks. The man-hours devoted to really grave issues stretch into eons."

It is to be hoped, however, that neither the public nor any congressional committee will allow attention to be diverted too

long by matters of procedure or organizational setup. It is a well-established axiom that any system will work if the right men are on the job. If we will oust the appeasers and install in their places men who believe in American principles with all their hearts and are determined that we shall win the cold war, the State Department can regain its proper role, never fear.

An alarming parallel

Use of the term "the system" brings up something which merits the most earnest attention in any investigation of the State Department. I refer to the widespread fear in large segments of the American public that the thinking of the State Department is dominated by an outside unofficial body, the Council of Foreign Relations (the CFR); that the council, with its interlock in radio, TV, and major elements in the press, along with other similar organizations, is responsible in large measure for the adoption and pursuit of the policies which have proved so disastrous in recent years; and that council members hold key posts in the State Department and elsewhere throughout the Federal Government.

These charges have been documented at some lengths in the weekly Dan Smoot Report. Himself a former FBI agent, Dan Smoot is one of the keenest present-day commentators on public affairs and has a wide following in many parts of the country.

I am not certain that my own observations within the Department over a long period of years tend to support this concept of the CFR role. I found that the Department itself, rather than any outside group, serves as the base for the policy planners and that it uses the CFR and similar outfits to help spread the official gospel and the dream of a world socialist state. Except for unfortunate dependence on the New York Times, as in the Cuban matter, the desk officers are, in fact, in large measure insulated from the mainstream of American thought by their preoccupation with alien points of view.

One need not accept all the implications of the indictment of the CFR, however, to recognize the possibility of a dangerously close parallel between the present-day role of the CFR and that of the Institute of Pacific Relations (the IPR) some years back. To indicate what I mean, I need only quote the following from the findings of the special Senate subcommittee which investigated the IPR in 1951:

"IPR activities were made possible largely through the financial support of American industrialists, corporations, and foundations, the majority of whom were not familiar with the inner workings of the organization.

"The names of eminent individuals were by design used as a respectable and impressive screen for the activities of the IPR inner core, and as a defense when such activities came under scrutiny.

"The IPR possessed close organic relations with the State Department through interchange of personnel, attendance of State Department officials at IPR conferences, constant exchange of information and social contacts.

"During the period 1945-49, persons associated with the Institute of Pacific Relations were instrumental in keeping U.S. policy on a course favorable to Communist objectives in China.

"The net effect of IPR activities on United States public opinion has been such as to serve international Communist interests and to affect adversely the interests of the United States."

Infiltrating the military

Infiltration of the Armed Forces with appeasers from the State Department is another charge which should be looked into by congressional investigators, particularly now that Foreign Service officers are increasingly being detailed as advisers—some critics

use the term "political commissars"—at military posts. The assignment of Roy Rubottom to the Naval War College is a recent case in point.

"To impose Mr. Rubottom on dedicated officers of the U.S. Navy, studying naval strategy at the War College in Newport, R.I., is an outrage," declared the News and Courier of Charleston, S.C. The editor continued: "Officers who know the story of State Department mishandling of Fidel Castro will rightly resent Mr. Rubottom's assignment as an 'adviser.' For a naval officer, running a ship aground usually means the end of a career—at least the end of opportunity for advancement. But Mr. Rubottom ran the whole United States aground on the political shoals of Cuba—and he is rewarded with an ambassadorship and a chance to advise future leaders of the U.S. Navy."

One heard similar protests expressed when it was learned that Robert Strong had in 1958 been assigned as a faculty adviser at the Army War College at Carlisle, Pa. This officer, as was noted earlier, was, in sworn testimony before a congressional committee prior to the recent assignment, charged with having sent reports out of Formosa—in his capacity as our top diplomat there—which were misleading and helpful to the Communists.

It is recalled in connection with these assignments that John D. Hickerson was sent to the National War College in Washington as deputy commandant in 1953, later going to Finland as Ambassador. Prior to the National War College assignment, Hickerson, a veteran Foreign Service officer, had come under fire from a congressional committee in connection with the hiring of undesirable by the U.N. at a time when he was the Assistant Secretary of State in charge of relations with the U.N. It was alleged that the Department had been slow in supplying adverse information about Americans on the U.N. staff. Subsequent publication of the Yalta papers brought to light a memorandum by Hickerson in 1945 recommending extensive concessions to Stalin.

Difficulties which our top military leaders have had with State Department advisers are clear from the record. General Wedemeyer mentions the "entirely justified suspicions" which General Hurley had of the State Department political advisers which the former had on his staff. General Wedemeyer adds: "Today, reading through the reports sent to me and to the State Department by Davies, Service, Emerson, and Ludden, it seems obvious not only that their sympathies lay with the Chinese Communists, but also that they were either consciously or unwittingly disseminating exaggerated or false, Communist-inspired reports concerning the Nationalist Government designed to stir up all manner of Sino-American distrust."

Similarly, Gen. Mark Clark, who had served in both Europe and the Far East, wrote that he "could not help wondering and worrying whether we were faced with open enemies across the conference table and hidden enemies who sat with us in our most secret councils."

The reader will find the following from the Economic Council letter of last December 15 particularly enlightening in this connection:

"Almost unnoticed so far in the discussion, is the determination of the foreign policy planners, from their base in the State Department, to take over policymaking in defense and limit our military men to technical questions only—those having nothing to do with whom we should fight, or when or where or how.

"The role of the foreign policy planners in military policy is further confused by the deep ideological split between the two branches of government, on communism.

The State Department has for over 20 years been soft on communism, while most of our military leaders are firmly anti-Communist. The foreign policy planners do not argue for communism. Not at all. Their line is to say that enemy is international communism. Any hint of communism here at home is stupid or wicked. The military are therefore obliged to raise the matter of communism here at home, in government, politics, and other public opinion forming agencies. To make the confusion complete, the planners make every effort to put their sympathizers into the top civilian jobs in the Defense Department."

In recent months the State Department censors have been deleting warnings of the Communist danger from the speeches of our military leaders, while at the same time the Reds have been spreading their tentacles throughout Latin America—this from their base in Cuba, 90 miles from our shores, which they gained with the help of State Department officials.

There are, indeed, many reasons why an investigation of the State Department has become imperative.

Mr. Speaker, that Congress should take a careful look at State Department operations is only too obvious. The investigation should be a carefully planned effort to find out what we must do to make the Department a more effective instrument for the execution of our foreign policy.

If the Department is to be staffed with people who are adequately prepared to cope with the problems which confront our Nation overseas, a Foreign Service Academy such as I propose in my bill H.R. 7291 must be established. The Academy which I have proposed would—

First, provide a 5-year program of study, covering in depth, first, three basic languages; second, the history, cultures, and customs of nations in which students at the Academy may serve; third, extensive U.S. history and governmental processes; fourth, psychological warfare, including instruction in Communist propaganda techniques; fifth, survival in jungle and remote areas; and, sixth, military strategy and its relation to diplomacy.

Second, be coeducational, admitting students who, first, have demonstrated high scholarship and leadership qualities; and, second, pass a rigorous mental and physical admission in the same manner that candidates for admission to the Military Academies are appointed.

Third, exchange teachers with the Military Academies in order that future military and overseas civilian representatives, including State Department Foreign Service officers, can better understand and respect each other's problems.

Fourth, confer the bachelor of arts degree for the first 4 years and the master of arts degree for the fifth year.

To conclude, Congress must investigate State Department operations with the view to recommending changes which will enable the Department to execute our foreign policy more expeditiously and effectively. Moreover, a Foreign Service Academy such as I have proposed must be established in order to train personnel for the Department who are capable of meeting the problems which we face overseas, especially those created by the international Communist conspiracy.

INDIAN CLAIMS AGAINST THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT

Mr. LATTA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. BERRY] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. BERRY. Mr. Speaker, I believe anyone who has any knowledge of Indians and the Indian problems of America will agree with me that one of the most disgusting articles to appear in print in recent years is one appearing in the March issue of Life magazine over the authorship of Robert F. Kennedy, the Attorney General of the United States, entitled "Buying It Back From the Indians." This young man, brother of the President, who has been traveling all over the world, telling peoples of other nations what they must do and how they must get their own house in order, tells the world in this article how surprised he was to find that the United States must still pay for lands and property taken by force from the Indians, for which settlement has never been made by the Government.

The whole article, Mr. Speaker, is written with a view of making light of the Indian claims against the Federal Government. It was really quite humorous to young Bobby to find that there have been some 370 claims filed before the Indian Claims Commission. It seems strange to me for him to set forth the fact that in 15 years only 33 of these claims have been finished, that 10 others are on appeal to the U.S. Court of Claims, and that some 76 are nearing completion and about 200 in various stages of trial.

Mr. Speaker, the reason these claims have not been settled is, because, as young Bobby indicates, the Federal Government has gone to every extreme in attempting to prove that the Indians are wrong, that the white man owes no money for the lands and property that he has taken from the Indian, that the Federal Government is not under obligation to keep its treaties with the Indian people.

Mr. Speaker, if the American Indian were located on any island in the world, or in any country in the world, other than within the United States, this same Federal Government would be flocking to that shore with boatloads of money trying to force them to take the cash and to use our gold and our currency to build up their economy—not so, Mr. Speaker, when these people live within our borders.

Peoples all around the world, who are of equal living standards, who are in similar economic conditions, and who are even less interested in becoming civilized and raising their standards of living to those of the non-Indian people in the United States, are having billions of dollars dumped in their laps, year after year, through a program known as foreign aid but when it comes to aiding and assisting the Indians within the borders of America the Federal Govern-

ment will give them nothing and Mr. Kennedy and his trained staff of assistants are taking every case to the highest court in the land to keep from paying the Indian the damages that are justly due to him.

Mr. Speaker, I assume the purpose of this article was to be cute and to make interesting reading for those who know nothing about Indians and the Indian problem. I suppose it may be interesting reading and quite light and trifling for a young man whose father is a multi-millionaire and who has never wanted for anything, for a young man whose brother has become President of the United States and has appointed him to one of the most important Cabinet spots in America. To him it is funny. To him it is humorous to even think that someone who formerly owned property, who formerly owned territory, who formerly owned these regions, and who were driven out by force, should now have the audacity to ask compensation from this great Federal Government. To him it is probably humorous to imagine that the great-grandfathers of the Sioux Indian people who lived in the State of South Dakota, for example, and who made a firm and binding contract with the Federal Government, believing that their contract and their treaty was as good as the gold behind it, only to find that neither the contract nor the treaty are worth the paper they were written on, and Bobbie's job is to get the courts to agree with this "treaty breaking" philosophy of the Department of Justice.

These are the things the young Attorney General tells the people of America were such a surprise to him. Why should the Indian people lay claim in damages for their lands?

In the article he says:

Another determination necessary in the Indian claims may be the most difficult of all: How much was the land in a specific area worth at the time it was acquired by the white man?

This, Mr. Speaker, is one of the most unfair questions that can be asked. Mr. Speaker, the price of land is or should be determined by what a willing seller is willing to accept from a willing buyer. In not one single instance, Mr. Speaker, has there been the case of a willing seller and a willing buyer. In every claim before the Indian Claims Commission the Indians were not willing sellers, they were forced to sell, they were forced to move, they were forced to flee at the point of a gun. Neither was the Federal Army nor the white settlers a willing buyer. They took the land at the point of a gun. Yet the young Attorney General writes a voluminous article, telling about the numbers of attorneys he has working in the Archives, digging through old files, attempting to arrive at a fair market price for this land, at the time it was taken.

You can be sure, Mr. Speaker, the Federal Government has no one digging through the Archives attempting to represent the Indian people in trying to determine what would be just and fair for them, having been routed from their homes and forced to suffer from the inclemencies of winter storms and bliz-

zards. No one is digging through the Archives attempting to compensate these people for these hardships suffered by them.

The young Attorney General has not indicated that he plans to hire any help to dig into the meaning of some of the treaties with these Indian people, treaties wherein the Federal Government agreed to provide assistance for the Indians so long as the water shall flow and the grass is green.

Possibly the Attorney General could find something humorous in those phrases if he tried. The Indian people can be sure of one thing, this young Attorney General will be turning all of his efforts and all of his talent toward defeating them in court, rather than paying them in justice.

In his article the young Attorney General had this to say:

In a second case involving income from canoes, one Chippewa complained to the Commission about a personal loss, even though the Indian Claims Act does not provide for individual claims. He held up a picture of an enormous canoe. He said it would hold 20, and judging by the picture there was no doubting him. "You've ruined my business," he said. "I used to get \$5 a head for taking people over the rapids. Now the rapids are gone." The rapids, near Sault Ste. Marie, Mich., had been eliminated by construction of locks on the St. Mary's River.

"The white man may have taken away your business," responded Mr. Barney, appearing for the Government, "but he also gave you your business in the first place."

The young Attorney General is using this example, Mr. Speaker, to make the Indian look silly before the reading public. It is no doubt true that this Indian had a large canoe that would hold 20 people and that he made a good living taking tourists over the rapids near Sault Ste. Marie, Mich. It may be real funny to the young Attorney General to think that he would come before the Claims Commission asking damages for the white man having taken away his business from him. This may seem real funny to him and to many of his readers.

I would point out, Mr. Speaker, that while the young Attorney General was writing his article and getting it sold to Life magazine, his brother, the President of the United States was writing another article. This article was a message to Congress in which the President of the United States asked the American taxpayer to give him the authority to cut tariffs or completely dispense with tariffs, permitting imports to come into this country from every foreign country in the world and then he asked Congress to provide subsidies and direct payments to the businesses and industries and firms that would be damaged by such competitive imports. In this message that the President was writing to Congress he not only asked Congress to subsidize the industries injured but also to subsidize the labor that was put out of jobs and the communities that were injured by both the industry being damaged and the labor being thrown out of work.

Now, Mr. Speaker, it was a real scream for the youthful Attorney General to

have an Indian come to the Federal Government and ask for a subsidy, because his industry had been injured by Federal manipulation, but it is strictly good business for the youthful President of the United States to come before Congress and ask for assistance to other industries injured by Federal manipulation of trade and tariffs. Is there so much difference between turning off the trade spigot and the water spigot in this river?

Certainly there is a difference, Mr. Speaker. In one instance we are dealing with our own people—good American citizens. In the other instance we are dealing with foreign investors and foreign industrialists and attempting to provide a market for them. When the young Attorney General tells about one person who is injured by Federal action this is a joke and sufficiently humorous to be able to sell his article to a large publishing company.

When the other brother provides a parallel situation it is dead serious and he claims the subsidies must be paid to American industries and American labor and American communities in order to protect the American economy.

The young Attorney General continues in his article by saying:

And yet I have to remind myself that in this area the spirit of the New Frontier must be tempered to cope with the unique problems of the old frontier—and these are not simply legal problems.

I am not sure, Mr. Speaker, whether this is intended as a witticism or a statement of a fact. If it is a witticism it is a very humble attempt and if it is a fact then Congress should begin to take action.

If the New Frontier is to serve the Indian people as the old frontier did, then the Indian people had better get atomic warheads on their arrows and head toward Washington because in the old frontier the Army moved westward with the pioneer. They rounded up the Indians and placed them in concentration camps and then down through the years they forced the Indian to live on these concentration camp areas. In later years they became known as Indian reservations—the poorest, the most worthless soil of any land in the area.

It was 50 years ago that the Federal Government established what is today known as "foreign aid" on all of these Indian reservations and after 50 years of foreign aid in which the purpose of the Government was to bring the Indian people up to the standard of living of the non-Indian people they are beginning to discover that the system has been wrong for 50 years, that it has been a complete failure, so this system that has proven worthless and valueless, this system that has wasted two generations of Indian people, is now being copied by the State Department and tried again in every country in the free world.

Yes, the youthful Attorney General, who was so surprised when he moved into his office to find that the Indian people might have the intestinal fortitude to claim payment for that which is rightfully theirs, now must remind himself that in this era the spirit of the New

Frontier must be tempered to cope with the unique problems of the old frontier.

Mr. Speaker, if the Kennedy boys are so hard up financially that they must use the prestige of their offices to sell this kind of tripe to the publishers of the Nation, working on taxpayers' time and putting the proceeds from the sale in their own private pockets, they should at least vent their humor on someone and some group other than the Indian people.

They scream about civil rights and the minorities in the South but they make money and sell magazine stories by tearing down the minority groups in the North.

Mr. Speaker, this, in my judgment, is an unpardonable sin.

COMPLACENCY IN UNITED STATES AS TO DANGER OF COMMUNISM

Mr. LATTI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Florida [Mr. CRAMER] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, the 10th of the series of excellent articles being written by former Vice President Nixon appeared in the Washington Post of yesterday, April 3. There is a final article to come.

Mr. Speaker, the gist of Mr. Nixon's article is that there is a complacency in the United States as to the dangers of communism here at home, coupled with diverse opinions on the subject, ranging from J. Edgar Hoover's deep concern to Robert Kennedy's statement that the Communist Party in this country has only 10,000 members and is a political organization of no danger in the United States. This amounts to still another example of the left hand of the administration not knowing what the right is up to, or how it feels about a given situation. I believe that the time has come for the Congress to take action designed to root out the dangers from within and to eradicate the Communist menace with every available weapon.

I do not feel that I can add very much to what Mr. Nixon says about our lack of concern with this very great danger, since his recommended eight-point program very candidly tells us what we must do. However, I should like to tie into his program a piece of legislation that passed the House in the 86th Congress and again nearly a year ago, and that has been awaiting Senate action since. That is my bill, H.R. 3247, to amend section 2385, title 18, United States Code, to define and broaden the term "organize" as used in the Smith Act of 1940, which outlaws conspiracy to overthrow the Government of the United States.

Identical bills passed the House in the 85th and 86th Congresses and, as I said, my bill passed last May 15, in each case without opposition. It is a bill that has the approval of the Department of Justice, and I am strongly hopeful for posi-

tive Senate action before long, since the menace of communism grows stronger with each passing day.

Mr. Speaker, since the Smith Act was passed, the Communists have not relented in their efforts to organize groups and cells dedicated to the purpose of overthrowing our form of government. Although the Smith Act states that organizing groups for this purpose is illegal, the Supreme Court of the United States subsequently decided, in the case of *Yates v. United States* (354 U.S. 298), that the term "organize" as used in the act referred to the original organization of the Communist Party in this country, rather than to any subsequent continuous, organizing, and, of course, the pinks and the fellow travelers and the rest of their ilk have had a field day since.

The Smith Act, as written, made it a crime for a person to commit any of three defined acts. The first was to knowingly or willfully advocate the overthrow, by force or by violence, of any Government in the United States; the second was to organize any society or group to teach or advocate the violent overthrow of any such Government; the third was to be a member of or affiliated with any such society or group.

The *Yates* case involved the question of whether 14 known Communists had violated the first 2 parts of the act. The defendants had been convicted after jury trial on a single count of indictment charging them with conspiring to overthrow the U.S. Government by force and violence and with organizing groups for the same purpose. Their convictions had been affirmed by the Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit. The Supreme Court of the United States reversed the convictions and held that as to "advocacy" there must be actual incitement to action, and that the term "organize" referred only to the official organization of the Communist Party and not to a continuing process of organization. In the opinion of the Court, that took place in 1945 when the Communist Political Association was disbanded and reconstituted the Communist Party of the United States. The indictment, returned in 1951, was therefore barred by the 3-year statute of limitations.

The Judiciary Committee of the House of Representatives studied the legislative history of the Smith Act, and concluded that the term "organize" was intended to mean a continuous process of organizing groups and cells and of recruiting new members and not merely the original organization of the Communist Party or some other party or society whose aims are inimical to the security of the United States. The trial court in the *Yates* case had instructed the jury that the term "organize" included such things as "the recruiting of new members and the forming of new units, and the regrouping or expansion of existing clubs, classes, and other units of any society, party, group, or other organization." The committee has concluded that this definition adequately expresses the original intention of Congress when

it enacted the Smith Act, and the bill recommended by the committee contains substantially that language.

The necessity for immediate action to counteract the effects of the Yates decision is borne out by a report received by the subcommittee from the Department of Justice outlining the history of Smith Act conspiracy cases since the decisions in Yates against United States. The following seven such cases have been reversed by courts of appeal, at least in part based upon the Yates decision's definition of "organize":

First. Bary case, Denver, 10th circuit (248 Fed. 2d 201): Seven defendants; August 23, 1957.

Second. Sentner, St. Louis, eighth circuit: Five defendants; April 4, 1958.

Third. Brandt, Cleveland, sixth circuit: Six defendants; May 23, 1958.

Fourth. Welman, Detroit, sixth circuit: Six defendants; March 25, 1958.

Fifth. Kuzma, Philadelphia, third circuit: Ordered the acquittal of four and authorized retrial of five; November 13, 1957.

Sixth. Fujimoto, Hawaii, ninth circuit: All seven defendants ordered acquitted; January 16, 1958.

Seventh. Huff, Seattle, ninth circuit: The convictions of all four defendants who had appealed were ordered reversed. One of the defendants in this case did not appeal but served her sentence, and therefore her conviction still stands; January 16, 1958.

The Government was authorized to retry the following six cases in which a total of 39 defendants were involved:

Yates.....	10
Bary.....	7
Sentner.....	5
Brandt.....	6
Welman.....	6
Kuzma.....	5

The Department of Justice reports that the Government dismissed the Kuzma and Yates cases, involving a total of 15 defendants, partly on the Yates definition of "organize." Still under consideration are the remaining four cases involving 24 defendants. In addition, the Government, since the Yates case, has also dismissed, in part due to the "organize" definition in Yates, two conspiracy cases involving 17 defendants, which had not been tried at the time of the Yates decision.

In reply to an inquiry on the part of Representative KENNETH B. KEATING, the author of H.R. 8867, which is identical to H.R. 13272—both bills are identical to H.R. 3247, 87th Congress—the Department of Justice reported as follows:

HON. KENNETH B. KEATING,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN KEATING: This is in response to your letter of July 7 in regard to the Department of Justice position with respect to the bill (H.R. 8867) to amend section 2385 of title 18 of the United States Code to define the term "organize" as used in that section, intended to deal with one aspect of the problem raised by the Supreme Court decision in *Yates v. United States*.

H.R. 8867 redefines the term "organize" as used in the Smith Act (18 U.S.C. 2385). The proposal would in-

clude within the term "organize" the recruiting of new members, the forming of new units, and the regrouping or expansion of existing clubs, classes, and other units of such society, group, or assembly of persons. In the Yates case the Supreme Court stated that Congress intended that the term "organize" does not include such activities as the recruiting of members, organizers of clubs within the framework of the Communist Party, and so forth, and that in its view the Communist Party was organized in 1945 and therefore evidence as to its organization was barred after the 3-year period of the statute of limitations.

The bill would redefine "organize" in the terms for which the Government contended in that case and would be beneficial in any future Smith Act conspiracy prosecutions.

The Department of Justice favors enactment of this legislation.

As both Mr. Nixon and Mr. Hoover have freely warned, immediate action is necessary if we are to wipe out this cancer upon our society. Therefore, I hope that we can look forward to favorable reaction to the eight-point Nixon program, and I am confident that if the Senate will take favorable action on H.R. 3247, the combined assault on the Communies will have the desired effect, which is to get rid of them once and for all.

Mr. Speaker, the article by former Vice President Nixon follows herewith:

ALL THINKING AMERICANS SHOULD JOIN FIGHT
ON U.S. REDS; PROGRAM OFFERED

(By Richard M. Nixon)

(Tenth article in a series of 11)

Because of the irresponsible antics of some self-styled experts on anticommunism, national attention for months has been directed to the subject of how not to fight communism in the United States. It is time now to direct attention to the even more critical problem of how to fight communism at home. Because if there is one thing that is more harmful to the national interest than exaggerating the internal Communist danger, it is ignoring it or downgrading it.

I will suggest here a program of how to mount a responsible attack upon communism and Communist influence within the United States.

First, we must recognize that there is a danger. As Cardinal Cushing, of Boston, pointed out recently, there seems to be "a concerted campaign to establish the conclusion that there is no internal threat from communism in the United States. The idea that there is no danger from communism contradicts the records of the congressional committees. It rests on the absurd premise that the United States, the prime target, is alone among the nations of the world exempt from concerted Soviet subversion and infiltration."

What is the magnitude of the danger? J. Edgar Hoover of the FBI stated in a recent speech:

"I would like to be able to report that the internal enemies of our society have virtually disappeared—that they have faded into the dim past like the dangers of the wagon trail and the Northwest frontier. But this is not so. * * * From the depths of our criminal and subversive underworlds, strong enemies—deadly enemies—continue to challenge the right of decent Americans to live in freedom and dignity under God. * * * The Communist threat from without must not blind us to the Communist threat from within."

"The latter is reaching into the very heart of America through its espionage agents and a cunning, defiant, and lawless Communist Party, which is fanatically dedicated to the Marxist cause of world enslavement and destruction of the foundations of our Republic."

On the other hand, Attorney General Robert Kennedy in a Los Angeles press conference on March 24 pointed out that the Communist Party had only 10,000 members and characterized it as a "political organization of no danger in the United States."

And the California Federation of Young Democrats reflected their estimate of the internal Communist threat when they recently passed abolition of the House Committee on Un-American Activities and repeal of the State law requiring State employees to sign loyalty oaths.

Which of these estimates of the threat of communism in the United States is most accurate?

The weight of evidence overwhelmingly support Mr. Hoover's conclusion.

To say that the Communist Party, because of its small membership, is of no danger in the United States is more than a misinterpretation of numbers; it is a misinterpretation of history.

Have we learned no lesson from the Hiss and Rosenberg cases, from the espionage activities of Klaus Fuchs in Great Britain, from the spy ring in Canada or from Robert Solhen and Irving Scarbeck most recently in the United States? The Communists do not need great numbers to steal state secrets.

Equally important, if not as dramatic as spying, is the alarming success of U.S. Communists in planting and spreading ideas that have affected U.S. policy. For example, Communist fronts and Communist dupes sold the idea of Mao Tse-tung as an agrarian reformer—a propaganda line which considerably influenced our China policy with disastrous effects.

To ignore 10,000 American Communists, in short, would be as foolhardy as to underestimate the Communist guerrillas in South Vietnam because they are only a few thousand. Communists around the world operate as an elite corps, not as an infantry division.

The fight against communism within our borders should be joined by every thinking American, regardless of political party. It should not be left by default to those who overestimate or underestimate the danger.

As a minimum program for dealing with communism in the United States, I would suggest the following:

1. The establishment of a privately financed national foundation, headed by men of great prestige and experience, which would be equipped to extend a seal of approval to responsible groups and organizations fighting communism, after a thorough examination of their personnel, programs, and financial records.

The private citizen today is in need of some trustworthy guidance in this area. This foundation should be completely nonpartisan. This is not a matter in which Americans should divide as Republicans or Democrats. Too many groups today are confusing the fight against communism with a variety of extraneous political, economic, and social issues.

2. Education at the school-age and adult level on Communist tactics, aims, and purposes—including high school courses on the contrasts between communism and the principles of free societies, implemented first by the selection of authoritative textbooks and the training of teachers.

The great problem in America today is not too much patriotism or too little patriotism, but too little knowledge—knowledge about communism and about our own way of life.

3. A similar educational program made available to all Americans traveling or living

abroad (privately or in Government service) so that they could better serve as ambassadors of freedom throughout the world.

4. Vigorous and strict enforcement of the Subversive Activities Control Act, which requires all Communists to register with the Attorney General, so that they may be labeled properly for what they are.

5. Public support of J. Edgar Hoover and the FBI in the investigation of Communist activities. Those from the far left who have made Hoover into their personal whipping boy will one day discover how scrupulously his methods have upheld civil liberties while doing a superb investigating job.

6. Public support of investigations by legislative committees in this complex field, including those of the Committee on Un-American Activities, the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee, and the investigating committees of State legislatures. Legislative investigative committees sometimes make mistakes; and when procedures are improper they should be corrected.

But I would suggest that those who have been calling for the abolition of the House Committee on Un-American Activities may one day examine its procedures and discover them to be as fair or more fair than the procedures of other investigating committees which have had their support. The anti-Communist arms of our Government deserve support and constructive suggestions from the press and public, not just carping criticism.

7. Public support of loyalty and security programs for Federal, State and local employees whose government employment is a privilege, not a right.

8. Denial of the use of tax-supported schools and institutions for speeches by any individuals who have defied the registration provisions of the Subversive Activities Control Act or who have refused to testify before legally constituted grand juries or legislative investigating committees.

I have limited this article to a discussion aimed primarily at the subject of dealing with the danger of communism at home. In my next and last article in this series I shall discuss what I believe are the actions we should take to deal with communism abroad.

A NEW TRAIN FERRY FOR ALASKA

Mr. LATTI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Washington [Mr. PELLY] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, the city of Seattle has long enjoyed the name of "Gateway to Alaska" because of its unique geographic position. The Puget Sound area has a natural advantage in water-surface transportation to the great 49th State.

Steamship service to and from Alaska, however, has had its problems. Some 80 steamship lines have engaged over the years in business between Alaska and the Pacific Northwest ports only to find that economic difficulties and other obstacles were too much and as a result these operators failed and were forced to discontinue service.

The principal problem has been one of high costs due to the fact that most of the traffic was northbound and return cargos were only available during certain seasons of the year. Also many communities that require service in Alaska do not offer a sufficient volume of freight

to justify the maintaining of year-round service.

The people of Alaska have realized that transportation is the key to the development of this great State and have long sought lower cost and speedier shipping.

Meanwhile, the waterfront interests of Seattle, together with the business firms that have enjoyed long business relations with customers in Alaska have been seeking some means of retaining Seattle's position as a shipping point for the northland. To hold this business maritime interests of Seattle have looked for some new means of speeding service and holding down shipping expenses.

At one time the Alaska Steamship Co. made an intensive study of the economic feasibility of constructing a train ferry but found that present construction costs were so high that it was not financially possible to proceed. Meanwhile, Alaskan interests have sought by various means to improve their transportation and at times have become exasperated that Seattle shipping interests failed to show any progress.

Recently, Mr. Speaker, I met in Seattle with a group of representatives of labor and management interested in this problem. I pointed out that Alaska's interests are Seattle's interests and that renewed study should be given toward providing Alaska with better transportation. I called attention to the fact that the railroads that serve the Pacific Northwest and maritime labor and management all had a great stake in Alaska's development. I noted that unlike the State of Hawaii and the Far East, Alaska did not have a joint rail-water freight rate from the East and Midwest. I also said that Seattle's attitude on transportation could not be negative and must be competitive. I said I was opposed to the exception that existed in favor of Canada as against the requirement that all coastwise service between American ports be by American-flag vessels. On the other hand, I frankly stated that I recognized that Seattle would have to offer Alaska something better than monopoly or we could not expect to retain our past relationship as terminal for Alaskan ports.

Mr. Speaker, I understand that today announcement is being made by the Alaska Steamship Co. of plans for establishing a new train-ship service which I am confident may well be Seattle's answer to Alaska's problem.

It would appear that a fast modern train ferry between the rail belt of Alaska and Seattle represents a joint rail-water type of speedy low cost freight service that Alaska has needed.

The president of the Alaska Steamship Co. is announcing that his company has acquired the *City of New Orleans* which can haul 56 rail cars including piggyback and container on the basis of regular 3-day service from Seattle to Whittier.

The *City of New Orleans* has been registered under the laws of Liberia. A member of the Alaska congressional delegation, Senator BARTLETT as well as Representative TOLLEFSON and myself are today introducing legislation which

will provide for the documenting of this vessel so it can engage in coastwise trade as provided in section 2 of the Shipping Act of 1916. Under American registry this 18-knot vessel which is the only special purpose vessel of its kind available can provide consumers and shippers with a type of service which will contribute to the development of Alaska. I am sure that when the facts about this new service are made public the significance of this transportation development will be widely supported by all those who have Alaska's interests at heart.

I am hopeful that the Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee, on which I have the honor to serve, will consider promptly legislation to authorize the admittance of the *City of New Orleans* to American registry. Meanwhile, I think that the bill, which is introduced both by an Alaska and a Washington State Member of Congress, should be recognized as important to all sections of the United States that have business firms that do business in the 49th State. Also, of course a searail operation will benefit our military and defense departments in the transporting of their freight and other requirements.

I have long tried to assist our own American shipyard and skilled labor. In this case I wish a suitable new vessel could be built for this purpose but the economics are such, I am satisfied, that there is no alternative to using the *City of New Orleans*. When all facts are available I am confident there will be no opposition to the bill.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent leave of absence was granted to Mr. MACK, for 5 days, on account of illness in family.

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. ROOSEVELT, for 15 minutes, on April 5, 1962.

Mr. STAGGERS, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that, following the legislative program of the day and other special orders on April 11, the following gentlemen may each address the House for 1 hour:

Mr. UTT.

Mr. PILLION.

Mr. GUBSER.

Mr. ROUSSELOT.

Mr. ASHBROOK.

Mr. BRUCE.

Mr. HOSMER.

Mr. YOUNGER.

Mr. MAILLIARD.

Mr. PELLY.

Mr. DEROUNIAN.

Mr. MEADER.

Mr. SCHADEBERG.

Mr. WILSON of California.

Mr. BECKER.

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

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mr. Bow to include extraneous matter in the remarks he made in the Committee of the Whole this afternoon.

Mr. WALTER and include a letter he wrote to the Librarian of Congress.

Mr. HAGEN of California.

Mr. KITCHEN.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. Bow) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. KYL.

Mr. FINO in two instances.

Mr. JOHANSEN.

(The following Member (at the request of Mr. BOLLING) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. MORRIS K. UDALL.

ENROLLED JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

Mr. BURLESON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that the committee had examined and found truly enrolled a joint resolution of the House of the following title, which was thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.J. Res. 441. Joint resolution to commemorate the 75th anniversary of the Interstate Commerce Commission.

SENATE ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The SPEAKER announced his signature to enrolled bills of the Senate of the following titles:

S. 193. An act for the relief of Rev. Patrick Floyd;

S. 899. An act for the relief of Liu Shui Chen;

S. 1305. An act for the relief of Kazuo Ito and Satomi Ito;

S. 1520. An act for the relief of Mary Elizabeth Sidor Polkowska;

S. 1578. An act for the relief of Edward Yin Liang;

S. 1638. An act for the relief of Felix Ledina Mendoza;

S. 1841. An act for the relief of Maria Zambetoulla;

S. 1874. An act for the relief of Roland Fernando Mishutani;

S. 2018. An act for the relief of Robert B. Kasperek, Robert M. Kearny, Richard A. Stokes, J. R. Whitehouse, Jr., and Herbert A. Wolff, Jr.; and

S. 2101. An act for the relief of Aida Mary Sorino Bocalary.

BILLS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. BURLESON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee did on April 3, 1962, present to the President, for his approval, bills of the House of the following titles:

H.R. 1352. An act for the relief of Giuseppe Anello;

H.R. 1451. An act for the relief of Mrs. Elfriede Frisch Rogers;

H.R. 1492. An act for the relief of Ernest John Large;

H.R. 1671. An act for the relief of Edvige Cianciulli;

H.R. 2180. An act for the relief of Eugene C. Harter;

H.R. 2684. An act for the relief of Mohan Singh;

H.R. 3105. An act for the relief of Christine Fahrenbruch, a minor;

H.R. 3376. An act for the relief of George A. McDermott;

H.R. 6082. An act for the relief of Mrs. Vartanus Usar;

H.R. 6216. An act for the relief of Theodore T. Bellmann;

H.R. 6276. An act for the relief of Athanasia Dekazos;

H.R. 6343. An act for the relief of Mrs. Isabel A. Miguel;

H.R. 6749. An act for the relief of Teofilo Estoesta;

H.R. 7676. An act for the relief of George W. Ross, Jr.;

H.R. 8422. An act for the relief of Sister M. Theophane (Jane Carroll);

H.R. 8780. An act for the relief of Dr. Carl F. Romney;

H.R. 8781. An act for the relief of Walter Singlevich;

H.R. 8947. An act for the relief of Harry A. Sebert;

H.R. 9612. An act relating to the elections under section 333 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 by the shareholders of the G. L. Bernhardt Co., Inc., of Lenoir, N.C.; and

H.R. 10573. An act to grant the American Numismatic Association perpetual succession.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly (at 6 o'clock and 54 minutes p.m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, April 5, 1962, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1897. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a review of maintenance of tracked combat vehicles at Fort Bragg, N.C., Department of the Army; to the Committee on Government Operations.

1898. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on the review of the financial and administrative activities relating to the development and construction of the Dulles International Airport, Federal Aviation Agency, September 1961; to the Committee on Government Operations.

1899. A letter from the Acting Director, Bureau of the Budget, Executive Office of the President, relative to plans for works of improvement relating to the following watersheds: San Gabriel River (western area), California; South Fork Blackwater River, Mo.; Indian Wash, Colo.; Mulberry Creek, Tenn.; and Rocky Comfort Creek, Ga., pursuant to section 5 of the Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention Act, as amended (16 U.S.C. 1005), and Executive Order No. 10654 of January 20, 1956; to the Committee on Agriculture.

1900. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on the review of selected activities of the low-rent housing program in the nine-State area administered by the San Francisco Regional Office of the Public Housing Administration (PHA), Housing and Home Finance Agency (HHFA) (H. Doc. No. 383); to the Committee on Government Operations and ordered to be printed.

1901. A letter from the Secretary of State, transmitting the ninth report of the De-

partment of State on its activities under the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 (Public Law 81-152, as amended) covering the calendar year 1961, pursuant to title IV, section 404(d), of the law; to the Committee on Government Operations.

1902. A letter from the Acting Director, Bureau of the Budget, Executive Office of the President, relative to plans for works of improvement relating to the following watersheds: North Branch of Forest River (supplemental), North Dakota, and Florence area, Arizona, pursuant to the Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention Act, as amended (16 U.S.C. 1005), and Executive Order No. 10654 of January 20, 1956; to the Committee on Public Works.

1903. A letter from the Administrator, General Services Administration, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to provide an office building for the Housing and Home Finance Agency"; to the Committee on Public Works.

1904. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to provide for the establishment of a land conservation fund, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

1905. A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to promote the coordination and development of effective Federal and State programs relating to outdoor recreation, and to provide financial assistance to the States for outdoor recreation planning, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. COOLEY: Committee on Agriculture. H.R. 11027. A bill to amend the Agriculture Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended; without amendment (Rept. No. 1552). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BARING:

H.R. 11024. A bill to amend the Mineral Leasing Act of 1920 in order to authorize geothermal steam leases under the provisions of such act; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. BENNETT of Florida:

H.R. 11085. A bill to increase the rates of basic pay, retirement pay, retainer pay and allowances for quarters and subsistence for officers and enlisted members of the uniformed services, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. CELLER:

H.R. 11086. A bill to amend title 28, United States Code, to provide for additional commissioners of the United States Court of Claims, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. COLLIER:

H.R. 11087. A bill to provide for the medical and hospital care of the aged through a system of voluntary health insurance, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DADDARIO:

H.R. 11088. A bill to amend the National Aeronautics and Space Act of 1958 with respect to property rights in inventions; to the Committee on Science and Astronautics.

By Mr. ELLSWORTH:

H.R. 11089. A bill to provide for the medical and hospital care of the aged through a system of voluntary health insurance, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FINO:

H.R. 11090. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code in order to provide the death penalty for the sale of narcotics to children; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HARRISON of Wyoming:

H.R. 11091. A bill to provide for the medical and hospital care of the aged through a system of voluntary health insurance, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HIESTAND:

H.R. 11092. A bill to provide for the medical and hospital care of the aged through a system of voluntary health insurance, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. JOHNSON of California:

H.R. 11093. A bill to amend title 23 of the United States Code to provide for a National Highway Academy; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. KEARNS:

H.R. 11094. A bill to provide for the issuance of a special postage stamp to commemorate the sesquicentennial of the Battle of Lake Erie; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. KING of New York:

H.R. 11095. A bill to provide for the medical and hospital care of the aged through a system of voluntary health insurance, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MICHEL:

H.R. 11096. A bill to provide for the medical and hospital care of the aged through a system of voluntary health insurance, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MILLER of New York:

H.R. 11097. A bill to provide for the medical and hospital care of the aged through a system of voluntary health insurance, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. NELSEN:

H.R. 11098. A bill to provide for the medical and hospital care of the aged through a system of voluntary health insurance, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ROBERTS of Alabama:

H.R. 11099. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide for the establishment of an Institute of Child Health and Human Development, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. TEAGUE of Texas:

H.R. 11100. A bill to amend chapter 11 of title 38, United States Code, to authorize special consideration for certain disabled veterans suffering blindness or bilateral kidney involvement; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. BASS of New Hampshire:

H.R. 11101. A bill to provide for the medical and hospital care of the aged through a system of voluntary health insurance, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. BLITCH:

H.R. 11102. A bill to replace the existing tariff schedules and trade agreements provisions of the Tariff Act of 1930, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BRADEMAS:

H.R. 11103. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to repeal the manu-

facturers excise tax on musical instruments; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HIESTAND:

H.R. 11104. A bill to amend section 620 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 so as to prohibit assistance under that act to the government of any country which has not established equitable procedures for compensating U.S. citizens for loss of property by expropriation; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. JOHANSEN:

H.R. 11105. A bill to provide for the medical and hospital care of the aged through a system of voluntary health insurance, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LIPSCOMB:

H.R. 11106. A bill to provide for the medical and hospital care of the aged through a system of voluntary health insurance, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. MAY:

H.R. 11107. A bill to provide for the medical and hospital care of the aged through a system of voluntary health insurance, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ROBERTS of Alabama:

H.R. 11108. A bill to amend section 610 of title 38, United States Code, to provide for the furnishing of hospital care to war veterans 70 years of age or older without requiring that they submit a statement under oath of their inability to defray necessary expenses; to the Committee on Veterans Affairs.

By Mr. VAN PELT:

H.R. 11109. A bill to provide for the medical and hospital care of the aged through a system of voluntary health insurance, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SHRIVER:

H.R. 11110. A bill to provide for the medical and hospital care of the aged through a system of voluntary health insurance, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SMITH of Iowa:

H.R. 11111. A bill to amend the act of October 4, 1961, authorizing the Secretary of Agriculture to sell and convey certain lands in the State of Iowa; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. BERRY:

H.R. 11112. A bill to provide a right of ingress and egress across national forest lands to all persons owning property within the boundaries of such national forests, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. CAHILL:

H.R. 11113. A bill to provide for the District of Columbia an appointed Governor and secretary, and an elected legislative assembly and nonvoting Delegate to the House of Representatives, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. CLANCY:

H.R. 11114. A bill to provide for the medical and hospital care of the aged through a system of voluntary health insurance, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GOODELL:

H.R. 11115. A bill to amend the prevailing wage section of the Davis-Bacon Act, as amended; the Federal Airport Act, as amended; and related sections of the National Housing Act, as amended; to provide judicial review of decisions of the Secretary of Labor under the Davis-Bacon Act; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. HARVEY of Indiana:

H.R. 11116. A bill to provide for the medical and hospital care of the aged through a system of voluntary health insurance, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. TOLLEFSON:

H.R. 11117. A bill to adjust the rates of basic compensation of certain officers and employees of the Federal Government, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. DEVINE:

H.R. 11118. A bill to provide for the medical and hospital care of the aged through a system of voluntary health insurance, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HOSMER:

H.R. 11119. A bill to provide for the medical and hospital care of the aged through a system of voluntary health insurance, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MAILLIARD:

H.R. 11120. A bill to provide for the medical care of the aged through a system of voluntary health insurance, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ABBITT:

H.J. Res. 684. Joint resolution to amend the Constitution of the United States to provide the right of States to establish their own election districts; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROUSSELOT:

H. Res. 586. Resolution authorizing the Committee on Foreign Affairs to conduct an investigation of the personnel and policy-making practices of the Department of State; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. LINDSAY:

H. Res. 587. 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.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII,

The SPEAKER presented a memorial of the Legislature of the State of New Jersey, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to enact legislation to implement the Federal Flood Insurance Act of 1956, which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. CLANCY:

H.R. 11121. A bill for the relief of Agnese Brienza; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DERWINSKI:

H.R. 11122. A bill for the relief of Edward J. McManus; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HORAN:

H.R. 11123. A bill for the relief of Hyung Jin Kim; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LANKFORD:

H.R. 11124. A bill for the relief of Fidel Villanueva Magbitang; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SMITH of Virginia:

H.R. 11125. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Blanche M. Napier; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TOLLEFSON:

H.R. 11126. A bill to authorize the admittance of the vessel, *City of New Orleans*, to

American registry and to permit the use of such vessel in the coastwise trade; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. WALTER:

H.R. 11127. A bill for the relief of Ernst Hausserman; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ZELENKO:

H.R. 11128. A bill for the relief of Winston Lloyd McKay; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BRADEMAs:

H.R. 11129. A bill for the relief of Rosa Macri; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PELLy:

H.R. 11130. A bill to authorize the admittance of the vessel, *City of New Orleans*, to American registry and to permit the use of such vessel in the coastwise trade; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII,

290. The SPEAKER presented a petition of Ray Killian, executive secretary, Arizona Interstate Stream Commission, Phoenix, Ariz., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to requesting that solutions to the saline problems as have arisen in the Mexicali Valley, Mexico, be sought strictly within the limits of the existing treaty, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Plight of the Cotton Industry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. B. EVERETT JORDAN

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, April 4, 1962

Mr. JORDAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the text of an address delivered by the distinguished junior Senator from Georgia, Mr. TALMADGE, at the annual convention of the American Cotton Manufacturers Institute in Palm Beach, Fla., on Saturday, March 31, 1962. Senator TALMADGE made a penetrating analysis of many of the problems facing the textile industry, and his address was extremely well received by those attending the convention.

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

TEXT OF REMARKS OF U.S. SENATOR HERMAN E. TALMADGE, OF GEORGIA, BEFORE THE ANNUAL MEETING OF THE AMERICAN COTTON MANUFACTURING INSTITUTE AT PALM BEACH, FLA., SATURDAY, MARCH 31, 1962

My friends, I have a deep appreciation for this great and vital industry whose guidance rests in your hands. It is inescapable, for I'm a Georgian.

It is your industry in which some 95,000 Georgians earn their daily bread.

It is your industry to which more than 85,000 Georgia cotton farmers sell their product.

It is your industry that keys countless other industries and businesses to such an extent that perhaps there isn't a Georgia family whose welfare isn't affected by your activity.

The conclusion is clear. As a Member of the U.S. Senate, any contribution I might make for the benefit of your industry will be also a contribution to the welfare of the State I have the honor to serve.

To go a step further, however, let me say I sincerely believe that any contribution that anyone might make for this essential industry will stand as a contribution to the welfare of our Nation.

And this view, you can be assured, is being taken by my colleagues in the Senate. Believe me, your industry is not without friends in the Congress. This fact has been demonstrated in an unusually unique and effective way in both Houses of the Congress during the past year or so.

There is a growing awareness of the unsound, unfair, and intolerable situation the American textile industry has been plunged into by Government policies.

Here we have an industry that virtually stands alone as a showcase of the American concept of free enterprise, yet one that has been damaged by cumulative Government policies that can be characterized charitably as careless but more accurately as stupid.

Since World War II we have seen the American textile industry retain its basic competitiveness, continue to turn out superior products at minimum prices, place on the market the results of the most modern research, meet consumer demands, and then find itself in trouble. Why?

We have seen textile jobs fall from more than one and a quarter million in 1947 to around 840,000 today. Production of cotton goods has plummeted. Prices have shrunk. Profits have fallen. Textile mill stocks are selling below their book value. Why?

That's the big question, ladies and gentlemen. Why?

The answer, or rather the explanation for this incredible, shocking situation, is to be found where our national policymakers gather.

The American textile industry, moreso than any other industry, has had to live and try to grow trussed in a governmental straitjacket. This happened, not because it had become unruly or ugly or dangerous, but primarily because the attendant—the policymaker—was unwilling to face up to the facts and deal with them intelligently.

You will remember that a few years ago the U.S. Senate established a special subcommittee to investigate everything that has happened to the industry. And the conclusion, in essence, was that most of its problems stemmed from Government policies and, by the same token, solutions would have to come from Government action.

A start in this direction was made just about a year ago. You will recall that my colleague from Rhode Island, the Honorable JOHN O. PASTORE, reactivated his Textile Study Committee to update all pertinent information and renewed its recommendations to the executive branch of the Government.

In turn, President Kennedy took some rather unprecedented steps to move in on some of the basic problems of this industry, particularly as they relate to policies of Government. He appointed a special Cabinet-level committee, headed by the Secretary of Commerce, to explore the situation and make recommendations to him. An interagency textile subcommittee was formed, headed by the Assistant Secretary of Commerce. For a period of months there was intensive activity in the executive branch of Government, given full support and encouragement by those of us in the Congress, and aimed at coming up with a plan of action.

It was, and continues to be, an unusual situation. I do not recall a previous instance where any American industry has received such concentrated interest and attention at the highest levels of Government—

both within the legislative and executive branches. It is a tribute to the national significance of your industry and to the manner in which you and your representatives have gained public understanding and recognition for your situation.

The result, of course, was the so-called President's textile program, and the steps that have been taken under it.

Now, I would like to convey to you an assessment of what has been done and what remains to be done for the President's program to become genuinely meaningful to the industry and to the Nation. And I can assure you that most, if not all, of my views are shared by my colleagues in the U.S. Senate and our friends in the House of Representatives.

First, the Treasury Department's action in having the Internal Revenue Service revise the depreciation schedules for the textile and apparel industries represents a concrete contribution toward strengthening the industry. This, coupled with an investment incentive proposal in the pending tax bill, can be regarded as an important plus, and I am sure is already stimulating new interest in plant improvement and modernization. This is an objective you have sought for years, and its attainment is a major victory.

Then there were the international trade arrangements, dealing only with cotton textiles, with which you are familiar and which certainly appear to become another plus. My colleagues and I, however, are fully cognizant of the fact that the international arrangements will stand or fall upon the character of enforcement given by our Government.

There must be no loopholes. There must be strict adherence to the terms and intent of the arrangements. There must be no departure from the position that, first and foremost, the interests of the American textile industry must be served.

Those of us who have watched closely the development of these arrangements are encouraged by recent actions of the U.S. Government in enforcing its rights under the program. Such positive action, right now in the beginning, is vital as a signal to the rest of the world that the United States means business. In all candor, I must say that this is a new and strange departure for our Government, and I hope it isn't too good to last.

Now, I understand there are some indications that the administration will move shortly in an effort to bring some order to free world trade in fibers other than cotton—woolens, worsted, manmade fibers, and silk. This is essential. There was never the slightest indication in the President's program that it was to apply only to cotton products, important as they are.

The textile industry of the world today is so complex, so interrelated, that a partial solution will create distortions that will plague both you and the Government from now on. The problem is not resolved on the

basis of a piecemeal solution, and those of us in the Congress will not rest on the subject until there is action across the board.

Many of us in the Congress share a view widely held in this audience. That is, if the Office of Emergency Planning were to rule favorably on the case now pending before it, the way would be clear for the President to deal quickly and forthrightly with problems on all fibers. In fact, the authority given to him by such an action would make it much easier and simpler for him to do whatever is necessary to complete his textile program.

It should be remembered that one aspect of the international arrangements concerned a change in attitude by the nations in the European Common Market toward Asian textile exports. The Europeans have been keeping their doors closed to the Japanese and Asian output. They let the U.S. market bear the brunt of the low-wage imports from these countries.

It is to the credit of U.S. negotiators that they were able to persuade the Common Market countries to lessen the Asian pressure on the United States by opening up their markets. This facet of the arrangement is of vital importance to Japan and the other countries of the East, and they make themselves look selfish and ridiculous when they threaten not to sign the arrangement if the United States takes certain other actions.

There is no question but that Europe represents an important market for American industrial and agricultural products. But let it not go unnoticed that the Common Market was established in part for the purpose of protecting the economies of the participating nations against all outsiders, not for the purpose of throwing wide open their doors to the rest of the world.

Now let us turn our attention to another item of unfinished business as we chronicle the results of the administration program for dealing with the Nation's textile import problem.

You may recall that last May 2 the President's pronouncement included these words—and I quote:

"I have directed the Department of Agriculture to explore and make recommendations to eliminate or offset the cost to U.S. mills of the adverse differential in raw cotton costs between domestic and foreign textile producers."

Almost 3 months later, by direction of the Secretary of Agriculture, the raw cotton cost differential between U.S. mills and foreign mills increased from \$30 to \$42.50 a bale.

Those of us in the Congress, and especially those of us on the Agriculture Committee of the U.S. Senate, were fully aware of the fact that a bad situation had worsened.

It strengthened my conviction that a farm bill I had offered to the Senate was on the right track. Its purpose was to free the farmer to sell his product on a market that could seek its own levels under the law of supply and demand. It is my view that the most efficient and economical way under such an arrangement would be to provide compensatory payments on basic commodities to farmers equal to the difference between the market price and 100 percent of parity.

In effect, such a program would have enabled our own textile mills to buy American cotton at the prevailing world price, thereby eliminating entirely the two-price system.

In my opinion, it is very unfortunate that the regional politics of this whole farm policy situation are such that any legislation along this line has not been able to gain momentum, even though there is substantial support among many Members of Congress.

This being true, there obviously is only one way to comply with the President's directive to the Secretary of Agriculture—that is, to offset the disparity between the United States and world prices for cotton by placing on all

cotton product imports a fee equal to the difference in price, as reflected by the raw cotton export subsidy.

As you well know, the Secretary of Agriculture made such a recommendation to the President; the President acted on the recommendation by initiating a Tariff Commission investigation of the subject; the required hearings have been held; and we now await the findings and recommendations of that body. In my opinion, an undeniably impressive case has been made for such an offset import fee.

My friends, let me say this, simply and clearly, for one and all, including our friends in Japan, to understand: The cotton cost equalization fee must be established.

And, at the risk of digressing, let me just say another word about our Japanese friends.

Personally, I resented very much the Japanese textile industry's intervention in the section 22 case before the Tariff Commission. To my way of thinking, this is a case of the Japanese interfering with the internal affairs of the United States.

Many of you here, I am sure, recall the efforts we went to in the postwar days to help Japan get back on her feet, back in the textile business and many other businesses. To be sure, Japan's friendship is important to us. But her textile industry went beyond the bounds of good order in raising a worldwide clamor of protest against our Government's efforts to correct an intolerably unfair situation here at home.

Some press articles would lead us to believe that Japan would attempt to frustrate the international textile trade arrangements if our Government establishes a cotton cost offset fee. This is incredible, but should it come to pass, I assure you it will not go unnoticed on the part of the U.S. Congress.

I repeat, it is imperative that the raw cotton cost equalization fee be established as a matter of equity and justice for you manufacturers, for the benefit of our cotton farmers, and in the interest of the general public.

My interest in this particular issue grows out of my official duties. It is my privilege to serve on the Finance and the Agriculture Committees of the U.S. Senate. And these committees have responsibility for helping to shape the Nation's foreign trade and farm program legislation.

Within a matter of weeks my committee is going to have an opportunity to examine and pass upon proposals for the law under which the United States will engage in foreign trade in the years to come.

The measure we will consider will be whatever bill the House of Representatives enacts. The House Ways and Means Committee, as you know, is presently holding hearings on the administration's proposal. And there is little likelihood that the administration bill as originally drafted will emerge from the House without change.

There is no doubt in my mind but that it is in our Nation's best interests for our trade legislation to take note of the development of the European Economic Community. It poses tremendous problems for us, not only from an economic standpoint but also with respect to Soviet Russia's announced purpose to use trade as a weapon in the cold war.

President Kennedy is correct in wishing to have a trade law that will permit the United States to expand its exports and thereby share in the growing prosperity within the Common Market. It is logical for him to seek broader authority to cope with trade problems in a fast-changing world situation.

For my part, however, I am gravely concerned over the failure of provisions in the present trade agreement act to protect individual American industries from debilitating injury as the result of indiscriminate imports.

It was heartening to see the President, only about 10 days ago, approve Tariff Commission recommendations for higher duties on imports of certain carpets and glass. This was an occasion where the executive branch of the Government permitted the intent of Congress to be served. This hasn't happened too often in recent years; this was a refreshing, encouraging change. And I hope sincerely it was the beginning of a trend.

It is inconceivable to me that the Congress, while fully in accord with the need for up-to-date trade machinery, would strip away all safeguards against destruction of American industries.

Our farmers, workers, and investors simply cannot be subjected to downward trends in employment, production, sales, prices, and profits while inventories, material costs, labor costs, and imports go skyward. Not if we are to maintain a healthy, expanding, and prosperous economy in our land.

I need not tell you that manufactured articles cannot compete under a system of free trade where the cost of labor is a paramount factor. Our products just cannot compete with those from Europe and Asia where their labor costs range from one-fourth to one-tenth of ours.

It is my conviction that the remedy for this does not lie in placing unemployed American workers and distressed American industries on the Government payroll. There must be a more reasonable and workable prescription. And it is my opinion that the success or failure of President Kennedy's proposed trade expansion program hinges upon the safeguards it provides for American jobs. There is no reason why such provisions, thoughtfully and carefully developed, should be inconsistent with the objectives of a new trade policy.

A Bill To Authorize Life Imprisonment or the Death Penalty for the Sale of Narcotics to the Youth of This Country

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. PAUL A. FINO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 4, 1962

Mr. FINO. Mr. Speaker, I am introducing a bill today which would authorize life imprisonment or the death penalty for the sale of narcotics to the youth of this country.

The objective of this bill is to safeguard our Nation's youth, which is another way of saying, safeguarding this Nation's future. In the words of FBI Director J. Edgar Hoover:

Of all the corrupters of youth, none is more terrible than the dope peddler who entices children to try narcotics. Such a calculated assault on the standards of our youth should be met by a force of good within each community, united behind stern law enforcement and punishment.

Stern law enforcement and stern punishment are the most effective universally recognized way to curb the flow of illicit drugs. But the penalties that we have put into the law for the sale of narcotics, especially for the sale of drugs to minors, are not commensurate with the vicious crime which is committed. It is important to note in this regard that the narcotic problem is to a great

extent a juvenile problem, since most, if not all, addicts acquire the habit during their teens. At present, the pusher who sells drugs to a minor is liable for a minimum jail sentence of only 10 years. This term is only 5 years longer than that which applies to pushers who sell to adults.

My bill would amend section 7237(b) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide that any person who sells drugs to a minor may be subject to life imprisonment or death. While the penalties I propose are severe, nobody will deny that the purveyor of this "living death" should get less, or that such a penalty is not commensurate with the crime.

The U.S. Commissioner of Narcotics has gone on record time and again to the effect that "strong laws, good enforcement, stiff sentences are the necessary foundation upon which any successful program must be predicated." And that makes good sense, as all of us know from the enactment of the Lindbergh Act and the more recent aircraft piracy legislation, both of which authorize the death penalty and both of which have had the desired deterrent effect. The insidiousness of narcotic addiction with its terrible implications to the individual, and indeed to the Nation as a whole, requires similar forceful treatment. Stern penalties must be written into our statute books. Without them the courts do not have the tools to implement the program to wipe this crime from our communities.

Unlike other proposals in this area, my bill does not lump the narcotic traffic and everything and everyone related to it as a criminal activity; it is aimed solely at the pusher, and not the affected person on whom this traffic feeds.

For the sake of our children and our Nation's future, I commend this proposal for your immediate and serious attention.

Future of Reclamation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. QUENTIN N. BURDICK

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, April 4, 1962

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. President, early in March, Chairman ANDERSON, of the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee, put in the RECORD an exchange of letters with the Secretary of Agriculture on the continuing need for irrigation. In his letter, Secretary Freeman made it clear that to produce our food requirements in 1980 on fewer acres, we will need better, upgraded acres capable of producing 56 percent more on each acre under cultivation.

The Secretary subsequently made an address at the Farm Policy Conference in Brawley, Calif., in which he elaborated on the irrigation situation.

I ask unanimous consent to include in the RECORD, copy of a Department of Agriculture release on his address.

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

REMARKS BY SECRETARY OF AGRICULTURE ORVILLE L. FREEMAN AT A FARM POLICY DINNER AT BARBARA WORTH COUNTRY CLUB, BRAWLEY, CALIF., MARCH 3, 1962

Secretary of Agriculture Orville L. Freeman said today in Brawley, Calif., in the Imperial Valley, that sound reclamation and irrigation projects and the land adjustment proposals of the food and agriculture program for the 1960's are compatible with each other.

The Secretary based his statement on three foundation facts:

1. To attempt to balance production with market needs by eliminating sound reclamation and irrigation projects would be tantamount to deliberately promoting inefficient use of agricultural resources.

2. Reclamation and irrigation have a highly necessary role to play in the wise present and future use of national land and water resources.

3. Most of the farm products coming from irrigated land are not the ones for which there are serious overproduction problems.

Speaking at the opening of the Imperial County Fair, Secretary Freeman noted that 95 percent of the cropland in Imperial County is irrigated. The average value of the land and buildings comprising the 1,300 farms in the county is more than \$200,000—twice the average for California as a whole and several times the average farm value in the United States.

"There is no conflict between sound reclamation and irrigation and the proposed A-B-C-D farm program," the Secretary said. "The crops grown on reclaimed and irrigated land are not primarily crops that are seriously in surplus.

"It is only through reclamation and irrigation that many areas in the West can have agriculture at all. Production from these acres is essential to both local and regional economies. More than 150 crops are grown on irrigated lands in the West, many of them not produced elsewhere in commercial quantities.

"It is unsound to suggest that the current imbalances which exist in some crops could be corrected by squeezing off water resource development in one section of the country.

"The same attitude is expressed by some who feel that the problem of overproduction could be solved by squeezing out farmers who have inadequate resources or by cutting back the investment in research. All such proposals avoid the basic question raised by the technological revolution in agriculture and none of them would solve the problem of production exceeding efficient use.

"Irrigation makes it possible for farmers to diversify to crops which are more profitable and in current market demand.

"As we look to the longtime future there is no question but that reclamation and irrigation must go forward. The concept fits logically into the abundance, balance, conservation, development approach. Certainly there is an urgent need for planning the future use of land to assure agricultural abundance and balance, while at the same time providing for conservation and development. We must plan now for farming, for recreation, for forests, for wildlife, for efficient use of limited water supplies, and for a land reserve before the acres are gobbled up and we have passed the point of no return in terms of future wise land use.

"Finally, there never has been, is not now, and I do not see how there ever can be, a sound argument for planned inefficiency in agriculture. Whatever short-term benefit might conceivably be derived from the standpoint of balancing supply and demand

through inefficiency would be far more than offset by the waste of human, natural, and manmade resources. Our entire economy rests in large measure on a foundation of increasing agricultural efficiency, and the future progress of that economy will rest on further increases in farming efficiency.

"The technological revolution in agriculture has brought great rewards to the economy of the Nation. It has provided American consumers with more and better food at lower real cost than the people of any other nation have ever enjoyed. It has brought sustenance to hungry people throughout the world. The one real difficulty is that it has not brought adequate rewards to the farmers who produce this abundance. Problems of surpluses and low farm returns have blinded us to the tremendous productive success of our agriculture that has become the envy of most of the world.

"The problems exist because we have not been able to match the rate of advance in productivity with commensurate advances in social, political, and economic engineering that are necessary if we would make full use of our abundance.

"Research and education—yes, and mechanization and irrigation—have taught and enabled the American farmer to produce abundantly, but we have not yet learned how to manage that abundance in the best interest of all. Agricultural and industrial science has shown us that we can produce more abundantly than we can consume, but social science has not yet shown us how to engineer this efficient productivity to benefit the farmer producers, whose incomes average far below those of the nonfarm producers in the economy."

Representative Collier, of Illinois, Addresses American University Marketing Conference

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN KYL

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 4, 1962

Mr. KYL. Mr. Speaker, the following is an address delivered by my colleague, the Honorable HAROLD R. COLLIER, of Illinois, at the Third Annual Conference on Business-Government Relations in Marketing, sponsored by the American University, on March 30. Representative COLLIER, who was an advertising and sales promotion executive prior to his election to the House of Representatives, looks at the problem of the business and Government relationship from "both sides of the fence" and provides an objective study of the subject. His remarks offer nutritious food for thought as Congress deliberates on many issues which will have a deep impact upon marketing procedures in the months ahead.

The address follows:

BUSINESS AND GOVERNMENT IN MARKETING

(By Hon. HAROLD R. COLLIER, of Illinois)

The subject of this conference is as vast in its scope as the entire operation of this Nation's economic system. This sounds like an exaggeration, but is it? Speaking of government on one hand, in its broad sense, we have the greatest centralization of power in a single entity existing anywhere in the free world. While marketing, on the other

hand, is properly defined as the aggregate of functions involved in transferring title and in moving goods from producer to consumer, including among others, buying, selling, storing, transporting, standardizing, financing, risk bearing, and supplying market information.

Hence the relationship between the two demands the closest cooperation and coordination in serving the public interests. Congress, in its wisdom, created the prime regulatory agencies and vested in them the power to regulate interstate commerce. Congress alone passes the laws which govern in varying degree the many facets of marketing; and it is incumbent upon the regulatory agencies to enforce these laws entirely within the realm of the intent of Congress. Obviously, if this were not the case, a regulatory commission or board would have the power to completely ignore regulations essential to the public interest in one extreme or virtually destroy any process of marketing on the other.

Since the Government must properly act to police the Federal statutes in many fields of commerce, it is entirely understandable that the performance of its enforcement duties generates allegations of hostility. But, of course, enforcement procedures in almost any field are accompanied by feelings of hostility on the part of those who are involved.

However, it seems to me that the Federal Government, its agencies, and the Congress have a certain responsibility, that of contributing to a healthy climate in which legitimate free enterprise can flourish. Laws which provide tools of too stringent control and harassment directly affect public confidence and create a business environment which is reflected in the marketing processes.

On this chord, let us briefly examine some of the legislation which I know is of deep concern to one segment or another of our marketing system.

Yesterday, for example, the House passed the Revenue Act of 1962, an omnibus bill which embraced many areas of tax revision. I suggest that each of you gentlemen in the advertising field acquaint yourself with its contents as your professional responsibility to yourself. For example, it provides for more stringent regulations in establishing your entertainment expenses for tax purposes. And you will have to interpret a variety of expressions such as "reasonable allowances" and "expenses directly related to the active conduct of a trade or business."

Of primary interest, I know, is the pending revision of our trade policies. While the final composition of the legislation to replace the expiring Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act of 1958 is yet unknown, the basic proposal of the administration as outlined in President Kennedy's recent message will naturally require reappraisals and reevaluations of certain marketing procedures in many industries. While Congress for the most part recognizes the problems inherent in dealing with the European Common Market, it likewise recognizes the effect which it is going to have upon certain segments of our economy. To assume that government action can absorb the shocks wherever they occur through subsidies or doles, is wishful thinking. To further assume that it will provide a bonanza of immediate increases of foreign markets for American-manufactured products would be a gross miscalculation, too.

Certain businesses have already shown a sensitivity to the anticipated impact of sweeping changes in our trade and tariff policies. Others directly concerned see it as a boon to our participation in the world market. On a long-range basis we are faced with no easy series of adjustments; but we must move forward, nevertheless, in our

broader national interest; and business and industry are sure to find in the final legislation a need to revise certain marketing procedures.

One item of legislation which is pending before our Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce—one which most certainly strikes at the core of our marketing processes—is House bill 8830. This would amend the Federal Trade Commission Act to provide for the issuance of temporary cease and desist orders to prevent certain practices, pending completion of the Federal Trade Commission's proceedings. The legislation itself is well meaning and basically designed to protect the consumer as well as foreclose the prolonging of any violation during the time hearings are being conducted by the Federal Trade Commission.

On the other hand, such legislation could cause irreparable damage before the defendant in such proceedings could establish his case.

The bill further states that under certain conditions the court could issue an order directing compliance with any temporary cease and desist order issued by the Commission and that failure to obey such an order of the court may be punishable as a contempt thereof.

You are all aware of the proposal before Congress that would change the drug patent law and would force holders of new drug patents into compulsory licensing for the manufacture of a new product at a fixed royalty after 3 years from the time of issuance of a new patent. As you know, patents are now protected for 17 years. Presently the proposal would be restricted to the drug industry but it most certainly has implications of precedent which can hardly be ignored in retrospect. There is no question that such legislation, if enacted, could, by reason of precedent, be broadened to include many types of patents.

Just yesterday the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce approved a bill which, if enacted, will require by law that television manufacturers include on all television receivers shipped in interstate commerce a unit for receiving both VHF and UHF signals, regardless of whether a particular consumer wants or needs the facility. There is a very good possibility that this bill will be enacted into law during this session; but there is a great deal less probability that Congress will act to eliminate the 10-percent Federal tax on television receivers to compensate for the inevitable increase in the cost of manufacturing only all-channel sets for shipment in interstate commerce.

It is normal for proponents of stringent regulatory legislation to point to malpractices of some individuals or companies in justification of their position. And none of us here are so naive as to believe that there isn't merit to this argument. More often than not, however, it is usually a case of requiring all business operations to suffer for the sins of a few who insist on making false advertising claims or engaging in some unethical practice or another.

In summary, let me say that management has before it the task of self-discipline, an area in which there is always room for improvement. And I hasten to assure you that this is applicable to Congress, the agencies and the Government itself, for that matter. But that is another subject.

The fact remains that it is the responsibility of the legislators and the agencies of Government to protect the consumer, just as it is the duty of business and industry.

Because the American business community is and always has been fiercely competitive, there is a great degree of consumer protection provided. And I have found from my own personal experience in this field that the American consumers are a pretty astute

lot. More business firms have failed because the American consumer would not tolerate mistreatment or malpractice than have been forced out of business by legislation or regulation. Granted, there are always consumers who are gullible and who will be victimized by misrepresentation; but I am prepared to believe that these are the exception rather than the rule and I also believe that most successful businesses remain successful because they render a service or a product in which the public has confidence. For it is elementary that when any enterprise operates in a manner that destroys public confidence in it, it is destined to failure.

At the same time, we all recognize that Government has a solemn responsibility to protect the consumer, too. But in this process, we must guard against legislation and practices that force business to operate in a climate of public suspicion and skepticism, or in an atmosphere of constant uncertainty.

The fact that Government today, through legislative channels and executive action, is applying artificial respiration to resuscitate some industries which it has helped to strangle through regulation and legislative controls is in itself significant.

The gigantic and vitally important business of advertising in this most productive Nation is one which requires mutual understanding and cooperation between its participants and Government. For only if this exists can we expect to achieve the goal to which we are all dedicated, that of expanding our gross national product to preserve and improve a standard of living which has been the highest for the greatest number of people of any nation in history.

The National Lottery of Greece

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL A. FINO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 4, 1962

Mr. FINO. Mr. Speaker, today I would like to bring to the attention of this body the national lottery of Greece. A nation does not have to be large in population or size to realize the tremendous benefits of a national lottery. All that is required is a little common-sense.

Greece is a small nation, and one not overly blessed with natural resources. The Greeks work hard to earn their money, and they know a good revenue device when they see one.

In 1961, Mr. Speaker, the Greek national lottery took in over \$15 million—almost \$3 million more than the previous year. The profits amounting to almost \$3½ million were applied by the Government to the support of welfare, education, science, and archeology.

Mr. Speaker, why can we not be as wise as our foreign friends and capitalize on the normal human urge to gamble? A national lottery in the United States can easily and painlessly pump into our Government coffers over \$10 billion a year in additional revenue which can be used to bring tax relief to our wage earners and start reducing our big national debt.

Post Office Gives Its Side of a Controversy Over the Mails

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. MORRIS K. UDALL

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 4, 1962

Mr. MORRIS K. UDALL. Mr. Speaker, the magazine and third-class mail interests are continuing their campaign against a reasonable adjustment of postal rates to meet the mounting postal deficit. One of their recent weapons is an article in the current issue of Reader's Digest. The Honorable J. Edward Day, Postmaster General of the United States, has answered this Reader's Digest article in the April 9 issue of U.S. News & World Report. Mr. Day's presentation is so factual and forceful that I have asked leave to insert it in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

The article follows:

POST OFFICE GIVES ITS SIDE OF A CONTROVERSY OVER THE MAILS

(By J. Edward Day, Postmaster General of the United States)

Myths, as everyone knows, die hard. Somehow cold facts never seem to be as attractive as legend. Some people simply prefer comfortable and familiar distortion to prosaic but demonstrable fact.

Sometimes legends serve a useful purpose. The familiar story of George Washington and the cherry tree has taught generations of American children a memorable lesson in truthfulness.

Sometimes legends serve a less laudable purpose. So it is with the hoary myths surrounding the Post Office Department. The Reader's Digest editorial, reprinted recently in U.S. News & World Report (in the issue of Mar. 26, 1962) dredges up once again the fanciful notions—almost all of them wrong—which do a great disservice to 582,000 proud, resourceful members of a vast but highly efficient communications system.

But more important is the disservice done the 54 million American households who use this system and, as mail users, can and do bear their share of the cost of its operation.

I speak so forcefully of myth versus fact in the postal service from a unique position—that of a Postmaster General who came to the management of this Department directly from a top executive position in one of America's largest corporations.

My management experience—first in business, now in Government—convinces me that any sound American business would do well to employ the kind of men and women who make up our postal service.

Our employees take pride in their increasing efficiency. They might be amused, for instance, at the Reader's Digest mention of the advanced technology of the Netherlands post office. There, the average Dutch postal worker handles the equivalent of 95,000 letters per year, while his much-maligned American counterpart, measured on the same basis, handles a volume of 121,000.

Since 1950 the volume of mail has increased 44.1 percent, but total man-years of employment have increased only 19.5 percent. Clerk employment alone has increased only 13.9 percent.

But I am heartened to find so many areas of agreement between the publishing industry and the Post Office Department.

We both agree that postal rates must be increased and postal costs must be carefully controlled.

We both agree that magazine-newspaper publishing is more than a business. The public interest is certainly served by the widest possible dissemination of news and information.

We both agree that publications should have a concessionary rate.

We both agree that magazine publishing these days is a precarious business at best.

We both agree that modernization and mechanization of the postal service are vital.

We both agree that the bulk of the cost of the proposed first-class increase would be borne by industry and commerce—as would the cost of the second- and third-class increases.

Our areas of agreement don't end here.

The Reader's Digest noted: "If a businessman were presented with the problem of putting the Post Office on a sound basis, he would take one obvious step at once: He would eliminate from postal expenses all costs for the many functions which are in every sense a public service."

I am the businessman who was presented with this problem. I did eliminate public service costs from postal expenses.

To review a bit, the Postal Policy Act of 1958, enthusiastically endorsed by the publishing industry, identified the areas of public service. But, up until 1961, the Department was quite content to ignore the intent of the Congress, clearly expressed in the 1958 legislation.

We, on the other hand, concluded early in our administration that the intent of the Congress should be implemented. For the first time, we successfully advocated proper recognition of these public service costs which should not be properly charged to the regular users of the mail.

If the previous pattern of cost determination were followed, ignoring the clear intent of the law, allowances for public services in 1963 would be about \$74 million.

We have determined these allowances—to be deducted from costs charged to mail users big and small—properly total \$247.8 million. Not surprisingly, we find the publishing industry agreeing with us on this more liberal and realistic approach.

But here, unfortunately, the area of agreement ends.

The Reader's Digest and other magazines need be concerned only with their own self-interest in regard to the adjustment of postal rates.

I cannot.

Let's make it clear what we mean when we discuss an increase in second-class postage. We propose to charge 1 cent more for each copy of a magazine or newspaper, such increases to become effective in two steps, 1 year apart.

At present, publications mailed at the regular rate pay 25 percent of what it costs us to handle them.

The Reader's Digest pays 2½ cents per copy mailed.

In other words, at the same time we ask the letterwriter to pay 5 cents instead of 4 cents, we ask the Reader's Digest to pay only 3½ cents instead of 2½ cents.

The Reader's Digest would shift the burden of increase in postal rates—which all agree are needed—to users of first-class mail to lighten the burden on second class, which is used for distributing their product. We cannot agree. I have the responsibility of being sure that the needed increases are fairly distributed among all the users of the mail.

Let us look at the economics of publishing. Magazines today are faced with new competition for the time and attention of their traditional audience. It is true that a number of magazines and newspapers have gone out of business or merged with others.

It is also true that a substantial number of new publications have gone into business and seem to be thriving. For example, such publications as TV Guide—third-largest magazine in the mails—American Heritage and Sports Illustrated are among some 30 magazines that have begun publication in the last 10 years.

The impressive list of successful new publications suggests strongly that factors other than postal rates determine the success or failure of a magazine.

A study by J. K. Lasser published by the Magazine Publishers Association indicates that second-class postage consumes just over 3 percent of total magazine revenues. Profits account for 1.7 percent of revenues.

Other costs run something over 95 percent. Most businessmen would be inclined to look at the vast area of 95 percent of an industry's cost for symptoms of its difficulty. Few managers, I think, would concentrate their efforts just in the 3-percent segment.

In an effort to solve immediate financial problems, magazines are placing greatest reliance on advertising revenues. In order to improve their revenue from advertising, they find it necessary and desirable to seek the largest possible circulation. With large circulation they can charge higher rates per page to their advertisers.

As a consequence, magazines are bending every effort to secure more and more subscribers. This is expensive.

For example, the Reader's Digest, which spends \$3.2 million for postage to deliver the magazine to the subscriber, spends \$4.4 million to solicit still more subscribers through the use of circular advertising mail.

The reader of a magazine who buys a year's subscription pays a lower per-copy price than the casual newsstand purchaser. Recently, in the race for expanded circulation, publishers have made special promotional subscription offers at substantial discounts below the regular subscription price. For instance, today the special offers have become the rule rather than the exception, with about half of all subscriptions being sold at the special rate. Some magazines have as much as 80 percent of their total circulation sold at special rates.

For example, the Reader's Digest has a special-rate offer, introduced in its current issue. The single-copy price at the newsstand is 35 cents. The cost of each copy bought at the regular subscription price is 33½ cents. But the current special offer brings the cost down to 17 cents per copy. This is 18 cents less than the newsstand price and 16 cents less than the regular subscription price.

The Reader's Digest only has to reduce the amount it is now giving away in discounts from 18 cents to 17 cents or from 16 cents to 15 cents in order to cover the added postage costs on a very large segment of its circulation.

According to the most recent publication of the Association of National Advertisers, the Reader's Digest, for example, sells 98.5 percent of all its subscriptions on terms under their basic subscription price.

The real question seems to be: Are lower rates for mailing magazines being used to serve the public interest or are they being used to increase the revenue from advertising by means of higher advertising rates based on artificially swollen circulation?

Merchandisers quite frequently sell products at discounted prices to build volume. On the other hand, if the discounted prices, in spite of the volume they create, reach the point where they wipe out profit, the merchandiser cannot logically turn to his Government for subsidy.

Yet the current position of the magazine-publishing industry, if we are to accept its plea that magazines be excused from paying their share of increased postal rates, is exactly that.

Such an approach to merchandising is not, in my opinion, sound business or good government.

The editors of the Reader's Digest quote John Fisher, editor of Harper's, as follows: "I just can't believe that the Government actually intends to destroy magazines such as Harper's, the Atlantic Monthly, the Reporter, Commentary, Commonweal, and Saturday Review."

The Post Office does not intend to destroy any magazines. That certainly is not our purpose. In proposing rate increases we cannot properly choose any user or any type of magazine as deserving particular or special consideration. The courts, including the Supreme Court, have ruled that, so long as its content does not violate the law, the Post Office cannot pass judgments as to the value or quality of the publication.

Value judgments are made by the reader when he chooses which of the 12,000 diverse magazines being published he will buy and read. This is as it should be.

There are one or two other observations I would like to make about specific points raised in the Reader's Digest.

A paragraph states that "several national accounting experts have recommended that the Post Office cost system should be overhauled to end the issuance of inaccurate, thoroughly misleading figures about profits and losses on the various classes of mail." This, too, is one of those myths that persist in the face of fact. The cost-accounting system is a convenient target for attack, when the actual target is not the system but the inescapable conclusion from its findings. The several national accounting experts apparently are not familiar with the discussion, debate, and legislative history on which the Post Office accounting system is based. These experts are apparently not familiar with the conclusion reached by such highly qualified people as Price Waterhouse & Co., which has testified to the soundness and accuracy of the cost-ascertainment system.

FOR A BALANCED POSTAL BUDGET

The Reader's Digest suggests that, even after the postal rates are increased, a deficit will remain because "red ink is waiting in the wings" in the form of increased pay for postal workers. Actually, President Kennedy's overall budget recommended an increase in postal rates sufficient to cover a deserved increase for postal employees. For the first time in history, an administration has simultaneously taken the initiative in both of these areas. The result of enactment by the Congress of both rate and pay legislation as proposed by the administration would be not barrels of red ink, but rather the first deficit-free peacetime postal budget since 1916.

Fiction and fact again appeared in an untidy intermixture when the Reader's Digest chose to say: "It is obvious that by ending the horse-and-buggy methods * * * by installing mail-handling machinery of all kinds, the Post Office could save tremendous sums of money."

I suspect that even the Reader's Digest would concede the way the mail was handled 100 years ago would not give them today the distribution system that makes possible the virtually simultaneous delivery of their magazine each month in millions of homes—at 2½ cents per copy.

As far back as 1922, mechanized sorting equipment was being tried out by the U.S. Post Office. Many of our offices today have modern machines to speed the flow of mail and eliminate the menial drudgery of our employees. As fast as they are developed—and proven practical—new mechanical aids are added to our postal system.

We have a high degree of mechanization in 27 of our major post offices which handle about 34 percent of our total mail. Exten-

sive mechanization is practicable only in our larger offices with their heavy, concentrated mail volume.

Meanwhile, foreign postal systems look to us—not the other way around—for the latest in postal mechanization. For example:

"The United States has made the most advances in research and development * * * as compared with all other members of the Consultative Committee on Postal Studies," according to L. T. Hoolboom, Superior Director of Posts, the Netherlands.

"The most advanced mechanization seen in any postal system," said Stanley Scott, Assistant Director of Mechanization and Building, London, England.

"We got numerous suggestions from your postal laboratory and your mechanized post offices for future development of mechanization and automation in our postal service." Franz Vierling, Post Director, Bundesministerium, Bonn, West Germany, wrote recently.

Like any business, we buy and use only proven machinery in those applications where volume and utilization make such usage practical. Like any business, we are devoting talent and money to research. Through our new challenge to industry program, we are enlisting private industry in the challenges of postal mechanization.

The Reader's Digest vaguely implies, perhaps in frustration, that some presently unused machine, installed simultaneously in each of our 35,000 offices, would magically create a new mechanized era of mail handling.

The concentrated engineering talent of the free world has yet to develop such machines. When—and if—such mechanical marvels do appear, the U.S. postal system will be the first to utilize them.

But, in the meantime, we have a gigantic day-to-day responsibility. So long as letters, addressed in everything from a child's scrawl to computer type, must be read several times to move them on their way, men—not machines—will be the heart of the postal system.

So long as Americans continue to be the world's most literate people and most voracious readers, magazines and newspapers that satisfy their subscribers' wants will sell by the million. And the Post Office will continue to deliver them at concessionary rates reflecting their public interest value.

So long as the U.S. Post Office continues to fill its unique dual role as a contractor to mail users and a service to the public, our rates will have to reflect those twin responsibilities.

The postal-rate bill, passed by the House and now pending before the Senate, does just that.

In providing for \$691 million in new revenues, it will give all users of the mail a fair and equitable share of the cost of the service they enjoy without violating the historic and justified concessions granted publishers and others.

In earmarking \$248 million for public service, the legislation will realistically acknowledge the postal and nonpostal costs of running this Department in the public interest which should not be borne by mail users.

Since the days of Ben Franklin there have been those who raised strident voices claiming that the postal revenue deficiency would somehow be resolved if only the Post Office were "modernized," or "energized," or "streamlined," or "automated."

The Reader's Digest seems to envision a robot clanking up to your house and mine, delivering our mail and our Digest mechanically, getting our signature on insured packages, opening a slot in his enameled chest for collecting postage due, petting the dog with a cold metallic hand and chatting about the weather, perhaps via prerecorded tape.

WHY MAIL COSTS ARE RISING

The dreamers of such dreams choose to ignore a number of the very wideawake facts which I have outlined briefly here. The costs of running a modern and efficient postal service for the benefit of all mail users are rising because of the greater and greater use of our service by more and more people.

Our choice is not between the letter carrier who brings the mail every day and a robot who might replace him—but between a mail service paid for by those who use it or paid for by all of the taxpayers.

Staff of the Committee on Un-American Activities

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANCIS E. WALTER

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 4, 1962

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I include the following letter sent by me to the Librarian of Congress:

APRIL 4, 1962.

MR. L. QUINCY MUMFORD,
Librarian of Congress, Library of Congress,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. MUMFORD: The Library of Congress report inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of March 28, 1962, at page 5354, leaves an entirely erroneous impression regarding the staff of the Committee on Un-American Activities, of which I am chairman.

Had you given any consideration to your responsibility in preparing such a statement, you would have ascertained that the staffing of this committee is entirely different from the impression your report gives.

This committee, as you should know, consists of five members of the majority party and four of the minority party, in order that it may function as free from political influence and restraint as our system of government can devise. The positions on the staff of this committee are not held by reason of political preference, and no member of the staff is considered as a "majority employee" or a "minority employee." In order to preserve the absolute freedom of staff action, such political classifications are not made with regard to the members of the staff of this committee.

The true situation relative to the staff of this committee will be briefly stated. Of the 14 key positions on the staff, 7 are occupied by Democrats and 7 by Republicans. Six of these individuals, three being Democrats and three being Republicans, have held positions with this committee for more than 13 years.

A more detailed statement of the facts is set forth below:

Richard Arens, Republican, was appointed the first director of the committee during the 84th Congress, and upon his resignation, effective September 1, 1960, Frank S. Tavenner, Jr., Democrat, who has served as counsel for the committee since the 81st Congress, succeeded to the position of director. Gwendolyn Lewis, Republican, was appointed administrative assistant to the director (Arens), in 1957, 85th Congress, and continues to occupy that position. Counsel and cocounsel, both Democrats, were appointed during the 86th Congress. The record clerk, a Republican, was appointed during the 79th Congress. The director of research, a Re-

publican, was appointed during the 85th Congress. The head of the files and reports section, a Democrat, was appointed during the 79th Congress. The head of the editorial staff was appointed during the 84th Congress. Of the investigative staff of six, one, a Republican, was appointed during the 79th Congress; two, one a Democrat and the other a Republican, were appointed during the 80th Congress; a fourth investigator, a Republican, was appointed during the 83d Congress, and of the remaining two, one, a Democrat, was appointed during the 85th Congress, and the other, a Republican, was appointed during the 86th Congress.

I need hardly suggest that you make an appropriate amendment to your report setting forth the facts as given to you in this letter, and that it be given as full publicity as your original report.

Sincerely yours,

FRANCIS E. WALTER,
Chairman.

The War We Are Waging

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. AUGUST E. JOHANSEN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 4, 1962

Mr. JOHANSEN. Mr. Speaker, on last Saturday evening I had the honor of addressing an American strategy seminar in Buffalo, N.Y., sponsored by the Buffalo Junior Chamber of Commerce under the chairmanship of Mr. John R. Owen, Jr.

I believe that public information and educational activities typified by this 2-day seminar are an important contribution to the understanding and resolute will essential for victory over the forces of international communism. I commend the Buffalo Junior Chamber of Commerce for its activities on this score.

Under unanimous consent, I include the text of my address, "The War We Are Waging":

THE WAR WE ARE WAGING

My fellow Americans, we are at war.

Those responsible for planning and conducting this American strategy seminar are aware of that fact. This 2-day seminar testifies to that awareness.

I am honored to be a guest in this Buffalo area, ably represented in the Congress of the United States by my colleagues and good friends, Hon. WILLIAM E. MILLER, Hon. JOHN R. PILLION, and Hon. THADDEUS J. DULSKI. I am also honored to share a place on your program with Congressman PILLION and Hon. MICHAEL A. FEIGHAN, of Ohio, keynoter of the seminar, as well as with the other distinguished speakers.

I repeat, Mr. Chairman, we are at war, and I would be remiss if I did not acknowledge and pay tribute to the joint resolution introduced in the House of Representatives on June 12 last year by Congressman PILLION, "expressing a declaration of war against the 98 Communist Parties constituting the international Communist conspiracy" and pledging the United States and all of its resources "to the defeat and destruction of the Communist parties of the world." I support and commend the realism of that joint resolution and its declaration of intent.

The most heartening aspect of this American seminar is its completely nonpartisan—or perhaps more accurately bipartisan—character. It is not going to matter one whit whether we are Democrats or Republicans if we do not win the war in which we are engaged.

Before I proceed further in my discussion, I offer two brief observations.

The first is that Americans can do one thing that Khrushchev, without their aid, can never do.

They can defeat the United States.

They can do it in many ways or combinations of ways—through ignorance, apathy, superficial thinking, intemperate suspicion, overtrustfulness, shortsighted selfishness and greed, undisciplined generosity, timidity and cowardice, or through simple default.

Your presence here tonight is a token of your awareness of this harsh fact and an earnest of your determination that this shall not happen.

One further comment:

A decade ago, in testimony before a joint Senate committee hearing, General of the Army Douglas MacArthur voiced his faith in America with respect to the global conflict with international communism.

He summed it up in a single sentence of five eloquent words:

"I have confidence in us."

I share that faith. And so, I am sure, despite some rude setbacks, do you.

It is in that spirit that I address you tonight.

The subject I am assigned tonight is vast and complex. The best I can hope to do is to develop my comments around a number of simple propositions—each one of which I can discuss only very briefly.

International communism confronts us with a totally new kind of enemy, engaged in a new kind of war, seeking a new kind of total victory.

The several propositions which I will offer are for the purpose of elaborating and illustrating this basic premise.

Proposition No. 1: Communism is not something to be dealt with as if it were merely an idea.

It is not to be dealt with as if it were merely an idea because it is not merely an idea.

To be sure, Communist dogma and strategy and goals involve ideas and ideologies.

As Eugene Lyons has so aptly said:

"Communism has become an engine of power, an apparatus of destruction, which has our destruction as its primary goal."

Unless we face up to this fact, we can expect that any counterstrategy we devise will miss its target and prove self-defeating.

International communism—whatever else it may be and it is too many things to recite them in detail here tonight—is all-powerful government in its ultimate and most ruthless form, operating by internal subversion and external aggression, bent on complete world domination, and employing all of the apparatus and techniques of brute force, blackmail, infiltration, propaganda, treachery, deception, brainwashing, liquidation and all of the other methods of protracted warfare.

Let me add two observations to underscore the point that communism is not something to be dealt with as if it were merely an idea. Early in this seminar you viewed the Pentagon film, "Challenge of Ideas."

Whatever your personal evaluation of this film, I submit that any merit it possesses is pretty well sabotaged by the title itself, "Challenge of Ideas." At best this is a fragmentary and therefore gravely misleading definition of the challenge we face.

The true symbol of the challenge we face is not the debating society but the firing squad.

Communism is not merely an idea but a very simple challenge and ultimatum to be

enforced by brute force or by the threat of brute force: either acquiescence and total capitulation to the victory of international communism or liquidation.

I stress this point for a further reason.

Quite understandably the inclination of young Americans particularly is to regard all movements as being primarily subject matter for discussion and debate. In many cases young people, and many adults, view the Communist movement in this light. Unfortunately for the true Communist, the movement is not a matter of discussion but of dedication. Of course the Communists would accept adherence won by persuasion but they make unmistakably clear that those who are not persuaded are to be compelled by naked power with liquidation as the sole alternative. We are confronted, therefore, not with theory but with tyranny and brute force.

Do you doubt that? Then ask the Hungarians, the East Germans, the people of China, and the Cubans.

Proposition No. 2: The claim that the Communist Party, U.S.A., is "just another political party" is a dangerous falsehood.

And that claim is also an attractive bait for the gullible.

Let's give it a cold, hard look.

In 1959 the Communist Party, U.S.A., marked its 40th anniversary. In that connection a prominent spokesman of American communism, Mr. Herbert Aptheker, editor of the Marxist magazine, Political Affairs, wrote an article for a Moscow Communist publication issued in October 1959 reviewing the history of the party in the United States.

In this article Mr. Aptheker praised the Communist Party, U.S.A., because even in its difficult first years "it came out in support of Soviet Russia." He pointed out that "after the Hitlerite attack on the Soviet Union, the Communist Party [in the United States] aimed all its efforts at increasing the contribution of the United States to insuring victory over the enemy." He didn't mention that prior to that attack the party had denounced American war efforts as "imperialistic activity."

Finally, while criticizing certain "opportunists" in the Communist Party, U.S.A., who fell away after Soviet Russia's ruthless suppression of the Hungarian Freedom Fighters in 1956, Mr. Aptheker boasted that "the rank-and-file members of the party * * * did not adopt the road of treason."

Note that language and its clear meaning. For him, as for all American Communists, treason does not relate to the United States but to a violation of loyalty to Soviet Russia.

Just another political party?

Moreover, Mr. Aptheker in this same article singled out for special praise as a loyal Communist leader, the late Comrade William Z. Foster, chairman emeritus of the Communist Party, U.S.A. Now let me quote a statement from a book written by this American Communist leader, William Z. Foster, in 1949:

"When a Communist heads the Government of the United States—and that day will come as surely as the sun rises—the Government will not be a capitalistic government but a Soviet government, and behind this government will stand the Red Army to enforce the dictatorship of the proletariat."

Just another political party?

Another commentary on this false and dangerous claim.

Back in 1934 a member of the Young Communist League was on trial—and was convicted—for activities in connection with a riot in Minneapolis. Here are some questions and answers from the record of that trial:

"Question. But you would prefer the Russian—you would prefer to be in Russia?"

"Answer. I prefer America with a Soviet government.

"Question. Are you willing to fight and overthrow this Government?

"Answer. Absolutely.

"Question. And you are willing to take up arms and overthrow the constituted authorities?

"Answer. When the time comes, 'Yes.' "

So what, you may ask. That was in 1934. Here is "So what."

That Young Communist League member was Gus Hall. In December 1959, this same Gus Hall was elected general secretary of the Communist Party, U.S.A.

He still holds that post.

At long last, in June of last year, the U.S. Supreme Court officially affirmed what the Congress many years before had spelled out; namely, that the Communist Party, U.S.A., is not "just another political party" but is a part of a foreign based and controlled international program of conquest.

Proposition No. 3: International communism is a unique combination of "enemies, foreign and domestic" and for this reason current debate as to whether the threat is external or internal is totally unrealistic.

The threat of the international Communist conspiracy cannot be described or accurately appraised on an either/or basis but only on a both/and basis. Of course, it is an external threat.

But the techniques of subversion, espionage, sabotage, and propaganda are likewise internal threats—real, unremitting, persistently active, and potentially deadly.

On this point I quote the ablest American authority on the subject, Hon. J. Edgar Hoover:

"Some 200 known or suspected Communist-front and Communist-infiltrated organizations are now under investigation by the FBI. Many of these fronts are national in scope with chapters in various cities throughout the United States.

"They have infiltrated every conceivable sphere of activity: youth groups, radio, television, and motion picture industries; church, school, educational and cultural groups; the press, nationality minority groups and civil and political units."

Also, in a speech delivered only 4 months ago in Washington, Mr. Hoover said:

"The Communist threat from without must not blind us to the Communist threat from within. The latter is reaching into the very heart of America through its espionage agents and a cunning, defiant, and lawless Communist Party, which is fanatically dedicated to the Marxist cause of world enslavement and destruction of the foundations of our Republic."

One final word on this matter. In an address last April, President Kennedy pointed out that armies and nuclear armaments served primarily as the shield "behind which subversion, infiltration, and a host of other tactics can steadily advance." Mr. Kennedy was speaking specifically of Communist methods in Latin America and the Far East.

Can anyone be so unrealistic to suppose for a moment that the United States—prime target of Communist designs of conquest—is immune from these tactics and these efforts of the international Communist conspiracy.

Proposition No. 4: An attempt to evaluate the Communist threat solely or primarily in terms of the number of avowed or identified adherents is equally fallacious and dangerous.

In other words, it is foolish and potentially fatal to hold that there is nothing to fear about communism in this country because there are so few Communists—only a few thousand party members. This glib premise flies in the face of the history of the international Communist conspiracy.

Communists today constitute only 3 percent of the population of Soviet Russia.

Moreover, 33 million Communists in a world-wide network control 40 percent of the population of this globe—900 million people—and honeycomb the vital control centers of the societies of the remaining 60 percent of the world population.

As the great American and great Democrat who heads the House Committee on Un-American Activities, Chairman FRANCIS E. WALTER, of Pennsylvania, has said, communism is not to be compared to two or three drops of red ink added to a large jug of water and immediately diluted to the point that it falls even slightly to discolor the water.

Addressing a patriotic rally in the Waldorf-Astoria Hotel, Congressman WALTER added:

"A true analogy [is] the vast and complicated electrical wiring system in this hotel. This wiring system can be short-circuited by a single disruption at a control point."

It didn't require very many dedicated Communists to deliver our nuclear secrets to Soviet Russia.

Bear in mind also the further ominous fact that the Communists themselves boasted, as Mr. Hoover has pointed out, that for every one formal party member in the United States there are 10 fellow travelers, sympathetic nonmembers, and dupes who serve the Communist cause.

The peril is not to be measured merely by arithmetic.

Proposition No. 5: "This is neither the time for inaction nor vigilante action; the job of curtailing and containing communism is one for legally constituted authorities with the steadfast cooperation of every loyal citizen."

This fifth proposition is a quotation from a public statement last year by J. Edgar Hoover.

I wish to draw two or three specific conclusions from the premise stated by Mr. Hoover.

1. The starting point for "the steadfast cooperation of every loyal citizen" is an understanding of the international Communist conspiracy, its objectives and its methods, both domestic and foreign.

That is precisely the value and the urgency of such seminars as this.

2. There are numerous "legally constituted authorities" which share in the job of curtailing and containing communism.

These include the Federal Bureau of Investigation, the Central Intelligence Agency, the National Defense Agency, the intelligence services of the three military departments, the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee, and the House Committee on Un-American Activities.

With respect to the last two named agencies—the investigating committees of the Congress—I should like to make one point. Despite the propaganda to the contrary—much of it Communist-inspired—these two committees are a safeguard against vigilantism and not its creator. They serve the dual purpose of recommending legislation against Communist propaganda and subversion and of informing the Congress and the American people as to the facts about communism.

3. In that connection, I should like to call attention to the statement of the Supreme Court in the 1959 Barrenblatt case—a statement by the way never quoted by those dedicated to the abolition of these two legislative committees:

"That Congress has wide power to legislate in the field of Communist activity in this country, and to conduct appropriate investigations in aid thereof, is hardly debatable * * * In the last analysis this power rests on the right of self-preservation * * * Justification for its exercise in turn rests on the long and widely accepted view that the tenets of the Communist Party include the ultimate

overthrow of the Government of the United States by force and violence."

To suggest that these two essential functions can be performed by the FBI and the other agencies of the executive branch is, of course, completely mistaken. Their role in combating communism is entirely different. They operate under restrictions of secrecy which would make them virtually useless to the legislative branch.

No one suggests, of course, that, because we have the FBI and the Department of Justice, and other investigative and law enforcement agencies dealing with interstate crime, labor racketeering, antitrust violations, or other criminal or antisocial activities, there should be no legislative committee investigations in these fields. This fallacious argument is not heard except with relation to legislative investigations of communism and subversion. The argument falls on its own weight.

4. Mr. Hoover's warning against vigilantism is a timely reminder that we must always differentiate between treason and dissent; between conspiracy and heresy; between loyalty and incompetence or wrongheadedness. This means, in simplest terms, that we must avoid reckless and indiscriminate charges of communism, and on this point Mr. Hoover has some further very sound advice:

"There exists today in our land a vital rift which the Communists are exploiting. Unfortunately, this involves certain people across the country who engage in reckless charges against one another. The label of 'Communist' is too often indiscriminately attached to those whose views differ from the majority * * *"

This warning goes not merely to the matter of accuracy and fairness and to the need of avoiding the cry of "Wolf! Wolf!" but to even more fundamental considerations.

Weakness, incompetence, wrongheadedness, mistaken policies, are not necessarily treason, but they can be as fatal and as deadly as treason.

But the point is that the method for dealing with weakness, incompetence, wrongheadedness, and mistaken policies are entirely different from those for dealing with treason, disloyalty, subversion, and so on. The former falls in the field of political action. The latter falls in the field of legislation, law enforcement, surveillance, and exposure.

We illy serve the cause of anticommunism if we mistakenly confuse either the offense or the corrective measures.

Proposition No. 6: Whatever serves the cause of communism serves that cause regardless of motives.

I interject this proposition because of the very harsh fact and real peril of parallelism.

I interject this proposition as a stern reminder to those of the so-called extreme left and those who are unconscious dupes of the Communist cause.

This is not primarily an area subject to correction by law or even by the exposures of legislative committees.

It is rather a matter of citizen responsibility and conscience.

But certainly not everyone who advocates a viewpoint which coincides with the international Communist line is therefore a Communist or a traitor.

But the point is that advocates of policies which do parallel the Communists can unwittingly and unintentionally serve the Communist cause. I think it is only a matter of fairness and reciprocity that those who assert their undoubted right, for example, to advocate recognition of Red China or unilateral suspension of nuclear testing, be willing to accept in good grace the equally undoubted right of other citizens to point out the parallelism and to continue to conclude that such advocacy does in fact serve the Communist cause.

It is one of the crimes of international communism that this is the inevitable consequence.

Proposition No. 7: It is imperative that we have straight thinking regarding the matter of suspicion in this conspiratorial age.

We are frequently told these days, and particularly by the enemies of the House Committee on Un-American Activities that anti-Communist organizations and activities and even the exposure of Communists by legislative committees tends to create an unhealthy divisive and dangerous climate of suspicion and that the effect is to make Americans distrustful of their neighbors.

Frequently this aura of suspicion is linked in these denunciations with that Communist-invented term "McCarthyism."

The accusations go even to the length of suggesting that this epidemic or contagion of suspicion is virtually psychopathic.

Now I should like to address myself to just two aspects of this matter of suspicion.

Insofar as there is suspicion, it would seem reasonable to raise the question as to the genesis of that suspicion. Let me use a homely illustration:

Suppose that I happen to attend a gathering in one of the large reception rooms in a Washington hotel to which room admission is gained only through one door and only by ticket. As I enter the room I take my pocketbook from my pocket, remove the ticket and present it and thereupon replace my pocketbook in my pocket.

A short time later I find the pocketbook is missing and after a quiet search fail to locate it anywhere. I reluctantly advise my host that there apparently is a pickpocket among his guests. In consequence of my complaint, my host turns indignantly upon me, accuses me of creating suspicion, and sees to it that I am promptly ejected.

Now it would seem to me that there is some basis for alleged confusion and illogic in the mind of my host in charging me with being the cause and source of the suspicion. I am naive enough to believe that the real offender—so far as suspicion has been created—is the pickpocket. Furthermore, added to the insult of being ejected is the injury which I continue to suffer in not regaining my pocketbook.

Without torturing the analogy, I cannot conceive of anyone who would be more interested in condemning me for creating suspicion and in diverting condemnation to me, than the pickpocket himself.

Again, it is one of the crimes of international communism that by its conspiratorial and subversive activities it creates the somewhat logical suspicion that there are Communists and that they do indulge in conspiratorial activities and subversion.

Let us carry the examination of this matter of suspicion one step further.

Are we not in danger of ignoring and minimizing the survival value and imperative of suspicion?

Is it an exaggeration to say that the parents who teach their children not to accept rides from strangers, or the safety experts who warn against picking up hitchhikers are in truth creating, or at least laying the basis for suspicion and distrust?

And isn't this a healthy, necessary, and vitally protective type of suspicion? I think the answer is obvious.

Now, of course, if a guest in every gathering, however selective, views his associates as actual or potential pickpockets or if there is a disposition to impute Communist affiliations or leanings to everyone who expresses a political, economic, or social view contrary to our own, we may well have a case of psychopathic suspicion.

Here again, I venture the suggestion that the constituted authorities dealing with the facts and machinations of the international Communist conspiracy—including legislative

investigative committees, instead of creating vigilantism and generating indiscriminate suspicion, actually serve, if we will but take the time to read and ponder their findings, to discipline suspicion and keep it from getting out of hand.

Proposition No. 8: It is imperative also that we have straight thinking regarding the matter of human greed, particularly as it relates to the class war propaganda of the international Communist conspiracy.

Incidentally, this matter goes to an idea aspect of international communism and its class war propaganda.

Let me explain what I mean.

In his farewell television address to the American people at the close of his first visit to the United States—when we generously made available to our declared enemy our vast communication facilities and no one bothered to claim equal time to refute his vicious propaganda—Mr. Khrushchev said something on this score:

"Human greed is a terrible thing. Did you ever know a millionaire who didn't want to become a multimillionaire?"

This was indeed a touching homily on the sinfulness of human selfishness, avarice, and covetousness delivered of a quiet Sunday evening by a grandfatherly appearing old scoundrel who himself—and in the system he represents—epitomized another and vastly more terrible form of human greed which has never scrupled at mass murder to accomplish its unholy purposes.

Of this other and infinitely more dreadful type of human greed—the grasping greed of the totalitarian state and the ruthless dictator—Mr. Khrushchev of course said not a word. Which was to be expected.

But then, as I have indicated, neither did any top-ranking spokesman for America. Which to me is unexpected and inexplicable.

Surely someone ought to have said at once—in paraphrase of Mr. Khrushchev's words—"Human greed is indeed a terrible thing. Did you ever know of a dictator who didn't want to tighten his totalitarian grip or extend and expand the scope and sway of his domination?"

It was against this very form of greed that our Founding Fathers sought in this constitutional Republic to provide lasting safeguards.

I am not unfamiliar with the manifestations of greed for wealth. But I'll take the millionaire eager to become a multimillionaire—under a system of freedom and self-government which can curb his avarice—in preference any day to the dictator and the centralized totalitarian government which leaves freemen and freedom defenseless.

Let Mr. Khrushchev preach his sanctimonious class warfare on other soil hereafter.

Proposition No. 9: It is imperative that we have straight thinking regarding the popular cliché that "it is better to be talking than shooting."

Winston Churchill's picturesque version is, "jaw, jaw, jaw, is better than war, war, war."

Now there is just enough truth to this proposition to make it plausible and appealing. It is one of those half-truths potentially more misleading and dangerous than an outright untruth.

And of course it is a risky business for anyone to challenge the statement—as I indeed do challenge it; risky because it subjects the challenger to the charge that he prefers war—nuclear war, no less—to talk, conferences, and negotiation. And this opens the way to the epithet "warmonger."

This glib cliché that "It's better to be talking than shooting" is a dangerous half-truth precisely because—standing alone and without qualification—it ignores the crucially important fact that talk can be just as perilous, just as fatal to the cause of justice, to national security, to the survival of our freedoms as war itself. It is possible

that freedom, justice and even life itself may better survive war than talk—if, in that talk, we say or believe or trust the wrong things.

You can suffer diplomatic defeat as disastrous as military defeat. You can surrender as completely and abjectly at the conference table as on the battlefield or under an atomic holocaust.

Talk can be as catastrophic as war itself—for one reason because Soviet Russia has amply demonstrated the accuracy of the warning given by Democratic Secretary of State Bainbridge Colby in 1920 that the leaders of the Soviet regime "have frequently and openly boasted that they are willing to sign agreements and undertakings with foreign powers while not having the slightest intention of observing such undertakings." Incidentally, 50 or 52 major agreements to which the United States has been a party have been broken by Soviet Russia since we extended diplomatic recognition in 1933.

Talk can be as catastrophic as war itself in this age of scientific propaganda for another even more crucial reason. As a prominent English authority on communism has so aptly pointed out, the Communists have deliberately "decided to harness the fear of war instead of war itself to the Communist cause."

This analysis of Communist strategy, one that I believe to be appallingly accurate, adds up to a strategy of blackmail—nuclear blackmail.

And this underscores the catastrophic potential of talk.

We talked at Yalta.

And the direful consequences of that talk can be magnified at future Yaltas if we become enamoured with the efficacy of talk alone.

There is one form of talk which I regard as particularly dangerous and fatal. It is the kind of talk by supposedly responsible public officials, of either the executive or legislative branch, and for that matter on the part of nongovernmental communication media, which announces to our enemies the steps we do not intend to take in behalf of our defense and national security. I am sure that I do not have to document for this audience the fact that we have had, from time to time, that kind of talking and from the highest sources in our Nation.

Proposition No. 10: Finally, we must be alert to, and vigilant against, the insidious doctrine of fatalistic inevitability and helplessness which can only serve to sap our courage, paralyze our wills, and neutralize our power.

We must be equally alert to and vigilant against this insidious doctrine whether it has its origins in the international Communist conspiracy or whether it has its origins in inept and foolish counsels of weakness in our own midst.

The only kind of disarmament that Khrushchev or international communism are really interested in is the moral and spiritual disarmament of their enemies and principally of the United States. Time permits only the briefest documentation of this warning and this peril.

As one example, I quote from a New York Times editorial of Wednesday, April 16, 1961: "One reason for the hesitant mood is the tragic dilemma facing a democratic society which, with all its imperfections, espouses certain moral principles as pursuing its own advantage under the law of the jungle. While the Soviets seek to stir up revolution and war against us wherever they can—even to the perfidy of the Hitler-Stalin pact—we must seek to discourage anti-Communist revolts in order to avert bloodshed and war. We must, under our own principles, live with evil even if by doing so we help to stabilize tottering Communist regimes, as in East Germany, and perhaps even expose citadels of freedom, like West Berlin, to slow death by strangulation."

Here is another example:

This is a statement by Dr. Kenneth A. Foreman which appeared in the October 1961 issue of the *Presbyterian Outlook*:

"Freedom * * * or fight * * * is not the alternative any more. * * * The alternative now is 'peace' with slavery, or total destruction."

It is not my wish in the slightest degree to violate the bipartisan or nonpartisan character of these remarks or of this seminar. Yet I must offer my respectful disagreement with the statement of the Honorable J. WILLIAM FULBRIGHT, chairman of the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations, made on the floor of the Senate July 24, 1961, when he said:

"Apparently we have not yet fully accepted the fact that there are no absolute solutions, that we can hope to do little more than mitigate our problems as best we can and learn to live with them."

I have only two comments to offer regarding this statement.

I do not profess to know what Senator FULBRIGHT means by "absolute solutions." I do believe that his statement, however intended, can contribute to the philosophy of fatalistic futility which can, in turn, sap our courage, paralyze our wills, and neutralize our power.

I am sure that if Senator FULBRIGHT were lost in a forest with a working compass in his pocket, he would accept the relative solution offered by that compass instead of resigning himself to helplessness because he had no absolute solution.

I suggest also that it is fortunate that medical science has not been paralyzed into immobility because it has no absolute solutions. Doctors, to be sure, have found no absolute solution to the fact of death, but they have defeated, and do defeat, death countless times. They have eliminated scourges. They have increased life expectancy. They have not only mitigated problems—they have solved them. They have not merely enabled men to live with physical handicaps and problems—sometimes, in truth, that is all that is possible—but they have eliminated these ills and removed the handicaps. Are we to ask or expect any less of statesmanship?

I am deeply disturbed by the frequent rebukes of those who, it is alleged, glibly offer "simple solutions." It is very easy, I suspect, to equate this rebuke with a resignation to the fact that there are no solutions.

I quote, for example, Chalmers M. Roberts in his December 23, 1961, article on "Thunder on the Right." Mr. Roberts offers the premise that "In today's vastly complex world, major international problems admit of no neat solutions soothing to the international ego." Mr. Roberts adds:

"In the simpler world of the past, American power could be, and was, brought to bear and was, in itself, or with the unwritten British alliance, sufficient to accomplish all our purposes in international affairs. But gunboat diplomacy is dead; in the newer age risk of direct action by a great power entails the risk of suicide.

"In such a complex world those with the easy explanation and the simple solution appeal to the many who are frustrated with insolubility."

Mr. Roberts cites as a typical attitude of these "frustrated Americans" those who "want to know why if we can't smack the big devil in Moscow, why can't we swat the little devil in Havana."

While I admit that Cuba is a graphic and appallingly dangerous "exhibit A" as to the consequences of both incredible blunders, of "too little and too late" in terms of action which could have been effective at minimum cost had it been taken timely, and as to the example of cumulative effect of misinformation, miscalculation, lack of courage, paralysis of will and neutralization of power. I

happen also to think that, late as it is, it is not too late for decisive action, but I cannot pursue that matter further here except to say that since October 1959, I have been detailing specific suggestions for a progressive course of firm and decisive action with respect to this bastion of international communism so near our shores.

I share with Clare Booth Luce the view that "the chain of destiny is forged link by link, and so is the chain of captivity." I share also the appraisal recently given by Roscoe Drummond, the distinguished columnist:

"Fear of war has almost continuously paralyzed Western policy [since the end of World War II] but fear of war has not paralyzed Communist policy.

"If we continue to be afraid of nuclear war while the Soviets are not afraid of nuclear war, we are going to end up losing diplomatically what we fear to lose in a nuclear war. If we keep stepping back from the Moscow-created brink every time Mr. Khrushchev says: 'Give us a little something more or you will get yourselves destroyed by war'—we will keep on losing the cold war and getting nearer to actual war."

Nuclear blackmail can be frustrated by the simple expedient of refusing to be black-mailed.

Progressive steps, including declaration of contraband, total embargo, and military intervention can be taken if necessary to liberate Cuba.

Nuclear testing can and should be resumed.

Unilateral concessions can be rejected. Futile—or even worse, peace at any price—negotiations can be foregone.

Domestic Communist machinations can be, and are being, kept under surveillance, and exposed and countered by effective measures. Captive nations can be encouraged and aided in their quest for the recovery of their freedom.

Capitalism—including American capitalism—given reasonable safeguards and encouragement, can wage effective war against the inroads of the slave system of communism.

The American people can be rallied to the support of policies of "firmness in the right, as God gives us to see the right."

To General MacArthur's declaration of faith, which I quoted at the outset, "I have confidence in us," I add his words of warning and challenge delivered on the battleship *Missouri* at the surrender at Tokyo Bay: "It must be of the spirit if we are to save the flesh."

Space Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. A. PAUL KITCHIN

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 4, 1962

Mr. KITCHIN. Mr. Speaker, it has been necessary that I spend a great deal of time in my congressional district; however, I return to Washington to cast my votes, and this week I returned to vote on some important measures—among them being additional authorization for our Peace Corps program—and a supplemental appropriation bill.

Included in H.R. 11038, the second supplemental appropriation bill, 1962, which passed the House and which I supported, is an appropriation of \$80 million for the National Aeronautics and Space Administration for research and devel-

opment. This includes \$50 million to increase development effort on the Saturn program, \$9 million for additional vehicle development costs on the Centaur, and \$26 million to begin program development of a 1-million-pound-thrust engine primarily for the Nova second stage. While these funds will not complete the program on these items, it will enable a balanced program to be pursued.

Mr. Speaker, recently it has come to my attention that there has been distortion from several sources, not alone in North Carolina, regarding a vote taken in 1959 on an authorization for the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, and since this is apparently an underhanded method of creating unfavorable publicity by distorting the record of those who have supported the space program, I welcome this opportunity to set the record straight since I have been included in this campaign of distortion, stating that I did not support the space program in 1959.

The statement has appeared in the press that "If Congress had followed Mr. KITCHIN in 1959 Colonel Glenn would not have orbited the earth yet," also stating that I "voted against appropriations for the space program."

I did not in 1959, or at any other time, vote against an appropriation bill for the space agency. I have voted for each appropriation bill brought to the House of Representatives for the National Aeronautics and Space Administration. I shall continue to give this program my unqualified support.

I have voted for the authorization bills for NASA, with the exception of one, and this was not a vote against the space program, but a vote against the parliamentary procedure by which this measure was brought to the floor. Many Members opposed the bill at this time, and I feel sure for the same reason I did, the parliamentary way in which it was brought up for passage, not under normal procedure, but under a procedure known as suspension of the rules, which limits debate to only 40 minutes, 20 minutes to each side, and under this procedure, no amendments are allowed to the bill. Under this procedure, Members have little knowledge of what is in a bill, or what they are called upon to vote, except the relative few who helped to draft the legislation. It has always been my policy on all legislation, whatever the subject, to study the measure carefully, listen to full debate on the floor, and then cast my vote accordingly.

There are many who oppose this procedure of bringing bills to the floor, rather than the legislation itself, when the full facts are not available. In fact, a check of the votes on this particular authorization bill indicates that the gentleman from Missouri, Representative CLARENCE CANNON, chairman of the Appropriations Committee in the House; the gentleman from Ohio, MIKE KIRWAN, chairman of the House Democratic Congressional Campaign Committee; and the gentleman from Louisiana, Representative HALE BOGGS, the No. 3 man in the Democratic leadership, as well as the Democratic whip; and other Members of the North Carolina delegation, also vot-

ed against the procedural aspect apparently for the same reason I cast my vote.

I have supported our authorization and appropriation legislation for military and civilian space programs since I have been in Congress, and I shall continue to do so.

Bakersfield, Calif., Chamber of Commerce Effectively Helps Small Business

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. HARLAN HAGEN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 4, 1962

Mr. HAGEN of California. Mr. Speaker, the bedrock of any free society with a representative form of government based on honest uncoerced elections and a democratic social structure is the existence of large numbers of privately owned and operated business ventures. The owners and operators provide the energy, inventiveness, and variety of viewpoint necessary to a free enterprise economy, and indeed to a successful operation of government.

Unfortunately, the growth of monopoly business and government practices and policies threaten the life of our small business establishment. An awareness of this fact has produced much talk about the needs of small business, but, too often, such talk is like discussion of the weather—much is said about it, but nothing is ever done about it.

It is refreshing, therefore, to discover an agency that has done something. I refer to the Greater Bakersfield Chamber of Commerce, which serves the major population complex at the southern end of California's San Joaquin Valley.

The success story begins with the establishment by the chamber of a military affairs committee in response to the location in Kern County of two major military installations, Edwards Air Force Flight Test Center and the Naval Ordnance Test Station.

This committee was designed to assist the military mission and the community simultaneously.

As a result of the efforts of this committee under the able chairmanship of William B. Rea, a local business leader, a military procurement department of the chamber was established to provide a link between the military establishments and business firms in Bakersfield and other areas of Kern County, which were potential sources of services and supplies to such establishments.

This department fortunately was not a paper tiger. Under the directorship of Charles Carr, an action program began.

Meetings were held with military procurement officials for the discussion of the mutual problems of buyer and seller. Military procurement officials were apprized of the capability of local suppliers through plant visits and other devices. The chamber department was constituted as a liaison agent between buyer and seller.

As a result the respective military establishments arrived at a favorable appraisal of the local supply capability and implemented that appraisal with increased blanket purchase orders. The

end result has been an increase in the value of services and supplies procured in the county of Kern with a flexibility of procurement which is of value to the Government.

The benefits of this program are greater than the commercial advantages to the buyer and seller. They include a general improvement of relations between what amounts to a Federal military family and a host civilian community. The end result will be better military morale and greater military efficiency.

The program has received favorable acknowledgment by General B. H. Schriever, Commander, USAF Systems Command.

In a memorandum—dated November 27, 1961, directed to his subordinate commander, entitled "Opportunities for Small Business Concerns"—he states "3. It is also recommended that the members of your staff, whose work brings them in contact with local chambers of commerce, suggest to such civic organizations that they establish their own programs to keep small business concerns informed on opportunities for doing business with local military procurement activities. For example, the Bakersfield Chamber of Commerce employs an individual who devotes full time to liaison work between AFFTC, other governmental agencies and small concerns in the local California area. Through this medium, information on bids and requests for proposal is obtained and disseminated throughout the local small business community. This type of effort on the part of the chamber of commerce has increased competition and the participation of new small business firms in AFFTC procurements."

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

THURSDAY, APRIL 5, 1962

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D.D., offered the following prayer:

I Thessalonians 5: 21: Prove all things; hold fast that which is good.

O Thou prayer-hearing and prayer-answering God, grant that in the atmosphere and attitude of the noonday prayer we may receive the blessing of a faith that looks beyond the shadows which so frequently darken our thoughts and feelings.

Lift us by Thy spirit into those lofty heights and zones of vision and fellowship with Thee whence cometh our help and strength to carry on faithfully and courageously.

We earnestly beseech Thee that in these days when nations seem to be struggling on in chaos and confusion we may hold fast those spiritual resources by which alone mankind can be held together.

May all the members of the human family be given that unity of insight and inspiration which will bring them into a kinship of common aspiration, common duties, and a common destiny.

In Christ's name we offer our prayer. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

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

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Ratchford, one of his secretaries, who also informed the House that on April 4, 1962, the President approved and signed a bill and a joint resolution of the House of the following titles:

H.R. 4130. An act to provide assistance to Menominee County, Wis., and for other purposes; and

H.J. Res. 441. Joint resolution to commemorate the 75th anniversary of the Interstate Commerce Commission.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. McGOWN, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate agrees to the amendments of the House to a bill and a concurrent resolution of the Senate of the following titles:

S. 270. An act for the relief of Mrs. Jeliza Prendic Milenovic; and

S. Con. Res. 61. Concurrent resolution requesting the President to designate the week

of March 25, 1962, as "Voluntary Overseas Aid Week."

The message also announced that pursuant to section 4355 of title 10, United States Code, the Vice President had appointed the Senator from Louisiana, Mr. ELLENDER, the Senator from Maine, Mr. MUSKIE, and the Senator from New York, Mr. JAVITS, as members of the Board of Visitors to the Military Academy.

Pursuant to section 6968 of title 10, United States Code, the Vice President appointed the Senator from Washington, Mr. MAGNUSON, the Senator from Virginia, Mr. ROBERTSON, and the Senator from Delaware, Mr. BOGGS, as members of the Board of Visitors to the Naval Academy.

Pursuant to section 9355 of title 10, United States Code, the Vice President appointed the Senator from Wyoming, Mr. MCGEE, the Senator from Nevada, Mr. BIBLE, and the Senator from Iowa, Mr. MILLER, as members of the Board of Visitors to the Air Force Academy.

Pursuant to section 194 of title 14, United States Code, the Vice President appointed the Senator from Hawaii, Mr. LONG, a member of the Board of Visitors to the Coast Guard Academy.

Pursuant to section 1126c of title 46, United States Code, the Vice President