Lt. Gen. Arthur Gilbert Trudeau, O15513, Army of the United States (major general, U.S. Army).

2. The following-named officers under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, section 3066, to be assigned to positions of importance and responsibility designated by the President under subsection (a) of section 3066, in rank as follows:

To be general

Lt. Gen. Robert Jefferson Wood, O18064, Army of the United States (major general, U.S. Army).

To be lieutenant generals

Maj. Gen. John Hersey Michaelis, O20328, Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Maj. Gen. William White Dick, Jr., O18384, Army of the United States (brigadier general, U.S. Army).

Maj. Gen. Dwight Edward Beach, O18747, U.S. Army.

The Army National Guard of the United States officers named herein for appointment as Reserve commissioned officers of the Army, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, sections 593(a) and 3392:

To be major general

Brig. Gen. George Justus Hearn, O295111.

To be brigadier generals

Col. Lyle Everett Buchanan, O1000717, Adjutant General's Corps.

Col. Paul Leonard Kleiver, O397818, Adjutant General's Corps.

Col. Roy Elcanah Thompson, O360841, Adjutant General's Corps.

The Army National Guard of the United States officers named herein for appointment as Reserve commissioned officers of the Army, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, sections 593(a) and 3385:

To be major generals

Brig. Gen. William John Lange, O1175482.

Brig. Gen. Henry William McMillan, O323208.

Brig. Gen. Weston H. Willis, O289949.

To be brigadier generals

Col. Glenn Charles Ames, O328307, Armor.

Brig. Gen. Thomas Sams Bishop, O403542.

Col. Wilbur Henry Fricke, O340297, Artillery.

Maj. Gen. Henry Vance Graham, O398163.

Col. Jack Guest Johnson, O370102, Signal Corps.

Col. Howard Samuel McGee, O387469, Artillery.

Col. Luther Elmer Orrick, O357391, Artillery.

Col. James DeWitt Scott, O381931, Armor.

Col. Max Henry Specht, O383575, Artillery.

Col. Herbert Owen Wardell, O293295, Artillery.

Col. Charles Austin Willis, O357988, Artillery.

The officers named herein for promotion as Reserve commissioned officers of the Army, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, sections 593(a) and 3384:

To be major generals

Brig. Gen. Chester Pilgrim Hartford, O288390.

Brig. Gen. Herbert Russell Morss, Jr., O293333.

Brig. Gen. Cooper Burnett Rhodes, O258656.

To be brigadier generals

Col. William Henry Baumer, O2201379, Infantry.

Col. Phillips Leland Boyd, O230117, Medical Corps.

Col. Edward Stephens Branigan, Jr., O325381, Artillery.

Col. Joseph Hall Buchanan, O407996, Artillery.

Col. Costas Louis Caraganis, O306965, Armor.

Col. John Peter Connor, O416675, Infantry.

Col. Felix Albert Davis, O466259, Corps of Engineers.

Col. Carl Jens Dueser, O300655, Infantry.

Col. Denver Woodrow Meacham, O314699, Artillery.

Col. Carl Curtis Saal, O923083, Transportation Corps.

Col. Myron Jewell Tremaine, O336516, Medical Corps.

Col. Lawrence Grant Treece, O291041, Corps of Engineers.

Col. John Edward Vance, O229832, Corps of Engineers.

Col. Louis Burton Wolf, O387002, Armor.

Col. Spurgeon Brown Wuertenberger, O295174, Artillery.

IN THE U.S. MARINE CORPS

To be lieutenant generals

Lt. Gen. Alan Shapley, U.S. Marine Corps, to be placed on the retired list in the grade indicated, in accordance with title 10, United States Code, section 5233.

Having been designated, in accordance with the provisions of title 10, United States Code, section 5232, Maj. Gen. Carson A. Roberts, U.S. Marine Corps, for commands and other duties determined by the President to be within the contemplation of said section, for appointment to the grade indicated while so serving.

IN THE AIR FORCE

The nominations beginning Richard W. Abele to be major, and ending Paul Edgerton Zumbro to be second lieutenant, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on April 2, 1962.

The nominations beginning Emmert M. Aagaard to be lieutenant colonel, and ending Lloyd J Neurauter to be lieutenant colonel, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on April 16, 1962.

IN THE ARMY

The nominations beginning Leslie W. Bailey to be lieutenant colonel, and ending Raymond J. Zugel to be second lieutenant, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on April 19, 1962.

IN THE NAVY AND MARINE CORPS

The nominations beginning Warren R. Abel to be ensign, and ending Thomas C. McAllister to be second lieutenant in the Marine Corps, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on April 16, 1962.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MONDAY, APRIL 30, 1962

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

Rabbi Gerald Kaplan, Agudath Achim Synagogue, Hibbing, Minn., offered the following prayer:

Almighty and Eternal God, as we stand before Thee admidst the multitude of Thy creation, we ask Thy divine guidance so that this day will bring forth the accomplishments necessary to eliminate the many insurmountable obstacles which lie in our path.

The obstacles of poverty and sickness, the obstacles of ignorance, and as we forge through these obstacles, we pray that amidst these problems, our wish, that mankind will strive to live in peace, will be a living reality in our time.

As this day slowly unfolds its page, let us ever be mindful of possessing the gift of life for another day—another day to comprehend our purpose in this world, another day to share with the unfortunate that which is loaned to us, another day in seeking to bring ourselves closer to the eternal ways of the Almighty. This then is the goal which we must seek this day.

Let us pray.

Our Father, who art in heaven, we pray for Thy blessing, united together, upon your dedicated servants, John F. Kennedy, the President of these United States; LYNDON B. JOHNSON, the Vice President; the Speaker of the House of Representatives; and all the Members of Congress. Be ever with them in their moments of triumph and their moments of struggle.

As in the words of the poet:

I looked for my God, but my God I could not see.
I looked for my soul, but it eluded me.
I looked for my brother, then I found all three.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, April 19, 1962, was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. McGown, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate agrees to the amendment of the House to a bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 1668. An act to authorize the imposition of forfeitures for certain violations of the rules and regulations of the Federal Communications Commission in the common carrier and safety and special fields.

JUSTICE LESTER HOLTZMAN

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, supplementing the remarks of the gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER] at our last session, may I join with him in expressing appreciation of having had the opportunity to serve here with our distinguished former colleague, Hon. Lester Holtzman—and particularly in felicitations to Judge Holtzman on his elevation to the bench of the Supreme Court of the State of New York.

We regret to lose him from the House. But his wide legal experience, his knowledge of the law, and his calm judicial temperament particularly fit him for the judiciary.

We wish for him many years of notable service in the eminent position to which he has been called.

NATIONAL MISS TWINS, U.S.A., WEEK

Mr. SISK. 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. SISK. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a resolution declaring September 23 to 29 "National Miss Twins, U.S.A., Week."

I should like at this time to invite you, Mr. Speaker, and all of my colleagues who have not had the experience of seeing double, as well as those who have had but would like to repeat the experience, to come to my hometown of Fresno during that week. I can assure them that they will enjoy a far lovelier and more interesting experience than is usually associated with those two words, "seeing double."

Seriously, during the week of September 23 to 29, my hometown of Fresno has been selected by Sales Promotion Associates, Inc., of Coral Gables, Fla., to be host to 50 sets of twins, 1 set from each State. A gala pageant, under the auspices of the North Fresno Kiwanis Club, is being planned, to be climaxed by the selection of Miss Twins, U.S.A. This is a new type of national beauty contest and Fresno hopes to make it an annual affair. Eventually, the contest will be expanded to find Miss Twins of the Americas—United States, South America, and Canada—and Miss World Twins. So, whether you want to see double or whether you want to see Fresno, center of the golden State of California, I hope you will come to Fresno the week of September 23 to 29 and participate in this birth of a pageant.

TO THE MEMORY OF EX-REPRESENTATIVE HATTON W. SUMNERS AND HIS DEVOTION TO THE CONSTITUTION

Mr. LANE. 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 Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, almost 16 years have passed since Hatton W. Sumners voluntarily retired from the U.S. House of Representatives, after having served the people of the Fifth Texas District and the people of our Nation for 34 consecutive years.

A former colleague who has been absent from the Washington scene for that length of time is usually forgotten, but "Judge" Sumners left a vivid and indelible impression upon those Members who were privileged to associate with him before he went back home to Texas in 1946.

His mind and personality won the everlasting respect of young Members who were inspired by his devotion to the Constitution. That personal legacy continues to guide the deliberations and the decisions of this House.

From 1931 until his retirement in 1946, he presided as chairman of the Judiciary Committee. In that critical span of time, he met the serious challenges of economic depression and of war with his eyes forever on the Constitution as the instrument that would make us equal to the great tasks imposed on our National Government without weakening our individual liberties.

Representative Sumners was a man of conscience and of principle. His abiding faith in the rule of law prompted him to press for legislation that would grant to citizens of the District of Columbia the right to vote for President and to elect voting Representatives in Congress. To him, the rights and responsibilities of freemen formed the living, pulsing heart of a democratic society. When the people of the Philippines prepared for the day when they would become independent and self-governing, they sought the advice of Representative Sumners in drawing up their constitution.

My first committee assignment was to Judiciary when Hatton Sumners was its chairman. That experience was one of the most instructive and valuable in my legislative career.

Service in this House is a special honor when a Member comes under the tutelage of a man like Judge Sumners to whom the Constitution was the very life of our Republic.

To the honor roll of great men that Texas has sent to Washington we add the memory of courageous and independent Hatton W. Sumners.

To his sister who survives him, Mrs. Willis J. Davis, of Atlanta, Ga., we send our sincere condolences, and our appreciation of her brother's distinguished service to the Nation.

TO SECRETARIES WEEK—IN RECOGNITION OF OUR ABLE AND LOYAL ASSISTANTS

Mr. LANE. 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 Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, on the occasion of Secretaries Week, which was observed the week of April 23, 1962, we publicly express our thanks to the hard-working and self-effacing secretaries who take our dictation, correct our errors, sift the important from the unimportant in our correspondence, serve as office ambassadors of good will, set an example of prompt and courteous efficiency, and often run the office better than the boss himself when he is on the road.

The world is apt to think of them as stenographers.

But any executive in commerce, industry, and government knows better.

With growing confidence in their skill, loyalty, and good judgment, executives regard them as administrative assistants who have the capacity for doing the right thing at the right time in a way that makes the boss look like a combination of supersalesman, wise leader, and understanding friend.

During most of the year we are inclined to overload them with work and responsibilities.

But on this week that is set aside to honor them, we gratefully acknowledge the contributions they make to our success.

In the chain of command, a good secretary is an able deputy.

Eventually, we intend to give them the full recognition that they deserve.

Meanwhile, we want them to know how much we appreciate their competence, their diligence, and their trustworthiness.

We hope that, guided by the tributes expressed during Secretaries Week, more young people will prepare and qualify themselves to become members of this indispensable profession.

TO AMEND THE INTERNAL REVENUE CODE OF 1954

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to eliminate the withholding of income tax from wages and salaries. I do this because I recognize we have lost all control over spending in this country, and who is paying the bill. Since the great burden of taxes is borne by the so-called little or modest income folks, I think it is high time that they found out how much taxes they are paying. In order to do that, I think we ought to let them pay their own. In any event, this bill might be a step in the direction of letting the people know who is footing the bill. I submit this bill to my colleagues on that basis.

The Members may remember that this legislation was originally passed in 1943 as part of the pay-as-you-go tax law. The early proposals of Beardsley Ruml, whose name was attached to the pay-as-you-go plan, did not include provisions for withholding. It was added later and despite extensive discussions of the Ruml tax plan the withholding proviso was adopted without serious debate. Its vital defects were overlooked. Congress did not reckon with its moral and political consequences. Even now, little attention is given to these factors.

Certainly withholding imposes an unjust burden on the employer, especially the small businessman. I may point out this is another additional cost of doing business which will reduce the employer's income and in so doing reduces income tax collections. We recognize, too, that employers pass on this additional expense to consumers in the form of increased prices with the result that the ultimate tax compliance burden is haphazard and capricious in its incidence. So it becomes, in effect, an excise tax.

Withholding is of questionable constitutionality. We force the employer to do the work of figuring, collecting, and remitting this tax to the Government without compensation. He is thus deprived of his property without due process of law.

A few statistics as to the effect of withholding may be of interest to Members who have taken this method of tax collection for granted without any serious study of what is happening. The Commissioner of Internal Revenue noted

that in 1961 37.8 million refunds were made on account of excessive prepayment of individual income taxes. This usually means excessive withholding. These refunds for the year 1961 totaled $4.8 billion.

Mr. Speaker, it seems to me the serious questions concerning the withholding tax which have gone unanswered for nearly 20 years make it imperative that Congress take a long second look at this method of tax collection and I hope that by introducing the bill, which I have introduced today, Congress may be spurred to restudy the problem so that the American people will know how much tax is being paid and who is paying it.

Unquestionably the withholding of taxes has facilitated more expeditious, and far heavier, tax collection. As responsible officers of Government, each Secretary of the Treasury, therefore, has favored this system, rather than to question it. As a result we have the present effort in the name of consistency of the Kennedy administration to withhold taxes on interest and dividends. This will result in massive overwithholding and administrative and policing chaos, as well as departing from the principle of voluntary tax compliance. Simultaneously, our President is skyrocketing Government spending. So it seems to me timely and sensible that the American citizens demand a halt to the continuation of the tax, tax, spend, spend, elect, elect policy. This repeal of the withholding tax will be the means of beginning the necessary and agonizing reappraisal.

TRANSPORTATION: THE LIFELINE OF OUR ECONOMY—THE KEYSTONE OF OUR MILITARY DEFENSE

Mr. SHORT. 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 North Dakota?

There was no objection.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, on the opening day of Congress, January 10, 1962, to be exact, I introduced H.R. 9554. This bill is identical to one introduced by Senator JOHN L. MCCLELLAN, of Arkansas, on September 19, 1961, before the U.S. Senate, and I am proud to be able to cosponsor this bill with a fine and effective Senator, such as JOHN MCCLELLAN.

This proposed legislation, if enacted into law, would make abuses of power by labor unions and their leaders in the transportation industry, subject to proper restraint under our Federal antitrust laws—the same restraints and the same laws to which business has been subject since 1890, when the Sherman Antitrust Act was passed. This proposed legislation would restore once more to the Federal courts the power to enjoin paralyzing strikes in the transportation industry which threaten the welfare of the public and the security of our Nation.

This power, possessed by the transportation unions and their leaders, was described by the late Justice Jackson in his dissenting opinion in the *Hunt* v. *Crumboch* (325 U.S. 821, 831) case as a power which permits to employees the same arbitrary dominance under the economic sphere which they control that labor so long, so bitterly, and so rightly asserted should belong to no man. Mr. David Josiah Brewer, an Associate Justice of the U.S. Supreme Court during the early years of this century, while speaking for the Supreme Court in a case involving the application of our Federal Antitrust laws—*In Re Debs* (158 U.S. 546, 581), had occasion to state:

> It is curious to note the fact that in a large proportion of the cases in respect to interstate commerce brought to this Court the question presented was of the validity of State legislation in its bearings upon interstate commerce, and the uniform course of decision has been to declare that it is not within the competency of a State to legislate in such a manner as to obstruct commerce. If a State, with its recognized powers of sovereignty, is impotent to obstruct interstate commerce, can it be that any mere voluntary association of individuals within the limits of that State has a power which the State itself does not possess?

The transportation system of a community or of a nation is the lifeline of its industrial economy and the keystone of its military defense structure. General Eisenhower once said:

> You will not find it difficult to prove that battles, campaigns, and even wars have been won or lost primarily because of logistics.

It is obvious, therefore, that power to control or disrupt the operation of the transportation facilities, or any major segment thereof, would pose a serious threat and danger to our national welfare.

No representative of government—including the President of the United States—has such power under our Federal Constitution. And no business organizations or representatives of business are permitted to exercise such power. Since 1890, the Federal antitrust laws have made it a criminal offense, punishable by imprisonment of up to 10 years, and fines up to $50,000, or both, for any business organization or its representatives to attempt to restrain trade and commerce by ordering a stoppage of public transportation.

Such power does exist, however, and is possessed by powerful labor leaders and powerful labor organizations in the transportation industry. It is possessed, for example, by James R. Hoffa, president of the International Brotherhood of Teamsters, the largest transportation union in this country—and by Harry Bridges, president of the International Longshoremen's and Warehousemen's Union, which controls the west coast shipping docks of this Nation, and by other transportation unions and their leaders.

These unions and their leaders not only have this tremendous power, but they are well aware that they have it. They have indicated what they can do with this power, should they decide to use it. In an interview which was published in the Los Angeles Mirror on April 10, 1961, Mr. Bridges was quoted as stating that any Government attack on him and Mr. Hoffa would mean a paralyzing strike on the Nation's land and sea transportation systems. In the same interview he is quoted further as saying: "We have the power—we can tie up the country from coast to coast." And he was not exaggerating.

To point up my contention, let us consider the west coast shipping strike which only a few days ago was threatening the very life and economy of our new State of Hawaii. President Kennedy saw fit to use the Taft-Hartley provision of the 80-day injunction in this strike—and this was the only thing which gave temporary relief to the entire State of Hawaii. I will not attempt to pass judgment on the question as to whether the shipowners or the maritime union were more at fault in this particular instance. This will be determined by other forums. The real question, and the most important one, is whether or not the public interest should be protected. It will be interesting to wait and see what happens after the 80-day injunction period is over. For the sake of those who live in Hawaii, I hope the problem is solved and speedily, but this does not mitigate the situation. Hawaii is the innocent victim of this strike. Further, two or three other similar strikes took place last year, but this strike is the longest on Hawaii's waterfront since a 6-month tieup in 1949.

Hawaiian shipping is almost a public corporation or utility. The Federal Government pays millions in subsidies to guarantee the existence of an American merchant marine. Therefore, any strike in west coast Hawaii shipping can, to some degree, be said to be a strike against the public—or even a strike against the Government.

Three unions appear to be involved in the strike—the Sailors Union of the Pacific, the Marine Firemen, and the Marine Cooks and Stewards. They have, if my information is correct, demanded increases in wages and fringe benefits of almost 18 percent over the next 3 years. The owners, represented by the Pacific Maritime Association, first offered increases of just under 12 percent annually in wages and fringe benefits over the next 3 years. When this was refused, the owners then withdrew their offer—citing the revenue lost because of the strike. As a result, with a combined membership of about 5,000 of the three unions involved in the strike, the health and welfare of over 700,000 people is involved.

An east coast maritime strike just this past year was—you will recall—also eventually settled at an 11.5 percent increase in pay and benefits, but the President had to obtain the same 80-day injunction before settlement was finally made.

For those who do not quite get the connection of the Hawaiian shipping strike to Senator MCCLELLAN's and my bill, let me point out that this can happen anywhere in the United States or to the entire United States under our present labor legislation.

The stoppage of any one of the major forms of transportation alone can

menace the economic life of a community, of an area, or even of the entire Nation. The power to do this rests in the hands of any transportation labor union and its leader. But you might ask: "Do we have reason to believe there is any real threat or danger that such tremendous power might ever be used?" Most definitely, we do.

Let us remember that the Internal Security Subcommittee of the U.S. Senate, after an extensive investigation into certain activities of Mr. Harry Bridges and the International Longshoremen's and Warehousemen's Union, as well as those of the Teamsters and some other transportation unions, issued a report under date of December 17, 1958. This report set forth the following conclusion:

The ILWU (International Longshoremen's and Warehousemen's Union) has in the past had ties to international Communist organizations such as the World Federation of Trade Unions and the World Peace Congress. The Communist International has expressed intense interest in the San Francisco general strike, led by Harry Bridges. These ties and the union's activities over the years in cooperation with foreign Communist-controlled unions indicate that the ILWU is susceptible to appeals and pressures from international Communist sources.

A second conclusion stated in the aforementioned report is:

The Communist Party, U.S.A., has for many years evinced a deep interest in operations on the waterfront and in the transport industry in general, with particular reference to operations in wartime.

Great as is the power now possessed by Mr. Harry Bridges and Mr. James Hoffa, and grave as is the danger which that power poses to the American people and the security of our Nation, there is ample evidence to indicate that each man is busily engaged in efforts to enhance that power. Not only have they entered into alliances between their respective organizations for the purpose of joint action and mutual assistance, they are also endeavoring to form alliances with other unions both inside and outside the transportation field.

In this connection, an editorial appearing in the Chicago Daily Tribune on February 26, 1958, refers to Mr. Hoffa's plan to form an alliance of all transportation unions, land, sea, and air, and quotes him as saying:

You cannot have a one-city strike any more or a strike in just one kind of transportation. You have to strike them all.

And in regard to a proposed alliance between the Teamsters Union, the west coast Longshoreman's and Warehousemen's Union, and the east coast International Longshoremen's Association, Mr. Bridges was quoted in an interview appearing in the Wall Street Journal and Washington Daily News on August 2, 1957, as saying:

There is one thing I know—if the Teamsters and the two dock unions got together, they would represent more economic power than the combined AFL–CIO.

He is further quoted as saying:

They are so concentrated, an economic squeeze and pressure can be exerted that puts any employer in a tough spot—and furthermore, puts the U.S. Government on a tough spot.

It is difficult for me to convince myself that men who will make such intemperate and threatening statements in public have only the good and welfare of this country—and its citizens—at heart.

Now the obvious question is: What is wrong with our antitrust legislation, that the United States of America can be placed in such jeopardy by two such labor leaders?

Very briefly, the Sherman Antitrust Act, passed in 1890, was brought about because of the public's fear of the coercive power of large industry and massed capital. It is concerned mainly with the preservation of legitimate competition by maintaining free markets—by regulation of, if not actual control of, trusts and monopolies. Its first two sections contain the most important aspects of the statute. Section 1 states:

Every contract, combination in the form of trusts or otherwise, or conspiracy, in restraint of trade or commerce among the several States, or with foreign nations, are hereby declared to be illegal, every person who shall make any such contract or engage in any such combination or conspiracy * * * shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor.

Section 2 states:

Every person who shall monopolize, or attempt to monopolize, or combine or conspire with any other person or persons, to monopolize any part of the trade or commerce among the several States, or with foreign nations, shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor.

The Federal courts have power to enforce provisions of the law. The Attorney General is authorized to secure injunctive relief against any violations and to initiate criminal prosecutions. Any person who suffers injury as a result of the violation of the law by others can maintain civil suits for triple damages against the violators of the act.

Prior to and after passage of the law, many questions arose relative to coverage and exemption. The status of labor unions and their behavior under the statutes were among the chief questions. It was questioned as to whether the labor activities came under jurisdiction of this law—and if so, which of their activities and what should be the extent of the application? Some contended that Congress intended to regulate or eliminate unfair higher consumer prices, resulting from combinations of power groups to control the market. Since businessmen would gain more by these activities, it was felt these groups had more of an incentive to combine.

During this period of our American history, we must remember that labor unions were very weak. It was not for a good many years that they attained the strong position they now enjoy.

Another point of view expressed was that labor was not a commodity. Labor had the legal right to accept or terminate employment at will, refuse to buy goods, and to persuade others not to buy them—as well as to strive for higher wages—because while increased labor costs might affect prices, good wages would help trade. Therefore, some felt the Sherman Act was designed only to regulate trade and not suitable to regulate employee-employer relations.

Labor, prior to passing the Sherman Antitrust Act, had requested specific exemption from coverage of the law. This was considered by the Senate Judiciary Committee—according to the legislative history of this act—as well as considered on the Senate floor, but the exemption was not placed in the act when it was passed. The controversy continued, after passage of the act, and in case after case the courts were confronted with problems of apparent restraints of trade in which unions were involved. Finally the Supreme Court had to act in a case which involved secondary boycotts instituted by the United Hatters of America against Loewe & Co. The Supreme Court found that while unions as such were legal—in other words, the act of organizing into unions was no longer regarded as a conspiracy against the public—they had in this instance combined in restraint of trade and commerce among the several States. The peaceful boycott was declared to be illegal and damages were imposed because the boycott interfered with interstate transactions.

Time passed, during which corporations and business units and trusts grew larger and larger. A fear developed in the public that business combinations and monopoly would take the place of competition among many smaller units. At the same time there was a more favorable reaction to arguments of labor spokesmen that labor was not a commodity, therefore should not be subject to laws enacted relative to monopolies in production and commerce and to the conduct of competitive business.

More time passed, during which many other cases were brought before the Supreme Court. The Court appeared to follow two rules or standards, that is, first, that the intent to interfere with interstate commerce must be proven; and second, that the reduction in commerce due to a union's behavior must be unreasonable, not reasonable, and incidental. Labor unions became more and more concerned, since the Supreme Court held in some cases that illegal combinations could be dissolved under the Sherman Act—and did so—in the famous Standard Oil Co. against the U.S. case. The labor unions felt that if the act allowed such a dissolution of business enterprises, and had jurisdiction over certain labor union activities, the very foundation of unionism was also threatened.

Later on, in 1914, the Clayton Act was passed. This act attempted to allay the fears of the unions and to define more clearly the status of unions under antitrust legislation. While it did not grant labor unions complete exemption from the Sherman Act, it did establish the doctrine that the mere existence and functioning of unions was not illegal, that unions were not conspiracies as such, and that lawful operations of labor organizations did not illegally restrain trade. The law, in its section 6, definitely stated that labor was not a com-

modity. However, the Supreme Court continued to hold that the Sherman Act applied to any illegal behaviors of labor unions. In many cases the Court put much emphasis on intent and motive. The labor unions, who had hailed the Clayton Act as being a "bill of rights" for workers, became disillusioned. Unions and their sympathizers thereupon began agitating for a clarification of labor's status under the antitrust laws. This has been held by many to be one of the prime reasons for passage of the Norris-La Guardia Act, which took place in 1932.

Labor clearly had benefited greatly from favorable legislation under the administration of President Roosevelt. A change took place in congressional policy approaching Federal sponsorship of labor unions. A liberal Supreme Court combined with the passage of the Norris-La Guardia Act of 1932—called the Anti-Injunction Act—and the comprehensive Wagner Act—the National Labor Relations Act of 1935—quite effectively reduced the area of union responsibility under the antitrust statutes.

In a now famous case, called the United States against Hutcheson case, an important decision was handed down by a 5-to-4 decision, by the Supreme Court, stating that a union may not be prosecuted under the Sherman Act for conducting a jurisdictional strike. Even though there was no employer-union dispute involved—this being instead a dispute over a work assignment between two unions in the employer's plant—and the employer under agreement with both unions, assigned the disputed work to the machinists, subject to arbitration with the carpenters—the carpenters refused to arbitrate. Instead they called a strike, picketed, and by means of circular letters and the official union paper, urged union members and others not to buy a particular beer made by the employer. President Hutcheson and three other officers of the carpenters' union were charged with criminal combination and conspiracy in violation of the Sherman Act.

The majority opinion of the Supreme Court was delivered by Justice Felix Frankfurter. He held there was no violation of the Sherman Act, since section 20 of the Clayton Act specified certain union activities which should not be considered as violations of any Federal law. Even though previously the Supreme Court had held that section 20 of the Clayton Act covered only those union activities involved in the immediate employer-employee relationship—and the Hutcheson case dealt with union activities outside that relationship—Justice Frankfurter argued that it was not the true congressional intent of section 20 that it be limited to the immediate employer-employee relationship. He held that Congress had rendered the previous decisions inoperable by enacting the Norris-La Guardia Act, which clearly applied to union activities outside the immediate employer-employee relationship. He concluded that whether union conduct violated the Sherman Act was to be determined only by reading the Sherman Act, section 20 of the Clayton Act, and sections 13 (b) and (c) of the Norris-La Guardia Act as a harmonizing or interlaced text in regard to outlawry of labor conduct. The four dissenters stated that abuses existed that ought not to be tolerated, but that their hands had been tied by Congress in passing the Norris-La Guardia Act, and it was up to the Congress to correct the situation.

Later the area of union responsibility under antitrust laws was reduced to almost complete immunity in a case called Hunt against Crumboch, where relief was denied an employer after the union refused to supply workers to him or to accept his employees into union membership—thus causing destruction to his business.

I believe we all know the later history of labor legislation. Briefly, in 1933 the National Industrial Recovery Act was enacted—establishing the right of workers to organize and to bargain collectively with their employers. The first National Labor Relations Board was established under the NIRA, with Senator Wagner as Chairman.

In 1935, the National Labor Relations Act—the Wagner Act—was passed—and this act adopted the same principle of protecting the right of individuals to organize and combine into unions.

No thought was given at this time to the possibility that some labor combinations might tend to lessen competition or to create monopoly. Hardly more than 3 million union members were in this country at that time, and these were concentrated in a few industries, such as mining, railroads, newspaper printing and the apparel trades. There were practically no effective union organizations in basic manufacturing industries such as steel, chemicals, automobiles, rubber and electrical products, or in utilities or services. The old practices of employers who fought unions in the past and who had been protected in this by older legal concepts changed. Now they were told that they must cease and desist from engaging in practices which would hinder workers who desired to combine into unions, and that they must bargain with such union as the workers selected to represent them.

It became fairly clear that Congress had done this intentionally, due to the widespread opinion that business had grown big and powerful and individual workers therefore were not able to bargain effectively regarding terms and conditions of employment.

Congress had been trying to achieve legislation which would protect the freedoms of the rank-and-file American citizen, and at the same time protect the freedoms of union organizations. Instead of becoming simply an organization to protect the interests of labor by controlling the supply of labor, either on a comparatively limited scale or on a national scale—which after all is the obvious and avowed objective of labor unions, and which has been approved as a matter of public policy not only by the Congress but by the courts—labor unions became, in the opinion of many, an undisciplined threat to the economy of our country.

Since the Wagner Act appeared after a time to many to be one sided—in that while it placed employers under an obligation to do certain things and to refrain from others, unions had no obligations placed on them with respect to collective bargaining—attempts were made by Congress to amend the Wagner Act. The House of Representatives passed a bill in 1941—being a radical revision of the Wagner Act; however, Pearl Harbor came along, and efforts at modification were dropped until the end of the war. Numerous bills were introduced after the war and debated by Congress, but it was not until 1947 that Congress passed the Taft-Hartley Act. This act is actually an elaborate amendment to the Wagner Act, and was called the Slave Labor Act by many labor union leaders. While the act contains many new provisions which place obligations on labor organizations and influenced practices of collective bargaining—it still continued the national policy of encouraging combinations of employees into unions. It attempted to eliminate coercion with respect to such organizations and some say it reverts to a large degree to individual bargaining. It does attempt to make certain strikes illegal and prevents unions from engaging in certain practices felt not to be in the public interest.

Repeated attempts were made to destroy the Taft-Hartley Act and to replace it with the Wagner Act. However, in the prevailing climate of opinion in the United States and in the Congress, this proved to be an impossible task. Secondary boycotting, outlawed by the Taft-Hartley Act, somehow continued by various means to be practiced by some labor unions.

The Landrum-Griffin bill was introduced in 1959, during my first year in Congress. This was passed in a storm of demand by many sections of the public, and in a storm of dissent by many unions. I do not believe I will forget—nor, I am sure, will many other Members forget—a particular letter sent to all the Members of Congress who voted for the Landrum-Griffin bill by a certain labor union leader—in which we were clearly threatened with the loss of our congressional seats if we continued to support that bill. Oddly enough, I have the feeling that this letter had a great deal to do with the coagulation of opinion in Congress. In any event, the bill was passed. I was interested to note that the authors of the bill recently—in fact on April 10—took the floor of the House to protest instances where they felt the National Labor Relations Board had, and I quote:

> With the application of strained and tortured reasoning handed down a series of decisions which, in their total effect, operate to legalize many of the picketing and boycott abuses which Congress, through the Landrum-Griffin Act, sought to eliminate.

At the same time they denounced one of the members of the NLRB, stating he had said, and I quote:

> In my view the Board is unquestionably a policymaking tribunal.

This, of course, tends to undermine the rightful authority of the Congress to be the proper policymaking body.

It appears to me, and to many who are much more knowledgeable than I on labor-management matters, that under our labor-management and antitrust laws, as interpreted by the Supreme Court, we today have no actual control over labor unions. To control the market for commodities with the purpose of eliminating competition and creating monopolies is illegal; but to control the market for labor for the purpose of permitting one or more designated representatives of labor to bargain over wages and other conditions of their work has been encouraged as a public policy, and is perfectly legal.

The previous low point of 3 million union members in 1932 has now been increased to approximately 18.1 million national and independent affiliated union members today. There are, in addition, about one-half million small company union members, according to late Labor Department statistics, not affiliated with national unions. There are no longer industries of any importance in our country that do not recognize and deal with their workers as combinations of employees represented by a union. Indeed, this Congress has seen the first actual official recognition of a Federal Government employees union. From being merely an organization which could deal with a single industry, while the same type of industry in other States could continue to operate—unions have become centralized until entire industries, such as the coal mining industry, steel industry, automobile industry, and electrical manufacturing industry were effectively shut down for weeks and months and no member of the industry under the control of the union in that industry engaged in production at all.

What do I mean by labor monopoly? All successful labor unions are either labor monopolies—or they strive to become labor monopolies.

At one time we had the open shop, consisting of union members and nonunion members working side by side—but this was a short-lived period in American labor history. Although the closed shop is illegal under the Taft-Hartley Act, the union shop becomes legal if favored by a majority of those union members eligible to vote in an election.

Let me quote from a comment made by Mr. James Hoffa in May of 1959, at a press conference in Brownsville, Tex.:

> We can call a primary strike all across the Nation that will straighten out the employers once and for all.

This is the President of the Teamsters Union talking—the union known to be the largest and strongest of all unions in the transportation field. It is powerful enough to put a stranglehold on all our Nation's economy by means of a nationwide strike. If Mr. Hoffa and Harry Bridges form an alliance or cooperative working arrangement which would enable them to act in conjunction with one another, or provide support and assistance to each other in connection with labor disputes or strikes—I do not believe it would take much imagination to envision the results.

This—quite simply—is the reason I felt impelled to cosponsor Senator McCLELLAN's bill, and introduced H.R. 9554. It is my considered judgment that this bill constitutes a prescription which could help the sick commercial patient—our United States of America. I want to help our country in its need to foster, promote, and develop the foreign and domestic commerce of the United States. I feel this proposed legislation would be an added cornerstone in the arch of liberty.

Let me reiterate that the power to control or disrupt the operation of our transportation facilities, or any major segment thereof, poses a serious threat and danger to our national welfare.

No representative of Government—including the President of the United States—has such power under our Federal Constitution. And no business organization or representative of business is permitted to exercise such power. Since 1890, the Federal antitrust laws have made it a criminal offense for any business organization or its representatives to restrain trade and commerce by ordering a stoppage of public transportation.

Such power which exists, and is possessed by powerful labor organizations and their leaders in the field of transportation—is a perversion of freedom as guaranteed to us under the Constitution.

Our Federal Constitution denies such power to the President of these United States. Our Federal antitrust laws deny such power to any business organization or business representative. We must not, therefore, by the sin of omission, permit this power to rest in the hands of any man or small group of men.

We all subscribe to the American view that labor is not a commodity or an article of commerce. On the other hand, the Marxian or Communist definition of labor states that labor is a commodity and is measurable as such.

We need to remember that the free world's fight against the menace of world communism depends to a tremendous degree on the success of our traditional free enterprise system. It should be strengthened—not weakened—by trusts or monopolies of either big business or big labor unions. Further, it not only should, but must, if we are to have any hope of preserving our American way of life.

I would like to close by saying that I hope the House of Representatives will join hands in pressing for consideration of my bill by the House Judiciary Committee, and for passage by the House before the end of this session. While my bill does not cover every aspect of reform needed in the antitrust laws, I believe it is an important step forward which will, if enacted, safeguard one of the most important aspects of our economy and defense—our transportation system. Further, I do not believe it will harm legitimate aims of our labor unions, but will instead, create balance where there is imbalance.

I wish to include, at this point in my remarks, my bill H.R. 9554:

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 "Antitrust Laws Amendments of 1961".

SHERMAN ACT AMENDMENTS

SEC. 2. (a) Section 1 of the Act entitled "An Act to protect trade and commerce against unlawful restraints and monopolies", approved July 2, 1890 (26 Stat. 209, as amended; 15 U.S.C. 1) is amended by—

(1) inserting, immediately after the section designation "SEC. 1.", the subsection designation "(a)"; and

(2) adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(b)(1) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, it shall be unlawful and contrary to the public policy of the United States for any labor organization in concert with any employer or with any other labor organization (whether or not affiliated with the same national or international labor organization), to call for, conduct, engage, or participate in, any strike, action, plan of action, agreement, arrangement, or combination directed against any employer in trade or commerce who is engaged in the transportation of persons or property among the several States or with foreign nations if the effect of such strike, action, plan of action, agreement, arrangement, or combination may be to restrain substantially the transportation of persons or property in trade or commerce among the several States, or with foreign nations.

"(2) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, every contract, agreement, or understanding, express or implied, between any labor organization and any employer engaged in the transportation of persons or property in trade or commerce among the several States, or with foreign nations, whereby such employer undertakes to cease, or to refrain from, purchasing, using, selling, handling, transporting, or otherwise dealing in any of the products or services of any producer, processor, distributor, supplier, handler, or manufacturer which are distributed in trade or commerce among the several States, or with foreign nations, or to cease doing business with any other person, shall be unlawful.

"(3) Every person who violates, attempts to violate, or combines or conspires with any other person to violate, the provisions of this subsection shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor, and, on conviction thereof, shall be punished by a fine not exceeding $50,000, or by imprisonment not exceeding one year, or by both said punishments, in the discretion of the court."

(b) Section 3 of such Act (15 U.S.C. 3) is amended by—

(1) inserting, immediately after the section designation "SEC. 3.", the subsection designation "(a)"; and

(2) adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(b)(1) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, it shall be unlawful and contrary to the public policy of the United States for any labor organization in concert with any employer or with any other labor organization (whether or not affiliated with the same national or international labor organization), to call for, conduct, or engage or participate in, any strike, action, plan of action, agreement, arrangement, or combination directed against any employer who is engaged in the transportation of persons or property in trade or commerce in any territory of the United States or the District of Columbia, or between any such territory and another, or between any such territory or territories and any State or States or the District of Columbia or with foreign nations, or between the District of Columbia and any State or States or foreign nations, if the effect of such strike, action, plan of action, agreement, arrangement, or combination may be to restrain substantially the

transportation of persons or property in any such trade or commerce.

"(2) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, every contract, agreement, or understanding, express or implied, between any labor organization and any employer engaged in the transportation of persons or property, whereby such employer undertakes to cease, or to refrain from, purchasing, using, selling, handling, transporting, or otherwise dealing in any of the products or services of any producer, processor, distributor, supplier, handler, or manufacturer which are distributed in trade or commerce in any territory of the United States or the District of Columbia, or between any such territory and another, or between any such territory or territories and any State or States or the District of Columbia or with foreign nations, or between the District of Columbia and any State or States or foreign nations, or to cease doing business with any other person shall be unlawful.

"(3) Every person who violates, attempts to violate, or combines or conspires with any other person to violate, the provisions of this subsection shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor, and, on conviction thereof, shall be punished by a fine not exceeding $50,000, or by imprisonment not exceeding one year, or by both said punishments, in the discretion of the court."

(c) Section 8 of such Act (15 U.S.C. 7) is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 8. As used in this Act—

"(a) The term 'person', or 'persons', shall be deemed to include corporations and associations existing under or authorized by the laws of either the United States, the laws of any of the territories, the laws of any State, or the laws of any foreign country.

"(b) The term 'labor organization' means any organization of any kind, or any agency or employer representation committee or plan, in which employees participate, and which exists for the purpose in whole or in part, of dealing with employers concerning grievances, labor disputes, wages, rates of pay, hours of employment, or conditions of work, and includes any national or international labor organization or federation thereof, and any conference, general committee, joint or system board, joint council, or parent, regional, State, or local central labor body.

"(c) The term 'employee' shall include any employee and any individual employed by an employer, and shall not be limited to the employees of a particular employer, and shall include any individual whose work has ceased as a consequence of, or in connection with, any current labor dispute.

"(d) The term 'employer' includes any employer, any person acting as an agent of an employer, directly or indirectly, and any person engaged in any trade or industry as a manufacturer, producer, distributor, supplier, carrier, or handler of any article, commodity, or service, and in the case of any corporate employer, includes all subsidiary corporations of the same parent corporation engaged in the manufacture, production, distribution, furnishing, transportation, or handling of articles, commodities, or services of the same kind.

"(e) The term 'strike' means any strike or other concerted stoppage of work by employees (including a stoppage by reason of the expiration of a collective bargaining agreement) and any concerted slowdown or other concerted interruption of or interference with operations by employees."

CLAYTON ACT AMENDMENTS

SEC. 3. (a) Section 6 of the Act entitled "An Act to supplement existing laws against unlawful restraints and monopolies, and for other purposes", approved October 15, 1914 (38 Stat. 731; 15 U.S.C. 17), is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 6. The labor of a human being is not a commodity or article of commerce. Nothing contained in the antitrust laws shall be construed to forbid the existence and operation of labor, agricultural, or horticultural organizations, instituted for the purposes of mutual help, and not having capital stock or conducted for profit, or to forbid or restrain individual members of such organizations from lawfully carrying out the legitimate objects thereof; nor shall such organizations, or the members thereof, be held or construed to be illegal combinations or conspiracies in restraint of trade under the antitrust laws, except as provided by sections 1(b) and 3(b) of the Act entitled 'An Act to protect trade and commerce against unlawful restraints and monopolies', approved July 2, 1890 (26 Stat. 209, as amended; 15 U.S.C. 1, 3, as amended)", and

(b) Section 20 of such Act (29 U.S.C. 52) is amended by—

(1) striking out the word "That" in the first paragraph thereof, and inserting in lieu thereof the words "Except for the purpose of preventing a violation of section 1(b) or 3(b) of the Act entitled 'An Act to protect trade and commerce against unlawful restraints and monopolies,' approved July 2, 1890 (26 Stat. 209, as amended; 15 U.S.C. 1, 3, as amended)"; and

(2) following the word "And" where it first appears in the second paragraph thereof, insert the words "except for the purpose of preventing a violation of section 1(b) or 3(b) of the Act entitled 'An Act to protect trade and commerce against unlawful restraints and monopolies', approved July 2, 1890 (26 Stat. 209, as amended; 15 U.S.C. 1, 3, as amended)"; and

(3) striking out the words "any law of the United States" in the second paragraph thereof, and inserting in lieu thereof the words "any other provision of the antitrust laws of the United States".

JURISDICTION OF COURTS

SEC. 4. The jurisdiction of courts sitting in equity to prevent and restrain violations of sections 1(b) and 3(b) of the Act entitled "An Act to protect trade and commerce against unlawful restraints and monopolies, approved July 2, 1890 (26 Stat. as amended; 15 U.S.C. 1, as amended), as amended", in this Act, shall not be limited by the Act entitled "An Act to amend the Judicial Code and to define and limit the jurisdiction of courts sitting in equity and for other purposes, approved March 23, 1932 (U.S.C., supp. VII, title 29, sec. 101–115)".

SCOPE OF JUDGMENTS

SEC. 5. Whenever a judgment for damages is granted against a labor organization under section 4 of an Act entitled "An Act to supplement existing laws against unlawful restraints and monopolies, and for other purposes (38 Stat. 731; 15 U.S.C.A. 15)", collection of such judgment shall be limited to the assets owned or controlled by such labor organization; and such judgment shall not be enforceable against any individual member.

NONEXCLUSIVE REMEDIES

SEC. 6. The provisions of this Act and the remedies provided herein shall not be exclusive, but shall be in addition to any other statutory provisions and legal or statutory remedies provided for protection against the same or similar actions under any law of the United States or of any State.

SEPARABILITY

SEC. 7. If any provision of this Act, or the application of such provision to any person or circumstances, shall be held invalid, the remainder of this Act, or the application of such provision to any person or circumstances other than those as to which its application is held invalid, shall not be affected thereby.

EFFECTIVE DATE

SEC. 8. The amendments made by this Act shall take effect on the first day of the fourth month beginning after the date of enactment of this Act.

RIBAULT QUADRICENTENNIAL

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. BENNETT of Florida. Four hundred years ago, May 1, 1562, Capt. Jean Ribault, searching for a place to found a French colony where those seeking freedom from the religious persecutions in France could establish themselves, came to the mouth of what we now call the St. Johns River, Fla. He called it the River of May, after the date of its discovery. He wrote of the events in his book "The Whole and True Discoverye of Terra Florida"—London, Hacket, 1563—as follows:

We did behold to and fro the goodly order of the woodes wherwith God hathe decked everywhere the said lande. Then percevving towardes the northe a leaping and breking of the water, as a streme falling owt of the lande unto the sea, forthewith we sett agayn up saile to duble the same while it was yet daye. And as we had so don, and passed byonde yt, there apeared unto us a faire enter (ye) of a great river, which caused us to cast ancre agen and tary there nere the lande, to thende that the next mornying we myght see what it was. And though that the wynd blewe for a tyme vehemently to the shore warde, yet the hold and auncordge is so good there, that one cable and one ancre held us fast withowt driving or slyding.

The next daye in the morninge, being the ffirst of Maye, we assaied to enter this porte with two rowe barges and a boate well trymed, finding littlel watter at the entrye and many surges and brekinges of the water which might hav astuned and caused us to return back to shippborde, if God had not speedely brought us in, where fynding fourthwith 5 or 6 fadom water, entered in to a goodly and great river, which as we went we found to increse still in depth and lardgness, boylling and roring through the multytute of all sor es of fishes. Thus entered we perceved a good numbre of the Indians, inhabytantes there, coming alonge the sandes and seebanck somewhate nere unto us, withowt any taken of feare or dowbte, shewing unto us the easiest landing place, and thereupon we geving them also on our parte tokens of assurance and frendelynes, fourthewith one of the best of apparance amonges them, brother unto one of there kinges or governours, comaunded one of the Indians to enter into the water, and to approche our boates, to showe us the easiest landing place. We seeing this, withowt any more dowbting or difficulty, landed, and the messenger, after we had rewared him with some loking glases and other prety thinges of smale value, ran incontenently towardes his lorde, who forthwith sent me his girdell in token of assurance and ffrendship, which girdell was made of red lether, aswell couried, and coulored as is possible. And as I began to go towardes him, he sett fourthe and came and receved me gentlye and reiosed after there mannour, all his men ffollowing him with great silence and modestie, yea, with more then our men did. And after we had ahile with gentill usage congratulated with him, we fell to the grownd a littell waye

from them, to call upon the name of God, and to beseche him to contynewe still his goodness towardes us, and to bring to the knoweledge of our Savior Jesus Christ this pooer people. While we were thus praying, they sitting upon the grownd, which was dressed and strewed with baye bowes, behelde and herkened unto us very attentively, withowt eyther speaking or moving. And as I made a sygne unto there king, lifting up myne arme and streching owt one fynger, only to make them loke up to heavenward, he likewise lifting up his arme towardes heven, put fourthe two fynge(rs) wherby it seemed that he would make us understand that thay worshipped the sonne and mone for godes, as afterward we understode yt so,

Laudonniere's account of the events of May 1562, is found in his book "The Notable History of Florida," printed in English in volume III of Hakluyt's Voyages—Glasgow, 1904—as follows:

He discovered a very faire and great River, which gave him occasion to cast anker that hee might search the same the next day very early in the morning: which being done by the breake of day, accompanied with Captain Fiquinville and divers other souldiers of his shippe, he was no sooner arrived on the brinke of the shoare, but straight hee perceived many Indians men and women, which came of purpose to that place to receive the Frenchmen with all gentlenesse and amitie, as they well declared by the Oration which their king made, and the presents of Chamois skinnes wherewith he honoured out Captaine, which the day following caused a pillar of hard stone to be planted within the sayde River, and not farre from the mouth of the same upon a little sandie knappe, in which pillar the Armes of Franch were carved and engraved. This being done hee embarked himselfe againe, to the ende alwayes to discover the coast toward the North which was his chiefe desire. After he had sayled a certaine time he crossed over to the other side of the river, and then in the presence of certaine Indians, which of purpose did attend him, hee commaunded his men to make their prayers, to give thankes to GOD, for that of his grace hee had conducted the French nation unto these strange places without any danger at all. The prayers being ended, the Indians which were very attentive to hearken unto them, thinking in my judgment, that wee worshipped the Sunne, because wee alwayes had our eyes lifted up toward Heaven, rose all up and came to salute the Captaine John Ribault, promising to shew him their King, which rose not up as they did, but remained still sitting upon greene leaves of Bayes and Palmetrees: toward whom the Captaine went and sate downe by him, and heard him make a long discourse, but with no great pleasure, because hee could not understand his language, and much lesse his meaning.

This was the first Protestant prayer ever said in what is now the United States, and these were the first freedom-seeking people ever to come to our shores. They moved up the coast to Parris Island, S.C., and left a garrison there of about 30 men at Charlesfort, but they followed Ribault back to Europe after a grim effort for survival, including cannibalism.

Later in 1564, Ribault's second in command, Rene Laudonniere, came over to the River of May and established Fort Caroline. This began the permanent settlement of our country by requiring the Spanish to establish St. Augustine in 1565, while subduing Fort Caroline in that year. The colony had as one of its motives religious freedom, and it included both Protestants and Catholics.

For the next 2 weeks in Jacksonville, Fla., there will be celebrations about these early settlers celebrating our quadricentennial in Jacksonville, Fla. A key portion of the celebrations will be the showing of Kermit Hunter's symphonic drama "Next Day in the Morning," which is expected to be shown, hereafter, annually—for 2 weeks as a way of refreshing our memory of these important events in our heritage. I have seen this excellent play and believe every American would be benefited by viewing it. Its production is a community enterprise, not for the personal profit of those local leaders who have underwritten its expenses. I hope that it will have a good attendance.

Mr. Speaker, these people who came here to Fort Caroline were both Catholics and Protestants. They should be a great inspiration to us in this day, four centuries later. They reached an important plateau in the development of mankind, a large step forward in man's quest for freedom.

Mr. Speaker, 200 years later another high plateau of freedom was established when our Nation was founded. I think we are still approaching higher plateaus and greater things for mankind, not only in learning how to get along with each other, but also in many and varied advances in science and in spirit.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FLOOD] be excused from attendance in the House for an indefinite period of time due to illness. Our distinguished colleague is confined to the Georgetown Hospital.

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

There was no objection.

IMPACT ON BUSINESS OF THE PRESIDENT'S ACTION AGAINST THE STEEL COMPANIES

Mr. LANGEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. ALGER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, before the House adjourned for the Easter recess, I pointed out the dangers to a free people embodied in the action by President Kennedy in using the power of his high office to set the price of steel. Since that statement was made, many of us have had an opportunity to go back to our districts and to learn, firsthand, what the people are thinking. I do not know what reaction some of the rest of you found at home, but my people are deeply concerned with the possibilities of future price and wage control by the Federal Government if the President follows the precedent he set in the case of steel. Regardless of what the labor leaders are saying in supporting the President's action against industry, many union members and working men and women are worried, and in my opinion rightly so, that any future wage demands will necessarily wait upon Presidential approval. Mr. Speaker, I think Congress should be equally concerned by the fact that we may be faced with price and wage control by Executive order without regard to any legislative action by this body.

We have not seen the end result of the gesture of dictatorship exercised by President Kennedy and none of us know what further steps he and his economic advisers, those who believe so strongly in a planned and directed economy, have in mind.

In order to bring the Members up to date on some further economic aspects in this situation I would like to include, as a part of these remarks a column written by David Lawrence in the Washington Evening Star, "An Economic Judgment in Steel," a special report by the Women Investors Research Institute, Inc., entitled "After the Steel Crisis, What?" a report by the American Institute for Economic Research, "Economic Aspects of the Steel Price Fiasco," a series of letters from the Chicago Daily Tribune, the text of a study by McGraw-Hill Publishing Co., "The Profits Squeeze," and finally the joint statement of the Senate-House Republican leadership of April 19, 1962:

AN ECONOMIC JUDGMENT IN STEEL—FACTS BEHIND PRICE-RISE DECISION TOLD IN QUESTION-AND-ANSWER FORM

(By David Lawrence)

This is the inside story of how an economic judgment of major importance was made within the steel industry only to be upset subsequently by the political judgment of the President of the United States, backed up by threats of criminal prosecution. The story is based on several days of research among many men in the steel industry and economists who analyze trade and financial news.

It is perhaps best to present the facts in what could have been a dialogue between an inquiring reporter and a group of men who, sitting as a finance committee, endeavored to make an economic judgment just after the contract with the National Steelworkers Union was signed. Here in composite form is the result:

Question. Did you assure the President or anyone else that you would hold the line on prices?

Answer. We not only didn't do this, but we couldn't do it without deliberately violating the antitrust laws. We sat down alongside our competitors only to negotiate with the labor unions. We could not mention prices either to the union representatives or to the men from the other companies.

Question. Wasn't it inferred or wasn't it implicit that, if the unions didn't get a big wage increase, you as a group wouldn't increase prices?

Answer. We gave no such promise or inference to anyone. The new increase of 10 cents an hour for labor in fringe benefits, it is estimated, will cost our industry about $100 million a year. Somebody has to pay for this. This is on top of the 30 cents an

hour increase in wages in the last 3 years which we absorbed without making any increase in our prices.

Question. But after all the public discussion of wage and price stability, why couldn't you go along?

Answer. Because we have a responsibility to those who have invested in our property. We have promised to pay back what we owe. We had to make an economic judgment.

Question. On what was your economic judgment based?

Answer. On the simple fact that 3 years ago we in our company began a program to modernize our plant and equipment at a cost of $1,185 million.

Question. Where did you get the money?

Answer. We got part of it out of surplus and depreciation reserve and part of it out of profits after paying dividends. The balance—about $800 million—we borrowed.

Question. Why didn't you just sell more stock instead of borrowing?

Answer. Because, to pay dividends on your stock at 5 percent, you would have to earn 10 percent before taxes, which take about a half of your earnings, whereas you can borrow money at 5 percent and get a tax deduction on half of the interest cost. And that's one of the major reasons why there has been such a big limitation on stock issues not only in our industry but in others as well.

Question. But how do you relate this to your pricing policy?

Answer. We make a 5-year forecast in our company as we take a long-range look at the economy. It's difficult to do, but finally you must make an economic judgment based on whether the market for your product will take the increase in prices and on what your competitors will do. This can only be based on published information in annual reports and on common knowledge as to markets and also on financial data in trade and financial journals in our industry. We can also make a reasonable calculation of the amount of depreciation reserve we are going to have over a period of time.

Question. What was your judgment on this particular price increase?

Answer. We felt it was a moderate one that could rapidly be absorbed by our customers. We had experienced a 6-percent deterioration in our cost-price relationship even before the latest wage increase. So a 3½-percent increase in prices seemed logical, since it was a bit more than half of the deterioration which had occurred.

Question. How did you come out your 1961 operations?

Answer. We made just a little more than $2 million in our company above our dividend payments and above the $210 million reserved for depreciation. This latter sum is available for capital expenditures and amounts today to only a partial replacement of the capital we originally invested, during previous years, in plant and equipment that now is wearing out or becoming obsolete. In fact, all this depreciation reserve and profit put together has been less each year than what we have been spending for new plants. The total profit we earned in 1961 didn't even take care of our debt payment requirements. So it was obvious that if we didn't do better in 1962, we would have to dig further into this depreciation reserve just to keep going.

Question. Lots of people are saying you will have to cut your dividends in 1962—is that so?

Answer. Stockholders and investors play a vital part in the free-enterprise system, and the best way to shake their confidence and either limit or eliminate that investment source is to cut dividends.

Question. How does this relate to borrowing power?

Answer. Well, those who lend you money must see before them what is called a "cushion"—enough leeway between the annual payment on your debt and your annual profits so that the lenders will feel they have a normal margin of protection if default occurs. The profit squeeze we're going through just isn't healthy for us or for the future of industry generally.

Question. One last question: It has been said that what you did was "bad public relations." Did you take into account public reaction?

Answer. There is never a "right time" to tell somebody they've got to pay more for their products. But we nevertheless have to make our determinations and judgments on economic facts. Public relations will not help us if we cannot modernize our plant and equipment fast enough to enable us to compete with European products and to help us to keep our prices down so that we can compete with substitute products in this country. Nor will public relations help us if we cannot earn enough each year to pay back what we have borrowed. When you go broke, that's bad timing and bad public relations, too.

AFTER THE STEEL CRISIS—WHAT?

Last week, this country saw a strange and ominous performance.

It witnessed, perhaps, the death of free enterprise and individualism in the United States.

For certainly, free enterprise and individualism cannot survive in an atmosphere of threat, intimidation and blackmail boldly and openly thrust forward by an administration in control of the executive branch of the U.S. Government.

If that is not what took place last week—then what did happen?

The steel industry, operating in a supposedly free economy, availing itself of what it thought was the constitutionally guaranteed right of free enterprise, announced a price increase of $6 per ton.

The next day over TV and radio Mr. Kennedy denounced that price increase as a dire threat to national security. He called upon the people to help him in forcing the industry to forego what evidently in the face of cold facts was a much-needed price increase.

PRICE CONTROL BY THREAT AND BLACKMAIL?

Then the "high priests" of the New Frontier moved into action—with threats and blackmail.

High Cabinet officers went on long distance telephone to cajole and coerce managers of various steel companies to refuse to announce an increase—or to rescind if they had announced one—in the price of their steel products. The Office of the Attorney General, manned by Robert Kennedy, called in Capitol Hill cloakrooms "Crown Prince Bobby" even as his brother John now is called "King John" in the same circles—announced a Federal grand jury investigation of the steel industry to determine what violations of antitrust laws have been committed. And subpenas were quickly issued and served on leading steel companies.

Senator ESTES KEFAUVER and Representative EMANUEL CELLER quickly moved their Senate and House Judiciary Antitrust Subcommittees into action. More subpenas were rushed out.

It is admitted that Under Secretary Edward Gudeman of the Department of Commerce spent many dollars of taxpayers' money on long distance phone calls to officials of Inland Steel Co.—but what offers he made to those officials are not yet known. But whatever he said—or offered—the result was the announcement by Inland Steel that it would "not go along on the price increase announced by United States Steel."

The line was broken—the threats and blackmail succeeded—the announced price increase was rescinded.

HITLERIAN TACTICS?

No other example of pressure by an administration of power in any allegedly-free government can be found in present-day history—with the possible exception of actions of Adolf Hitler in the early thirties when he was forcing German industry to accept price, profit, and production controls in that country.

The New Frontier high priests in press, radio, and TV—and on the floors of the Congress—started the to-the-present continuing paeans of high praise for the "courageous action of our great leader."

One cannot but help call to mind that—almost 2,000 years ago—other high priests manipulated a mob with their paid-for cries of "Give us Barabbas."

Did Mr. Kennedy truly win a real victory last week—a victory that will be helpful to the American people—the American economy—and the American Republic?

What has really happened?

Is there anyone who will question that—after last week's exhibition of ruthless power against free enterprise—that all businessmen now must first look to Washington before daring to make any increase in any price of any product? Will not almost all businessmen now have to come to Washington—hat in hand—and, in effect, say "Pretty please—can I please increase my prices a little bit because if I can't I will be forced out of business?"

The record establishes that profits in the steel industry—as in practically all American industry—have been steadily declining. Any businessman—or even almost any high school student of economics—should know that the choice in such a situation is increased profits—or go out of business.

WHAT ABOUT PROFITS?

How can profits be increased?

Either by reducing costs or by raising prices.

If costs are to be reduced—plants must be modernized. And that costs money.

Where can American industry get the money required to modernize its obsolete plant in order to compete in both domestic and world markets today against the modern plants of Europe and Japan—plants, for the most part, built since World War II with the money of American taxpayers?

There are only two sources—in a free enterprise system—from which such money may be obtained.

From the savings of the people—from profits—or from both.

If profits are to be squeezed by administration edict to the point where the funds will not be available for such modernization—then the only remaining source is from the savings of the people.

And—under the present system of Government waste and high taxes—how much savings will be allowed the people to invest in corporate securities? And—if the present system of price and profit control by administration threat and blackmail is to continue—why should the people risk their savings in corporate securities? After all—they can get from 4 to 4¾ percent interest on their savings from savings banks—with their savings protected and guaranteed by the U.S. Government up to $10,000 under the FDIC.

And—if they are willing to "plow back" the interest payments on their savings accounts—they can double their money in 16 years at 4½ percent. So—why risk it in corporate securities and the threat of Administration reprisals?

Of course, there is another source from which money for modernization can come—but not in a country operating under a free enterprise system. That is through nationalization and printing press money. But—when that happens in this country—the free

enterprise system and the Republic will be only memories of old people to discuss—very privately—with their grandchildren.

A 25-CENT DOLLAR?

Mr. Kennedy—in his raging speech last Wednesday—charged that the proposed steel price increase "threatened price stability" and "inflation" in this country.

What is the principal cause of inflation?

Government deficit spending.

And the U.S. Treasury recently announced that it "expects the deficit for fiscal 1962—ending June 30, 1962—will be approximately $9,700 million." Senator HARRY F. BYRD, chairman of the Senate Finance Committee, whose estimate of deficits invariably are far more accurate than Treasury estimates—has stated he expects the fiscal 1962 deficit to be more than $10 billion.

What will a $10 billion deficit do to the inflationary pressures in this country? What will it do to the value of the dollar—not only in purchasing power of the people but in *world commerce*? Can it do anything but depress that purchasing power lower? It is estimated now that the dollar has a purchasing power of about 45 cents against the 1939 dollar.

Are we headed for a 25-cent dollar—as a result of Kennedy's New Frontier deficit spending?

And, if so, what will that mean to our present gold holdings?

Past experience has shown that when the currency of a country begins to depreciate gold is withdrawn from that country because the currency of that country ceases to be of much value in international trade.

Mr. Kennedy has talked much about halting the outflow of gold from this country—but will his present policies of deficit spending and squeezing of profits halt that outflow? It is very, very doubtful—rather it may be anticipated it will increase that outflow.

THREE MILLION NEW JOBS NEEDED ANNUALLY

Mr. Kennedy also has talked considerably about the need to end unemployment in this country.

Unemployment can be ended only by the creation of new jobs. Such jobs can be created in only one of two ways, by private enterprise or by Government. And, again, the sad record of 1930's established that, when the Government creates the jobs, such jobs are of no real value, contribute nothing to the economy, and cost from three to four times what it costs to create a job in private enterprise.

Recent figures from the Bureau of the Census and the Labor Department indicate that—if we are to take up the slack in employment—that is, end present unemployment—and, at the same time provide jobs for new employables coming into the market almost daily, we must create about 3 million new jobs each year for at least the next 5 years.

It is generally conceded by economists that it costs at least $15,000 to create a new job in American industry today—and that is a very low cost figure.

On that basis, if we are to create a minimum of 3 million new jobs annually for the next 5 years, it means the cost will be approximately $47 billion per year.

And—if profits are to be squeezed, taxes to continue high and private enterprise is to be under continual attack by the administration in power.

Where are we going to get that money?

Can it come from the squeezed profits of industry and/or the savings, if any, of a highly taxed people while prices, due to inflation caused by administration deficit spending, continue to mount?

WHO WON WHAT VICTORY?

Apparently there is only one answer—if the present policy of profit and price control by administration threat and blackmail is to continue and we are to meet that goal of 3 million new jobs a year.

The Government must nationalize the basic sources of production and resort to printing press money.

Can that mean other than socialization of our economy?

And, if that is the final end of it all, we should remember that Karl Marx, Lenin, Stalin, and William Z. Foster all have declared that "Socialism is the transition period from the overthrow of capitalism into the final goal of communism."

So, while the high priests of the New Frontier gleefully chortle over the "great victory of our leader" last week, the question is, Who won what victory?

Did the American people win, or will events establish that Khrushchev really won another advance toward the communization of the Republic of the United States?

WHO WILL BE BLAMED FOR RISING PRICES NOW?

Yes, the New Frontier now is looking gleefully forward to a great victory at the polls next November when its high priests are certain the people will vindicate our great leader by returning control of the Congress to us liberals.

But, while waiting for those delightful grapes to ripen on the vine to be pressed into the heady wine of such a victory, what if the people wake up through mounting prices, realize they really "bought a Barabbas" last week?

For, in indicting the steel industry for ruthlessly attempting to force unconscionably high prices on the American people—and by forcing the rescinding of that proposed price increase, on whom will Mr Kennedy try to place the blame if prices begin to climb due to his program of huge deficit spending? On the steel industry or American industry generally when the administration has prevented industry from raising its prices? Of course, he will not dare to place such blame of the high wage and benefit costs forced on American industry by uncontrolled, powerful unions.

Who, then, must accept the blame if prices do rise?

Barabbas?

THE PROFITS SQUEEZE—FACTS, CAUSES, EFFECTS, REMEDIES

U.S. business is in a bind. Profits are caught between rising costs and stable prices. And unless the pressures are substantially eased, everyone—and not just the Nation's businessmen—will soon be hurt by the squeeze.

The situation is critical, but correctable. Much of what is needed is more understanding, a fuller knowledge of the facts, and a wider appreciation of the role profits play in the American economy.

This statement is designed to contribute to this end. It shows what has happened to profits since World War II. It looks at events behind the change. And it suggests routes out of the predicament.

A SMALLER SHARE OF SALES AND INCOME

Among the most important developments of the present business recovery is the rise in corporate profits. Edging slightly above the 1960 level, after-tax profits last year rose to $23 billion. They are likely to push on to a new high this year.

But this does not mean that corporations are doing unusually well. Far from it. As the table below shows, profits for 1961 were less than those for 1959 and 1956. They just equaled 1955 profits, and were only a hair's breadth above the earnings of 1950 when the economy was 45 percent smaller than it is today.

Profits after taxes of U.S. corporations

[In billion dollars]

Year:	
1946	13.4
1947	18.2
1948	20.5
1949	16.0
1950	22.8
1951	19.7
1952	17.2
1953	18.1
1954	16.8
1955	23.0
1956	23.5
1957	22.3
1958	18.8
1959	23.7
1960	22.7
1961 estimate	23.0

What's more, profit margins—profits as a percent of sales—are far below those earned in the earlier postwar years. From 5 percent of sales during the years 1946–50, profits dropped to 3.6 percent during 1951–55. They slid to 3.2 percent for the period 1956–60. And last year they were down to 3.1 percent.

Profits are also a shrinking share of national income, as the chart at the top of this column shows.

In considering these figures, it should be remembered that they are averages for all corporations. Some companies make more than the average, and some make no profits at all.

WHY WORRY?

If only a few companies were making low profits or showing losses, there would be scant reason for public concern. But when business firms generally begin showing a poor profit record, it becomes the proper concern of everyone—stockholders, managers, workers, Government officials, and consumers. This is because profits perform three indispensable jobs in the American economy:

First, profits provide economic motive power. They induce businessmen to research new products and new techniques of production. They encourage risktakers to put their savings into economic activity that is useful to the entire community.

Second, retained profits are the single most important source of growth capital. As President Kennedy said in his Economic Report to Congress, "While we move toward full and sustained use of today's productive capacity, we must expand our potential for tomorrow."

Third, the quest for profits directs labor and other resources to the jobs people want done. They tell management whether it is doing a good job or a bad job, and channel resources into the production of the things consumers want.

If profit margins continue dwindling at the present rate, these jobs can't be done efficiently. Businessmen will provide fewer new goods and services for consumers. Investors won't buy the new plants and equipment that mean more employment opportunities and better working conditions for labor. And some companies will lose their zeal for shifting their efforts in accord with consumer preferences.

BEHIND THE DECLINE

While profit margins have been falling, the corporate compensation of employees has taken a growing share of both corporate sales and national income. The following table shows what has been happening here.

Corporate compensation of employees

Year	Percent of total sales	Percent of national income
1946–50	23.5	40.1
1951–55	24.3	42.4
1956–60	24.4	43.8
1961 (estimate)	25.0	43.5

But generally confronted by increasingly competitive conditions, both at home and abroad, companies have usually been unable to pass along a bigger wage and salary bill to their consumers in the form of higher prices, even if they wanted to. In the early years after World War II it was often possible to pass along higher costs by marking up prices, but in these days of general abundance intense competition for sales makes this difficult. Hence the squeeze of profits between rising costs and relatively stable prices.

High Federal taxes also intensify the profit squeeze. Except for the profits of very small companies, the Federal Government still takes 52 percent of business profit. This is the same giant slice that was taken before tougher competition made profit dollars so much harder to acquire.

WHAT CAN BE DONE?

There is no disposition here to deprecate the desirability of high wages. Nor is there any lack of appreciation that the Federal Government must have very large revenues if it is to perform its role in the sixties properly.

But it is important to realize that excessive wage hikes and excessive taxes can be self-defeating. They can lead to reduced wages and reduced tax revenues if they squeeze profits to the point where these cannot play their vitally necessary role in the economy. Before this happens both labor and Government should take time out to ponder the long-run effects of today's actions.

There is an ancient and honorable phrase which says that "the laborer is worthy of his hire." Labor leaders, as they sit around the negotiating tables this year, should remember that profitmakers, no less than they, are likewise worthy of their hire.

In considering new tax legislation, it's up to Congress to keep constantly in mind that a prosperous business community is absolutely essential to the defense of freedom, to the maintenance of high employment, even to the revenues that pay congressional salaries. The present tax load works against having this prosperous kind of business community.

Of course, business too has an obligation to keep profits from falling to an ineffective remnant. One of the best ways it can discharge this obligation is by continuing its research efforts, by developing new products and new cost-cutting ways to make them as well as their present products and services.

The prevailing profits squeeze is a matter of vital concern to every American. We all have a stake in seeing that steps are taken—in the offices of business management, in halls of Congress where tax laws are made and revised, and at the bargaining tables where agreements on wage rates are made—to see that this squeeze is relaxed.

ECONOMIC ASPECTS OF THE STEEL PRICE FIASCO

Readers of these bulletins presumably are well aware that we have much confidence in the ability of free markets to establish prices such that exchange and distribution of goods will be effected most efficiently. In the ability of political agencies to determine such prices we have no confidence whatsoever for the simple, and to us adequate, reason that the historical record of innumerable such attempts reveals only a succession of abject failures. That colossal failure, the Nation's farm program, is only one example among many.

Our opinion is that present economic conditions and those to be expected in the near future would have forced the steel companies to rescind the price increase in any event. In fact, we suspect that price decreases rather than increases are what the free markets of the world will dictate for steel prices during the next few years.

Nevertheless, we believe that the steel companies, like the other participants in a free enterprise economy, should have the right to test the market, including the right to make mistakes in judging the market. The managements of steel companies, and of all other businesses, can best serve the public, their stockholders, and their employees, by following the dictates of free markets. When market pressures tend to raise steel prices, management should raise prices and should use the greater profits for expansion in order to meet the market demand, eventually perhaps at lower prices. On the other hand, when market pressures indicate that lower prices for steel are needed if production is to be absorbed, prices should be lowered and so also, when necessary, should the wages of labor, dividends, and management bonuses be reduced.

The notion that changes in the price of steel will determine whether or not more inflation occurs is ridiculous. If more inflationary purchasing media are added to those already in circulation, the increase will come from the same sources that have provided the inflationary purchasing media now in use: i.e., monetized Government and private debt. In the long run, and in spite of Mr. Kennedy's wishes, inflation or deflation will determine the price of steel, not the reverse.

As for Mr. Kennedy's part in the steel price fiasco, we confine our comments to the economic significance when a President apparently is laboring under the delusion that he or a few of his advisers can possibly know what the correct price for steel or any other commodity should be. Anyone who holds that conviction with such assurance that he is enraged when the companies concerned, however stupidly, attempt to test the market is, in our opinion, suffering from delusions as to the economic wisdom attainable by himself or his advisers. That an individual apparently suffering from such delusions should now be in the White House has seriously adverse implications, in our opinion, for the economic future of the United States.

KENNEDY AND STEEL

DES PLAINES, April 16.—President Kennedy did not win, as he would have us believe, a victory against inflation. What he did win was a propaganda victory based on the false premise that he was dealing inflation a severe blow. Furthermore, he took undue advantage of conditions which made him appear as a bold and courageous man; it was not necessary for him to attack labor or any other large segment of voters. Why has he not shown such boldness and decision in other vital matters?

GAYLORD M. PACKARD.

WILLOW SPRINGS, April 16.—The Pacific coast shipping strike forced the refunding of millions of dollars to thousands of passengers. Thousands were herded like cattle from ships as striking seamen walked off. Washington was unmoved.

Then, United States Steel decided to give a pay increase to that forgotten man—the investor. All Government agencies were mustered into action to stop the steel companies.

This no longer is a democracy. What is it?

MRS. R. E. CONE.

JONES, MICH., April 16.—When the Government by threats and intimidation can compel a citizen to do what it cannot legally require him to do, our liberties are gone. We then no longer live under a rule of law, but dance to the fiddling of a coterie of bureaucrats. It is the steel companies today—tomorrow, it may be you or I.

GARFIELD CANRIGHT.

CHICAGO, April 15.—Our votes go to Mr. Blough, a man who has been able to run his company since 1958 without price increases, while taxes were going up all around. If they can get men like him to run United States Steel, why can't we get the same kind of men to run our Government?

D. J. SMITHERS.

CHICAGO, April 12.—If Mr. Kennedy thinks it's wrong to raise the price of steel, why does he think it is right to raise the price of Government?

L. CARLTON MERTZ.

MILWAUKEE, April 15.—Now that our President has managed to prevent a raise in steel prices, perhaps he also will be able to prevent a raise in postal rates.

ED BATZNER.

THE STEEL DISPUTE

CHICAGO, April 16.—Now that the so-called steel crisis has ended, perhaps some clear thinking can be had.

Raising the price of steel in itself is not a crisis. This action didn't frighten me one bit. If the price of steel had gone up too high and if the demand wasn't there, the price could have been reduced again. Many industries have increased or lowered their prices according to the demands of the market. I don't know of any one person or any industry that was ever hurt by this fluctuation.

John Kennedy's comments during this period didn't upset me either. I thought on some points he went too far, but then I've grown accustomed to exaggerations by politicians. Possibly, if Mr. Blough had timed his increase to, say, 1 week after his visit to the White House, the increase would have been accepted and no one would have been hurt by what seems to have become an important factor in our lives—loss of face.

But what did frighten me was the action taken by Robert Kennedy. Certainly a mild crisis such as a steel price increase couldn't possibly call for three newspapermen being awakened in the middle of the night by Government agents on only the word from the Attorney General of the United States. Night raiding, without warrants, by an Attorney General is certainly reminiscent of Nazi Germany.

H. MITCHELL.

ELMHURST, April 15.—Those people who are thinking only about the fact that prices were held down by the President's action in the steel price dispute should also think about the following:

When an individual regardless of his position, has the power to bring the coercive forces of Government to bear against a law abiding industry in order to enforce his will in the name of some nebulous thing called the "national interest," he also has the power to bring these forces to bear against a law abiding citizen in order to bend him to his will in the name of the national interest. Is this freedom?

As Lord Acton said, "Power corrupts, and absolute power corrupts absolutely."

GEORGE L. BERGHORN.

CHICAGO, April 16.—Our President, who seems to enjoy tossing our money right and left by the bushel, became hysterical because the steel industry had the temerity to raise prices for the first time in several years. Does it bother him when unions "negotiate" new raises and fringe benefits? What choice does the employer have? Strikes cost him plenty; so he surrenders, and agrees to higher wages and fringe benefits every year or two. Who pays the difference? All of us—in higher prices, taxes, and everything—again and again.

JOHN BLASE MECCIA.

EVERGREEN PARK, April 15.—At present several Senators are planning to introduce legislation to strengthen antitrust laws because of the recent proposed steel price rise. This is all well and good, but why not go a step further and also provide labor antitrust laws?

Legislation of this nature, is equally important, and I'm certain union members themselves would welcome more control over their moneys.

P. M. PAUL.

STATEMENT BY THE JOINT SENATE-HOUSE REPUBLICAN LEADERSHIP

We, the members of the joint Senate-House Republican leadership, deplore the necessity for issuing this statement, but the issues involved are too compelling to be ignored.

Beyond the administrative operations of the Federal Government, it is a proper function of a President, in fact it is a duty, to help American private enterprise maintain a stable economy. In our free society he must usually find his way by persuasion and the prestige of his office.

Last week President Kennedy made a determination that a 3½-percent increase in the price of steel would throw the American economy out of line on several fronts. In the next 24 hours, the President directed or supported a series of governmental actions that imperiled basic American rights, went far beyond the law, and were more characteristic of a police state than a free government.

We, the members of the joint Senate-House Republican leadership, believe that a fundamental issue has been raised: should a President of the United States use the enormous powers of the Federal Government to blackjack any segment of our free society into line with his personal judgment without regard to law?

Nine actions which followed President Kennedy's press conference of Wednesday, April 11, were obviously a product of White House direction or encouragement and must be considered for their individual and cumulative effect. They were:

1. The Federal Trade Commission publicly suggested the possibility of collusion, announced an immediate investigation, and talked of $5,000-a-day penalties.

2. The Justice Department spoke threateningly of antitrust violations and ordered an immediate investigation.

3. Treasury Department officials indicated they were at once reconsidering the planned increase in depreciation rates for steel.

4. The Internal Revenue Service was reported making a menacing move toward United States Steel's incentive benefits plan for its executives.

5. The Senate Antitrust and Monopoly Subcommittee began subpenaing records from 12 steel companies, returnable May 14.

6. The House Antitrust Subcommittee announced an immediate investigation, with hearings opening May 2.

7. The Justice Department announced it was ordering a grand jury investigation.

8. The Department of Defense, seemingly ignoring laws requiring competitive bidding publicly announced it was shifting steel purchases to companies which had not increased prices, and other Government agencies were directed to do likewise.

9. The FBI began routing newspapermen out of bed at 3 a.m. on Thursday, April 12, in line with President Kennedy's press conference assertion that "we are investigating" a statement attributed to a steel company official in the newspapers.

Taken cumulatively, these nine actions amount to a display of naked political power never seen before in this Nation.

Taken singly, these nine actions are punitive, heavy-handed, and frightening.

Although the President at his press conference made it clear that "price and wage decisions in this country * * * are and ought to be freely and privately made," there was nothing in the course of action which he pursued that supported this basic American doctrine.

Indeed, if big Government can be used to extra legally reverse the economic decisions of one industry in a free economy, then it can be used to reverse the decisions of any business, big or small, of labor, of farmers; in fact, of any citizen.

Most disturbing in its implications was the use of the FBI. Since the days of our Founding Fathers, this land has been the haven of millions who fled from the feared knock on the door in the night.

We condone nothing in the actions of the steel companies except their right to make an economic judgment without massive retaliation by the Federal Government.

Temporarily President Kennedy may have won a political victory, but at the cost of doing violence to the fundamental precepts of a free society.

This Nation must realize that we have passed within the shadow of police-state methods. We hope that we never again step into those dark regions, whatever the controversy of the moment, be it economic or political.

TRIBUTE TO THE NASHVILLE TENNESSEAN PUBLISHER, AMON CARTER EVANS, AND EDITOR JOHN SEIGENTHALER, WHO WAS A NIEMAN FELLOW AND FORMERLY ADMINISTRATIVE ASSISTANT TO ATTORNEY GENERAL ROBERT KENNEDY

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. BOLAND] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, I want to take this opportunity to congratulate Publisher Amon Carter Evans and Editor John Seigenthaler on the 150th anniversary of the founding of the Nashville Tennessean, a great independent newspaper which for a quarter of a century has been a major weapon in the fight for America's and Tennessee's betterment.

The 34-year-old editor of the Nashville Tennessean is a native Tennessean who has spent years as a newspaper reporter and has an illustrious journalistic background. A native of Nashville, he broke into the newspaper business after school and under the tutelage of Silliman Evans, father of the present publisher, who took over the Tennessean in April 1937. Editor Seigenthaler was a Nieman fellow at Harvard University, devoting 1 full academic year in 1958–59 to research and study in American government and economics. He returned to the Nashville Tennessean where he became one of the outstanding and skilled investigative reporters in the Nation.

Mr. Speaker, one of Editor Seigenthaler's investigations and news stories ultimately resulted in the impeachment of a State judge whose connections with undesirable elements in the Teamsters Union had been revealed in the Nashville Tennessean. John Seigenthaler left newspaper work and joined the Kennedy team in the 1960 presidential campaign. He later was named administrative assistant to Attorney General Robert Kennedy, a position he filled for more than a year. He recently left the Justice Department when named editor of the Nashville Tennessean. I am sure that Attorney General Kennedy and his colleagues feel that this was a sad day for the Justice Department, but John Seigenthaler's return to active newspaper work was certainly a good day for American journalism. Editor Seigenthaler has been the personification of the highest traditions of our American free press—thorough, honest, responsible, capable, and fair. His ability has been reflected in the daily newspaper he edits.

Again, I want to take this opportunity to offer my best wishes to Publisher Evans and Editor Seigenthaler for many years of success with the Nashville Tennessean, and to congratulate them for their fine 150th anniversary edition. I would like to have permission to include with my remarks at this point a telegram from President Kennedy to Publisher Evans:

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, D.C.

Mr. AMON CARTER EVANS,
Publisher, the Nashville Tennessean,
Nashville, Tenn.

DEAR AMON: I want to extend my congratulations to your mother and to you on the 150th anniversary of the founding of the Nashville Tennessean and the 25th anniversary of the Evans family ownership.

You may feel great pride in the progress made in your region over the last 25 years.

In 1812, your paper stood on the frontier of this country. Now our world stands on the frontier of space. The Tennessean, like all newspapers, can help this world meet today's challenges by informing our citizenry by continuing to report the daily history which is news, and explaining why it happens and what it means.

I am certain you and the staff of the Tennessean will fulfill the great task our Founding Fathers set for this Nation's press when they made freedom of information a basic tenet of our democratic way of life.

JOHN F. KENNEDY.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to Mr. WEAVER (at the request of Mr. ARENDS), for 5 days, beginning April 30, on account of official business.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. LANGEN) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. FINO.
Mr. SHORT.
Mr. HORAN.
Mr. KEARNS in two instances.
Mr. ALGER.

(The following Member (at the request of Mr. ALBERT) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. LIBONATI.

SENATE ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The SPEAKER announced his signature to an enrolled bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 1668. An act to authorize the imposition of forfeitures for certain violations of the rules and regulations of the Federal Communications Commission in the common carrier and safety and special fields.

BILL AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. BURLESON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee did on this day present to the President, for his approval, a bill and joint resolution of the House of the following titles:

H.R. 11027. An act to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended; and

H.J. Res. 449. Joint resolution providing for the establishing of the former dwelling house of Alexander Hamilton as a national memorial.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 11 minutes p.m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, May 1, 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:

1969. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on the review of central rebuild of World War II vehicles and assemblies in the Pacific Area Command (PACOM) under the military assistance program (MAP); to the Committee on Government Operations.

1970. A letter from the Secretary of Defense, transmitting 17 reports covering 17 violations of section 3679, Revised Statutes, and Department of Defense Directive 7200.1, entitled "Administrative Control of Appropriations Within the Department of Defense", pursuant to section 3679(1)(2), Revised Statutes; to the Committee on Appropriations.

1971. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to amend sections 510 and 591 of title 10, United States Code"; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1972. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of Defense, transmitting the quarterly report on Federal contributions for the quarter ending December 31, 1961, pursuant to the Federal Civil Defense Act of 1950, as amended; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1973. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of Defense, transmitting the quarterly report of Federal contributions for the quarter ending March 31, 1962, pursuant to the Federal Civil Defense Act of 1950, as amended; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1974. A letter from the Administrator, General Services Administration, transmitting a notice of a proposed disposition of approximately 5 million pounds of molybdenum now held in the national stockpile, pursuant to 50 U.S.C. 98b(e); to the Committee on Armed Services.

1975. A letter from the Secretary of the Air Force relative to the number of officers assigned or detailed to permanent duty in the executive element of the Air Force at the seat of government as of March 31, 1962, pursuant to section 8031(c), title 10, United States Code; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1976. A letter from the President of the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to amend provisions of law relating to personal property coming into the custody of the property clerk, Metropolitan Police Department, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

1977. A letter from the President of the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to amend the act entitled 'An act to authorize the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to make regulations to prevent and control the spread of communicable diseases', approved August 11, 1939, as amended"; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

1978. A letter from the Director, District Unemployment Compensation Board, Government of the District of Columbia, transmitting the 26th Annual Report of the District Unemployment Compensation Board for the year 1961; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

1979. A letter from the president, D.C. Transit System, Inc., transmitting a report covering operations of the D.C. Transit System, Inc., for the year ended December 31, 1961, pursuant to the act of Congress approved March 4, 1913 (Public 435); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

1980. A letter from the Chairman, National Labor Relations Board, transmitting the 26th Annual Report of the National Labor Relations Board for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1961, pursuant to the Labor Management Relations Act of 1947; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

1981. A letter from the Secretary of State, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to amend the act of September 7, 1950, to extend the regulatory authority of the Federal and State agencies concerned under the terms of the Convention for the Establishment of an Inter-American Tropical Tuna Commission, signed at Washington May 31, 1949, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1982. A letter from the Director, Congressional liaison staff, Agency for International Development, Department of State, transmitting the report on the contingency fund use as of March 31, 1962, pursuant to section 451(b) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1983. A letter from the Administrator, General Services Administration, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to amend the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended, to provide for a Federal telecommunications fund"; to the Committee on Government Operations.

1984. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States; transmitting the report on a review of selected activities of the Federal-aid highway program of the Bureau of Public Roads, Department of Commerce, in the State of South Carolina; to the Committee on Government Operations.

1985. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States; transmitting a report on the audit of the Government Printing Office for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1961; to the Committee on Government Operations.

1986. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States; transmitting a report on a review of the fee arrangements made by the Small Business Administration (SBA) with lending institutions that participate in making business loans to small concerns; to the Committee on Government Operations.

1987. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States; transmitting a report on the review of the procurement of certain major shipboard equipment by the Bureau of Ships, Department of the Navy; to the Committee on Government Operations.

1988. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States; transmitting a report on the review of supply management of photographic supplies and equipment within the Department of Defense (DOD); to the Committee on Government Operations.

1989. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States; transmitting a report on the examination of the procurement of special tooling for the B–58 airplane program under Department of the Air Force negotiated cost-plus-incentive-fee contracts with Convair, a division of General Dynamics Corp., Fort Worth, Tex.; to the Committee on Government Operations.

1990. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States; transmitting a report on examination of the pricing of certain missile tooling under Department of the Air Force negotiated contract AF 33(600)–36319 awarded to the Boeing Co., Seattle, Wash., for the production of Bomarc missiles and related spare parts and support equipment; to the Committee on Government Operations.

1991. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior transmitting a letter citing that the Banta Carbona Irrigation District of San Joaquin County, Calif., has applied for a loan of $967,000 to be used for improvement and modernization of its irrigation facilities, and submitted pursuant to section 10 of the Small Reclamation Projects Act of 1956; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

1992. A letter from the Secretary of State, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill for the relief of Don C. Jensen and Bruce E. Woolner"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1993. A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting a report, authorized under title XII of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended, empowering the Secretary to provide war risk insurance and certain marine and liability insurance for the American public, and upon request for any department or agency of the United States, as of March 31, 1962, submitted pursuant to section 1211 of the act; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

1994. A letter from the Secretary of State, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill, entitled "A bill authorizing the acquisition of certain property in the District of Columbia and its conveyance to the International Monetary Fund, on a full reimbursement basis, for use in expansion of its headquarters"; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

1995. A letter from the Acting Secretary of Commerce, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled, "A bill to amend the act of March 3, 1901 (31 Stat. 1449), as amended, to incorporate in the Organic Act of the National Bureau of Standards the authority to make certain improvements of fiscal and administrative practices for more effective conduct of its research and development activities"; to the Committee on Science and Astronautics.

1996. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, U.S. Department of Justice, transmitting copies of orders entered in cases where the authority contained in section 212(d)(3) of the Immigration and Nationality Act was exercised in behalf of such aliens, and presenting an attached list giving the names of aliens covered by the orders, pursuant to section 212(d)(6) of the act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, pursuant to the order of the House of April 19, 1962, the following bill was reported on April 24, 1962:

Mr. HARRIS: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. H.R. 11040. A bill to provide for the establishment, ownership, operation, and regulation of a commercial communications satellite system, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 1636). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

[Submitted April 30, 1962]

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. HAYS: From the Delegation of the U.S. House of Representatives to the Seventh NATO Parliamentarians Conference. Report pursuant to Public Law 689, 84th Congress pertaining to the Seventh NATO Parliamentarians Conference (Rept. No. 1637). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. HÉBERT: Committee on Armed Services. H.R. 5532. A bill to amend the Armed Services Procurement Act of 1947; without amendment (Rept. No. 1638). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. HÉBERT: Committee on Armed Services. H.R. 11217 A bill to amend section 6112 of title 10, United States Code; without amendment (Rept. 1639). 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. ALGER:

H.R. 11492. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to eliminate the withholding of income tax from wages and salaries; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BENNETT of Florida:

H.R. 11493. A bill to amend section 303 of the Career Compensation Act of 1949 relating to travel and transportation allowances of certain members of the uniformed services retired, discharged, or released to inactive duty; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. ELLSWORTH (by request):

H.R. 11494. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act to provide for the adjustment of inequities and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. JOHNSON of California:

H.R. 11495. A bill to provide for an appropriation of a sum not to exceed $75,000 with which to make a survey of a proposed Sierra Way in the State of California; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. KEARNS:

H.R. 11496. A bill to amend the act providing financial assistance for local educational agencies in areas affected by Federal activities in order to provide educational assistance under the provisions of such act to the District of Columbia and to make the change in the District of Columbia motor fuel tax law needed to insure that such assistance will be fully effective; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. GEORGE P. MILLER:

H.R. 11497. A bill to authorize the Housing and Home Finance Administrator to provide additional assistance for the development of comprehensive and coordinated mass transportation systems in metropolitan and other urban areas, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. ROBISON:

H.R. 11498. A bill for the establishment of a Commission on Federal Taxation; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SISK:

H.R. 11499. A bill to provide for an appropriation of a sum not to exceed $75,000 with which to make a survey of a proposed Sierra Way in the State of California; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. SPENCE:

H.R. 11500. A bill to extend the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H.R. 11501. A bill to amend section 3515 of the Revised Statutes to eliminate tin in the alloy of the 1-cent piece; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. SISK:

H.J. Res. 702. Joint resolution designating the 7-day period beginning on the 23d day of September of each year as "National Miss Twins U.S.A. Week," to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. VINSON:

H. Con. Res. 473. Concurrent resolution providing the express approval of the Congress, pursuant to section 3(e) of the Strategic and Critical Materials Stock Piling Act (50 U.S.C. 98b(e)), for the disposition of certain materials from the national stockpile; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. RAINS:

H. Res. 621. Resolution expressing the sense of the House with respect to the restrictions presently being placed by the Budget Bureau on the availability of funds for farm housing loans which have been heretofore authorized by the Congress; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By Mr. LANE: Memorial of the General Court of Massachusetts, memorializing the Congress of the United States to provide for the establishment of a Civilian Conservation Corps; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Also, memorial of the General Court of Massachusetts, memorializing the Congress of the United States not to subject the interest on State and local bond issues to the Federal income tax; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, memorial of the General Court of Massachusetts, memorializing the Congress of the United States to enact legislation presenting to the States a proposed constitutional amendment concerning equal rights for women; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, memorial of the General Court of Massachusetts, memorializing the Congress of the United States to enact legislation providing for the establishment of a national health insurance plan financed through the Federal old age survivors insurance law; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, memorial of the General Court of Massachusetts, memorializing Congress to consider extending medical aid to the aged to persons at age 62; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, memorial of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, memorializing the Congress of the United States to enact legislation providing for certain pensions, medical benefits, and funeral benefits for persons over 65; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to providing for the establishment of a Civilian Conservation Corps; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States not to enact legislation to subject the interest on State and local bond issues to the Federal income tax; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to enacting legislation presenting to the States a proposed constitutional amendment concerning equal rights for women; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to enacting legislation extending financial aid to the Commonwealth of Massachusetts for purification of the waters of the Merrimack River; to the Committee on Public Works.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to enacting legislation providing for certain pensions, medical benefits, and funeral benefits for persons over 65; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to considering extending medical aid to the aged to persons at age 62; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to enacting legislation providing for the establishment of a national health insurance plan financed through the Federal old age survivors insurance law; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BLATNIK:

H.R. 11502. A bill for the relief of Lee Sun Hi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GUBSER:

H.R. 11503. A bill for the relief of Bohdan Oparko; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KILBURN:

H.R. 11504. A bill for the relief of Hedwig Hadbawnik Pearson; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WALTER:

H.R. 11505. A bill for the relief of Dr. Rafael H. Lopez; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

315. By the SPEAKER: Petition of Mrs. Elija Druva, president, Baltic Women's Council, Washington, D.C., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to seeking congressional support for the restoration of freedom in Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

316. Also, petition of James J. Vigilante, president, New Jersey State Patrolmen's Benevolent Association, Inc., Morristown, N.J., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to deploring a recent statement of the Attorney General of the United States contained in a message to congressional leaders in which he impliedly charged policemen with the use of brutality and other so-called third degree methods, and declaring the statement unjustly criticizes policemen and defames law enforcement policy of this country; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

317. Also, petition of Chyung Sang Bak, Pusan, Korea, relative to requesting favorable action on H.R. 7704, a bill providing for compensation of expenditures and other claims following an accident May 28, 1951, at Pusan railroad station, Korea; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SENATE

MONDAY, APRIL 30, 1962

(Legislative day of Friday, April 27, 1962)

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

Rev. F. E. McKenzie, rector, St. Paul's Episcopal Church, Wilkesboro, N.C., offered the following prayer:

O Lord, our God, Who art the source of all power and authority in this world, and hast committed into the hands of man the ministry of reconciliation: We beseech Thee to bless and guide those whom Thou hast called to serve in this U.S. Senate, that in all things they may seek to do Thy will.

Direct and prosper all their consultations and deliberations, to the advancement of Thy glory and the safety, honor, and welfare of Thy people.

Grant unto them clear vision, true judgment, with great daring, as they seek to right the wrong; and so endue them with cheerful love that they may minister to the suffering and forlorn and seek in all things to bring peace among men and nations in this troubled world.

All of which we ask in the name of Him who came to bring peace, our Lord and Saviour, Jesus Christ. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Friday, April 27, 1962, was dispensed with.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT—APPROVAL OF BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries, and he announced that on April 27, 1962, the President had approved and signed the following acts and joint resolution:

S. 505. An act for the relief of Seymour Robertson;

S. 508. An act for the relief of John E. Beaman and Adelaide K. Beaman;

S. 683. An act to amend the Communications Act of 1934, as amended, by eliminating the requirement of an oath or affirmation on certain documents filed with the Federal Communications Commission;

S. 704. An act for the relief of Marylys E. Tedin and Elizabeth O. Reynolds;

S. 1057. An act to provide for a National Portrait Gallery as a bureau of the Smithsonian Institution;

S. 1371. An act to amend subsection (e) of section 307 of the Communications Act of 1934, as amended, to permit the Commission to renew a station license in the safety and special radio services more than 30 days prior to expiration of the original license;

S. 1589. An act to amend the Communications Act of 1934 to authorize the issuance of radio operator licenses to nationals of the United States;

S. 2151. An act for the relief of Harvey Burstein;

S. 2319. An act for the relief of Harry E. Ellison, captain, U.S. Army, retired;

S. 2522. An act to defer the collection of irrigation maintenance and operation charges for calendar year 1962 on lands within the Angostura unit, Missouri River Basin project;

S. 2549. An act for the relief of Edward L. Wertheim; and

S.J. Res. 147. Joint resolution providing for the establishment of the North Carolina Tercentenary Celebration Commission to formulate and implement plans to commemorate the 300th anniversary of the State of North Carolina, and for other purposes.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE—ENROLLED BILL 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 enrolled bill (S. 1668) to authorize the imposition of forfeitures for certain violations of the rules and regulations of the Federal Communications Commission in the common carrier and safety and special fields, and it was signed by the Vice President.

CALL OF LEGISLATIVE CALENDAR DISPENSED WITH

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the call of the Legislative Calendar was dispensed with.

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.

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.

TREATY OF FRIENDSHIP, ESTABLISHMENT AND NAVIGATION WITH LUXEMBOURG—REMOVAL OF INJUNCTION OF SECRECY

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the injunction of secrecy be removed from Executive B, 87th Congress, 2d session, transmitted to the Senate by the President of the United States today, and that the message from the President and the treaty be referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, and the letter of transmittal printed in the RECORD.

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

The message from the President is as follows:

To the Senate of the United States:

With a view to receiving the advice and consent of the Senate to ratification, I transmit herewith a treaty of friendship, establishment and navigation between the United States of America and the Grand Duchy of Luxembourg, together with a related protocol, signed at Luxembourg on February 23, 1962.

I transmit also, for the information of the Senate, the report by the Secretary of State with respect to the treaty.

JOHN F. KENNEDY.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *April 30, 1962.*

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. FULBRIGHT, from the Committee on Foreign Relations:

G. Griffith Johnson, of Connecticut, to be an Assistant Secretary of State;

Edwin M. Martin, of Ohio, a Foreign Service officer of the class of career minister, to be an Assistant Secretary of State;

Walter M. Kotschnig, of Maryland, to be the representative of the United States of America to the 17th plenary session of the Economic Commission for Europe of the Economic and Social Council of the United Nations;

Clark R. Mollenhoff, of Iowa, and Morris S. Novik, of New York, to be members of the U.S. Advisory Commission on Information;

Dr. Walter Adams, of Michigan, James R. Fleming, of Indiana, Dr. Mabel M. Smythe, of New York, Dr. Walter Johnson, of Illinois, Dr. Roy E. Larsen, of Connecticut, Dr. Franklin D. Murphy, of California, Dr. Luther H. Foster, of Alabama, Dr. John W. Gardner, of New York, and the Reverend Theodore Martin Hesburgh, of Indiana, to be members of the U.S. Advisory Commission on International Educational and Cultural Affairs;

Lucius D. Battle, of Florida, for reappointment in the Foreign Service as a Foreign Service officer of class 1, a consul general, and a Secretary in the diplomatic service;

Alton W. Hemba, of Mississippi, now a Foreign Service officer of class 2 and a secretary in the diplomatic service, to be also a consul general;

John F. Archer, of California, and sundry other persons, for appointment as Foreign Service officers of class 7, vice consuls of career, and secretaries in the diplomatic service;

Michael J. Barry, of New York, and sundry other persons, for appointment as Foreign Service officers of class 8, vice consuls of career, and secretaries in the diplomatic service;

Gilbert F. Austin, of Washington, and sundry other Foreign Service Reserve officers, to be consuls;

James E. Bradshaw, of Tennessee, and sundry other Foreign Service Reserve officers, to be vice consuls;