

placed. I grieve over that, because it is difficult for a man to foresee these emotional shocks in these trying and difficult days.

For example, I had hoped that the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. MORTON] would lead the fight to strike down the dangerous beast called unemployment. When the proposed legislation for area redevelopment and unemployment compensation, for public works, for small business and expansion, and many other fine programs, was offered, much of which had to be cut back because of the combination of conservative opposition in the Senate, I was hopeful that our Republican friends would stand with us as the defenders of the Republic, the protectors of the good life, the champions of full employment. I was hopeful that they would help us to overcome these difficulties.

But alas and alack, we received little or no help. Despite that, we did better than our predecessors. That is not much of a standard by which to measure oneself, but we did a little better than those who preceded us.

Mr. MORTON. Many of us Republicans stood by the Democrats. Considered by Republican standards, the Democrats have a workable majority in this body. The fact that the Democrats cannot make their programs succeed is not the fault of the Republicans. If we had as much of a majority as the Democrats have, or even half as much, in my opinion we would make some of the programs work.

I agree with the Senator from Minnesota. I, too, have been wrong. I was even so wrong that I organized Willkie clubs in 1940 and thought we were going to win.

Mr. HUMPHREY. That was pretty wrong.

Mr. MORTON. I was wrong in 1960.

Mr. HUMPHREY. So was I. [Laughter.]

Mr. MORTON. I understand that the repayment of the debt to West Virginia has so far consisted of the presentation of an autographed copy of "Profiles in Courage" to the library at St. Albans. I know that some of my coal mine friends there find the situation today worse than it was when the Senator from Minnesota made his heroic, courageous effort in 1960.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Would the Senator like to add the word "futile," too?

Mr. MORTON. No; I think the Senator from Minnesota rendered a great service. In all fairness and honesty, I think the Senator from Minnesota rendered a great service.

However, because the Senator from Minnesota is so understanding, has such a keen sense of humor, and is one of the great Members of this body, one who can "take it" as well as "dish it out," I could not help reminding him of our joint appearance on "Meet the Press," when he so adamantly said that unemployment would be a page in history by the time the calendar year had ended.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Now that the Senator from Kentucky has been so kind as to remind me of that statement once, I hope he will forget it from here on out. [Laughter.]

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Minnesota yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. DOUGLAS. The Senator from Minnesota has spoken of unrequited hope. I wonder if he remembers the somewhat well known quatrain in poetry, which has become somewhat moth-eaten by now:

Truth, crushed to earth, shall rise again;
The eternal years of God are hers;
But error, wounded, writhes in pain,
And dies among his worshipers.

Does not the Senator from Minnesota believe that that is an apt characterization of the two political parties—the party of hope and the party of error?

Mr. MORTON. It is simply a question of which is which. I am the one who needs hope now.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I appreciate that confession. [Laughter.] This is one of the signs of the rebirth of the Republican Party—when Republicans speak with such sincerity of hope. I wish to commend the Senator. [Laughter.]

ADJOURNMENT TO MONDAY

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, if there is no other business to come before the Senate at this time, I move that the Senate adjourn until 12 o'clock noon on Monday next.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 3 o'clock p.m.) the Senate adjourned until Monday, March 11, 1963, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATION

Executive nomination received by the Senate March 8, 1963:

IN THE ARMY

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

Maj. Gen. James Karrick Woolnough, O18709, U.S. Army, in the grade of lieutenant general.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate March 8, 1963:

AMBASSADORS

William J. Porter, of Massachusetts, a Foreign Service officer of class 1, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Democratic and Popular Republic of Algeria.

Charles D. Withers, of Florida, a Foreign Service officer of class 2, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Republic of Rwanda.

Carl T. Rowan, of Minnesota, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Finland.

Edward M. Korry, of New York, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Ethiopia.

WORLD HEALTH ORGANIZATION

Dr. James Watt, of the District of Columbia, to be the representative of the United States of America on the Executive Board of the World Health Organization, to which office he was appointed during the last recess of the Senate.

UNITED NATIONS

Jonathan B. Bingham, of New York, to be the representative of the United States of America on the Economic and Social Council of the United Nations.

Sidney R. Yates, of Illinois, to be the representative of the United States of America on the Trusteeship Council of the United Nations.

Charles F. Baldwin, of the District of Columbia, Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary to the Federation of Malaya, to serve concurrently and without additional compensation as the representative of the United States of America to the 19th session of the Economic Commission for Asia and the Far East of the Economic and Social Council of the United Nations.

U.S. ARMS CONTROL AND DISARMAMENT AGENCY

Archibald S. Alexander, of New Jersey, to be an Assistant Director of the U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency.

IN THE DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

The nominations beginning Edward G. Curtis to be a consul general of the United States of America, and ending Miss Catherine Van Lier Ribbink to be a consul of the United States of America, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on January 15, 1963.

SENATE

MONDAY, MARCH 11, 1963

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, and was called to order by Hon. E. L. BARTLETT, a Senator from the State of Alaska.

Rabbi Albert Shulman, national chaplain, the American Legion, South Bend, Ind., offered the following prayer:

Our Heavenly Father: Life is essentially a matter of human relations. Human relations is the art of living together. And living together is a matter of sharing our love, our talents, and our blessings for the betterment of mankind. These are embodied in the general welfare of our country and our people.

Through the wise use of the mind and the heart, our America can be made into the great dream that vests every man with dignity, freedom, and promise.

We are grateful that this body of lawmakers is dedicated to the principle that only freemen living in a free society can live with dignity, freedom, and promise. We are grateful that we have fashioned a nation in which every individual is considered a child of God, and every human being is entitled to share the blessings of our American way of life.

May our America always stand for all that is good, just, and right. May our America always be the symbol of man's eternal struggle to achieve the good life. May our America always stand for a grateful people ever mindful of the many treasures that make up our American way of life. Amen.

DESIGNATION OF ACTING PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

The legislative clerk read the following letter:

U.S. SENATE,
Washington, D.C., March 11, 1963.

To the Senate:

Being temporarily absent from the Senate, I appoint Hon. E. L. BARTLETT, a Senator

from the State of Alaska, to perform the duties of the Chair during my absence.

CARL HAYDEN,
President pro tempore.

Mr. BARTLETT thereupon assumed the chair as Acting President pro tempore.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Friday, March 8, 1963, was dispensed with.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

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

REPORT OF COMMISSION ON INTERNATIONAL RULES OF JUDICIAL PROCEDURE — MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, which, with the accompanying report, was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary:

To the Congress of the United States:

Pursuant to the provisions of Public Law 85-906, as amended, I transmit herewith for the information of the Congress the Fourth Annual Report of the Commission on International Rules of Judicial Procedure covering the period ending December 31, 1962.

JOHN F. KENNEDY.
THE WHITE HOUSE, March 11, 1963.

MANPOWER REPORT—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, which, with the accompanying report, was referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare:

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, D.C., March 11, 1963.

The Honorable the PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE.

The Honorable the SPEAKER OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

Sirs: I am transmitting herewith my manpower report as required under the Manpower Development and Training Act of 1962.

In preparing this report, I have had the advice and assistance of the Secretary of Labor, who in turn, has had the assistance of members of the Cabinet, heads of independent agencies, and the National Manpower Advisory Committee appointed under this act.

Together with my report I am presenting the report of the Secretary of Labor on manpower requirements, resources, use, and training required by section 104 of the Manpower Development and Training Act.

Respectfully,

JOHN F. KENNEDY.

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 STATEMENTS DURING MORNING HOUR

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

COMMITTEE MEETING DURING SENATE SESSION

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the Banking and Currency Committee was authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business, to consider the nominations on the Executive Calendar, beginning with the new reports.

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

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. If there be no reports of committees, the nominations on the Executive Calendar, beginning with the new reports, will be stated.

AMBASSADORS

The Chief Clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations of Ambassadors.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that these nominations be considered en bloc.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nominations will be considered en bloc; and, without objection, they are confirmed.

ENVOY

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Donald A. Dumont, of New York, a Foreign Service officer of class 2, to be Envoy Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Kingdom of Burundi.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

U.S. ADVISORY COMMISSION ON INFORMATION

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Sigurd S. Larmon, of New York, to be a member of the U.S. Advisory Commission on Information for a term of 3 years expiring January 27, 1966, and until his successor has been appointed and qualified.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

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

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the President will be notified forthwith.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

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

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

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

REPORT ON CONSTRUCTION OF AN ELECTRONICS, INSTRUMENTATION, AND MATERIALS LABORATORY AT MISSISSIPPI TEST FACILITY

A letter from the Deputy Administrator, National Aeronautics and Space Administration, Washington, D.C., reporting pursuant to law, on the construction of an Electronics, Instrumentation, and Materials Laboratory at the Mississippi Test Facility; to the Committee on Aeronautical Space Sciences.

REPORT ON REPROGRAMMING OF FUNDS RELATING TO CONSTRUCTION OF LOAD TEST ANNEX AT MARSHALL SPACE FLIGHT CENTER

A letter from the Deputy Administrator, National Aeronautics and Space Administration, Washington, D.C., reporting, pursuant to law on the reprogramming of funds relating to the construction of a load test annex at the Marshall Space Flight Center; to the Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences.

REPORT OF FEDERAL CROP INSURANCE CORPORATION

A letter from the Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of the Federal Crop Insurance Corporation, for the calendar year 1962 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

AMENDMENT OF TITLE 10, UNITED STATES CODE, RELATING TO THE APPOINTMENT, PROMOTION, SEPARATION, AND RETIREMENT OF MEMBERS OF THE ARMED FORCES

A letter from the Deputy Secretary of Defense, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend title 10, United States Code, relating to the appointment, promotion, separation, and retirement of members of the armed forces, and for other purposes (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Armed Services.

STATISTICAL SUPPLEMENT, STOCKPILE REPORT

A letter from the Director, Office of Emergency Planning, Executive Office of the President, transmitting, pursuant to law, a statistical supplement, Stockpile Report, for the period July-December 1962 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Armed Services.

REPORT OF COMPTROLLER GENERAL OF THE UNITED STATES

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, his report on the activities of the United States General Accounting Office, during the fiscal year ended June 30, 1962 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

AUDIT REPORT ON U.S. STUDY COMMISSION ON CERTAIN RIVER BASINS, STATE OF TEXAS

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, an audit report on the U.S. Study Commission on the Neches, Trinity, Brazos, Colorado, Guadalupe, San Antonio, Nueces, and San Jacinto River Basins and intervening areas, State of Texas, for the period August 28, 1958, through August 28, 1962 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

REPORT ON REVIEW OF SELECTED PURCHASE ORDERS ISSUED BY SANDIA CORP., ALBUQUERQUE, N. MEX.

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the review of selected purchase orders issued by Sandia Corp., Albuquerque, N. Mex., under contract AT(29-1)-789 with the Atomic Energy Commission, dated March 1963 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

AMENDMENT OF FEDERAL PROPERTY AND ADMINISTRATIVE SERVICES ACT OF 1949, TO IMPROVE THE ADMINISTRATION OF TRANSFERS AND CONVEYANCES OF CERTAIN REAL PROPERTY

A letter from the Administrator, General Services Administration, Washington, D.C., transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended, to improve the administration of transfers and conveyances of certain real property for various public uses, and for other purposes (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Government Operations.

RELIEF OF CERTAIN NAVAL OFFICERS

A letter from the Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation for the relief of certain officers of the naval service erroneously in receipt of compensation based upon an incorrect computation of service for basic pay (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

AMENDMENT OF SECTION 1825, TITLE 28, UNITED STATES CODE, TO AUTHORIZE PAYMENT OF CERTAIN WITNESS' FEES

A letter from the Director, Administrative Office of the U.S. Courts, Washington, D.C., transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend section 1825 of title 28 of the United States Code to authorize the payment of witness' fees in habeas corpus cases and in proceedings to vacate sentence under section 2255 of title 28, for persons who are authorized to proceed in forma pauperis (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

TEMPORARY ADMISSION INTO THE UNITED STATES OF CERTAIN ALIENS

A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, transmitting, pursuant to law, copies of orders entered, granting temporary admission into the United States of certain aliens (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

ADMISSION INTO THE UNITED STATES OF CERTAIN DEFECTOR ALIENS

A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, transmitting, pursuant to law, copies of orders entered granting admission into the United States of certain defector aliens (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS TO CLASSIFY STATUS OF CERTAIN ALIENS FOR FIRST PREFERENCE

A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department

of Justice, transmitting, pursuant to law, petitions to classify status of certain aliens for first preference (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

INCREASE OF APPROPRIATION FOR CONTINUING WORK IN THE MISSOURI RIVER BASIN

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to increase the authorization for appropriation for continuing work in the Missouri River Basin by the Secretary of the Interior (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Public Works.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, or presented, and referred as indicated:

By the ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore:

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Montana; to the Committee on Finance:

"SENATE JOINT MEMORIAL 9

"Joint memorial of the senate and house of representatives requesting that the Federal portion of cost on Federal aid primary highways and secondary highways be increased from about 57 percent to 75 percent

"Whereas in recognition of the heavy interstate traffic on highways built and maintained by the various States, the Federal Government now contributes 50 percent of the total costs of construction on highways designated as Federal aid primary highways; and

"Whereas in recognition of the additional financial burden which would be placed on the various States having large areas of land owned by the Federal Government, an additional payment is made, in the case of Montana about 7 percent, to compensate for the Federal lands; and

"Whereas having a large area, sparse population, and being a bridge State for interstate traffic, Montana highways contribute a great deal to the welfare and pleasure of the entire Nation; and

"Whereas due to these conditions, the citizens of Montana must make very high per capita contributions to build and maintain this system; and

"Whereas the additional 7 percent contribution now made by the Federal Government for Federal aid primary highways and secondary highways is entirely inadequate to cover the costs of construction and maintenance borne by Montana as a result of heavy interstate traffic: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the State of Montana, That the Legislative Assembly of Montana hereby respectfully requests that Congress take action to increase the additional payment made to Montana for Federal aid primary highways from 7 to 20 percent; and be it further

"Resolved, That the secretary of state is instructed to send copies of this memorial to the President of the United States, to the Secretary of the Senate and Clerk of the House of Representatives of the U.S. Congress, to the Secretary of Commerce, to the Commissioner of the Bureau of Public Roads, to each member of the Montana congressional delegation, and to each member of the Montana Highway Commission.

"DAVID F. JAMES,
President of the Senate.

"_____
Speaker of the House."

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Montana; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs:

"SENATE JOINT MEMORIAL 3

"Joint memorial of the Senate and House of Representatives of the State of Montana to the President of the Senate and to the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States; to the Honorable MIKE MANSFIELD and the Honorable LEE METCALF, Senators from the State of Montana; to the Honorable JAMES BATTIN and the Honorable ARNOLD H. OLSEN, Representatives from the State of Montana; to the Secretary of the Interior and to the U.S. Bureau of Reclamation, urging the passage of legislation to amend the Reclamation Act and any other laws or rules, to waive the application of the land limitation clause in the area above Canyon Ferry Dam in the State of Montana

"Whereas the Reclamation Act of 1902 applied primarily to public lands; and

"Whereas in an effort to limit the application of this Act to family sized farms, the maximum holding of land in a single ownership was fixed at 160 acres or less; and

"Whereas the present reclamation laws requiring acreage limitations are based on outmoded, half-century-old farming methods of the walking plow and horse team days; and

"Whereas the present farm acreage that one man can handle is two to five times the amount that could be handled at the time the reclamation laws were passed in 1902; and

"Whereas the gross income has not kept pace with the total acres that one man can handle; and

"Whereas the area above Canyon Ferry Reservoir on the Missouri River is at high elevations which limits the crops to stock raising purposes, requiring large acreages for a balanced economy; and

"Whereas present acreage limitations will not permit farmers in the area above Canyon Ferry to own sufficient crop acreage to give them full employment and a gross income sufficient to maintain the standard of living generally provided in farm areas of the humid or subhumid regions; and

"Whereas since the passage of the original Reclamation Act in 1902, it has been amended to include furnishing supplemental waters to lands already irrigated; and

"Whereas in order to establish a realistic family sized farm in this area, the acreage allowed in a single holding often must be greater than 160 acres: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved, by the Legislative Assembly of the State of Montana as follows:

"1. That the land limitation provisions of the Reclamation Act, and any other laws and rules, be waived and not applied in the area above Canyon Ferry in the State of Montana; recognize the difference in types of farming and crop production and provide for flexibility in acreage found to be needed for farm units.

"2. That such legislation provide for relaxation of the acreage limitation provisions as to supplemental water supply projects for established farming areas.

"3. That any legislation amending the land limitation provisions shall not be retroactively applied to areas now exempt from such land limitation provisions.

"4. That the acreage allowed in a single holding may be determined by the Bureau of Reclamation; and be it further

"Resolved, That copies of this resolution be forwarded by the secretary of state of the State of Montana; to the President of the Senate of the United States; to the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the United

States; and to the Honorable MIKE MANSFIELD and the Honorable LEE METCALF, Senators from Montana; and the Honorable ARNOLD H. OLSEN and the Honorable JAMES BATTIN, Representatives in the Congress from Montana; to the Secretary of the Interior; and to the U.S. Bureau of Reclamation.

“DAVID F. JAMES,
President of the Senate.

“_____
“Speaker of the House.”

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Montana; to the Committee on the Judiciary:

“SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 15

“Joint resolution of the Senate and House of Representatives petitioning Congress to call a convention for the purpose of proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States

“Whereas the authority to apportion the legislative body of each State properly belongs to the legislative assembly, or to the people of that State, and

“Whereas through its decision in *Baker v. Carr* the Supreme Court of the United States has attempted to extend the judicial power of the courts into an area which is traditionally, properly, and constitutionally a prerogative of the legislative branch of State government.

“Whereas article V of the U.S. Constitution provides that Congress, ‘on the application of the legislatures of two-thirds of the several States, shall call a convention for proposing amendments’: Now, therefore, be it

“Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the State of Montana, That the legislative assembly petitions the Congress of the United States to call a convention for the purpose of proposing the following article as an amendment to the Constitution of the United States:

“‘ARTICLE —

“SECTION 1. No provision of this Constitution, or any amendment thereto, shall restrict or limit any State in the apportionment of representation in its legislature.

“SEC. 2. The Judicial power of the United States shall not extend to any suit in law or equity, or to any controversy relating to apportionment of representation in a State legislature.

“SEC. 3. This article shall be inoperative unless it shall have been ratified as an amendment to the Constitution by the legislatures of three-fourth of the several States within 7 years from the date of its submission; and be it further

“Resolved, That if Congress shall have proposed an amendment to the Constitution identical with that contained in this resolution prior to January 1, 1965, this application shall no longer be of any force or effect; and be it further

“Resolved, That the secretary of state is instructed to send copies of this resolution to the Secretary of the Senate and the Clerk of the House of Representatives of the United States, and to each member of the Montana congressional delegation.

“DAVID F. JAMES,
President of the Senate.
“_____
“Speaker of the House.”

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of West Virginia; to the Committee on the Judiciary:

“HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 24

“Resolution of the West Virginia Legislature making Sir Winston Churchill an honorary citizen of the State of West Virginia

“Whereas Sir Winston Churchill, a citizen of Great Britain by birth, has close ties with the United States of America; and

“Whereas said Sir Winston Churchill has demonstrated during the strife and turmoil

of two World Wars that he is a friend and ally of the United States; and

“Whereas he also has demonstrated his loyalty and devotion to the aims, purposes, and aspirations of this Nation at peace conferences, world trade meetings, the United Nations, and elsewhere; and

“Whereas there is now a proposal before the Congress that he be made an honorary citizen of the United States; and

“Whereas it is appropriate that this great soldier, world statesman, and noted historian and writer be made a citizen of our State prior to being made an honorary citizen of the United States: Therefore be it

“Resolved by the Legislature of West Virginia, That said Sir Winston Churchill be made an honorary citizen of West Virginia and that the Congress of the United States be memorialized to award him honorary citizenship as an American.”

A resolution of the Legislature of the State of Minnesota; to the Committee on the Judiciary:

“RESOLUTION 3

“A resolution ratifying a proposed amendment to the Constitution of the United States of America to outlaw the poll tax

“Whereas, both Houses of the Congress of the United States by a joint resolution proposed an amendment to the Constitution of the United States which reads as follows:

“Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to the qualifications of electors

“Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled. That the following article is hereby proposed as an amendment to the Constitution of the United States, which shall be valid to all intents and purposes as part of the Constitution only if ratified by the legislatures of three-fourths of the several States within 7 years from the date of its submission by the Congress:

“‘ARTICLE —

“SECTION 1. The right of citizens of the United States to vote in any primary or other election for President or Vice President, for electors for President or Vice President, or for Senator or Representative in Congress, shall not be denied or abridged by the United States or any State by reason of failure to pay any poll tax or other tax.

“SEC. 2. The Congress shall have power to enforce this article by appropriate legislation”: Therefore be it

“Resolved by the Legislature of the State of Minnesota, That the proposed amendment to the Constitution of the United States is hereby ratified by the Legislature of the State of Minnesota.

“The secretary of state is directed to forward copies of this resolution to the presiding officer of the Senate of the United States and the Speaker of the House of Representatives and transmit an official notice of this resolution to the Secretary of State of the United States as provided by the law of this State.

“_____
“Speaker of the House of Representatives.

“A. W. KEITH,

“President of the Senate.

“Passed the house of representatives this 19th day of February in the year of Our Lord one thousand nine hundred and sixty-three.

“G. H. LEAHY,

“Chief Clerk,

“House of Representatives.

“Passed the senate this 27th day of February in the year of our Lord one thousand nine hundred and sixty-three.

“_____
“Secretary of the Senate.

“Approved March 6, 1963.

“ELMER L. ANDERSEN,

“Governor of the State of Minnesota.”

A resolution of the Senate of the State of South Carolina; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry:

“SENATE RESOLUTION 190

“A Senate resolution to express the appreciation of the members of the Senate of the State of South Carolina to the Honorable Orville L. Freeman, U.S. Secretary of Agriculture, for his action in holding the support price on 1963 upland cotton at 32.47 cents per pound.

“Whereas cotton farmers will take a 10-percent reduction in the 1963 cotton acreage allotment and there is all indication that the cotton production cost per acre will continue at high or higher levels than the 1962 crop; and

“Whereas it is becoming increasingly difficult for family size farms to exist and provide the necessities of life for such families; and

“Whereas the U.S. Secretary of Agriculture has announced the 1963 support rate on middling one inch upland cotton as thirty-two and forty-seven hundredths cents per pound and this decision of the Honorable Orville L. Freeman, Secretary of Agriculture, is of material importance to cotton producers of South Carolina and the economy of the State; and

“Whereas any reduction from this base support price would be punitive to the State's cotton growers and general economy: Now, therefore, be it

“Resolved by the Senate: That the Members of the Senate of the State of South Carolina express appreciation to the Honorable Orville L. Freeman, U.S. Secretary of Agriculture, for his action in holding the support price on 1963 upland cotton at thirty-two and forty-seven hundredths cents per pound; and be it further

“Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be forwarded to the presiding officer of the U.S. Senate and to each Senator from South Carolina and to the Honorable Orville L. Freeman.”

A resolution of the Senate of the Commonwealth of Kentucky; to the Committee on Finance:

“SENATE RESOLUTION 11

“A resolution petitioning the President of the United States to reject reports favoring relaxation of import controls on foreign residual oil

“Whereas the mining of bituminous coal is one of Kentucky's major industries, and, as such, contributes substantially to the overall economy of the Commonwealth and particularly to the economic well-being of thousands of Kentuckians whose livelihood is dependent upon the coal, railroad, and related industries; and

“Whereas the coal industry in Kentucky and elsewhere is now and has been for some time in a depressed condition, which would be further compounded by any cause which would lessen coal's ability to compete in the fuels market; and

“Whereas the importation of foreign residual oil (waste) in an increasingly excessive volume at unrealistic prices has adversely affected coal's competitive position, and, thereby, has been and is now responsible for the displacement of millions of tons of American coal, and, hence, thousands of jobs and millions of dollars of wages to workers; and,

“Whereas the President of the United States has received a report from the Office of Emergency Planning recommending that there be a gradual relaxation of import controls on foreign residual oil; and

“Whereas the supporting reason given by Mr. Edward A. McDermott, Director of the Office of Emergency Planning, is that such relaxation will not adversely affect the security of this Nation; and

“Whereas this supporting reason is based on the statement that, in conventional-type

warfare, oil tankers from Central and South America could deliver crude and residual oil to the east coast, which is extremely difficult, if not impossible, to justify and substantiate, especially if the experience to the contrary in World War II, when Germany with only 75 submarines did great damage to oil tankers in the Atlantic Ocean, is projected to the present-day situation with Russia having a reported 600 or more modern submarines: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the senate of the General Assembly of the Commonwealth of Kentucky, That the senate, in special session assembled, does hereby petition the President of the United States to completely reject the report from the Office of Emergency Planning regarding the relaxation of import controls on foreign residual oil, and, further, that he utilize existing legislative authority to implement a program which will keep these imports within limitations that will permit domestic coal and oil to maintain production at a level which will protect the security and economy of this Nation, and thereby halt further economic hardship upon the coal industry, the coal-hauling railroads and related industries, and upon the Kentuckians and other Americans whose employment is provided by these industries; and be it further

Resolved, That the clerk of the senate transmit a copy of this resolution to the President of the United States, the President of the U.S. Senate, the Speaker of the U.S. House of Representatives and the Members of Congress from the Commonwealth of Kentucky.

"Attest:

JOHN W. WILLIS,
"Clerk of Senate."

A resolution of the house of representatives of the Commonwealth of Kentucky; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare:

"HOUSE RESOLUTION 26

"A resolution respectfully urging the U.S. Senate to pass the bill to establish a Youth Conservation Corps

"Whereas the U.S. Senate is considering a proposal to establish a Youth Conservation Corps; and

"Whereas a serious problem has been created by the 1 million youths from the ages of 16 to 22 years that are out of school and unemployed; and

"Whereas these young people lack the necessary skills to obtain employment; and

"Whereas the seriousness of the situation is evidenced by the actions of the President and the testimony of five Cabinet officers who appeared before the Senate labor subcommittee urging passage of the bill; and

"Whereas the program would provide training for approximately 1,800 of Kentucky's unemployed youths: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the house of representatives of the general assembly of the Commonwealth of Kentucky: That the U.S. Senate be and hereby is respectfully urged to pass the Youth Conservation Corps bill; and that the clerk of the house of representatives transmit copies of this resolution to Kentucky's U.S. Senators and to the presiding officer of the U.S. Senate."

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Idaho; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs:

"SENATE JOINT MEMORIAL 10

"To the Honorable Senate and House of Representatives of the United States, in Congress Assembled:

"We, your memorialists, the members of the Senate and House of Representatives of the Legislature of the State of Idaho, assembled in the 37th session thereof, do respectfully represent that:

"Whereas it is known that one of the most pressing problems facing all areas of the United States and in fact all areas of the

world today is the securing of the maximum beneficial use of land and water resources for the further progress of our people, of our State, and of our Nation, not only to realize the most from our present resources for the immediate problems of today, but also to meet our future needs for the long-range future; and

"Whereas the area of southwestern Idaho known as the Mountain Home Snake River plain area contains a large body of land which is both economically and engineeringly feasible for the development of a highly productive and economically desirable potential for the further development of the people of this area and of the Nation and which would add greatly to the overall economy and assist in stabilizing the existing economy of this State and of the Nation, and would present many opportunities to stimulate the economic growth of the State and of the Nation; and

"Whereas adjacent to this fine body of potential irrigated land there are adequate supplies of water in the Snake River which are now running off and unused in the State of Idaho to the detriment of the State and Nation's economy; and

"Whereas upstream developments have been demonstrated to be in the long-range interest for providing the best and most comprehensive plan of development for the utilization of the water and land potential of our river basins; and

"Whereas the Bureau of Reclamation, in cooperation with local interests, has been making engineering, water resource, and land classification studies which have indicated economic and engineering feasibility of a development of this area under a plan known as the Guffey plan of development; and

"Whereas the orderly continued investigation and ultimate construction and development of a water resource program for the irrigation of this potentially productive area of the State of Idaho will inure to the benefit of the State and of the Nation at large: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the 37th session of the Legislature of the State of Idaho, now in session, the senate and house of representatives concurring, That the Congress and President of the United States be respectfully petitioned to give early consideration to the continued investigation and construction of the Mountain Home division, Snake River project, Guffey plan of development; be it further

"Resolved, That the secretary of state of the State of Idaho be, and he hereby is, authorized and directed to forward certified copies of this memorial to the President and Vice President of the United States, the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the Congress, the Department of the Interior, the U.S. Bureau of Reclamation, and to the Senators and Representatives representing this State in the United States.

"This senate joint memorial was adopted by the senate on the 21st day of February 1963.

W. E. DREVLOW,
"President of the Senate."

"This senate joint memorial was adopted by the house of representatives on the 25th day of February 1963.

PETE T. CENARRUSA,
"Speaker of the House of Representatives."

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Idaho; to the Committee on the Judiciary:

"SENATE JOINT MEMORIAL 9

"To the Honorable Senate and House of Representatives of the United States in Congress assembled:

"Be it resolved, by the thirty-seventh session of the Legislature of the State of Idaho, now in session, the senate and house of representatives concurring, That we most re-

spectfully urge the Congress of the United States of America to call a convention for the purpose of proposing the following amendment to the Constitution of the United States:

"ARTICLE —

"SECTION 1. A \$350 billion limit to be set on the U.S. Federal Government indebtedness.

"SEC. 2. Upon a declaration of a national emergency, approved by 75 percent of the House and Senate, this debt limit can be temporarily extended but the amount of debt temporarily extended must be retired within 10 years after the cessation of hostilities or declaration of an emergency.

"SEC. 3. All national debt commencing with the year 1970, whatever the sum, as of July 1, 1970, shall be retired at the rate of \$3 billion a year in addition to payments of interest.

"SEC. 4. The national debt limit of \$350 billion may be raised beyond said sum, upon being approved by Congress and ratified by two-thirds of the States, exclusive of those amounts defined in section 2."

"The secretary of state is hereby directed to send duly authenticated copies of this memorial to the President and Clerk of the U.S. Senate, the Speaker and Clerk of the U.S. House of Representatives and to each Member of Congress from the State of Idaho, and to the presiding officers of the senate and house of representatives of the several States."

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of Hawaii; to the Committee on the Judiciary:

"SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 1

"Concurrent resolution ratifying a proposed amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to the qualification of electors

"Whereas the United States is proud to be considered one of the world's leading democracies, and Hawaii is equally proud to share in that great tradition; and

"Whereas the preservation of the great traditions nurtured and passed on by our forefathers requires the constant vigilance of an enlightened population; and

"Whereas there have been injustices in our country which demand the attention of our people and require action by those who have been entrusted with the authority to govern by the people; and

"Whereas one of the most flagrant injustices has been the artificial barrier to participation in the electoral process provided by the imposition of the poll tax in some of these United States; and

"Whereas the Congress of the United States has taken steps to remove one of these injustices by initiating an amendment to the Constitution of the United States through U.S. Senate Joint Resolution 29 which reads as follows:

"S.J. RES. 29

"Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to the qualification of electors

"Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the following article is hereby proposed as an amendment to the Constitution of the United States, which shall be valid to all intents and purposes as part of the Constitution only if ratified by the legislatures of three-fourths of the several States within seven years from the date of its submission by the Congress:

"ARTICLE —

"SECTION 1. The right of citizens of the United States to vote in any primary or other election for President or Vice President, for electors for President or Vice President, or for Senator or Representative in Congress,

shall not be denied or abridged by the United States or any State by reason of failure to pay any poll tax or other tax.

“SEC. 2. The Congress shall have power to enforce this article by appropriate legislation”: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate of the Second State Legislature of the State of Hawaii, General Session of 1963 (the house of representatives concurring), That the article proposed as an amendment to the Constitution of the United States as set forth in United States Senate Joint Resolution 29, dated August 27, 1962, be and it is hereby ratified; and be it further

Resolved, That a certified copy of this concurrent resolution be transmitted to the Administrator, General Services Administration, and that copies of this concurrent resolution also be transmitted to the President of the Senate and to the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States and to the members of Hawaii’s delegation to the Congress of the United States.

“We hereby certify that the foregoing concurrent resolution was adopted by the Senate of the second Legislature of the State of Hawaii, general session of 1963, on March 6, 1963.

“NELSON K. DOL,
“President of the Senate.
“SEI CHI HIRAI,
“Clerk of the Senate.

“We hereby certify that the foregoing concurrent resolution was adopted by the House of Representatives of the second Legislature of the State of Hawaii, general session of 1963, on March 6, 1963.

“ELMER F. CRAVALHO,
“Speaker, House of Representatives.
“SHIGETO KANEMOTO,
“Clerk, House of Representatives.”

A resolution of the Senate of the State of Hawaii; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs:

“Whereas the State of Hawaii possesses a history and development unlike that of other States in the United States; and

“Whereas the United States of America through its Congress and its Department of Interior has seen fit to recognize this unique history; and

“Whereas Congress has implemented this recognition by the appropriation of \$175,000 for the restoration of the City of Refuge; and

“Whereas pursuant to said appropriation, the Department of Interior through its National Park Service has begun the restoration of the historic trails and general area abounding the City of Refuge; and

“Whereas this project will preserve in living form a part of the history of these isles, for the enlightenment and education of our own people as well as our visitors; and

“Whereas this project is also providing employment for a great number of citizens: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate of the Second Legislature of the State of Hawaii, general session of 1963, That sincere appreciation and Aloha be extended to the Congress of the United States and the Department of Interior for its continuing interest in these fairest of all islands; and be it further

Resolved, That a certified copy of this resolution be forwarded to the President of the Senate of the United States, the Speaker of the House of Representatives, the Secretary of the Interior and to each of Hawaii’s delegation to the Congress of the United States.”

A resolution of the Senate of the State of Alaska; to the Committee on Commerce:

“SENATE RESOLUTION 21

“Resolution relating to the promotion of State commercial fishery research and development projects

“Whereas the several States of the Union have taken the initiative in fishery research and development; and

“Whereas the off-shore fishery resources of the United States are the proper concern of both the Federal and State governments; and

“Whereas the Federal Government has an obligation to encourage and assist in State research and development programs; and

“Whereas a bold program to assist the States in their efforts to develop their fishery resources is essential to the proper conservation and utilization of this basic resource: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Congress is respectfully requested to give favorable consideration to H.R. 3738 introduced by the Honorable RALPH J. RIVERS, U.S. Representative from Alaska, a bill to promote State commercial fishery research and development projects; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be transmitted to the Honorable LYNDON B. JOHNSON, Vice President of the United States and President of the Senate; the Honorable JOHN W. McCORMACK, Speaker of the House of Representatives; the Honorable WARREN G. MAGNUSEN, chairman of the Senate Committee on Commerce; the Honorable HERBERT BONNER, chairman of the House Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries; and the Members of the Alaska delegation in Congress.

“Passed by the Senate March 4, 1963.

“FRANK PERATROVICH,
“President of the Senate.

“Attest:

“EVELYN K. STEVENSON,
“Secretary of the Senate.”

A resolution adopted by the Council of the City of Marysville, Calif., protesting against the proposed subsidy formula of the Civil Aeronautics Board; to the Committee on Commerce.

A resolution adopted by the Oklahoma Association of Electric Cooperatives, relating to the death of the late Senator Robert S. Kerr, of Oklahoma; ordered to lie on the table.

By Mr. MUNDT:

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of South Dakota; to the Committee on Finance:

“SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 8

“A concurrent resolution, memorializing Congress to take all necessary steps in promoting the sale of grain and to guarantee continuing access of U.S. wheat to the Common Market countries

“Whereas the production and sale of wheat forms a vital part of the economy of South Dakota;

“Whereas the countries now involved in the formation of the European Economic Community—including West Germany, France, Italy, Belgium, the Netherlands, and Luxembourg—represent one of the best cash customers of U.S. wheatgrowers;

“Whereas there is a danger that the European Economic Community may develop policies which would curtail the importation of U.S. wheat;

“Whereas the adoption of protectionist and inward-directed trade restricting agricultural policies would seriously damage the economy of South Dakota and other major wheat growing States of the Great Plains and would greatly hamper the free exchange of goods between the United States and the Common Market countries: Be it

Resolved, That the South Dakota Legislature hereby urges the U.S. Government to take all necessary steps to guarantee continuing access of U.S. wheat to the Common Market countries in line with the spirit of the Trade Expansion Act of 1962; and be it further

Resolved, That a duly attested copy of this resolution be immediately transmitted to the U.S. Secretary of Agriculture, the Sec-

retary of the Senate of the United States, the Clerk of the House of Representatives of the United States and to each Member of the Congress from this State.

“Adopted by the Senate February 19, 1963. Concurred in by the House of Representatives February 25, 1963.

“NILS A. BOE,
“Lieutenant Governor,
“President of the Senate.

“Attest:

“NIELS P. JENSEN,
“Secretary of the Senate.

“PAUL E. BROWN,
“Speaker,
“House of Representatives.”

“Attest:

“W. J. MATSON,
“Chief Clerk,
“House of Representatives.”

(The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of South Dakota, identical with the foregoing, which was referred to the Committee on Finance.)

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of South Dakota; to the Committee on Government Operations:

“HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 8
“A concurrent resolution, memorializing the Congress of the United States to amend the Federal statutes in order to provide for payments in lieu of property taxes imposed on land prior to acquisition by the Federal Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife and Wildlife Agency

“Whereas the State game, fish, and parks department, supplied with Federal matching funds, has and will continue to purchase wetlands and marshlands for the State of South Dakota for the purpose of protecting present breeding and feeding areas of migratory waterfowl;

“Whereas this State, vested with the titles to such lands as the game, fish, and parks department has purchased, provides to the several counties and their school districts, within which wetlands owned by the State of South Dakota are located, payments and grants in lieu of property taxes;

“Whereas the Federal Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife has and will continue to purchase similar tracts of land for identical purposes and is not subject to county or school district tax levies or required to make payments in lieu of property taxes;

“Whereas the tax burden of the people of South Dakota and the landowners residing within the several counties and their school districts in which certain land titles are held by the Federal Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife in the name of the Federal Government is necessarily increased in direct proportion to the amount of land purchased by the Fish and Wildlife Agency: Now, therefore, be it

“Resolved, That the House of Representatives of the 88th Legislature of the State of South Dakota, the senate concurring, do hereby memorialize the Congress of the United States to amend the Federal statutes in order to provide payments in lieu of property taxes no longer able to be levied on those wetlands and marshlands acquired by the Federal Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife in order to equalize generally the tax burden of the citizens of the State of South Dakota and specifically the tax burden of the citizens of the several counties and their school districts; and be it further

“Resolved, That a copy of this memorial be transmitted to the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States, and to the Senators and Congressmen repre-

senting the State of South Dakota in the Congress of the United States.

"Adopted by the house, February 16, 1963.
"Concurred in by the senate, February 25, 1963.

"NIELS A. BOE,
"President of the Senate.
"NIELS P. JENSEN,
"Secretary of the Senate.
"PAUL E. BROWN,
"Speaker of the House.
"W. J. MATSON,
"Chief Clerk of the House."

(The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of South Dakota, identical with the foregoing, which was referred to the Committee on Government Operations.)

Two concurrent resolutions of the Legislature of the State of South Dakota; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs:

"SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 5

"A concurrent resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States; His Excellency, the President of the United States; the Secretary of the Interior of the United States; and the Secretary of the Treasury of the United States; to allow singing at Mount Rushmore by nonprofessional student workers and to remove the restrictions imposed in 1962 which caused this to cease

"Whereas singing at Mount Rushmore by student help at the concession is a source of enjoyment to the more than 1 million persons who annually visit the shrine of democracy; and

"Whereas the nonprofessional singing student waiters have voluntarily inaugurated this custom for their own pleasure and the enjoyment of those they serve without this being a part of their duties; and

"Whereas the figures of Washington, Jefferson, Lincoln and Theodore Roosevelt are symbolic of freedom and the democratic way of life; and

"Whereas impromptu singing by young people at work is a manifestation of the joys of freedom inherent to the United States and the free world; and

"Whereas this singing is an additional source of inspiration to all visitors in the true meaning of democracy as exemplified by this showplace of freedom: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved, That the Senate of the State of South Dakota, the house of representatives concurring therein, do memorialize the Congress of the United States; His Excellency, the President of the United States; the Secretary of the Interior of the United States; and the Secretary of the Treasury of the United States, that in the interests of the millions who seek this inspiration at Mount Rushmore and as a source of encouragement to the youth of America to enjoy their freedom of choice of endeavor, the National Government allow this singing on a voluntary basis by nonprofessional student workers and remove the restrictions imposed in 1962; which caused it to cease; be it further

"Resolved, That the secretary of the senate be instructed to forward enrolled copies of this concurrent resolution to His Excellency, the President of the United States, to the presiding officers of both Houses of Congress, to the Secretary of the Interior of the United States, to the Secretary of the Treasury of the United States, to U.S. Senators KARL MUNDT and GEORGE McGOVERN, and to U.S. Congressmen E. Y. BERRY and BEN REIFEL.

"Adopted by the senate February 23, 1963.

"Concurred in by the house of representatives March 4, 1963.

"NIELS A. BOE,
"Lieutenant Governor,
"President of the Senate.

"Attest:

"NIELS P. JENSEN,
"Secretary of the Senate.
"PAUL E. BROWN,
"Speaker,
"House of Representatives.

"Attest:

"W. J. MATSON,
"Chief Clerk,
"House of Representatives."

"SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 12

"A concurrent resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States; His Excellency the President of the United States to support construction of the Crazy Horse Memorial near Custer, S. Dak.

"Whereas the Black Hills of South Dakota is one of the outstanding recreation areas of the United States of America; and

"Whereas the Government of the United States of America has assisted greatly with development of the Black Hills as a recreation area through its program of national parks, shrines, and monuments; and

"Whereas continued development of the Black Hills is necessary so future generations can enjoy the same outdoor natural beauties as their predecessors; and

"Whereas one of the outstanding attractions of the future Black Hills development is being developed by a private group through the carving of Crazy Horse Memorial, a tribute to the heritage of the American Indian; and

"Whereas the Sioux Indians of South Dakota will benefit educationally, socially, and esthetically when the monument is completed; and

"Whereas funds from the self-supporting Crazy Horse carving on Thunder Mountain by Sculptor Korczak Ziolkowski are inadequate to complete the monument expeditiously: Now therefore be it

"Resolved, That the Senate of the State of South Dakota, the house of representatives concurring, therein, do memorialize the Congress of the United States, the Secretary of the Interior, and His Excellency the President to assist the Crazy Horse Memorial Foundation Commission in speeding completion of the monument by providing funds to be repaid from admissions and concession sales during and after construction of the mountain carving; and be it further

"Resolved, That the secretary of the senate be instructed to forward copies of this concurrent resolution to His Excellency, the President of the United States, to the presiding officers of both Houses of the Congress, to the Secretary of the Interior of the United States, to U.S. Senators KARL MUNDT and GEORGE McGOVERN and to Congressmen E. Y. BERRY and BEN REIFEL.

"Adopted by the senate, March 2, 1963.
"Concurred in by the house of representatives, March 5, 1963.

"NIELS A. BOE,
"Lieutenant Governor,
"President of the Senate.

"Attest:

"NIELS P. JENSEN,
"Secretary of the Senate.
"PAUL E. BROWN,
"Speaker,
"House of Representatives.

"Attest:

"W. J. MATSON,
"Chief Clerk,
"House of Representatives."

(The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate two concurrent resolutions of the Legislature of the State of South Dakota, identical with the

foregoing, which were referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.)

Two concurrent resolutions of the Legislature of the State of South Dakota; to the Committee on the Judiciary:

"SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 9

"Concurrent resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States, relative to the so-called right-to-work laws of the respective States of this Union

"Whereas the people of the sovereign State of South Dakota have adopted as an integral part of their State constitution the following section in their bill of rights:

"'Article VI—Bill of Rights

"Sec. 2. No person shall be deprived of life, liberty or property without due process of law. The right of persons to work shall not be denied or abridged on account of membership or nonmembership in any labor union, or labor organization; and

"Whereas the Legislature of the sovereign State of South Dakota has implemented said section of the State constitution with statutory law to enforce this constitutional provision.

"Whereas 20 States in this Union have the same or similar constitutional or legislative enactments: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved, That the members of the Legislature of the State of South Dakota respectfully request that the Congress of the United States refrain from any legislation abrogating the rights of the respective States in this field of civil rights; and be it further

"Resolved, That the Secretary of the Senate be instructed to send out a duly attested copy of this resolution to the Secretary of the Senate of the United States, the Clerk of the House of Representatives of the United States, and to each Member of the Congress from this State.

"Adopted by the senate February 21, 1963.
"Concurred in by the house of representatives February 28, 1963.

"NIELS A. BOE,
"Lieutenant Governor,
"President of the Senate.

"Attest:

"NIELS P. JENSEN,
"Secretary of the Senate.
"PAUL E. BROWN,
"Speaker, House of Representatives.

"Attest:

"W. J. MATSON,
"Chief Clerk, House of Representatives."

"SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 13

"Concurrent resolution requesting the Congress of the United States of America to propose an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to provide for the appointment of electors of the President and Vice President on a basis similar to the election of the Congress of the United States

"Whereas under the Constitution of the United States election of the President and Vice President is by electors in the several States, appointed in each State as directed by its legislature, with each State having an elector for each of its Senators and Representatives in Congress; and

"Whereas the legislature in each State has directed that the appointment of its electors be by popular election on a statewide basis, a method that is not representative of the division of the voters within most of the States; and

"Whereas the whole body of electors (the electoral college) is the exact counterpart of a joint session of the two Houses of Congress in the representation of the States as units as well as the population of the States, and should be elected on a comparable basis so as to give the President and the whole Congress the same form of voting constituency; and

"Whereas the executive and legislative branches of the Government of the United States rest upon nationwide constituencies so altogether different as to make presidential U.S.A. and congressional U.S.A. two different countries within one national boundary: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved, that the Congress of the United States of America is respectfully requested to propose the article of amendment as proposed in Senate Joint Resolution 12, now pending in the U.S. Senate, as an amendment to the Constitution of the United States; and be it further

"Resolved, That duly attested copies of this resolution be transmitted immediately to the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States, directed to the Secretary of each body; to the Members of Congress from this State; and to each house of the legislature of each of the other States.

"Adopted by the senate February 26, 1963.

"Concurred in by the house of representatives March 4, 1963.

"NIELS A. BOE,
"Lieutenant Governor,
"President of the Senate.

"Attest:

"NIELS P. JENSEN,
"Secretary of the Senate.
"PAUL E. BROWN,
"Speaker, House of Representatives.

"Attest:

"W. J. MATSON,
"Chief Clerk, House of Representatives."

(The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate two concurrent resolutions of the Legislature of the State of South Dakota, identical with the foregoing, which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.)

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of South Dakota; to the Committee on Public Works:

SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 14

"Concurrent resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States to provide financial relief either through amending Public Law 81-874 or direct grants to the Fort Pierre Independent School District, Stanley County, S. Dak.

"Whereas the program of the U.S. Corps of Army Engineers for the construction on the Missouri River in central South Dakota of Oahe Dam, an important link in harnessing the upper Missouri River, necessitated a peak employment of thousands of skilled and unskilled personnel during the past decade, which caused the population of Fort Pierre, a small, historic community within immediate proximity to the dam construction site, to explode with the rapid influx of Federal and Federal-contractor employees, their wives, and, of immediate consequence to the Fort Pierre Independent School District, their children; and

"Whereas the housing patterns of Government and private personnel employed in the construction of Oahe Dam resulted in substantial numbers of mobile homes being moved into Fort Pierre, with relatively few permanent dwelling structures being constructed, while the school population increased by 234 percent, thereby decreasing the equity and effectiveness of the property tax, Fort Pierre's normal tool for financing education; and

"Whereas under Public Law 81-874, as amended, the Fort Pierre Independent School District received payments from the Federal Government to ameliorate the sudden and massive increase in school enrollments which continued through the past decade but which the Corps of Army Engineers discontinued upon the completion of Oahe Dam, no longer requiring the services of large numbers of personnel; and

"Whereas the completion of the construction of the Oahe Dam should have resulted in the community losing the temporary pop-

ulation gained in the beginning of the last decade, but with a similar dam being constructed only 66 highway miles downstream, many workers lingered in the community commuting to the new damsite, and continuing to educate their children in Fort Pierre schools, despite the school district's loss of impacted area funds; and

"Whereas the burden of supporting the community's educational facilities now rests entirely upon State aid and the property taxes paid by established, home owning and permanent community residents who are already taxed at the maximum constitutional amount and who have, lacking other alternatives, turned to the State for immediate and emergency assistance; and

"Whereas the constitution of the State of South Dakota prohibits the State legislature from enacting special appropriations to relieve the plight of the Fort Pierre Independent School District; and

"Whereas the Federal Government remains the only remaining source of assistance and aid to solve the community's rapidly deteriorating school district financial condition arising from the construction of the Oahe Dam and the subsequent and sudden withdrawal of financial support: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved, That the Senate of the State of South Dakota (the House of Representatives concurring therein), do memorialize the Congress of the United States, to take immediate and necessary action to recognize the ignored responsibility of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare or the U.S. Corps of Army Engineers and provide financial relief, either through direct financial aid or an amendment to Public Law 81-874, as amended, to the Fort Pierre Independent School District, Stanley County, S. Dak., to be effective until the construction employment patterns of the U.S. Corps of Army Engineers and its contractors no longer affect the enrollment of the school district; and be it further

"Resolved, That copies of this resolution be transmitted to the chairmen of the Committee on Education of the U.S. Senate and the U.S. House of Representatives, the chairmen of the Appropriations Committees of the U.S. Senate and the U.S. House of Representatives, the chairmen of the Committees on Public Works of the U.S. Senate and the U.S. House of Representatives, the Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations, and the members of the South Dakota delegations to the U.S. Senate and the U.S. House of Representatives.

"Adopted by the Senate March 5, 1963.
"Concurred in by the House of Representatives March 6, 1963.

"NIELS A. BOE,
"Lieutenant Governor,
"President of the Senate.

"Attest:

"NIELS P. JENSEN,
"Secretary of the Senate.
"PAUL E. BROWN,
"Speaker, House of Representatives.

"Attest:

"W. J. MATSON,
"Chief Clerk, House of Representatives."

(The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of South Dakota, identical with the foregoing, which was referred to the Committee on Public Works.)

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina, from the Committee on Rules and Administration, without amendment:

S. Res. 95. Resolution to provide funds for additional staff for the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare (Rept. No. 42).

By Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina, from the Committee on Rules and Administration, without additional amendment:

S. Res. 14. Resolution authorizing the Committee on Banking and Currency to make certain investigations (Rept. No. 20);

S. Res. 15. Resolution authorizing the Committee on Banking and Currency to investigate matters pertaining to public and private housing (Rept. No. 21);

S. Res. 22. Resolution authorizing the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare to examine, investigate, and study matters pertaining to migratory labor (Rept. No. 43); and

S. Res. 75. Resolution authorizing the Committee on Armed Services to investigate certain matters relating to national defense (Rept. No. 18).

By Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina, from the Committee on Rules and Administration, with an additional amendment:

S. Res. 74. Resolution authorizing the Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences to make a study of matters pertaining to aeronautical and space activities of Federal departments and agencies (Rept. No. 17); and

S. Res. 79. Resolution to authorize a study by the Committee on Armed Services on strategic and critical stockpiling (Rept. No. 19).

By Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina, from the Committee on Rules and Administration, with an amendment:

S. Res. 16. Resolution authorizing the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs to investigate certain matters within its jurisdiction and authorizing certain expenditures therefor (Rept. No. 28);

S. Res. 20. Resolution authorizing the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service to employ additional clerical assistance (Rept. No. 44); and

S. Res. 64. Resolution to investigate national penitentiaries (Rept. No. 37).

By Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina, from the Committee on Rules and Administration, with amendments:

S. Res. 12. Resolution authorizing the Committee on Public Works to investigate certain matters (Rept. No. 46);

S. Res. 13. Resolution to study certain aspects of national security operations (Rept. No. 27);

S. Res. 17. Resolution authorizing the Committee on Government Operations to make certain studies as to the efficiency and economy of the operations of the Government (Rept. No. 24);

S. Res. 18. Resolution authorizing the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service to investigate the postal service and the civil service system (Rept. No. 45);

S. Res. 23. Resolution extending the Special Committee on Aging through January 31, 1964 (Rept. No. 49);

S. Res. 25. Resolution authorizing the Committee on Foreign Relations to examine, investigate, and make studies of matters pertaining to the foreign policies of the United States and their administration (Rept. No. 23);

S. Res. 26. Resolution authorizing the Committee on Foreign Relations to continue its study of the activities of nondiplomatic representatives of foreign principals (Rept. No. 22);

S. Res. 27. Resolution to provide funds for the study of matters pertaining to interagency coordination, economy, and efficiency (Rept. No. 25);

S. Res. 45. Resolution authorizing a study of intergovernmental relationships between the United States and the States and municipalities (Rept. No. 26);

S. Res. 49. Resolution authorizing the Select Committee on Small Business to make a study of American small and independent business problems (Rept. No. 48);

S. Res. 55. Resolution to study administrative practice and procedure (Rept. No. 29);

S. Res. 57. Resolution authorizing a study of matters pertaining to constitutional amendment (Rept. No. 30);

S. Res. 58. Resolution to investigate matters pertaining to constitutional rights (Rept. No. 31);

S. Res. 59. Resolution to consider matters pertaining to Government charters, holidays, and celebrations (Rept. No. 32);

S. Res. 60. Resolution to study matters pertaining to immigration and naturalization (Rept. No. 34);

S. Res. 61. Resolution to study and examine the Federal judicial system (Rept. No. 33);

S. Res. 62. Resolution to investigate the administration, operation, and enforcement of the Internal Security Act (Rept. No. 35);

S. Res. 63. Resolution to investigate juvenile delinquency (Rept. No. 36);

S. Res. 65. Resolution to examine and review the administration of the Patent Office (Rept. No. 38);

S. Res. 66. Resolution to investigate problems created by flow of escapees and refugees from communistic tyranny (Rept. No. 39);

S. Res. 67. Resolution to study revision and codification of the Statutes of the United States (Rept. No. 40);

S. Res. 68. Resolution to investigate the administration of the Trading With the Enemy Act (Rept. No. 41); and

S. Res. 73. Resolution authorizing the Committee on Rules and Administration to make expenditures and to employ temporary personnel (Rept. No. 47).

By Mr. EASTLAND, from the Committee on the Judiciary, without amendment:

S. 92. A bill for the relief of Hom Wah Yook (also known as Hom Bok Heung) (Rept. No. 51);

S. 97. A bill for the relief of Purificacion Siat (Rept. No. 52);

S. 208. A bill for the relief of Young Wai (Rept. No. 53);

S. 234. A bill for the relief of Harold and Sylvia Freda Karro and their three minor children, Ailan Karro, Jennifer Karro, and Michelle Karro (Rept. No. 54);

S. 436. A bill for the relief of Stanislaw Balogowski (Rept. No. 55);

S. 506. A bill for the relief of Panagiota Makris (Rept. No. 56);

S. 574. A bill for the relief of Antonio Gutierrez Fernandez (Rept. No. 57);

S. 596. A bill for the relief of Roswitha Seib (Rept. No. 58); and

S. 688. A bill for the relief of Ronald Whiting (Rept. No. 59).

By Mr. EASTLAND, from the Committee on the Judiciary, with an amendment:

S. 193. A bill for the relief of Michelina Lanni (Rept. No. 60).

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

S. 195. A bill for the relief of Isabel Loretta Allen (Rept. No. 61);

S. 421. A bill for the relief of Ho Koon Chew (Rept. No. 62); and

S. 635. A bill for the relief of Krystyna Rataj (Rept. No. 63).

By Mr. DIRKSEN, from the Committee on the Judiciary, without amendment:

S. J. Res. 4. Joint resolution to provide for the actual participation of the United States in the West Virginia centennial celebration (Rept. No. 50).

**TO REPRINT COMMITTEE PRINT,
87TH CONGRESS, ENTITLED "PART
1 OF CONCENTRATION RATIOS
IN MANUFACTURING INDUSTRY,
1958"—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE**

Mr. KEFAUVER, from the Committee on the Judiciary, reported an original concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 30); which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration, as follows:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That there be printed for the use of the Senate Committee on the Judiciary two thousand additional copies of part 1 of its committee print of the Eighty-seventh Congress entitled "Concentration Ratios in Manufacturing Industry, 1958", a report prepared by the Bureau of the Census for the Subcommittee on Antitrust and Monopoly.

**APPOINTMENT AS MEMBERS OF
JOINT COMMITTEE ON PRINTING
AND JOINT COMMITTEE OF CON-
GRESS ON THE LIBRARY—RE-
PORT OF A COMMITTEE**

Mr. JORDAN, of North Carolina, from the Committee on Rules and Administration, reported an original resolution (S. Res. 107); which was placed on the calendar, as follows:

Resolved, That the following-named Members be, and they are hereby, elected members of the following joint committees of Congress:

Joint Committee on Printing: Mr. HAYDEN, of Arizona; Mr. JORDAN, of North Carolina; and Mr. SCOTT, of Pennsylvania.

Joint Committee of Congress on the Library: Mr. JORDAN, of North Carolina; Mr. PELL, of Rhode Island; Mr. CLARK, of Pennsylvania; Mr. COOPER, of Kentucky; and Mr. SCOTT, of Pennsylvania.

**REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON UTI-
LIZATION OF FOREIGN CURREN-
CIES AND U.S. DOLLARS**

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, in accordance with the Mutual Security Act of 1954, as amended, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the reports of the Committees on Public Works; Labor and Public Welfare; the Judiciary; and the Joint Economic Committee concerning the foreign currencies and U.S. dollars utilized by those committees in 1962 in connection with foreign travel.

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

Report of expenditure of foreign currencies and appropriated funds by the Committee on Public Works, U.S. Senate, expended between Jan. 1 and Dec. 31, 1962

Name and country	Name of currency	Lodging		Meals		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Senator Jennings Randolph: Mexico	Peso	400	31.10	140	11.20	900	72.40	528	42.30	1,968	158.00
Senator Ernest Gruening: Mexico	do	460	36.50	350	28.00	950	76.00	530	41.80	2,280	182.30
Theo W. Sneed: Mexico	do	350	28.00	200	16.00	800	64.10	430	34.40	1,780	142.50
Lorenzo E. Tapia: Mexico	do	460	36.90	350	28.00	800	64.10	330	26.50	1,940	155.50
Herbert W. Beaser: Mexico	do	350	28.00	100	8.00	800	64.10	237	19.00	1,487	119.10
Total			161.50		91.20		340.70		164.00		757.40

RECAPITULATION

Foreign currency (U.S. dollar equivalent) Amount 757.40

MARCH 4, 1963.

PAT McNAMARA,
Chairman, Committee on Public Works.

Report of expenditure of foreign currencies and appropriated funds by the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, U.S. Senate, expended between Jan. 1 and Dec. 31, 1962

Name and country	Name of currency	Lodging		Meals		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Pat McNamara: Switzerland	Franc	512	128	488	122	4,122	1,030.50	-----	-----	5,122	1,280.50
Total			128		122		1,030.50		-----		1,280.50

RECAPITULATION

Foreign currency (U.S. dollar equivalent) Amount 1,280.50

FEBRUARY 27, 1963.

LISTER HILL,
Chairman, Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

Report of expenditure of foreign currencies and appropriated funds by the Committee on the Judiciary, U.S. Senate, expended between Jan. 1 and Dec. 31, 1962

Name and country	Name of currency	Lodging		Meals		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Senator Kenneth B. Keating:											
Austria	Schilling							165.90	6.83	165.90	6.83
Belgium	Franc	1,285	25.70			425	8.50	250	5.24	1,960	39.44
Germany	Deutsche mark							96	24.00	96	24.00
Italy	Lira					11,178	18.00			11,178	18.00
Nigeria	Nigerian pound									1/10/0	4.23
Poland	Zloty	1,115	44.60					407	18.82	1/10/0	4.23
United Kingdom	Pound					4/17/6	13.65			1/17/6	13.65
Netherlands	Dutch guilder					3934.17	1,094.65				1,094.65
Subtotal			70.30					1,134.80		59.12	
Milton Eisenberg:											1,264.22
Nigeria	Pound		17	48.00	7	20.00					
Netherlands	Dutch guilder					3,496.96	973.00				
Subtotal				48.00		20.00				6.00	
Paul L. Laskin:											
France	Franc										
Italy	Lira	47,330	76.20	21,000	33.82	3,870	1,109.74	10,800	17.40	5,438	1,109.74
Subtotal			76.20		33.82		1,115.97		17.40	83,000	133.65
Phyllis T. Piotrow:											
Germany	Deutsche mark	208.35	52.09	28.60	7.15	143	35.75	24.80	6.20	404.75	101.19
Italy	Lira	9,793	15.75	4,310	7.00	2,200	3.55	2,352	3.75	18,655	30.05
United Kingdom	Pound	18/1/10	50.65	2-2-10	6.00	1-19-6	5.55	1-4-11	3.50	23-9-1	65.70
Netherlands	Dutch guilder					2,425.95	2,675.00				2,675.00
Subtotal			118.49		20.15		710.85		13.45		871.94
Total			312.99		73.97		3,943.62		95.97		4,426.55

¹ Certain portions of this ticket were not used and refunds for such will be made by airlines. ² Ticket not used; amount will be refunded by airline.

RE CAPITULATION

Foreign currency (U.S. dollar equivalent)

Amount
4,426.55

JAMES O. EASTLAND,
Chairman, Committee on the Judiciary.

MARCH 8, 1963.

Report of expenditure of foreign currencies and appropriated funds by the Joint Economic Committee, U.S. Senate, expended between Jan. 1 and Dec. 31, 1962

Name and country	Name of currency	Lodging		Meals		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Hon. Martha W. Griffiths:											
Panama	Balboa	60	60.00	18.75	18.75			3	3.00	181.75	81.75
Costa Rica	Colón	350	52.60	203	30.50			145	21.80	1,698	104.90
Guatemala	Quetzal	18.40	18.40	13.55	11.55			5	5.00	1,369.5	36.95
Mexico	Peso	525	42.00	432	34.60	440.00	35.20	45.50	3.60	1,442.50	115.40
Netherlands	Guilder					1,513.8	420.50			1,513.8	420.50
Subtotal			173.00		97.40		455.70		33.40		759.50
Ann Cooper Penning:											
Panama	Balboa	60	60.00	16.70	16.70			3.35	3.35	180.05	80.05
Costa Rica	Colón	163.20	24.50	134.30	20.20			47	7.10	1,344.50	51.80
Guatemala	Quetzal	18.40	18.40	11.50	11.50			3	3.00	32.90	32.90
Mexico	Peso	525	42.00	420	33.60	365	29.20	37.90	3.10	1,347.90	107.90
West Germany	Deutsche mark					1,866	466.55			1,866	466.55
Subtotal			144.90		82.00		495.75		16.55		739.20
William H. Moore:											
Panama	Balboa	60	60.00	19.75	19.75			6	6.00	175.75	85.75
Costa Rica	Colón	163.20	24.50	126.20	19.00			45	6.90	1,334.50	50.40
Guatemala	Quetzal	18.40	18.40	13.50	13.50			6	6.00	1,379.0	37.90
Mexico	Peso	525	42.00	406	32.50	295	23.60	71	5.70	1,295	103.80
West Germany	Deutsche mark					1,866	466.50			1,866	466.50
Subtotal			144.90		84.75		490.10		24.60		744.35
Hon. Jacob K. Javits:											
Germany	Deutsche mark			60	15.00			40	10.00	100	25.00
Netherlands	Guilder			1,343.70	268.74	2,078.28	577.30			2,078.28	577.30
France	New franc									1,343.70	268.74
Total			615.65	125.64	474.50	96.83	195	39.80	230.50	47.05	1,515.65
Belle Notkin, France	do.										309.32
Ettore Lolli, ³ Italy	Lira					125,000	201.29			125,000	201.29
Jurg Niehans, ³ Switzerland	Franc					4,411	1,019.64	119.75		4,530.75	1,047.33
Alan Day, ³ United Kingdom	Pound sterling	35-0-0	94.50	22-0-0	59.40	334-5-0	936.54	0-2-10	6.10	391-7-10	1,096.54
Subtotal				94.50		59.40		2,157.47		33.79	
											2,345.16

See footnote at end of table.

Report of expenditure of foreign currencies and appropriated funds by the Joint Economic Committee, U.S. Senate, expended between Jan. 1 and Dec. 31, 1962—Continued

Name and country	Name of currency	Lodging		Meals		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Harvey J. Winter:											
Italy	Lira	35,200	56.77	33,100	53.38	7,300	11.77	9,400	15.16	85,000	137.08
France	New franc	465	93.00	445	89.00	5,472.95	1,107.80	55	11.00	6,437.95	1,300.80
Subtotal			149.77		142.38		1,118.57			26.16	
D. B. Hardeman:											
Netherlands	Guilder					4,818	1,340.82			4,818	1,340.82
Poland	Zloty	760	31.67	1,043	43.46			639	26.62	2,442	101.75
Yugoslavia	Dinar	60,425	90.57	33,820	45.09	39,405	52.54	16,350	21.80	150,000	200.00
Subtotal			112.24		88.55		1,393.36		48.42		1,642.57
Hon. Henry S. Reuss:											
France	New franc	350	70.00	215	43.00					565	113.00
Switzerland	Franc	195.50	48.88	85	21.25					280.50	70.13
Belgium	do					88	22.00			88	22.00
Subtotal			118.88		64.25		22.00				205.13
Harold A. Levin:											
Belgium	Franc	200	5.20	125	2.50					508	10.16
England	Pound	10-10-9	29.49	3-7-9	9.47	0-10-0	.46	0-7-6	1.04	15-16-0	44.20
West Germany	Deutsche mark	170.55	42.64	54.45	13.61	4,168.75	1,044.80			4,393.75	1,101.05
Subtotal			77.33		25.58		1,046.66		5.84		1,155.41
Thomas H. Boggs, Jr.:											
France	New franc	313.6	64.00	362.6	74.00					800	163.27
Italy	Lira	25,900	41.11	32,130	51.00	5,040	13.27	6,930	12.00	70,000	111.11
Germany	Deutsche mark					4,921	8.00			4,921	1,224.00
Subtotal			105.11		125.00		1,245.27		23.00		1,498.38
Philip Patman:											
Belgium and Luxembourg	Franc	3,040	60.80	4,120	82.40	2,661	53.20	420	8.40	10,241	204.80
Germany	Deutsche mark	285	71.25	360	90.00	5,810.66	1,381.20	100	25.00	6,556.66	1,567.45
Austria	Schilling	1,560	60.00	1,325	59.95	105	4.00	310	11.95	3,300	126.90
Greece	Drachma	1,755	58.50	1,680	56.00	155	5.15	410	13.70	4,000	133.35
Italy	Lira	24,800	39.35	30,250	48.00	3,850	6.15	6,100	9.65	65,000	103.15
France	New franc	461	130.80	535	109.20	204	41.65	60	12.20	1,440	293.85
Subtotal			420.70		436.55		1,491.35		80.90		2,429.50
W. Andrew Carothers, Jr.:											
Belgium	Franc	3,950	79.00	4,400	88.00	900	18.00	355	7.10	9,605	192.10
France	New franc	724	147.75	552	112.65	348	71.02	196	40.00	1,820	371.42
West Germany	Deutsche mark	364	91.00	408	102.00	6,126.66	1,437.20	125	31.25	7,023.66	1,661.45
Greece	Drachma	1,755	58.50	1,595	53.17	650	21.66	500	16.67	4,500	150.00
Italy	Lira	25,000	39.66	32,000	50.78	5,800	9.20	7,200	11.48	70,000	111.12
Turkey	do	360	40.00	415	46.11	97	10.77	128	14.23	1,000	111.11
Subtotal			455.91		452.71		1,567.85		120.73		2,597.20
Robert G. Williams:											
Luxembourg and Belgium	Belgian franc	4,843	96.80	5,000	100.00	776	15.52			10,619	212.32
West Germany	Deutsche mark	465.39	116.34	500	124.60	6,100.75	1,532.85	74.61	18.65	7,140.75	1,792.44
Austria	Schilling	1,361.30	51.40	1,639	63.35	300	11.55			3,300	126.30
Greece	Drachma	1,117	37.25	1,483	49.41			400	13.34	3,000	100.00
Italy	Lira	27,520	44.70	43,070	69.00	9,470	15.50	15.50	40	90,000	144.70
France	New franc	298.20	81.23	500.20	102.08	6,180	12.44	8.16	1,000		203.91
Subtotal			427.72		508.44		1,587.86		55.65		2,579.67
Vernon A. Mund:											
Belgium and Luxembourg	Belgian franc	4,800	96.00	5,900	118.00	1,273	44.32	2,200	44.00	14,757	302.52
Germany	Deutsche mark	384	96.00	384	96.00	7,016	1,664.70	382	95.00	8,166	1,951.70
Austria	Schilling	1,600	61.80	1,600	61.80			1,800	69.50	5,000	193.10
Greece	Drachma	2,250	75.0	2,050	68.00			1,100	36.00	5,400	179.00
Italy	Lira	30,000	48.39	35,000	56.45			35,000	56.45	100,000	161.29
France	New franc	490	100.00	441	90.00			169	34.00	1,100	224.00
Subtotal			477.19		490.25		1,700.22		334.95		3,011.61

¹ Purchased with Mexican pesos.

² Witnesses brought to United States to testify at hearings.

³ Represents cost of luncheon meeting of the NATO Parliamentarians' Economic Committee, of which Senator Javits is Chairman, at Pavillon Dauphine in Paris.

⁴ Less unused portion of ticket.

RECAPITULATION

Foreign currency (U.S. dollar equivalent)

Amount
22,325.92

MARCH 8, 1963.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
JOINT ECONOMIC COMMITTEE,
March 8, 1963.

HON. CARL HAYDEN,
Chairman, Committee on Appropriations,
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR HAYDEN: In conformity with section 502(b) of the Mutual Security Act, enclosed is the report on foreign currencies expended under authorization of the Joint Economic Committee for the period January 1-December 31, 1962.

These expenditures were authorized by the chairman of the Joint Economic Committee

who held that office during the 87th Congress.

Faithfully,

PAUL H. DOUGLAS,
Chairman.

Amount
22,325.92

PAUL H. DOUGLAS,
Chairman, Joint Economic Committee.

By Mr. ENGLE:

S. 1053. A bill to amend chapter 79 of title 10, United States Code, to provide that certain boards established thereunder shall give consideration to satisfactory evidence relating to good character and exemplary conduct in civilian life after discharge or dismissal in determining whether or not to correct certain discharges and dismissals; to authorize the award of an Exemplary Rehabilitation Certificate; and for other

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION INTRODUCED

Bills and a joint resolution were introduced, read the first time, and, by unani-

purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

S. 1054. A bill for the relief of William Radkovich Co., Inc.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SCOTT:

S. 1055. A bill for the relief of Jack Baer; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DOUGLAS:

S. 1056. A bill to amend section 4071 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. EASTLAND (for himself and Mr. HRUSKA):

S. 1057. A bill to promote the cause of criminal justice by providing for the representation of defendants who are financially unable to obtain an adequate defense in criminal cases in the courts of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. NEUBERGER:

S. 1058. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act, as amended, with respect to survivor annuities; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

(See the remarks of Mrs. NEUBERGER when she introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. CARLSON:

S. 1059. A bill to provide for the establishment of the Old Fort Hays National Historic Site in the State of Kansas; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

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

By Mr. DOMINICK:

S. 1060. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Annie Yang; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SCOTT (for himself and Mr. CLARK):

S.J. Res. 58. Joint resolution establishing a commission to participate in the 100th anniversary of the Battle of Gettysburg and the 100th anniversary of Lincoln's Gettysburg Address; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

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

dustry, 1958," which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

See the above concurrent resolution printed in full when reported by Mr. KEFAUVER, which appears under the heading "Reports of Committees."

RESOLUTION
APPOINTMENT AS MEMBERS OF
JOINT COMMITTEE ON PRINTING
AND JOINT COMMITTEE OF CON-
GRESS ON THE LIBRARY

Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina, from the Committee on Rules and Administration, reported an original resolution (S. Res. 107) providing for members on the part of the Senate of the Joint Committee on Printing and the Joint Committee of Congress on the Library, which was placed on the calendar.

(See the above resolution printed in full when reported by Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina, which appears under the heading "Report of a Committee.")

LIBERALIZATION NEEDED IN CIVIL
SERVICE RETIREMENT SURVI-
VORSHIP

Mrs. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, Congress in 1948 wisely provided survivorship benefits for those retired under the Civil Service Retirement Act. This was an important step forward. Last year Congress liberalized the survivorship formula so as to decrease the reduction in annuitants' retirement in order to provide for survivors. Health benefits have also been extended to eligible survivors.

One of the serious weaknesses of the survivorship program is that when a person retires with a reduced annuity with a survivorship annuity provision, the survivorship provision covers only benefits for the spouse living at the time of retirement. If this spouse should die prior to the death of the annuitant, there is no way in which survivorship benefits, under present law, can be extended to a new husband or wife. This is indeed cruel, and creates extreme hardship in many cases.

I have received heart-rending letters from all parts of the country pointing out this hardship situation. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to include at this point in my remarks just two of the many recent letters I have received.

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

HACKETTSTOWN, N.J.,
January 28, 1963.

Senator MAURINE B. NEUBERGER,
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR NEUBERGER: I enjoyed reading your comments on retirement legislation in the January issue of Retirement Life magazine. We are deeply grateful for the interest you have taken and the bills you have introduced to benefit us.

My former husband, who served as a letter carrier for 39 years, died in 1940. In 1958 I received a monthly pension of \$50, granted to the "forgotten widows." I lost my annuity when I remarried in 1960.

My present husband, a retired letter carrier, who served 33 years, designated his former wife for survivor benefits. He is still receiving a reduced pension even though she predeceased him.

My husband feels that since he is paying for survivor benefits, and since I gave up survivor benefits when I remarried, that he should be able to name me as his beneficiary and thus provide for me in the event of his death. This, I know would give him peace of mind.

I hope this session of Congress will pass a bill to solve this problem. I waited 18 years for the "forgotten widows" bill to pass. Now I don't have that much time left.

Again, may I say we are deeply grateful for your efforts in our behalf. Somehow, I feel that when the sunset of your life rolls around, you will be blessed for your kindness to us.

Very truly yours,

CHARLOTTE A. GEIS.

SPARTANSBURG, S.C.,

January 7, 1963.

Hon. MAURINE B. NEUBERGER,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR NEUBERGER: I was deeply interested in the reproduction of your recent address to the Portland, Oreg., chapter of retired civil employees, which appeared in the January issue of Retirement Life magazine. It was especially interesting to read what you had to say relative to survivorship provisions.

My husband and I were married 10 years ago, 1953, and I am his second wife, and we were married after his retirement. His first wife was designated as his beneficiary and since her death he has been paying on his first wife, as beneficiary, since his retirement on February 1, 1950, and will have to continue to pay under the present law.

I am sure that there are similar cases such as mine and it would be most helpful to thousands of retirees if this injustice could be corrected. We appreciate all that you have done, and are doing for retirees. We are also grateful to you for the assistance given in the last raise of 5 percent; however, it would have been more helpful toward the high cost of living had your more liberal bill been passed.

Wishing you much success in all of your undertakings in the 88th Congress,

Very truly yours,

NANNA P. HARRISON.

Mrs. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, I am introducing today proposed legislation to alleviate this hardship situation. My bill provides that an annuitant retired on a reduced annuity with a survivor annuity may, in the event of death or divorce of his spouse and remarriage continuing for at least 2 years, designate the second wife or husband to receive survivor annuity benefits. I realized that more liberal bills have been introduced previously, and while they have merit they have failed of enactment. I am aware that my bill is more restrictive, but because of the reduced cost involved I am hopeful that it will stand a good chance of favorable consideration.

Other governmental retirement laws such as social security and railroad retirement do provide adequately for survivorship, without the restrictions imposed by the civil service retirement system. It is my hope that Congress will give favorable consideration to liberalizing the survivorship provisions along the lines which exist in social security and railroad retirement.

TO REPRINT COMMITTEE PRINT,
87TH CONGRESS, ENTITLED
"PART 1 OF CONCENTRATION
RATIOS IN MANUFACTURING IN-
DUSTRY, 1958"

Mr. KEFAUVER, from the Committee on the Judiciary, reported an original concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 30) to reprint copies of the committee print, 87th Congress, entitled "Part 1 of Concentration Ratios in Manufacturing In-

Under present law when an annuitant retires and provides survivorship benefits by taking a reduced annuity, the reduced annuity remains in force even though the spouse precedes in death and no benefits are derived from survivorship reduction.

As a member of the President's Commission on the Status of Women, I feel that present civil service survivor provisions are unduly restrictive and primarily cause grievous injury to widows, who are oftentimes left destitute in old age. I ask Congress to extend simple justice to our retired Federal employees by liberalizing the survivorship provisions.

Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act as amended with respect to survivor annuities.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. NELSON in the chair). The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 1058) to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act, as amended, with respect to survivor annuities, introduced by Mrs. NEUBERGER, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

DESIGNATION OF THE KANSAS HISTORICAL PARK AS A NATIONAL HISTORIC SITE

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, the formation and development of the Midwest and West of the United States produced many shining examples of bravery and heroism. Kansas, the center of the United States, played a most important part in this development.

Its brilliant history resplendent in courage, stamina, and character helped to make it a great State—and this a great Nation. Many of the great historical events in the development of our country took place within the boundaries of Kansas. I sincerely believe some of the events and the sites upon which they happened should be memorialized and preserved for future generations.

One of these is Old Fort Hays, Kans.

Established in 1867, Fort Hays played an important role in the opening of the West to settlement and to the building of the Kansas Pacific Railroad across the Plains country. It was one of the last important outposts established for protection of railroad workers and settlers from the Indians who inhabited the Plains.

Many of the famous military men who had fought in the Civil War were stationed here: General Philip Sheridan; General Forsyth; General Armstrong Custer; the famous 7th Cavalry unit and many famous officers of lesser rank. The fort was active for 22 years and in 1889 was abandoned because, it was said, the West had become civilized and there was no longer danger from foes within the Nation.

Two buildings, the famous Block House and the Guard House, both constructed in 1867 of native sandstone, are still in perfect state of preservation and attract tourist attention continuously.

The Block House was the headquarters building when the fort was active.

Two highways intersect at the corner of the reservation, U.S. 40 and 183, and there is a constant flow of visitors to the reservation. The story of the fort is known across the Nation and it attracts general attention. In 3 months' time last summer when the Old Fort Hays Museum, in the Block House, was open, more than 19,000 visitors registered. They were from both coasts and many foreign countries. These buildings are now a part of the Kansas Frontier Historical Park. I believe it should be made a national center of interest to all people. Therefore, Mr. President, I am introducing, for appropriate referral, a bill which would designate the Kansas Historical Park as a national historic site.

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

The bill (S. 1059) to provide for the establishment of the Old Fort Hays National Historic Site in the State of Kansas, introduced by Mr. CARLSON, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

COMMISSION TO PARTICIPATE IN 100TH ANNIVERSARY OF BATTLE OF GETTYSBURG AND LINCOLN'S GETTYSBURG ADDRESS

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, this year Americans everywhere will observe the centennial of the Battle of Gettysburg and the centennial of Lincoln's Gettysburg Address, two of the most important events in our Nation's history.

I am offering a bill today that would authorize the President to appoint a commission of 10 persons to cooperate with the commission appointed by Governor Scranton, of Pennsylvania, to plan and carry out the ceremonies relating to those events. It also would authorize the Secretaries of the Army, Navy, and Air Force to provide for the participation of the armed services in the observances.

The State of Pennsylvania has already allocated \$105,000 for use by the State commission and this bill authorizes up to \$150,000 for Federal participation.

My senior colleague from Pennsylvania, Senator CLARK, is cosponsoring this bill, and Congressman GEORGE A. GOODLING, of Pennsylvania, is introducing an identical measure in the House.

Although the center of activity for these observances is in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, the Battle of Gettysburg and Lincoln's address at the battlefield are integral parts of American history. I am hopeful that the Congress will recognize the great national interest in these events and act favorably on this bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The joint resolution will be received and appropriately referred.

The joint resolution (S.J. Res. 58) establishing a commission to participate in the 100th anniversary of the Battle of Gettysburg and the 100th anniversary

of Lincoln's Gettysburg Address, introduced by Mr. SCOTT (for himself and Mr. CLARK), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

APPOINTMENTS BY THE VICE PRESIDENT

The PRESIDING OFFICER. In behalf of the Vice President the Chair announces the appointment of the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. MCINTYRE] to be a delegate to the Mexican parliamentary meeting, in place of the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS]; and also the appointment of the Senator from Iowa [Mr. MILLER] in place of the Senator from Colorado [Mr. ALLOTT] to the same meeting.

Also, on behalf of the Vice President, and pursuant to the provisions of section I of Public Law 87-883, the Chair announces the appointment as members of the Battle of Lake Erie Sesquicentennial Celebration Commission, the following Senators: LAUSCHE and YOUNG, of Ohio; KEATING, of New York, and SCOTT, of Pennsylvania.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSOR OF BILLS

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, it had been the belief of the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. McCLELLAN] and me that I was a cosponsor of Senate bill 287, placing the transport industries under the antitrust laws, and Senate bill 288, prohibiting strikes at missile sites, but making provision for compulsory arbitration.

An examination of the RECORD shows we were both mistaken in that belief.

Having obtained the consent of the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. McCLELLAN] to become a cosponsor of both bills, I ask unanimous consent that my name be added to the bills as a cosponsor.

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

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

Mr. LAUSCHE. I yield.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I wish to thank the distinguished Senator from Ohio. We are very happy to have his support of these measures. I think they are important. I think they are measures which this Congress should act on. I do not think we can continue indifferently and permit some conditions that exist now in the labor-management field. I think both of these measures are necessary for the Congress to meet its responsibilities in meeting the problems involved. I thank the Senator for his support and great concern in this field.

ASSISTANCE TO STATES IN FISHERY RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMS—ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF BILL

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that at its next printing, the names of the Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS] and the Senator from Maryland [Mr. BREWSTER] be added as cosponsors to my bill S. 627, which will

assist States in their fishery research development programs.

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

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

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

By Mr. RANDOLPH:

Article entitled "U.S. and Burma Reach Accord in Working Road to Mandalay," appearing in the Washington (D.C.) Post of March 8, 1963; also, an adaptation by Senator ERNEST Gruening, of Alaska, of Kipling's poem, "On the Road to Mandalay."

PROBLEMS OF SECRETARY OF DEFENSE

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, in the March issue of Armed Forces Management appears an excellent editorial on the current problems which confront the Secretary of Defense and the manner in which he has gone about dealing with them.

No job in this Government—other than the Presidency—is more complex or more taxing than that of Secretary of Defense. Secretary McNamara has been exceptional in discharging its responsibilities. As is to be expected of anyone in public office, he is subjected from time to time to criticism. But as Secretary of Defense he has to look at defense from every angle, and at the total cost of defense in juxtaposition with the total problem of defense. He cannot afford the luxury of putting on blinders and not considering all aspects of defense and all elements in its cost. And let me say that we, as a Nation, cannot afford that luxury, either.

It is for that reason, Mr. President, that I was struck by this editorial. It provides some understanding of the immense scope of the Secretary's current organizational tasks, and a well-balanced evaluation of the way in which he is trying—with great dedication—to discharge them.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

THIS HORRENDOUS STATE OF AFFAIRS

Packs of nasty little academic debates have been scurrying around military circles, and even beyond, recently over a tongue-twisting polysyllable mouthful called the "trend to centralization of decisionmaking authority" in the Pentagon.

While we sympathize with the subjective reasons for this fretting, we find little objective fact to support the argument that McNamara's mailed fist is creating in the ranks, all by itself, a truly horrendous state of affairs.

Having just finished an analysis of the 15-year evolution in how the Defense Department has been run, we are convinced today's apprehensive palaver (that "the trend" must be reversed) is largely over-loaded with nonsense.

Part of the complainer's difficulty comes from their being forced to view the total national defense need from somewhere be-

low the top level. Properly, but unfortunately for their peace of mind, the nature of the challenge and of the resources we have to meet it can be evaluated best only from Defense Secretary McNamara's office—and this would be so, incidentally, whether he or someone else was warming the chair.

On top of that, the cause of good personnel relations is boosted little when the job itself is such that a new Secretary, whether he wants to or not, must operate not unlike, interestingly enough, Boston Celtics Basketball Coach Red Auerbach. Said Auerbach recently, describing why his ball club has for years been so successful, "They [the team] must adjust to me. I don't have to adjust to them."

It is hardly surprising then that McNamara faces a raft of internal communications problems. The manned bomber force is being told it has precious little life expectancy left. The fleets are under serious challenge to prove they have any mission worth their expense. The Army is struggling with an organizational shakeup greater than anything it has faced in recent history.

Drop into that environment a hard-driving leader who analyzes problems and options with cold, unemotional logic and makes rapid-fire decisions based on cost-effectiveness facts—all of which are changing drastically the former decisionmaking routine of the services—and some human turmoil is bound to result.

Significantly, much of the chatter has cropped up at budget hearing time on Capitol Hill. Thus Pentagon veterans write about 20 percent of the talk off to "Gamesmanship," that grand old military art of setting the proper congressional stage for stating why a particular program should be given by the legislators better than it got from its own military review.

Not that the Secretary's office is executing its decisions these days with unchallengeable excellence. Its sledgehammer implementation in some very detailed areas has caused considerable consternation; discouraged all but the most courageous crusaders from responding to a key McNamara philosophy (printed in AFM 2 years ago) that he expected "prompt decisions from Defense personnel who accepted responsibility and did not seek excessive advice."

But translating philosophy into procedure in as complex a setup as Defense takes quite a while. Until McNamara closes the large-sized information gap which exists, particularly at the working military level, over who is supposed to do what and why, he will probably have to continue to make many decisions on details. (The fact that they haven't bogged him down so far is a break for the rest of the organization.)

However, this understandable lag in awareness has been twisted around lately by some incomprehensible thought process into a set of qualifying credentials for criticizing McNamara. Even more ridiculous: he's being charged, basically, not with incompetence but with having the audacity to do what the law says he's supposed to do—run the Defense Department.

If you inspect the record, it is clear that most, if not all, the barbs being thrown at McNamara accuse him of doing today what a Defense Secretary was being chastized for not doing just 3 years ago.

Understandably, observers who don't have their emotions all jangled up in this debate are considerably confused by the flip-flop nature of the protagonists' new viewpoint, find few facts to support it and know many facts that don't.

For instance, this ridiculous business that he ignores his professional military leaders' views, apart from being an incredibly suspect charge on the face of it, ignores a couple key points:

1. McNamara is pushing programs which were not that popular before. The reason,

said one general, "There have been too many problems critical to the total national defense interest which we and the other services, with limited resources and our own rating of mission priority, could only be half interested in before."

2. His highly skeptical questioning of service statements on new weapons has soured a lot of military types but considering the current, generally poor military track record for estimating hardware cost, development time, and performance, he can hardly be blamed for that.

Unless this complaining is allowed to well up into a crusade, we have little doubt that the internal hassle over decisionmaking will ease off eventually if (1) McNamara and his team stick with the job another couple years and (2) all levels—McNamara's immediate staff, the service staffs, the field installations—bend over backward a little to view problems as seen by the rest of the outfit.

To nurture understanding (which in final analysis is the only real problem) will require the highest kind of statesmanship. But we can hardly expect much progress when reasonable, responsible people are tangled instead in a distracting separatist argument full of high-flown theorizing and ghostly managerial abstractions which have no fact-supported substance except in their own minds.

C. W. BORKLUND.

ADMINISTRATION POLICY OF CONCEALING INFORMATION FROM THE AMERICAN PEOPLE

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, this administration is adopting a policy of concealing from the American people far too much information which has no bearing on our security. It is becoming a habit to conceal waste of the taxpayers' money, under the stamp of a confidential or secret classification.

Today, I call the attention of the Senate to a typical example of unnecessary secrecy. Under date of February 15, 1963, the Comptroller General of the United States submitted to the President of the Senate and to the Speaker of the House of Representatives a report in which the first paragraph reads as follows:

COMPTROLLER GENERAL OF THE UNITED STATES,

Washington, D.C., February 15, 1963.
To the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives:

Enclosed is our report on the review of license fees being charged the U.S. Government for the right to produce the SS-11 antitank guided missile mutually developed by France and the United States under the mutual weapons development program.

The report then proceeds to describe an expenditure of several million dollars, which should have been wholly unnecessary had the Department been exercising the proper degree of caution in the administration of previous programs.

All of this information, however, is marked "confidential." Under this formula the information is for the use of the committee members only, and is not to be repeated to the American people.

I should emphasize that my criticism here today is not directed against the Comptroller General, since it is my understanding that he does not have the jurisdiction of releasing information which is classified as confidential by the

Department of Defense or the State Department.

The final paragraph of this report, however, is "unclassified," and it reads as follows:

Copies of this report are being sent to the President of the United States, the Secretary of Defense, and the Secretary of the Army.

JOSEPH CAMPBELL,
Comptroller General of the United States.

These two paragraphs—the first and the last paragraph of the report—are the only ones which are not classified.

Mr. President, I do not blame the Department for being ashamed of these unnecessary expenditures, but I disagree completely with their right to keep the information from the American people.

THE COAST GUARD SHOULD NOT BE THE ATTORNEY GENERAL'S PRIVATE GUARD

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, today I wish to discuss a new policy of the Kennedy administration under which the Attorney General of the United States has commandeered the U.S. Coast Guard to act as his special nursemaid when sailing his sloop on the Chesapeake Bay. He is demanding this special attention even to the extent of having the Coast Guard ignore calls from other boats in distress.

The U.S. Coast Guard has over the years established an enviable record in protecting the lives and safeguarding the property of those in distress. It has always been the rule of the Coast Guard that people in distress would be helped, without regard to their social or political position.

With this historical background of service, it is with regret that I find that in the present administration there are those who have taken it upon themselves to order the Coast Guard to give special protection to them and their friends, even to the point of ignoring a distress call from others.

This new policy was forcibly called to my attention when a constituent who was cruising in the Chesapeake Bay last October 14 had his motor stall, and appealed to the Coast Guard for assistance. Utilizing his two-way radio, this man called the Tilghman Island Light Attendant Station, and asked for assistance.

His message was intercepted by the Coast Guard auxiliary boat which was cruising in the area. The Coast Guard cutter soon arrived alongside the boat in distress, and the one in charge discussed its problem, but stated that he was unable to render any assistance, due to the fact that he was under special orders to trail the yacht or sailing sloop of the Attorney General of the United States around the bay, just in case his boat developed some trouble. He left after telling the man in the broken down boat that he would try to send someone else to help.

The result was that the man and his party were left with a stalled motor, to await assistance from some other source, which hours later came from a private company which towed them to port.

Adm. E. J. Roland, Commandant of the U.S. Coast Guard, has confirmed that

the reason for this was that orders had been received the week before, from the Attorney General's office, instructing that the Coast Guard make arrangements to provide communication with the yacht *Honya*, which would be sailing on Chesapeake Bay during the 13th and 14th with the Attorney General of the United States on board.

Based on this request, CG-40572, from Tilghman Island Light Station, was assigned the special mission of surveillance of the *Honya*, the Attorney General's sailing yacht, on October 14. It was while the Coast Guard cutter was carrying out this special assignment that a boat in distress was ignored and was left to wait and hope for assistance from some other source.

It is true that the weather was calm and clear at the time; so, in the absence of any sudden squall, the boat was in no danger; but this is all the more reason why the Attorney General did not need an escort.

Neither the Attorney General of the United States nor any other member of the President's Cabinet nor any Member of Congress has any right to order that the services of the Coast Guard be devoted to his exclusive protection.

It was highly improper for the Attorney General, even though he is a brother of the President of the United States, to allow the Coast Guard to disregard a boat which was in distress, just to trail him around as a special nursemaid.

This administration has said much about businessmen who charge off on their expense accounts the cost of operation of their yachts. But in my opinion it is even worse for an official of the U.S. Government to charge to the American taxpayers the expense of having a Coast Guard cutter operate exclusively just to trail his own yacht around the Chesapeake Bay.

It has always been the responsibility of the Coast Guard to patrol these waters and to stand ready to assist anyone in distress; and over the years they have established an enviable record in that connection.

I am not criticizing the Commandant of the Coast Guard; I appreciate the position in which he found himself when he received such orders from the brother of the President of the United States. But I sincerely hope that in the future he will instruct the Attorney General—who should know the law—that he is not entitled to any consideration different from that accorded any other boating party cruising in the area.

We all recognize that the President of the United States and the immediate members of his family do, and very properly should, have special protection. No one takes exception to that point, but I doubt that even he would ask the Coast Guard to ignore a boat in trouble.

Not only do I very much regret that this incident happened, from the standpoint of the unnecessary inconvenience to my constituent, but this incident is even more regrettable from the standpoint of the embarrassing position in which it placed the Coast Guard.

I sincerely hope that in the future the Attorney General will be more discreet.

At this point I ask unanimous consent that a letter signed by Adm. E. J. Roland, Commandant of the U.S. Coast Guard, confirming these special arrangements, be printed in the RECORD.

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

DECEMBER 14, 1962.

HON. JOHN J. WILLIAMS,
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR WILLIAMS: This is in further reply to your letter of October 22, 1962, concerning the failure of the Coast Guard to assist Mr. ——, of Wilmington, Del., when he requested them to do so.

I have received a full report of this matter from the commander, 5th Coast Guard District. This report discloses that the Attorney General's Office requested the Coast Guard to make arrangements in case of emergency to provide communications with the yacht *Honya*, which would be sailing on Chesapeake Bay during October 13 and 14, 1962, with the Attorney General of the United States on board. Based on this request, the CG-40572 from Tilghman Island Light Attendant Station (rescue) was assigned the mission of surveillance of the *Honya* to provide communications as necessary on October 14.

At about 1445 hours the *Helen R* is reported to have called for Coast Guard assistance on 2182 kilocycles. This signal was not received by the Tilghman Island station. However, it was heard by the Coast Guard auxiliary boat *Black Jack III*, which immediately relayed the call to the Tilghman Island station. The Tilghman Island station was unable to contact the *Helen R* directly, therefore the *Black Jack III* acted as a relay station and forwarded the necessary information to Tilghman Island station. The Tilghman Island station then notified the CG-40572 on 2702 kilocycles that the *Helen R* was anchored off Wade Point with engine trouble. The CG-40572, which was en route to the *Honya*, at this time, proceeded to the *Helen R* to investigate.

At 1455 hours the CG-40572 arrived alongside the *Helen R* which was safely anchored and in no immediate danger. The weather at the time was clear with light airs and a calm sea. The coxswain of the CG-40572, because of his assigned surveillance duties, called the Baltimore group commander and advised him of the circumstances and conditions. The group commander, when advised of the situation, called the Tidewater Fisheries Service and inquired if that organization could provide assistance to the *Helen R*. The group commander was advised that the Tidewater Fisheries patrol boat at St. Michaels, Tilghman Island, could provide the necessary assistance and would get underway immediately.

In view of the fact that the *Helen R* was in no danger and that the Tidewater Fisheries vessel would take her in tow, the CG-40572 was ordered to proceed on its assigned mission. This information was given by radio to the CG-40572 and the coxswain of the boat advised Mr. —— that a Tidewater Fisheries vessel had been called to tow them in. The Tidewater Fisheries patrol boat got underway at approximately 1520 hours and arrived alongside the *Helen R* at about 1600 hours. It towed the *Helen R* into Claiborne Harbor, arriving there at approximately 1630 hours.

From the investigative report, it does not appear that the safety of the *Helen R* was jeopardized by waiting for the Tidewater Fisheries boat. However, it does appear that a clear understanding of the actions of the crew of the CG-40572 and the Coast Guard in calling for assistance for the *Helen R* was not fully made known to Mr. ——.

Sincerely yours,
E. J. ROLAND,
Admiral, U.S. Coast Guard,
Commandant.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware subsequently said: Mr. President, earlier today I called the attention of the Senate to an incident that happened last October in which the Attorney General of the United States had ordered the Coast Guard to follow him around and act as a nursemaid for his yacht during a little sailing cruise in the Chesapeake Bay. Since I made my statement the Attorney General has issued a statement, which I should like to read:

In a statement, Kennedy's office said the Attorney General "took the normal precautions that any boatowner would do and advised the Coast Guard of his proposed course." The statement said Kennedy's "only request of the Coast Guard was 'that they be able to locate him in the event of an emergency.'" It said the Attorney General had no knowledge of any boat in trouble and found it strange that WILLIAMS would put out 5 months later "this distorted version of the incident."

First I answer the Attorney General as to why it took me 5 months to develop the facts. The answer is very simple—I do not have the entire FBI at my disposal where I can order them out in the middle of the night to interview prospective witnesses.

I understand that in his reply the Attorney General also pointed out the fact that the incident occurred in a period in which there was a grave crisis with Cuba. Presumably this was an argument to support his ordering the Coast Guard to stand by.

I wish to keep the record straight for the Attorney General, whose memory apparently slipped. The report which I put in the RECORD was confirmed by the Commandant of the Coast Guard himself, who said that during the week before the Attorney General took his October 13 and 14 cruise, which was on a Saturday and Sunday, his office had been called and asked to stand by for surveillance of the yacht of the Attorney General, which would be cruising in the bay on those dates.

I understand that the Attorney General now claims that one of the reasons he had his office call was that he was inexperienced in sailing. I recognize the danger of sailing when one is inexperienced, but that fact would not give the Attorney General the right to take over the Coast Guard and ask them to trail him around. On that same day the Coast Guard had to bypass a vessel that was in trouble.

As to the Attorney General's reference to a crisis at that time in Cuba, I am glad to know that he has belatedly recognized the crisis, but he certainly must not have known anything about it on this particular occasion because this trip took place on the 13th and 14th of October. He called the Commandant of the Coast Guard and set up the arrangements a day or two before, but based upon the statement of the President of the United States as made to the country on October 22, the President himself did not receive any information about the real problem in Cuba until October 16, which was Tuesday morning. So unless the Attorney General of the United States knew more about the fact that Russia had offensive weapons in Cuba

than did the President of the United States or his Secretary of Defense he certainly cannot use that as any excuse.

On October 22, the President said:

Upon receiving the first preliminary hard information of this nature last Tuesday morning at 9 a.m., I directed that our surveillance be stepped up. And having now confirmed and completed our evaluation of the evidence and our decision on a course of action, this Government feels obliged to report this new crisis to you in full detail.

That is a quotation from the President's speech to the country on October 22. The Tuesday to which he referred was October 16.

Furthermore, Secretary of Defense McNamara, in his press conference on Tuesday, October 23, said:

The first evidence, the first hard evidence was received by me at 10 p.m. a week ago last night and was presented to the President at 9 o'clock Tuesday morning. This was the first hard evidence giving any indication, and that was but partial of the movement of offensive weapons into Cuba.

Here we find the Secretary of Defense saying he knew nothing about the build-up in Cuba with offensive weapons until 10 p.m., Monday evening, which was October 15. The President was advised, based upon both statements, the following Tuesday morning at 9 a.m.

But we now find the Attorney General, who was cruising in the Chesapeake Bay on the Saturday and Sunday before, using this crisis as an excuse for having the Coast Guard stand by. Either the administration was kidding somebody then, or he is kidding them now.

I flatly refuse to accept any such excuse.

I wish to make the record very clear that I still think this was an arrogant usurpation of power by the Attorney General. By what line of reasoning does he think that when he takes a cruise on the Chesapeake Bay he has the authority to order a Coast Guard cutter in service to trail him around just in case he might have trouble when at the same time other boats which may be in trouble would be bypassed.

Mr. President, I should like to read from the letter written by the man who was left drifting around the Bay on that particular day. The letter states:

DEAR SIR: I recently had an experience that I believe will be of interest to all boatowners. Five of us went out fishing in Eastern Bay, a branch of the Chesapeake, on Sunday afternoon, October 14. Due to an oversight, the marina that installed a new engine last spring failed to place a resistor in line with the coil. The overburdened article finally burned out when we were approximately one-half mile offshore from Clalborne Harbor. We tried to signal some passing yachts without success, so I finally called the Coast Guard at Tilghmans Island. To my surprise a boat, *Black Jack III*, answered my call saying I could not get through to the Coast Guard but that they would relay my message. This was very unusual. I had never heard of a situation in which the Coast Guard Station could not be reached by radio using the emergency frequency, unless some disaster had rendered their communications system inoperable. However, even more unusual things were to follow.

We gave our description, location, number of passengers and nature of our trouble to *Black Jack III*, who called back in a few minutes to inform us the Coast Guard boat

would be along shortly. After 20 minutes had elapsed, we sighted the Coast Guard 40 footer across Eastern Bay and signalled to him. When he came along side, the skipper informed us that he could not help us then because he had to watch the "Secretary General" who was taking a sail. He hung around for a few minutes about 50 feet away and we could hear him across the water talking with someone on the radio describing our boat.

Without any further word, he left and followed a sloop of about 30 feet that was taking a leisurely sail back and forth across Eastern Bay. We watched until both boats were completely out of sight beyond Poplar Island.

Two and one-half hours later, a Maryland Tidewater Fisheries boat came by and asked if we were broken down. They very courteously gave us a tow into Clalborne harbor which took between 5 and 10 minutes. There we found a mechanic who quickly installed new coil and we were finally on our way again. The skipper of the fisheries boat informed us that Bobby Kennedy was taking a sail that afternoon in Eastern Bay.

There are some implications in this incident that bother me a great deal. Perhaps my background is partially to blame for my concern. I was born and raised on the North Carolina coast. There the life saving service had its origin and subsequently was expanded into the U.S. Coast Guard. The men in that service were the heroes in our section. They were the ones who willingly risked their lives to give assistance to boats in distress. They never refused, regardless of the conditions. They were always on call.

Now I wonder what has been done to that wonderful organization? Has it become a political football to be used as a private babysitter for political appointees? Of one thing we can be sure. Someone ordered that Coast Guard boat to follow Bobby Kennedy. They did not close down a whole Coast Guard station on their own initiative. Who issued such an order and from where came the authority to do so? What would have happened if a real emergency had occurred and the skipper tried in vain to reach a Coast Guard station that was not monitoring the emergency channel?

As I mentioned previously, I am bothered and I believe a number of the boating fraternity will be also.

Sincerely,

Mr. President, certainly the Attorney General did not know the week before that he was going to break down on the following Sunday. If he did, he should have stayed in the harbor. Furthermore, he cannot say that he was out in the bay at a time when there was fear of a Cuban crisis. If there was he should have been in Washington attending to his business.

In addition, I should like to know how he knew so much about what would happen in Cuba the following week, when the President of the United States and the Secretary of Defense disclaimed any knowledge until the following week as to what was happening.

I still think that what occurred was an arrogant action on the part of the Attorney General. I hope he will be more discreet in the future.

HIGHER INTEREST RATES NO SOLUTION TO BALANCE-OF-PAYMENTS DIFFICULTIES

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, one of the difficulties of the proposed tax cut is bound to be an adverse effect on our international balance of payments,

which is already adverse. That is true because the increase in spending at home is sure to increase imports. At the same time testimony before the Joint Economic Committee by economic experts is that a tax cut would also be likely to increase costs and prices, which would decrease our exports. The administration has proposed that one way to counteract this tendency would be to increase interest rates in order to encourage investment of capital in our country. Such a procedure has many weaknesses and difficulties.

I was very much impressed by the fact that the Wall Street Journal, which has been consistently in favor of high interest rates, published this morning an article by the able and accomplished commentator George Shea on that very issue. Mr. Shea points out that the great difficulties involved in trying to improve our balance-of-payment situation by increasing interest rates. He suggests that such action aimed primarily at short-term interest rates would be sure to increase long-term interest rates and tend to slow down the economy. That position was corroborated by economic experts brought before the committee, some of whom said that if we persisted in the monetary policy suggested by Secretary Dillon and Chairman Martin, the multiplier effect of the tax cut would be sharply reduced, and that whatever stimulating effect a tax cut might have on the economy would be very greatly diminished.

In that connection, I ask unanimous consent that the thoughtful and authoritative article by Mr. George Shea on the front page of the Wall Street Journal be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

APPRaisal OF CURRENT TRENDS IN BUSINESS AND FINANCE

The Kennedy administration seems to be leaning toward higher interest rates on borrowed money as a means of combating the deficit in the Nation's international payments. However, causing or permitting interest rates to rise entails some difficult problems.

The theory is that higher interest rates would help reduce our deficit because they would cause investors, businesses, banks—foreign as well as domestic—to lend their cash here instead of abroad where interest rates now are higher than they are in this country. The sending of such money abroad has been a substantial factor in the size of the deficit in the last few years. Also, the administration has noted that England and more recently Canada have found their international deficits shrinking rapidly when they raised interest rates at home substantially.

However, one problem that faces the money managers if they decide to raise the cost of borrowed money is that they would like to concentrate the boost in rates on short-term funds. It is this kind of money that moves most quickly across international borders in search of the most attractive interest rates. Long-term money likes high interest rates, too, but it is also influenced by other important considerations.

In addition, high rates on, and restricted supplies of, long-term credit are supposed to be bad for general business, whereas the rates on short-term loans are not so important. Businessmen, it is widely believed,

hesitate to commit themselves to pay high interest rates for years ahead to build a new plant or apartment house, or to buy new equipment, but they don't mind so much in the case of a loan that will be repaid in a few months.

The questions are whether it is possible to change rates on one kind of money only and how it can be done. The answers are, first, that it isn't entirely possible, but that short-term rates can be changed much more quickly and widely than long-term rates; and second that the only measure that works at all well is a change in the supply of credit—which sooner or later affects long as well as short rates.

Long rates almost always move with short rates because lenders or borrowers can switch from one to another. If short-term rates soar to 6 percent while long-term rates stay at 4 percent, lenders will stop offering money at long term, tending to cause the rates on long-term money to rise, and will offer their money at short term, tending to cause those rates to fall.

The fact that short-term rates fluctuate more sharply than long-term rates is clear from the record of recent years. The following table gives average rates by years through 1962 and so far this year on U.S. Treasury 3-month bills and U.S. long-term bonds:

	[In percent]	
	Bills	Bonds
1963	2.9	3.9
1962	2.8	4.0
1961	2.4	3.9
1960	2.9	4.0
1959	3.4	4.1
1958	1.8	3.4
1957	3.3	3.5
1956	2.3	3.1
1955	1.8	2.9
1954	1.0	2.7

In that period of more than 9 years the short-term rate has fluctuated between 1 percent and 3.4 percent, or 2.4 points, whereas the rates on long-term bonds have an extreme range only between 2.7 and 4.1 percent, or 1.4 points. Put another way, the differential between the long and short rates has been as wide as 1.7 in 1954 and as narrow as 0.2 in 1957.

The causes of these fluctuations in the differential provide a good answer to how such changes can be engineered. Since late in 1960 the Federal Reserve Board and the U.S. Treasury have been seeking jointly to keep short-term rates strong for the same balance-of-payments reason that now concerns them. They've tried to do it by keeping the supply of Treasury bills available in the market especially large by selling such bills whenever they could. But at the same time the "Fed" has kept the Nation's banks supplied with substantial unspent reserves.

The measure of their success has been that the differential has narrowed from 1.8 late in 1960—when bills paid 2.2 percent and bonds 4 percent—to 1.2 now. In contrast, note what happened in 1954-57 or 1955-57, when there was no particular effort to stiffen short-term rather than long-term rates, but when the supply of unused bank credit was gradually restricted as business boomed. The differential then narrowed from 1.7 in 1954 and 1.1 in 1955 to 0.2 in 1957.

Another means of raising short-term rates, being mentioned aside from restrictions on bank credit, is boosting the Federal Reserve discount rate. That's the interest banks pay when they borrow from the Reserve banks. By itself that probably wouldn't work well either. The discount rate is effective when banks are borrowing heavily in order to make loans, and at such times they want to earn more than the discount rate of any loans or securities they hold. At present the bill of 2.9 percent is below the 3-percent discount

rate, because the banks aren't borrowing much. Just raising the discount rate now would be acting almost in a vacuum.

Thus one problem the Government faces is that the only way it can engineer the boost in short-term rates is to restrict credit generally, and it hesitates to do it at present because of a fear it might hurt business. That's why Secretary of the Treasury Dillon the other day brought forward as a new argument for a tax cut that it would strengthen business enough to stand higher interest rates, which he said were needed to reduce the international deficit.

There is another problem, too. A lot of the short-term funds that have gone abroad in search of higher interest rates have gone to England, as well as to other European nations. The difference is that while the nations of the Continent seem pretty well able to stand a reversal of the flow of funds back to the United States, England is regarded as vulnerable, its balance of payments being precarious like ours. After this newspaper had reported on the new interest-rate plan of the administration last week, the British pound weakened in the foreign exchange market.

GEORGE SHEA.

MILWAUKEE JOURNAL SUPPORTS RESOLUTION FOR MEMORIAL COMMISSION

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I have introduced proposed legislation to support the appeal of Secretary of the Interior Udall for a commission which would consider proposed statuary to commemorate distinguished statesmen. A number of newspapers around the country have supported my proposal. I am happy to see that some newspapers in our own State of Wisconsin are included among those.

One of the recent editorials on that subject appeared in the Milwaukee Journal. The editorial pointed out that among those who have been honored by statuary in the District of Columbia are Charlie Kutz, Joe Darlington, Frank Newlands, Sam Hahnemann, Joe Henry, Andy Downing, Bill Schuetz, Julie Jusserant, Sam Gross, and the original patentees of the District of Columbia.

The fact is that whenever a proposal to honor almost anyone is made by a Senator or Representative in behalf of a friend or a person he supports, it is difficult and embarrassing for a Member of Congress to oppose the proposal. That is why I think the commission suggested by Secretary Udall makes sense, not only from the standpoint of the District of Columbia, but also particularly from the standpoint of the American taxpayer, because it could discourage wasteful expenditure of funds. I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

[From the Milwaukee (Wis.) Journal, Mar. 6, 1963]

CLUTTER OF STATUARY

"Unless we exercise some discrimination in honoring our great departed statesmen, Washington will become a clutter of stony statuary," Senator PROXMIRE, Democrat, of Wisconsin, said in criticizing the continuing practice of his congressional colleagues in approving monuments.

PROXMIRE is backing up Interior Secretary Udall, who wants a curb on new monuments

and a commission to make sure that any that are approved are deserving.

Ever hear of Charlie Kutz, Joe Darlington, Frank Newlands, Sam Hahnemann, Joe Henry, Andy Downing, Bill Schuetz, Julie Jusserant, Sam Gross or "The Original Patentees of the District of Columbia"?

The Interior Department, according to the Washington Post, reports that these individuals are among those honored by some 96 statues or memorials in District of Columbia park land. They stand as evidence that memorials often don't stir memories after a generation or so. And they argue for being extremely selective in deciding upon future memorials to give pigeons a roosting place.

LITHUANIAN INDEPENDENCE

Mr KEATING. Mr. President, on February 17, 1963, there was a mass meeting of Lithuanian Americans in New York City under the auspices of the Lithuanian American Council of New York commemorating the 45th anniversary of restoration of Lithuania's independence.

Mr. President, this dedicated group, all citizens and permanent residents of the United States, are seeking independence and freedom from the tyranny and evil of Soviet colonialism for those who remain in Lithuania. They seek the liberation of those with whom they have ancestral and close family ties.

This was a sad occasion for this group. As free people themselves, they know that the chains of communism cannot bind the hopes of men nor hold back the desire of people, who were once self-governing, again to attain the sacred goal of independence and freedom.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD following my remarks the resolution adopted by the Lithuanian rally of February 17, 1963.

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

We, Lithuanian Americans of Greater New York, citizens and permanent residents of the United States, gathered on February 17 of this year of grace 1963 at Webster Hall in New York City to commemorate the 45th anniversary of the restoration of the Independent Lithuanian State;

Voicing once more our indignation and our protest against the brutal suppression by Soviet Russia of Lithuania's independence and freedom and her subjugation by Soviet colonial rule;

Acclaiming the firmness and determination of the President of the United States during the Cuban confrontation and his unequivocal attitude toward the evil of Soviet colonialism, as expressed in the state of the Union message last January;

Acknowledging with gratitude the stand taken by the U.S. delegation in the United Nations on self-determination for Lithuania and the other captive European countries;

Pointing out that the global surge toward national independence poses a particular challenge to the United States and other Western countries to press for the restoration to Lithuania and to all other captive European nations of a free exercise of their right to self-determination and the respect of human rights and fundamental freedoms;

Resolved:

1. To appeal to the President, the Secretary of State, and the Congress of the United States firmly to restate and vigorously to promote in the United Nations and elsewhere the established U.S. policy of the restoration of the independence and freedom

of Lithuania through free and unfettered elections after the withdrawal of Soviet armed forces and agents, and to reaffirm the determination of the Government of this great country not to be a party to any agreement or treaty which would confirm or prolong the subjugation of Lithuania, now held in bondage by the U.S.S.R.;

2. To ask the President of the United States to designate the third week of July 1963, as Captive Nations Week;

3. To urge that the Radio Free Europe extend in its broadcasts the use of the Lithuanian language;

4. To rededicate ourselves to the just cause of Lithuania's independence and freedom and to combating communism, Soviet imperialism and colonialism;

5. To assure the Lithuanian people under Soviet occupation of the indissolubility of our ties and of our unwavering determination to spare no efforts and sacrifices for the attainment of the sacred goal of the Lithuanian nation—its independence and its freedom;

6. To support actively the policy of the U.S. Government aiming at the establishment in Europe and elsewhere of a just and durable peace based on the inalienable right of the respective peoples to government of their own choice.

J. KIAUNE,
President.
A. SKERYS,
Secretary.

THE 245TH NIKE MISSILE BATTALION

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, in the reorganization of the Army National Guard, one unit that has been designated for elimination in New York State is the 245th Nike Missile Battalion. This unit has a particularly long and fine tradition of service to the Nation, dating all the way back to 1654.

Naturally, changing defense needs call for continued reevaluation and planning but in my judgment, it is most unfortunate when a unit with such a historic background is told it can no longer play its honored role in national defense.

I am asking the Department of Defense for a full report on this matter, but in the meantime I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD following my remarks a brief history of the regiment.

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

THIS IS YOUR REGIMENT

In 1654, a company of "Minute Men" was organized by the Dutch burghers in Breucklen (Brooklyn), to suppress lawlessness and smuggling in their village and nearby communities along Long Island Sound.

To that early body of Dutch "Minute Men", the present 245th Nike Missile Battalion traces its proud lineage, and can well boast as being one of the oldest continually active units in U.S. Military Establishment.

When, in 1776, the 64th Regiment of Foot was organized as a part of the Continental Army, this same Brooklyn unit of "Minute Men" was given the signal honor of becoming the "Right Flank Company" of that regiment and fought as such throughout the Revolutionary War and the War of 1812.

Old family records and authorized histories establish a continuity of service of individuals through this "Right Flank Company" of the 64th Regiment of Foot to the "Old Village Guard" which, later, when the village of Brooklyn became an incorporated township, consolidated with the Nassau Guards to form the "Brooklyn City Guard."

In 1847, the New York State militia was composed wholly of independent companies without any battalion or regimental organization. This heterogeneous composition finally attracted the attention of the State legislature with the result that a new division of 12 distinct regiments was authorized for Brooklyn alone.

One of the leading companies in point of numbers and efficiency, at this period, was the aforementioned "Brooklyn City Guard." Through the efforts of this company, 8 other independent companies joined with them in forming a regiment which was embodied into State service on July 5, 1847, as the first of the 12 newly authorized regiments and designated as the 13th Regiment of Infantry.

To conform to the regulations of this period, the assignment of the companies was as follows:

Right flank company of light artillery, Brooklyn City Guard; Company A, Pearson's Light Guard; Company B, Washington Horse Guard; Company C, Brooklyn Light Guard; Company D, Williamsburg Light Artillery; Company E, Williamsburg Light Artillery; Company F, Oregon Guard; Company G, Washington Guard Rifles; Company H, Jefferson Guards.

The two companies of Williamsburg Light Artillery shortly after withdrew and two other companies were admitted: City Cadets as Company D; Greenwood Rifles as Company E.

In the present organization of the 245th Nike Missile Battalion, Battery A is the direct lineal descendant element of the old right flank company of that original 13th Regiment of Infantry.

The first time this 13th Regiment of Infantry was called for active Federal duty was for Civil War service when it was the first New York militia regiment to volunteer to a man for service and was in the field for three known periods from April 23 to August 6, 1861, May 28 to September 12, 1862, and June 20 to July 20, 1863. It has been confirmed that the records covering the regiment's further periods of service in the Civil War were lost in the unfortunate fire which destroyed the old armory on Hanson Place in Brooklyn.

The regiment's next tour of Federal service was in the Spanish-American War when it was mustered in on May 24, 1898, as part of the 22d New York Volunteers with which it served until it was mustered out on November 23 of the same year.

The regiment remained as the 13th Infantry until 1900, when it was organized as artillery and designated the 13th Heavy Artillery and companies then became batteries. This designation was changed on September 1, 1906, to the 13th Coast Artillery. On June 23, 1908, they were changed to the 13th Artillery District and on August 10, 1914, to the 13th Coast Defense Command. During the disintegration of the regiment at the time of World War I, this number and title were temporarily discontinued, but were revived on the reorganization of the National Guard in 1919.

In World War I, the regiment entered the Federal service on July 23, 1917, and was assigned to Forts Wadsworth, Hamilton, and Tilden, in the New York Harbor defenses. The command was shortly after broken up, the greater part forming the nucleus of the newly organized 59th and 70th Coast Artillery regiments, and officers and men were also assigned to the 38th, 46th, 50th, and 74th Coast Artillery, 119th Field Artillery, Trench Mortar battalions, ammunition trains, motor transport and the 6th Antiaircraft Light Artillery. A great majority of these organizations served with distinction and efficiency in combat action in France, particularly in the St. Mihiel and Meuse-Argonne offensives and the defensive sector of the 1st Army, the Lorraine sector. After the departure of the regiment for World War I action, the

13th Coast Artillery Corps, New York Guard, was formed for emergency State service as infantry and was disbanded when the National Guard was reorganized at the war's end, the return of the war personnel who again resumed normal peacetime service as the 13th Coast Defense Command, which designation continued until January 1, 1924, when the regiment was given the number and title, 245th Coast Artillery.

Under the Presidential proclamation of national emergency in 1940, the 245th Coast Artillery was once again called to Federal service and sent to garrison the artillery fortifications at Fort Hancock, Sandy Hook, N.J. After the Japanese attack on Pearl Harbor in December of 1941, most of the senior noncoms and officers of the regiment were sent to various training camps over the country as cadres to train the rapidly expanding Army that was to eventually carry the United States to victory over the Axis Powers. The remainder of the regiment was brought to full combat strength and served throughout World War II. Members of the 245th saw action in all parts of the globe during the monstrous conflict; in all theaters of the war, from Bataan to Okinawa. Some older veteran officers and noncoms of the regiment became the nucleus for the 13th Regiment of Infantry, New York Guard, formed for State duty in 1941 and deactivated in 1945 with the reorganization of the 245th at the end of World War II.

Once more the "call to arms" was sounded, this time in 1951 when the Communist forces of North Korea attacked South Korea, and a United Nations force was alerted, and the 245th was again called to service until the cessation of hostilities in 1955.

Over the years, the regiment has been called for State service in aid of civil authorities as follows: New York draft riots, 1863, when it was rushed from Gettysburg, immediately following that battle to help quell the bloody riots in New York City; the orange riots of 1871; railroad riots in 1877; Buffalo railroad strike in 1892; Fire Island, 1892; Brooklyn trolley strike, 1895; guard for public property, 1917.

At the present time, the 245th Nike Missile Battalion is serving the Nation at missile bases on Long Island, proud of the fact that from the early company of Dutch "Minute Men" to the present battalion of "Missile Men," this staunch and venerable organization of American fighting men has ever been ready to serve its country's call, and will, in the words of the late Gen. Sydney Grant, one of its beloved commanding officers, always "Carry On."

AFRICAN STUDENTS LEAVE BULGARIA

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, a constituent of mine—a young man from Rochester—has written to me about a commendable project which has been undertaken by the students at Brown University. Recently, 12 students from Ghana and 6 from Ethiopia fled from Communist Bulgaria, where they were attending a university as exchange students. They charged racial bias on the part of the Communists and asserted that they had encountered forced political indoctrination, police brutality, arrest and constant insults behind the Iron Curtain.

Upon reading of this incident, students at Brown decided that the situation presented them with a golden opportunity to demonstrate America's good will and interest in the education of African students. A petition was circulated requesting the administration of the university to offer a scholarship to one of

these African boys. Within hours, 200 Brown and Pembroke undergraduates signed the petition and over the weekend, the university administration acceded to their request. The university has pledged to match any funds which are raised by the students themselves, and to offer admission to one of the Africans who is qualified. The students, have raised a substantial share and hope that the full amount will be raised in time for the exchange student to come to this country in September.

I call this incident to the attention of the Members of the Senate, because I feel it is a fine example both of American initiative and the good will of our youth toward the many visiting students we welcome to our shores each year. It is exactly this kind of spirit which gives me assurance that the recipient of this scholarship will be far happier in the United States than he was in Communist Bulgaria.

GIRL SCOUTS OF AMERICA

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, it is an honor and a privilege for me today to pay tribute to the Girl Scouts of America during this the week of their 51st birthday.

We all welcome the sight every spring of those familiar figures in brown and green in groups of two's and three's, laden with boxes of cookies, beginning their annual sale. The event serves to underline the fact that the organization which developed out of the Girl Guides of England is another year older.

It was on March 12, 1912, in Savannah, Ga., that Juliette Gordon Low founded the first troop of Girl Scouts in this country with 12 members. Since that time the Girl Scouts have captured the imagination of millions and become an American institution.

In those early days of the Scouting movement, the Girl Scouts waived tradition and moved into the realm of outdoor activities such as camping and active sports previously reserved for their male counterparts. One of their prime aims has always been to develop the whole worth and dignity of the individual, not merely one segment of it.

Today the Scouting program for girls from 8-18, Brownies to Senior Scouts, is carried on in 51 nations of the world. Its interesting and worthwhile projects, its ideal of service to community and country have directly affected the lives of over 18 million girls in the United States alone, and have had an indirect influence on countless others.

I feel that I should say something, too, about the indebtedness of the organization to the millions of men and women who have volunteered their time and energies as leaders and administrators to help make the Scouting program a success.

The Scouting program has helped to guide girls into the path of maturity by offering them a solid basis upon which to build for the future. The Girl Scout laws set forth an ethical code by which to live and develop into responsible citizens of a free democracy, willing to assume the task of making our country a better place in which to live.

To quote the Girl Scout Council of the Nation's Capital:

Girl Scouting is more than fun. It opens windows to knowledge, doors to skills, and provides opportunities for friendship and service across the Nation and around the world. Girl Scouting is learning by doing and living by the best ideals of democracy.

ONE HUNDREDTH ANNIVERSARY OF THE RHODE ISLAND HOSPITAL

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, perhaps never in our national history has medical care been of such universal concern as in this year of 1963. Fortunate are those areas where the people enjoy abundant hospital facilities and a dedicated medical profession.

Such an area is my State of Rhode Island and particularly its capital city of Providence.

This year—this very week—is the centennial of one of the great centers of medical concern and service to both the city and the State.

The Rhode Island Hospital is celebrating its 100th anniversary.

One hundred years ago this week the General Assembly of Rhode Island passed the act to incorporate the hospital and on March 13, 1863, the then Governor of Rhode Island put his signature to the document.

As the Rhode Island history of that month of March 1863 is intertwined with the history of this Senate, it seems appropriate to present the record here in a single paragraph.

There had been a quick change of command in Rhode Island. The man who was Governor on March 13, 1863, had been merely a State senator 2 weeks earlier. He had succeeded to the presidency of the State senate and then to the Governorship only because both the Governor and Lieutenant Governor of Rhode Island in March 1863 were in this U.S. Senate recently removed to this Chamber. On March 4, 1863, Gov. William Sprague succeeded Lt. Gov. Samuel Greene Arnold who had been U.S. Senator from December 1, 1862. Samuel Greene Arnold was the granduncle of our beloved former colleague, Theodore Francis Green, who was born only 4 years after Rhode Island Hospital was founded.

March 1863 was indeed an historic period. In the words of a speaker at the dedication of Rhode Island Hospital—the Civil War was at the height of its grim and desolating fury. It was a time when, if ever, men are inspired with generous sentiments and are ready to acknowledge the high humanities and duties that bind them to each other and to their race.

But an institution for the healing of the sick and the care of the injured must be an expression of something more than Christian benevolence alone. It must also be the embodiment of every device and arrangement which science has discovered or art has contrived for the alleviation of suffering and the restoration of health. Philanthropy prompts the enterprise but it is science that presides over its accomplishment and fits it for its high ends. Civilization must lavish upon it its choicest treasures both of humanity and knowledge, in making it all that it ought to be.

For all this century Rhode Island Hospital has taken the spirit of that oration

as an obligation. Out of the generosity of individuals and with the cooperation of the official community there has been built upon the gift of land and buildings—extended land and expanding buildings—one of the largest voluntary hospitals in all our land.

It has assumed what might have been immediate burdens of city and State and in an annual cost of \$10 million has given more than a million dollars in free services to the community.

Last year 20,000 of its neighbors were admitted for bed care and over 40,000 more received emergency treatment. Seven hundred thousand bed patients have known Rhode Island Hospital's care.

Its medical and surgical staff have made important contributions to the advancement of medical science—it has been a center of teaching and research; and Brown University has honored its staff in the projection of their new medical studies. In every respect the hospital has the potential for meeting the needs of a modern progressive medical school.

The original incorporators were all physicians but its practical encouragement came from all segments of our people and that close affinity has prevailed through this century of substantial cooperation.

We of Rhode Island are proud that the hospital bears the name of our State, but is as independent as the independent man who stands atop our state house. Our Governor and our general assembly by proclamation renew this week their enthusiasm of March 1863.

Every man, woman, and child, of every race and faith, salutes Rhode Island Hospital for its century of superlative service.

TRIBUTE TO A DEPARTED MOTHER

Mrs. SMITH. Mr. President, the loss of a loved one is an experience that everyone of us must have. While it is a loss and grief that our friends share with us, no one can ever really know the true meaning of the loss to the individual.

We cannot capture the inner emotions of the individual and we keenly feel our own inadequacy to express our sympathy.

That distinguished writer and commentator, Tris Coffin, has written a tribute to the mother of a mutual friend of ours. It is a moving tribute that comes the nearest to capturing the inner emotions of one's sorrow that I have ever read or heard.

Because I think it has a very deep and meaningful message for most everyone, I ask unanimous consent that it be placed in the body of the RECORD.

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

TRIBUTE BY TRIS COFFIN

I have a friend who drives 15 miles to work every morning and then the same 15 miles home again. In the morning, the drive isn't bad, for this is a new day. He sees the frost glistening on the ground if it is winter, or if the time is spring he has been walking in the dew, or if summer picking wild strawberries. This gives a tang to the day, and he leaves the country in good spirits. This

pulls him through even the terrible traffic snarl at the point where all the suburban roads dump into one overcrowded city street, to the tune of impatient horns.

The evening is different. My friend works hard and in a very competitive society, the Congress. He is conscientious to an extreme, has a great generalship for plotting and conducting the sieges and counter sieges. And what is also rare, he is intelligent and daring. This means that by the end of the day, 6 o'clock or even as late as 9, much of his emotional energy has been spent, he is weary beyond account, and still intent on the wars of the day.

An associate who rides with him tells me my friend, Bill, may drive all through the horrible rush-hour traffic of the city saying nothing but an occasional terse, ironic phrase, and grim faced.

There is a point, an exact point, when he changes, throws off the mask of the office. This is when the city is left behind—its noise, its confusion, its overbright signs, its deceptions, and he can see open spaces. Perhaps they are overgrown with weeds and the owner is waiting to sell for a good price, but it is country.

My friend Bill begins to relax. His fingers on the wheel loosen. The hard lines of his face fall away and he smiles.

His mind has sped ahead to the moment when the car will pull in the driveway of the house with the white fence around it, and he will get out, and look up at the window. A face will smile at him, perhaps waving a hand or nodding, depending on how she feels this night. This face is beautiful, it seems to me, and indeed it is, for it shows always, steadfastly a joy in life. No matter what has happened, her face is proud of living.

She is my friend's mother, and she has been an invalid for a number of years, sitting in the chair at the window, watching the bluebirds, the squirrels scampering across the snow, the wind tossing the upper branches of the trees, the pattern of the clouds, the gathering gray of dusk. She had been an active, talented woman, a lawyer and a beauty. Sickness altered her life, as much as if she had been picked up by a storm and sent spinning off to Timbuktu. More, because she had to accept quietness, reflection, the knowledge that death may fall with the next shadow.

To hear him tell of her, with great admiration, the new life has not shrunken but enlarged, nobled, and given an almost cosmic dimension. She discovered joys lost to most of us, joys dearer than all those we pursue so madly. My friend was able to share some of these joys with her, and this is why when the city was gone and only the stretch of country left, he smiled in secret enjoyment.

He might wonder what it was she had seen today to make her life more exciting, sitting there by the window. Would it be that the bluejays came again, big and brilliant and comic, or a rabbit crossing the yard had paused to look up at her and stare, his nose twitching? He looked forward eagerly to hearing from her. The end of the day always had this promise for him.

But no joy is ever eternal. Bill and his mother understood this, she better than he. This is what he tries to remember now when, driving in the evening, he leaves the rumble of the city. He knows that when he enters the driveway and looks at the window, there will be no smile for him. She has left him, as she knew she would. Still she is there in all the things she loved outside her window.

This is the essence, perhaps, of death and transfiguration. No one ever dies completely, but remains in the rose tumbling over the arbor, the evening star, the first call of the song sparrow.

EXPANSION OF JUNIOR ROTC

Mr. TALMADGE. Mr. President, many Americans have been shocked by

the proposal of the Secretary of Defense to cut back or eliminate the junior ROTC program. In my judgment, this is one of the finest youth programs in our country. Under the program, young men are taught discipline and love of country. I believe the program has instilled in our youth a desire to participate in the national defense program.

I have seen many young men who were in the junior ROTC programs go on to college, further their ROTC education, become some of the finest officers in the military organization of our country, and serve for long periods of time in the defense of the Nation. Probably the desire to perform this service was inculcated during their participation in the junior ROTC program.

It is strange indeed that we would be considering programs for a domestic Peace Corps and for a youth program and at the same time the Secretary of Defense would be discussing eliminating or abolishing the ROTC program, which I believe costs the magnificent sum of approximately \$5,500,000. I am informed through articles in the press that the Secretary of Defense is considering or is reappraising this program. I hope he will reach the conclusion that the program not be abolished.

Mr. President, the General Assembly of Georgia has adopted a resolution on this subject. I ask unanimous consent that it be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

SENATE RESOLUTION 68

Resolution opposing the proposed cutback and urging the expansion of junior ROTC; and for other purposes

(By Senator Hunt of the 26th)

Whereas the Defense Department has recommended a proposal to eliminate the Reserve officer training program in our high schools and to streamline the college ROTC program; and

Whereas military service is still compulsory in the United States; and

Whereas money now being spent on compulsory training could be diverted into an expanded junior ROTC program to sustain summer training; and

Whereas the money would be reasonable pay to the young men involved which could eliminate financial hardships; and

Whereas summer military training would reduce the summer influx on the labor market and reduce juvenile delinquency; and

Whereas in many cases the present system is harmful to many of our young men because they postpone making decisions on their future education, training, or professions because of their service obligation; and

Whereas under a new and expanded program the military could select volunteer military personnel who excel in ROTC; and

Whereas through a system of promotions and further inducements the military would produce high-type personnel who were trained during the years when they learned best and excelled most; and

Whereas the rigors of an intensive and thorough military training program would give our young men an outlet for their energies which would be used to a productive and healthful advantage; and

Whereas under this program training would be continuous until completed rather than interrupted as at present (or no training at all) until the youth enlists or is drafted under the current compulsory military training program; and

Whereas the best soldiers are generally between the ages of 18 and 25 when given the proper training and leadership; and

Whereas if we discontinue high school ROTC this will mean raising our average training age several years which will be a decided deterioration of our military potential: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the General Assembly of Georgia, That we go on record as opposing any cutback in the present junior ROTC program and further go on record as recommending a proper and adequate expansion of junior ROTC; and be it further

Resolved, That the secretary of the senate is hereby instructed to transmit a suitable copy of this resolution to each Member of the Georgia delegation of the U.S. Senate and U.S. House of Representatives.

Approved in senate March 5, 1963.

Approved in house March 6, 1963.

IN GOD IS OUR TRUST

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. President, I would like to call to the attention of the Senate a speech prepared by Mr. Ed Webster, a senior at Cody High School, Cody, Wyo. Eddie is an outstanding young American who is presently the president of the Cody High School student body and an active member of his church. He is truly a student of Americanism as indicated by his keen insight into the things that have made this country the envy of the world. He has prepared a speech entitled "In God Is Our Trust," which points out the anguish suffered by the God-loving people of America when the Supreme Court recently ruled that the 22-word nondenominational New York school prayer was unconstitutional.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of this speech be made a part of the RECORD.

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

IN GOD IS OUR TRUST

We are citizens of the greatest Nation in the world today. A nation which offers untold opportunities for man to better himself. A nation who proclaims to the world: "Give me your tired, your poor,

Your huddled masses yearning to breathe free

The wretched refuse of your teeming shore; Send these, the homeless, and tempest-tost to me,

I lift my lamp beside the Golden door."

This Nation was founded by the people seeking an opportunity to worship God, how, when, and where they would. This factor was so important to these founders of yesteryear that they inscribed into almost every national document an assurance that this loyalty to, and fraternization of God, would continue as long as these United States should endure.

The worship of God as one deems fit, and the guarantee that all others have the same right is insured in our Bill of Rights; on every coinage of this country is the statement, "In God we trust"; the Declaration of Independence is believed by many to have been inspired of God; in the national anthem is reference to our trust in God.

Belief and worship of God has been a factor of strength and hope throughout our Nation's history. This belief was so strong as to induce thousands to leave their homes and come to this promised land when it was hard, cruel, treacherous, and unknown. The army of George Washington, as it fought for our independence, is reported to have

had a minister in the lines; and throughout the years the soldiers of the United States have had a chaplain with them to give them spiritual guidance and comfort.

From the very beginning of the First Continental Congress, a prayer has been said at the beginning of every day's session of the Supreme Court, and of Congress. As late as 1954, the line "under God" was inserted into the Pledge of Allegiance to the U.S. Flag, again proving the devotion of the American people to Almighty God.

It might be well to remember that when Adolf Hitler came to power in Germany, his first move toward world conquest was the expulsion of religion from the schools. Slowly and methodically he succeeded in doing away with religion in the schools, the government, and lives of the German people. It would seem that this example, and others of godless nations who rose to great power and then toppled, would serve as sufficient warning to the wise; however, today we find ourselves facing an alarming situation: Dateline 1962: The Supreme Court of the United States ruled it unconstitutional for a 22-word prayer to be said at the beginning of every schoolday in New York schools. This prayer read:

"Almighty God, we acknowledge our dependence upon Thee, and we beg Thy blessings upon us, our parents, our teachers and our country."

This prayer was repeated at the beginning of each schoolday along with the Pledge of Allegiance to the Flag. Those who did not wish to participate, could remain silent or be excused from the room; or even come late to miss the prayer. There was no possible way that anybody could take offense at a prayer which was set up in this way; yet, because one family took a dislike to this prayer, it was ruled unconstitutional.

Justice Stewart, who gave the one vote for the constitutionality of the prayer, remarked: "Is the Court suggesting that the Constitution permits judges and Congressmen and Presidents to join in prayer, but prohibits schoolchildren from doing so?"

Nearly half the States require or authorize either prayers or Bible reading in their schools, however, steps are now being taken by the American Civil Liberties Union, who sponsored the New York case, to bring these cases into question, along with the legality of a Christmas program in the schools, recitation of the Lord's Prayer, and baccalaureate services.

Presently there is question being raised as to the constitutionality of saying a prayer at the beginning of each day of Congress, action is also being taken against the last verse of the national anthem which states: "And this be our motto; in God is our trust."

But this is not the end, if these measures are allowed to be ruled unconstitutional, there will be an ever-ending flow of cases concerning the coinage, Pledge of Allegiance to the Flag, and every Bible reading, or religious holiday observances in the 35,000 schools which now participate in such practices.

Now, I ask you, Will this great Nation, founded under a strong faith in God, now deny that same faith—that same God? Will this great Nation, who has prospered above all other nations, forsake the very creed on which its prosperity has flourished? A strong and unwavering faith in the Almighty has grown to be one of the predominating factors in America's greatness. What were our forefathers looking for when they stepped ashore on the desolate, windswept shores of America of yesteryear? A place where they could worship their God in peace, without censor or magistrates. Freedom of worship—foremost among all the freedoms we hold so dear.

Tyrants and dictators throughout the ages have denied the existence of the Almighty—

have tried to replace His hallowed presence with the false image of greatness they have built around themselves. Allegiance to a cause, rather than to God, and they have failed miserably.

Will our beloved America follow in the footsteps of these godless tyrants?

The voices of millions of Americans, raised in unison, thunder a defiant "No." And as silently, these millions bow their heads together, and in the faith that makes them great whisper in humility, "In God we trust."

JOINT RESOLUTION OF WYOMING LEGISLATURE

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. President, I bring to the attention of the Senate a joint memorial adopted by the State Legislature of Wyoming memorializing the Congress of the United States of America with reference to limiting and reducing the threat of communism in the Western Hemisphere.

Mr. President, I request that the memorial be made a part of the RECORD.

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

ENROLLED JOINT MEMORIAL 19

Joint memorial memorializing the Congress of the United States of America with reference to limiting and reducing the threat of communism in the Western Hemisphere. Whereas the people of the Western Hemisphere have for over 100 years had the privilege of determining, without outside intervention, their own form of government; and

Whereas the United States of America has supported their privilege through enforcement of the principles of the Monroe Doctrine; and

Whereas there now exists within this hemisphere a militant and aggressive arm of international communism, that has formed its roots in Cuba; and

Whereas the existence of the Communist government of Cuba is dependent upon support from outside this hemisphere; and

Whereas the avowed purpose of the Communist government of Cuba is to export its revolution throughout the Americas, with the aid of governments beyond our hemisphere; and

Whereas this situation is not conducive to the continued peace, harmony, and progress among nations of free peoples in this hemisphere: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, by the house of the 37th Legislature of the State of Wyoming (the senate of such legislature concurring), That the President and Congress of the United States of America be and they are hereby memorialized to consider the welfare and interest of the people of Wyoming, the United States of America, and our sister republics throughout the Western Hemisphere who favor a strong and vigorous action through every available means to limit and reduce the Communist threat to our safety and well-being; and be it further

Resolved, That certified copies hereof be promptly transmitted to the President and Vice President of the United States, Speaker of the U.S. House of Representatives, Senator GALE W. McGEE, Senator MILWARD L. SIMPSON, and Representative in Congress, WILLIAM HENRY HARRISON.

Approved February 13, 1963.

CLIFFORD P. HANSEN,
Governor.

CHARLES G. IRWIN,
President of the Senate.

MARLIN T. KURTZ,
Speaker of the House.

NATIONAL SECURITY STAFFING AND OPERATIONS—STATEMENT BY GEN. LAURIS NORSTAD

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, Gen. Lauris Norstad made a brilliant and able statement before the Subcommittee on National Security Staffing and Operations this morning. I ask unanimous consent that his statement be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

STATEMENT BY GEN. LAURIS NORSTAD, FORMER SUPREME ALLIED COMMANDER, EUROPE; MEMBER, BOARD OF DIRECTORS, OWENS-CORNING FIBERGLAS CORP., AND PRESIDENT, INTERNATIONAL DIVISION; CHAIRMAN, ATLANTIC COUNCIL, BEFORE SENATE SUBCOMMITTEE ON NATIONAL SECURITY STAFFING AND OPERATIONS, SENATOR HENRY M. JACKSON, CHAIRMAN, MONDAY, MARCH 11, 1963

I am honored to appear as the opening witness in your study of national security staffing and operations.

Until now my experience has been entirely in the armed services, and what I have to say this morning will be based on that experience. I have had the good fortune to participate in some interesting enterprises. When I was in the War Department shortly after the last war, I worked with one of the most distinguished military leaders of our time, the late Adm. Forrest Sherman, on a number of studies which helped to clear away some of the final obstacles to the reorganization of the Nation's Military Establishment in 1947. These studies included worldwide military command arrangements, roles and missions of the three services and finally the details of the agreement between the War and Navy Departments which was the basis or starting point of the Unification Act itself.

But an unusually large part of my experience has been overseas—with American and Allied commands. Since I first put on a uniform 37 years ago, more than half of my service has been abroad—which may be a record of some sort—and perhaps living and working far from our shores has given me a certain kind of perspective as it has many others who have shared this experience—a perspective which is not necessarily better but one which comes from a slightly different angle.

An outstanding characteristic of the years since the Second World War has been the steadiness of purpose and action of the United States in building strength in the free world. The Soviets have pursued their ambitions with determination. But they have encountered a will at least as firm as their own. The confrontation we call the cold war has, right from the start, involved a test of wills. On the outcome of this test depends in good degree the future of the freedom we hold dear.

For many years we were preoccupied with the weakness of Western Europe. For years to come we will be adjusting to the fact of its strength. In great part, the problems ahead—and there are and will be great problems—arise from the success of our policies. But I would far rather live with such problems than to be wrestling with the difficulties that would have grown out of continued European weakness.

Sometimes people talk as though success were a state of affairs in which there were no problems. But as I see it a successful country, like a successful man, will never see the day that does not bring a fresh quota of problems, and the mark of success is to deal with them effectively.

We learned some important lessons from World War II, and we have shown a capacity to go on learning. That is the important thing. I have no qualms about the future so

long as we can examine the past coolly in order to improve our performance in the future.

Along with other democracies, we learned at great cost in the thirties that a foreign policy is no more impressive than the force that exists to back it up. It took us a long time to learn this elementary principle of international affairs. Back in 1911 Admiral Mahan said to a congressional committee:

It appears to me that the three functions of Government—the diplomatic, the Army, and the Navy—work now in what you might call watertight compartments. * * * It seems there is very little appreciation in the country of the relation between diplomacy and Army and Navy. * * * Our military and naval policy depends substantially upon what we conceive our relation to be with foreign countries, a forecast of the future, and what the probabilities of the future are. * * * I think what is very much needed in this country is to bring the three functions into necessary relation with one another.

In 1947, when Congress passed the National Security Act, creating the Department of Defense and the National Security Council, we took a substantial step in the direction indicated by Admiral Mahan in 1911.

The President has always had full authority over the armed services, and still does. No President, however, can give the management of military affairs the time the job requires. He needs a deputy who can. If we did not have a Secretary of Defense with authority, a President could, in times like the present, spend all of his energy dealing with military issues—and still not get the job done.

It is sometimes said, I know, that the 1947 act did not unify the armed services but instead further divided them. The charge does not stand up. The National Security Act with its amendments has created a strong Department of Defense and has given strength and authority to the Office of the Secretary of Defense. We can, we should, we do criticize when criticism is warranted but it seems to me that the structure of the Military Establishment permits us to have strong military services, balanced internally and in relation to one another, and all under the supervision, direction, and control provided for by law. If we sometimes have difficulties, what would be the situation, today, with all its complexities, if we had not taken the road to unification in 1947? It is hard to imagine, frightening to contemplate.

I have served in unified commands—and although I know that you of this committee appreciate the significance of this development, I do not believe that there is a full understanding in the country of the degree to which the services are now organized and operated according to the tasks to be performed and not according to the color of a man's uniform. Unified commands were, of course, established in World War II but the progress in this field, in the last 10 or 15 years, although it has been so quiet that many people have not noticed it, has in fact been quite dramatic.

The creation of the Department of Defense, the 1947 Reorganization Act and all that has flowed from it, have not only improved our military posture but have made it far easier to relate defense to national policy as a whole.

The creation of the National Security Council was another part of our national effort to learn and apply the lessons of the Second World War. Congress charged the Council with the task of advising the President "with respect to the integration of domestic, foreign, and military policies relating to the national security so as to enable the military services and the other departments and agencies of the Government to cooperate more effectively in matters involving the national security."

It is obvious that we have not always achieved a successful integration of domestic, foreign, and military policies. And I think

this committee is doing a most interesting and important work in studying our policy processes with a view to improving them. There is most certainly room for improvement, and some will consider this a notable understatement. But we should also keep in mind that the National Security Act of 1947 has served us well. On the whole our Military Establishment has effectively served our foreign policies and has meshed effectively with allied forces. The contrast with earlier periods—the approach to World War II for instance—is striking.

But you are interested in possible improvements. And here I would like to draw mainly on my NATO experience. Looking at the policy process in Washington from overseas, I have drawn a few conclusions that may be of interest to the committee in its work.

1. In thinking about problems of administration, too much attention tends to be paid to system and perhaps to little to men and their relationships. System is obviously important. But policy is not the product of a system. It is the product of responsible men who are in touch with one another.

A crisis highlights this fact, for it engages the attention of the highest authority and by stripping away the nonessential from the essential relationships, it identifies the men who are in fact his advisers and helpers, whatever the organization charts may say. Authority attracts authority. Responsible men attract responsible men around them. I have never known it to fail that when the going gets rough, responsible authorities are drawn to each other.

This is just as true and as necessary in allied relationships as in national. When one has command responsibilities, he feels a need to be in personal touch with key allied leaders. In a crisis, authority comes to have a very personal meaning, and one must go to the sources of authority before taking action. Things have to be done that way. A commander has got to know, of course, where the top political authorities stand, but more than this he must have a "feel" for their attitudes, a sense of their moods. A direct contact, therefore, is most useful.

At a time like the Cuban crisis last October the President, it seems to me, acts virtually as a commander, personally assuming direction of detailed operations on which depend peace and war. He is in frequent and intimate touch with his assistants in Washington and the field. And decisions are made as they go along.

Involving the highest authority in this degree of detail is, I suppose, a new departure. Certainly the President's title as "Commander in Chief" evokes a picture of larger and grander units than those with which he sometimes has to concern himself at the early stage of a serious development. We in the military service may sometimes feel that this is "getting into our business." But in my judgment the power and the speed we deal with today makes it necessary. At time of crisis, when the issue is peace or war, there is no substitute for direct, person-to-person relationships between the highest political and military authorities, and this inevitably involves the Commander in Chief, the President, in considerable detail.

A key factor is the quality of the relationships between the men who carry responsibility. No one can write directives fast enough to meet a crisis situation, like a Berlin or a Cuba. The man in the field may have to make decisions—and it is essential that he be in direct contact with the political authorities. In terms of my own experience, the NATO machinery works but it can and should be improved in this respect. I have tried to suggest some ways in which this could be done. But the machinery is less important than the personal relationships that have been built up over the past 14 years among leaders in the allied countries.

I speak emphatically—and freely—on this subject because my own experience in this respect has been a most satisfactory one. My own work as Supreme Allied Commander Europe was made possible by the understanding and support of the leaders of the 14 countries with whom we are allied in NATO, and, when necessary, by direct contact with the President of the United States in the two administrations under which I have served.

2. The second point I wish to raise is really a question of definition. To say that any issue or policy—economic, military, cultural, or whatever—which bears directly on our relations with other countries is essentially political, will startle no one who has thought about the subject. Our military forces, for instance, serve political ends. The limits or constraints within which we act are political in nature—as recent events in Europe eloquently demonstrate. The most powerful military force is helpless without the will to use it and the political ability to control and direct it.

One of our real problems in formulating policy at any level is that too many people become involved in it, with too many preconceived ideas, producing too many little policies.

Policy—and here I speak of what we might call grand policy—must be established at the top. That is the only way clarity as to our objectives can be achieved—and without such clarity day-to-day decisions on this or that particular issue will lack focus and coherence. Moreover, the higher policy is made the less likely it is to be a pale concoction of warmed-over ideas. One of the things I have learned over the years is that the higher one's responsibilities, the less one can afford the luxury of preconceived ideas.

Grand policy, or national policy, can be coordinated in a committee, a board, or a council but it cannot be developed there. Someone has to think through the problems and propose what our policy should be—for consideration and decision at the highest level. In the foreign field, for example, Defense and other agencies make contributions, and proposals can and should be examined and debated in groups or committees. But the particular responsibility belongs to the Secretary of State and his associates. If this conclusion, because it is so obvious, falls short of being a notable one, perhaps we should ask ourselves whether our practice faithfully reflects it.

One sentence in the committee's staff report struck home with great force. It is that "the nature of concrete policy issues and the character of governmental action processes push for a pragmatic one-thing-at-a-time-on-its-own-terms approach" to policymaking. And of course this is true. When a specific issue arises, we so often shop around for a solution to the problem in its own terms rather than in terms of our larger purposes.

Good staff work is supposed to insure the careful and broad look at a problem—and we should gratefully take advantage of whatever help it can provide. Clarity at the top is probably a precondition to good staff work, for if your staff does not know what you are trying to accomplish, how can the staff advise you about the consequences of this or that particular decision?

But given a clear understanding of objectives, then a staff of knowledgeable persons, tuned to the political realities, who have developed over the years the ability to sense the full implications of a situation, can be extremely helpful.

3. Another conclusion I have reached is that we Americans talk too much, especially when we are abroad. Paris was a good place to observe this phenomenon, for almost everyone came to Paris, sooner or later, and almost everyone had something to say.

It seemed to me that we sometimes spoke with too many voices. On a number of occasions important European officials asked me how seriously to take what appeared to be a statement of a new American position on a subject of interest to NATO, made by someone just off the plane from Washington. I could always say quite honestly that the American position remained as it had been stated to NATO bodies by the appropriate American representatives. Nevertheless, such episodes can lead to serious misunderstandings.

I think we should strictly follow the established procedures for making known the American position on policy questions.

In my experience, our officials who travel about the world saying that American policy is this or that rarely say it in exactly the same way. It comes out differently each time, and this is quite understandable.

It is a rather pleasant American habit, in some ways, to do our thinking out loud, but it is not a way to conduct affairs with other governments.

My own rule at SHAPE was to report facts but not to try to make news. In the first place, SHAPE was not supposed to be a policymaking organization, and I did not want it to be thought of as an important source of news. My public relations officers sometimes got a little impatient with me about this, but I am sure that had we talked more, it would have made it more difficult for us to do the jobs we were sent there to do.

We were able to speak with great frankness to allied governments, and when necessary to express sharp disappointment at their policies. We could do this because they knew the discussions were confidential and would not be spread all over the morning papers or even reported to other official agencies which had no need or right to such information. I think that we often accomplished a good deal because they were grateful that delicate matters were not aired too freely.

4. A closely related point is that reappraisals of our policies should be made as quietly as possible. Of course, we must review our policies from time to time. A new administration, for instance, certainly has an obligation to do so. I have always thought that it is useful to throw the policy papers away every so often, and reexamine things from the ground up. Unless one does this, the tendency is to work on producing a better mousetrap instead of asking whether a mousetrap is the best way to catch the mouse.

But it should be done privately. For as soon as one begins an analysis, reappraisal, or reassessment, one attacks, or at least brings into question, the validity of one's plans, policies, or strategy. And, furthermore, it may be that once the basic concepts are opened up for reassessment, one will find that some people want to go in one direction and others in exactly the opposite direction. This is especially true in dealings with allies. Some may want to reduce their commitments at the very time we think that their commitments ought to be increased. In that case reappraisals may become agonizing indeed.

I am afraid that we tend to involve too many people in such reassessments. There are too many Indians writing too many papers. The fewer the people, the better their product is likely to be. I once created a planning staff at SHAPE and assigned five colonels to it. It was a planning group that was all chiefs and no Indians. The idea was to get fewer papers but a better product. Believe me, it worked.

5. The last point I want to raise is that we should make a deliberate effort to develop our most promising talent.

A good man is still hard to find. When we find one with judgment and courage,

with intellect and intuitiveness, we should do everything we can to bring him along fast, to put him in situations where he can develop—especially situations where he is called upon to carry responsibilities at least as heavy as he can carry, even a little heavier.

I remember that back in the thirties a lieutenant I knew received a promotion to captain. He had been a lieutenant for almost 20 years. I congratulated him, but did not get a warm response and asked him why he wasn't happier about his promotion. He said: "Norstad, don't you know that a man who has been a lieutenant for 20 years will always be a lieutenant?"

When we find a good man, therefore, we ought to push him ahead rapidly, even if this means some preferential treatment. For men grow when they have to make decisions and carry responsibility.

I might also add that we should make every effort to build up and give support to our officials, civilian and military, who serve in allied groups. I am not talking about press-agent techniques, but about the marks of confidence and support that say much more about personal trust and reliance.

We want our officials in allied groups to have influence and to be effective advocates of our interests. There is no better way to help them than to show that they have influence in our own counsels and have the respect and confidence of the men for whom they work.

Finally, the tasks of national security, I believe, may well be more complex and demanding today than ever before. Foreseeing as early as 1946 our basic dilemma, Henry Stimson said these wise words:

"The sinfulness and weakness of man are evident to anyone who lives in the active world. But men are also good and great, kind and wise. Honor begets honor; trust begets trust; faith begets faith; and hope is the mainspring of life. I have lived with the reality of war, and I have praised soldiers; but the hope of honorable, faithful peace is a greater thing, and I have lived with that, too. That a man must live with both together is inherent in the nature of our present stormy stage of human progress, but it has also many times been the nature of progress in the past, and it is not reason for despair."

The choices before us are profoundly difficult and they lie within firmly fixed limits: we must devise the means that will discourage and prevent war with its terrible destructiveness, but we cannot weaken the guarantees of freedom, we cannot forfeit the means of defending the future of our Nation and of the individual liberty without which we could not live.

THE TASK OF IMPROVEMENT OF U.S. BALANCE OF PAYMENTS

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, on Thursday, March 7, Secretary of the Treasury Dillon addressed the 10th Annual Monetary Conference of the American Bankers Association on the subject "Our Unfinished Task of Improving the U.S. Balance of Payments."

This address is a very fine exposition of the relationship between the President's tax program and the balance-of-payments problem, and I commend it to the attention of the Senate especially in this respect.

I ask unanimous consent that the address and an editorial commenting on it, published in the Washington Post of March 11, 1963, be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

**OUR UNFINISHED TASK OF IMPROVING THE U.S.
BALANCE OF PAYMENTS**

(Remarks by the Honorable Douglas Dillon, Secretary of the Treasury, at the 10th Annual Monetary Conference of the American Bankers Association, Princeton, N.J., Thursday, March 7, 1963)

A year ago, in Rome, I reviewed with you our balance-of-payments problem and the measures we were taking to deal with it. Today, I would like to appraise the record of the past 12 months in the perspective of the hard tasks still before us, and discuss the contributions which can be made to equilibrium in our international accounts by the President's tax proposals.

While last year's progress toward our goal of overall balance was disappointing, we continued to move ahead, and the groundwork for further improvement was laid. I am convinced that tax reduction, prudently financed and accompanied by persistent and firm expenditure control, can play a major role in that improvement. It will also free the hands of American monetary authorities to deal more vigorously with any contingencies that may arise—thus reinforcing our already strong defenses against pressures on the dollar during the difficult period until balance is fully restored.

Last year's overall balance-of-payments deficit amounted to \$2.2 billion—the smallest annual deficit since 1957, and only a little more than half the total 2 years ago. But, measured against the \$2.4 billion deficit of 1961, progress was limited, and the gold outflow continued at close to \$900 million.

However, it must be remembered that during 1962 we absorbed the full impact of the rebound of imports from the abnormally low, recession-induced levels of 1961. As business recovered at home, imports increased by \$1.7 billion, or 12 percent. Exports also rose substantially during the first part of the year, but then tapered off, reflecting the slower growth of our export markets in Europe and Japan. The Canadian tariff surcharges, together with adjustments in the Canadian exchange rate also, had a measurable adverse effect on exports during the latter part of the year since Canada is our single, largest foreign market. As a result, our commercial trade surplus (which excludes aid-financed shipments) declined by about \$1.2 billion from the exceptionally favorable 1961 figure. While this surplus, at \$2 billion, was still larger than that of any other Nation, its decline last year offset almost all of the improvement in our other accounts.

A major source of improvement during 1962 reflected our persistent efforts to curtail the outflow of dollars stemming from our commitments for defense and aid. Taken together, the net balance-of-payments drain from these two programs was reduced by more than \$700 million. Much of this improvement stemmed from implementation of the cooperative logistics agreements with West Germany, providing for increased purchases of American military goods and services, while simultaneously strengthening the defense capabilities of both countries.

The vigorous efforts of the Department of Defense to economize in its own foreign exchange outlays were unfortunately offset by rising local costs and the full-year impact of the "Berlin buildup" on the size of our forces based in Europe. Moreover, the usual long interval between foreign aid commitments and actual spending obscured the progress that has been made in supplying a larger share of American assistance to the developing countries in the form of American goods and services.

However, on the basis of current policies and directives, there is a clear prospect of

further savings in these two areas in the years ahead. For example, more than three quarters of AID commitments during this fiscal year will be directly reflected in purchases in this country, and that percentage is being raised still higher. A new agreement with Italy provides for the purchase of American-produced military equipment in an amount in excess of the foreign exchange costs of maintaining our forces in that country during 1963. And the Defense Department is continuing to reduce its foreign exchange outlays.

Smaller outflows of short-term capital also contributed to last year's improvement. However, the outflow was larger than we had expected. Much of it was submerged among unrecorded transactions making it difficult to pinpoint the precise cause and the source of these outflows. Certainly, our effort to maintain a structure of short-term rates in the American market that would reduce the incentive to shift funds abroad in search of higher interest returns—an effort that was greatly facilitated by downward rate adjustments in some important European markets—appeared to be reasonably successful, and the upward trend of trade financing and foreign bank loans tapered off. However, the total of short-term and unrecorded outflows, placed at more than \$1½ billion in preliminary reports, remained uncomfortably high and clearly indicated an area where much further progress is required.

Outflows of longer term private capital, approximating \$2½ billion, continued in undiminished volume, although the composition fell off moderately while the total of new foreign bond issues on the New York market rose. In discussing this problem at Rome last year—when the anomalous pattern of borrowers in Western European countries with strong payments positions seeking large amounts of long-term funds in the United States was already becoming clear—I suggested that much of the difficulty stemmed from the absence in Europe of an efficient, fully effective capital market mechanism, freely open to potential foreign borrowers and capable of absorbing new issues in the required volume. The fact that roughly 45 percent of the total official European, Australian, and New Zealand flotations in New York last year were taken up by foreign buyers—in some instances located in the same country as the borrower—provides further confirmation of this analysis.

It has been gratifying to us that during the past year a number of European countries have begun to reexamine their capital market mechanisms, recognizing their own internal need for more efficient means of mobilizing and distributing savings to support further rapid growth. Italy has made particular progress in developing and strengthening its capital markets and has also found it possible to open them to a few international institutions, as well as to initiate measures to free portfolio investment abroad by its own residents. I have also been glad to see signs of greater interest on the part of American commercial and investment bankers in participating in this process of strengthening European capital markets. That is an area where efforts to provide better service to your customers operating abroad by assisting them to raise local capital and credit can also have important benefits, both for the host country and the United States. Dramatic results cannot be expected within a limited period of time, but over the years ahead, the result will be a healthy freedom from dependence on the New York market, with a consequent lessening of one drain on our balance of payments.

Other factors of basic, long-run strength became more apparent during 1962. For instance, the flow of earnings from our \$60 billion of private foreign investment rose

by almost 10 percent to a new record of more than \$3.5 billion—a figure that will continue mounting in the years ahead. Even more important, for it underlies our whole international trading position, has been the sustained stability in the prices of our industrial goods and materials. Unit wage costs have not risen since 1961, and the index of wholesale prices has now been virtually unchanged for 5 years. In contrast, pronounced upward cost pressures have developed in most industrialized countries in Europe, squeezing profits and bringing price pressures of the sort that have been all too familiar in this country.

A few years ago, there was much talk of a deterioration of the international competitive position of the United States. Today, that talk is diminishing—and for good reason. Our share of world exports of manufactured goods, after declining substantially during the fifties, has been essentially stable since 1959.

At the same time, however, we must recognize—as our alert competitors did long ago—that our competitive position depends on more than price alone. Knowledge of markets and willingness to search them out, product design, sales and servicing facilities, and export credit facilities are all vitally important. Recognizing the key role of commercial exports, the Government is improving and strengthening the facilities of the Export-Import Bank, as well as the export programs of the Department of Commerce. But, in the last analysis, it is the American businessman who must make the sale—and I should add that alert banks can play an important role as catalysts.

Now let us see how our program of tax rate reduction and reform can help to reinforce and support these various developments that are contributing to longer run balance of payments improvement. First of all, it will provide new incentives for investment and intelligent risk taking—increasing profits directly through lower tax rates, and indirectly through enlarged domestic markets and the establishment of a better atmosphere for growth. This is the best way—and ultimately the only way consistent with our free market system—to encourage the productive employment of American capital at home, and to attract more foreign investment to our shores.

It is clear that enlarged domestic spending for plant and equipment will help to employ the abundant supply of savings that today is aggressively seeking longer run investment—and at times seeping out in excessive volume abroad. An attempt to dry up those savings through severe credit contraction would run a serious risk of impeding domestic expansion. The far more constructive route toward the same objective is to bring about the sort of conditions in which these savings can be fully and productively utilized at home—and in which increases in interest rates are a reflection of the improved profitability of investment opportunities.

The more rapid growth fostered by tax reduction will, to be sure, generate further increases in our imports. To the extent that this results in higher foreign exchange earnings by the developing countries, we can expect larger demands for our exports as well. But more directly, the tax program can also help to sharpen the competitive position of our industries in world markets. Our export effort must be concentrated on new and sophisticated manufactured goods, for it is there that export markets are strongest, and there that the needed expansion in our foreign sales must be centered—but it is also there that our foreign competitors have made their greatest strides. We must redouble our efforts to remain at the very forefront of technological progress by applying our scientific abilities to industrial products and processes, and incorporating our

new technology in new investment. The President's proposal to permit equipment used in research and development to be charged off as a current expense will directly support this objective. But far more important is the basic encouragement tax rate reductions can give to investment and growth, so that our industry can be better equipped to pour out in ever-increasing volume the new products the world wants.

Thus, there are sound reasons for believing that the tax program will, as it becomes fully effective, reinforce the fundamental longer run factors that are moving our payments position toward equilibrium. But I would not want to lull anyone into a false sense of confidence over the immediate outlook. The sound medicines of more profitable investment at home, stable prices, and a dynamic industry penetrating new export markets can work their cure only with time.

The immediate prospect, as nearly as any one can judge, is for another year of deficit in 1963, and for further gold losses. Faced with this prospect, it is vitally important that we redouble our efforts to reduce further the drains related to our Government programs overseas, and to achieve the kind of performance of our market economy that will bring higher exports and move attractive investment opportunities at home. At the same time, to meet our immediate problems, we need to maintain sound defenses for the dollar. That is why we have worked so steadily, in full cooperation with our friends abroad, to test and develop a wide variety of techniques designed to head off speculative disturbances in the gold and exchange markets and to absorb temporarily excessive supplies of dollars passing into the hands of foreigners.

We fully recognize that these devices are not substitutes for balance-of-payments equilibrium. Indeed, their success ultimately depends upon confidence in our ability and willingness to deal with our fundamental payments problem. But they are an important bulwark for the international payments system upon which all free nations depend, and which ultimately rests upon the free interchange of gold and dollars. Moreover, the usefulness of these arrangements in meeting potential or actual pressures on the dollar and on other currencies has now been amply demonstrated—for example, at the time of the stock market break, the Canadian crisis, and last fall's Cuban showdown.

But, during this critical period, we also need flexible monetary policies, alert to possible strains on the dollar and free to respond promptly in time of need. The difficulty today is that in the absence of expansionary fiscal or tax policy, a sharp and substantial tightening of credit could present real risks to the domestic economy. But, as the President has emphasized on several occasions, and specifically in his tax message, "a nation operating closer to capacity will be freer to use monetary tools to protect its international accounts, should events so require." In short our immediate balance-of-payments situation offers one of the most telling arguments in favor of a tax policy designed to stimulate the economy and thus give greater freedom to those who bear the heavy responsibility of administering monetary policy.

I do not pretend that the tax program alone can meet all of our problems at home or abroad, or that it entails no risks. That would be nonsense. Fiscal policy is not a tool to be used with abandon. We would much prefer to have been able to present our tax program within the context of a balanced budget, and we had hoped to do so. But we cannot afford to wait—and the prospect of budgetary balance in the years ahead will be enhanced, rather than reduced, by soundly conceived tax reduction. Our unsatisfactory growth of recent years, the sluggishness of our investment, the pres-

sures on profits, our idle capacity and manpower, and the failure of revenues to expand with more vigor, can all be traced in good part to the restraining effects of a tax structure unsuited to today's needs. I am firmly convinced—along with a broad cross section of the business community—that to continue operating with the present tax structure would not be consistent with true fiscal responsibility.

We have arranged the phasing of the proposed tax reductions over 3 fiscal years in a manner, consistent with earlier proposals by business groups, that will minimize the transitional budgetary deficits. In fiscal 1964, the great bulk of the anticipated \$12 billion deficit would face us in any event, and has no connection with the tax program. The critical need is to finance this deficit in a way that will not give rise to renewed inflationary pressures as we move closer to full employment and reasonably full capacity operations. This is what we have done in financing the deficits of the past 2 years—and what we mean to do in the future.

Our latest figures on the distribution of the public debt, those for January 31, show that the entire increase over the preceding 12 months was financed outside the banking system—an increase of \$1.8 billion in Federal Reserve holdings being fully offset by an equivalent decrease in commercial bank holdings. Furthermore, the increase in the outstanding marketable debt maturing in 5 years or more was larger than the total deficit. This policy of working persistently toward a balanced debt structure can be symbolized in a short-hand way by the fact that on March 15, after taking into account the results of our current advance refunding, the average maturity of the marketable debt will be 5 years and 1 month, 11 percent longer than at the end of 1960, and the longest since the fall of 1958.

Some observers have felt that we have been over zealous in our desire to maintain a debt structure that will avoid the danger of excessive liquidity and a future inflationary problem. But this view, in my judgment, underrates the continued availability of new savings in amounts more than adequate to meet the current borrowing requirements of business, individuals, and State and local governments, as well as the essential need to forestall any rebirth of inflation as the stimulus from the tax program takes hold. Moreover, the techniques available to us—and especially the device of advance refundings—have enabled us to attract longer term funds with a minimum of market disturbance.

As I look ahead, I see no reason to believe that we cannot continue for some time to finance the deficit largely from savings, without bringing strong upward pressures on market rates, for there is today a vast flow of funds through our financial institutions seeking longer term commitments. Of course, as investment activity increases in response to the stimulus of tax reductions, private credit demands will also expand, and the available supply of savings will be more fully absorbed. As I have suggested, this is one of the primary reasons why the tax program can be helpful to our balance of payments. We must also recognize that under these conditions, interest rates may rise in response to market forces—even though savings, too, can be expected to rise with incomes.

I can assure you that we have no intention of retreating at that point to excessive monetization of debt to meet our financing needs. When the economy approaches more closely the limits of its capacity, we will need to redouble our guard against potential inflationary pressures. Even more to the point, the higher revenues generated by economic expansion would be directed toward achieving budgetary balance and surplus,

thereby releasing savings for productive use by other sectors of the economy.

The President has repeatedly stated that, after enactment of the tax program, a substantial portion of the increased revenues that can be expected in the years ahead will be devoted to reducing and eliminating the budgetary deficit. This policy is an integral and essential part of our financial and tax program. In recognition of the need to accompany tax reduction with rigorous expenditure control, several billions of dollars were cut from estimates developed only a few months ago. Programs that in other circumstances might have been expanded were cut back or deferred. Efforts to achieve economies—including those within the Defense Department—were intensified. And we are proceeding vigorously with efforts to substitute private for public credit wherever feasible.

Nevertheless, a realistic appraisal of the international situation has compelled a further increase in our spending for defense. And our program to put a man on the moon in this decade required an increase of \$1.8 billion in space expenditures. These items, together with interest costs, account for more than 70 percent of our entire budget, and for all of the increase in fiscal 1964. Total spending for civilian programs is scheduled to decline. In a longer perspective, it is worth noting that, of the total increase of \$17.3 billion in administrative budget expenditures over the 3 fiscal years from 1961 to 1964, \$12.6 billion is for defense, space and interest on the public debt, while not much more than a quarter, or \$4.7 billion, is for civilian programs. In the 3 preceding fiscal years—excluding temporary unemployment compensation and all the other anti-recession expenditures incurred by this administration during the closing months of fiscal 1961—the rise in civilian spending was over \$4 billion, or almost as large.

Our Defense Establishment is now approaching the new level of readiness set by the administration, and Secretary McNamara has expressed his confidence that the upward spending trend will taper off after fiscal 1964. If our lunar exploration timetable is to be met, another sizable—but probably smaller—increase in spending for space will be necessary in fiscal 1965, but the prospect here also is for a leveling trend thereafter. This will substantially ease our budgetary task, but we recognize that it will not relieve us from the need for continuous rigorous screening of domestic civilian programs.

A compelling case can be made for increased spending for certain of these civilian programs, some of them new, that are vital to the national interest, but it is our job to find the savings in other areas that will make these programs possible within the confines set by our target of budgetary balance. In undertaking our program of tax reduction we have committed ourselves to do just that. But to defer the tax program to some indefinite future point in the hope that budgetary balance can somehow be achieved with present tax rates—when it is those very rates that stifle the growth we need—seems to me to be self-defeating, and to carry grave risks both for domestic expansion and the balance of payments.

There are simply no easy solutions to our multiple problems at home and abroad. The challenge, for both Government and business, is to appraise these problems realistically, and to seek together in a spirit of partnership the kinds of answers that are fully consistent with our traditions of free markets and free enterprise. The special role of Government, beyond intensive efforts to economize in its own overseas spending, must be to provide an environment of monetary stability, responsible budgetary and debt management policies, and freedom from oppressive taxation in which private enterprise

can find renewed incentives to invest at home and to seek our profitable export markets. The special responsibility of business is to make extra efforts—consistent with its own longrun interest—to develop foreign markets and sources of foreign finance, to exercise appropriate restraint in wage and pricing decisions, and—by no means least—to contribute to a process of serious discussion and debate from which intelligent public policy can emerge. Over the past 10 years these monetary conferences sponsored by the American Bankers Association have provided a forum for just such discussion, and I am especially grateful to have had this opportunity to discuss our thinking with you today.

[From the Washington Post, Mar. 11, 1963]

GROWTH AND PAYMENTS

Treasury Secretary Douglas Dillon's speech at the annual monetary conference of the American Bankers Association in Princeton provides an effective antidote to the unfounded fears that a tax cut and a larger fiscal deficit will aggravate the balance-of-payments problem and accelerate the outflow of gold.

The Secretary's cogent analysis provides a timely rebuttal to the argument advanced by a segment of the banking community which holds that there is a direct and inexorable series of causal links between fiscal deficits, increases in the domestic money supply, balance-of-payments deficits and gold losses. According to this view, which has an articulate proponent in John Exter, vice president of the First National City Bank of New York, a balance-of-payments equilibrium can only be achieved by restrictive monetary and fiscal policies. But this view flies in the face of both logic and the dreary monetary experience of the 1930's. Far from solving the balance-of-payments problem, restrictive monetary and fiscal policies would at this juncture plunge the economy into a recession and do irreparable damage to confidence in the international dollar.

Mr. Dillon was on firm ground in insisting that the only hope for improving our balance-of-payments position lies in accelerating the growth of the American economy. By expanding the volume of activity and increasing the demand for domestic investment funds, the tax cut will strengthen our international payments position by reversing outflow of capital. And the Secretary added that "it is clear that the enlarged domestic spending for plant and equipment will help to employ the abundant supply of savings that today is aggressively seeking longer-run investment—and at times seeping out in excessive volume abroad. An attempt to dry up those savings through severe credit contraction would run a serious risk of impeding domestic expansion. The far more constructive route toward the same objective is to bring about the sort of conditions in which these savings can be fully and productively utilized at home."

Mr. Dillon also said tax reduction will "free the hands of the American monetary authorities to deal more vigorously with any contingencies that may arise." This remark has strengthened the speculation that the monetary authorities may act to raise short-term interest rates after the passage of the tax bill. But since high interest rates have hardly been successful in stanching the outflow of short-term capital, other alternatives should be exhausted before measures which arrest domestic activity are adopted.

uel F. Pryor, Jr., vice president of Pan American Airways, who resides in Greenwich, Conn. There were 34 graduates, 4 being sons of State police officers and the majority being former members of the U.S. Marine Corps.

Mr. Pryor's address centered around the point that if we are to save our society from crumbling from within we must give much more attention to the professions of education and law enforcement.

It was an address filled with good sense, from a man who is not only one of the most outstanding businessmen in the country, but one who has also given so generously of his time and energy to civic causes.

I ask unanimous consent that the address be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

ADDRESS BY SAMUEL F. PRYOR, JR.

I thank your commissioner for inviting me to say a few words on law enforcement to this graduating class. In addition to the privilege he has given me of cooperating with your State police force and the privilege Chief Robbins has given me for many years of cooperating with our Greenwich police force, I have for some years had the honor of being an official adviser to the Bureau of Narcotics of the U.S. Treasury Department. I attended their Advanced Narcotics Training School, and just last year represented the commissioner at the interpol convention in Copenhagen. This experience has convinced me that Edgar Hoover was right in saying that law preserves the heart of our democracy and freedom; but the existence of law itself is no guarantee that it will be administered effectively. You must play your part in effective administration. How law is administered is the safeguard to democracy and freedom, which each and everyone of us treasure so deeply. I strongly believe that if the moral fiber of our country is to be maintained—if we are to survive in a competitive world—we must have greater citizen cooperation and assistance in support of our law enforcement agencies. Crime is a community problem, not just a police problem.

My business takes me to 81 countries of our world, so possibly I see law enforcement at work in many countries, cities, and towns—in many ways—good and bad—more than the average citizen. It has been my privilege to visit many of the ancient cities, which are now either in ruins or buried under desert sands, not only in the European countries but also in the pre-Christian kingdoms, and on our own continent, the Mayan civilization, the Aztec, and the Inca. Some of these civilizations have been dead now over 2,000 years. Each of these nations, at its peak, stood in the forefront of civilized achievement and accomplishment. Each asserted its influence throughout the then known world. Each was the leader of its time.

Pondering over these ruins caused me to wonder about ourselves. What is happening to us today—right now in this year 1963. Crime in the United States increased five times faster than the Nation's population in the 5 years preceding 1962. Some 7,800 law-enforcement agencies in the country reported an estimated 1,926,090 serious crimes in 1961, 3 percent more than in 1960. On the average there was a murder, forcible rape, robbery, aggravated assault, burglary, major larceny, or automobile theft every 16 seconds in 1961.

Preliminary statistics for 1962 show a continuing upward surge. A 5-percent increase

was recorded in the first 9 months of 1962 over the same period of 1961.

A major increase has occurred in one of the more serious types of crime—bank robberies, burglaries, and larcenies in 1962. There has been an average of 100 such crimes each month for an increase of about 25 percent over 1961.

An analysis of crime statistics reveals that the crime rate—number of offenses per 100,000 inhabitants—generally is higher in the areas with the largest population increase. The crime rate in metropolitan areas—cities over 50,000 and their fringes—is three times greater than in rural areas, and twice that of smaller cities.

Over half the cash and property stolen in robberies, burglaries, larcenies, and auto thefts in 1961 was recovered through effective law enforcement work. Also, the vast majority of crimes committed directly against individuals were cleared by arrest, ranging from 93 percent of all murders to 73 percent of all forcible rapes.

There is an average of just under two police employees for every 1,000 inhabitants in the United States. This should leave no doubt that greater citizen cooperation and assistance is needed by law enforcement agencies in protecting the safety and welfare of the Nation and its citizens. Every citizen should do what they can to combat crime. A great help would be the taking of simple precautions with property of value. Of the burglaries committed in 1961, 21 percent took place in buildings to which some means of access had been left open. A great reduction in the \$22 billion annual crime bill could be effected if citizens merely took normal, intelligent steps to protect their property.

Crimes reported from agencies within our State of Connecticut for the first 9 months of the 1962 calendar year were up 18 percent from 1961—the increase primarily attributable to the increase in burglary and larceny categories. The percentage of reported crimes cleared by arrest for this same period was approximately 38 percent, which is above the national average.

As each of you goes out from here to join the ranks of law enforcers, you will come to wonder how the citizens of this country can be so unaware as to virtually invite the committing of crime daily. The fact remains that the public is often naive, and this will be a constant irritant to you in the days and years ahead.

Yet you must never lose sight of the need—indeed, the duty—to teach the everyday citizen to help you safeguard his freedom. This aspect—education—can be as important in your new role as that of actual crime detection and prevention.

If you will permit me a bit of pride as a resident of Connecticut, let me emphasize to you the State's program of education, for example, in the area of motor traffic alone. Whereas many States appear to welcome speeders as a potential source of income, laying traps for the unsuspecting (and unwarned) driver, Connecticut does everything it can to educate the driver to exercise prudence before it cracks down. This genuine attempt to help citizens protect themselves is a goal to keep before you always. Law-enforcement agencies reflect the spirit of their communities.

As I mentioned before, I have had an interest in a special area of law enforcement—narcotics. In no other area can education do so much to prevent the thrill-seeker, the depressed, the experimenter from becoming a rotting shell of a human being.

While the Soviet countries have us all looking into space, they are encouraging the distribution of narcotics, not in their countries, but in all other countries around the world including our own. A teenager can become a dangerous criminal by becoming an addict to heroin. Governments can fall or surrender to the Communists easily if

EDUCATION AND LAW ENFORCEMENT

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, recently, there came to my attention a notable address delivered to the graduating class of the Connecticut State Police, by Sam-

enough government officials, using bad judgment, should come under the influence of narcotics.

Nationwide attention was directed to this problem in the latter part of September, during the White House Conference on Narcotic and Drug Abuse. It was my privilege to be a representative at this Conference. The Conference, which was held on September 27 and 28, brought together 400 experts in the various fields of medicine, the social sciences, and law enforcement.

Two aspects of the Conference are particularly noteworthy. First, the President announced his intention to appoint a special committee to advise him regarding a program for the civil commitment of narcotic addicts and their rehabilitation. Second, it was pointed out that the abusive use of dangerous drugs (i.e., barbiturates and amphetamines) may be a more serious problem than the abusive use of narcotic drugs. The President's advisory committee is to inform him regarding any needed Federal legislation in this area.

Arnold Toynbee has documented, in the case of civilization after civilization, that complete destruction comes from within. Egypt, Babylon, Crete, Greece, Assyria, Rome—and in our own hemisphere the Mayas and the Incas—were not destroyed from without. In each and every case the conqueror found a civilization which had begun its self-destruction from within. We can look back through the long, long vista of human history and we can see that today the whole cause of human freedom is in the greatest danger mankind has ever known.

Thinking about this has brought me to the conclusion that there are two professions that we in this country must encourage and strengthen to the utmost—teaching and law enforcement. I do not think we are going to have a nuclear war. Our one enemy capable of waging nuclear war against us realizes that there is no such thing as victory today; if they attacked us, our country would be half dead, but they themselves would be three-fourths dead. Therefore, the war in which we will engage will be a war of minds, so education of our young must be greatly strengthened. The teaching profession must be a chosen profession with much greater respect and remuneration. However, this cannot be accomplished without first our law enforcement profession being also a most honored and respected profession. This is the profession you have chosen.

In the Marine Corps the highest honor that one can wish for is to be called a good marine. You as police officers must have spotless integrity, uncommon bravery, and complete devotion to duty—then you will be judged by your community with what should be one of the highest community honors—you will be called a good police officer. We need you.

Good luck to you and God bless you.

MORE INDIANA SCIENTISTS PLEAD THAT DUNES BE SAVED

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, the vigorous support of the scientific community for the effort to save the Indiana Dunes is heartening. This support, which has come from the universities and colleges of Indiana, and from throughout the free world, should put to rest the completely untrue claim made by Bethlehem Steel Co. and the other dunes despilers that nothing of value remains in the dunes to be saved.

On March 7, I had printed in the RECORD at page 3666, the fine letter of the members of the biology department of Notre Dame University which clearly states the uniqueness and irreplaceability of the dunes.

On February 4, I discussed in the Senate the appeal made by 166 scientists and educators working within the State of Indiana that the central section of the dunes be preserved because of the high scientific and recreational values.

Last July, some of the most famous zoologists, biologists, and ornithologists of the world appealed to Northwestern University and other participants in the planned destruction of the key section of the dunes to reconsider their actions. I put a full account of this appeal by European and American scientists in the RECORD of July 27, 1962.

Numerous other individual scientists and scientific associations have written to me and to the Senate Subcommittee on Public Lands, stating their expert opinions that the Indiana Dunes are unique, irreplaceable, and of inestimable scientific and recreational value.

Now, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to add to this irrefutable record by having printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a letter written by 19 members of the faculty of Purdue University, Lafayette, Ind., which appeared in the Lafayette Journal-Courier of February 22, 1963.

This letter from prominent Hoosiers corrects some of the propaganda of the dunes destroyers and Burns ditch harbor proponents and takes the position which more and more Indiana people are expressing, namely, "We favor combining all the economic benefits, including tourism, by having the port elsewhere, and having a great lakeshore park where it belongs."

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

DUNES VERSUS PORT

The charge is being made that opposition to the State's Burns ditch port plan is heavily financed by Chicago interests attempting to impede Indiana's economic development. None of this is true. The Save-the-Dunes Council has a \$19,000 annual budget derived from dues and contributions from its 3,000 members, and from sale of Christmas cards. The attempt to portray this group of dedicated volunteer workers for conservation, without paid officers, as a sinister economic octopus is ludicrous when one considers the combined forces of officialdom, industry, press, and political power arrayed on the other side. Nevertheless, the undersigned council members and sympathizers deny and resent these reckless accusations against their integrity and motives.

Many pertinent facts have been obscured in the public furor over the proposed Burns ditch port site. Only after persistent urging by Indiana citizens unable to enlist support for dunes conservation from Hoosier politicians did Senator DOUGLAS reluctantly consent to assist the largely Indiana organization, the Save-the-Dunes Council. The unjustified campaign of vilification against him has put our State in a very bad light. If we resent "interference in our sovereign business" by out-of-Staters, we should stop agitating for Federal funds to build our port.

Far from opposing another lake port in Indiana (although we now have four, two of which are open to public use), Senator DOUGLAS has pledged his influence to obtain generous Federal funds for one, anywhere except in the contested dunes and beach area. It is a question of where, not whether. Specifically, he has accepted (1) the tricity site, for which the 87th Congress appropriated funds for a thorough Army Engineers feasibility

study, and (2) the Burns ditch compromise plan drawn up by the Lake Michigan Region Planning Council, an affiliate of the American Institute of Architects. This plan calls for a canal leading inland to an excavated port behind the strip of dunes in question.

The economic argument for a port at the Burns ditch site is unconvincing. The number of new jobs it would bring about is variously claimed as from 25,000 to 100,000. These figures were picked out of the air, they are hardly confirmed by Bethlehem Steel's announcement of about 2,000 employees for the automated mill it has planned and for which the land is being prepared. Professor Efraymson, Butler University economist, wrote that more economic benefit for Indiana would result in the long run by a lakeshore park to stimulate our tourist industry, than from a port at Burns ditch. Other economists judge that the new jobs there would be more than offset by resulting increased unemployment in the less automated steel mills in Indiana farther west. The United Steelworkers, representing 65,000 Hoosiers, have declared against the Burns ditch site.

The legislators who were given the recent conducted tour have never seen the land in question except in the dead of winter and with the earth scorched by fires set to facilitate clearing and bulldozing. Is their judgment of parkland quality better than that of Interior Secretary Udall and National Park Service authorities who found that the area meets the exacting standards of quality for inclusion in the national park system? Or better than that of the 165 outdoors-oriented Indiana scientists who wrote President Kennedy jointly urging the lakeshore?

We favor combining all the economic benefits, including tourism, by having the port elsewhere, and having a great lakeshore park where it belongs.

Preston Adams, Irving W. Burr, Marjorie K. Elsinger, Raymond E. Girton, Clarence J. Goodnight, Marie L. Goodnight, Arthur T. Guard, Joseph A. Kuc, Alton A. Lindsey, James S. Lovett, Phyllis K. Martin, Melvin G. Mellon, Russell E. Mumford, Elroy L. Rice, Sumner A. Rifenburgh, Oscar G. Ward, Jr., Barbara Webster, Grady Webster, and Arthur H. Westing.

THE PRESIDENT'S TAX PROGRAM

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, the Assistant Secretary of the Treasury, Mr. Stanley Surrey, spoke recently before the Juristic Society of Philadelphia about the President's tax program.

As there is so much misinformation about the program, I think it important that Members of the Congress and the public generally have access to Mr. Surrey's remarks where he explains factually just what many of the proposals would do.

I ask unanimous consent that his speech be printed in the RECORD.

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

THE TAX PROGRAM IN PERSPECTIVE

(Remarks by Stanley S. Surrey, Assistant Secretary of the Treasury before the Juristic Society of Philadelphia, Philadelphia, Pa., February 28, 1963)

THE BACKGROUND—WIDESPREAD CRITICISM OF THE TAX STRUCTURE

Throughout the postwar period there has been increasing recognition that the Federal income-tax structure deserved revision. It has been criticized on the ground that its high rates are a heritage of war and post-war inflationary pressure, and that these

rates dull initiative, destroy incentives, and inhibit risktaking.

There have also been charges that our tax law contains special preferences, which discriminate without justification among taxpayers and contribute to gross unfairness. The many exclusions and deductions have been blamed for unduly narrowing the tax base, contributing to the need for high rates. The tax system has been blamed for showing favoritism to some industries and transactions, and distorting the allocation of resources in the economy as well as interfering with the free play of market forces. As a result of all this, the energies and talents of many people—including a great number of highly skilled executives and professional people—have been taken up devising intricate schemes to take maximum advantage of opportunities for tax reduction.

It is hardly surprising, then, that criticism of our tax system became more insistent as the postwar period lengthened. The Congress took account of such criticism in 1955 and 1959, when, under the leadership of Chairman WILBUR MILLS, of Arkansas, noteworthy studies of our tax system were made. Considerable testimony from professional experts was compiled in these studies, not merely on the criticisms themselves, but on the possible lines of improvement which might be taken.

That was the situation when President Kennedy took office. He immediately set tax revision as one of the major domestic goals of his administration. He made his views clear in his first tax message to the Congress, in April of 1961. In that message he urged the adoption of an investment tax credit as a stimulus to spur investment and accelerate growth, proposed a series of specific tax reforms, and ordered a Treasury study of additional, broader changes in the income tax structure.

The Congress responded with the Revenue Act of 1962, containing both the investment tax credit and significant reform provisions in almost all of the areas recommended by the President—in all nearly a billion dollars of tax reform to roughly match the revenue lost by the investment credit. A significant first step in revision of the tax structure was thus accomplished.

YEAR 1963—THE CASE FOR TAX REVISION BECOMES IMPERATIVE

The year 1963, however, brought a new dimension to the situation. The tax revision that all had agreed was one of our desirable domestic goals came to be recognized as imperative to our economic health.

We have seen four recessions since the end of World War II. We have seen unplanned deficits resulting from a failure of the economy to achieve levels of operation consistent with its potential in terms of capital, manpower, and productivity. The gap between our potential and our actual performance—now about \$40 billion in terms of lost gross national product per year—is evident in unused industrial capacity, high unemployment, and a lagging rate of capital formation. As a result we are running the risk of recessions that could cut deeper and last longer, followed by shorter recoveries. Furthermore, the America we all want—with full employment, with more and better schools, health facilities, and public services, with urban redevelopment on a faster and larger scale, with better living standards for all—will come about far more quickly through an economy yielding us all that our resources in men and capital are capable of producing.

The overwhelming weight of economic analysis indicates that the income tax structure presses too heavily on the economy. Its especially high individual income tax rates, starting at 20 percent, sweep too much out of private hands in relation to our GNP, so that consumer demand is kept throttled

down in periods of recovery. The rate structure, rising to 91 percent, means high marginal tax rates that deter incentive, risk taking, and personal effort, thereby lessening the contribution that private initiative is able to make. The corporate tax rate, at 52 percent, unduly limits the profitability of corporate investment and presents corporate management with the fact that the shareholders are the lesser and the Government the greater partner in the enterprises they guide. Added to all this is the waste arising from the distortions induced by the special preferences—the uneconomic allocation of resources, the talents and time lost in the pursuit of tax schemes, the resentments created by the gross unfairness.

We thus come to these conclusions—the America we want and the America we must have to meet our international obligations and hazards can be obtained only by a more productive economy. We possess the resources required for a higher level of economic activity. Our task is to secure the full utilization of those resources. The most effective way to achieve that full utilization is to revise the tax system. Tax revision, by removing the present tax restraints on the private sector, will enable it to provide the force and initiative so necessary to economic vitality. Tax revision—for long acknowledged as a desirable thing to do—is now of paramount economic importance.

THE NATURE OF THE PROPOSED REVISION—THE RATE REDUCTIONS

In full recognition of the imperative of tax revision, the President's tax program recommends large reductions in the rate scale and significant structural changes. Combined these mean, in full operation, a reduction of \$10.3 billion in tax liabilities—about 15 percent of our present individual and corporate tax liabilities. Let us start with the major reform of the tax structure, the reduction in tax rates. The present individual rates run from 20 percent in the bottom bracket of \$2,000 to \$4,000 for a married couple—to 91 percent at the top. President Kennedy's tax program would start the tax scale at 14 percent on the first \$1,000 to \$2,000 for a married couple—and rise to a maximum of 65 percent. The intermediate rates are all pulled down—the present marginal rate of 30 percent for the \$15,000 married man would be 24 percent, of 43 percent for the \$25,000 man would be 34 percent. The 50-percent marginal rate now reached at \$32,000 would be reached at \$52,000. The 60-percent marginal rate now reached at \$52,000 would not be reached until \$140,000. These large reductions in the marginal tax rates—the rates on added dollars of income—show the significant increase in incentives inherent in the program.

The resulting rate scale means a reduction of \$11 billion in individual income tax liabilities.

On the corporate side our present rates are 30 percent on the first \$25,000 of income and 52 percent on the remainder. The proposed tax rates would be 22 percent on the first \$25,000 and 47 percent on the balance. The 22 percent rate for small business—a rate which would apply to 80 percent of all taxpaying corporations—is a reduction of 27 percent. It means a significant lift for a large segment of American enterprise. The 47-percent rate is a 10-percent reduction, so that the reduction for the corporations above \$25,000 ranges in between—it is 16 percent for a \$50,000 corporation, 12 percent for a \$100,000 corporation. The overall reduction in corporate tax liabilities is \$2.6 billion. This reduction is about the same as that obtained in 1962, when over \$2 billion of corporation tax liabilities were removed through the combined effect of the investment credit and administrative revision of the depreciation rules. The resulting total would mean that overall corporate tax lia-

bilities would be reduced by nearly 20 percent.

These reductions would thus achieve a sizable lowering of the individual and corporate rate structures. In terms of increased incentives, of increased private resources available for consumer spending and capital investment, of a significant lessening of the weight of the tax system on all private enterprise and activity, of the impetus given to cost cutting and improvements in productive efficiency, the new rates represent the most significant of the reforms of the tax system that the program embodies. They are a direct and effective response to the need for loosening the present tax restraints on the economy. They recognize that the achievement of a greater level of economic recovery and more rapid growth cannot rest either on increased consumer spending alone or on increased incentives and savings for investment alone. Both are vitally needed, consumer demand to press on existing and future capacity to bring us to full employment and lead to a higher level of investment; the investment incentives to stimulate us to go on to a higher level of capital formation and economic growth. The rate reductions pull back the entire rate structure, individual and corporate, from top to bottom.

THE NATURE OF THE PROPOSED REVISION—THE STRUCTURAL CHANGES

The major reform in the tax program is thus the large reduction in tax rates. These reductions are complemented by—and their revenue cost partially offset by—a number of proposed structural changes. These structural changes are not all in one direction—some involve revenue losses and some revenue gains, some affect corporations and some individuals, some are directly associated with changes in the rate structure and some are required by the objectives of eliminating hardships, unfairness, and unjustified preferences.

Individual structural changes that lose revenue: On the individual side, a number of structural changes are proposed to remove particular hardships and unfairnesses that rate reduction by itself will not rectify. Thus, at the lower end of the scale, the insistence by many that exemptions be raised has been prompted by the realization that an income tax reaching as low as \$667 for single persons and \$1,333 for married couples taxes persons in the area of real poverty. Rate reductions alone obviously cannot meet this problem. Yet the solution of raising exemptions by \$100 would mean a revenue loss of \$2.5 billion under proposed rates and remove 3 million taxpayers from the rolls; an increase of \$200 in exemptions means a revenue loss of almost \$5 billion and removal of 6½ million taxpayers. This exemption approach is wasteful of revenue, since its effects reach beyond the lower levels where the particular relief is needed, and is often overgenerous where family size is large. Of the \$2.5 billion of revenue that would be lost through a \$100 increase in exemptions, only 20 percent or \$500 million would go to the group below \$5,000.

As a more appropriate solution the program proposes a minimum standard deduction of \$300 for a single person and an additional \$100 for a spouse and for each dependent. As a consequence, single persons below \$900, married persons below \$1,600, and married persons with two dependents below \$3,000 cease to be taxable—as compared with \$667, \$1,333, and \$2,666 levels of today. The revenue loss is only \$310 million, concentrated almost entirely in the group below \$5,000. Yet this approach achieves in the lowest income range the equivalent of an exemption increase of as much as \$233 for a single person, of as much as \$133 for each spouse of the married couple, and of as much as \$83 for each member of the

family of four. About 1.5 million persons would become nontaxable by this proposal.

In short, the minimum standard deduction proposal uses the deduction factor of the tax computation as a technique to achieve a fair adjustment of the tax burdens at the lowest levels of income, in preference to the more traditional, yet wastefully expensive technique, of raising exemptions.

Another hardship that tax rate reduction alone cannot meet is the present complex and discriminatory treatment of the aged. Present law embodies an extra \$600 exemption—which at higher income levels is unneeded and thus a revenue waste—and a complicated retirement income credit designed to give pensioners and those receiving investment income a tax reduction somewhat comparable to the exclusion of social security benefits from income. Its effect is to discriminate against all those over 65 who receive earned income—about three out of every four taxpayers over 65. The consequent unfairnesses among the aged in the income levels below \$10,000, depending on source of income, are too great to tolerate—a tax of zero for a \$3,000 income from interest and rent, but a tax of \$300 if wages are the only source of income. And again the credit is unneeded in the upper levels.

The tax program proposes to substitute for all this a flat \$300 credit against tax for each person over age 65. Recognition of the present social security exclusion is taken account of in the proposal. This is done by reducing the credit by an amount based on one-half of social security benefits times the taxpayer's bracket or marginal tax rate. This procedure reflects the fact that both the employee and employer contribute equally to the benefits. The cost of this change is \$320 million, one-half of which goes to persons below the \$5,000 income level and most of the balance to those with incomes between \$5,000 and \$10,000. This change would thus continue the present policy that age is a factor justifying tax relief, and then provide a mechanism which both grants that relief in a fair and simple way and confines it to the income levels where it is needed most.

A third structural change under the individual income tax also meets a hardship which rate reduction cannot solve—that faced by the person with fluctuating yearly income. While fluctuating incomes may be more characteristic of people in certain occupations, such as authors, artists, actors, athletes, ranchers, fishermen, farmers, architects, and individual business proprietorships, it obviously may be experienced in many other situations. The combination of graduated tax rates and an irregular pattern of income produces more tax today over a period of years than does a stable income pattern. The tax program meets this hardship by a uniform averaging formula applicable to all, under which income is, in effect, averaged over a 5-year period whenever the current year's income is significantly higher than the average of the preceding 4 years. The revenue cost is about \$40 million.

A fourth structural change, involving a revenue cost of \$50 million, is aimed at meeting the hardship experienced by persons who must incur moving expenses for themselves and their families as a consequence of a change in employment. The burden can often be severe and its impact, apart from hardship, can be such as to place an undesirable restriction on labor mobility. The tax program proposes a deduction for these moving expenses, both for a transferred person who continues to work for the same employer and for a person who changes his employer.

The remaining individual structural changes that lose revenue smooth out or extend existing provisions respecting certain expenditures. One change would expand the

benefits of the child-care provision (revenue cost 20 billion); another would apply the 30-percent limitation uniformly to all publicly supported charities, thereby replacing the present distinctions between a 20-percent and a 30-percent limitation for these charities (revenue cost nominal); and a third would clarify and simplify the medical expense deduction (revenue cost nominal).

In sum, this group of reforms, which in total involve a revenue cost of \$740 million, will thus meet some of the persistent and well-founded complaints regarding the hardships resulting today, not from the present rate scale but from the operation of the tax structure even under a reasonable rate scale. They deal with specific unfairnesses requiring specific reforms for their cure. It is just as important to the persons affected, in terms of fairness under an income tax, that their problems be met as it is to those whose objections are directed to the present rate scales. Moreover, these changes have a considerable bearing on the economic scene in terms of labor mobility and allocation of individual skills. This group of reforms or structural changes thus contributes significantly to the insistent urgings for improvement in the tax structure.

Individual structural changes that gain revenue: The remaining individual structural changes involve revenue gains. The most significant from a revenue standpoint is the proposed floor on deductions for personal expenses—interest, charitable contributions, State and local taxes, medical expenses, casualty losses. Under this proposal only the total of those expenses above 5 percent of adjusted gross income would be deductible. A consideration of this proposal in its proper perspective requires that we go back to the origin and effect of the standard deduction. The Congress in 1944 adopted our present standard deduction of 10 percent of adjusted gross income up to a \$1,000 maximum as a device to simplify the tax law. Since the 10-percent figure chosen was somewhat above the average of those expenses then being itemized as deductions, the policy also eliminated any distinctions between itemizers and nonitemizers among taxpayers below or around the average level.

Since 1944 there has been a considerable growth in the average amount of these personal expenses, as a result of rising income levels, rising costs, and changing habits. In 1944, about 35 million returns used the standard deduction and only 8 million used itemized deductions; in 1962 the figures were 26 and 25 million respectively. In 1944, the standard deduction represented 63 percent of the total of all deductions for these personal expenses; in 1962 this figure had dropped to 23 percent. In 1944 the itemized and standard deductions combined represented about 10 percent of adjusted gross income; in 1962 they represented about 15 percent. The standard deduction now comes to \$12½ billion. The itemized deductions come to \$41 billion, used by taxpayers with an adjusted gross income of \$217 billion, or about 20 percent. In 1944, the itemized deductions amounted to only \$4.6 billion, used by taxpayers with \$32.5 billion adjusted gross income, or about 14 percent. This is the key figure, for it indicates the persistent narrowing of the tax base that has occurred in postwar years as a result of the large increase in amount of itemized deductions—from 14 percent to 20 percent of the adjusted gross income of the returns involved. Parenthetically, by contrast the total of personal exemptions has dropped from about 40 to 27 percent of adjusted gross income.

The standard deduction represents a congressional policy of eliminating distinctions between itemization and nonitemization of expenses at the level of average expenses for taxpayers with incomes below \$10,000. Underlying this policy was a desire for simplification and a willingness to recognize that

some of the rental expenses of the renter reflected personal expense akin to those of the homeowner. In view of the increase in these personal expenses relative to gross income, it is obvious that if we were today adopting the policy of the standard deduction for the first time, the appropriate figure would be about 15 percent instead of 10 percent, with a limit perhaps of \$1,500. But in the meantime we have seen that the narrowing of the tax base represented by the rise in personal expenses is a factor in keeping marginal rates at an excessively high level. A standard deduction at 15 percent would also have a base-narrowing effect and mean a loss of revenue. The intent behind the standard deduction, however, can be as well expressed through a different mechanism, that of placing a floor under itemized deductions. Instead of a standard deduction of 15 percent, the objectives can be achieved by continuing the standard deduction of 10 percent and adopting a 5-percent floor under itemized deductions. This policy would, of course, gain revenue. Since it would be adopted to keep the base from narrowing and thereby keeping or forcing tax rates up, it is appropriate that the revenue gained be devoted to a lowering of the rates.

The policies behind the standard deduction—simplification and a balanced allowance to all taxpayers of the average of personal expenses—today in the light of the great increase in personal expenses would thus appear to require either a rise in the standard deduction or a floor under itemized deductions. The expression of that policy through an increase in the standard deduction would contribute to further narrowing of the tax base and would necessitate higher rates. An expression of that policy in the 5-percent floor will broaden the tax base and permit a far larger reduction in marginal tax rates. Some may feel that the continuation, through the use of a floor, of this policy of achieving some balance in the recognition of personal expenses raises problems, especially in those brackets where the itemizers and nonitemizers are both significantly represented. Expression could be given to this viewpoint by combining a floor on itemized deductions with some comparable reduction in the standard deduction.

The combination of the 5-percent floor and rate reduction will leave itemizers with significant tax reductions. Further, the 5-percent floor will not reduce the incentives that the deductions for personal expenses seek to encourage, such as home ownership or charitable contributions. Itemized expenses today average about 20 percent of adjusted gross income, so that most of present expenses and, of course, all new expenses are above the floor. Those, for example, who have expressed fears over reduced charitable or educational giving should be relieved of their worries when they study the facts. Clearly for most itemizers the present non-discretionary expenses of State taxes, mortgage interest, and medical expenses are obviously above a 5-percent floor. Voluntary charitable contributions, therefore, would be fully deductible. Moreover, despite the forebodings of some of these institutions in 1944 when the standard deduction was adopted—and 80 percent of taxpayers were shifted to that method—charitable giving was not adversely affected. Finally, the volume of charitable giving appears to depend primarily on the level of income—for years it has been about 2 percent of national personal income despite changes in tax rates and structure. The tax program will not only increase the after-tax incomes of individuals but through its effect on the economy will greatly increase national personal income. A rise in that income from the present \$440 to \$525 billion—which could be achieved under the tax program—would alone increase charitable giving from its present \$8.8 to \$10.5 billion.

The 5-percent floor is thus not only in keeping with the policies behind the standard deduction, but it also expresses those policies in a manner that permits a larger tax rate reduction than would otherwise be possible. The revenue gain from the floor is \$2.3 billion. If this \$2.3 billion were not thus available, then the rate scale would have to be raised, primarily in the middle and upper brackets if the revenue involved were to be distributed in the same fashion as reflected by the floor. This would mean top bracket marginal tax rates would be scaled to 75 percent and not 65 percent.

The 5-percent floor, while keeping the essential policies underlying the deductions for personal expenses, also contributes to a rate scale more conducive to personal incentives and economic well being. The basic point is to preserve and strengthen all of the incentives that are important—both those involved in the deductions for personal expenses and those involved in lower marginal tax rates—and the combination of the 5-percent floor and the lower rate scale it permits achieves this result.

The remaining individual revenue-raising changes raise about \$700 million—an amount equal to the revenue-losing changes. Two of the changes are associated with reductions in the rates, especially the top rates, and would remove preferences or escapes not justifiable under lowered top rates. The proposal to eliminate the dividend credit and exclusion would alone recover \$460 million in tax revenue. Nearly 80 percent of the benefits of these provisions presently goes to taxpayers over \$10,000, and over 50 percent to those over \$20,000. Even as to the exclusion only 15 percent of its benefits goes to persons under \$5,000, with 60 percent of the benefits to those over \$10,000. This, of course, is merely a reflection of the concentration of corporate ownership and dividends in middle and upper income groups. In 1960 only 5 percent of the returns under \$5,000 reported dividends, which dividends amounted to one percent of the total adjusted gross income on these returns; these returns accounted for 14 percent of dividends reported. Returns over \$20,000 accounted for 60 percent of the dividends, and almost all returns reported some dividends; these dividends represent 10 percent of adjusted gross income at \$20,000, 20 percent at \$50,000, and 40 percent above \$200,000.

It is appropriate to eliminate this special preference for dividends, which has achieved no useful economic purpose, at a time when the individual rate scale is being lowered and the corporate rate also reduced. The incentives for investment and risk-taking which these lower rates provide would be far more significant in their impact on the economy than the dividend credit and exclusion. Moreover, the 5-point proposed reduction in the corporate rate will give more relief from double taxation than does the 4 percent credit for incomes up to \$186,000. The credit reduces double taxation by amounts ranging from 4.3 percent for taxpayers in the first bracket to 10.4 percent in the proposed top bracket. The five-point reduction in the corporate tax rate would reduce double taxation by 10 percent for everyone. The other proposal related to the rates is a tightening of the personal holding company rules, to end the escapes from individual taxation now available through the use of these devices to shelter investment income or income from personal efforts.

The other revenue-gaining changes would eliminate undesirable or inequitable preferences that now exist and improve existing rules. These involve elimination of the sick-pay exclusion; the taxation to the employee of the value of the economic benefit of employer-provided group term life insurance above a minimum figure, in keeping with the present tax treatment of other forms of employer-provided insurance; the institu-

tion of a 4-percent floor under casualty losses comparable to that under medical expenses, and the elimination of the unlimited charitable deduction.

In sum, the revenue-raising structural changes in the individual area—seven in number—involve about \$3 billion, of which \$2.3 billion is concentrated in the 5 percent floor and \$700 million in the remaining items. They offset to this extent the \$11.7 billion revenue loss involved in a rate scale running from 14 to 65 percent and the \$740 million of changes needed to eliminate hardships that cannot be reached by rate reduction. They represent reforms responsive to the persistent urgings that our tax structure be altered to keep the tax base from constantly narrowing and to eliminate unfair preferences. They involve no departures from basic income tax concepts and no complications of technical implementation. They clearly do not broaden the individual tax base as much as some have urged. At the same time, they represent significant improvements in the tax structure. Together with the changes designed to eliminate hardships, they contribute to a balanced program of revision in the tax structure.

Corporate structural changes: The structural changes in the corporate tax are few in number. Two are associated with the reduction of the normal tax on the first \$25,000 of corporate income from 30 to 22 percent. The normal tax concept represents a policy designed to assist "small business" and the reduction in this rate—a 27-percent reduction—will strengthen that assistance. It is important that this tax benefit—and the consequent revenue loss—be confined to what are truly small businesses. However, we find that enterprises and activities which are conducted with multiple corporate structures could obtain this small business tax benefit many times over if each corporation in the structure were taxed at only 22 percent on its first \$25,000 of income. It is obvious that a rational application of a tax policy designed to assist small business requires aggregation of corporations under common ownership before the \$25,000 test is applied. This is so whether the multiple corporations serve genuine business purposes or are simply tax motivated. It may be observed that eligibility for the other nontax small business benefits accorded by the Congress is determined on such a consolidated basis.

The tax program, in order to make possible the reduction of the small business rate to 22 percent, thus proposes only a single surtax exemption for multiple corporation enterprises, the change to be phased over 5 years. The revenue gain is \$120 million. At the same time, in further application of this policy of neutralizing the tax effect of multiple corporate structures, it is proposed that the two percent additional tax on consolidated returns be eliminated and that intercorporate dividends between affiliated corporations not be taxes. The revenue cost is \$50 million.

These two structural changes are thus directly linked to the new corporate rate structure. Of the remaining structural changes, one that costs revenue (\$50 million) would permit the current expensing of equipment used in research and development activities, with the objective of encouraging the expansion of private civilian research. A change that would gain revenue (about \$250 million, of which \$10 million comes from individuals) involves improvements in the taxation of natural resource activities designed to carry out the purposes behind the existing depletion policies.

In sum, these corporate structural changes, few in number, involve revenue costs of \$100 million and gains of \$360 million. They reduce the \$2.63 billion of corporate rate reduction to about \$2.3 billion. Here also a balance is preserved, with the changes pro-

posed being either necessitated by the new rate structure or designed to meet particular problems in the corporate area. A further significant structural change—the acceleration in the current corporate tax payment of larger corporations—would yield \$1.5 billion in annual budget receipts in the next 5 years but would not increase tax liabilities.

THE NATURE OF THE PROPOSED REVISION— THE CAPITAL GAIN CHANGES

The final set of recommendations in the tax program relates to the area of capital gains and losses. This area has always involved complex tax issues, since it is necessary to give proper weight to a number of factors that do not all work in the same direction—the fact that capital gains accrue over time and arise from a variety of economic causes; the importance of encouraging private risk-taking and initiative; the importance of maintaining the flow and mobility of capital, and the need to maintain on equity grounds an appropriate relationship to the taxation of other types of profit and income. Our present system, for individuals, is to include only 50 percent of capital gains, limit the taxation of the gain to a maximum rate of 25 percent, and permit the gain represented by appreciation accumulated until death to escape income taxation entirely.

The tax program proposes several basic changes, whose primary objective is to achieve increased mobility of capital and encourage private risk-taking. First, it would reduce the present 50 percent inclusion ratio to only 30 percent of the gain. With a proposed basic rate scale running from 14 to 65 percent, capital gains would thus be taxed at a scale running from 4.2 to 19.5 percent. This is far lower than the present range of 10 percent at \$2,000 of taxable income to 25 percent at about \$32,000 and higher on a joint return. The proposed rate at \$32,000 of taxable income would only be 12 percent. The combination of reducing the 50 percent inclusion to 30 percent, and then reducing the basic rate scale, thus involves reductions in capital gains tax ranging from 58 percent for first-bracket taxpayers to 52 percent for taxpayers at \$32,000, 40 percent at \$52,000, 30 percent at \$100,000, on down to 22 percent for top-bracket taxpayers. The benefits would be concerned mainly in the middle and upper income groups. Nearly 50 percent of present capital gains are realized by persons with incomes between \$10,000 and \$100,000, and these gains represent 3 percent of adjusted gross income at \$10,000 and about 20 percent at \$100,000. A complementary provision would extend the present 5-year carryover of capital losses to an unlimited carryover (revenue cost of \$20 million). The corporate capital gain rate would be reduced from 25 to 22 percent.

A significant obstacle to the mobility of capital today, and one which "locks in" many an investor, is the inducement under present rules to hold an appreciated asset until death so that the gain will escape tax. The tax program would end this lock-in effect by treating as a taxable capital gain any gain present in assets transferred at death. The advantage in capital mobility, with consequent benefits to increased initiative and risk-taking, would be highly beneficial to economic growth. The revenue gain involved would offset the cost of the lowered capital gain rates and make those rates possible. The result is an integrated treatment of capital gains and losses that should have a large positive effect on increasing investment and capital formation.

Necessarily the proposal to tax gains transferred at death—which will affect annually only about 3 percent of decedents—must be implemented by technical rules designed to permit as fair and as practical an applica-

tion of this approach as is possible—such as the exemption of the gain on a residence and on personal or household effects, the exemption of gains passing to a wife along the lines of the present estate tax marital deduction, a blanket \$15,000 exemption of gain to eliminate small estates, an exemption of transfers to charity, an averaging device, provisions to ease the time of payment of the tax, a transition period before the new rule is to become fully effective, and so on.

The benefits to taxpayers and the economy of the new low rates on capital gains turn also on one other necessary change, that of a reexamination of the definition of capital gains. If something called a capital gain is to be included to the extent of only 30 percent of the gain—as compared to a 100-percent inclusion for wages, salaries, business profits, interest, dividends, and so on—it becomes imperative that the present eligibility rules defining capital gains be considerably tightened. It is in this area, even under the present capital gain rates, that the suggestions for reforms to end the special preferences resulting from ordinary income items being classified as capital gain have been perhaps the most insistent. With capital gain rates being reduced by 22 to 58 percent, the existing definitional rules would involve intolerable special preferences and inequities. The tax program therefore proposes a number of definitional changes which can be grouped into three categories: One, the proposal that the holding period be extended from 6 months to a year. Two, changes affecting the interrelationship of ordinary deductions and capital gain, designed to extend the approach of the 1962 act under which that part of the gain on the sale of an asset that represents prior deductions would be treated as ordinary income—these changes affect the real-estate shelter, sales of oil and other natural resource interests, and certain sales of cattle and farm assets. Three, changes affecting ordinary income items now treated as capital gains, designed to reverse this characterization where appropriate—these changes affect such items as employee stock options, lump-sum distributions under pension and profit-sharing plans, the sale of patents, the cutting or sale of timber, and the sale of life estates. Some of these provisions either came into or remained in the law as an offset to the high marginal top rates. With a reduction in those rates to 65 percent and lower, for this reason alone these provisions are no longer justifiable.

The direct revenue effect of all the changes is a gain of \$100 million, assuming the present character and volume of transactions. However, the increased turnover of assets resulting from the unlocking of asset holdings, together with the net effects on transactions of the other changes, is expected to yield an additional \$650 million.

These then are the main details of the tax program. We believe the program is a balanced one, treating all levels of income and all types of taxpayers as fairly as possible. It is difficult to obtain any precise measure or index of the distribution of its benefits. Some may point to the percentage change in tax liability at each income level, and show that the highest percentages of reduction are in the bottom and the lowest at the top. Whether one likes or dislikes this result we must remember it fails to reflect the proportion of total tax liabilities paid at each level. Some may point to the percentage increase in after-tax incomes, and show that the highest percentage is at the top. Whether one likes or dislikes this result, it does fail to reflect the impact of the present rate scales which, under almost any program, would produce such an after-tax effect. Moreover, in any allocation of the benefits, it is necessary to remember that the corporate rate changes and the capital gain changes will yield large benefits to the mid-

dle and upper income groups, first through the increase in dividends consequent upon higher corporate after-tax profits and second through lower capital gain rates combined with increased mobility of capital. It is difficult to quantify these benefits.

We believe that when all the changes are considered, and their effects weighed as carefully as possible, the overall result is a distribution that bears a close relationship to the present pattern except where relief for the extremes of low income hardship or old age are involved.

It is at this point that we must consider the final dimension of the tax program, that of its relationship to the current economic climate. Three aspects stand out: One, we are faced with an economy which while sluggish is still moving slowly upward. This means that the program need not be geared to a shot-in-the-arm approach to ward off an immediate recession threat. Instead, the tax program can be responsive to the insistent demands for a basic tax revision that will make a lasting contribution to economic growth and lessen the risk of recurring recessions. It also means that while tax reduction is an imperative, there is legislative time to work out this year, with effective and expeditious action, a properly constructed bill.

Second, we are faced with a deficit for fiscal 1964 that, apart from the tax program, would be \$9.2 billion. While this deficit is the direct consequence of an economy moving at a slow rate, which the tax program is intended to accelerate, care must be taken that the costs of tax reduction are handled in a fiscally responsible manner to keep the transitional deficit within prudent bounds. The tax program meets this requirement, one additional to the substantive issues of tax revision, in three ways: One, the rate reductions are staged over 3 years, commencing in 1963, with the structural changes starting essentially in 1964; two, appropriate structural changes keep the overall revenue cost of the rate reductions within a prudent figure of \$10.3 billion; three, another structural change—the proposal to accelerate under a 5-year transition the payments of estimate tax of the larger corporations—will improve the budget picture by about \$1.5 billion so that the budgetary cost of the program is an overall \$8.8 billion before any feedback.

A third aspect of our present situation is that we must end our unplanned deficits and move on to a budget balance at a high level of employment. As far as the tax program is concerned, this means an effect on the economy that will produce sufficient revenues for this purpose. It is believed that the large rate reductions and the effects of the entire program on consumer spending and investment incentives will permit the economy rapidly to move to new heights. At these higher levels of gross national product, the resulting revenues even under reduced rates will be in excess of our present revenues. The difference, of course, is that the resulting dynamic economy will be able to maintain these higher revenues, whereas our present sluggish economy finds the tax structure an impediment to growth.

But revenues are only one side of the budget. The other requirement is firm control over expenditure policy. The President and the Budget Director have made these matters clear: one, civilian expenditures will be firmly controlled, and in the 1964 budget have been reduced; two, defense and space expenditures should begin to level off; and third, as the tax reduction becomes fully effective, and the economy moves upward, a part of the revenue increases must go to eliminating the deficit.

Under this combination of revenue increases and a budgetary policy of firm expenditure control, we can move on to a balanced budget and full employment. To be

sure, certain assumptions and expectations respecting the economic response to the tax program underlie this belief. But we must remember that the alternative course would not be without its set of assumptions and expectations. Indeed, in the light of the history of our business cycles, without tax action the risks become far greater of a recession coming and of its lasting longer and cutting deeper. Such a recession would increase the deficit far more than the program, without affording even any hope of improvement or offset.

CONCLUSION

The tax program is responsive to two main requirements. First, it responds to the imperative need for the large reductions in individual, corporate, and capital gain rates required now to enable the economy to reach its full potential for output and growth, while at the same time permitting these rate reductions to be achieved in a fiscally responsible manner compatible with the deficit condition of the budget. Second, it responds to the long-felt need for a revision of the income tax structure that would scale down the rates, broaden the tax base, eliminate serious hardships, and end unjustifiable abuses and preferences. The program thus fits into the efforts that commenced with the Revenue Act of 1962 to achieve the tax revision which the earlier studies of the Congress delineated as vitally necessary.

As the President has firmly and consistently stated, the core and central theme of the tax program are the large reductions in all the tax rates—reductions that remove the restraints now imposed by the tax system on the economy and on incentives for private initiative. The cost of these reductions, plus the elimination of hardships which the rate reductions cannot reach comes to over \$14 billion. The revenue gained from structural changes, important in themselves as contributing to equity and economic growth, and from increased mobility through capital gains revisions will bring that cost down to \$10.3 billion. A further structural change, the acceleration of corporate payments, reduces this figure to a budgetary cost, before feedback, of \$8.8 billion. The structural changes thus bring the rate reductions within a budgetary cost that is clearly fiscally responsible. If these structural changes are to be substantially altered, the overall program would, therefore, have to be reshaped by significantly limiting the rate reductions—so that we would not achieve an individual rate scale running from 14 to 65 percent, a corporate rate reduction to 47 percent, and elimination of hardship for the poor and the aged—thus significantly lessening the effect on the economy and on incentives; or it must be reshaped by increasing the cost and budgetary impact of the program, or by some combination of these approaches. Naturally, it is not necessary to enact all the changes exactly as proposed. But a measure designed to provide the maximum effect on the economy through rate reductions and to do so in a manner most consonant with appropriate fiscal responsibility would involve some structural changes of one sort or another.

These are decisions which must and will be made in Congress. The Committee on Ways and Means has commenced its consideration of the tax program. It will shape a tax bill that takes account of the helpful criticisms and suggestions which the legislative process produces. The Treasury Department will fully cooperate in this process.

In the process of moving forward with a tax program so vitally needed, we must not let all of the detailed bits and pieces inevitable in tax legislation obscure the objectives we are seeking to accomplish. The total is far more than the bits and pieces, far more than how each of our individual pocketbooks is affected, far more than how much tax reduction this or that person gets in

1963, or in 1964 or in 1965. The total is a revision of our income tax which will enable us to achieve, as far as it lies within the power and effect of the tax system, the strong and growing economy which is vital to the kind of America we all desire.

THE McNAMARA MONARCHY?

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. President, the latest issue of the Saturday Evening Post contains an excellent article by Hanson W. Baldwin entitled "The McNamara Monarchy." Mr. Baldwin is one of the world's foremost military affairs writers. He is the military editor of the New York Times where he has worked since 1929. In 1944 he won a Pulitzer Prize for his reporting on the war in the Pacific.

Mr. Baldwin's article raises questions that have been giving serious concern to many of us in recent months. We have no objection to bright young men participating in the military affairs of this country. On the other hand, some of us believe that there is a tendency to disregard the experienced military advisers in the Defense Department. The TFX contract is now under investigation. Without passing on the merits of that controversy, a question is naturally raised when four evaluation boards are reversed. The controversy of the Skybolt is well known. Some members of the Armed Services Committee and the Appropriations Committees of the House and the Senate bowed to the slowdown on the RS-70 on the assurance that the Skybolt would give the B-52 a longer life. This was done, I am sure, with some misgivings. But the Skybolt, notwithstanding previous assurance to our committees, has been canceled.

Four committees of the Congress consistently urged the development of the B-70—now called the RS-70—as a complete weapons system. Those committees are the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations and the House and Senate Committees on Armed Services. Repeatedly, we have given Secretary McNamara more money than he requested but he has refused to spend it.

I believe that Members of Congress would be interested in what Mr. Baldwin has to say in his article. I believe that the questions he raises will be matters of continuing discussion here in the Congress. I call the article to the attention of my colleagues and ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD.

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

THE McNAMARA MONARCHY (By Hanson W. Baldwin)

The unification of the armed services sponsored by Secretary of Defense Robert S. McNamara poses some subtle and insidious dangers—creeping dangers that are political, military and administrative. And they could present, in their ultimate form, almost as great a threat to a secure and free nation as the attempted military coup, envisaged in the recent novel, "Seven Days in May."

For the kind of unification being practiced and preached today has ominous overtones. It is dangerous to the Nation's political system of checks and balances, dangerous to the continued development of sound military advice and effective military leadership, dangerous to managerial and administrative efficiency.

Mr. McNamara is, first and foremost, trying to make the armed services speak with one voice and attempting to reduce greatly or eliminate altogether interservice competition.

He has established tremendous Defense Department superagencies, such as the Defense Intelligence Agency, which has taken over most of the intelligence functions formerly performed by the individual services.

This centralization of intelligence has made service dissent on intelligence more difficult, and it has facilitated the molding of intelligence estimates to preconceived policies. In the Cuban situation, the primary reason for delay was the insistence of the Kremlinologists that it won't happen here, that Mr. Khrushchev would not take the risk. There's not much doubt that intelligence was influenced by this atmosphere of certainty. In fact, this centralization facilitates top political and policy control of military intelligence. And this is politically dangerous—domestically and internationally.

But this is only one area where Mr. McNamara is attempting to have the Pentagon speak with one voice. The Defense Supply Agency, a huge superagency, is procuring so-called common items for all the services. A Defense Communications Agency is being groomed for further expansion into a National Communications Agency which might well place virtually all of the Government's long-line communications systems under military control. Budgeting, the selection of weapons systems, contracting, personnel standards, uniforms, codes of justice, administrative procedures—all are now tailored to the pattern set by the Secretary of Defense.

Objections or dissent, even to Congress, are discouraged, muted or, when possible, stifled. Mr. McNamara has pressured the Joint Chiefs to sign written statements testifying to Congress that the administration's defense budget is adequate. He has censored, deleted, and altered statements to Congress by the chiefs of the services and their secretaries. He has downgraded, ignored, bypassed or overruled the advice of the Joint Chiefs of Staff. Gen. Maxwell D. Taylor, the chairman of the Joint Chiefs, is a known advocate of the abolition of the Joint Chiefs of Staff system. He favors a single voice.

PROGRESS MEANS PERIL

Mr. McNamara has not yet succeeded in forcing all the services to speak, officially or unofficially, with one public voice. But he has come much closer to it than anyone before him, and he is still trying. And the progress he has made carries its own political dangers.

For 175 years of our history, separate Army and Navy Departments (and then an Air Force) provided a natural interservice system of checks and balances. The services did not speak with one voice, and politically this was a desirable safeguard. They balanced each other, and their secretaries provided contrasting viewpoints at Cabinet level. Now only the Secretary of Defense is a Cabinet officer; the service secretaries as well as the uniformed chiefs of the services are submerged in an immense Pentagon hierarchy.

The latest reorganization of the State-controlled National Guard, still opposed by some Governors, may ultimately extend Washington's power over the Guard. Such developments represent dangerous weakening of our traditional military checks and balances.

Equally threatening to the Nation's future is the concentration of politicomilitary power, not merely in Washington but in one department. It places more and more power over the military-industrial complex in the hands of a few men in the executive branch of Government. The dollar volumes of military contracts amount to more than \$20 billion annually, with billions more in backlog orders outstanding. The individual

services no longer have the final power to contract. The rewarding or cancellation of contracts—which may make or break companies and affect thousands of workers—is now ultimately controlled by a very few men in the top echelons of the Defense Department.

Perhaps the greatest military danger in this centralization and unification is that it overrides the voice of professional experience and substitutes a military party line, a single strategic concept. The opinions of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, unless they happen to coincide with Mr. McNamara's, are usually given short shrift. Managerial techniques, computer analyses, cost-effectiveness yardsticks—rather than judgments learned on the battlefield—dominate decisions on strategy, weapons choices, even force levels.

Alternatives, variations, disagreements are the breath of life in any organization; imposed solutions, inflexible strategies, a party line from which no deviation is permitted could mean disaster. Mr. McNamara's policies are ostensibly intended to provide alternatives and increase flexibility, but there are many who feel they are having exactly the opposite effect. As Air Force magazine noted in its January 1963 issue, the decision of the Secretary of Defense to phase out the manned bomber will mean that by 1970 the Nation will be almost entirely dependent upon missiles for strategic nuclear delivery.

"We will have substituted rigidity for flexibility," states the magazine. "There will be fewer, rather than more, options for a future President to exercise."

The "one voice" unification trend in the Pentagon presents another potential danger: the development of future generations of officers who will be essentially military yes-men and conformists. They may be wizards of the new techniques of operational analyses and computer calculations, but without the moral courage of leadership qualifications required by the battlefield.

COMPROMISES ON WEAPONS

The single-voice concept is also enforcing—in the name of conformity and standardization—undesirable compromises in weapons systems. Technical competition between the services is being discouraged despite the lessons of the past. The air-cooled and liquid-cooled aircraft engines which ultimately gave us air supremacy in World War II were a direct result of differing Army and Navy technical concepts and interservice competition. In the Cuban crisis of last fall, a Navy camera used in low-level reconnaissance flights over Cuban missile sites proved to be far superior to a camera used by the Air Force low-level flights. The Air Force planes were hastily reequipped with the Navy camera.

Yet, ever since Mr. McNamara took office his slide-rule statisticians have been pressuring both industry and the services into designing and producing a single, all-purpose aircraft supposedly capable of doing the varied jobs of all the services. The objective is economy, but the indications are that the attempts to force all into a single mold, may ultimately cost more—in combat-effectiveness, if not in dollars. The so-called TFX tactical fighter has been delayed for 2 years while the Defense Department tried to force a design for a fighter that could perform equally well from carrier decks and land airfields. The final result—though officially described as a standard airplane—is actually two variants, of them probably compromised in effectiveness by enforced conformities. The obvious danger of this approach is the production of a series of hybrid weapons rather than the kind of equipment the men who do the fighting and dying would like to have.

Finally, what about administrative efficiency; what has Mr. McNamara's brand of unification done to the Pentagon? Not only policy formulation, but operations and ad-

ministration are directed from the office of the Secretary of Defense.

A program called the 5-year force structure and financial management program, dubbed "the book" in the Pentagon, attempts to chart and elaborate nearly every detail of weapons systems and force structures required by the Armed Forces for the next 5 years. Any significant change in this plan requires an elaborate process of justification, review and approval all along the line from lowest to highest echelons. Contracting budgeting, progress on weapons systems—even lawn cutting—is programmed and controlled in detail from various echelons of the Secretary's office.

The reporting and analytical system required has resulted in a tremendous burgeoning of paper work and great increase in numbers and rank of both civilian and military personnel assigned to echelons above the fighting services in the Department of Defense. But there has been no commensurate reduction, as yet, in administrative personnel and their workloads in the services.

When Mr. McNamara took office, he set out, as the Army-Navy-Air Force Journal and Register put it, "Courageously and confidently to streamline top echelon Department of Defense management." Instead he has added more to top overhead—the apex of the Defense pyramid—than any Secretary before him. There were 15 Presidential appointees of Assistant Secretary of Defense rank or higher in January 1961; there are 15 today, though responsibilities and functions have been rearranged. There were 11 Deputy Assistant Secretaries of Defense 2 years ago; there are 26 today.

The Joint Chiefs of Staff is limited by law—a law approved by a Congress wary of the development of a "greater general staff"—to 400 officers. But the restriction has been evaded by assigning at least 250 other officers to an amorphous division, called the Organization of the Joint Chiefs of Staff. The total military personnel assigned to the Joint Chiefs of Staff today is about five to six times as large as it was a decade ago. Yet one of the tentative plans discussed in the Pentagon contemplates a further considerable increase in the Joint Staff and the Organization of the Joint Chiefs.

There has been a steady increase in the numbers of top-ranking, high-salaried personnel—particularly civil service top grades—assigned to the Office of the Secretary, the Department of Defense, and the Pentagon. As of June 30, 1959, there were 3,009 civilians in the GS-14 to 18 brackets (the top-salaried brackets); last June there were 3,950. Moreover, their salaries had gone up from a minimum of \$11,355 to a top of \$17,500 in 1959 to a minimum of \$12,845 and a top of \$20,000 in 1962.

This tophat system has obviously built-in delay factors, and, as the record of the McNamara administration shows, it is far harder to start a new project or weapons system than it is to cancel or curtail an old one. In the first 18 months of the McNamara regime, no major new weapons system was started. Even today the Defense Department can find no military requirement for man in space, and it has curtailed, eliminated, or held back such important development projects as a future manned-bomber system (the RS-70), the Skybolt air-to-ground missile, and the Nike-Zeus anti-ballistic-missile system.

Though Mr. McNamara has centralized to a far greater degree than any other Secretary, he alone is by no means responsible for the trend toward a monolithic Department of Defense. It has been going on ever since the war.

CONGRESS SHARES BLAME

Concentration of power in the hands of the Secretary of Defense has been hastened

by the loosening of congressional control over the Pentagon. The power to raise and maintain armies and navies, conveyed to the legislative branch by the Constitution, has been watered down as a result of the sheer immensity and size of the Defense Department, the tremendous increase in executive power, and the weakness and mistakes of Congress itself. In the Senate and the House, intercommittee jealousies and the small size of the staffs of these committees—which have not matched, in any way, the growth in size of the armed services—have hampered examinations and control. And Congress, by loose legislation, conferred upon the President and the Secretary of Defense such immense power to reorganize the Pentagon that it has, in the view of some legislators, virtually abandoned its former power to check, control and approve every detail of defense policy and organization.

The process of centralization in the Pentagon has gone so far there is very considerable doubt that the service departments can remain separate at all.

Both Adm. Arleigh A. Burke, retired Chief of Naval Operations, and Gen. Lyman L. Lemnitzer, former chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, now NATO Supreme Allied Commander, Europe, have publicly opposed a single chief-of-staff system, and have endorsed the separate service "techniques of land warfare, naval warfare and air warfare." Former Secretary of the Navy, later Secretary of Defense, Thomas S. Gates has warned against centralization and has said that to "submerge *** honest differences of (service) opinion and free expression *** in any monolithic system would be a fatal mistake."

Gen. Matthew B. Ridgway, U.S. Army (retired), spoke in 1960 against reduction of "everything to its lowest denominator, one service, one uniform *** to the dead level of mediocrity, jacks of all trades, masters of none, a group of 'Yes' men always in unanimous agreement—what an insidiously dangerous philosophy."

If the Pentagon ever does speak with one voice, if the Nation's Armed Forces do come, as the trend now indicates, to represent a monolithic military-political point of view, both freedom and security will be in jeopardy through the slow erosion of democracy into a garrison state and the stagnant conformity that leads to combat ineffectiveness.

EXPORT AND TOURISM EXPANSION PROGRAM

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. President, last Monday, March 4, the President's E Award for export promotion was conferred upon the Air Transport Association of America in recognition of that organization's significant contribution to our Nation's export and tourism expansion program.

The Air Transport Association, which was founded in 1936, is the national trade and service organization of the U.S. scheduled airlines, both domestic and international. It has long been a leader in our country's endeavors to facilitate and promote international travel and trade.

In presenting the E Award to ATA's President Stuart G. Tipton, Secretary of Commerce Luther H. Hodges said this:

The Air Transport Association of America has worked continuously to develop travel to the United States. Its international promotion efforts, through a wide variety of programs, have stirred interest in tourism overseas, and its program to streamline requirements and procedures to visitors has resulted in the elimination of many time-consuming formalities. It has worked

assiduously to promote exports and obtain more simplified shipping requirements. These efforts reflect credit on the organization and our private enterprise system, and constitute a substantial contribution to the export expansion programs of the United States.

Secretary Hodges echoes precisely my own sentiments and, I am certain, those of many other Members of this body. As one who has long urged increased efforts to increase American trade and thereby improve our balance-of-payments position and stem the gold flow, I commend the Air Transport Association for its constructive program and the Department of Commerce for its work in promoting exports and attracting tourists. I think the conferring of this award is a timely reminder to all of us of the tremendous importance to the Nation of the U.S. flag air transport industry and of its conspicuous achievements in international commerce and trade.

SOUTH DAKOTA SIOUX INDIANS POINT THE WAY TO BETTER LIFE

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. President, one of the most urgent challenges confronting the Nation today is the necessity of raising standards of life on our American Indian reservations. It is well known that health, housing, educational and job opportunities for the American Indian lag far behind conditions for our citizens as a whole.

It is gratifying to note that with the cooperation of public authorities, the Indian tribes have been making an effort to build a better life for themselves and their children. I am especially pleased with progress that has been made by the South Dakota Sioux Indians on the Pine Ridge reservation. This reservation became the center for the first public housing program for American Indians when the Kennedy administration declared Indians eligible for such assistance under the public housing authority. The Pine Ridge reservation has also pioneered in the field of industrial job development.

Both of these encouraging steps have been well reported in a series of articles by Mr. Aubrey A. Graves, staff reporter for the Washington Post. As Mr. Graves points out, attorney Richard Schifter of Washington, D.C., who represents the Oglala Sioux, was a prime mover in instigating these two hopeful developments. I commend the Washington Post, and I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Graves' two articles to date appearing in the Washington Post of March 10 and March 11 be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

[From the Washington Post, Mar. 10, 1963]
IN WELTER OF CITIES, THE RED MAN WITHERS

(By Aubrey Graves)

An almost complete about face has occurred in the past decade in the Federal Government's manner of dealing with Indians living on reservations.

During the 1950's, policies pushed by Indian Commissioner Dillon Myer were put into effect looking toward early termination of the Government's trusteeship. The Bureau of Indian Affairs undertook a national

program of relocation assistance for Indian "volunteers." Carried out in cooperation with State and Federal employment services, it was focused at first on seasonal employment in agriculture and on the railroads.

Indians were given help in moving permanently away from the reservations. They were shipped off to large cities, particularly Chicago, Denver, Los Angeles, and San Francisco.

Help provided the Indian jobseekers and their family dependents included transportation to the relocation destination, subsistence grants prior to receipt of the first paycheck and guidance in community adjustment. These grants averaged \$1,700 for single Indians, \$3,500 for family groups.

In 1953, as a result of increased appropriations made available by Congress, the bureau increased both the geographic scope of the program and the range of services provided. Three years later, Congress gave the program additional impetus by authorizing the bureau to provide Indians, chiefly between the ages of 18 and 35, with vocational training, on-the-job training and apprenticeship training.

During the 1950's, the BIA was held largely to a custodial, recordkeeping function. Little was done about housing needs or human resource development on the reservations and previously existing bureau services (except for education) were severely curtailed.

Seeking relief from poverty and miserable living conditions on the reservations, Indians by the thousands ventured, or were pushed, into the white man's world. Here, many felt discriminated against and, in the slums to which their economic and social position consigned them, they were unable even to see the sky.

Homesickness set in. In their frustration, many heads of families took to drink and lost their jobs. Others decided it was better to live without comforts in a hovel, out of which a man could step into wide, open, sunny places where, at least, congenial companionship could be found.

Forty percent of the tribesmen drifted back to the reservations, some after having been resettled two and three times.

Toward the end of the Eisenhower administration, Assistant Secretary of Interior Roger Ernst decided that the experiment had failed. It had become evident that, under the resettlement policy, the more skilled and enterprising people moved away and the less enterprising stayed on, or came back to, the reservation. The effect was to distill off the most competent people, generation after generation. With the support of Interior Secretary Fred A. Seaton, Ernst called off the pressure for assimilation.

WORK, NOT WELFARE

Today, the emphasis has shifted from resettlement to improvement of the Indian in his natural habitat. Health and educational services have been stepped up, decent housing is beginning to be provided and vocational training is being expanded.

"There is very little wrong in the Indian picture," said Indian Commissioner Philleo Nash, "that jobs won't fix. The Indian people want work, not welfare. Our goal is to train the Indian workers and get them connected with opportunities, wherever they may be. It means teaching the Indians, on and off the reservation, a trade or a vocation for which there is a real demand in the job market."

In short, the white man's world, with some of its comforts and opportunities, is being taken to the reservations.

Last month, in order to observe the effects of the shift of emphasis, I spent 4 days and nights on the Oglala Sioux Indian Reservation at Pine Ridge, S. Dak. During that period, it was slowly thawing out after a spell of 40-below-zero temperatures. This

winter, I was told, has been colder than most. But at Pine Ridge, all winters are cruel.

SITE OF LAST MASSACRE

The Pine Ridge Reservation—about 40 miles wide and 100 miles long—was chosen because it is one of the largest in both acreage and population. Here, members of the Oglala Sioux Tribe have lived in peace—and most of them in extreme poverty—since buffalo hunters killed off the herds and the U.S. Army crushed the Indian warriors.

The massacre at Wounded Knee in 1890, the last engagement in which U.S. soldiers killed Indians, took place on Pine Ridge. It is a living and bitter memory to men who are still walking and talking today.

The population of the reservation is now about 1,900 families—(8,303 people at the last count). Two-thirds or more live in shacks, tepees and canvas tents that are dirty, draughty, and overcrowded. A 1961 survey by the Public Housing Administration showed 98 percent of all the habitations to be substandard. Two-thirds of the heads of families are unemployed.

But on Pine Ridge I saw also a glimmer of hope in 51 modern residences nearing completion. For the first time, public housing is being made available to Indians living on a reservation.

For these new dwellings, the Indians owe thanks in large measure to attorney Richard Schifter, who represents the Oglala Sioux and three other tribes in Washington. In 1961, Schifter persuaded the Public Housing Administration, which since its inception had done its work in larger centers of the country, that it had the legal authority to help Indian reservations as well.

With money borrowed from the Federal Government, the newly created, tribally controlled Oglala Sioux Housing Authority proceeded to clear land, lay out streets, and construct homes.

CHARACTER A QUALIFICATION

Twenty-four of the houses have 4 bedrooms, 22 have 3 bedrooms each, 3 have 2 bedrooms, and 2 have only 1. The homes were built on 60- by 100-foot lots at an average cost of \$8,000. These are said to be equal in value to privately constructed off-reservation homes costing from \$11,000 to \$12,000.

The dwellings are being rented by the OSHA on the basis of need and character, particularly sobriety. Preference is given to displaced or homeless families, war veterans and the disabled or handicapped.

A few have been assigned to families on permanent relief. Rent, which includes electricity, water, propane gas, and maintenance, ranges from \$28 to \$58 a month, depending on ability to pay.

With the exception of the sheet metal work, Indians performed all the labor. Of 135 who initially applied for work, only 2 could be classified as journeymen carpenters. Most had no tools at all; some had only hammer and saw. None had any experience in laying cement blocks.

Under the tutelage of the two carpenters and Federal Housing Inspector Charles Heintzelman, the novices learned as they worked. A lone plumber and a lone electrician likewise taught their trades to others.

Heintzelman soon discovered that it was costing 50 cents each to lay foundation blocks. He told the Indians they would have to do much better or non-Indians would be brought in.

"This work is for Indians only," he was reminded. "Only for Indians who work," Heintzelman countered.

The effect of the warning was good. Soon the cost of laying blocks dropped to 17 cents each. Reviewing his work at the end of the year, Heintzelman said: "Indians can do good work, skillfully, with their hands after a little training. Never before in my experi-

ence have I seen such a change in a group of men."

Now all the Indian construction workers own their tools. Soon they are to begin work on 76 similar homes on the reservation.

OWN INTERIOR DECORATORS

Emil Redwing, with his wife and children, moved into the first completed house. Emil had taken the carpenter trainee course. Into the second went a widow, Athelia Yellow Boy, and her five children. Another was assigned to Margaret Fills Pipe, a widow with four young ones. Ten houses now have tenants, another 10 are scheduled to be occupied by April.

Few of the families to whom houses were assigned had any belongings to speak of. So the tribal council appropriated \$500 to buy old and broken furniture and new upholstery supplies. In a workshop conducted by a State home demonstration agent, Bessie T. Cornelius, Indian men and women repaired and refinished their own second-hand beds, tables, lamps, and chairs.

Hovelwives about to become housewives were shown how to take care of floors and walls, bathrooms and electric refrigerators, and how to operate washing machines. In sewing classes, the women learned to make their own curtains, draperies, and slipcovers.

Classes were conducted in time management (the Sioux language contains no word meaning "time"); the women were shown the advantages of budgeting their hours and days. Instruction was given in family and neighbor relations, first aid and personal hygiene, and in the preparation of balanced, nutritious meals.

HOUSEPROUD TENANTS

There is some skepticism about how these houses will look after they have been lived in 6 months or so. The tenants I interviewed showed extreme pride in their new abodes; the homes I visited were sparsely furnished but immaculate.

Last October 28, a message to the Oglala Sioux from President Kennedy expressed his "fervent hope that these new homes, built by your own people, are the beginning of a better life for your community. As industry, commerce, and tourist trade develop, poverty and disease can be stamped out and the people of the Pine Ridge Reservation can at last enjoy a standard of living comparable to that of the country as a whole."

[From the Washington Post, Mar. 11, 1963]
FISHHOOK INDUSTRY GIVES SIOUX A LIFT

(By Aubrey A. Graves)

What has been the effect of the Federal Government's decision to call off its emphasis on early termination of its trusteeship over the American Indians, and instead to start creating employment and improving living conditions on their reservations?

On the Pine Ridge Reservation in South Dakota, I found that more Indians are gainfully employed today than at any time since the Civilian Conservation Corps of the 1930's.

Here, a simple, inexpensive item—a fishhook—has given the Oglala Sioux Tribe a substantial economic lift and many secondary benefits.

MINIMUM WAGE

Two hundred and twenty-four heads of families are now employed in three plants established by the Wright & McGill Co. of Denver. Bare fishhooks are sent to the reservation, where the Indians snell (tie leaders on) them. Then the finished product is shipped back to Denver.

Paid the minimum wage of \$1.15 an hour, the Indian workers draw \$46 a week. Many receive bonuses for overquota production. This adds up to a weekly payroll in excess of \$10,000 in an impoverished community where 1,300 of the 1,900 heads of families are still unemployed.

These incomes have enabled some of the workers to move their families out of canvas tents and log shacks into some of the 51 modern dwellings being built at Pine Ridge with Federal funds.

Seventy-six similar homes are to be started soon at Wounded Knee and Kyle, within walking distance of the Wright & McGill plants at those two centers.

The tribesmen have developed high skill at this work. The men tie from 80 to 100 dozen hooks a day, the women average about 60 dozen.

"Nothing has happened since tribal days to so boost the economic situation and morale of the Sioux," declared Leslie Towle, superintendent of the Bureau of Indian Affairs at Pine Ridge.

ENTER TRAINING

Seven hundred and thirty-one Indians entered training for the jobs; 439 successfully completed the course. As of May, 1962, 388 were working. Excess inventories at the Denver factory have since caused 164 to be laid off. The training program cost the BIA \$66,000. The apprentices were paid 57½ cents an hour, out of BIA funds, during the learning period.

The Indians have taken great pride in their success. "It used to be a great honor when one of our fellows came home with a buffalo," said Emil Redfish, manager of the three plants. "Songs were sung for him, there was dancing, and powwows were given in his honor. Strangely, these celebrations are coming back with this industry."

PRIDE WONDERFUL

Redfish said the Denver office was bewildered when the payroll was sent in containing such names as Many Cartridges, George Respects Nothing, Return From Scout and Afraid of Hawk. "A Wright & McGill lady telephoned," he recalled with a chuckle, "and asked if these were the real names that were supposed to go on the paychecks."

It is wonderful, Redfish said, to see the pride displayed by his people when they come out of the plant on Friday with that check in hand. "One man told me it was the first time he was able to walk into a store, pick out what he wanted and pay for it."

Redfish said that about one-third of the employees are women. He explained that "we have a lot of women who need jobs who have families. Mrs. McGill, the head of the company, insists on women having equal opportunity. Believe me, when the boss says put this many women on, you don't answer her back."

In one respect, the women proved superior to the men. "We have 44 machines in use," explained Redfish. "We had men on these machines and they handled them like they would a truck. They were banging them around and it was costing a little money to keep them in repair every month, so we switched over to women and we haven't had one cent of repair expense since."

AREA DIRECTOR

All workers must punch a timeclock. When one is late, he is docked. When he is absent from work more than once and doesn't call in or have a valid excuse when he comes back, he is fired. "The Wright & McGill Indians," said Redfish, "now understand what time is."

The area director for BIA in Aberdeen, S. Dak., Martin Holm, made a survey of benefits resulting from the existence of the plants. They had resulted, he reported, in increased school attendance. The children are better dressed and better fed. Study habits and classroom work have improved.

"When parents get up in the morning to go to work," he wrote, "they naturally send the children to school more regularly. And, because their parents work near home, they no longer drag their children out of school to the potato fields at harvest time."

Because of the new employment, general assistance payments dropped at Pine Ridge from \$53,864 during 3 winter months of 1961 to \$41,226 during the same 3 months in 1962, when the plants were operating. The names of 74 families on relief rolls in 1961 were not on them in 1962.

One adverse effect has been noted. Because the Indians have more money to spend, drinking has increased in the locale of the plants, particularly among single male workers. "They are prone to dissipate their checks for alcoholic beverages," the report said. "The married workers tend to use their checks for self and family improvement."

MRS. LYNDON B. JOHNSON HELPS TO DRAMATIZE FEDERAL AID TO ECONOMICALLY DEPRESSED AREAS IN WEST VIRGINIA

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, West Virginians will not soon forget the March 1, 1963, visit of Mrs. Lyndon B. Johnson to the cities of St. Albans and Charleston, W. Va. The Vice President's wife, braving a heavy rain, cheerfully participated in groundbreaking ceremonies for a new library, the construction of which is made possible by an accelerated public works program grant of \$69,000.

On that same day, and with none of her good spirits diminished, Mrs. Johnson toured the Food Machinery Corp. plant in Charleston, W. Va., presenting diplomas to previously unemployed workers who were retrained, under the area redevelopment administration program, for the good jobs they now hold with FMC.

To West Virginians who saw her in action on that memorable day, Mrs. Johnson was a lovely, gracious, and spirited symbol of the continuing high interest which President Kennedy's administration holds for the people of the Mountain State. None of us who accompanied her will ever forget the affection which she engendered and the encouragement she imparted to the many people she met and to those who turned out to hear her inspiring words.

The story of Mrs. Johnson's visit to West Virginia is excellently related in the Wednesday, March 6, 1963, edition of the Christian Science Monitor by Staff Correspondent Josephine Ripley. If anything, Miss Ripley's account stirs one with appreciation for the Vice President's wife, and for the many thoughtful ways in which she is serving the Nation. I ask unanimous consent to have Miss Ripley's article printed at this point in the RECORD so that Mrs. Johnson's fine efforts on this occasion in West Virginia can be universally read and admired.

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

UNITED STATES LENDS HELP IN WEST VIRGINIA
(By Josephine Ripley)

CHARLESTON, W. Va.—The visit of Mrs. Lyndon B. Johnson, wife of the Vice President, to West Virginia in the beating rain dramatized the helping hand which the Federal Government is extending to this mountainous State with its long unemployment lines.

While a local official held a huge umbrella over her head, Mrs. Johnson participated in

the groundbreaking ceremonies on March 1 for a new library in St. Albans, turning over a ladylike spade full of mud.

But the scene was by no means dreary. A crowd had turned out for the occasion. It was a big day in St. Albans, if not a bright one.

BOOKS PRESENTED

Massed umbrellas roofed the small stand where speakers one by one, including Senator ROBERT C. BYRD, Democrat, of West Virginia, stepped to the microphone, and Mrs. Johnson presented the new library with a dozen or more books autographed by the President, the Vice President and others.

There was a pause after announcement of each book as someone groped for it under the cover placed over the carton to protect the volumes from the rain.

But despite the dripping umbrellas, the muddy site of the new library, and the damp costumes of the majorettes whose act was canceled by the weather, the occasion was not a dismal one.

On the contrary, the ground breaking represented a \$69,000 public works grant by the Federal Government. It heralded a construction project which will give jobs to nearly a hundred townspeople. It will mean a real library in St. Albans for the first time—a civic project toward which the town has worked for the past 7 years.

Officials regard it as symbolic of some \$15 million worth of public works projects in West Virginia designed to spur employment. These are projects toward which the State contributes half the necessary amount with the Federal Government making up the rest.

Mrs. Johnson's next official stop in her 1-day trip to Charleston was at the FMC plant where another form of aid, under the Area Redevelopment Administration is being extended to the State.

RETRANEES CEREMONY

The huge, cavernous factory clattered, clangled, and spat blinding flame as acetylene torches bit into steel. At the end of the assembly line stood a lumbering, tractor-like vehicle known as a personnel carrier.

These carriers are being manufactured under a defense contract for the transportation of military troops.

Mrs. Johnson's task, surprisingly, was to preside here in the factory at a kind of graduation ceremony for retrainees to whom she presented diplomas.

These were former miners, construction workers, and laborers of various kinds—all unemployed—who had taken the ARA retraining course to become machinists, welders, metalworkers of various kinds, and qualify for work in the FMC plant.

The men who put down their tools to step up and receive the diploma inscribed with their name and their newly acquired skill studied it closely—and liked what they saw.

FORMER MINEWORKER

A former mineworker who had earned no more than \$5 a day, and sometimes as little as 40 cents a day, at his old job, is now making \$2.08 an hour with a 40-hour week. Others told of similar wage improvement.

West Virginia's unemployed now total 66,800. Retraining of miners for whom there is now no mining and for others whose jobs have been eliminated by changing times is a slow process.

The FMC plant employs 230 retrained workers today, with the number expected to increase to 1,000 eventually as the program turns out more qualified "graduates."

In the State as a whole, more than 2,000 men have been retrained for new employment.

The FMC itself, whose home plant is in California, opened its West Virginia branch under the ARA which encourages plants with defense contracts to locate in States

with heavy unemployment, if conditions warrant such a move.

The company here moved into an abandoned ordnance plant built in World War I.

West Virginia has received \$4,300,000 in aid under the ARA program over the past year.

"Much has been done," as Mrs. Johnson put it when she presented diplomas to the FMC retrainees, "much more needs to be done. The problems in the depressed areas of the country didn't spring up overnight, and they will not be cured overnight. But we have started."

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

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

OUTDOOR RECREATION

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request by the Senator from Montana? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 20) to promote the coordination and development of effective Federal and State programs relating to outdoor recreation, and for other purposes.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

APPOINTMENT OF HON. OREN E. LONG TO THE SOUTH PACIFIC COMMISSION

Mr. FONG. Mr. President, it was with a great deal of personal pleasure that I noted the appointment a few days ago of my longtime friend and former colleague, Oren E. Long, as senior U.S. member of the South Pacific Commission.

His appointment recognizes Oren Long's special knowledge, background, and longtime interest in the important problems of the Pacific Basin. He has expressed his pleasure in accepting this appointment, since it would enable him to continue his residence in his beloved Hawaii. Nevertheless I am sure his legion of friends realize his qualifications merit even greater honors.

Six months ago, near the close of the 87th Congress, I delivered a farewell tribute on the Senate floor to Oren Long, who had announced earlier his decision not to seek reelection to the Senate. Oren and I worked closely on numerous problems involving the new State of Hawaii—problems that faced the 50th State as it shed its territorial status and assumed new and heavier responsibilities of statehood. We attained a fine working relationship—a relationship which I am happy to say is being

continued on the same high plane and mutual cooperation by Oren Long's successor, my friend and distinguished colleague, DAN INOUYE.

I fervently hope that the President's appointment of Oren Long will be the forerunner of more appointments to come for others in Hawaii who, like Oren, have given so much to their State and country. I regret to say that the 50th State has been conspicuously overlooked in the matter of major appointments in the national administration. We have among our population outstanding men and women who have demonstrated their talents and capabilities in government, the professions, business, agriculture, and industry. As the Pacific crossroads, Hawaii has developed a reservoir of educated and specialized persons who are particularly knowledgeable about the Orient and the Occident, the East and the West.

We are disappointed that Hawaii has been bypassed by the White House, especially when we note that our island friends in Puerto Rico and Guam have received recognition in appointments to high posts in the U.S. Government. We salute such appointees from Puerto Rico as Dr. Arturo Morales-Carrion, the Deputy Assistant Secretary of State for Inter-American Affairs, and Mr. Teodoro Moscoso, Chief of the Alliance for Progress; and from Guam, Mr. Richard F. Taitano, Director of the Office of Territories, Department of the Interior.

There are men and women in Hawaii, talented, dedicated, and skillful in special fields, who are ready and eager to serve. They ask not what America will do for them but rather what they can do for their country. I say to President Kennedy: Give these islanders the opportunity to work for their country. They will more than prove their merit, especially in problems involving Asia and the Pacific basin.

DISPOSAL OF ELLIS ISLAND TO TRAINING SCHOOL AT VINELAND, N.J.—STATEMENT BY SENATOR CASE

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, the distinguished senior Senator from New Jersey [Mr. CASE] is unable to be present in the Senate today. He has been called away from Washington by reason of his duties as a member of the Board of Visitors of the U.S. Naval Academy, and he is in Annapolis at the present time.

He had prepared a statement for the RECORD dealing with the disposal of Ellis Island to the training school at Vineland, N.J.

I ask unanimous consent, in the absence of the distinguished Senator from New Jersey, that the full text of the remarks which he had prepared be inserted in the body of the RECORD.

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

REMARKS PREPARED FOR DELIVERY BY SENATOR CASE, MONDAY, MARCH 11, 1963, ON SENATE FLOOR ON DISPOSAL OF ELLIS ISLAND TO THE TRAINING SCHOOL AT VINELAND, N.J.

There are three recent developments which encourage me to reintroduce a bill to author-

ize the disposal of Ellis Island to the training school at Vineland, N.J.

First, Senator EDMUND S. MUSKIE, of Maine, chairman of the Senate Subcommittee on Intergovernmental Relations, has written me of the "effective presentation" made by Author Pearl Buck, chairman of the training school's board of directors, and another official of the Vineland institution for retarded children at hearings conducted late last year by the Muskie subcommittee. I recognize fully that this letter does not constitute a commitment for the bill, but it does point up the decided advantages of the Vineland program.

Second, President Kennedy has focused on the enormous effort that needs to be made if mental retardation is to be effectively prevented and controlled. On February 5, the President sent a special message to Congress dealing with mental illness and mental retardation in which he recommended an impressive expenditure of Federal funds for the expansion of facilities throughout the Nation. The President's program emphasizes the need for diagnostic and other facilities of the very type proposed by the Vineland school, which is an internationally recognized private institution, willing to pay the Government for the privilege of taking the idle island off its hands.

Third, I have been joined in sponsoring the bill by Senator PHILIP A. HART, of Michigan, who is deeply interested in the problems which the Vineland Training School seeks to meet.

The full text of the letter written by Chairman MUSKIE is as follows:

MARCH 1, 1963.

DEAR CLIFF: I have your good letter of March 1, advising of your tentative plans to reintroduce legislation similar to S. 2852 of the 87th Congress, which authorized the disposal of Ellis Island to the training school at Vineland, N.J.

As of this moment, the subcommittee is awaiting the printing of the record of the hearings held last year on the disposition of Ellis Island. I anticipate that these hearings should be printed within the next 2 weeks, and I hope that in the very near future we can move to further consideration of this matter.

You will be pleased to know that Miss Buck and Dr. Jacob made a very effective presentation at our New York City hearings in behalf of the proposed disposal of the island to the training school at Vineland, N.J. Certainly, the Vineland plan is one of the best developed proposals which has been presented to the subcommittee and it has the added advantage of emanating from a long-established institution which enjoys an outstanding reputation in the field of mental retardation.

I assume that the subcommittee will decide to give further study and consideration to the matter of the disposition and future utilization of Ellis Island. If that is the case, I am confident that the plan presented by the training school at Vineland will be carefully examined.

Hoping that we may look forward to further counsel and advice from you on this very complicated question, and with warmest personal regards, I remain,

Yours sincerely,

EDMUND S. MUSKIE,
U.S. Senate, Chairman.

In his special message, President Kennedy emphasized the magnitude of the problem of mental retardation when he noted:

"The care and treatment of mental retardation, and research into its causes and cure, have—as in the case of mental illness—been too long neglected. Mental retardation ranks as a major national health, social, and economic problem. It strikes our most precious asset—our children. It disables 10 times as many people as diabetes, 20 times as many as tuberculosis, 25 times as many as

muscular dystrophy, and 600 times as many as infantile paralysis. About 400,000 children are so retarded they require constant care or supervision; more than 200,000 of these are in residential institutions. There are between 5 and 6 million mentally retarded children and adults—an estimated 3 percent of the population. Yet, despite these grim statistics, and despite an admirable effort by private voluntary associations, until a decade ago not a single State health department offered any special community services for the mentally retarded or their families.

"States and local communities spend \$300 million a year for residential treatment of the mentally retarded, and another \$250 million for special education, welfare, rehabilitation, and other benefits and services. The Federal Government will this year obligate \$37 million for research, training, and special services for the retarded and about three times as much for their income maintenance. But these efforts are fragmented and inadequate.

"Mental retardation strikes children without regard for class, creed, or economic level. Each year sees an estimated 126,000 new cases. But it hits more often—and harder—at the underprivileged and the poor; and most often of all—and most severely—in city tenements and rural slums where there are heavy concentrations of families with poor education and low income."

There is every reason to believe, as the President does, that we are on the threshold of important advances in this field. Fifteen to twenty-five percent of the cases of mental retardation can now be identified as to cause. But many specific causes are still unknown. Preventive steps are wholly inadequate. Lack of prenatal care can be tied directly to resultant cases of mental retardation. Community services are not sufficient to the task. Frequently, they are outmoded in concept.

New institutional services are needed. Public understanding of the problem must be improved. Diagnostic, health, educational, training, rehabilitation, employment, welfare, and legal aid services need to be strengthened. We need to improve our research facilities. There is a need to expand special education, training and rehabilitation services. Due to a lack of trained teachers, supervisors and the rest, only about one-fourth of the Nation's 1,250,000 retarded children of school age have access to the special education they require.

Several years ago Ellis Island was declared surplus to the needs of the Federal Government and the General Services Administration was authorized to arrange for disposal of this white elephant. In 1960 the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare invited applications for acquisition of Ellis Island at up to 100 percent public discount to groups acting in the field of health, education or welfare or a combination thereof. After reviewing the applications submitted at that time, the Department rejected them all and, in effect, returned the problem of disposing of Ellis Island to the General Services Administration.

Early in the first session of the last Congress several bills were introduced in both the House and the Senate, each directing the head of the General Services Administration to convey Ellis Island to a particular organization for a particular purpose. My own bill was S. 2852.

The training school sought to purchase Ellis Island outright from the General Services Administration but was informed that inasmuch as these bills were pending in the Congress, the agency could not consider any bids.

It is apparent that GSA is looking to Congress to make the policy decision both as to the purpose to which Ellis Island shall be devoted in the future and as to which organization should acquire the island to carry out this purpose.

The training school at Vineland is a non-profit corporation of the State of New Jersey and has pioneered in the field of mental retardation since 1888. Diagnosis is necessarily the first step in any program of training or treatment. The school was one of the first institutions in the world to establish a laboratory for basic research in mental retardation and also a school for the training of teachers in this field. This has led to the development of techniques of special education which are commonplace today. The result is that the training school has become a demonstration center receiving annually more than 5,000 visitors from all over the world to study these techniques and methods in action.

The training school seeks to acquire Ellis Island to expand its programs in this vital area by establishing there an international diagnostic center for development and exposition of efficient methods of diagnosis of mental deficiency. Such a center would also afford greatly expanded clinical study and examination in a comprehensive variety of fields related to mental deficiency. A research and professional training program in the field of mental retardation would be developed in cooperation with universities and other organizations interested in mental deficiency. All of these services would be made available on an international basis, with worldwide dissemination of the information acquired.

The bill we have introduced would direct the Administrator to convey Ellis Island to the training school at a price equaling the appraised value as determined by the administration of the General Services Administration, less such public discount as may be recommended by the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare.

The training school is an outstanding institution which has been advancing the frontiers of knowledge in mental deficiency for nearly three-quarters of a century and has achieved a worldwide reputation in this field. For much of this period, arrival at Ellis Island, in the shadow of the Statue of Liberty, represented the achievement of years of work and hope on the part of millions of people yearning to be free—free from tyranny, free from persecution, free from lack of opportunity.

Freedom from the handicaps of mental retardation is still another freedom to which historic Ellis Island can yet be the gateway.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that further proceedings under the quorum call be suspended.

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

MUST THE ALLIANCE FOR PROGRESS FAIL?—THE ACID TEST IS AT HAND

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, the Alliance for Progress was one of the great, constructive, imaginative proposals of President Kennedy. It proposed, through U.S. financial aid, plus U.S. know-how, expertise, and cooperation, to help the Latin American countries move into the mid-20th century. It proposed, by means of a cooperative understanding, based on a willingness on the part of the Latin American governments, to establish long overdue reforms—taxation, anti-inflation measures, cessation of usurious lending practices, land distribu-

tion, a willingness to increase the efficiency and integrity of government operation to prevent aid funds from being wasted or misappropriated—and thereby to achieve, by evolutionary means, a peaceful economic and social revolution. Such a peaceful revolution is essential if a violent, bloody revolution is to be obviated.

The fact is that many of the countries of Latin America are ripe for revolution. At the top of an antiquated feudal structure is entrenched a power elite who control both government and the financial and economic resources of the nation. Theirs is the power monopoly that maintains the archaic political, economic, and social structure which makes the majority of Latin American countries a fertile ground for revolution by the exploited, ill nourished, ill housed, virtually destitute and hopeless vast majority.

Such countries—in the absence of the needed reform and in the failure by those on top to provide it—should have revolutions. Unfortunately, any revolution today is promptly infiltrated by international communism—as in Cuba—directed by Moscow or Peking and diverted from its legitimate goals.

Mexico furnishes an illustration in point. Its long overdue, needed revolution began in 1910 and was concluded at the end of the century's second decade. It was both a political and social revolution. It abolished usurped continuity in the presidential office, such as that of Parfirio Diaz, who had overthrown existing constitutional provisions and kept himself—a dictator—in the presidency for a generation, by providing one 6-year term for the president and no reelection. It provided for the breakup of the vast latifundios, or land estates, and the distribution of the land to the peasantry. The ideology and motivations of the Mexican revolutionaries—Madero, Zapata, Carranza, Obregon, Calles, and their associates—were wholly indigenous. They were drawn out of Mexico's own experience and responded to Mexico's needs. There was no foreign infiltration, either ideologically or materially.

But we may be certain that had the Mexican revolution taken place a quarter of a century or more later, it would have been invaded by Kremlin agents, who would have attempted to take it over and to spread their subversion throughout Latin America.

The sad fact, however, is that the noble concept of the Alianza para el Progreso is about to fail, because those in power in Latin America have not, in the great majority of cases, initiated or carried through the needed reforms. It was perhaps a bit naive to expect those entrenched in power—politically, economically, and socially—to yield in any substantial degree their vested prerogatives, their palaces, their landed estates, their "conspicuous consumption", to borrow a phrase from Thorstein Veblen, in order that the people on whose backs and shoulders their affluence rested might be lifted from their abject misery. Nevertheless, that was the hope, and President Kennedy's prescription of such action on the part of the Latin

American power elite was supposedly a sine qua non of the Alliance.

A large part of the fault, however, is ours. The administration itself has been inveigled into giving without receiving its stipulated quid pro quo. It has continued to pour our dollars into unstable and uncooperative regimes, to buttress their follies, to give them budgetary support, to finance their deficits. By doing this it has not merely wasted our substance, but actually, by supporting the feudal edifice, given encouragement and comfort to the very subversive forces which seek to overthrow the existing regimes and enthroned Communist-dominated leadership in their place.

The time has passed when lip-service from these power elites should suffice to turn on the numerous spigots—variously, grants, development loans, and other so-called loans or credits, or refunding operations.

The issue is pertinently and crucially posed by the presence in Washington of a high-powered financial delegation from Brazil which seeks to persuade President Kennedy that just once more the pitcher should go to the well of American financial assistance and rescue the Government of Brazil from its past extravagances and follies.

It will be argued—as it has been argued before—that this time it is different. It will be eloquently pleaded that President Goulart has a new mandate to establish an austerity regime; that he has already taken and proposes to take such-and-such steps.

On the basis of such or similar previous promises, the United States has poured over \$2 billion into Brazil. What is there to show for it?

If the Alliance for Progress is to succeed, it is imperative that for once our Government stand firm and wait at least 6 months or a year to see how these promises are carried out and whether the Goulart government is capable of seeing them through into the realm of tangible results.

If again we weaken—as we did in the case of Peru after our 1 week's firm stand against the military takeover—and as we have repeatedly “refunded” Brazil's financial chaos, our Government itself can take to itself a large share of the blame for the collapse of the Alianza.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that various articles bearing on this subject be printed at the conclusion of my remarks. They are: An article from the Washington Post of March 10, entitled “Dantas Due Here for Talks Vital to United States-Brazilian Ties”; an article from this morning's Washington Post, by its distinguished columnist, Marquis Childs, entitled “Brazil's Choice: Reform or Ruin”; an article from the Miami Herald entitled “Alianza Makes Little Headway in Four Key Latin Countries.”

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

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, the last article mentioned does not deal with Brazil. It deals with four other countries—smaller countries—Venezuela, Colombia, Ecuador, and Peru—where, cer-

tainly in the case of the first two, the efforts of their governments to meet President Kennedy's prescriptions have been valiantly attempted. Even there the difficulties and problems are great. But if in the case of Brazil we now again become soft and an easy touch before the evidence of compliant action by the Brazilian Government is crystal clear and demonstrable after adequate trial, we shall be making the task of successful implementation of the Alianza in other countries even more difficult, if not virtually impossible.

Our action now in the case of Brazil—and for the sake of Brazil—will constitute, in my judgment, at least, the acid test of whether the Alianza Para El Progreso can be made to succeed.

EXHIBIT 1

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, Mar. 10, 1963]

DANTAS DUE HERE FOR TALKS VITAL TO UNITED STATES-BRAZILIAN TIES

(By Dan Kurzman)

Brazilian Finance Minister Francisco Clementino de San Tiago Dantas will arrive here this evening on a mission that could determine the future pattern of American-Brazilian relations.

Ties between the two Nations have been strained in recent months owing to U.S. dissatisfaction with Brazil's efforts to stabilize its inflation-ridden economy and contain extreme leftist activities.

This friction was underscored when Attorney General Robert Kennedy made a hurried trip to Brazil earlier this year. Kennedy let President Joao Goulart know that Washington's inclination to aid Brazil under the Alliance for Progress will hinge on Brazil's willingness to help itself.

Since the Kennedy mission, the Brazilian Government has shown signs of embarking on a serious endeavor to strengthen its economy and its resistance to far leftist infiltration. And the visit of Finance Minister Dantas reflects American satisfaction with this progress.

In Dantas, the most powerful man in the Brazilian Cabinet, the United States will be dealing with a man who does not always see eye to eye with Washington's hemisphere policy.

FAVORS CUBA NEGOTIATIONS

He has often said that the American publics should negotiate with Cuba instead of isolating it. As Foreign Minister in an earlier Goulart government, he opposed the ouster of Cuba from the Organization of American States (OAS) in early 1962. He also pushed for the renewal of Brazilian diplomatic relations with the Soviet Union in 1961.

In his new role of Finance Minister, Dantas, who will meet with President Kennedy, Secretary of State Dean Rusk, and other U.S. officials, is not expected to discuss Cuba on a formal basis. But the subject may come up informally in the course of the conversations.

With the United States edging toward a coexistence policy regarding Cuba, the views of Brazil and this country are probably closer than they had been in the past. The United States, however, may suggest that the Brazilian Government tighten up its efforts to control Castroite subversion in Brazil, particularly travel to and from Cuba by agents and trainees.

The main purpose of Dantas' visit, however, is to solicit American assistance in stabilizing Brazil's finances and implementing development projects under a newly blueprinted 3-year plan.

SEEKS DEBT REVISION

Dantas will ask the United States to reschedule repayment of debts falling due in 1963, 1964, and 1965 over a period of about 20 years. Of Brazil's total world debt of \$2.8 billion, \$1.5 billion must be repaid with interest in the next 3 years.

About two-thirds of this \$1.5 billion is owed the United States, the remainder to European countries and several international financial organizations, including the International Monetary Fund and the World Bank. Dantas will ask the other creditors as well as the United States for rescheduling of debt payments.

The foreign exchange liberated by agreement of the creditors to this request, Dantas will argue, could be used to finance development projects.

U.S. officials indicate they may consider such a request for rescheduling, but that in most cases refinancing would be more feasible. That is, Brazil would be required to pay off its debt on time and then would be offered new credits.

Such credits may come from a release of part of the \$338 million committed to Brazil in 1961. Eighty-four million dollars of this has been held up because of Brazil's apparent lack of effort until recently to take effective anti-inflationary and other economic measures.

The changing U.S. attitude toward Brazil can be attributed to a number of measures taken since full presidential powers were restored to Goulart following a plebiscite in early January.

Goulart, because of his leftist tendencies, had been denied these powers by Congress when he took over the government following the dramatic resignation of President Janio Quadros in 1961. Brazil's Armed Forces had pressed for such limitations.

Having regained these powers with the help of the far left, Goulart has increasingly dissociated himself from the extremists. These groups now are accusing the President and Dantas of conservatism.

Economically, the government has, despite the political dangers, adopted an anti-inflationary program calling for a 35 percent slash in government spending.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, Mar. 11, 1963]

BRAZIL'S CHOICE: REFORM OR RUIN

(By Marquis Childs)

The Government in Brazil got hold of some secret documents the other day that illustrate the depth of the split between the hard-line Chinese Communists and the followers of the Khrushchev line of coexistence. Throughout Latin America the split is developing into more or less open conflict.

The seized documents reveal a quarrel between hard-line leaders over funds believed sent from Havana for carrying out propaganda and subversion in Brazil's poverty-ridden northeast. The accusation was that somewhere along the way sticky fingers held back part of the money. As word of the documents got around, an emissary of the Moscow coexistence faction approached the Government with a request for copies—they would be useful in blasting the enemy.

Cuba, as seen from Brazil, has quite a different look than the perspective from Washington. The blacks and the whites are not nearly so well defined. President Joao Goulart has told recent visitors of his concern that the United States by directly attacking Cuba might bring the quarreling factions together and thereby put an end to the greatest hope since 1917 of permanently dividing the world Communist movement.

To see ourselves as others see us—or, more important, in the current struggle to see the world as it looks to others—is a difficult task as we become increasingly preoccupied with our own immediate troubles. This applies

to all of Latin America and particularly to Brazil, which has just sent an important mission to Washington headed by Minister of Finance Francisco San Tiago Dantas.

As India is the key to the future in Asia, so Brazil is the test for Latin America. What Guatemala or Nicaragua have to say may serve the purposes of American foreign policy. But what Brazil says—and does—is likely to be decisive. And so critical is Brazil's raging inflation that perhaps no more than 2 to 2½ years of choice remain.

This is not to suggest any real parallel between the economies of the two nations. São Paulo has industry as advanced as anywhere in the world, and Rio de Janeiro is a modern capital in every sense of the word.

But the desperate poverty in Brazil's northeast, where in some areas per capita income is no more than \$50, bears a close resemblance to the problem of India with its average per capita income of \$69.

In presenting his case for rescheduling \$89 million of loans and for further economic assistance to American and international loan and monetary agencies, Dantas is pointing to stern measures to curb inflation. These include a major tax reform, a cut in the Federal budget of 35 percent, eliminating subsidies on imported wheat and fuel and an effort to put some sense into the chaotic government-owned transport and communication system with a raise in rates.

Stringent efforts are being made to check the flight of capital. Since the plebiscite in January ending the political crisis and giving Goulart authority, Brazil's currency has strengthened.

Dantas claims wide support from the non-Communist left for the anti-inflationary program, with workers realizing that a 52-percent inflation, as in 1962, robs the rich more than the poor. At the same time he is pushing the 3-year development program, with two-thirds of new investment to come from the private sector.

In Brazil, as in most of Latin America, there is a growing skepticism over the Alliance for Progress. On a TV program in Rio the other day a speaker said:

"The Alliance for Progress is dead, however much I should hope for its resurrection. The main reason for its failure seems to be the following: It was necessary to establish close coordination between help from the Alliance and basic reforms."

"But unfortunately the rich in Latin America talk too much about reform and label as Communists all those who would enforce it. This is easy to understand: The rich in Latin America go on holding 80 percent of the land on the continent. Often they control parliament and have the intensity of their idealism and hope in the future gaged by the bank deposits kept in their names in the United States and in Europe."

These words were spoken not by a radical leftist but by Dom Helder Camara, the Roman Catholic Archbishop of Rio. They underscore how very late the hour is. In Brazil, with its furious economic and political currents, time is rapidly running out.

[From the Miami (Fla.) Herald]

ALLIANCE MAKES LITTLE HEADWAY IN FOUR KEY LATIN COUNTRIES
(By Dom Bonafede)

LIMA, PERU.—After almost 2 years, the Alliance for Progress has hardly made a ripple in four strategic countries in Latin America.

An on-the-scene assessment of the program in Venezuela, Colombia, Ecuador, and Peru indicates that little, if any, headway has been made toward the original concept of the Alliance—to promote social and economic reforms for the betterment of the Latin masses within a decade.

For the most part the humanitarian objectives of the program have been amended. Instead of working at the bottom of the social structure, Alliance funds and manpower are concentrated in the rarified atmosphere of higher economics, apparently on the theory that political stability and industrial growth must precede help for the common man.

Large doses of money are being poured into these countries to prop up the national economy, balance budgets (including those top-heavy with military expenditures), and improve balance-of-payments deficits.

"In order to pay for the social improvements envisaged under the Alliance there must be a significant increase in economic production," reported an official of the Agency for International Development (AID) in Quito, Ecuador.

CAMPESINO MUST WAIT

Meanwhile, the illiterate, barefoot campesino with the tubercular wife and famished children is waiting for help to filter down to him.

In many cases claims made by AID officials are distorted since the amount of money earmarked for a country and the actual funds disbursed vary greatly, the latter being considerably less.

Here is a summary of how each of the four country's are faring under the Alliance:

Venezuela: In 1961 the country was scheduled to receive \$115 million. Of this \$80 million from the Export Bank was mainly used for bolstering the balance-of-payments structure, \$3 million went for housing. Last year \$92 million was available on paper but only \$6.5 million has been put into use—\$5 million for aqueducts and \$1.5 million for rural housing.

Colombia: This is the country which AID portrays as the showcase for the Alliance in South America. But Alliance funds have been used in most part to plug the economic gap caused by falling coffee prices. An agrarian reform program is bogged down in politics, lack of trained administrators, and peasant disinterest.

Banditry and violence in the rich coffee-growing regions have frightened many campesinos into leaving their small farms. Lower income workers complain that there is too much red tape involved in getting into the new housing projects near Bogotá, including the one visited by President Kennedy during his trip there. Yet, the Alliance appears to have the best chance of succeeding here, if only because of the all-out effort.

Ecuador: Of \$64.5 million made available, less than a third has actually been disbursed. Despite the pitiful plight of Indian share-croppers an agrarian reform program has not yet come out of the planning stage. AID officials say that a few hospitals and schools have been built under the Alliance but no houses. A recently approved loan has been granted to open up the dark jungle interior. And a loan application of \$4 million is pending for the construction of 2,000 classrooms and 700 teacher lodgings.

Peru: Suspension of United States-Peruvian relations in July 1962 interrupted the AID program. With the lifting of the suspension aid has been resumed but is only beginning to trickle in. Palace spokesmen maintain that Jorge Grieve, Peruvian member of the "nine wise men" who pass on Alliance economic proposals, is opposed to the ruling junta and is blocking credit for the country.

"We would rather deal with North Americans than Latins," declared Julio Vargas Prado, secretary to the military government.

Plans have been drafted to develop the Communist-infiltrated Convencion Valley. The Peace Corps, which feeds 182,000 Peruvian children through a school lunch program, is making a favorable impression.

OFFICIALS PLEAD FOR TIME

In each country AID officials plead for time. However, the high birth rates of these countries, the flight of foreign capital and the drop in basic commodity prices means that injections of money cannot keep pace with the vast needs of the people.

In Venezuela, which boasts a 3.6 percent annual population explosion—the highest in Latin America—President Romulo Betancourt has resettled some 53,000 families under an agrarian reform program, started incidentally prior to the launching of the Alliance. But the country's housing shortage is estimated at more than 700,000 units with an annual demand of about 60,000 units.

Declared an AID executive in Caracas: "There is no organized resistance here. But a feeling of urgency does not permeate all levels of government, especially at the lower levels. We're ready to go whenever they are."

While visiting the new housing projects it was found that some of the tenants had refrigerators and gas stoves but no electricity or gas to operate them.

Disenchantment with the Alliance has led to Latins blaming the United States and AID officials blaming the Latins.

In Peru, international politics is said to take precedence over the need for help.

"We have received practically no money under the Alliance for social development since the junta took over last year," reported Vargas Prado.

The Kennedy administration is known to be cool towards the junta government. The relationship between the two governments points up the unresolved problem whether aid should be dispensed along humanitarian lines unaffected by political bias.

Many Latins complain that the Alliance is not revolutionary enough. Yet when innovations are introduced with which they are unacquainted, such as savings and loan associations, they are slow in accepting them.

THE U.S. QUARANTINE OF CUBA

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, we are all aware of the forthright action taken by President Kennedy last October to force the removal of Russian missiles and bombers from Cuba. I think we all agree that the President acted properly, in view of the fact that the national security of the United States as well as that of the entire free world was at stake. What the President did was necessary, even though at the time there was probably no chance to make a careful study of its legality.

A scholarly article has recently been written, however, which demonstrates that the U.S. quarantine of Cuba violated neither the Charter of the United Nations nor the established rules of international law. This article, written by a member of the New York Bar, appeared in the February edition of the American Bar Association Journal.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the body of the RECORD, immediately following these remarks.

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

THE LEGALITY OF U.S. QUARANTINE ACTION UNDER THE UNITED NATIONS CHARTER

(By Eustace Seligman)

(Note.—In this article, Mr. Seligman examines the legal position of the action of the United States in imposing a quarantine on shipments to Castro at the height of the Cuban crisis. His analysis indicates that

the U.S. action was consistent both with the U.N. Charter and with established principles of international law.)

The question of whether the quarantine action taken by the United States was or was not a violation of its obligations under the U.N. Charter is one of great importance, and not merely to lawyers. We profess to believe in sanctity of obligations, we demand that of other nations, and yet we hear it frequently stated in connection with the Cuban quarantine that, since our national security was involved, we could not be deterred by legal niceties.

Was our action in imposing the quarantine of this nature in violation of our written word? It is believed not, for the reasons hereinafter set forth.

ARTICLE 2(4) OF THE CHARTER

The basic restriction on the use of force in the U.N. Charter is article 2(4). This article does not expressly prohibit all use of force—but only force of specific kinds. It reads as follows:

"All members shall refrain in their international relations from the threat or use of force against the territorial integrity or political independence of any state, or in any other manner inconsistent with the purposes of the United Nations."

In order for a use of force to come within the prohibition of article 2(4) it must be of a kind enumerated unless the enumeration is to be deemed surplusage and ignored, which would appear to be unjustified by any sound rule of construction.

As is stated in Bowett, "Self-Defense in International Law," 1958, at page 151: "This, in effect, was the construction which the U.K. agent, Sir Eric Beckett, sought to place on the article in contending before the International Court of Justice in the Corfu Channel case that Operation Retali, the subsequent minesweeping operation, was not contrary to article 2(4). He said: 'But our action on the 12th and 13th of November threatened neither the territorial integrity nor the political independence of Albania. Albania suffered thereby neither territorial loss nor any part of its political independence.'

"As previously indicated, the finding of the Court against the United Kingdom on this point, made no specific reference either to this argument or indeed to article 2(4)."

Writers on international law have expressed conflicting views on the question. However, Bowett, after weighing them, concludes at page 152: "Despite these reasons it is submitted that, the phrase having been included, it must be given its plain meaning. Moreover, to give it its plain meaning coincides with the limitations on the obligation of nonintervention which traditional international law recognizes."

Unless article 2(4) is construed to prevent all use of force, it is difficult to conceive of any use of force which would be more clearly excluded from the scope of article 2(4) than a quarantine to prevent the introduction of offensive weapons. The quarantine was not a use of force, (a) against the territorial integrity of Cuba; or (b) against the political independence of Cuba; or (c) in any other manner inconsistent with the purposes of the United Nations—or which the paramount one under article 1 is to maintain peace and security—the objective of the quarantine.

It would, therefore, appear that under the sound construction of article 2(4), which has heretofore been advocated by Britain, the U.S. quarantine did not violate its obligations under the U.N. Charter.

SELF-DEFENSE

Even if article 2(4) could be construed to include in its prohibition the use of force involved in a quarantine, it is well recognized that it cannot properly be construed to pro-

hibit a quarantine or any other use of force, if carried out in self-defense.

This question is fully discussed in Bowett, *op. cit.*, who concludes at page 186: "For these reasons we would maintain that the obligation assumed under article 2(4) is in no way inconsistent with the right of self-defense recognized in international law."

However, the use of the words "armed attack" in article 51 of the charter raises a further question as to whether the charter as a whole should be construed to forbid "anticipatory" self-defense—that is, action prior to an actual armed attack. Article 51 reads as follows: "Nothing in the present charter shall impair the inherent right of individual or collective self-defense if any armed attack occurs against a member of the United Nations, until the Security Council has taken the measures necessary to maintain international peace and security."

There is a full discussion of this question also in Bowett, who concludes at page 191: "It is not believed, therefore, that article 51 restricts the traditional right of self-defense so as to exclude action taken against an imminent danger but before an 'armed attack occurs.' In our view such a restriction is both unnecessary and inconsistent with article 2(4) which forbids not only force but the threat of force, and, furthermore, it is a restriction which bears no relation to the realities of a situation which may arise prior to an actual attack and call for self-defense immediately if it is to be of any avail at all. No state can be expected to await an initial attack which in the present state of armaments, may well destroy the state's capacity for further resistance and so jeopardize its very existence."

The traditional right of self-defense which it is believed was preserved by the charter has been described by Westlake, "International Law," second edition 1910, part I, page 312, as follows: "A state may defend itself, by preventive means if in its conscientious judgment necessary, against attack by another state, threat of attack, or preparations or other conduct from which an intention to attack may reasonably be apprehended. In so doing it will be acting in a manner intrinsically defensive even though externally aggressive."

From this it follows that the legality of the quarantine depends upon whether it was an act of genuine self-defense even though anticipatory, or in fact an unprovoked act of aggression. The answer to this is clear: The conveying to Cuba by the Sino-Soviet powers of offensive weapons was the initiating cause which led to the U.S. reaction and was a threat to U.S. security. The unprovoked and unjustified secret installation of offensive nuclear weapons in an area previously free from them and close to another state, creates a threat to such other state justifying under the right of self-defense the use of force in order to cause their removal.

Applying the test laid down by Westlake quoted above, the installation of such weapons under all the attendant circumstances, including Castro's threats against Guantanamo and various Latin American countries, was conduct from which an intention to attack may reasonably be apprehended." Who outside the Kremlin knows what the purpose was of secretly building up nuclear offensive weapons in Cuba, located so as to be able to bypass our DEW line radar detective network? Was another Pearl Harbor planned? Or was it intended once the installation was completed to deliver to us an ultimatum to withdraw from West Berlin, Europe, Turkey, or elsewhere? Surely the possibility of this was sufficiently great so as to justify our taking immediate action to remove the danger.

Furthermore, the limited nature of the U.S. reaction confirms that it was defensive only and solely designed to eliminate the

threat to its security caused by the introduction of the offensive weapons. Consequently, the quarantine was not an act of aggression prohibited by the obligations we have entered into when we signed the U.N. Charter.

One of the problems raised by the claim of self-defense is the difficulty of deciding when it is false and when legitimate. The justification of anticipatory self-defense has frequently been falsely advanced—as in the case of Hitler's claim in September 1939, that Germany had been attacked by Polish troops. This, however, is no reason for denying reliance upon it when it is in fact justified.

The U.N. Charter has endeavored to solve this problem by recognizing the necessity of an immediate unilateral decision by a threatened state of when and how to react, but under article 51 requires it to report immediately to the Security Council the action taken. This is clearly set forth in Oppenheim's "International Law," eighth edition, 1957, edited by Lauterpacht, volume 1, at page 299: "The reason of the thing, of course, makes it necessary for every State to judge for itself, in the first instance, whether a case of necessity in self-defense has arisen. But, unless the notion of self-preservation is to be eliminated as a legal conception, or unless it is used as a cloak for concealing deliberate breaches of the law, it is obvious that the question of the legality of action taken in self-preservation is suitable for determination and must ultimately be determined by a judicial authority or by a political body, like the Security Council of the United Nations, acting in a judicial capacity. The Charter lays down expressly that measures taken in the exercise of the right of self-defense must be immediately reported to the Security Council."

This obligation to report to the Security Council was complied with by the United States.

Oppenheim (*op. cit.* p. 299) gives the following example of the exercise of the right of anticipatory self-defense, of a far more extreme nature than the quarantine: "After the peace of Tilsit of 1807, the British Government was cognizant of a secret article of this treaty, according to which Denmark should, in certain circumstances, be coerced into declaring war against Great Britain, and France should be enabled to seize the Danish fleet so as to make use of it against Great Britain. As Denmark was not capable of defending herself against an attack of the French Army in North Germany under Bernadotte and Davout, who had orders to invade Denmark, the British Government requested Denmark to deliver up her fleet to the custody of Great Britain, and promised to restore it after the war. Denmark, however, refused to comply with the British demands; whereupon the British considered that a case of necessity in self-defense had arisen, shelled Copenhagen, and seized the Danish fleet."

In a footnote on the following page Lauterpacht states that: "The action of Great Britain in this case, while condemned by most continental writers, is approved by many British and American writers."

One of the British writers who states that this action is "justifiable in our opinion" is Westlake (*op. cit.* p. 315).

Two other arguments should be considered in connection with our reliance on self-defense. First, it has been urged that the Russian-Cuban action was not a threat of the use of force, but itself justified by self-defense of Cuba to prevent a U.S. invasion. This contention is clearly fictitious. The Castro regime has been in power for almost 4 years and yet no attempt has been made by U.S. forces to invade the island. On several occasions Cuba has appealed to the Security Council to ask protection against a threatened invasion, but has never been

able to adduce any evidence in support of its claim. Finally, proof conclusive of its falsity was furnished when at the time of the landing at the Bay of Pigs by the returning Cubans we refused to give them the assistance of our Air Force which they desired.

Second, it has been suggested that if the position of the United States is sound, it follows that the action which the United States took in establishing a base in Turkey was similarly a threat to the peace in violation of the Charter.

This suggestion is without merit for the following reasons:

The action we took in Turkey was not the initiating action of an aggressive nature, but our response to the prior aggressive steps taken by Russia in its expansionist program, and was of a defensive nature. As has been well stated by Mr. Frank Altschul, vice president of the Council on Foreign Relations, in a letter to the New York Times of October 29, 1962:

"There are few things less in keeping with our national tradition or desires than to have, in time of peace, Armed Forces of the United States stationed far from home at distant points around the globe. Yet we have felt obliged to break with tradition and preference in response to Soviet conduct, which has, ever since the fall of Czechoslovakia, in and out of the United Nations carried the conviction that the Soviet Union has in no sense placed limits on its well-advertised determination to spread its dominion to the farthest corners of the earth.

"Our bases, accordingly, represented an important, if by no means the only, contribution we have made to the defense of the non-Soviet world against the overweening ambitions of the Kremlin.

"The Soviet missile base in Cuba, on the other hand, is of quite a different character. Our history, as Mr. Kennedy said in his eloquent address, unlike the Soviet's since the end of World War II, demonstrates we have no desire to conquer or dominate any other nation or impose our system on its people."

"The masters of the Kremlin know as well as we do that the missile base, so furtively under construction in Cuba, cannot possibly be regarded as essential either to the defense of the Soviet Union or Cuba. Located close to our shores, it is purely aggressive in nature and furnishes evidence that the Soviet Union still regards the threat of a nuclear holocaust as a useful instrument for advancing Soviet objectives."

THE ACTION OF THE OAS

It has been suggested by our State Department that there is a different legal basis for the quarantine in the resolution adopted on October 23, 1962, by the Council of the OAS authorizing action which would include and go beyond the quarantine. The argument advanced is that the Charter specifically recognizes regional organizations and assigns to them an important place in carrying out the purposes of the United Nations in that article 52(1) states that "Nothing in the present charter precludes the existence of regional arrangements or agencies for dealing with such matters relating to the maintenance of international peace and security as are appropriate for regional action, provided that such arrangements or agencies and their activities are consistent with the purposes and principles of the United Nations."

It is urged that this article gives to regional organizations the right to use force collectively for the removal of threats to the peace in their region in a situation where an individual State would not have the right to use force.

This position seems to be of doubtful validity. Certainly the wording of article 52(1) above quoted gives it no support. Nor do the debates at the San Francisco Confer-

ence and the discussion there of the Act of Chapultepec support the suggested construction, for that act specifically provided only for the collective use of force "to prevent or repel aggression."

It would therefore seem that under the charter the resolution of the OAS would not justify the quarantine action by the United States if it had not been justified, absent the resolution.

The resolution does, however, have very real weight on the issue of the validity of the contention of the United States that the quarantine was in fact an act of self-defense. Instead of relying on a unilateral decision of the United States that it was acting in self-defense, there is now the unanimous judgment of the 20 members of the OAS after considering the evidence that the peace of the continent was threatened and that the United States and the other members should take necessary action including the use of armed force to stop the flow of offensive missiles into Cuba.

In addition the resolution of the OAS furnishes convincing refutation to the asserted claim referred to above, that the United States was contemplating an invasion of Cuba to overthrow Castro and that the installation of even offensive weapons was defensive and not a threat of aggression. Surely it could not be claimed that the 20 members of the OAS all contemplated joining in an invasion of Cuba; nor could they have believed that the United States had such a plan in mind when the resolution of October 23 was adopted by them. On the contrary, this resolution constitutes their unanimous judgment that this excuse for the introduction of missiles in Cuba is unjustified.

This action of the OAS is thus of the greatest importance in confirming that the quarantine was an act of self-defense and that the action of the United States was not in violation of its obligation under the Charter.

MILITARY AID TO WESTERN EUROPE

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, I would like to call the attention of my colleagues to an editorial appearing recently in one of the largest and most influential newspapers in the West, the Salt Lake Tribune. This editorial alerts the paper's readers to the disproportionate burden the United States is carrying in providing an adequate system of European defense. The editorial shows that our NATO allies are not meeting their share of this burden, either in terms of money or manpower.

The editorial points out that the United States is now supporting about the same number of men under arms as all of the NATO countries put together, even though the population of the NATO countries is almost 100 million larger than that of the United States. In addition, defense spending in the United States is currently about \$52 billion a year, or \$277 per capita, while the current spending of all NATO countries is only \$15 billion, or \$53 per capita.

The editorial concludes with a plea that this relationship between the United States and our NATO allies be corrected. And correct it we must.

As I have pointed out on numerous occasions in the past, there is no justification for the United States to continue subsidizing the armed forces of our prosperous NATO allies. Congress stopped further substantial economic aid to these

countries some 9 years ago, when it was recognized that they had fully recovered their capacity to be self-supporting.

Yet, since 1950, the United States has given to the nations of Western Europe, in the form of outright military assistance grants, a sum approaching \$15 billion. This vast sum is in addition to our contribution to the NATO infrastructure. These countries have long since recovered their capacity to support their own armed forces without further help from us. The United States, however, continues to extend these military grants, to the tune of \$314½ million in fiscal 1963 alone. Must the taxpayers of this country pay this bill indefinitely? Is there to be no end to the subsidy?

I am certainly aware, Mr. President, of the great wealth of the United States, and I am also aware that our per capita gross national product is much higher in the United States than in Western Europe. But is this difference in wealth proportionate to the burden being carried by the United States? The figures indicate otherwise. The per capita GNP in the United States is about 2.6 times as great as that of Western Europe. But, as I mentioned before, the average American taxpayer spends \$277 yearly for defense purposes, while his West European counterpart pays only \$53 yearly for defense purposes. The average American taxpayer is therefore spending over 5 times as much for defense purposes than the average taxpayer in Western Europe, which is almost twice the burden that would be warranted by comparing the individual income of each. This leaves no conclusion but that the American taxpayer has a legitimate complaint, and that it is high time for the financially successful NATO countries to assume a somewhat more equitable share of their own defense burden.

To demonstrate further the level of prosperity that has now been achieved by most of our NATO allies in Western Europe, we need look only to the unemployment figures for the United States and for the NATO countries. A study has been made which compares the unemployment levels of the United States with the countries of Western Europe, during the period from 1953 through 1961. Figures were available for all of the NATO countries except Greece, Portugal, and Turkey. In 1953, the average number of unemployed persons in Western Europe—Belgium, Luxembourg, Denmark, France, Germany, Netherlands, Italy, Norway, and the United Kingdom—was about 4.1 million of the total labor force. This number has steadily decreased over the years, until in 1961 the total unemployed in these same countries was only about 2.2 million persons. In the United States, on the other hand, our citizens have not been so fortunate in finding needed jobs. In 1953, the United States had about 1.9 million unemployed persons in our labor force, while in 1961 we had an average of over 4.8 million unemployed persons. The unemployment trend in the United States is up; in Europe, it is down.

For these reasons, I think the Tribune editorial, entitled, "Sharing Burden of Defending Freedom," is particularly appropriate. It is time for our NATO allies to pay their own way, and for this result to be realistically accomplished, it is essential that this year's foreign aid bill be amended to express such a policy by congressional action. If we continue unwarranted subsidies to rich NATO members, we not only disserve ourselves, but the alliance as well. In the long run, it will be greatly weakened, because it will lack the strong internal respect that comes from each member doing its share. This Congress should terminate further military grants to the individual NATO countries that have no further need for them.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point the editorial in the February 4, 1963, issue of the Salt Lake Tribune.

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

SHARING BURDEN OF DEFENDING FREEDOM

Something of an "agonizing reappraisal" of relationships within the Western Alliance is now in progress. It is related to the fair sharing of the burden of European defense, both in terms of money and manpower.

The reappraisal was in process well before France's brutal action in vetoing expansion of the European Common Market. But this French withdrawal from closer British and United States association is bound to further exacerbate strained relations and divergent views among the allies on defense policies and proper burden shares.

That dispute was dramatized by the furor in Britain over the United States decision to abandon the Skybolt missile. Hardly had that been ironed out at the Nassau Conference between President Kennedy and Prime Minister Macmillan, than new controversy erupted over British responsibility to pay part of the cost of the improved Polaris missiles offered as a substitute for Skybolt.

Meanwhile France insists on going its own way as a nuclear power and downgrades its commitment to NATO by assigning a puny division and a half to NATO forces—contrasted with Britain's 55,000-man NATO Army and the 400,000 men the United States has committed to NATO.

In Britain, meanwhile, the influential Manchester Guardian is challenging the whole plan to have six British Polaris submarines as not worth the estimated \$1 billion cost.

At the same time the United States is challenging all its European allies to take over more of the task of defending themselves. Defense Secretary McNamara put the case quite bluntly at a recent meeting with the allies in Europe.

And there is reason for a blunt presentation.

The United States with a population of about 188 million is now supporting about the same number of men under arms as all the European NATO countries with their population of some 280 million.

The United States is the only large NATO power with a 2-year draft. Britain has none, most others 18 months or less.

The monetary comparison is even more weighted against this country. United States defense spending currently is at the rate of \$52 billion a year, or \$277 per capita. All 12 of our European allies spend only \$15 billion, or \$53 per capita.

With such a disproportionate share of the defense burden, it is no wonder America's groaning taxpayers can't provide enough tax revenues to balance the national budget; or

that the international balance of payments continues to be against this country; or that the American economy and its rate of growth remains sluggish in comparison with most European nations.

This relationship must be, and it is being, reappraised.

As President Kennedy said recently, it is really fantastic what the United States has done to defend freedom around the world and to rebuild the economies of war-shattered countries, including our former enemies. This magnificent effort has undeniably halted the advance of communism and built the foundations of Europe's present prosperity.

But other nations of the Western World are now capable of resisting communism themselves, and their economies need no more support. It is time for them to accept a more equitable share of the burden of defending freedom.

Failure to resolve this problem on a basis of commonsense and reasonableness could so weaken the alliance as to make its members easy prey to Communist takeover.

OUTDOOR RECREATION

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 20) to promote the coordination and development of effective Federal and State programs relating to outdoor recreation, and for other purposes.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, the bill—S. 20—is now before the Senate. I ask unanimous consent that the committee amendments be now considered, and I ask unanimous consent that they be agreed to en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendments en bloc.

The amendments were agreed to en bloc.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, I also send to the desk an amendment which was very carefully studied by the committee and agreed to by the members of the subcommittee, which I ask the Senate to adopt at this time.

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

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 3, line 21, after the word "purposes" it is proposed to delete the semicolon, insert in lieu thereof a comma and add the following: "including advance payments without regard to section 3648 of the Revised Statutes—39 U.S.C. 4154—for initial costs of such research to any educational institution or other nonprofit organizations when necessary and in the public interest;".

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, after consultation with the distinguished minority leader and the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON] concerning the unanimous-consent agreement entered last week, I ask unanimous consent at this time that the unanimous-consent agreement for a vote at 3 o'clock tomorrow be vacated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, the reason for making the request at this

time is that it is my understanding there will be no yea-and-nay vote on the measure now pending; that it is agreeable to all sides; and that the measure can be disposed of today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, those who may oppose S. 20, to promote the coordination and development of effective Federal and State programs relating to outdoor recreation, have done a very real service, whether it was intended or not. The bill will receive more careful study, and our recreation problems will become better understood as a result.

The Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs held a 1-day conference on the bill on February 5, during the debate on the Senate rules, which claimed all the headlines. The committee subsequently decided to regard its February 5 proceedings as a hearing, and printed them as a hearing record.

The committee then considered the bill at its first executive session, adopted three minor amendments, and unanimously ordered the measure, as amended, reported to the Senate. Since that time, agreement has been reached to amend one of the committee amendments in regard to advance payments for research, which we have now done.

Bringing the measure to issue and debate affords us an opportunity to use the floor of the Senate to lay before the country a little more of the background and the dimensions of the outdoor recreation problem.

In the last two decades the United States has seen a phenomenal growth in use of outdoor recreation facilities.

Their use was growing some prior to World War II, but not so tremendously that it could not be handled by the addition of a new national park occasionally, or the development of a few picnic grounds and campgrounds in the national forests.

AN OPPORTUNITY MISSED

During the depression days in the thirties, Secretary of the Interior Harold Ickes foresaw the need for preservation of some areas to meet growing recreation demand. At his direction, the National Park Service made a survey of the shores of the Atlantic and the Gulf of Mexico to determine if steps should be taken to reserve part of them for recreation.

The Park Service recommended that at least 10 percent of the 4,025 miles of oceans and gulf shore should be reserved. It consequently recommended that the Federal Government acquire 12 tracts of land, totaling 600,000 acres with 400 miles of water frontage, at an estimated cost of \$12 million. The tracts stretched all the way from Barnegat Inlet in New Jersey to Padre Island, Tex.

It is a very regrettable fact of history that the pressure for recreation facilities was not sufficient at that time to push the program through. The Nation could have acquired the 12 sites, with their 400 miles of frontage, for a very small fraction of what considerably less frontage is going to cost us today.

Only 1 of the 12 sites was acquired in the years just after the Ickes' survey—a part of Cape Hatteras off North Carolina. We are now in the process of buying a part of a second one—80 miles of the 117-mile Padre Island off Texas. It is going to cost us eight times the estimated cost of the whole 117 miles of Padre Island in 1935.

All of the other 10 sites recommended in the thirties have now been developed by private developers. A resurvey of them in 1955 showed that land values had multiplied many times in the two decades. One of the areas, Bogue Island off North Carolina, is a 30-mile island which could have been acquired in 1935 for \$260,000. In 1935 there was only 9 miles still undeveloped and its value was put at more than \$1 million—an increase of 1200 percent in valuation in two decades. The story at the other sites is the same. At one of them, which had been subdivided, values in 1955 were up from \$26 an acre to \$65 per front foot for a building lot.

WARTIME DECLINE

Part of the reason for our failure to act at that time was the approach of World War II, rising employment, and economic activity. When the war engulfed us, demand on recreation facilities plummeted.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD a table showing the number of visitors at National Park Service areas and at the national forests from 1941 through 1961.

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

Visits to national park areas and national forests

Year	Park Service areas ¹	National forests
1941	21,236,947	18,004,785
1942	9,370,969	10,407,120
1943	6,828,420	6,274,659
1944	8,339,775	7,151,933
1945	11,713,852	10,074,089
1946	21,752,315	18,240,677
1947	25,534,188	21,330,751
1948	29,858,828	24,010,984
1949	31,736,402	26,080,255
1950	33,252,589	27,367,797
1951	37,106,440	29,950,252
1952	42,299,836	33,006,885
1953	46,224,794	35,403,050
1954	47,833,913	40,304,037
1955	50,077,838	45,712,868
1956	54,923,000	52,556,084
1957	59,285,000	60,957,273
1958	58,677,000	68,449,500
1959	62,812,000	81,521,000
1960	72,288,000	92,594,500
1961	79,040,000	102,000,000
1962	88,000,000	112,762,000

¹ National park areas include parks, monuments, historical sites, and related areas.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, this table tells only a part of the story of recreation demand in the United States. But it shows how demand declined during World War II, and then literally skyrocketed.

The national parks had 21 million visitors in 1941. That fell under 7 million in 1943, jumped back past 21 million in 1946, and has quadrupled since the immediate post-war period.

The Forest Service story is even more striking.

Visits to the national forests ran 18 million in 1941. They fell off to about 6 million in 1943, climbed to 10 million in 1945, and they were 10 times 10 million in 1961—102 million. The gain alone in 1962 is now estimated to be greater than the total attendance back in 1945.

GROWTH UNDERESTIMATED

We became aware of the tremendous growth in use of recreational facilities in the Nation in the fifties, when visitors and tourists started overflowing not only old facilities for recreationists, but all the new ones we could build. Our old pace of providing recreation areas and facilities wasn't keeping up with demand.

In 1954, Stephen Rauschenbush of the Public Affairs Institute here in Washington went to a natural resources conference in Canada and told the participants that demand on recreational facilities was growing a great deal faster than population; that multipliers were at work. Rauschenbush related rising per capita income and shorter working hours to the rising demand to explain why the increase was exceeding population growth. He made a very interesting attempt to startle the natural resources experts into a realization of the dimensions of the recreation problem they confronted by projecting demand ahead to 1960 on the basis, not just of population growth, but population growth times increased income and increased leisure. Rauschenbush's projections were for a 32 percent to 50 percent increase in visits to park and forest recreation areas between 1953 and 1960. The actual increase was in the order of 110 percent. The U.S. parks and forests had 77.7 million visitors in 1953 and 164.9 million in 1960.

Rauschenbush was not the only estimator in the fifties who was later shown to be overly conservative. Agencies across the country, in the recreation business, were awakening in this period to the situation which confronted them and planning to handle increased visitors, but they almost invariably set their sights too low. One factor they overlooked was the effect that post-war road building would have on recreation demand—the increased mobility of the increased numbers of people with higher incomes and more leisure time.

The 50 million visitors to National Park Service areas in 1955 were twice the capacity of facilities available to service them. Vacationists who were turned away from the crowded camping grounds and picnic areas grumbled, and they grumbled so loudly even those of us here in Washington could hear it. It came to us through the press and in our mail.

SCENIC AREAS ENDANGERED

The overload of park visitors was not only a public relations problem, it was resulting in damage to the natural and historic features of the park areas which the Park Service was supposed to protect and preserve. Campers who were unable to get into regular camping areas pitched their tents, built their fires, and left their garbage in the most scenic and interesting spots they could find. They were often right beside or even astride the finest attractions in the parks.

An inadequate force of park rangers was unable to police them all.

The National Park Service has a dual responsibility under its basic charter, the National Parks Act of 1916. One is to preserve and protect the great natural scenic areas entrusted to it for the undiminished enjoyment of future generations. The other is to provide reasonable access to the areas for the pleasure and recreation of the present generation.

The 50 million visitors to the parks were making it impossible for the Park Service to discharge its preservation responsibility, and so, in 1956, it submitted to Congress a 10-year \$600 million program to provide facilities to handle 80 million visitors. That was the number of visitors anticipated in 1966 under the project, known to all of us now as Mission 66.

If Senators will refer to the table I have placed in the RECORD, they will find that the number of visitors to the Park Service areas went beyond 80 million in 1962—4 years ahead of the predicted time schedule. It should have been Mission 62 instead of Mission 66.

THE FOREST SERVICE RESPONSE

The National Forest Service responded to the recreation pressure on its facilities in the midfifties with Operation Outdoors, developed in 1956 and initiated in 1957.

Operation Outdoors was less than a one-tenth part of the program for the national forests submitted to Congress in 1957. The total program for the forests was estimated to cost \$1.7 billion. Out of that total, \$123 million was for 102 new family camping units and similar recreational facilities.

In 1961, when demand had overrun the original estimates and after President John F. Kennedy had called for greater emphasis on natural resources conservation, mentioning the forests specifically, the Forest Service revised its program upward by 50 percent to a \$2.5 billion level. But it more than tripled the share of the recreational programs in the new allocation of funds. Instead of \$123 million for recreation, the revision contained \$409 millions for that purpose. To handle its more than 100 million annual visits, the Forest Service proposes the reconstruction and rehabilitation of 2,000 existing campgrounds; development of 28,000 new camping and picnic areas; development of 4,000 recreation sites where boating, swimming, winter sports, and other recreational uses can be served; and special developments at outstanding scenic and recreational areas which attract unusually large crowds.

Thus, the bold new programs of the fifties, proposed by both the Park Service and the Forest Service—Mission 66 and Operation Outdoors—proved overly conservative.

It should be said, in fairness, that program proposals which reach Congress are almost invariably more modest than the original agency proposals. There is a Budget Bureau between the agency and Congress, with an eye on the dollar and the budget balance, and too little contact with the realities of life out where people live. For example, the Bureau for

some years vetoed any appropriation request in behalf of the Fish and Wildlife Service for recreation, although millions of visitors were pouring into the game ranges and refuges every year. The visitors had to be policed, the garbage picked up and essential recreation services performed by staff and facilities pilfered from other budget items.

Unquestionably, the Park Service and the Forest Service originally sought more adequate programs than those which were finally proposed to the Congress.

By 1958 it had become apparent even to us in the Congress that we had a bear by the tail—almost literally. We were trying to handle a bigger problem than we had realized by a handle which was wholly inadequate to the situation.

Congress enacted a bill which I was privileged to introduce in the Senate and which Representative WAYNE ASPINALL, of Colorado, introduced in the House, establishing a national Outdoor Recreation Resources Review Commission.

We instructed that Commission to inventory and evaluate the outdoor recreation resources and opportunities of the Nation, to determine the types and location of such resources and opportunities which will be required by present and future generations; and in order to make comprehensive information and recommendations leading to these goals available to the President, the Congress, and the individual States and territories. Also the Commission shall compile such data and in the light of the data so compiled and of the information available concerning trends in population, leisure, transportation, and other factors, shall determine the amount, kind, quality, and location of such outdoor recreation resources and opportunities as will be required by the year 1976 and the year 2000, and shall recommend what policies should best be adopted and what programs initiated, at each level of government and by private organizations and other citizen groups and interests, to meet such future requirements.

The chairman of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, Senator JACKSON, made a splendid, concise statement on Friday last of the nature of the Commission, its membership and its recommendations leading up to the presentation of the measure before the Senate, S. 20, and of the contents of the bill.

The Commission, appointed by President Dwight D. Eisenhower, followed the mandate of the bill. It was bipartisan, including four Senators and four Representatives equally divided between the parties. The seven citizen members appointed by Mr. Eisenhower were, as the bill directed, "citizens known to be informed about and concerned with the preservation and development of outdoor recreation resources and opportunities, and experienced in resource conservation planning for multiple resource uses."

The report of the Commission was a conscientious effort to find the best possible solutions to growing recreation demands.

This is not a Kennedy new idea measure, although the President is to be highly praised for the strong support he

has given it and the whole recreation program.

S. 20 is the product of two decades of national experience with burgeoning recreation demands followed by one of the finest examples of bipartisan—indeed, nonpartisan—study and planning that will be found in the history of our country.

Seldom have a group laid their partisanship aside so completely, outlined factual studies, enlisted technicians and experts in the field, and made so thorough a study of a major national problem.

The bill which created the Commission was introduced on February 5, 1957, by Senators Anderson, Murray, Watkins, Carroll, Barrett, Kuchel, Allott, Neuberger, Morse, Mundt, and Goldwater—six Republicans and five Democrats.

The congressional posts on the Commission were divided equally between the parties. The politics of some of the commissioners appointed by President Eisenhower aren't known to most of us.

We can assume that the Chairman of the Commission, Mr. Laurance Rockefeller, brother of the Republican Governor of New York, is a Republican. One or two other of the citizen members of the Commission could be suspected of being Republicans by their identities outside the Commission, but within the Commission there was no way to tell whether Joe Penfold of the Izaak Walton League, Dean Samuel Dana, of the University of Michigan, and any of the others were Democrats or Republicans. I can testify that they have acted on this work without political or partisan prejudice.

The whole group—including the congressional members—were citizens and conservationists working together to dig out the facts and develop a sound national recreation policy and program to supplant the piecemeal and inadequate efforts of the individual agencies of government at both the Federal and State levels.

The adjectives "piecemeal" and "inadequate" are used here without any implication of criticism whatever.

The National Park Service and the Forest Service were criticized for asking as much as they did in Mission 66 and Operation Outdoors. No one can properly do anything but commend them for their early responses to the emerging problem of surging recreational demand.

Congress was not so farsighted that we pressed extra authorizations and appropriations on them with an injunction to do more than they had proposed.

Nor is Congress to be criticized. When we realized the size of the problem, we made arrangements to get the facts by the creation of the Outdoor Recreation Resources Review Commission.

The report of the Commission is, to my way of thinking, one of the finest ever submitted to Congress. It was expensive. The Nation invested more than \$2 million in its preparation. It is worth every penny if we carry it out. It is backed up by an extensive inventory of outdoor recreation areas in the Nation, including the names of approximately 10,000 of them, plus the managing agency, acre-

age, county location, facilities available and much other data. It is backed up further by 25 studies of special problems involved in planning a proper recreation program. There are studies of the place of wilderness in a recreation program, of shoreline resources, hunting, and fishing. There is an extensive study of the types of recreation people enjoy and of the quality required to give the users satisfaction. More than 16,000 people were questioned extensively on their recreation activities, reactions, and aspirations to determine accurately the nature and extent of public demand.

The Commission studied the proper role of each level of government in meeting recreation needs. Study No. 11 is of the private role in supplying outdoor recreation demand, a careful appraisal of how far the Government should go, and how much of the load private agencies and private enterprise can meet.

There was detailed analysis of Government agencies involved in the recreation field, and of how Government could best organize itself to carry on a recreation program.

Copies of the Commission report were sent to every Member of Congress and I hope that every Member will get out his copy and examine it carefully before we vote on S. 20. Its thoroughness cannot fail to impress any openminded person.

It is to the credit of the Commission that it did not do as so many commissions do, and dodge the tough, controversial questions.

The Commission outlined a recreation policy for the U.S. Government and then it blueprinted in detail how that policy should be translated into action programs. It made recommendations on where responsibilities should be assigned, what should be done, and how the bill for such work should be paid.

The Bureau of Outdoor Recreation established by Secretary of the Interior Udall in April last year was not only recommended by the Commission, but its functions were outlined in detail—the very same functions that S. 20 proposes to have it discharge.

The citizen members of the Outdoor Recreation Resources Commission served without compensation. They were all able people, unselfishly contributing many, many days of their time to their Government. We met for 50 days. It took at least that many more days to study over the reports and prepare for the meetings.

Those of us in Congress are accustomed to harsh comment. But I would deeply regret that men like Dean Samuel Dana, of the University of Michigan; Bernard Orell, of Weyerhaeuser Lumber; Frederick Smith, of the Prudential Life Insurance Co., and some of the other citizen members might have been disturbed by a stern statement in opposition, as their first recommendation comes to the floor. They deserve our very great gratitude.

Mr. President, we frequently need the assistance of gifted citizens in the solution of major problems. We have used such commissions of citizens many times. They have the ability to take

problems outside the partisan arena and study them objectively. None has ever done a finer job than this group, headed by Laurance Rockefeller. None has ever done a more conscientious job.

I am sure that the minority leader with his usual fairness, did not intend to indicate a lack of appreciation for what the citizen members of the Outdoor Recreation Resources Review Commission did. S. 20 is not a "bright new idea" of the Kennedy administration; in reality it is the thoughtful, carefully considered and unanimous recommendation of a bipartisan group including some very splendid and outstanding citizens.

There will be at least one more measure following this one before the present Congress to implement the ORRRC report. It is now before the Interior Committee. There has been some objection to some features in it. We are going to study them carefully in the committee. I am hopeful that a fine bill will finally be presented to the Senate.

So, the sharp comment which has been made about S. 20, may ultimately serve an excellent purpose in identifying the source of this piece of recreation legislation and the impelling reasons why it has come before us with strong bipartisan support.

I trust that it will pass and I am gratified that the minority leader has relented somewhat on his call for all-out resistance to the bill.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, as indicated by the majority leader, I had intended to ask for a yea-and-nay vote; and by unanimous consent it was determined that that vote would come on Tuesday, March 12, at 3 o'clock p.m.

I prefer to have the yea-and-nay vote come on an implementing bill which, so far as I can tell, will shortly be reported by the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. That bill is S. 859. It provides the sinew and the substance to give real validity to the pending bill.

However, I am still opposed to the bill, as such, which is before the Senate. I am opposed to it because, in effect, it enlarges the functions of a bureau which was created by an order of the Secretary of the Interior last year. The bill now contains a congressional finding and, in addition, spells out a vast variety of authority that shall be handled through the Bureau for Outdoor Recreation. The only allusion in the bill to funds is that the Bureau shall have authority to accept donations and contributions.

I believe we are faced with the enactment of a bill which would authorize Treasury advances, over a period of 8 years, of a maximum of \$60 million a year. Those advances would be interest free; and if the whole potential were authorized and were utilized, it would mean that this Bureau in the Department of the Interior could then expend up to \$480 million to advance moneys for the purpose recited in the pending bill. There would be no requirement to repay out of the so-called fund, to be established in the companion bill, until the 11th year. That is just another method of back-door financing.

I do not know why these bills were not combined. I do not know why the whole package, including the authorization and

the funds to be used to cover those authorizations, was not set before us in a single bill. However, the fact is that the bill before the Senate is a naked authorization and a finding. That is extremely interesting, because in the very first section of S. 20 the bill recites:

That the Congress finds and declares that the general welfare of the Nation requires that all American people of present and future generations shall be assured such quantity and quality of outdoor recreation resources as are necessary and desirable.

Mr. President, that is a pretty big package, I must say, when we talk about the quantity and the quality which are needed and are desirable. It reminds me of a former British Prime Minister, of whom someone once asked, "Why don't you let the country live like gentlemen?"

The Prime Minister replied, "To let the country live like gentlemen would soon mean bankruptcy for the Empire."

Mr. President, there ought to be some limitations provided in the bill. The bill contains rather fancy words, when it extends a finding by Congress as to how far we shall go in this field.

Mr. President, in the order issued on April 2, 1962, by the Secretary of the Interior, the so-called spending functions of the National Park Service were transferred to the new Outdoor Recreation Bureau. This, then, under S. 20, now before us, is an expansion and the creation of a great many new functions which this agency would undertake. In a sense it is, then, a new function; and, as such, it will require new obligatory authority, which will come in a later bill, in the form of advances.

Mr. President, I would be the last Member of the Senate to be opposed to the development of the outdoor resources of this country. I was born in the country; I sort of grew up in the country; I have the same deep desire to enjoy the outdoors that anyone else does; and I do wish to see those functions properly developed. But I have to measure the undertaking of a vast function at this time—and I emphasize the words "at this time"—against the fiscal problems presently before us.

We are confronted with what is popularly referred to as a \$99 billion budget. But, Mr. President, actually we are not confronted with a \$99 billion budget; we are confronted with a \$108 billion budget, because the \$99 billion budget, as has been emphasized, is the administrative budget; it is the spending budget. However, it does not include the new obligatory authority, which amounts to a little more than \$9 billion. So let us be realistic about this matter, and put the budget in the correct light, and call it what it is; namely, a \$108 billion budget.

We are confronted with an amazing deficit—estimated various at up to \$12 billion—for the fiscal year 1964.

The rest of the fiscal program embraces the recommendations of the President that there be tax reduction and tax reform, scattered over a 3-year period; so that probably the net budget deficit might be in the \$10 or \$11 billion range.

Mr. President, what a strange thing to make a request for tax reduction and a \$108 billion budget, and then undertake \$9 billion of new functions and activities, and in so doing jeopardize the solvency of our country. That is the matter which concerns me; and I intend to lift my voice against these new authorizations. Furthermore, others will be requested, including some for the domestic Peace Corps, which presently is in the making.

I am advised that at 736 Jackson Place, in Washington, D.C., applications for the domestic Peace Corps are being accepted—although, in fact, Congress has not acted on that subject, and there is no domestic Peace Corps. But one can go to that address on Jackson Place—only a stone's throw from the White House—and can procure a form 57, to make application for work in an agency which does not exist.

That situation reminds me of the old ditty:

The other day upon the stair,
I saw a man who wasn't there.
He wasn't there again, today.
I hope that man will go away.

In short, Mr. President, this agency "isn't there," but, notwithstanding that fact, it is accepting applications. I think that is a rather astonishing state of affairs. It is in the field of new obligatory authority, new functions, and new activities, along with the Youth Corps and others.

So, Mr. President, in light of our fiscal responsibilities and the obligations which will be placed upon the Government and upon the country's taxpayers, I do not see—in all good conscience—how Congress can undertake to authorize new functions and to spend additional sums and to derive them by a very interesting and appealing back-door method, because the companion bill, on which hearings have been held, and which I apprehend will in the not-too-distant future inch itself to the floor of the Senate, for consideration, contains an authorization for advances from the Treasury over an 8-year period, interest free. If my arithmetic is worth anything, I find that eight times \$60 million is \$480 million. Furthermore, the bill provides that repayment will not begin until the 11th year. So \$480 million in advances from the Treasury, interest free, would be authorized; and then there would be a hiatus or a grace period of 3 years, before certain revenues would be supposed to be available out of the conservation fund, in order to be able to make reimbursement.

Mr. President, that is an ingenious proposal; but it occurs to me that the appropriate way would be to come in with this bill and with a request for the required appropriations, and then permit the Senate to work its will upon the proposal, because that is not only the simple approach; it is also the accepted approach; and, in my judgment, it is the constitutional approach.

Mr. President, returning to the bill now before us, let me point out that it would do the following, among other things: It would provide for an inventory of the needs and resources of our people in the

field of outdoor recreation. It calls for an evaluation of those needs and resources. It provides for a system of classification of those resources. It calls for a nationwide plan of needs and "demands."

Mr. President, I presume there are a great many things that could be demanded; but, after all, the criterion should be whether we can afford them in the light of the program the President has submitted to Congress. Among other things, another function or activity would be "to identify outdoor problems." Mr. President, that is a mouthful.

We could gather a whole team of people—in fact, battalions of people—put them on the payroll, and send them forth in the country to identify outdoor problems, and they would never run out of identification work.

Then, of course, comes the crux of the thing—to recommend solutions for the problems. Those problems could be legion. I presume the solutions would be legion, too. Then to identify desirable actions by local governments—what an endless job that would be.

Then they would submit a so-called 5-year plan. It seems to me that I have heard of 5-year plans before in other areas of the earth. After the first 5-year plan, the program would doubtless require modification; so there would be authority to adduce and submit a second 5-year plan, with all necessary future revisions.

Then our old friend appears—research. Research is one of those words which have crept into the contemporary lexicon. It can cover a multitude of sins as well as a multitude of virtues.

Then they will be authorized to contract for studies. What kind of studies? Education programs, technical assistance, and other agencies. Other agencies would be allowed to spend their own money to help, with or without reimbursement. There is latitude like a 40-acre field when we say to an agency of government, "Any other agency can help you with its own funds." That has about it an aura of indirect appropriation in my book.

Perhaps it would be interesting to test out a point of order on some of the language that we find in Senate bill 20 now before us.

Mr. President, all the new authority proposed would be meaningless unless it were implemented with money. The necessary money is not provided in the pending bill. It will come in Senate bill 859. Senate bill 859 is, to say the least, an interesting bill. It is called the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act of 1963. It contains wording which is similar, identic, and comparable to what is contained in Senate bill 20, now before us. There again appear the words "quality and quantity as are necessary and desirable." Then the bill provides funds for "Federal acquisition of certain land and water areas."

Mr. President, where are the funds to be obtained to give implementation to Senate bill 20? The related provision begins on page 2 of Senate bill 859, which was introduced on February 19 of this year by quite a number of cosponsors.

What is the first source of funds? It would be "entrance and user fees." These are the entrance and user fees that cover our national outdoor resources, our parks, and recreational areas; and it would be for the President to determine what the fees and charges should be.

Among other things, the bill provides:

The proceeds from fees or charges established by the President pursuant to this subsection for entrance or admission generally to Federal areas shall be used solely for the purposes of this act.

So we see in that provision a grant of authority to the President of the United States to impose a fee, an admission charge, or a user charge. It is not unlike providing authority to impose a tax.

When that suggestion was made in a larger frame last year, Congress got its hackles up about the idea of giving the President authority to modify taxes at its own will and desire. But now we see again proposed a grant of authority to the President of the United States to impose charges at the very same time that deep concern has been manifested to make sure that people in the low- and middle-income tax brackets get their full and fair share of the tax cut. So it is suggested that we put the cut for those people in one place, and put a new charge on them in another. No wonder that item begot such animated conversation and discussion in the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. No wonder the committee members fulminated about user charges and admissions.

Mr. President, there is a broader grant of authority with respect to fees and user charges. These would apply to the National Park Service, the Bureau of Land Management, the Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife, the Bureau of Reclamation, the Forest Service, the Corps of Engineers, and the U.S. section of the International Boundary and Water Commission.

This is the authority:

The President is authorized to provide for the establishment, revision, or amendment of entrance, admission, and other recreation user fees and charges at any land or water area administered by or under the authority of the Federal agencies listed in the preceding paragraph: *Provided*, That this subsection shall not authorize Federal hunting or fishing licenses, nor shall it authorize fees or charges for commercial or other activities not related to recreation.

Mr. President, in S. 859 and I think in S. 20, there is a provision for utilization of some of these areas for commercial purposes.

I point out the grant of power, and I point out the sources of funds to go into the so-called conservation fund with which to reimburse that fund after 8 years of interest-free advances; the reimbursement not to begin until the 11th year.

There is another source of funds, Mr. President, and that is surplus property sales. If I read that section correctly, it would take in what we receive on all sales of real property and related personal property, with an exception. And, insofar as I can tell, that exception is nothing more than the \$8½ million of administrative expenses which are au-

thorized in the independent offices appropriation bill.

In addition, there is another source of funds. That is the motorboat fuels tax.

Finally, there may be one or two other items in the bill of no particular moment.

But those, Mr. President, are the funds which are to be taken from Treasury receipts, and at some time 11 years from now to be used in order to reimburse the Treasury Department for these recreation and conservation purposes.

This is an astonishing approach, Mr. President. It could not have been more complicated if they had set out to make it so. I do not know whether the commission which was set up in the nature of an advisory commission in the Eisenhower administration to make all these recommendations did so or not, but they certainly could have brought it within the frame of simple appropriations, instead of 8 years of tax free advances.

I emphasize one other thing, and that is that this is essentially and definitely a new function. We ought to be pretty careful about expanding the functions of government at a time when the whole fiscal fabric is so uneasy, when there is a hope that a huge and deep tax slash can get the country from its sideways motion and get it to moving again, a hope so earnestly expressed some 2 years ago, shortly after the inauguration.

One should not trifle with the solvency of the country at a time like this, and I do not propose to do so. So I am opposed to what is before us today, though not because I oppose the objectives as such. I think those are desirable. The question is, What can we afford in the country at a given time?

Government financing in a sense is not unlike family financing. If a family is to spend out of pocket for the things which are desirable, as the bill points out, how long can it remain solvent? How long can the family maintain solvency and credit?

How long will it be before government credit will become a little shaky, in view of the fact that the Congress in this session will be confronted with a request to boost the public debt to perhaps \$320 billion or \$325 billion, and to accept a deficit, and to put the imprimatur of approval upon not a \$99 billion budget, Mr. President, but upon a \$108 billion budget? Let us be honest about it, because the new obligatory authority may begin with a little money this year, but it will become the predicate for increases year after year, and year after year, and the budget will then start going into orbit all over again. That is what we are confronted with at the present time.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a brief observation?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. LAUSCHE. This morning I appeared before the Committee on Banking and Currency, with respect to the mass transportation bill. That supposedly involves a 3-year expenditure of \$500 million by way of gifts, but it was thoroughly apparent during the questions that were asked that the program will not be a 3-year program but, in all probability, a permanent program. There is an exam-

ple of the built-in authorizations and what eventually occurs—growing larger and larger all the time, making us more and more incapable of reducing the debt and more and more incapable of reducing the deficits, precipitating us into fiscal trouble of graver and graver consequence all the time.

Mr. DIRKSEN. If my friend from Ohio wants a classic example, I point out to him that the Peace Corps started with \$5 million of borrowed funds. The next year they asked for and received \$30 million. The following year they received \$58 million. If the Senator will take a look at that unexpurgated Sears, Roebuck catalog we call the U.S. budget he will find that for fiscal year 1964 they do not want \$5 million, or \$30 million, or \$58 million—they are asking for \$108 million.

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

Mr. DIRKSEN. If one wants an example of classic growth, there it is.

I yield to the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. LAUSCHE. In the 6 years I have been in the Senate I have repeatedly listened to the argument that the initial expenditure for a proposed new program was inconsequential; but during those 6 years it has repeatedly been shown, time after time, that what in the beginning was inconsequential grew into proportions of great consequence as the years went by. Not a single one of the programs that began in a sort of miniature size failed to grow. They never stayed at that small size. They never got smaller. They grew and grew all the time, like Topsy. That has been my experience in the 6 years I have been in the Senate.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I remind my distinguished friend from Ohio that some years ago—and I think my figures are correct—there was an interesting little board in Government called the Board of Geographic Names. It was in the Department of the Interior, as I recall. In that bureau were three persons. Their job was to examine and to ascertain where our soldiers were serving, to find the names of villages, towns, and so forth, and have diacritical marks placed on the names so soldiers could pronounce them.

I am not positive, but the next time I looked into the matter, it did not have 3 employees; there were 100 persons in that bureau.

Talk about getting liquidated—it is like pulling teeth. The best medicine is not to let them get out of hand in the first instance. Then we will not have to fight all over hell's half acre to get them liquidated.

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

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. LAUSCHE. The aspects of the problem pointed out by the Senator from Illinois are serious, but there is another facet to the problem which, in my opinion, is graver. Those who say we spend little, that we should not worry about it, are making that argument knowing in their minds that next year they are going to ask for substantial increases. That is the grave aspect of the problem. It is grave because on one side we are

fighting juvenile delinquency, badness of youth, while on the other side, by our example, by our approach to problems, we are showing a base, a twisted, a deceptive mind, knowing, as time goes on, that the innocent presentations made at the beginning are going to become entirely false by what, in our expectation, is going to be done in the future.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Well, I can say to my friend from Ohio that when I came here 30 years ago the Federal budget was a little over \$4 billion for all purposes, including national defense. I do not ask the country to stand still. I do not expect it to stand still. I expect funds to be expended, that appropriations will grow from year to year; but I do expect, in connection with annual appropriations and the contingent liabilities of Government, that the Government will maintain a posture which does not jeopardize our solvency, for if the time ever came when we had to use a peremptory weapon like a moratorium, I would not like to see the shudder in the chancellories of the world and what would happen to credit. It would make October 29, 1929, look like a picnic before we got through.

Let us stop for a moment to consider the commitments that have been made. We owe the civil service retirement fund \$37 billion. We agreed solemnly as a Congress that we would put in half and match the fund for every Federal employee. There are over 600,000 former Federal employees living in a retired status. They paid their share because we took it out of their pay checks. The Government has not paid its share. We owe that fund \$37 billion. Perhaps we can put a moratorium on it. Perhaps we can engage in fancy financing if we like. But we still owe it, and it is a Government obligation. We owe the military funds and a great many other funds. There are so many contingent liabilities we have that it will probably amount to \$450 billion before we get through.

We know the status of our fiscal structure. We cannot duck it. We cannot continue to put straws on the camel's back, under those circumstances, without inviting trouble.

Mr. President, there is little I need add to what I have said. This is a new function that is proposed. I am quite familiar with provisions for matching and the division as between the Federal Government and the States. I know about the payback provisions. I know the differences between matching and planning as distinguished from acquisition and development. But the fact of the matter is that this is a new authorization for expenditure. The provision for the money will come very shortly out of the same committee that sent this bill to the Senate floor. It will mean new obligations at a time when our fiscal problems are of the most solemn and serious nature.

Deep as my devotion is to the whole question of outdoor recreation, I still believe our first obligation is to the continuing solvency of the United States of America. That is the overriding consideration. That is the reason why I

raise my voice with respect to the bill that is before us today.

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, I wish to address myself for a few moments to the pending business, S. 20, which expresses the interest of the Congress in recreational facilities throughout this country.

The rapid progress which our Nation is making on all fronts—in automation, transportation, technology, education, and research—tends to provide increasing amounts of leisure for our people. It is most appropriate for us to recognize that our increased time from labor can cause us many headaches in the future unless we make every effort to see that it will be used in a healthy fashion. We must be sure that it will not evolve into simply time on our hands—into an excuse for boredom and lethargy.

We all know how difficult a problem the blessings of agricultural surpluses has become for us. We do not know what to do with good fortune; and the situation will grow worse until we make preparations to meet it.

So it is with leisure. We must be prepared to use it wisely, or it will confront us with seeds of decay.

Recreation, and its handmaiden, tourism, is a most important industry in my State of Vermont. I believe most sincerely that these two luxuries will soon become a very important necessity both to our economy and to the well-being of the American people. Vermonters have recognized this, and we have been making great strides to provide increased recreational and tourist facilities throughout our State.

Turning to the bill, S. 20, itself, I want to make two comments.

First, I am glad to see that the committee has amended the bill to include private interests, in its technical assistance provisions, and not simply to limit such assistance to State and political subdivisions.

Second, I am happy to note that the bill requires the Government to cooperate with educational institutions in research and other educational programs and activities to encourage wise use of leisure through recreation.

Mr. President, this bill is a step in the right direction. We recognize the perils of ever increasing leisure time unless we seek means to provide for its wise use. I am sure Vermont will play an ever increasing role in the rapidly expanding recreation and tourist industries. Already my State is well on the way with its plans for the future in this area. Fortunately, with a program such as is contemplated in this bill, coupled with the energies of the people of Vermont and other sections of the country, we will be prepared to prevent leisure from becoming an excuse for idleness.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, I wish to add a few words on the general subject covered by Senate bill 20, though probably not exactly in line with what the distinguished minority leader has said. I also wish to make a few remarks with respect to Senate bill 859 while I am speaking.

In the first place, I want to make it perfectly clear that I shall support the bill now that it includes the amendment

which the distinguished Senator from New Mexico added earlier in the day, which provides that Revised Statutes section 3648, 39 U.S.C. 4154, will not be wholly done away with in the operation of the proposed act. That section provides that the United States may not pay for services or for goods until they have been performed or delivered.

The bill now pending, S. 20, as originally written, authorized the Secretary of Interior to make payments without regard for the provisions of section 3648 of the Revised Statutes. In my opinion, such a provision was unthinkable, and I have never been shown any real reason why the exemption should be allowed with the exception of educational institutions.

In committee we struck out that portion of the bill, and the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON] has submitted—and the Senate has adopted—an amendment which provides that it shall apply only with respect to research with regard to educational institutions or other nonprofit organizations.

While this particular amendment is satisfactory to me, I believe that we should make exceptions to the original act only in most unusual circumstances. We do in this instance with respect to educational institutions and nonprofit organizations, upon the basis that they cannot get these projects started unless in some instances the Government does provide funds with which to start them.

For the sake of legislative history on the bill I wish to call attention to the fact that the amendment as adopted refers to "initial" costs of such research. It provides an exemption for initial costs of such research if the Secretary deems it necessary. It is not an accident that the word "initial" is included. It is in there because it is meant to be in there. It means that the Government shall not finance these projects in advance, *carte blanche*, but that only the initial cost shall be taken care of, and then only with respect to educational institutions and other nonprofit organizations.

Upon this basis I will support the bill. It should be observed, however, that what we are really doing is to give legislative sanction to a bureau already established and in operation—this one was set up a year ago. Our action today is *ex post facto*, a practice we have had to engage in many times in the last 2 years.

I must say that the gentleman who heads this Bureau, Mr. Crafts, is one of the most capable Government employees I have ever met. I have great faith in his integrity and in his ability to do a good job with respect to these recreational resources.

I wish to say, too, that what the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] has said is accurate. We are now operating, without any authority from Congress, with something like 75 people, if I recall correctly, in this unauthorized Bureau of the Federal Government, set up by the Secretary of the Interior. Mr. Crafts says that if the bill is enacted there will be 200 employees by the end of the year. Therefore, Parkinson's law is in operation.

When we get to the consideration of S. 859, which is the land funding portion of this bill, and which provides for a system of user fees to all national parks and all national forests, for a tax on motor fuel, and then goes to the absurdity of providing that all money realized from the sales of Federal surplus property, real and personal, will also go into this fund, I expect to have a little more to say. I wish to say right now that when that bill comes on the floor it is going to be discussed at great length. I do mean great length. It violates many basic principles of taxation, and in my opinion, as it now reads, in its present form, it is wholly unacceptable.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, I would be the last person to suggest that there are not some good things which would flow from the passage of S. 20 and that there are not some worthwhile groups and individuals interested in this subject.

Certainly what I am about to say does not reflect upon the fine Senators who have interested themselves in the proposed legislation.

I shall oppose the bill, and my reason is quite simple. I believe that we are so far in debt, that our deficit is so large, that we have to say no to some desirable things. At this time I will not try to establish a priority of what proposals are most desirable. The simple fact remains that our national debt will have increased in the first 4 fiscal years of this administration by \$30 billion. I called the Treasury to ask what was the average rate of interest paid on the debt, and, as I recall it, I was told it was 3.288. This means that the Government of the United States in 4 years has placed upon the backs of the people an additional billion dollars a year in interest alone. It means that year after year after year, unless at some time we start paying off this debt, it will carry a penalty for the mismanagement of Government in these 4 years of a billion dollars a year.

Frankly, I am concerned about the people who are entitled to some recreation. I think they can get a little more enjoyable recreation if the burdens of Government are not quite so heavy.

Therefore, I shall not support the pending bill.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that that portion of the outdoor recreation resources review report appearing at page 122, entitled "Its Creation and Composition," be printed in the RECORD.

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

ITS CREATION AND COMPOSITION

The Bureau of Outdoor Recreation should be created by vesting it with authority to carry out the functions proposed for it and transferring to it those national recreation planning responsibilities now lodged in the Secretary of the Interior and exercised by the National Park Service under the Park, Parkway, and Recreational Area Study Act of 1936.

The new Bureau should be headed by a Director and should have a small, highly qualified planning and administrative staff in Washington. Wherever possible, the Bureau should be staffed by transfer of ex-

perienced personnel from existing agencies. Regional offices should be located so as to provide effective assistance to other Federal and State agencies.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, on January 31, 1962, the Outdoor Recreation Resources Review Commission submitted a report to the 87th Congress and to President Kennedy. The report was based on an exhaustive 3-year study by that Commission, a Commission, incidentally, created by the 85th Congress during the previous administration, bipartisan in composition, headed by Laurance Rockefeller, and numbering its members several of my distinguished colleagues here present. The several citizen members of that Commission were appointed by President Eisenhower.

This report made a number of specific recommendations designed to assure adequate outdoor recreational opportunity for living Americans—today—and for generations yet unborn—tomorrow. Prominent among these recommendations was one to establish in the Federal Government a bureau to act as a focal point for the planning and coordination of outdoor recreation programs. The need for such an organization was so obvious and so urgent that the administration, acting under the authority of the Reorganization Act of 1950, shifted certain funds and certain functions from other bureaus and established in the Department of the Interior, the Bureau of Outdoor Recreation.

A bill introduced in the last Congress, which passed the Senate, would have given formal congressional sanction to this action. That bill, however, included an additional provision for grants to the States for outdoor recreational planning, and at the late stage in the session when it reached the House, it was not possible for that body to explore sufficiently all the ramifications of the proposal, so the measure was not enacted. This bill we are considering today, S. 20, does not include that provision. Its purpose is to give congressional recognition to the establishment of the Bureau of Outdoor Recreation and to delineate what its functions and responsibilities shall be.

Attempts have been made to demonstrate a relationship between this measure and S. 859 which would establish a land and water conservation fund and provide how such a fund would be used. But at this time I want to point out emphatically that there is no connection between these two measures other than that both relate to outdoor recreation. This bill, S. 20, gives specific statutory status to a small bureau which can coordinate the outdoor recreational activities of more than 20 Federal and more than 500 State agencies which have responsibilities in this field. Further, this Bureau will act as a focal point for the planning needed to assure the orderly development of the facilities required to meet the mushrooming demands of Americans for outdoor recreational opportunity. Its budget request is moderate, only \$1,115,000 more than has been appropriated in the past for two National Park Service functions now being performed by that Bureau.

Yet it has the mission of developing a national outdoor recreation plan, of coordinating State recreational planning, of aiding the States in all aspects of outdoor recreation, of reviewing and coordinating the outdoor recreational programs of some 20 Federal agencies to prevent overlap, eliminate unnecessary expense, and to assure that Federal investment in this field is best designed to meet national needs, of stimulating needed research, and of disseminating needed information and educational material.

It contemplates a staff of only 225 employees to perform its broad responsibilities.

This is a long-needed planning and coordinating agency in the outdoor recreation field. It will prevent waste and duplication of effort. It will see that Federal, State and local recreation programs follow an orderly pattern. Its formation follows the recommendation of a bipartisan commission established during the last administration. I urge passage of S. 20.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to amendment. If there be no further amendment to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, and was read the third time.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill having been read the third time, the question now is, Shall it pass?

MR. CURTIS. Mr. President, I ask for a division.

On a division, the bill was passed, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Congress finds and declares that the general welfare of the Nation requires that all American people of present and future generations shall be assured such quantity and quality of outdoor recreation resources as are necessary and desirable, and that prompt and coordinated action is required by all levels of government and by private interests on a nationwide basis to conserve, develop, and utilize such resources for the benefit and enjoyment of the American people.

SEC. 2. In order to carry out the purposes of this Act, the Secretary of the Interior is authorized, after consultation with the Recreation Advisory Council and with the heads of Federal departments and agencies concerned, to perform the following functions:

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

(b) **CLASSIFICATION.**—Prepare a system for classification of outdoor recreation resources to assist in the effective and beneficial use and management of such resources.

(c) **NATIONWIDE PLAN.**—Formulate and maintain a comprehensive nationwide outdoor recreation plan, taking into consideration the plans of the various Federal agencies, States and their political subdivisions. The plan shall set forth the needs and demands of the public for outdoor recreation and the current and foreseeable availability in the future of outdoor recreation resources to meet those needs. The plan shall identify critical outdoor recreation problems, recommend solutions, and identify the desirable actions to be taken at each level of gov-

ernment and by private interests. The Secretary shall transmit the initial plan, which shall be prepared as soon as practicable within five years hereafter, to the President for transmittal to the Congress. Future revisions of the plan shall be similarly transmitted at succeeding five-year intervals. When a plan or revision is transmitted to the Congress, the Secretary shall transmit copies to the Governors of the several States.

(d) **TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE.**—Provide technical assistance and advice to and cooperate with States, political subdivisions, and private interest including nonprofit organizations with respect to outdoor recreation.

(e) **REGIONAL COOPERATION.**—Encourage interstate and regional cooperation in the planning, acquisition, and development of outdoor recreation resources.

(f) **RESEARCH AND EDUCATION.**—(1) Sponsor, engage in, and assist in research relating to outdoor recreation, directly or by contract or cooperative agreements, and make payments for such purposes, including advance payments without regard to section 3648 of the Revised Statutes (39 U.S.C. 4154) for initial costs of such research to any educational institution or other nonprofit organizations when necessary and in the public interest; (2) undertake studies and assemble information concerning outdoor recreation, directly or by contract or cooperative agreement, and disseminate such information without regard to the provisions of section 321n, title 39, United States Code; and (3) cooperate with educational institutions and others in order to assist in establishing education programs and activities and to encourage public use and benefits from outdoor recreation.

(g) **INTERDEPARTMENTAL COOPERATION.**—(1) Cooperate with and provide technical assistance to Federal departments and agencies and obtain from them information, data, reports, advice, and assistance that are needed and can reasonably be furnished in carrying out the purposes of this Act; and (2) promote coordination of Federal plans and activities generally relating to outdoor recreation. Any department or agency furnishing advice or assistance hereunder may expend its own funds for such purposes, with or without reimbursement, as may be agreed to by that agency.

(h) **DONATIONS.**—Accept and use donations of money, property, personal services, or facilities for the purposes of this Act.

Sec. 3. The term "United States" as used in this Act shall include the District of Columbia; and, to the extent practicable in carrying out the provisions of this Act, the terms "United States" and "States" may include the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands, Guam, and American Samoa.

MR. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed.

MR. MORSE. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to table was agreed to.

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

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT UNTIL THURSDAY AND PROGRAM FOR THURSDAY

MR. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate concludes its business today it

stand in adjournment until 12 o'clock noon on Thursday next.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

MR. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, on Thursday next, it is the intention of the leadership to call up the money resolutions which affect the conduct of affairs of the various committees during the year.

A DES MOINES NEGRO VIEW

MR. MILLER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD an article entitled "District of Columbia Negro Paper Backs Powell," written by Richard Wilson and published in the Des Moines Sunday Register of March 3, 1963.

The article relates some of the problems with respect to the recent furor over the actions of a Member of the House of Representatives, and also includes an editorial entitled "A Des Moines Negro View," which first appeared in the Iowa Bystander, a weekly newspaper published at Des Moines by and for Negroes. The editorial takes a point of view of the situation entirely different from that expressed in a Washington, D.C., newspaper published for Negroes.

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

[From the Des Moines Sunday Register, Mar. 3, 1963]

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA NEGRO PAPER BACKS POWELL

(By Richard Wilson)

WASHINGTON, D.C.—Critics of ADAM CLAYTON POWELL should not indulge in the illusion that he lacks prestige in the nationwide Negro community, or that the recent attacks on POWELL have shaken this prestige very much.

POWELL is much admired as a symbol even by those who may deplore some of his acts. He seems to many Negroes to be one of their race who has broken through racial prejudice to stand on his own as an individual.

In Washington, with its 54 percent Negro population and its 84 percent Negro school enrollment, criticism of POWELL raps on raw nerves in the Negro community.

REACTION ANGRILY

The Washington Afro-American, one of the chain of newspapers which strongly affects Negro opinion, reacted angrily to the attempt of Clark R. Mollenhoff of the Register's Washington bureau to pin down POWELL at a press conference. The prize-winning investigative reporter was probing POWELL on the charges of Senator JOHN WILLIAMS, Republican of Delaware, who accuses POWELL of extensive abuses of his congressional position with the connivance of Kennedy administration officials.

The reporter, a Drake University football star once optioned to the New York Giants, was criticized in a page 1 story in the Afro-American both for his questions and his physical condition.

"The pasty-faced Mollenhoff, who resembled a former shotputter who has let himself go to pot, tried repeatedly with just a trace of preciousness in his slightly lisping voice to put POWELL on the spot," the article stated. It continued with its derision of the reporter but told little of either the questions or answers at the press conference.

An editorial in the Afro-American elaborated on these views, centering its attack on Senator WILLIAMS and Columnist Drew Pearson. The editorial predicted the day would come when "this great civil rights fighter [POWELL] attains even greater heights."

"When he does," the editorial continued, "18 million colored thumbs are going to go up to 18 million colored noses to remind Drew Pearson and Senator WILLIAMS that 'what's good for you white geese is sure good for us colored ganders!'"

The editor of the Washington Afro-American is C. Sumner Stone, Jr., who signed his name to the page 1 news article as "Chuck Stone."

Stone will not long remain as editor of the Afro-American. He has been appointed public affairs officer in the U.S. Information Service and will be placed in charge of the office in Tanganyika. His responsibility there will be to carry out programs of USIA intended to give to the residents of the former British colony in east Africa a clear and accurate picture of conditions, opinions, attitudes, and culture of the United States.

Stone says that he expects to go to Tanganyika in April. He reinforces in conversation his views stated in the Afro-American.

"I could take you into the bars and barber shops and street corners in Washington and show you that 95 percent of the colored people think that the attack on POWELL was clearly racial," he says.

"POWELL has pulled a lot of deals we don't like, but if he is going to be criticized it has got to be on the Negro's terms."

ANOTHER NEGRO VIEW

It is impossible to convince Stone and most Negroes within sound and sight of POWELL that WILLIAMS was inspired by anything but racial feelings in spite of his long record to the contrary, and in spite of the role he has played over many years in the exposure of serious abuses in Government.

Negroes sharing the view of Stone, and only grudgingly aware of POWELL's long and flagrant violation of generally accepted congressional standards, white or Negro, cannot conceive of any but a racial reason for WILLIAMS's attack.

This is saddening. It is more saddening that POWELL can play upon the misguided Negro racism which is so evident in the words and tone of the Washington Afro-American.

The dialog between the races in Washington does not seem to be improving in anywhere near the measure that the circumstances justify. Nor is it reassuring that the well-mannered, well-dressed, but passionately spoken Stone is going to Tanganyika to interpret America to the people and officialdom of an emerging nation.

DIFFERENT VIEW

We get quite a different view than Stone's of Negro attitudes when another Negro journalist, Simeon Booker, of Ebony magazine, speaks. Booker is writing a book which he intends to make a balanced account of the need for Negro self-improvement as well as a plea for the opening of fairer opportunities.

He points out that POWELL does not have much support or sympathy "among people who think." Booker's tool is rationality; Stone's is emotion; POWELL's is flimflam.

[From the Des Moines Sunday Register, Mar. 3, 1963]

A DES MOINES NEGRO VIEW

(The following editorial appeared in the Iowa Bystander, a weekly newspaper published at Des Moines by and for Negroes.)

It often happens that some people, placed in a position of responsibility and prominence, use this situation to abuse it by doing things a far less prepared citizen does. Rep-

resentative ADAM CLAYTON POWELL, of New York, is an excellent example of this.

A minister of one of the largest churches in America, elected from a district comprising mostly Negroes and Puerto Ricans, POWELL has moved up to chairmanship of the Health, Education, and Welfare Committee. In this post, he could be a power in Congress and serve as an example for younger people to point to with pride that a Negro had attained such a commanding position.

There are those who opposed his elevation to that high post but the system of seniority made the choice automatic.

However, Representative POWELL, unlike some other Negroes serving in Congress, has abused his position by his continued absenteeism from duty, by loading up his staff far out of proportion to the other chairmen. He has abused the expenditure of public funds and he has failed or refused to pay his taxes to the Government which pays his salary.

These derelictions of duty have brought stern criticism from Members of both Houses to the extent never before witnessed, and all because the charges lodged against him are true.

Here is a public servant, a minister who, instead of conducting himself in a straightforward manner, has done many things which bring disgrace, distrust, and shame, while representing a district whose people are entitled to a leader who should bring honor and prestige to the position which he holds. There is no excuse for Representative POWELL's conduct. It should not be condoned.

ADLAI STEVENSON'S UNDERSTANDING OF THE SOVIETS

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD an article entitled "Wilson Finds Adlai Slow To Understand Soviets," written by Richard Wilson and published in the Des Moines Register of March 7, 1963.

In his article, Mr. Wilson, a distinguished columnist, indicates some concern over the fact that the U.S. representative to the United Nations has apparently taken such a long time to come to grips with the nature of the international Communist conspiracy.

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

WILSON FINDS ADLAI SLOW TO UNDERSTAND SOVIETS

(By Richard Wilson)

WASHINGTON, D.C.—In an interview with the Associated Press, Adlai E. Stevenson has revealed the attitude of mind toward Russian negotiations which so many have found hard to understand.

With 2 years' experience as U.N. Ambassador, Stevenson says that he has changed his mind about the Russians. He has discovered that they will stubbornly support positions which they seem fully prepared to reverse when it is expedient to do so.

It seems odd that Stevenson would have had to learn such a lesson, for this has been the uniform experience of Secretaries of State for the last quarter of a century. Stevenson has been a student of foreign affairs for at least that long.

EXPECTED RUSSIA TO ACCOMMODATE

Stevenson's statement is implicit confirmation that the Kennedy administration came into office with the belief that a new set of conditions with Russia could be created. The United States should be able to accommodate itself in some ways to Russian policy, and, in turn, if the negotiators

were skillful enough, Russian policy would make accommodations, too.

Thus Secretary Rusk began his "quiet" diplomatic moves. President Kennedy conferred with Premier Khrushchev. New thoughts were formulated by Walt W. Rostow, McGeorge Bundy, and Paul Nitze.

Under almost all conditions new solutions were pursued. About all this has proved was that the American political administration had changed, but the Russian political administration had not.

Still, the idea that the Russians could somehow be made to see the light was hard to put down. This frame of mind has persisted right through the Cuban crisis, manifesting itself in the care exercised in not pushing Khrushchev too far, too fast when he was so obviously on the run.

THINKS RUSSIANS CAN BE HANDLED

The result, to borrow a phrase from Communist Arthur Krock, has been half-won victories, which the administration continually advertises as great triumphs.

In the wake of Khrushchev's withdrawal of missiles from Cuba a wave of euphoria washed over Washington. Large but poorly described changes were foreseen. There were premonitions of some new order in the world based on Khrushchev's back down and his quarrel with his Chinese allies. It was supposed that the noncommitted nations were losing their fascination with Russia. Administration officials spoke of the missile withdrawal as if it were some historic turning point.

But now all the airy castles built on the shifting sands of the imagined new world order are coming tumbling down. The cold war seems to have been renewed. Khrushchev is seen to have achieved important objectives in Cuba, though not all he sought. The test ban negotiations are again in a state of collapse. We are warned once again that Russia will burn us up if we touch Cuba.

TROOPS ARE STILL THERE

It does not appear that there is much to be gained by not pressing advantages against the Soviet Union to their full limit when it was possible to do so, as in Cuba. Now, months after the fullest pressure could have been brought, Russian troops are still in Cuba. We do not know how many are being taken out. Nor have we achieved all the aims we sought when we confronted the world with the imminent prospect of nuclear war.

There is enough now to confirm Stevenson's new-found wisdom about the Russians. We should keep the pressure on them when we can and gain the most from it. Only too soon they will have found new ways to move toward their unchanging general objectives.

SUMMERTIME STUDENT JOBS IN THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Plum Jam," published in the Milwaukee Sentinel of March 7, 1963. The editorial relates to the recent announcement that appointments of student trainees to Federal jobs during the summertime will be cleared through the White House.

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

PLUM JAM

Each year, more than 10,000 students are given summer jobs by the Federal Government. The jobs mainly are in Washington. Quite a bit of personal political patronage is involved, although the Civil Service Commission requires applicants to pass civil

service examinations for clerical, typist, and stenographer jobs. In the case of student trainee jobs, in which college students take Federal summer employment in what the Government hopes will be their Federal professions after graduation, they are selected from civil service registers.

Now a storm of protest has blown up in Congress following a report in the Washington Star that the White House has taken control of student job patronage. A clearance system reportedly has been set up whereby the names of all students who have filed applications for summer employment in Government agencies will be sent to the White House, along with information as to home States and the college attended (if any).

Assuming that it is essential in the first place to hire 10,000 students for summer Federal work, the action of the White House in having them all run through the Presidential funnel for clearance fouls the civil service system. Worse yet, this latest action appears to be but another example of a New Frontier attitude that is disdainful of the spirit, if not the law, of Federal civil service.

In a Senate speech rapping the White House student patronage plan, Senator MILLER, Republican, of Iowa, accused the administration of having "an irresistible urge to play politics with our civil service system."

"First," Senator MILLER recalled, "there was the shocking directive to civil service employees that they should be expected to participate in trying to sell proposed new programs to the general public. This was belatedly and grudgingly withdrawn due to the revulsion of the public in general and career civil service employees in particular. Next our civil service employees were pressured to buy \$100 tickets to the Democratic fundraising dinner here through the clever device of having them invited to cocktail parties of their bosses if they had purchased a ticket. * * * And now, this administration apparently is not going to wait until people have civil service status for an opportunity to engage in partisan political activities."

The Kennedy administration defends the plan by saying that its primary concern is that the student talent be put to the best use possible and groomed for regular Federal employment when the youths graduate.

Despite this high sounding explanation, the plan is highhanded. It's something new in the way of harvesting political plums—pick 'em while they're green.

DELAY SOUGHT ON FEED GRAIN PROGRAM UNTIL AFTER WHEAT REFERENDUM

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD an article entitled "Shuman Asks Congress To Wait Until After Wheat Referendum To Write Farm Laws," published in the American Farm Bureau Federation's official newsletter of March 4, 1963, together with table 1, which indicates the various factors which have occurred in the reduction of the carryover of feed grains. The table points up in an excellent way why the reduction of the carryover in feed grains is due in very minute part to the emergency feed grain program of the last 2 years.

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

SHUMAN ASKS CONGRESS TO WAIT UNTIL AFTER WHEAT REFERENDUM TO WRITE FARM LAWS

Charles B. Shuman, president of the American Farm Bureau Federation, has urged

Congress to delay any decision on the type of feed grain program to be in effect after 1963.

He said the legislators should wait until after the signup under the 1963 feed grain program has been completed and the result of the forthcoming wheat referendum is known.

At a House Agricultural Subcommittee hearing last Thursday, Mr. Shuman said that if the wheat referendum carries, "there still will be ample time to consider and adopt a feed grain program for 1964.

"If the wheat referendum does not carry, which we think more likely, then by all means this committee and the Congress should consider wheat and feed grains together.

"There is urgent need for a more effective, less costly, and less disruptive program," the Farm Bureau president declared.

"We pledge our support in helping to develop such a program when the results of the wheat referendum are known."

Here is the full text of Mr. Shuman's statement at the hearing:

"We appreciate the opportunity to discuss the operation and results of the 1961 and 1962 feed grain programs. We also would like to comment briefly on the 1963 feed grain program and its implications. Finally, we would like to discuss with this committee a course of action which we believe would be wise and best for farmers.

"Before we get into a detailed discussion of the feed grain program, we would like to urge strongly that this committee delay any decision on the type of feed grain program to be in effect after 1963, until (1) the signup under the 1963 feed grain program has been completed and announced and (2) the multiple-price wheat referendum has been held and the result is known.

Our reasons for asking the committee to delay any decision on a feed grain program are:

1. Most feed grains are spring planted. There will be ample time, after the wheat referendum, for action by Congress on a future program for feed grains.

2. The signup for the 1963 feed grain program will continue until at least March 22 (or later if the time is extended). No one knows until then what feed grain producer reaction will be to the 1963 compensatory payment program.

3. If the complicated, restrictive, multiple-price wheat program is approved in the upcoming referendum, one set of circumstances will prevail. On the other hand, if it is voted down, this will create substantially different conditions for wheat, feed grain, and livestock producers. If this happens, this committee and the Congress would then most certainly want to reanalyze the entire wheat, feed grain, and livestock problem in order to do justice to all producers. This committee should not tie its own hands by acting prematurely, without having all the facts necessary for sound judgment.

You are well aware of the fact that Farm Bureau has a membership of over 1,607,000 farm families in 49 States and Puerto Rico. Most of our members produce feed grains and livestock although many, of course, have a larger economic stake in other commodities. A large number produce wheat and feed grains. Our members strongly believe that feed grain and wheat legislation are closely related and that both affect livestock production and prices. We strongly believe that any future programs for feed grains and wheat should be considered together.

RESULTS OF 1961 AND 1962 FEED GRAIN PROGRAMS

The administration claims that the so-called emergency feed grain program has been a great success, since the buildup in supplies has been halted and some progress has been made in reducing carryover stocks. What are the facts?

Fact 1. A sizable majority of the eligible producers gave the program a "no confidence" vote by staying out, both in 1961 and 1962.

In 1961 only 42 percent of the farmers with corn and grain sorghum bases signed program contracts. In 1962 contracts were signed by 44 percent of the producers with corn and grain sorghum bases and 29 percent of those with barley bases.

Fact 2. The acreage that was diverted under the program did not result in a corresponding reduction in feed grain plantings.

In 1961 the Government contracted for approximately 4 acres for each 3 acres by which corn and grain sorghum plantings were reduced from the 1959-60 base. In 1962 it contracted for approximately 5 acres for each 3½ acres by which corn, grain sorghums, and barley were reduced from the 1959-60 base.

In 1959-60 the total acreage planted to the four principal feed grains averaged 151.3 million acres.

In 1961 farmers planted 129.3 million acres to feed grains and were paid for diverting 26.7 million acres. Thus, the total of 156 million acres planted or diverted in 1961 was 4.7 million acres greater than 1959-60 plantings.

In 1962 farmers planted 125.9 million acres to feed grains and were paid for diverting 32.7 million acres. Thus, the total planted plus the acreage diverted rose to 158.6 million acres, or 7.3 million acres more than the average planted in 1959-60.

The increase in feed grain acreage (including diverted acreage) under the program reflects increased plantings by non-participating farmers and adjustments in the base acreage of participating producers.

Fact 3. The production of feed grains was reduced less than the reduction in acreage planted because yields increased.

Apologists for the program have attributed most of the 1961 increase in yields to weather. But yields rose again in 1962. (Per-acre corn yields averaged 53.8 bushels in 1959-60 and rose to 62 bushels in 1961 and 64.1 bushels in 1962.)

In 1961, as compared with the base period 1959-60, the acreage devoted to four feed grains was reduced 14.5 percent and the production of four feed grains (total tonnage basis) was reduced 7.9 percent.

In 1962, as compared with the 1959-60 base, the acreage devoted to four feed grains was reduced 16.8 percent and the production of four feed grains was reduced 6.2 percent.

Fact 4. The reduction in feed grain stocks has been due almost entirely to increased utilization and not to the Government program.

At the beginning of the 1961 marketing year, feed grain stocks totaled a record of 84.7 million tons.

By the beginning of the current marketing year stocks had been reduced to 71.8 million tons. Only a very small part of this reduction of 12.9 million tons can be attributed to the feed grain program.

The production of feed grains was reduced 15 million tons in 1961, but barley and oats—which were not included in the 1961 program—accounted for 3.1 million tons of this reduction.

One of the most significant factors in the feed grain situation is the increase in utilization which has been occurring. Domestic consumption and exports of feed grains increased 8.1 million tons in the marketing year 1961 (as compared with 1960).

To summarize, under the 1961 program, stocks were reduced 12.9 million tons, but if there had been no increase in utilization and no reduction in the production of feed grains not covered by the 1961 program, the reduction in carryover would have been less than 2 million tons.

It now appears that stocks will be reduced 10.8 million tons (from 71.8 to 61 million)

during the 1962 marketing year. This reduction is almost entirely accounted for by increased utilization and a reduction in the production of oats. As compared with 1961, total production of feed grains increased 2.5 million tons (from 140.6 million tons to 143.1 million tons) and exports are expected to decline by about 1.7 million tons this year.

By the fall of 1962, feed grain stocks will have been reduced by a total of approximately 23.7 million tons from the 1961 level. But, if there had been no increase in utilization and no reduction in production of crops not under the program, the total reduction in stocks would be only a little over 2 million tons (see table I). Thus, 90 percent of the reduction in feed grain carryover was due to factors other than the effect of the emergency program.

Fact 5. The total direct cost—\$1.7 billion—of the 1961 and 1962 feed grain programs cannot be justified by what has actually been accomplished under these programs.

MARKET PRICES DEPRESSED

Early in 1961, when this committee was discussing the 1961 feed grain program we spoke out against one of its most disturbing features. We called this the obvious threat to use the Government's huge surplus stocks to beat down the market price of feed grains. We denounced this proposal as a brandnew and fallacious concept. We continued to oppose the dumping of CCC feed grain stocks during the 1962 program. We have continually pointed out that this use of CCC stocks is bad for our market system for grain and that it severely penalizes producers who want to sell their feed grains on the market.

As we have already pointed out, considerably more than 50 percent of all feed grain producers stayed out of the feed grain program in 1961 and in 1962. Dumping CCC feed grains on the market held down their market price and, of course, lowered their incomes.

We also pointed out early in 1961 that dumping feed grain stocks onto the market would ultimately adversely affect poultry, dairy, and livestock production and prices for these commodities. Let us review briefly what has happened in this regard.

Poultry and dairy production have continued above what they would have been if CCC stocks of feed grains had not been dumped. Prices of both these commodities have been depressed because of this unwise action.

Numbers of hogs coming to market and cattle on feed and being marketed are also up considerably. Hog prices are down, and top cattle prices have taken one of the sharpest drops in history—over \$7 per hundredweight since last fall. This, too, has been caused in part by the dumping of CCC stocks of feed grain.

We realize that some persons have supported the feed grain program on the ground that it has been an effective way of pouring "free money" from Washington into the feed grain areas. But what is happening currently to livestock, dairy, and poultry prices would indicate a loss in income to feed grain, poultry, dairy, hog, and cattle producers of several times the payments made to feed grain growers under the 1961 and 1962 programs.

THE 1963 FEED GRAIN PROGRAM

As we stated previously, it is too early to determine the reaction of feed grain producers to the 1963 program and the results that can be anticipated from its operation. The signup period has several weeks to run.

The 1963 program has most of the bad features of the 1961 and 1962 programs and, in addition, contains a provision for Brannan-type compensatory payments. Since payments are to be made on the "normal" yield of planted acres, they encourage producers

to participate on a minimum basis and to divert their poorest acres.

As members of this committee know, we are opposed to the compensatory payment concept. Our reasons for opposing payments are spelled out in our 1963 policies as adopted by the voting delegates of the member State Farm Bureaus:

"Compensatory payments are proposed in a variety of forms. Regardless of the form in which presented, the payment approach is unsound and dangerous to our economic and political system. It would be fantastically expensive and would stimulate production, increase unit costs, depress market prices, lead to tight production controls, and make farmers dependent on congressional appropriations for a substantial part of their total income.

"Limitations on payments to individuals would place a ceiling on opportunity and level farm incomes downward.

"Payment programs would socialize the production and distribution of food and fiber by having consumers pay a part of the cost through taxes—rather than full value at the store. This is a trap for producers. Ultimately, the payment approach also would be a trap for consumers, since it would encourage inefficiency and thereby result in high real costs of food and fiber.

"We vigorously oppose any system of compensatory payments for agriculture."

In summary, we strongly urge this committee to delay any further action on a feed grain program until after the multiple price wheat referendum. If the wheat referendum carries, there still will be ample time to consider and adopt a feed grain program for 1964. If the wheat referendum does not carry (which we think more likely), then by all means this committee and the Congress should consider wheat and feed grains together.

Finally, we have pointed out why we believe the 1961, 1962, and 1963 feed grain programs have not, and will not, solve the basic problem in feed grain and livestock agriculture. There is urgent need for a more effective, less costly, and less disruptive program. We pledge our support in helping to develop such a program when the results of the wheat referendum are known.

TABLE I.—*Factors in the reduction of feed grain stocks*

[In million tons]

	1961	1962	Total
Reduction in production from 1960 of crops covered by program:			
Corn.....	7.9	7.4	15.3
Grain sorghum.....	4.0	3.1	7.1
Barley.....	0	0	0
Total.....	11.9	10.5	22.4
Reduction in production from 1960 of crops not covered by program:			
Barley.....	.8		.8
Oats.....	2.3	2.0	4.3
Total.....	3.1	2.0	5.1
Increase in utilization from 1960 marketing year.....			
	8.1	8.3	16.4
Net effect of reduction in production of crops not covered by program and increase in utilization on carryover.....			
	-11.2	-10.3	-21.5
Total reduction in carryover.....			
	12.9	10.8	23.7
Reduction in carryover due to feed grain program.....			
	1.7	.5	2.2

NOTE.—It may be argued that the carryover would have increased if there had been no feed grain program. The point, however, is that the program has done little except to stop the buildup. The reduction in accumulated stocks is almost entirely due to increased utilization and reduced production of feed crops not covered by the program.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

VENEZUELAN FARMERS WANT TO HELP THEMSELVES

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, recently I received a copy of the January 16 issue of the South Dakota Union Farmer, a publication of the Farmers Union in the State of South Dakota. In that issue I found a splendid article entitled "Assignment in South America—Venezuelan Farmers Want To Help Themselves." The article was written by Arlene Schley, education director of the South Dakota Farmers Union, who had visited in South America.

I had the privilege of being in Venezuela last November; and I visited many of the rural areas, and took a great deal of interest in the rural development program.

The Government of Venezuela, under President Betancourt, is doing an admirable job in the area of what we call agrarian reform, including not only land distribution, but also—and of equal importance—the development of farm cooperatives and the development of supervised credit, at reasonable rates of interest, over a long period in which the farmers can make repayment. In these rural areas I also found the development of housing, public health, and general community programs. It was very encouraging to see people truly helping themselves. The remarkable record of educational development in the rural areas of Venezuela should give all of us encouragement.

In the article Miss Arlene Schley tells—for example—how people there would meet in the out-of-doors—"under the trees," as she writes—while they were working on the construction of new buildings to accommodate their community activities. Her article also points out some of the shortcomings, such as the lack of proper youth programs in the rural areas.

I believe the article will commend itself to the attention of every person who is really interested in what is developing under the Alliance for Progress, and also to the Members of Congress who recognize that rural development in these essentially agrarian countries is of the utmost importance.

I wish to compliment Arlene Schley upon her splendid article and upon the excellent sense of understanding and the perception which she has exhibited in the article. I ask unanimous consent that it be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

[From the South Dakota Union Farmer, Jan. 16, 1963]

VENEZUELAN FARMERS WANT TO HELP THEMSELVES

(By Arlene Schley)

In Venezuela, the cooperation exhibited to us between the Federacion Campesino (FCV),

the Instituto Agraria Nacional (IAN), and the Ministerio de Agricultura (MAC) stands out as one of the most gratifying aspects of the entire mission. Apparently, at times, there are some areas of disagreement between these groups as any country has overlapping of responsibilities and personality problems. I firmly believe that the way they worked together on our behalf may have far-reaching effects on their close working relationships in the future.

Prior to our visit to Venezuela and during our first week in Caracas, each of the three agencies contacted their offices in the field to notify them of our visits and urged them to plan our itineraries and to set up meetings for us. In this way, they were prepared for us and our only difficulty was to try to reduce the number of activities that they had planned so that our health could stand up for the length of time that we were to be there. In many places, we were presented with written resolutions of welcome and brotherhood to further emphasize the cordiality with which we were received.

The campesinos (farmers) are eager for improvement but at the same time appear to be somewhat frustrated. Now that action has been started by the government on their behalf, in the area of land reform programs, they are impatient for this transitional period to settle down into a way of life fair to all, with fulfillment of their demands for economic and social democracy and human dignity.

We worked in 7 states in Venezuela and during this time we contacted people from 12 states. We traveled in the interior (anywhere outside of Caracas) by Mercedes-Benz autobus for 3 weeks and by plane the fourth week. This car was furnished by IAN as well as the driver. The main highways between cities are good-surfaced roads, but in the course of the 4,000-odd miles we traveled, we covered dirt roads and paths leading from one land reform settlement to the next.

MEETS UNDER TREES

We attended and conducted approximately 35 meetings, ranging in attendance from 25 to 500 people, including get-togethers in the shade of a tree to state conventions of delegates. Our second day in the interior, we conducted three meetings between 4:30 p.m. and midnight. By doing this, we were able to meet with more people because we went to their communities, rather than expecting them, with their limited modes of transportation, to come to a central place to meet with us.

In each state, the FCV officials had pre-selected candidates for us to interview in their area for the second phase of our program. This includes inviting a total of 75 campesinos from six Latin American countries to spend 6 months in the United States next year.

The procedure of our meetings varied as much as the situation, location, and attendance at the meetings. In one State, approximately 200 delegates had gathered in a meeting hall on Sunday noon for our meeting. At this time, each of us, with the assistance of our interpreter, explained the various phases of the Farmers Union program, with heavy emphasis on education and cooperatives.

LACK JUNIOR PROGRAM

I found that it was very difficult at times to explain our youth education program because of the complete lack of familiarity with this type of thing. Our background is such that we automatically understand that any organization's education program is completely separate from the formal education of our schools.

Yet, in Venezuela, where the highest local educational level is six educational grades, and many only attend from 2 to 4 years, they immediately identified any education

program with the special agricultural schools that they have for young farm boys. Therefore, my presentations usually took the general form of the importance of family participation in an organization that involves a family occupation, as does agriculture.

FAMILY TIES STRONG

I found this to be very well received as family ties, for security and other reasons, are very strong. Therefore, they readily accepted the concept of a family organization for family farmers.

The first day, we visited La Morita, the settlement that President and Mrs. Kennedy had visited and we received firsthand the feeling of the tremendous admiration and hope that these people have in Kennedy and his Alliance for Progress. Our reception is beyond description in the warmth and enthusiasm exhibited by the people. The reason for this enthusiasm is easy to explain in very simple terms when you consider the skepticism of these people because of their experience with broken promises in the past. But here, Kennedy had visited and promised assistance.

ARLENE-JACKIE

Then we came, not just as a Farmers Union team, but in their minds we were the Alliance for Progress and we were fulfilling a promise of President Kennedy and the United States. We were inviting 25 Venezuelan campesinos to the United States. As a strictly personal note, I would like to say that at this place, they called me "Jackie."

I would also like to insert that it was a little difficult at first, but soon I began to accept the uncanny feeling that I was something of a museum piece to these people. I'm very certain that in most areas, I was the first North American woman to visit them as a member of a project team. That a woman should be on this team was strange to them in itself because it is something apart from what they ordinarily think of as being the accepted role of women in this world. However, I feel that the presence of a woman, in farm organization work, is very essential in rural community development in Latin America; not only in the areas of home and family development but also in the workings of the organization.

VISIT OFFICIALS

In several States, arrangements had been made for us to meet and talk with the Governors of the States. In this way, we received not only the welcome from the farm organization and Federal Government agencies, but also from State governments. The graciousness of their receptions included dinners at the Governors' mansions in some cases as each was extremely interested in what our program could do for his people.

One of our most interesting experiences was in Yaracuy State at a land reform settlement named Santa María. While meeting with the officers of their farm production cooperative there, we noted with pleasure that in the office were displayed posters depicting the Rochdale principles of cooperatives. We observed sugarcane being cut by hand with machetes and this was the beginning of a most interesting human interest story.

LOST GLASSES

Later that day, Arnold Ackermann, my fellow team member from Willmar, Minn., discovered that he had lost his glasses and determined that they must have slipped from his pocket in the sugarcane field while he was wearing his sunglasses. Since this was only the second week of our project in Latin America, the replacement of his glasses as soon as possible was of great concern to him. The cane field was a large one and the cut cane was laying from 8 to 12 inches deep and finding them seemed like an impossible task. However, the next morning at 8 a.m., the president of the

cooperative and a couple of campesinos arrived at our hotel to return his glasses. A large group of campesinos had formed a "callapa" which is similar to our "harvesting bees" in the Midwest. They all got together for no pay and combed every inch of that field until they found the glasses. What a terrifically moving experience this was for all of us to have been extended such friendship and such great assistance. We are attempting to find a candidate for our program from Santa María as a gesture of appreciation.

EDUCATION

We observed a great deal of fine work being done by the extension service people in Venezuela. Their home demonstration agents are teaching people to make simple furniture for their homes, to boil their water to help prevent disease, and to make room dividers for their homes for a certain amount of family privacy. There are also many handicraft projects, all of which are useful in the home. County agents are beginning to develop 4-H Clubs, which they call 5-V Clubs, and have even had achievement days in some areas. But there is so much work to be done and so little money and people with which to do it.

But I will always remember the determination and impatience on the faces of the campesinos. They know that there are better ways of living and more modern methods of farming. They are going to get these things for themselves in whatever manner they can. If the United States is not willing or able to assist in the development of Latin America, then someone else is, and the time is short. As Theodoor Moscoso, Director of the Alliance for Progress, has said, "It is 1 minute to midnight in Latin America."

PUBLIC SERVICE BY MINNEAPOLIS RADIO STATION KDWB

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I am proud to report that a Minneapolis radio station has performed a magnificent public service—a deed of compassion—which deserves the highest commendation. The station is KDWB, of Minneapolis.

Last Thursday, a brief wire service story came into the KDWB office and newsroom. It told of a 17-year-old Oklahoma boy ill with hemophilia in a Dallas, Tex., hospital, and of his desperate need for blood transfusions.

Station KDWB did more than offer a simple report of the story. Its staff immediately phoned the Dallas hospital, to ask: "What can we in the Twin Cities and throughout Minnesota do to help?"

The answer—a need for blood donations—brought an immediate and continuing response from KDWB. Through its radio facilities, KDWB urged blood donations by Minnesota citizens. In addition, the station sent some of its own staff members to Dallas, to make blood donations.

The result is that hundreds of pints of blood plasma have been made available for the individual case in Dallas, plus hundreds more for the general blood bank available to others.

I am pleased to note that station KDWB related this effort to the continuing need for blood donations, and stressed the general need for support of the Red Cross blood donor program during the whole year, and particularly during National Red Cross Month, this month.

Mr. President, I wish to emphasize the point that this is National Red Cross Month, and again it gives us an opportunity to express our eternal gratitude and appreciation to the Red Cross for all the wonderful work it undertakes and accomplishes. I wish to salute the American Red Cross and also the International Red Cross for their humanitarian activities—for the lives they have saved, for the communities they have helped, and for the encouragement they have given to so many persons. In my opinion, these activities are the finest examples of compassion and humanitarianism.

Mr. President, I also salute the effective public service exhibited in the effort of station KDWB; and I ask that a brief chronology of this effort be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

**CHRONOLOGICAL REPORT ON CREATION OF
KDWB RADIO'S FLIGHT FOR LIFE**

On Thursday, March 7, 1963, a national wire service carried the following story:

"A 17-year-old Oklahoma boy needs help. He needs blood. Fred Wallace is a victim of hemophilia or 'Bleeder's Disease.' Officials at Baylor University Medical Center, Dallas, Tex., say Wallace has been given more than 800 pints of blood and blood plasma since he entered the hospital last October. This, they believe, is the largest amount of blood received by a single patient in the history of medical transfusion. Wallace is now receiving four transfusions a day. An urgent call is out for voluntary donors. Fred's family has been able to replace only about 250 pints of blood so far."

Upon receipt of this news story KDWB went to work to see what Twin Citians and Minnesotans could do to help this unfortunate family in Texas. KDWB news immediately telephoned Dr. Fred Souls, assistant director of the Wadley Research Institute and Blood Bank in Dallas and asked: "What can we in the Twin Cities and throughout Minnesota do to help?" Dr. Souls, in a specially recorded telephone conversation, outlined how people could go to the Red Cross blood bank in St. Paul and donate blood in the name of Fred Wallace.

This tape recording and story were put on the air on KDWB immediately, and immediately interested people started calling the radio station for more information. The story was repeated a couple of more times on Thursday. On Friday morning the St. Paul office of the Red Cross blood bank contacted KDWB for further information on the entire story. It seems a number of people had expressed an interest to them to donate their blood for Fred Wallace in Dallas, Tex.

KDWB's public service director, in talking with Twin City Red Cross officials, realized that this public response to a couple of news stories could mean a lot more; possibly a big public service campaign drawing public attention to (1) Fred Wallace's needs, and (2) the Red Cross blood donor program, during this, National Red Cross Month.

Through KDWB management and Mr. Lou Schaefer at Braniff International Airways, tickets were purchased for six members of the KDWB air staff to fly to Dallas, Tex., and personally donate a pint of blood each to Fred Wallace. Meeting the KDWB air personalities in Dallas will be members of Dallas radio station KBOX and the Dallas Red Cross. (The KDWB personnel leave Minneapolis-St. Paul International Airport at 8:35 a.m., Monday, March 11, via Braniff flight 51;

they return Monday evening arriving at 10:30 p.m. in the Twin Cities.)

During the entire time the six KDWB air personalities are flying to Dallas to donate this blood, Louis (Lou) Elegert, another KDWB staff member, will run an all day marathon on the air in the Twin Cities. Throughout the day he will be announcing names of people in Minnesota who have called their local Red Cross blood bank and offered their services as a volunteer worker or offered their blood in hopes of saving somebody's life—possibly Fred Wallace's.

KDWB views this public service campaign as a sort of "domestic people to people friendship," doing, as has been mentioned, two primary things. No. 1, KDWB hopes it will draw national public attention to the Red Cross and their blood program, now during Red Cross Month. No. 2, and equally important, KDWB hopes to play some small part in possibly helping Texas medical men save the life of Fred Wallace.

**STATEMENT OF SECRETARY OF
STATE RUSK ON NUCLEAR TEST
BAN**

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, earlier today the Secretary of State Mr. Dean Rusk appeared before the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations. The committee had met to hear the testimony of our Secretary of State on the very important subject of the U.S. treaty proposals relating to a test ban on nuclear weapons testing.

This subject has been one of great importance, of considerable public interest, and of much controversy.

The Secretary of State appeared before our committee for about 2½ hours. He gave us a prepared statement which I believe is one of the most cogent and well-reasoned statements as to national policy relating to nuclear weapons and the position of this administration relating to agreeing to a nuclear test ban treaty to which I have ever listened.

The Secretary of State is a man of good judgment. He is a prudent man. He is always very careful in his testimony. At the same time, he is thoughtful and persuasive. I am very much impressed with the integrity of the Secretary of State and his grasp of the intricate problems which confront this Nation.

The Secretary of State has to be informed on many issues of both national and international importance. The proposed nuclear test ban treaty is only one of a dozen or more important problems and issues on which he must be informed, yet Dean Rusk demonstrated a mastery of the subject matter of nuclear weapons testing which was nothing short of amazing.

I take this brief moment to commend the Secretary of State and to thank him for the manner in which he explained the position of this administration and, may I say, of the previous administration. He properly pointed out that this was not a matter of partisan debate or even of partisan controversy. He appropriately pointed out that both the previous Eisenhower administration and the present Kennedy administration have endorsed as a matter of national policy the proposals in the form of a treaty which would make possible a prohibition upon further nuclear testing.

The Secretary of State called our attention to improvements in detection of underground nuclear tests. He pointed out in a convincing manner the national interest our country has in obtaining a treaty which would prohibit further tests—I might add, an enforceable treaty, a treaty with safeguards so as to minimize the risks which might be involved in any such arrangement.

The Secretary pointed out, first, that "a nuclear test ban treaty would constitute a significant step in the direction of the slackening of the pace of the arms race"; and he documented his statement.

Secondly, he said that "an effective nuclear test ban treaty would be to the military advantage of the United States"; and he went on to document that conclusion.

Third, he pointed out that "a primary advantage of an effective nuclear test ban treaty to the United States in relation to the Soviet bloc is a political one." He also said:

I have repeatedly emphasized in my public statements in the United States and at the Geneva Disarmament Conference, and in previous statements before this committee, my conviction that disarmament and secrecy are incompatible.

The Secretary went on to point out how important were the onsite inspections to the United States and, indeed, to the total relationship between the United States and the Soviet Union.

The Secretary, with his customary candor, called to our attention the fact that "a test ban would not of itself solve the problem of proliferation of nuclear weapons," but he did say that "a nuclear test ban could lead to further steps which would deal more directly with the proliferation problem."

The Secretary also called to our attention the fact that "a nuclear test ban would be fully consistent with the possibilities for increased participation in the multilateral control of nuclear forces dedicated to NATO by our partners in the Alliance."

This was a remarkable statement, and I believe that in the main it answers many of the criticisms which have been leveled at the proposed nuclear test ban treaty.

The Secretary cited the increase in our technical ability to detect seismic events at long distances, thereby permitting us to rely upon seismic stations outside the Soviet Union to detect underground nuclear explosions inside the Soviet Union. He called to our attention the fact that "an effort has been made to increase the effectiveness of our present proposals over previous positions."

In conclusion, the Secretary cited that it was the considered judgment of the President and of his chief advisers in the national security area "that clandestine testing which might escape detection, in spite of the verification system, would not result in developments which would significantly alter the military balance." He also said:

An announced national policy of maintaining our readiness to test will minimize the risks to the United States stemming from

the possibility of Soviet abrogation of the treaty and an open resumption of testing.

He believes, and he called to our attention, the fact that "the cessation of nuclear weapons tests would advance the interests of the foreign policy of the United States."

The Secretary also said that "the present proposals of the United States for a nuclear test ban provide a sound basis for negotiation of an effective treaty."

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that this well-reasoned, brief, thoughtful, and excellently documented statement by our able and conscientious Secretary of State, Mr. Rusk, be printed in the RECORD at this point.

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

STATEMENT BY SECRETARY RUSK BEFORE THE SENATE FOREIGN RELATIONS COMMITTEE, MARCH 11, 1963

Mr. Chairman, I am very glad to have this opportunity to talk with the committee today about a most important aspect of our foreign policy, our long-continued effort to achieve agreement on a safeguarded nuclear test ban treaty.

Since the summer of 1958 the U.S. Government has consistently adhered to the view that a safeguarded cessation of nuclear weapons testing would be in our national interest. Periodic policy reviews in the light of shifting patterns of foreign policy, of changes in the negotiating situation, and of technical developments have always produced the same answer: that an effective test ban treaty is in our national interest.

Indeed, it is worth recalling that in 1945-46, at the very birth of the nuclear age, it was clearly perceived that a nuclear arms race would create the greatest dangers for all mankind. Consequently, President Truman directed the most serious and diligent effort to prevent such a race by bringing atomic energy under international control. Unhappily, the Baruch proposals did not succeed.

Today, I would like to discuss a nuclear test ban with you from the standpoint of our relations with the Soviet bloc and with countries outside the bloc, including our allies. I would also like to discuss what I believe to be the basic requirements for a nuclear test ban treaty to be effective. For it is clear that an illusory set of obligations on this sensitive subject ought never to be entered into by the United States.

In my judgment, the conclusion of an effective nuclear test ban treaty would have three advantages of primary importance in our relations with the Soviet Union.

First a nuclear test ban treaty would constitute a significant step in the direction of slackening the pace of the arms race. Once this step had been taken with satisfactory results, new opportunities for further steps toward turning the arms race downward might well be more within the realm of reality than at present. For the past 16 years during which the cold war has been waged, we have experienced the effect of an almost unlimited arms race on our national security and on our position in relation to the Soviet Union in the world arena. Although our position has been preserved and Communist aggression has been effectively deterred to a large extent by the buildup and deployment of our military forces, our security in that position has not necessarily been improved. Indeed, our military position might well be more secure today if we had successfully achieved agreement on a test ban treaty several years ago, earlier in the negotiations.

Because of the extensive history of past negotiations on this particular question, the

narrowing of the issues that has resulted from these negotiations and the worldwide interest, I believe that this problem may be more ripe for solution than perhaps any other first step in the arms control and disarmament field. It is clear that unless at some point we are able to step off in a new direction, the upward spiral of the arms race will continue unabated. The prospects of such a future for both ourselves and the Soviet Union are not attractive.

Second, an effective nuclear test ban treaty would be to the military advantage of the United States. At the present time we feel confident in our nuclear capabilities. We have today a stockpile of nuclear weapons which ranges from a few tens of tons of TNT, equivalent to many megatons. These weapons are useful for a variety of strategic and tactical uses. The Soviet Union has a stockpile of its own.

In certain areas of the spectrum of explosive power, namely the extremely large yields, the Soviets have developed weapons for which I am informed we do not have a present military requirement. In other areas, namely in the development of intermediate and lower yield weapons, we believe that we have a more varied arsenal than the Soviet Union. The President and his chief national security advisers, including myself and the Secretary of Defense, believe it doubtful that either side would, through further testing, achieve major advances in any significant area which could be translated into a military advantage without the other side making either a similar or offsetting gain. There is one proposition which we must keep in mind despite confidence and understandable national pride: Nature does not yield up its secrets with political favoritism. The list of Nobel Prize winners in the sciences over the past half century shows that major breakthroughs in knowledge come from many directions and have little to do with national frontiers. If our present assessment of the military situation is correct, and I believe it is, now would be an opportune time from our point of view for the conclusion of a treaty to halt further nuclear weapon testing.

The third primary advantage of an effective nuclear test ban treaty to the United States in relation to the Soviet bloc is a political one. I have repeatedly emphasized in my public statements in the United States and at the Geneva Disarmament Conference, and in previous statements before this committee, my conviction that disarmament and secrecy are incompatible. The Soviet Union has reasons of its own for its penchant for secrecy. Regardless of the merits of their case, however, it is clear that a closed society breeds suspicion and distrust on the part of other nations. Such an atmosphere is not conducive to taking steps to treat the symptoms of international tensions or to come to grips with the causes of these tensions.

A nuclear test ban treaty would obviously not lift the veil of secrecy from the Soviet Union. It would not even result in any substantial opening up of Soviet society. It could, however, have a very important impact on the Soviet attitude toward secrecy, especially as it relates to problems of arms control and disarmament. The carrying out of onsite inspections on Soviet territory would provide the United States with not only the necessary assurance that unidentified seismic signals were not underground nuclear explosions but also additional advantages. If a test ban treaty can operate effectively and in ways which demonstrate that the inspection connected with it does not jeopardize Soviet security or result in any particular embarrassments to the Soviet Union and its people, then the Soviet leadership may be more inclined to enter into other similar agreements. The first step seems to be the most difficult. If it can be made successfully then further steps in the same

direction might be taken with less difficulty than the first.

Therefore, in our relations with the Soviet Union I believe that a nuclear test ban treaty would have both political and military advantages. In addition, an effective nuclear test ban would have advantages in our relations with countries outside the Soviet bloc.

Among the dangers to the United States from continued testing by both sides I would consider the danger of the further spread of nuclear weapons to other countries of perhaps primary importance. Unlimited testing by both the United States and the Soviet Union would substantially increase the likelihood that more and more nations would seek the dubious, but what some might consider prestigious, distinction of membership in the nuclear club. The risks to the security of the free world from nuclear capabilities coming within the grasp of governments substantially less stable than either the United States or the Soviet Union are grave indeed.

A test ban would not of itself solve the problems of proliferation of nuclear weapons. It should be recognized that at least one present nuclear power and one power apparently bent on developing nuclear weapons might not be persuaded to subscribe to the test-ban treaty from the outset. However, many potential nuclear powers might at this stage be induced to accede to the treaty.

Moreover, a nuclear test ban could lead to further steps which would deal more directly with the proliferation problem. I am referring here to the possibility of an agreement on the one hand by the nuclear powers not to transfer control of weapons nor to give assistance in weapons development to countries not already possessing them, and on the other, by the nonnuclear powers not to produce or acquire nuclear weapons of their own. Another possibility would be an agreement to halt further production of fissionable materials for use in nuclear weapons and to transfer agreed quantities of such materials to peaceful uses. What should be emphasized here is that while a nuclear test ban by no means offers a total solution, it would be a necessary first step.

What I have just said is, I believe, applicable both to the problem of the spread of nuclear weapons outside the North Atlantic alliance and to the problem of the development of additional national nuclear capabilities by NATO members. I believe that a nuclear test ban would be fully consistent with the possibilities for increased participation in the multilateral control of nuclear forces dedicated to NATO by our partners in the alliance.

Of secondary, but nevertheless significant importance is the problem of radioactive fallout. In large part because of real or assumed dangers from fallout, nuclear testing has become a key political issue in a great many countries around the world. Our relations with those countries are sometimes adversely affected when our tests produce fallout outside our own borders. On the other hand, our initiatives in seeking a test ban agreement have been well received by not only our allies but by the uncommitted countries.

I have pointed out what I believe to be the primary advantages to the United States in an effective nuclear test ban treaty in terms of our relations with the Soviet Union and with other countries around the world. However, I would like to make it clear that I believe there may also be advantages to the Soviet Union in a nuclear test ban.

A certain degree of mutuality of interest is an obvious prerequisite for any agreement.

I have stated that an effective nuclear test ban would be to the military advantage of the United States. This should not exclude the possibility that the Soviet Union could at the same time have valid military reasons

for entering into a nuclear test ban treaty with the intention of carrying it out. The United States and the Soviet Union have to date apparently pursued somewhat different objectives in their testing programs. This difference in emphasis appears attributable to different strategic concepts, as well as technological considerations. Therefore, while we may be assured that our own retaliatory capability in the event of nuclear attack is sufficient to deter such an attack, the Soviet Union could at the same time believe that it has a sufficient nuclear capability for its own security requirements without the need of further testing. Similarly, the possibility of the future spread of nuclear weapons is a legitimate concern not only to ourselves, but to the Soviet Union as well.

I have thus far attempted to demonstrate why and how an effective nuclear test ban treaty would serve the foreign policy interests of the United States. I would now like to address the question of what makes a nuclear test ban treaty effective.

Three requirements are, in my judgment, basic to an effective nuclear test ban treaty.

First, the verification arrangements must provide an adequate deterrent to violation on the part of the Soviet Union. However, no verification system, no matter how elaborate or intrusive, could be foolproof. Therefore, the second requirement of an effective treaty is that the scope of any violation which might escape detection must not be so extensive that it would substantially affect the military balance. Finally, a nuclear test ban treaty will be adhered to only so long as a mutuality of interest in the agreement persists. If the Soviet Union were ever to conclude that a test ban were no longer in its interests, we can be sure that the Soviet leadership would not hesitate to abrogate the treaty and resume testing. Therefore, an effective test ban treaty must not leave the United States in a state of unpreparedness in the event of a Soviet change of attitude.

In my opinion, our present test ban proposals meet these three requirements for an effective treaty.

Last week the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy held a series of illuminating hearings on developments in the field of detection and identification of nuclear explosions and their relationship to the nuclear test ban negotiations. These hearings explored in considerable depth the scientific and technical basis for the present U.S. position with respect to a nuclear test ban. The efficacy of the technical underpinning for our test ban proposals is certainly an important factor in determining the overall effectiveness of a treaty based on these proposals. However, the effectiveness of the verification arrangements associated with a test ban do not depend entirely upon numbers or locations of detection stations. Nor is any particular number of onsite inspections the key to effectiveness. The verification arrangements must be considered as a totality. The effectiveness of the total system should be judged in the light of the entire geographic, technical, military, political and economic environment in which it would operate.

The increase in our technical ability to detect seismic events at long distances permits us to rely upon seismic stations outside the Soviet Union to detect underground nuclear explosions inside the Soviet Union. Moreover, a decrease by a factor of two and one-half in a previous estimate of the number of earthquakes of a given seismic magnitude occurring annually in the Soviet Union has enabled us to reduce the number of onsite inspections on Soviet territory to seven. But perhaps more important than

a particular number of onsite inspections in determining its effectiveness as a deterrent to cheating is the manner in which an onsite inspection would be carried out. Our present position with respect to the number of onsite inspections which would be acceptable to us has, therefore, been very clearly stated by Mr. Foster in discussions with the Soviet representatives to be conditional upon further agreement on such important matters as the method of selecting particular earth tremors for inspection, the size and composition of inspection teams, the area and duration of search, and logistical arrangements. Finally, an effort has been made to increase the effectiveness of our present proposals over previous positions by vesting control over the installation and operation of the detection network, and control over the carrying out of onsite inspections in the Soviet Union, more completely in the hands of the United States and United Kingdom. This has resulted in a proposal for a simpler and more economical system. It would also permit us to evaluate a greater range of factors in determining whether the Soviet Union was honoring its treaty obligations than would be the case under a treaty providing for more complete international operation and control of the verification system.

I will leave to officials of the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency the discussion of the details of this proposal. But it is the conclusion of the President and his chief advisers in the national security area that clandestine testing which might escape detection, in spite of the verification system, would not result in developments which would significantly alter the military balance.

Finally, an announced national policy of maintaining our readiness to test will minimize the risks to the United States stemming from the possibility of Soviet abrogation of the treaty and an open resumption of testing. Indeed, such a policy would be a deterrent to abrogation and would reinforce the effectiveness of the treaty itself.

In conclusion, I believe that the cessation of nuclear weapons tests would advance the interests of the foreign policy of the United States, and that the present proposals of the United States for a nuclear test ban provide a sound basis for negotiation of an effective treaty. In reaching this conclusion I am aware of the risks involved in an undetected Soviet violation of the treaty or its surprise abrogation. I am also aware, however, of the graver risks to our security and the security of the free world implicit in a future without any multilateral restraint on the development of nuclear weapons. In addition to the risks with and without a test ban which must be carefully weighed against each other, we should also consider the opportunities created by taking a step in the direction of controlling the arms race. I believe that if these new opportunities are placed in the scale, it will be tipped decisively in favor of our present proposals for a ban on the further testing of nuclear weapons.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL THURSDAY

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, if there is no further business to come before the Senate—and I know of none—under the order previously entered, I move that the Senate stand in adjournment until next Thursday at noon.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 2 o'clock and 27 minutes p.m.) the Senate adjourned, under the previous order, until Thursday, March 14, 1963, at 12 o'clock meridian.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate March 11, 1963:

DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE AMBASSADORS

William C. Doherty, of Maryland, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Jamaica.

C. Vaughan Ferguson, Jr., of the District of Columbia, a Foreign Service officer of class 1, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Malagasy Republic.

Outerbridge Horsey, of the District of Columbia, a Foreign Service officer of the class of career minister, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Czechoslovak Socialist Republic.

William R. Rivkin, of Illinois, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Luxembourg.

Horace G. Torbert, Jr., of Massachusetts, a Foreign Service officer of class 1, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Somaliland Republic.

Olcott H. Deming, of Connecticut, a Foreign Service officer of class 1, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Uganda.

ENVOY

Donald A. Dumont, of New York, a Foreign Service officer of class 2, to be Envoy Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Kingdom of Burundi.

U.S. ADVISORY COMMISSION ON INFORMATION

Sigurd S. Larmon, of New York, to be a member of the U.S. Advisory Commission on Information for a term of 3 years expiring January 27, 1966, and until his successor has been appointed and qualified.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MONDAY, MARCH 11, 1963

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Proverbs 22: 6: *Train a child in the way he should go; and when he is old, he will not depart from it.*

Eternal God, who art the Father of our hearts and our homes, in this moment of prayer, we would earnestly beseech Thee that the family and home-life of our beloved country may rise to its sacred shrines of influence and power as it seeks to mold and develop into beauty and strength of character and conduct the children and youth of our day and generation.

Grant that in our high calling as homebuilders, whether living in a castle or cottage, we may strive during this Lenten season to cultivate the fine and congenial virtues and attributes of love and kindness, of considerateness, and thoughtfulness, of peace and joy, so that childhood and youth may not be reared and spent in an atmosphere pervaded and poisoned by contention and discord.

May the children and teenagers learn and practice the noble and necessary art

of self-discipline and appreciate more fully that they also are challenged and privileged to have a glorious share in contributing to the greatness and glory of our Republic and to help build a healthier and happier social order.

Hear our prayers in Christ's name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, March 7, 1963, was read and approved.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Sundry messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the House by Mr. Ratchford, one of his secretaries, who also informed the House that on the following date the President approved and signed a joint resolution of the House of the following title:

On March 6, 1963:

H.J. Res. 284. Joint resolution making supplemental appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1963, and for other purposes.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. McGown, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed a bill of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 816. An act for the establishment of a Commission on Science and Technology.

The message also announced that the President of the Senate, pursuant to Public Law 86-420, had appointed Mr. MANSFIELD, Mr. SPARKMAN, Mr. MORSE, Mr. LONG of Louisiana, Mr. DODD, Mr. SMATHERS, Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey, Mr. MUSKIE, Mr. BREWSTER, Mr. BENNETT, Mr. ALLOTT, Mr. MECHAM, and Mr. KUCHEL to be members of the U.S. group of the Mexico-United States Interparliamentary Group.

The message also announced that Mr. MAGNUSON, chairman of the Committee on Commerce, pursuant to title 14, United States Code, section 194(a), had appointed Mr. BARTLETT and Mr. BEALL to be members of the Board of Visitors to the U.S. Coast Guard Academy.

The message also announced that Mr. MAGNUSON, chairman of the Committee on Commerce, pursuant to title 46, United States Code, section 1126(c), had appointed Mr. ENGLE and Mr. SCOTT to be members of the Board of Visitors to the U.S. Merchant Marine Academy.

The message also announced that the President of the Senate, pursuant to section 1, Public Resolution 32, 73d Congress, had appointed Mr. HRUSKA as a member of the U.S. Territorial Expansion Memorial Commission.

The message also announced that the President of the Senate, pursuant to Public Law 250, 77th Congress, had appointed Mr. LONG of Louisiana and Mr. SALTONSTALL to be members of the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures.

The message also announced that the President of the Senate, pursuant to sec-

tion 1, Public Law 523, 78th Congress, had appointed Mr. HARTKE and Mr. DOMINICK to be members of the National Memorial Stadium Commission.

The message also announced that the President of the Senate, pursuant to section 1, Public Law 87-759, had appointed Mr. ELLENDER, Mr. LONG of Louisiana, Mr. COOPER, Mr. MORTON, Mr. EASTLAND, Mr. STENNIS, Mr. KEFAUVER, and Mr. GORE to be members of the Battle of New Orleans Sesquicentennial Celebration Commission.

The message also announced that the President of the Senate, pursuant to section 3, Public Law 86-380, had appointed Mr. ERVIN, Mr. MUNDT, and Mr. MUSKIE to be members of the Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations.

The message also announced that the President of the Senate, pursuant to section 1, Public Law 372, 84th Congress, had appointed Mrs. NEUBERGER to be a member of the Franklin Delano Roosevelt Memorial Commission.

The message also announced that the President of the Senate, pursuant to Public Law 87-758, had appointed Mr. MAGNUSON and Mr. PROUTY to be members of the National Fisheries Center and Aquarium Advisory Board.

The message also announced that the President of the Senate, pursuant to title 14, United States Code, section 194, had appointed Mr. DODD to be a member of the Board of Visitors to the Coast Guard Academy.

The message also announced that the Vice President, pursuant to title 10, United States Code, section 9355(a), had designated Mr. HOLLAND, Mr. HUMPHREY, and Mr. GOLDWATER to be members of the Board of Visitors to the U.S. Air Force Academy.

The message also announced that the Vice President, pursuant to title 10, United States Code, section 4355(a), had designated Mr. PASTORE, Mr. KEFAUVER, and Mr. KEATING to be members of the Board of Visitors to the U.S. Military Academy.

The message also announced that the President of the Senate, pursuant to title 46, United States Code, section 1126e, had appointed Mr. BAYH to be a member of the Board of Visitors to the U.S. Merchant Marine Academy.

The message also announced that the Vice President, pursuant to title 10, United States Code, section 6988(a), had designated Mr. ROBERTSON, Mr. BARTLETT, and Mr. BEALL to be members of the Board of Visitors to the U.S. Naval Academy.

RESIDUAL OIL IMPORTS

Mr. CONTE. 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. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, as I have done in the past, I rise today to speak

on residual oil imports. I am not going to let this matter drop, and will continue to speak for the interests of New England and the entire eastern seaboard.

I am greatly disturbed with the administration's attitude on this topic. Apparently the pressure exerted on President Kennedy has been too much for the former junior Senator from Massachusetts.

As a member of the party in power in 1959, I rose to speak immediately against the import quotas placed on residual and crude oil by Mr. Eisenhower. As a new Republican in the House, this was not an easy thing to do. I was joined by the then Senator Kennedy, who said he believed in the rightness of this cause.

Now the President has decided to turn a deaf ear to the subject—except to listen to the coal barons, who keep reminding him of campaign promises. The fact of the matter is, Mr. Speaker, that New England has been losing \$30 million a year because these quotas prevent most of our hospitals, large apartment homes, schools, and industries from using this very practical cheap oil.

Another very direct and most important issue is the President's intellectual honesty in this issue. Just 2 weeks ago he promised President Betancourt that he would do everything he could to help the economy of that country. Now Venezuela is crippled economically because it cannot send oil to this country. The country is fighting, almost alone, Castro militancy in Latin America.

The showdown on this issue is about to come. The President cannot keep walking on both sides of a perilous street. He must walk on the humanitarian side, on the side of the people, and not the coal barons. I speak briefly today, Mr. Speaker, to say simply that the fight, from my standpoint, is just beginning.

GAS AND OIL PERCENTAGE DEPLETION TAX

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. NYGAARD. Mr. Speaker, I wish to insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a statement made by Ernest R. Fleck, president, North Dakota Oil & Gas Association, in which he calls attention to the deficiencies in the proposals made by the administration for revisions of tax laws governing oil and related industries:

The proposed tax reduction and reform program presented by President Kennedy, and which is now being considered by the Congress, provides a back-door method of reducing percentage depletion. It hits the North Dakota oil and gas producing industry at its most vital point, that of exploring for and developing new reserves. If accepted by Congress, these changes will immediately reduce the incentive for the exploratory drilling which is essential to the health and future growth of North Dakota's second largest industry.

The provisions of the program are highly technical and the full ramifications can only be determined after careful and extensive study. Nevertheless, it has been stated by the administration that the proposed changes will increase the taxes of the mineral industries by over \$300 million, of which \$280 million will come from the petroleum branch alone. The brunt of this will be borne first and hardest by the companies, large and small, who are exploring for new oil and gas reserves. Still more taxes cannot be justified for an industry whose national drilling activity is already at the lowest point in 19 years, and at the lowest ebb in North Dakota since the beginning of oil development.

In a recent interview, Secretary of the Treasury Dillon stated that existing tax provisions have been built into the economy of the oil industry, and that oil industry earnings, after taxes, were no greater and even less than many other businesses. He further stated "that without these provisions there could be no doubt that gasoline and oil products of the oil industry would have to be priced somewhat higher."

In these critical times of world unrest it is completely without logic that the administration should propose measures which will seriously cripple the major energy producing industry of the United States, and in so doing endanger our preparedness to meet national defense emergencies.

The policies and attitudes of our Government will be a major factor in the long-range outlook for the U.S. oil supply. This attack on the sound and time-tested tax policies of the petroleum industry can only serve to seriously endanger the means of providing that supply.

SOCIAL SECURITY REFORM

Mr. DORN. 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 South Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, some textile workers in my district have worked in the textile mills for more than 30 years and still cannot draw social security, though disabled to continue on that job. I have known textile employees, men and women, who worked 40 years and some even more, and still could not draw their social security because of that provision of the law which states that to be disabled, a person must be unable to engage in any other work at all.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that this provision of the law is unfair and should be changed. When a person works for 30 years in a textile mill and becomes disabled because of injury or ill health, then I say, Mr. Speaker, that person should start drawing social security.

It is a hardship and it is wrong for such a person to have to go around knocking on doors seeking other employment. Ladies and gentlemen of the House, you know and I know it is next to impossible for this person to get another job.

I am speaking today primarily of textile workers because I have such a great textile industry in my congressional district. More people are employed in the

textile industry in my district than all other employment combined. Although I have mentioned my textile workers as an example, I think any worker in the United States regardless of what industry should be able to draw social security after 30 years on the same job when disabled.

I have today introduced a bill which would permit a person to draw social security after 30 years on the same job when that person becomes disabled to continue on that job. I hope the Congress will consider this bill this year so as to permit our folks who have worn themselves out on the same job after 30 years to start drawing social security.

RESIDUAL OIL IMPORTS

Mr. HAYS. 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 Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, I was slightly amused at the indignation of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. CONTEL] about the President's order on residual oil. He kept talking over and over about coal barons. I wonder if he will be one of the same ones who next week, with others in his party, who will talk about the outflow of gold. I wonder why he is not indignant about the oil barons, such as the Rockefellers—I do not want to mention other names—who are benefiting from the dumping of this residual oil in the United States. I think that he should get upset about the plight of the coal miners, thousands of whom have lost their jobs because of this residual oil rather than referring to the plight of Venezuela, which is not doing too badly at this time, if you will look at the figures and the amount of money they get from the United States.

U.S. POST OFFICES

Mr. JONES of Missouri. 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 Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, last week I called attention to some plans that were underway for the building of federally owned post office buildings. I also called attention to the inconsistencies that were evident in this program.

During the past week it has been called to my attention that in the northern part of the State of Missouri, in a town of 1,900 people, they are proposing to build a federally owned post office building costing \$377,800. In an adjoining county, in a town of 12,000 people, more than 6 times as large, with post office receipts of 7 times as much, they are building a lease-type building which will cost less than \$300,000, probably around \$250,000.

May I also call attention to the fact that where these buildings have been built, and extravagant waste resulted, they are being criticized even by the people and the newspapers of the town where this is being done.

At Perryville, Mo., there was a post office building built in 1935, at a cost of \$35,000. More than 2 years ago they came out with a proposal to modernize and enlarge that building at a cost of \$275,000.

I raised Cain with the Department for that, and they revised their estimate and came out with a new estimate of \$175,000. They are now spending \$178,400 to remodel, enlarge, and modernize a building that originally cost about \$35,000. The newspaper out there said, "It could have been admitted also that it erred in having the old building practically gutted, serviceable floors torn out, and unnecessary extras added, a waste of many thousands of dollars."

No administration can make friends and gain support through a policy of profligate spending.

THE INTERNATIONAL SECRETARIAT OF THE PEACE CORPS

Mr. GROSS. 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 Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, on February 18, 1963, I noticed in one of the Washington newspapers a reference to the International Secretariat of the Peace Corps.

This appeared to be something new to me, so I wrote to Mr. Sargent Shriver, Director of the Peace Corps, and asked him about this International Secretariat. His letter, dated March 2, was received in my office last Saturday. It reads in part as follows:

The International Secretariat which you mentioned is not part of the Peace Corps. The International Peace Corps Secretariat was established for a trial period of 1 year by the act of the nations and international organizations attending the International Conference on Middle Level Manpower in San Juan, P.R., last October.

You will remember that this was the meeting at which the Rockefeller Hotel reduced the rate from \$56 a day to about \$26 a day.

The Secretariat was not established by the United States, although the U.S. delegation to that Conference did vote in favor of the resolution establishing a Secretariat and did agree to furnish it with its chief administrative officer and other personnel and funds to meet the expenses of the Secretariat during the trial period.

That is all we did, just vote the money—\$150,000—to take care of the International Secretariat for the Peace Corps, and the Secretary is paid at the rate of \$19,650. All the representatives of this country did was vote to provide all the money for this new outfit. Now they are coming to Congress, Mr. Shriver says, to set this up as a permanent organization. I think the Members

of Congress would be interested to know how they got that way and where they are going to get the next \$150,000 to pay some jackanape \$19,650 a year.

FOURTH ANNUAL REPORT OF THE COMMISSION ON INTERNATIONAL RULES OF JUDICIAL PROCEDURE

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on the Judiciary:

To the Congress of the United States:

Pursuant to the provisions of Public Law 85-906, as amended, I transmit herewith, for the information of the Congress, the Fourth Annual Report of the Commission on International Rules of Judicial Procedure, covering the period ending December 31, 1962.

JOHN F. KENNEDY.

THE WHITE HOUSE, March 11, 1963.

MANPOWER REPORT — LETTER FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following letter from the President of the United States, which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Education and Labor:

The Honorable the PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE.

The Honorable the SPEAKER OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

SIRS: I am transmitting herewith my Manpower Report as required under the Manpower Development and Training Act of 1962.

In preparing this report, I have had the advice and assistance of the Secretary of Labor, who in turn, has had the assistance of members of the Cabinet, heads of independent agencies and the National Manpower Advisory Committee appointed under this act.

Together with my report I am presenting the report of the Secretary of Labor on manpower requirements, resources, use, and training required by section 104 of the Manpower Development and Training Act.

Respectfully,

JOHN F. KENNEDY.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA BUSINESS

The SPEAKER. This is District of Columbia Day. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. McMillan].

Mr. McMillan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that after the passage of each bill, the chairman or subcommittee chairman may have permission to submit for the RECORD an explanation of the bill.

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

There was no objection.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA CANINE CORPS

Mr. McMillan. Mr. Speaker, I call up the bill (H.R. 1935) to authorize the acquisition, training, and maintenance of dogs to be used in law enforcement in the District of Columbia, and ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered in the House as in Committee of the Whole.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Commissioners of the District of Columbia, acting through the Chief of Police of the Metropolitan Police force of the District of Columbia, are authorized to acquire, train, and maintain as many dogs as may be necessary to be used in connection with law enforcement in the District of Columbia.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. McMillan. Mr. Speaker, the purpose of this bill is to authorize the expansion of the canine corps of the Metropolitan Police force.

The use of dogs in urban police work originated in Belgium more than 50 years ago, and has since spread to many other countries. Today, more than 40 police departments in the United States are utilizing dogs in patrol work, and the number is increasing very rapidly.

The canine corps was first established in the District of Columbia in December 1959, and on April 19, 1960, six dogs went on the streets of the city with their handlers. By the end of that year, the number had increased to 20 such teams, and today the corps consists of 59 dogs on the streets and 11 more in training, for a total strength of 70.

The effectiveness of the canine corps as an arm of the Metropolitan Police force may be evaluated from the following statistics for the calendar year 1961, which were submitted to this committee by the Police Department:

Number of arrests made by men with the assistance of dogs, classified according to types of offenses

Housebreaking	62
Robbery	37
Assault	21
Larceny	13
Disorderly	14
Homicide, assaults on police officers, destroying property, etc.	50
Total	197

This total constituted 40 percent of all the arrests made by these men during that year.

This remarkable record was accomplished by a corps which ranged from 19 to 42 man-dog teams during the year. In addition to their actual participation in these arrests, the dogs of the canine corps have proved invaluable on many other occasions by the deterrent effect of their mere presence at the scene of actual or potential trouble. The dogs' keen sense of smell enables them to locate fugitives hiding in buildings, junkyards,

and other places where the policemen would otherwise have a most difficult and dangerous task in apprehending them.

At a public hearing on April 4, 1962, one of our subcommittees heard testimony on this bill from the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia, the Chief and other members of the Metropolitan Police force, the trainer of the canine corps, and spokesmen for community organizations. No opposition whatever was expressed against the bill, and the success of the program was described in terms of highest praise.

Actually, the committee was told that for several reasons the program of expansion of the corps cannot be made to proceed too rapidly. First, the recruitment and selection of the dogs must be accomplished carefully and deliberately. Then the training itself takes 14 weeks, and the nature of the training work forbids too large groups. In this connection also, each dog is assigned to one particular man, and this patrolman and his dog must be trained together. Thus, any rapid acceleration in the training program would take too many patrolmen off their regular beats at one time, to the detriment of law enforcement in the city. In addition, each man-dog team in service must be brought back for 1 day of refresher training every 2 weeks. For these reasons, the Police Department estimates that not more than 25 new dogs can be acquired, trained, and added to the corps each year. Thus, it is their plan to take about another year to build the organization up to a total of 100.

Thus far, all the dogs in the canine corps have been donated, and thus have cost the police department nothing. However, if the contemplated program of expansion necessitates the purchase of any of the new dogs, it is estimated that they may cost as much as \$250 each. An item of expense is involved in the fact that the policemen who handle these dogs must transport them daily in their own cars, and also must keep the dogs at their homes. This calls for fenced yards, and extra cleaning. Also, most of the work of these policemen must be performed at night. For these reasons, these men are paid additional compensation in the amount of \$538 per year, as grade 2 technicians.

The cost of adding 25 man-dog teams to the present canine corps, which will take a year to accomplish, is estimated to be \$19,000. This includes the patrolman's extra compensation as a technician, and the food and veterinary care for the dogs, but not any cost of purchase.

This committee strongly endorses the expansion of this arm of the District of Columbia Police Department, which in its 3 years of existence, despite its limited size, has proved such an invaluable asset as a weapon against the appalling crime situation in the District of Columbia.

The House approved this same bill last year.

LOWERING AGE LIMIT FOR REGISTERED NURSES

Mr. McMillan. Mr. Speaker, I call up the bill (H.R. 1933) to amend the

act of February 9, 1907, entitled "An act to define the term 'registered nurse' and to provide for the registration of nurses in the District of Columbia," as amended, with respect to the minimum age limitation for registration.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the second and fourth sentences of section 4 of the Act of February 9, 1907, entitled "An Act to define the term 'registered nurse' and to provide for the registration of nurses in the District of Columbia" (D.C. Code, sec. 2-404), as amended, are amended by striking "twenty-one" wherever it appears therein and inserting in lieu thereof, "nineteen."

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Speaker, the purpose of this bill is to lower the minimum age for registered nurses in the District of Columbia from 21 to 19 years.

The original statute providing for the registration of graduate nurses in the District of Columbia, enacted February 9, 1907, specified that "no nurse shall be registered in the District of Columbia who has not attained the age of 21 years." It is provided also that no applicant may take the examination for licensure in the District unless she is 21 years of age or will attain that age within 6 months after the date set for the examination.

Until a few years ago, we are informed, students under 18 years of age were not admitted to schools of nursing, and therefore were not being graduated below the age of 21. Thus, the above-mentioned statute posed no problem. However, as high schools began graduating persons of 16 and 17 years, the admission age to schools of nursing was lowered to 17 years. Also, diploma programs have decreased in length from 36 months to 32 and 33 months, which has increased the problem relating to age.

According to "Facts of Nursing," published by the American Nurses' Association, 20 States presently have no minimum age requirement for registration of nurses; and the age requirements in the other States, with the exception of North Dakota and the District of Columbia, range from 18 to 20 years.

The disadvantages to the District of Columbia resulting from this situation are twofold. First, it handicaps local recruitment of the best qualified students. The better students graduate from high school at an earlier age, and they prefer to take their nursing training in jurisdictions which allow them to become registered immediately upon completion of their training program. Second, the younger student who does decide to take her nursing training course in the District of Columbia must go to the additional expense of taking her licensing examination in another jurisdiction. This will qualify her to practice as a registered nurse in that locality, whereas she is prohibited from registration and practice in the District of Columbia until she becomes 21 years of age. The result is that such nurses usu-

ally remain elsewhere to work, and the District thus loses the services of many young registered nurses.

At a public hearing conducted on September 17, 1962, testimony in favor of this proposed legislation was presented by the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia, the Capital City School of Nursing, the Washington Hospital Center School of Nursing, and the Graduate Nurses' Association of the District of Columbia. No opposition was expressed.

Passage of this bill will not involve additional expense to the District of Columbia government.

A bill identical to this was approved by the House on September 24, 1962.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA ARMORY BOARD

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Speaker, I call up the bill (H.R. 39) to amend the act of June 4, 1948, as it relates to the appointment of the District of Columbia Armory Board, and ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered in the House as in the Committee of the Whole.

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

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, and I do not think I will object, I would like to ask the gentleman from South Carolina a question or two concerning this bill.

What is the necessity for increasing the membership of this board?

Mr. McMILLAN. The three members of the present board came to our committee and asked that we add two additional members because they already have three members on the board who are connected with the District government, and they want two additional members who are not connected with the District government.

Mr. GROSS. Solely because they want two additional members who are not connected with the District government?

Mr. McMILLAN. That is my understanding.

Mr. GROSS. May I ask the gentleman this question: Is this some kind of a preliminary to coming to Congress for funds to take care of that white elephant stadium which the District of Columbia has on its hands?

Mr. McMILLAN. If it is, they did not let it be known at the hearings.

Mr. GROSS. Would the gentleman think that this was directed toward a program to do what they could not do before; that is, to get Congress to dump a bunch of money into the stadium operation?

Mr. McMILLAN. I cannot see how this would be any assistance to them in getting any District funds for the stadium.

Mr. GROSS. The gentleman does not think that is the purpose of the bill?

Mr. McMILLAN. I do not think so.

Mr. GROSS. I thank the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the first sentence of section 2 of the Act entitled "An Act to establish a District of Columbia Armory Board, and for other purposes", approved June 4, 1948, as amended (D.C. Code, sec. 2-1702), is amended by striking out "a third person not employed by the Federal or District Governments who shall be appointed" and inserting in lieu thereof "three other persons not employed by the Federal or District Governments each of whom shall be appointed".

Sec. 2. The amendment made by the first section of this Act shall not affect the term of office of any person serving on the Armory Board on the date of enactment of this Act.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 2, line 1 insert the following: ", and by inserting immediately before the period at the end thereof the following: 'Provided, That of the two persons initially appointed to the Board after the effective date of this proviso, one shall be appointed for a term of two years, and one for a term of three years'."

Page 2, line 7, insert immediately after the word "shall" the following: "take effect as of October 12, 1963, but shall".

Page 2, line 9, insert immediately after the period:

"Any member appointed to the Armory Board to fill a vacancy shall be appointed only for the unexpired term of the member whom he succeeds."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Speaker, the purpose of this legislation is to increase the membership of the District of Columbia Armory Board from three to five members, with the terms of the three non-Government-employed members to be staggered so as to provide for some continuity of membership.

Under existing law the President of the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia, the commanding general of the District of Columbia Militia, and a third person not employed by the Federal or District Governments, is appointed by the chairman of the District of Columbia Committees of the U.S. Senate and the U.S. House of Representatives, to serve for a term of 3 years. Two of the present members of the Armory Board are ex officio members and have other duties of a substantial and time-consuming nature.

This legislation would simply increase from one person to three persons, not employed by the Federal or District Governments, to be appointed by the chairman of the District of Columbia Committees of the Senate and House of Representatives for staggered 3-year terms. This legislation has the strong endorsement of the present District of Columbia Armory Board, and at a public hearing held by a subcommittee of the

House District Committee on Thursday, July 26, the three members of the Board testified to this fact.

There is no objection to the enactment of this legislation and there is no cost involved to the District of Columbia government since all the members of the Board serve without compensation.

A bill identical to this passed the House in the last Congress.

APPOINTMENT OF NEW TRUSTEES IN DEEDS OF TRUST

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Speaker, at this time I yield to the gentleman from New York [Mr. MULTER] to call up a bill from Subcommittee No. 3 of the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I call up the bill, H.R. 682, to amend the act of March 3, 1901, to permit the appointment of new trustees in deeds of trust in the District of Columbia by agreement of the parties.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) section 522 of the Act entitled "An Act to establish a code of law for the District of Columbia", approved March 3, 1901, as amended (D.C. Code, sec. 45-603), is amended by inserting immediately after "a new trustee" the following: "by agreement of the parties pursuant to section 538(b) (D.C. Code, sec. 45-614(b)) or", and by striking out "or trustee" in the proviso and inserting in lieu thereof the following: ". trustee, or new trustee".

(b) Section 534 of such Act of March 3, 1901, as amended (D.C. Code, sec. 45-611), is amended by adding at the end thereof the following: "Nothing contained in this section shall prevent the appointment of a new trustee pursuant to section 538(b) (D.C. Code, sec. 45-614(b)) and the execution of the trusts of said deed of trust by such new trustee."

(c) Section 537 of such Act of March 3, 1901, as amended (D.C. Code, sec. 45-619), is amended by adding at the end thereof the following: "Nothing contained in this section shall prevent the appointment of a new trustee pursuant to section 538(b) (D.C. Code, sec. 45-614(b)) and the execution of a deed of release by such new trustee."

(d) Section 538 of such Act of March 3, 1901, as amended (D.C. Code, sec. 45-614), is amended by inserting "(a)" immediately before "In case of the refusal" and by adding at the end thereof the following new subsections:

Notwithstanding the provisions of subsection (a) of this section, and notwithstanding any provision in a deed of trust to the contrary, whenever the grantors named in, and the persons secured by, the deed of trust (or their successors in interest) so desire, they may by written agreement executed and acknowledged in the same manner as an absolute deed substitute any trustee named in the deed of trust with a new trustee. No written instrument entered into pursuant to this subsection shall be effective as to any person not having actual notice thereof until a notice of the appointment of the new trustee signed, sealed, and acknowledged by the parties agreeing to the appointment of the new trustee shall be recorded among the land records in the Office of the Recorder of Deeds.

"(c) Notwithstanding any provision of a deed of trust to the contrary, the owner of the debt secured by such deed of trust may,

by a written designation signed, sealed, and acknowledged by him, appoint substitute trustees, and such designation shall be effective from and after the tenth day following the filing of such designation in the United States District Court for the District of Columbia and the service of a copy thereof upon the debtor in the manner provided for the service of a petition by section 534 of this subchapter, unless within such ten-day period the debtor shall file in said court an objection to the appointment of any such substitute trustee. In the event any such objection is filed in said court, further proceedings shall be in accordance with section 534 or 537 of this subchapter, or subsection (a) of this section, whichever is appropriate. The clerk of the court shall maintain a separate docket in which there shall be kept a record of designations of substitute trustees filed under this subsection."

SEC. 2. The amendments made by the first section of this Act shall apply to all deeds of trust, whether entered into before, on, or after the date of enactment of this Act.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, the purpose of the bill is to provide for the substitution of trustees under deeds of trust in the District of Columbia by means of a written instrument entered into by all the parties or their successors in interest, notwithstanding any provision of the deed of trust to the contrary.

The bill affects two situations whereby new trustees to a deed of trust can be appointed. One is where the parties to a trust agree in writing to the appointment. Provision is included that before any such instrument is effective, notice of the appointment of the new trustee, bearing the signatures under seal of the parties, and acknowledged by them, shall be recorded among the land records in the Office of the Recorder of Deeds. This affords notice to other parties not having actual notice of the designation of the new trustee.

The other situation covered by the bill is where the owner of the debt secured by a deed of trust may, unilaterally, acting on his own, and without the prior agreement of other parties to the deed of trust, appoint a new trustee by written designation signed, sealed, and acknowledged by said owner of the debt. However, in such case, such appointment of new trustee is effective only after the lapse of a 10-day period following the filing of such designation with the U.S. District Court for the District of Columbia and service thereof on the debtor. If the debtor within the 10-day period files an objection to the appointment of such trustee, court proceeding would follow as are provided under the District of Columbia Code for appointment of a substituted trustee in the event of death of the designated trustee, under which proceedings the court may appoint a new trustee.

In the 2d session of the 87th Congress, a bill on this subject, H.R. 8988, was amended to conform with the views expressed by the District of Columbia Commissioners, in the form of a new bill, H.R. 11698. The current bill, H.R. 682,

is identical to H.R. 11698 of the last Congress as it passed the House on August 13, 1962.

INCREASE JURISDICTION FOR DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA MUNICIPAL COURT

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Speaker, at this time I yield to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. Dowdy] to call up any bills which he may have from Subcommittee No. 4 of the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Mr. DOWDY. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on the District of Columbia I call up the bill H.R. 3537 and ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered in the House as in Committee of the Whole.

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

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, do I understand that this is made necessary—this legislation—partly because of the importance and dignity of the court?

Mr. DOWDY. I might say to the gentleman that the purpose of this bill is to correct what was done last year. Last year the House and Senate passed a bill which was not correctly enrolled but which was sent to the President and signed into law. This bill contains in it the provisions that the Congress of the United States passed last year.

Mr. GROSS. Then it is not alone for the purpose of increasing the importance and dignity of the court; is that correct?

Mr. DOWDY. Not alone; no, sir.

Mr. GROSS. But that is one subsidiary effect of the bill?

Mr. DOWDY. It increases jurisdiction from \$3,000 to \$10,000 and that would have that effect.

Mr. GROSS. The bill would extend the power of the court, as I understand, to issue and serve subpoenas for attendance to anyone within a 25-mile radius of the District of Columbia. This poses no problem with respect to the States of Maryland and Virginia, is that correct?

Mr. DOWDY. As I understand from our colleagues who represent Maryland and Virginia, it is all right with them.

Mr. GROSS. I did not hear the gentleman.

Mr. DOWDY. Our colleagues who represent those two States, I understand it is all right with them. I do not know what my attitude would be if it affected the State of Texas, but it does not.

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, there is no opposition from the States of Virginia and Maryland. The situation is simply that last year when we first passed the legislation, it provided a radius of 100 miles. When the bill passed the other body, our junior Senator from Virginia had the bill called back in order

to reduce that radius from 100 miles to 25 miles. That is what caused the slipup in the enrollment of the legislation and caused the President to sign it in error. That is what we are attempting to correct at this time.

Mr. DOWDY. I think that is the only effect this bill has.

Mr. GROSS. Then it is safe to say that to extend the jurisdiction into Maryland and Virginia has the approval of those States—that is, to extend the jurisdiction of the District of Columbia Municipal Court into those States?

Mr. DOWDY. Yes, but I raised that question myself in the hearings.

Mr. GROSS. And by increasing the dignity and importance of the court by changing the name of the Municipal Court of the District of Columbia, it does not mean that Congress will be asked to increase the salaries to come up to the new status, does it?

Mr. DOWDY. Mr. Speaker, I might say to the gentleman that all of this was done last year. The real objective of this bill is to decrease that radius from 100 miles to 25 miles as the new bill provides.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the court established by the first section of the Act entitled "An Act to consolidate the Police Court of the District of Columbia and the Municipal Court of the District of Columbia, to be known as 'the Municipal Court for the District of Columbia', to create 'the Municipal Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia', and for other purposes", approved April 1, 1942, as amended (56 Stat. 190; D.C. Code, sec. 11-751), hereafter shall be known as the "District of Columbia Court of General Session". Whenever reference is made in any Act of Congress (other than this Act or the amendments made by this Act) or in any regulation to the Municipal Court for the District of Columbia, such reference shall be held to be a reference to the District of Columbia Court of General Sessions.

Sec. 2. Subsection (a) of section 4 of such Act, approved April 1, 1942, as amended (D.C. Code, sec. 11-755(a)), is amended to read as follows:

"(a) The District of Columbia Court of General Sessions, as established by this Act, shall consist of the criminal, civil, and small claims and conciliation, and domestic relations branches. The court and each judge thereof shall have and exercise the same powers and jurisdiction as were heretofore had or exercised by the Municipal Court for the District of Columbia or the judges thereof on the day before the effective date of this amendatory subsection, and in addition the said court shall have exclusive jurisdiction of civil actions commenced after the effective date of this amendatory subsection, including such actions against executors, administrators and other fiduciaries, in which the claimed value of personal property or the debt or damages claimed, does not exceed the sum of \$10,000 exclusive of interest and costs, and, in addition, shall have jurisdiction of all cross-claims and counterclaims interposed in all actions over which it has jurisdiction regardless of the amount involved: *Provided, however, That nothing herein shall deprive the United States Dis-*

trict Court for the District of Columbia of jurisdiction over counterclaims, cross-claims, or any other claims whether or not arising out of the same transaction or occurrence and interposed in actions over which the United States District Court for the District of Columbia has jurisdiction. The District of Columbia Court of General Sessions shall also have jurisdiction over all cases properly pending in the Municipal Court for the District of Columbia on the effective date of this amendatory subsection."

Sec. 3. Subsection (a) of section 5 of such Act approved April 1, 1942, as amended (D.C. Code, sec. 11-756(a)), is amended to read as follows:

"(a) If, in any action, other than an action for equitable relief, pending on the effective date of this amendatory subsection or thereafter commenced in the United States District Court for the District of Columbia, it shall appear to the satisfaction of the court at or subsequent to any pretrial hearing but prior to trial thereof that the action will not justify a judgment in excess of \$10,000, the court may certify such action to the District of Columbia Court of General Sessions for trial. The pleadings in such action, together with a copy of the docket entries and of any orders theretofore entered therein, shall be sent to the clerk of the said Court of General Sessions, together with any deposit for costs, and the case shall be called for trial in that court promptly thereafter; and shall thereafter be treated as though it had been filed originally in the said Court of General Sessions, except that the jurisdiction of that court shall extend to the amount claimed in such action, even though it exceed the sum of \$10,000."

Sec. 4. Subsection (c) of section 5 of such Act approved April 1, 1942, as amended (D.C. Code, sec. 11-756(c)), is amended to read as follows:

"(c) The District of Columbia Court of General Sessions shall have the power to compel the attendance of witnesses by attachment and any judge thereof shall have the power in any case or proceeding whether civil or criminal to punish for disobedience of any order, or contempt committed in the presence of the court by a fine not exceeding \$50 or imprisonment not exceeding thirty days. At the request of any party subpoenas for attendance at a hearing or trial in the District of Columbia Court of General Sessions shall be issued by the clerk of the said court. A subpoena may be served at any place within the District of Columbia, or at any place without the District of Columbia that is within twenty-five miles of the place of the hearing or trial specified in the subpoena. The form, issuance and manner of service of a subpoena shall be as otherwise prescribed by Rule 45 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure."

Sec. 5. (a) Section 1114 of the Act entitled "An Act to establish a code of law for the District of Columbia", approved March 3, 1901 (31 Stat. 1189; D.C. Code, sec. 11-1520), is hereby repealed.

(b) The paragraph relating to witness fees under the heading "District of Columbia" in the Act entitled "An Act making appropriations to supply deficiencies in the appropriations for the fiscal year ending June thirtieth, nineteen hundred and two, and for prior years, and for other purposes", approved July 1, 1902 (32 Stat. 552, 561; D.C. Code, sec. 11-1520a), is amended by striking "cases in the police court of the District of Columbia" and inserting in lieu thereof "criminal cases in the District of Columbia Court of General Sessions".

(c) The fees and travel allowances to be paid any witness compelled by subpoena to attend any branch of the District of Columbia Court of General Sessions other than the criminal branch shall be the same amount as paid a witness compelled to attend before the United States District Court for the District of Columbia.

Sec. 6. The court established by section 6 of the Act of April 1, 1942 (56 Stat. 190; D.C. Code, sec. 11-771), hereafter shall be known as the "District of Columbia Court of Appeals". Wherever reference is made in any Act of Congress (other than this Act) or in any regulation to the Municipal Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia, such reference shall be held to be a reference to the District of Columbia Court of Appeals.

Sec. 7. This Act shall take effect as of January 1, 1963.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. DOWDY. Mr. Speaker, public hearings were held on similar legislation—H.R. 12708—during the 87th Congress. At those hearings testimony was received from representatives of the judicial conference for the District of Columbia, the U.S. Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia, the U.S. District Court for the District of Columbia, the Municipal Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia, the Municipal Court for the District of Columbia, the Office of the Corporation Counsel, and the Bar Association of the District of Columbia. Full support for the legislation was expressed and no objections were heard by the committee.

Following the approval of the legislation—H.R. 12708—by the House, it was amended by the Senate. The House agreed to the Senate amendments. However, the text of the bill as enrolled for and approved by the President contained the text of the original unamended House bill. The pending bill, H.R. 3537, carries the text of H.R. 12708 as amended and as approved by the House and Senate in the 87th Congress. Its enactment will result in law conforming to that which was intended and approved by the House and Senate in the 87th Congress. The effective date, January 1, 1963, of H.R. 3537 is the same as that provided in H.R. 12708 of the 87th Congress, which was numbered Public Law 87-873.

The following statement of the purposes of H.R. 3537 and the section-by-section analysis are identical to those contained in House Report 2137 accompanying H.R. 12708 of the 87th Congress except for the inclusion of the amendments to that bill approved by the House and Senate and a provision for the same effective date.

PURPOSE OF THE BILL

H.R. 3537 proposes, first, to increase the maximum jurisdictional amount of the Municipal Court of the District of Columbia from \$3,000 to \$10,000; second, to extend the power of the court to issue and serve subpoenas for attendance to any point within a 25-mile radius of the District of Columbia; third, to change the name of the Municipal Court to the "District of Columbia Court of General Sessions"; and fourth, to change the name of the Municipal Court of Appeals to the "District of Columbia Court of Appeals".

In 1958, the Congress, to relieve the U.S. district courts of the increased burden of judicial business, approved legislation to increase the jurisdictional amount of such courts from \$3,000 to \$10,000—Public Law 85-554; 72 Stat.

415. However, the maximum jurisdictional amount for the Municipal Court of the District of Columbia—District of Columbia Code, section 11-755(a)—established at \$3,000, has remained unchanged. The bill will place the courts of local and Federal jurisdiction within the District of Columbia into the same relationship as to jurisdictional amounts as exists between such courts in the other States.

The renaming of the Municipal Court and the Municipal Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia to the District of Columbia Court of General Sessions and the District of Columbia Court of Appeals, respectively, is believed to be more suitable in view of the importance and dignity of these courts.

The power of the court of general sessions to serve process within 25 miles is felt to be proper and desirable in view of the close interrelationship between the District of Columbia and the metropolitan area.

SECTION-BY-SECTION ANALYSIS

The first section of the bill amends existing provisions of law to provide that the Municipal Court established under present law shall be renamed and wherever in the existing statutes reference is made to the municipal court of the District of Columbia, such reference shall be held to refer to the "District of Columbia Court of General Sessions."

Section 2: This section amends existing law to provide that the District of Columbia Court of General Sessions shall consist of criminal, civil, small claims and conciliation, and domestic relations branches, and that the court and each judge thereof shall have the same powers and jurisdiction as were had by the municipal court prior to the effective date of the amendment. In addition to such jurisdiction, the court of general sessions shall have exclusive jurisdiction of civil actions, including those against executors, administrators, or fiduciaries, where the value of the personal property, debt, or damages in controversy does not exceed the sum of \$10,000 exclusive of interest and costs. Further, the court shall have jurisdiction of all cross-claims or counterclaims, regardless of the amount involved, which are interposed in actions over which the court shall have jurisdiction. Finally, it is provided that nothing in the amendment shall deprive the U.S. District Court for the District of Columbia of its jurisdiction over counterclaims, cross-claims, or any other claims which are interposed in actions over which the U.S. District Court for the District of Columbia has jurisdiction.

Section 3: Section 3 amends existing law to provide that in any action, other than actions for equitable relief, pending on the effective date or thereafter commenced before the U.S. District Court for the District of Columbia, if the district court determines at or subsequent to any pretrial hearing but before the trial of the matter that the action will not justify a judgment in excess of \$10,000, may certify the action, together with the pleadings, any deposits, docket entries, and order issued in connection therewith, to the court of general sessions. The

jurisdiction of the court of general sessions in such case shall extend to the amount claimed even though it exceeds the amount of \$10,000.

Section 4: Section 4 of the bill amends subsection (c) of section 5 of the act of April 1942. It empowers the Court of General Sessions to compel the attendance of witnesses by attachment, and grants to the judges of that court power to punish for disobedience of any order or contempt committed in the presence of the court by a fine not to exceed \$50 or imprisonment not to exceed 30 days. It further provides that at the request of any party a subpoena for attendance at a hearing or trial in the Court of General Sessions shall be issued by the clerk of that court. A subpoena may be served any place within 25 miles of the place of the hearing or trial specified in the subpoena. The form, issuance, and manner of service of the subpoena shall be that prescribed by rule 45 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure.

Section 5. Subsection (a) of this section repeals existing law regarding the payment of witness fees in civil cases.

Subsection (b) continues the present municipal court fees for witnesses in the criminal branch of the Court of General Sessions.

Subsection (c) is new language providing that the fees and travel allowances for witnesses compelled to attend any branch of the Court of General Sessions other than the criminal branch shall be the same as those provided for witnesses compelled to attend the U.S. District Court for the District of Columbia.

Section 6: Section 6 provides a new name for the Municipal Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia which shall hereafter be known as the District of Columbia Court of Appeals.

Section 7: This section provides that the effective date of the act shall be January 1, 1963.

TREATMENT OF MINORS FOR COMMUNICABLE DISEASES

Mr. DOWDY. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on the District of Columbia, I call up the bill H.R. 2485, 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 and preventable diseases," approved August 11, 1939, as amended, and ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered in the House as in Committee of the Whole.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That 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 and preventable diseases," approved August 11, 1939 (53 Stat. 1408), as amended (sec. 6-119 et seq., D.C. Code, 1961 ed.), is amended by renumbering section 13 as section 14 and by inserting the

following new section immediately following section 12:

"IMMEDIATE TREATMENT OF MINOR WITH VENEREAL DISEASE"

"SEC. 13. If a minor appears in any clinic, hospital, or other facility of the Department of Public Health of the government of the District of Columbia, and the Director of Public Health or his authorized agent, after having caused a medical examination to be made of such minor, has probable cause to believe that such minor is affected with a venereal disease or is a carrier of a venereal disease, and if, as a result of such examination, the Director of Public Health or his authorized agent determines that immediate medical treatment of the minor will adequately control the disease of the minor so as to protect his health and the health of others without having said minor detained as provided in this Act, the Director of Public Health or his authorized agent shall present to such minor a paper, upon which such minor shall state either (1) that he consents to such treatment, in which event such treatment shall be given to the minor forthwith, or (2) that he refuses to consent to such treatment, in which event no such treatment shall be given to him pursuant to this section."

SEC. 2. So much of section 3 of the Act entitled "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 and preventable diseases', approved August 11, 1939", approved August 8, 1946 (60 Stat. 919), as reads "renumbered as section 13" is amended to read "renumbered as section 15".

SEC. 3. Nothing in this Act shall be construed so as to affect the authority vested in the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia by Reorganization Plan Numbered 5 of 1952 (66 Stat. 824). The performance of any function vested by this Act in the Board of Commissioners, or in any office or agency under the jurisdiction and control of said Board of Commissioners may be delegated by said Board of Commissioners in accordance with section 3 of such plan.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. DOWDY. Mr. Speaker, the Committee on the District of Columbia, to whom was referred the bill H.R. 2485 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 and preventable diseases," approved August 11, 1939, as amended, having considered the same, report favorably thereon without amendment and recommend that the bill do pass.

The purpose of this bill is to authorize the Department of Public Health of the District of Columbia to treat minors for venereal disease upon their own consent, when they present themselves voluntarily to the Department's health centers, rather than having to obtain such permission from their parents or guardians.

At present, minors for whom parental consent for treatment of gonorrhea cannot be obtained are given only oral antibiotics, which are relatively safe to administer but are not the drugs of choice, since effective treatment is assured only by injections, and also because oral medication is impractical in patients who are irresponsible or careless. In the case of

syphilis, there is no prophylactic agent other than penicillin, and hence minors who have been exposed to this disease receive no treatment whatever without parental consent. According to testimony presented in a public hearing on August 10, 1962, this legal impediment to the administration of adequate treatment has resulted in the loss of 35 percent of the minors who are found in the Health Department clinics to have contracted or to have been exposed to venereal disease, with no treatment of any kind.

The seriousness of this situation is graphically illustrated by the following statistics which were reported to this committee by the Bureau of Disease Control of the District of Columbia Public Health Department.

Venereal disease: District of Columbia, fiscal years 1956-62

Diagnosis	1956	1957	1958	1959	1960	1961	1962
Grand total	12,420	11,825	10,979	12,760	14,098	11,761	10,484
Total, syphilis	1,900	1,967	1,670	1,942	2,500	2,420	1,927
Primary and secondary	36	109	153	199	472	550	701
Early latent	263	301	268	356	432	396	331
Late latent and other	1,569	1,519	1,213	1,350	1,555	1,432	857
Congenital	32	38	36	37	41	35	38
Gonorrhea	10,418	9,781	9,231	10,679	11,215	8,901	8,295
Other venereal disease	102	77	78	139	383	440	262

NOTE.—According to the latest available statistics, the District of Columbia ranks 1st among cities of the United States in the incidence of early and infectious syphilis per 100,000 population, and 3d in the incidence of gonorrhea.

Source: District of Columbia Department of Public Health, Bureau of Disease Control, Preventable and Chronic Diseases Division.

We were further informed that between the dates of August 28 and November 10, 1961, a total of 74 minors who were in need of treatment for venereal disease presented themselves to the Northwest Central Clinic without written parental consent for treatment. Of this number, 44 were treated at the discretion of the examining physician with oral antibiotics for clinical or bacteriologic gonorrhea or because they were designated sexual contacts to this disease. The other 30 were denied treatment at the time, for lack of written consent. Five of these returned the following day with signed permission and were treated; however, 24 hours had elapsed during which further infection might have been spread and irreparable damage done to the patient. The remaining 25 were never treated.

The difficulties involved in obtaining written parental permission for treatment are numerous. The minor who lives with one or both parents is said to pose few problems, provided that one parent can be readily contacted. Frequently, however, both parents are working. In other instances, a minor may be residing here with a relative other than his parents, or with a friend, and thus the required consent is extremely difficult to obtain. The most common source of difficulty, however, is probably the fact that in most cases, these minors fear the reaction on the part of their parents when the presence of these diseases is revealed to them.

The health of the community is seriously endangered by failure to treat this group of patients promptly. Through fear of their parents' displeasure, these

District of Columbia Department of Public Health—Treated venereal disease cases age 20 and under for fiscal years 1959, 1960, 1961

	1959	1960	1961
Total syphilis	132	192	217
Primary and secondary	38	90	126
Early latent	72	68	75
Congenital	20	24	13
Other syphilis	2	10	3
Gonorrhea	3,089	3,263	12,539
Lymphogranuloma venereum	16	81	93
Chancroid	12	11	12
Granuloma inguinale	5	6	4
Total treated	3,254	3,553	2,865

¹ Notes a decrease. The basic reason for this is that in order to devote more time to the epidemiology of syphilis, it was decided that effective July 1, 1960, field investigative epidemiology of gonorrhea would not be conducted.

FALSE STATEMENTS ON INSURANCE LICENSE APPLICATIONS

Mr. DOWDY. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on the District of Columbia, I call up the bill, H.R. 1937, to amend the act known as the Life Insurance Act of the District of Columbia, approved June 19, 1934, and the act known as the Fire and Casualty Act of the District of Columbia, approved October 3, 1940.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That sections 26 and 29 of chapter II of the Life Insurance Act approved June 19, 1934, as amended (48 Stat. 1139, 1141; sec. 35-425 and sec. 35-428, D.C. Code, 1951 ed.), are hereby amended by adding after the second sentence of each such section the following: "Any such applicant who willfully files with or otherwise submits to the Superintendent, orally or in writing, any material statement, knowing such statement to be false, shall, in addition to any other penalty prescribed by law, be guilty of perjury and subject to the penalties thereof."

SEC. 2. The second sentence of section 32 of chapter II of the Fire and Casualty Act approved October 9, 1940, as amended (54 Stat. 1078; sec. 35-1338, D.C. Code, 1951 ed.), is amended to read: "The person to whom the license may be issued shall file sworn answers, subject to the penalties of perjury, to such interrogatories as the Superintendent may require."

SEC. 3. Section 35 of chapter II of said Fire and Casualty Act, as amended (54 Stat. 1078; sec. 35-1338, D.C. Code, 1951 ed.), is amended by adding: "Any applicant who, in connection with such application for renewal of an expiring license, willfully files with or otherwise submits to the Superintendent, orally or in writing, any material statement under oath, knowing such statement to be false, shall, in addition to any other penalty prescribed by law, be guilty of perjury and subject to the penalties thereof."

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. DOWDY. Mr. Speaker, the purpose of the bill is to make the District of Columbia perjury statute applicable to those persons who make false statements under oath when applying for licenses or renewal of licenses as insurance agents and brokers in the District of Columbia.

This legislation is made necessary by a recent decision of the U.S. court of appeals—*Nelson v. U.S.*, U.S.C.A. D.C. No. 15726, decided January 12, 1961—which held that a person swearing falsely to the Superintendent of Insurance in an application for agent's license was not subject to the perjury statute of the District of Columbia.

The Superintendent of Insurance, in a memorandum to the Commissioners of the District of Columbia, dated January 16, 1961, reported as follows:

The urgent necessity for such a bill arises from the decision * * * of the U.S. court of appeals in the *Nelson* case. * * * In that case, it was decided that a person swearing falsely to the Superintendent of Insurance in applying for an agent's license is not subject to the penalties of perjury.

The danger to the public in the present situation is obvious from the facts of the case * * *. *Nelson* obtained from the De-

Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia have endorsed this bill, and no one has expressed any opposition to its passage.

A bill identical to this passed the House in the second session of the last Congress.

partment of Insurance a license to act in the District of Columbia as a life insurance agent. In his application he falsely swore that he had never been convicted of any offense against the laws of the District of Columbia, or of any other jurisdiction. Actually, at the time of his application he had recently been paroled from the penitentiary where he had served a sentence upon conviction of a felony involving a money transaction, and he was still reporting to the parole officer.

The business of insurance is a highly technical one, which is not understood by the average policyholder *** (who) *** may easily be deceived and defrauded by a dishonest salesman. There is obvious danger to the public *** in the situation *** whereby felons may not be convicted of perjury when they are found to have obtained licenses through false representations.

The District of Columbia perjury statute, applicable under the proposed bill, is found at section 858 of the act approved March 3, 1901 (31 Stat. 1329; sec. 22-2501, D.C. Code, 1951 ed.), and provides a penalty, upon conviction, of imprisonment in the penitentiary for not less than 2 nor more than 10 years. The perjury statute has already been made applicable by the Congress to certain violations of the insurance laws of the District of Columbia at section 27 of chapter II of the Life Insurance Act, as amended (72 Stat. 21; sec. 35-426, D.C. Code, 1951 ed., supp. VIII), and at section 9 of chapter 11 of said act (48 Stat. 1132; sec. 35-408, D.C. Code, 1951 ed.). The former provision declares that any person testifying falsely under oath at a Superintendent's hearing to determine whether a license should be suspended or revoked "shall be subject to the penalties of perjury." The latter provision states that any director, officer, agent or employee of any insurance company who willfully and knowingly makes oath to any false annual statement or other statement required by law "shall be guilty of perjury."

The proposed bill makes no change in these sections. It adds the penalty of perjury in the additional cases of false, sworn statements in applications for agents' and brokers' licenses and applications for renewal of such licenses.

The Board of Commissioners favor the bill, and its enactment will not result in additional expense for the District of Columbia.

REPORTS OF MOTOR VEHICLE COLLISIONS

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Speaker, at this time I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. WHITENER] to call up a bill from his subcommittee.

Mr. WHITENER. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on the District of Columbia, I call up the bill H.R. 1982, to amend section 10 of the District of Columbia Traffic Act, 1925, as amended, so as to require reports of collisions in which motor vehicles are involved.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That subsec-

tion (a) of section 10 of the District of Columbia Traffic Act, 1925, as amended (43 Stat. 1124; sec. 40-609(a), D.C. Code, 1951 ed.), is amended (a) by adding at the end of the first paragraph the following: "In addition to the preceding requirements with respect to the action to be taken immediately in cases involving personal injury or substantial damage to property, every person who, in the District of Columbia, operates a motor vehicle which is involved in a collision, which has resulted in damage to the property of any one person in excess of \$100 or in bodily injury to or in the death of any person, shall immediately make a written report thereof to the Chief of Police, on a form prescribed by him. Such written report shall be made without regard to the degree of personal injury resulting from such collision. In the event the operator of a motor vehicle involved in a collision is injured or otherwise disabled to such an extent as to render him incapable, in the opinion of his attending physician, of making any report of the collision as required by this subsection, such operator shall make such report within forty-eight hours after the date on which, in the opinion of his attending physician, he can reasonably be expected to have recovered from his injury or other disability to the extent of being able to prepare and submit the required report.": and (b) by striking "substantial" in the third paragraph.

SEC. 2. Nothing in this Act shall be construed so as to affect the authority vested in the Commissioners by Reorganization Plan Numbered 5 of 1952 (66 Stat. 824). The performance of any function vested by this Act in the Commissioners or in any office or agency under the jurisdiction and control of said Commissioners may be delegated by said Commissioners in accordance with section 3 of such plan.

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

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

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, may we have a brief explanation from the gentleman from North Carolina of this bill?

Mr. WHITENER. Mr. Speaker, I shall be happy to try to explain it to my friend. This is an identical bill to one the House passed last year. It was not passed by the other body.

It merely corrects a deficiency in the existing law of the District of Columbia so as to require that persons involved in motor vehicle accidents doing property damage in excess of \$100 shall make a report to the Chief of Police of such collision and such damage.

Under the present law the Metropolitan Police Department does not necessarily receive complete reports upon such collisions which occur in the District. The Department of Motor Vehicles does get those reports. We feel that the Police Department should have this information. I might say to the gentleman that this provision which we would invoke into the law of the District of Columbia is consistent with the law of most States.

Mr. GROSS. Do I understand this deals only with the handling of reports and does not change the amount of \$100? Is the present requirement that those cases involving property damage to the amount of \$100 must be reported?

Mr. WHITENER. The present law, as I indicated, requires that all accidents

be reported to the Department of Motor Vehicles within 5 days. This agency is concerned primarily with the financial responsibility of the parties. Only accidents involving personal injury must be reported to the police at the present time. The police under the present law must send to the Department of Motor Vehicles copies of all reports which they get involving personal injury, but the Department of Motor Vehicles does not have to reciprocate as to property damage accident reports received by the Department of Motor Vehicles.

Mr. GROSS. Does this for the first time establish the amount of \$100? If there is damage of \$100 or personal injury it must be reported? Does this add a \$100 provision? I am not clear on that.

Mr. WHITENER. This bill would for the first time establish the requirement that an operator of a motor vehicle make a report to the Police Department where property damage is involved. We merely reached the arbitrary figure of \$100. As we all know, most any kind of bump today will do \$100 worth of property damage to present-day automobiles.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. WHITENER. Mr. Speaker, the purpose of this bill is to require that all collisions involving motor vehicles in the District of Columbia which result in property damage in excess of \$100, or in personal injury of any degree, be reported immediately to the District of Columbia Chief of Police.

Under present law, motor vehicle collisions as described above must be reported within 5 days to the safety responsibility officer of the District of Columbia, who functions as a part of the Department of Motor Vehicles and whose primary responsibility is to determine the financial responsibility of the various parties to such accidents. However, only those collisions which result in personal injury are required to be reported to the Chief of Police. Although the Police Department is required to forward copies of all their accident reports to the safety responsibility officer, the latter does not send his reports to the Police Department.

At a public hearing conducted on July 16, 1962, this committee was informed that during fiscal year 1962, while approximately 31,000 motor vehicle collisions were reported to the safety responsibility officer, only about 22,000 were reported to the Chief of Police. Thus, during this year some 9,000 motor vehicle accidents involving property damage in excess of \$100 were never reported to the police.

Two glaring weaknesses are inherent in this situation. First, whereas copies of all the Police Department's reports are sent to the Bureau of Traffic Engineering and Operations of the District of Columbia Highway Department, where they serve to reveal dangerous areas in the city's street system and

thus guide the Highway Department in effecting corrective measures, the safety responsibility officer's reports are not adaptable for this purpose and hence are not sent to the Bureau of Traffic Engineering. Thus, the facts involved in 9,000 serious collisions per year are not made available to the Highway Department for this very valuable purpose.

The second major point of weakness which H.R. 1982 seeks to correct is the matter of the chronic offenders among the drivers involved in the 9,000 collisions per year of which the police are not apprised. When any driver becomes involved in accidents with sufficient frequency to cause suspicion as to his fitness to operate a motor vehicle, the safety responsibility officer reports the case to the Director of the Department of Motor Vehicles, who orders a hearing to determine the person's fitness status, both physical and with respect to attitude. An adverse finding as a result of this hearing brings about a suspension or revocation of the offender's permit to drive. However, the safety responsibility officer and the Department of Motor Vehicles do not and cannot act in any way to initiate legal prosecution against any such offender, for this is a police function. It is obvious that a chronically negligent driver, utterly lacking in a normal sense of responsibility, may become involved in frequent motor vehicle collisions and thus become a real hazard to the public; and while suspension or revocation of the operator's permit may be effective in some such cases, certainly in many others nothing short of legal prosecution can provide the protection to which the public is entitled.

H.R. 1982 therefore, is designed to bring about a degree of accident control and traffic safety which is not possible under existing law.

This same bill passed the House last year.

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Speaker, that concludes the business of the Committee on the District of Columbia.

MEXICO-UNITED STATES INTER-PARLIAMENTARY GROUP

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of section 1, Public Law 86-420, the Chair appoints as members of the U.S. delegation of the Mexico-United States Interparliamentary Group for the meeting to be held in Guanajuato, Republic of Mexico, beginning on Monday, March 18, 1963, the following members on the part of the House: Mr. NIX, of Pennsylvania, chairman; Mr. MONTOYA, of New Mexico; Mr. McDOWELL, of Delaware; Mr. ZABLOCKI, of Wisconsin; Mr. MACDONALD, of Massachusetts; Mr. WRIGHT, of Texas; Mr. JOHNSON, of California; Mr. WHALLEY, of Pennsylvania; Mr. DERYINSKI, of Illinois; Mr. HOEVEN, of Iowa; Mr. NORBLAD, of Oregon; and Mr. SPRINGER, of Illinois.

EXTENSION OF DRAFT LAW

Mr. TRIMBLE. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules I call up the resolution (H. Res. 287) provid-

ing for the consideration of H.R. 2438, a bill to extend the induction provisions of the Universal Military Training and Service Act, and for other purposes, and ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 2438) to extend the induction provisions of the Universal Military Training and Service Act, and for other purposes. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill, and shall continue not to exceed two hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Armed Services, the bill shall be read for amendment under the five-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. TRIMBLE] is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. TRIMBLE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. SMITH] and pending that I yield myself such time as I may require.

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 287 provides for the consideration of H.R. 2438, a bill to extend the induction provisions of the Universal Military Training and Service Act, and for other purposes. The resolution provides an open rule with 2 hours of general debate.

H.R. 2438 has five objectives of vital importance to our national security. These five objectives are as follows:

First, it will extend the authority to induct individuals into the Armed Forces from July 1, 1963 to July 1, 1967, a period of 4 years;

Second, it will extend the suspension on strength limitations of the Armed Forces from the present termination date of July 1, 1963 to July 1, 1967;

Third, it will extend the Dependents Assistance Act from July 1, 1963 to July 1, 1967;

Fourth, it will extend the so-called doctors draft law from July 1, 1963 to July 1, 1967; and

Fifth, it will extend from July 1, 1963 to July 1, 1967 the authority to grant special pay to physicians, dentists, and veterinarians who are ordered to active duty before that date.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the adoption of House Resolution 287.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time and now yield to my colleague, the gentleman from California [Mr. SMITH].

Mr. SMITH of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may use.

Mr. Speaker, as stated by the distinguished gentleman from Arkansas, House Resolution 287 will provide for the consideration of H.R. 2438 on an open rule

with 2 hours' time limit. As is usual in connection with this distinguished Armed Services Committee, they have a very fine report setting forth in detail just what the bill does and what the legislation to be considered here will do. The purpose of the legislation is set forth rather succinctly on page 15 where it says:

The principal purpose of the proposed legislation is to extend the induction authority of the Universal Military Training and Service Act, as amended (50 App. U.S.C. 451 et seq.), and the authority to make special calls for the induction of persons in the medical, dental, and allied specialist categories, until July 1, 1967.

On page 1 of this report, there are listed the five different sections of the law which will be extended for this period of time, all being presently existing laws which are being extended. It came out of the committee, as I understand it, by unanimous vote of 37 to 0. I have received a letter from one member stating that he contemplates offering an amendment to limit the age to 22.

Mr. Speaker, I suppose we have to have legislation like this in the present precarious position that we find ourselves in in the world today. I would certainly hope, Mr. Speaker, that the time will come, if we are at peace, where we can get away from this Universal Military Training and Service Act. This law causes the teenagers to become upset and concerned. As time goes on and they are waiting to finish college or to go into college and they do not know for certain what their future may be, this causes some of them to lose their incentive a little bit, Mr. Speaker, and it is a little difficult for them to make their plans for the future so that they can go ahead in the American way of life which they would like to do. So I do hope, Mr. Speaker, that in due time the situation can be worked out throughout the world so we can do away with this particular act and let American youth of today go ahead and develop their future in accord with what I believe they would like to do.

Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time.

Mr. TRIMBLE. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON].

CALL OF THE HOUSE

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

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Iowa makes the point of order that a quorum is not present.

Evidently, a quorum is not present.

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

A call of the House was ordered.

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

[Roll No. 7]

Ashley	Griffiths	Philbin
Belcher	Gurney	Pike
Bolling	Healey	Powell
Bromwell	Henderson	Rains
Burkhalter	Joelson	Reid, III.
Celler	Johnson, Wis.	Rhodes, Ariz.
Daddario	Kee	Roosevelt
Davis, Tenn.	Macdonald	St. George
Derwinski	Madden	Sullivan
Diggs	Matthews	Teague, Tex.
Dingell	May	Thompson, N.J.
Ellsworth	Michel	Tupper
Flood	Miller, N.Y.	Walter
Fogarty	Morrison	Watson
Fulton, Tenn.	O'Brien, Ill.	Wright
Glenn	Patten	Zablocki
Griffin	Pepper	

The SPEAKER. On this rollcall, 384 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

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

EXTENSION OF DRAFT LAW

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 2438) to extend the induction provisions of the Universal Military Training and Service Act, and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill H.R. 2438, with Mr. SIKES in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 20 minutes, and ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, this bill, H.R. 2438, is one of the most vital legislative items the Congress will consider during this session. Its enactment is indispensable to the maintenance of our security.

Let me explain exactly what this bill seeks to accomplish:

First, it will extend until July 1, 1967, the authority to induct men for training and service into the armed services.

Second, it will extend until July 1, 1967, the present law which suspends other provisions of law that impose restrictions on the authorized personnel strengths of the armed services.

Without suspending these provisions of law which impose ceilings on the number of personnel who may serve on active duty in our Armed Forces, the Army would be limited to 837,000 personnel; the Air Force to 502,000; the Navy, 500,000 enlisted personnel, plus the authorized number of line and staff corps officers; and the Marine Corps, 400,000.

These strength ceilings have been suspended since August 3, 1950.

As of December 31, 1962, we had an Army of 952,000 personnel; a Navy of

581,000 enlisted personnel and 74,000 officers; an Air Force of 863,000; and a Marine Corps of 188,000. Thus, if we do not extend the law which suspends these ceilings, the Army would be reduced by 115,000 personnel; the Navy by 81,000 enlisted personnel and a corresponding number of officers; and the Air Force would be reduced by 361,000 personnel.

It is obvious, therefore, that we must continue to suspend these ceilings.

Third, the bill would extend the Dependents Assistance Act to July 1, 1967.

This act is the authority under which we pay enlisted members of the uniformed services who are in pay grades E-4 with 4 or less years of service, E-3's, E-2's, and E-1's an increased basic allowance for quarters because they have dependents.

Under this law, an enlisted man, when he allotts \$40 of his pay, is entitled to amounts ranging from \$55 a month for one dependent, \$83 for two dependents, and \$105 for three or more dependents. Unless we extend this provision, these enlisted men would only be entitled to a quarters allowance of \$45 a month, regardless of the number of their dependents, and, in addition, would only be entitled to such an allowance if quarters were not furnished to the enlisted man.

Fourth, the bill will extend until July 1, 1967, the authority vested in the President to provide for the special selection or induction for service in the Armed Forces of persons qualified in needed medical, dental, veterinary, or allied specialist categories. This is popularly known as the Doctors Draft Act.

Actually what happens is that under the draft law all persons who are deferred for any reason remain liable for induction up to age 35. Almost all medical, dental, and veterinary students are deferred in order to complete their training and under existing law the President, until July 1, 1963, may select for induction persons in this category who are qualified in needed medical, dental, veterinary, or allied specialist categories.

In other words, the President may induct physicians, dentists, veterinarians, or allied specialists who are over the age of 26 and have been deferred to complete their educations without regard to other persons who are in these age groups.

This provision of law must be extended until July 1, 1967, because it is the only way we can meet the medical, dental, and veterinary requirements in our Armed Forces.

Finally, the proposal would extend until July 1, 1967, the authority to grant special pay to physicians, dentists, and veterinarians who are ordered to active duty before that date.

This special pay amounts to \$100 for physicians and dentists who serve on active duty for a period of 2 years; \$150 a month for physicians and dentists who serve on active duty for more than 2 years; \$200 a month for physicians and dentists who serve on active duty for at least 6 years; and \$250 a month for those physicians and dentists who have completed at least 10 years of active duty.

Veterinarians are entitled to a flat \$100 a month.

I might add that this special pay is applicable to physicians, dentists, and veterinarians for the remainder of the time that they may serve on active duty, but no physician, dentist, or veterinarian entering on active duty after July 1, 1963, would be entitled to this special pay unless we extend the date to July 1, 1967, which is proposed in the bill before us. Without this special pay we would be unable to retain the experienced medical, dental, and veterinarian personnel so vital to the health needs of our Armed Forces.

Now, I would like to briefly describe the operation of the draft law.

All male persons in the United States must register with their local boards after they attain the age of 18.

Men are liable for induction from age 18½ to age 26.

Any person who is deferred remains liable for induction up to age 35.

After an individual registers with his local board, the board classifies each man as to his availability for service. There is an appeal procedure provided in the law for those who feel that they have been improperly classified.

There are also certain statutory deferments provided in the law for college students, which permits them to finish an academic year when they have been ordered for induction, and for high school students which permits them to stay in school to graduate or until they attain the age of 20. You might be interested to know that 363,000 students are now in a deferred status.

The law also permits the President to provide for deferments because of an individual's occupation or because of his dependency status. However, an individual may not be deferred under the law on the basis of marriage alone, except in cases of extreme hardship. Two million men are now deferred because of their dependents; 118,000 men have industrial deferments; and 18,000 men have agricultural deferments.

In addition to deferments for college students, high school students, occupations and dependency, there are also certain statutory deferments for individuals who satisfactorily participate in ROTC programs, as well as Reserve and National Guard activities. This accounts for 912,000 deferments.

In addition to deferments, there are also certain statutory exemptions, including sole-surviving sons, ministers and students of the ministry, and conscientious objectors who are opposed to both combatant and noncombatant service. At present there are 17,000 conscientious objectors, and 71,000 ministers or divinity students. Conscientious objectors may be ordered to perform 2 years of service in the national interest.

Any person who has served honorably on active duty for a period of 1 year or longer is not liable for induction except in time of war or national emergency, and a person who has been discharged for the convenience of the Government is also exempt from induction if he has served at least 6 months on active duty.

Persons who have served satisfactorily as members of the Organized Reserve since February 1, 1951, are also exempt

from induction, and, as I have indicated, persons who enlist in the National Guard are deferred from induction so long as they perform satisfactorily in the National Guard. However, these persons remain liable for induction should they cease to perform satisfactorily in the National Guard, up to age 28.

All persons who are inducted are required to serve 24 months on active duty unless sooner released.

At present, the average age of induction is about 23, and men are being called in the following sequence:

First, those men who are declared delinquent for failure to comply with the law;

Second, the next to be called are those needed to fill local board quotas, or men who have volunteered for induction. Men may volunteer for induction at age 17 with parental consent, and without parental consent after age 18. Almost 50 percent of all draft quotas are being met by young men who volunteer for induction;

Third, after that the local boards call nonfathers between the ages of 19 and 26 with the oldest being called first. I might add that this group makes up the major portion of the I-A pool and will fill all needs short of a heavy mobilization; and

Fourth, after the nonfathers are called for induction, local boards, if necessary, would order fathers in I-A between the ages of 19 and 26 with the oldest first, then men over 26 who have been deferred, and finally men between the ages of 18½ and 19.

Insofar as physicians and dentists are concerned, the law provides them with an opportunity to apply for commission and they are then ordered to active duty in a grade commensurate with their professional education, experience and ability.

These are the major provisions of the Universal Military Training and Service Act which has now been in almost continuous operation since 1940.

For a brief period after the 1940 act expired in March of 1947, we did not have a draft law. We soon found that we could not maintain our Armed Forces on a voluntary basis, and in June of 1948 we enacted the Selective Service Act, which was renamed the Universal Military Training and Service Act in 1951.

Thus, for practical purposes, we have had an almost continuous draft law since 1940.

From the testimony we received from the Secretary of Defense and the Joint Chiefs of Staff, we know that we could not maintain our present recruiting rates without the draft law.

During fiscal 1962, we inducted 157,000 men, almost twice the number that had been originally planned. To this must be added the thousands of men who voluntarily enlisted in the regular services or in a Reserve component.

Without the stimulus of a draft law, many of these men would not have volunteered for service.

Without the draft, it is clear that we could not get the needed manpower for our armed services.

Without the special provisions in the draft law dealing with physicians, dentists, and veterinarians we would be unable to meet the health needs of our armed services.

I might also add that the special pay for physicians, dentists, and veterinarians seeks to compensate them for their expensive educational training and the years of service they spend in colleges and universities, while their line counterparts of comparable ages are advancing in grade and obtaining longevity credit on active duty.

Certainly we must continue to suspend the strength ceilings that would otherwise require a reduction in the size of the Army, Navy, and Air Force.

And, finally, I am sure there is complete agreement that we must extend the Dependents Assistance Act so long as we maintain a draft law.

Mr. CHAIRMAN, no one likes a draft law. But, I am sure that almost all of us will agree that we have no practical alternative.

First, about 1,400,000 young men register for the draft each year;

Second, at any one time there are about 9½ million men between the age of 18½ and 26 who are registered and eligible for classification;

Third, by the time any age group attains the age of 26, about 58 percent of these young men will have served in the Armed Forces in one capacity or another; and

Fourth, the remaining 42 percent will consist of those who are physically or mentally disqualified, fathers, agricultural and industrial employees in essential occupations, and those who are exempt from induction by law, such as ministerial students and sole-surviving sons.

I sincerely hope the House will pass this bill unanimously, and again demonstrate to the world our firm determination to remain strong and ready, at all times.

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

Mr. VINSON. I yield to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. AVERY. I apologize for interrupting the gentleman during his statement, but I do have a question which relates to the matter he has been discussing before the committee.

I was in my home State a few weeks ago to meet with a group of young people. They were visiting me about joining the Peace Corps and related their contemplation as connected with their military obligations. I said:

You understand that joining the Peace Corps is not a substitute for your military obligation?

They responded like this:

Yes. But we understand by the time our Peace Corps service is over, Congress will act, and our service in the Corps may be counted in lieu of our military obligation.

The reason I ask the question at this time, I think the record ought to be made indelibly clear if this has been contemplated by the Committee on Armed Services or suggested by the administration.

Mr. VINSON. It has never been discussed by the Committee on Armed Services, and it is not contemplated by the Committee on Armed Services. In addition the gentleman has just stated good reasons why the draft should be extended 4 years instead of 2 years.

Mr. AVERY. I agree with the gentleman. If this is being used as a recruiting device by the Peace Corps, I deplore it.

Mr. VINSON. The gentleman need not worry. No man will be exempted on account of being in the Peace Corps.

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

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

Mr. GROSS. What was that good reason for extending it 4 years?

Mr. VINSON. The good reason is: First, it has been done three different times. When the gentleman offers an amendment later on—

Mr. GROSS. It may be offered by somebody else. I will offer it if someone else does not.

Mr. VINSON. We will discuss it at that time, and I will offer satisfactory reasons to the House why it should be extended 4 years instead of 2 years.

Mr. GROSS. Why not explain that now to the House?

Mr. VINSON. I will do that under the 5-minute rule. You can rest assured that there is no contemplation on the part of the Committee on Armed Services to give any consideration at all to granting an exception by statute to any member who joins the Peace Corps.

Mr. AVERY. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. VINSON. The testimony we received from the Secretary of Defense and from the Joint Chiefs of Staff all was to the effect that it is absolutely essential, with world conditions as they are, that the draft be extended. I hope the committee will vote to extend it for 4 years. Each one of these laws must be extended 4 years. So, therefore, if the Committee this afternoon decides to accept an amendment to make it 2 years, it should apply to each one of these extensions. But I certainly hope when we debate that we can convince you we are on firm ground to let it remain like we have done in the three previous extensions of the draft.

The draft has been in operation since 1940, practically. There was only a short period when this country did not have the draft. We have agreed on this 4-year program. It enables the young men back in the Nation to map out their course without as much uncertainty as the 2-year proposal would create. So I hope when the proposition comes up of 2 years it will be the wisdom of the House not to accept the 2 years.

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

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

Mr. LINDSAY. I thank the gentleman.

I just want to ask the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Armed Services whether he proposes to discuss at all the 6-month program.

Mr. VINSON. If an inductee or volunteer serves 6 months in the Armed Services, he is not liable to the draft.

Mr. LINDSAY. I understand that; but what is the future of the 6-month program?

Mr. VINSON. We will extend it, I am confident. I have referred that bill to the distinguished gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. HÉBERT], and on Wednesday of this week we will start hearings on extending the 6-month program.

Mr. LINDSAY. The proposed 4-year extension of the draft has nothing to do with it, then?

Mr. VINSON. Nothing at all; it has no relation to it. If a boy volunteers for 6 months under the law, he gets deferred from the draft.

Mr. LINDSAY. I thank the gentleman.

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

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

Mr. FARSTEIN. I would like to advise the distinguished chairman of some difficulty that I have had in my congressional district in relation to the 6-month program. Now, I have had numerous young men come to see me and inform me that the list of those who seek entrance into the 6-month program is so long that they see no possibility of ever being granted deferment.

Mr. VINSON. Well, as I stated to the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. LINDSAY] this whole matter will be opened up by our distinguished colleague from Louisiana [Mr. HÉBERT] on Wednesday. We will go into it thoroughly. I certainly hope that the committee will see fit, in their wisdom, to recommend an extension of it, and I feel confident that they will.

Mr. FARSTEIN. May I also suggest, not alone extend the program but also the number of young men that can enter the program.

Mr. VINSON. Yes.

Mr. FARSTEIN. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. VINSON. Let me give the House this information. There are about 1.4 million young men registered for the draft each year. At any one time, and at this time, there are over 9.5 million men between the age of 18½ to 26 who are registered and eligible for classification, and by the time any age group attains the age of 26, about 58 percent of those registered either enter the service under the draft or as volunteers.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. OSMERS].

Mr. OSMERS. Mr. Chairman, the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Armed Services has given a very clear and complete explanation of the bill before us which extends the Draft Act. As Members of the House we have no real choice except to extend the Draft Act in view of our defense needs. An amendment will doubtless be offered to reduce the length of the extension from 4 years as proposed by the committee to 2 years. It would be most unwise for us to extend the draft for less than 4 years, for two very simple reasons: First,

a 4-year extension enables the young men affected to better plan for their futures and, second, of course, it seems most unlikely to me that a drastic change will occur in our defense manpower needs during the next 2 or 3 years. For these reasons, we should extend the act for 4 years.

With respect to the 6-month active duty Reserve program, the chairman of the Committee on Armed Services, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON] has announced that a subcommittee headed by the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. HÉBERT] will start hearings on this program on Wednesday.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, in view of the fact that the gentleman made some reference to the 6-month training program, the committee should understand that there is imposed a 5½-year Reserve obligation on the person who takes the 6 months' training.

Mr. OSMERS. The gentleman from Georgia has wisely added this important fact to the remarks he made in response to a previous question about the 6 months' program.

Mr. Chairman, some of us who originally sponsored the 6 months' active-duty Reserve program have concluded that the program is not now fulfilling its basic intended purpose.

Many Members of the House may have forgotten but this 6-months' active duty, 6½-year Reserve program when first proposed was to apply only to young men between 18 and 19½ years of age. The thinking behind the original proposal was to provide a means for young men to get their active duty obligation fulfilled between high school and college, or between high school and joining the work force.

As we all now know, by raising the age limit to 26 for the 6-month training program, we defeated to a considerable extent one of its major purposes. We now find that young men who have graduated from college at age 21, 22, and 23 are seeking places in the 6-month program as a substitute for serving 2 years under the Draft Act. We cannot criticize any young man for this for the simple reason that present law gives him a clear right to apply for the 6-month program.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. OSMERS. Mr. Chairman, would the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ARENDS] yield me 1 additional minute?

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 1 additional minute.

Mr. OSMERS. Mr. Chairman, it is my hope that the Hébert subcommittee will give very careful consideration to reducing the age of those admitted into the 6-month program. It might also add to the effectiveness of the program if the active duty period is increased from 6 months to a year. This would still allow a young man to get his active military duty out of the way before he starts college or his career yet provide for a longer active duty period.

Mr. Chairman, in conclusion, let me say that the Nation owes a debt of gratitude to our volunteer local draft boards who administer the Draft Act.

Throughout the entire Nation, these boards perform wonderful service to the Nation and its youth. Without the dedicated help of these citizens the administration of this act would be impossible.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. GUBSER].

Mr. GUBSER. Mr. Chairman, naturally I rise in support of this bill.

I would like to point out that these hearings, though concluded in a very few days, afforded every person interested in this bill the opportunity to present his views.

Mr. Chairman, we heard conscientious conscientious objectors and I suspect we heard some who were not quite so conscientious. We heard people who believe that the road toward peace necessarily involves a demonstration of our good will by abandoning the draft and universal military training. We heard these views and every other shade of opinion that the mind of man could conceive.

The interesting part about all that testimony which was patiently listened to by members of our committee was that we did not hear one single new point against the draft that we did not hear 4 years ago.

Mr. Chairman, I remember one of the points raised 4 years ago was the fact that we could get civilians to replace military men. We heard further that we are not properly utilizing our manpower.

I sat through lengthy hearings as a member of a Subcommittee on Manpower Utilization, headed by the distinguished gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PRICE]. Though we found room for improvement in the utilization of manpower, though our report did influence the military, did effect some very notable improvements, we still found that it was absolutely impossible for the needs of the military forces to be fulfilled except for the Universal Military Training Act.

Mr. Chairman, we heard a lot of talk about how military men were being utilized in a servant status. As we went into that subject in great depth we found that most of it was just talk, and there was little abuse of this situation by the military.

Mr. Chairman, we also found at the same time that the needs of the military must be geared to military requirements and we could not expect civilians to perform a military task.

And so I say in conclusion that there were fair, adequate, and complete hearings held on this bill. There is a requirement for the extension of this draft. Manpower is being efficiently utilized, progress is being made toward even better utilization. We should extend this draft for 4 more years.

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

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

Mr. GROSS. Has the gentleman been over to the Pentagon lately to see how military personnel is used for purposes other than combat duty?

Mr. GUBSER. I have been to the Pentagon quite frequently. I would not say that it is the most perfect example of utilization of manpower that one could find, but I would say that probably it is a lot better than we are giving it credit for.

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

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

Mr. BECKER. Among the people who came before our committee as conscientious objectors I think it is interesting to note that some of those conscientious objectors who came before our committee and opposed any bill are on the Federal payroll right here in Washington.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California [Mr. GUBSER] has expired.

Mr. AREND'S. Mr. Chairman, I yield 8 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GROSS].

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I shall vote to extend this for 2 years, but I do not see how I can vote for an extension of 4 years. The gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. OSMERS] made a good argument for an extension for 2 years. The chairman added to that argument for a 2-year extension. On the grounds that the Hébert committee is going to go into the 6 months' training program and may increase it to 1 year.

Mr. VINSON. That has no relationship to this bill.

Mr. GROSS. It has every relationship to this bill, because the conscription program is used as a club to get men into the present 6 months' program. With the conscription program, and its 2 years of obligated service, the gentleman well knows that it is used in that fashion. It is one of the prime reasons for the continuation of the conscription program. There is every reason to extend this for 2 years, and no solid reason for extending it for 4 years. There has been talk about planning. If this is a valid argument why do we not establish all governmental programs on a 4-year basis and appropriate for 4 years? That argument falls of its own weight.

Mr. Chairman, I should like to ask the chairman a question or two. As I understand, we have some 2.5 million men in the various branches of the uniformed services; is that about correct?

Mr. VINSON. I think the strength of the three services totals about 2,700,000.

Mr. GROSS. When does the gentleman expect to cut back on the 2,700,000 in view of all the missiles that are available?

Mr. VINSON. With world conditions as they are now I think the gentleman will agree with me that it would be very unwise to talk about cutting back the size of the armed services.

Mr. GROSS. I will say to the gentleman that it is about time that somebody gave some attention to it, because in this country the taxpayers cannot continue to support these huge conventional forces and at the same time stockpile and overstockpile nuclear warheads. I wish somebody in the armed services would explain this to me, the need for these

huge conventional forces if we are going to fight a war with nuclear weapons? Can the gentleman tell me how he relates these two?

Mr. VINSON. I think it would be shortsighted on the part of the Government to put all of its weapons in one basket. I think that to be on safe ground we must have the capability of meeting the challenge of conventional warfare as well as nuclear warfare. Notwithstanding the fact that we have a great many missiles, nevertheless the enemy might not fight with missiles. Therefore, if you put all your eggs in that basket you could be helpless. We must have a ground force, an Air Force, a Navy, a Marine Corps, missiles, and all of these things.

Mr. GROSS. Let me ask the gentleman this question: How many divisions does the United States have in NATO today?

Mr. VINSON. Five or six.

Mr. GROSS. How many total divisions are there in NATO?

Mr. VINSON. Twenty-four, I believe.

Mr. GROSS. Does the gentleman think that 24 divisions can contest in conventional warfare with 240 divisions?

Mr. VINSON. It all depends on how they are used. If they use the ground forces, I think we can give a pretty good account of ourselves. We are well armed, we are not cowards, and we are going to fight if necessary.

Mr. GROSS. But if these troops do not use nuclear warheads, how can 24 divisions compete with 240 divisions?

Mr. VINSON. I find myself today in much disagreement with our learned friend from Iowa, whom I oftentimes follow. He attempts to lead me down the primrose path of defending this country with one kind of defense. That is the way to defeat.

Mr. GROSS. The gentleman knows I am not suggesting that. However, I hope the gentleman will take me with him on one of those trips through the White House rose garden. I would like to take a sniff of them and find out what goes on there.

Mr. VINSON. I am now trying to lead the gentleman in the rose garden of the House.

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

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

Mr. BECKER. I think the gentleman should point out to us the change in the size of the military forces that came about in the advent of this administration. Prior to the advent of this administration we were building on the basis that we would at any time use all the forces at our command. President Eisenhower said at the time of the crisis of 1959 we would use any military force at our command, including nuclear weapons. But the new course now is to have more conventional forces to meet the great conventional challenge of the Soviet Union. This requires more manpower. Under the old concept it required less manpower. That is why we started a number of years ago to build what was called a pentomic army, to reduce the size of the military.

Mr. GROSS. What has happened to the men who have been made available through the recent abandonment of foreign bases?

Mr. BECKER. If the gentleman will let me follow this thought, under this concept now we must realize we have let the enemy choose the weapons and the kind of warfare. He is going to fight a conventional war, so we are to prepare for a conventional war. Therefore we need all these additional weapons and manpower to meet that challenge.

Mr. GROSS. I did not know we are actually fighting the Russians.

Mr. BECKER. We are not, except that there is the threat.

Mr. GROSS. All right, but if our troops in Europe are going to fight a conventional war with the Russians we are whipped before we start.

Mr. BECKER. I do not agree with the gentleman that we are going to fight a conventional war at any time with anybody.

I would say this, that the concept that we were following a few years ago is one that I believe many military leaders believe is the ideal one, namely, that we always hold the threat of using nuclear weapons, if we are attacked anywhere.

Mr. GROSS. Well, then, what is the shooting all about?

Mr. BECKER. That is a different version. I cannot tell you that. Maybe the chairman can answer that one—I cannot.

Mr. GROSS. I would like to have the chairman—I would like to have somebody—tell me how it is planned to fight the next war and how this country expects to win the next war unless our forces use thermonuclear weapons.

Mr. VINSON. It is my belief that the philosophy that there is more than one way to fight a war is a sound philosophy and that philosophy, as has been so ably pointed out by the gentleman from New York [Mr. BECKER] was inaugurated some years ago. There is today in the Department a different concept which is something that worries me and it hurts me to see my learned friend, the gentleman from Iowa, falling into the trap of this new concept of this new philosophy. I, on the other hand, adhere to the previous and the older philosophy and I hope the gentleman from Iowa will get back on the track and stay there.

Mr. GROSS. I am on the track. It is others who are off the track and trying to have it both ways.

Mr. AREND'S. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. PIRNIE].

Mr. PIRNIE. Mr. Chairman, the real question before the committee is the extension of the draft and its necessity.

Mr. Chairman, current and foreseeable national defense requirements impose upon the Congress the vital responsibility of maintaining Armed Forces exceeding 2½ million men.

From experience we have learned that these manning levels cannot be sustained by enlistments alone. We allowed the Selective Service Act to expire after World War II, but were obliged to reinstate the program only 17 months later. Volunteers could not fill the gap and

since that time Congress has found it necessary to continue the Selective Service System.

The more modest manpower requirements of the cold war permit a relatively high degree of selectivity. Thus, all our young men are not forced to fulfill military obligations. It is said that many are classified, but few are chosen. However, this is not the measure of the success of the legislation. Although the draft today does not impose universal military training, it has served effectively to stimulate widespread voluntary participation in other branches of the Military Establishment. Including all forms of military service such as the ROTC, National Guard, and Reserves, 58 percent of American men under 27 years of age have had or are undergoing military training. The remainder were either rated ineligible because of rigid peacetime standards or were deferred because they were fathers or students.

Few claim that the system produces complete equity, but even fewer say that it has not served the Nation well, both in war and in peace. Furthermore, no acceptable alternative has yet been presented which will assure accomplishment of the required objectives. No doubt future adjustments will be necessary, but for the next 4 years, we will need the selective service system. H.R. 2438 is essential to the national defense and merits our complete support.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PUCINSKI].

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Chairman, at the appropriate time it is my intention to offer an amendment to this bill being reported out today by the Armed Services Committee, which would provide that no person shall be inducted into the Armed Forces pursuant to this act except as provided in sections 5(a) to 6(h) of this title after he has attained his 22d birthday. But this paragraph shall not apply to any period of national emergency hereafter proclaimed by the President.

Mr. Chairman, in offering the amendment to H.R. 2438, sponsored by the distinguished chairman of the Armed Services Committee, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON], one cannot help having a very distinct feeling of how David felt when he met Goliath. I yield to no one in my respect for the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON].

I am convinced that when the final chapter of our Nation's victory over international communism is written, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON] and the members of the Armed Services Committees on both sides of the aisle will be listed among the chief architects of that great victory.

It has been my great pleasure, my honor, and my privilege to support this committee in virtually every single bill it has brought to the House because I know how diligently this committee has worked to preserve that very precious commodity of freedom which we Americans love so dearly. In this particular instance, however, I hope the chairman will not oppose my amendment.

We now have in this country 10 million young men registered under the draft. We are now receiving, and will receive even more with the baby boom now coming in, one and one-half million additional young men every year as registrants under the draft. Testimony before this committee shows that in this fiscal year, 1964, we will draft only 76,000 young men out of the reservoir of 10 million; and half of those 76,000 will come from volunteers.

In each of the 4 succeeding fiscal years we expect to draft into the Armed Forces only 90,000 young men a year, again out of a backlog of well over 10 million; and, again, more than half of that 90,000 will come from volunteers. Therefore, Mr. Chairman, I submit that while I am basically for this bill—and whether my amendment is adopted or not I shall vote for this bill—I think we are imposing a very cruel hardship on the young men of this country by keeping them in the shadow of the draft for 7½ years, from the age of 18½ to 26—when we cannot possibly use all of these men in the Armed Forces short of a major catastrophe.

My amendment permits the President to go back to the old law any time he feels such action is necessary. Before my committee, the House Labor Committee, we have ample testimony to show that there are in this country in the unemployed labor force 800,000 young men of draft age.

Employers have written to me repeatedly saying they hesitate to hire a young man of draft age for two basic reasons: because they lose him to the draft; but more important, because the employer must commit himself to a 2-year obligation once this young man goes into the service; and, therefore, employers prefer not to hire young men of draft age.

Under my amendment cutting it down to 22 years, a young man reaching the age of 22 would be exempt from service thereafter unless there was a national emergency. He would remain on the rolls but would be called only in the event of an emergency proclaimed by the President. I know we cannot completely eliminate the draft at this time. Everyone knows that the draft stimulates voluntary enlistment. My amendment would not interfere with that concept one iota; you would still have five million men between the ages of 18½ to 22 in the reservoir. These younger men would stimulate voluntary enlistments but it would give the older men a chance at permanent employment and an opportunity to plan their lives in a more orderly manner once they reached their 22d birthday and have not previously been called up for the draft. After their 22d birthday, they would be exempt except if they had taken a previous deferment. In the case of the latter, they would remain subject to the draft just as they are under existing law.

Why in heaven's name keep them under the draft until they are 26? We would actually be doing a great favor to the college students. My amendment does not disturb the formula at all. A young man who is in college and is now

subject to the draft can get a deferment; but once he gets that deferment he remains liable to military service until the age of 35. When this young man gets through with his college training, gets his degree and goes out to practice law or whatever he wants to do, he is subject to draft until he is 35 years old. Under my amendment, it is true, these young men, if summoned for the draft and enrolled in college before reaching their 22d birthday, could continue to take the deferment as they can under existing law and be subject to the draft at a later age.

However, if this young man has not been called up by the time he reaches his 22d birthday, and he is attending college, the young man then is exempt from the draft, as would any other young man. We would have parity between those going to college and those not fortunate enough to go to college. We would be giving the armed services the young men they need instead of the older men.

In Illinois my attention was called to a directive that was sent to all draft boards urging them to be as lenient as possible on deferments, because in Illinois we have a backlog of 60,000 1-A men, when we are drafting only 230 a month from the whole State, half of them volunteers. So they said to the draft board, "Be as lenient as possible in deferments." But this is not meeting the problem. A deferment still leaves them subject to the draft at a later age.

Under existing law there is some question as to whether or not the President has the right to change an age bracket. Perhaps he does. But the sense of Congress can fortify the whole concept. It is my hope that this amendment will be accepted so we can go on record as being for a lowering of the draft age. While at the same time we serve notice on our allies that we are ready to help, and on our enemies, that we are going to keep our armed services ready.

As reasonable men, we can see the havoc this prolonged draft call is creating to millions of young Americans. I do not know of a single young man who is not ready and willing to serve his country. I do not know of any young men who are unwilling to make their sacrifice. But the fact remains, Why keep these men on the hook, so-called, up to the age of 26 when there is not a chance in the world under the existing backlog of recruits that we can use them.

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

Mr. PUCINSKI. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. VINSON. As I understood the gentleman's statement, in his proposed amendment he wants to change the draft age from 18½ to 22 years?

Mr. PUCINSKI. That is correct, I want them subject to the draft at age 18½ and exempt from the draft when they reach their 22d birthday if they have not been called up by then.

Mr. VINSON. The law today is 18½ to 26?

Mr. PUCINSKI. That is correct. If we bring the maximum age limit down to 22, any older young man, whether he

is in college or out of college, and he has reached his 22d birthday, if he has not been drafted by that time he is then excused. You are going to have to do this sooner or later, you might as well realize that.

Mr. AREND'S. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. GOODELL].

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. Chairman, I simply wish to express my agreement with one aspect of the remarks made by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PUCINSKI].

We Republicans on the Committee on Education and Labor last Friday presented to the public and to the Congress what we called a constructive alternative to the Youth Opportunities Employment Act. We listed some seven recommendations to replace the President's proposal for a Youth Conservation Corps. One aspect was trying to encourage enlistments and selection of some of the younger boys in this 18- and 19-year-old category, who in certain parts of our country are adrift, looking for job training, looking for jobs. They are uncertain as to when they will be called. This does now present a problem, and it is very acute with many of these young people.

I am not sure but what the amendment to be offered by the gentleman from Illinois will involve some other complications. If so, I intend to offer a softer type of amendment, which will simply say it is the sense of Congress, if possible, that they select younger men for the draft.

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

Mr. GOODELL. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. QUIE. I want to commend the gentleman from New York on his position here, because from the studies we made in our subcommittee on youthful employment you can see there were young people 18 years of age who did not know exactly what they ought to be doing, and they have not seen fit to enlist, and I think with the draft at an earlier age it would lessen youthful unemployment and present a requirement to young men which would lessen unemployment.

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

Mr. GOODELL. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. VINSON. As I understood the gentleman, he proposes some amendment with reference to the policy section.

Mr. GOODELL. That is correct.

Mr. VINSON. Would the gentleman be kind enough to let us see what that amendment is?

Mr. GOODELL. I certainly will, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. VINSON. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. GOODELL. I will read the amendment to the Members in the remaining time I have:

On page 1, and after line 6, insert the following new subsection:

Section 1 of the Universal Military Training and Service Act is amended by inserting the following subsection (f): "It is the sense of the Congress that, in the selection

of men for induction for training and service under this Act, greater emphasis should be given to the selection of the younger registrant non-fathers who have not entered regular employment or continued their formal education."

Mr. AREND'S. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mrs. REID] may extend her remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mrs. REID of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I am in favor of H.R. 2438, which calls for extension of the Universal Military Training and Service Act, since I feel that such extension of the draft is necessary if we are to maintain our military strength and thereby insure our national security.

As a mother of two sons—one currently serving in the Marines and another certain to be eligible for military service in the near future—I would be the first to vote against this measure if I believed that present world conditions permitted a weakening of our defenses.

I shall, of course, strive for peace in the world—but peace with honor and with freedom—so as to make any further extension of the draft unnecessary in the future. In the meantime, however, I am convinced that it is vital to the preservation of our freedom to remain strong militarily—especially when we are faced with the Communist menace only 90 miles from our shores; and I believe that extension of the draft is vital to maintaining that strength.

Mr. AREND'S. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time.

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

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate, as always, the courtesy of the great chairman of the Committee on Armed Services, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON], in giving me this time, and I take this time because it seems to me there is an important issue of policy present in the bill before us.

Mr. Chairman, I intend at the proper time to offer a very simple amendment which would extend the draft not for 4 years but instead for 2 years, so that the next Congress, the 89th Congress, may likewise have an opportunity to examine and debate the underlying questions involved. I say that as one who, ever since he has been here, has supported the draft law, in 1955 and 1959.

But I think that there are present in the world today some considerations which were not present on those earlier occasions.

If we look at the nations of Europe, our friends and allies over there, seized, as many of them are, with the new nationalism, we hear them making demands that they conduct a larger part of our joint defense themselves. Well, the natural corollary of this is that they ought to commit more ground troops, particularly to the defense of the great ground mass of Europe. If that were done in the next 2 or 3 years, the need

for an armed service level at our present level would diminish.

Secondly, I am glad to know that the Committee on Armed Services shortly is going to consider the question of pay and emoluments generally for our armed services. Action in this field could mean that the armed services become a more attractive voluntary career, and hence that the draft would one day prove to be unnecessary. I am certainly not trying to predict that in 1965 we can do away with the draft. But I am saying that the 89th Congress, in 1965, ought to have the opportunity to reach its own judgment on that.

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

Mr. REUSS. Very briefly. I only have 5 minutes.

Mr. LAIRD. I share the position of my colleague from Wisconsin and can well understand his concern that the draft activities be reviewed every 2 years. However, in the event that his amendment fails, it is important to me as a member of the Defense Appropriations Committee that this legislation be enacted. If the 2-year amendment fails, I will then be in a position where I must support the 4-year extension.

Mr. REUSS. I agree with the gentleman from Wisconsin that it is important that the draft law be extended and be continued for 2 years. In the case of my own vote on this question, if and when we come to that point in the proceedings, I am going to be guided very largely by the debate between then and now, but in principle I certainly agree with the gentleman.

The one reason that appears from the committee report and the testimony for not amending the bill so that the draft law would be continued for 2 years rather than 4 years is that—and here I quote the Department of Defense:

To do so would create an element of uncertainty.

I am not sure I know just exactly what this means. But I take it the element of uncertainty that would be created would be the possibility that in 1965, due to world events, a draft would not be necessary. Common sense tells me that it is better to be uncertain about whether things will get better than certain that there will be no improvement.

Mr. Chairman, I note also that there is considerable uncertainty now in the life patterns of our young people between the ages of 18 and 25. I do not think that amending the bill to create a 2-year extension rather than a 4-year extension would in any way add to the uncertainty.

Mr. Chairman, the 89th Congress—the one that will be sitting in 1965—is entitled to the opportunity to debate and to vote on the draft.

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

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Chairman, would the gentleman yield in order to permit me to ask the chairman of the Committee on Armed Services a question?

Mr. KASTENMEIER. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Chairman, how many men have been deferred now?

Mr. VINSON. Well, of course, they have been deferred in different groups and for different reasons.

Mr. GAVIN. In different categories?

Mr. VINSON. I said in my statement what those groups were. I do not have the figures right before me, but I did give those figures.

Mr. GAVIN. What is the total?

Mr. VINSON. My recollection is that in one group there were 3,500,000; in another group there were 2 million, and in another group of students there were 363,000. I am sorry I cannot pinpoint the groups more accurately at this time.

Mr. KASTENMEIER. Mr. Chairman, 4 years ago when we considered whether or not to extend the Universal Military Training and Service Act for another 4 years, it was quite properly pointed out that we are living in a dangerous world and the dangers are not apt to be significantly lessened in the foreseeable future. Today, we are no closer to a peaceful settlement of world problems than we were in 1959.

It is a big jump, however, from the proposition that we are living in dangerous times to the conclusion that we must maintain a permanent system of military conscription. In fact, no one of those who support the extension for another 4 years of the draft maintains that conscription ought to be permanent. The fact that we extend the draft for only 4 years at a time is an indication of this feeling. We in America have traditionally resisted the concept of a permanent large Military Establishment. We may tolerate the draft, but we do not approve of it.

The question, then, is not whether we need to maintain strong defenses in today's uncertain world but rather whether we need to extend the draft for an additional 4 years.

Is the draft bill necessary? Many people say "No." Many others say "Yes." Between these divergent opinions, however, there remains a large area of agreement.

First. We can all agree that, in the present world situation, we must maintain a strong, efficient military force.

Second. We can all agree that we must spend as much money as necessary to maintain a sufficient military force. At the same time we would all agree, I think, that we should spend no more money than absolutely necessary to provide adequately for the defense of this Nation. Money that is wasted, or that is not used as efficiently as possible, does nothing to add to our safety; it only puts more of a burden on the taxpayer.

Third. We can all agree that the draft is not a desirable way to raise men for military duty. All three branches of the service have said this many times, as have the Armed Services Committees of both Houses of Congress. The most that can be said for the draft is that it is necessary.

Mr. Chairman, it had been my intention to offer an amendment similar to that which my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. REUSSL] plans to offer, but I shall not

offer my own amendment. Rather, I shall be pleased to support the amendment which will be offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. REUSSL]. My amendment would have differed only insofar as it would have created a Presidential commission to study the problem relating to manpower utilization so that, if possible, it could then be determined whether in the years ahead it would be possible to phase out the draft.

Mr. Chairman, for one thing, every time we extend the draft for an additional 4 years, we increase the likelihood that the draft will become permanent, that the 4-year review will be pro forma. Yet there seems to be unanimous agreement that this is what we do not want.

Second, the review of our military establishments, published in what has become known as the Cordiner report, is about to bear fruit. Some time soon hearings will be held on a new military pay raise bill, designed to make military life and military service more equitably compensated, and therefore more attractive. This bill appears to have a good chance for passage. What effect it would have on the enlistment and re-enlistment rates in the services cannot now be predicted with any degree of accuracy. But certainly within 2 years the effect will be felt.

Thirdly, even more than was true 4 years ago, modern warfare has become a technical and exacting business. Since 1959 we have launched a fleet of nuclear submarines, which require the greatest degree of skill to man on the part of every member of the crew. Since 1959 we have installed an entire arsenal of missiles, including intercontinental ballistic missiles, that are launched and directed by the use of complex electronic equipment. It is far clearer now than it was in 1959 that large, mass armies no longer are the mainstay of a nation's defenses. Even in those areas of the world where the use of conventional weapons is practical—and the present administration has placed much stress on the need for flexibility—the troops that are needed are small groups of highly trained fighters, expert in the use of ever more sophisticated weapons.

It is important, therefore, to ask in 1963 whether the draft serves any useful purpose in meeting today's military needs. There are many who believe there is no clear-cut answer. I am not proposing to end the draft immediately. Let us err, if we must, on the side of caution. I am suggesting, however, that we must find out if it is necessary. I believe 2 years is enough time to find out. A civilian study would, in my opinion, eliminate any possibility that competing interests of the different services, and the understandable human desire to supervise as many others as possible, will color the report.

The draft is an expensive way to run a defense program. It is expensive in terms of the people it takes away from constructive work for largely nonproductive laborers. It is expensive in terms of taxpayer dollars; to train boys to be soldiers and then to have to train new boys to do the same jobs because the old ones have returned to civilian life is a waste of money.

This Nation spends over a billion dollars a week on defense. At such a rate the taxpayers have a right to ask that their money not be spent wastefully. In terms of maintaining an efficient defense program, the draft may very well be wasteful. At least we ought to find out.

I propose the establishment of a President's Commission on the Utilization of Military Manpower which would be made up of civilian experts in the field of military manpower procurement—former Secretaries of Defense, business executives, educators, psychologists, students of military affairs. This Commission would conduct a study of our present military situation, our military manpower needs, and the possible alternatives to the draft for meeting our manpower defense needs. Among other questions, the Commission would seek to answer the following:

First. What tasks do the 2.7 million men in our armed services now perform? Which of these are necessary from a military point of view; which would better be performed by civilian employees.

Second. Are men in the services adequately trained for the tasks they are now performing? How long should it take to train men to use the modern equipment for our defense? Can it be done in 6 months? In two years? How long after being trained should a serviceman serve in order to be worth the money spent to train him?

Third. What alternatives to the draft as a method of encouraging enlistment and reenlistment can be devised? What positive incentives can be offered. What would be the effect of a pay raise? How much of a pay raise would be needed to provide adequate incentive? What would be the cost of such positive incentives to be to the taxpayer?

Fourth. How many men would be used in a modern war? Do we now have more men under arms than we could possibly need in any foreseeable conflict? What exactly are our military manpower needs?

Fifth. What are the effects of the draft on our civilian economy? Are the armed services taking needed skills out of our Nation's manpower pool? Could these skills be supplied to the military any other way?

Sixth. What are the psychological effects of the draft? How does the military life effect those who are drafted? Those who are not? Are those who are drafted efficient soldiers, or does their unwillingness to be in uniform make them a drag on the whole Military Establishment?

These are the questions that require answers if the American people are going to get the maximum protection for their defense dollar. Merely extending the draft another 4 years does nothing toward answering the questions that remain unanswered. We must know if the draft, which no one really wants, is necessary in today's world. Our Nation must not be burdened with either the cost or the disruptive effects of conscription 1 day longer than necessary.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KASTENMEIER] has expired.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 1 additional minute to answer a question.

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

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

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Chairman, I am sure that my colleague from Wisconsin will admit that it is necessary for us to extend the draft at this time and if the 2-year amendment does fail, I hope he will join with us in extending the draft. It is absolutely necessary that some action be taken. Does the gentleman concur in that point of view?

Mr. KASTENMEIER. Mr. Chairman, let me say this to the gentleman from Wisconsin; it is my position that a 2-year extension should be enacted.

Mr. LAIRD. And the gentleman feels that it is necessary?

Mr. KASTENMEIER. I feel it is most desirable that the extension be for 2 years.

Mr. LAIRD. But the gentleman feels it is necessary to extend it for 2 years?

Mr. KASTENMEIER. For 2 years.

Mr. LAIRD. But if that amendment does fail it is my hope that those of us on the floor of the House who do favor the 2-year review will agree that we cannot adjourn this Congress without extending the draft. This is particularly true in this year 1963 with the cold war challenge we as a nation face.

Mr. KASTENMEIER. Let me say to the gentleman from Wisconsin that I have thought that the draft in some form will be extended, and I think the gentleman need have no fear on that point.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. ALGER].

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Chairman, I am interested in getting answers to questions that puzzle me. Of course, I recognize that we all start at the same point, that we need military strength, we need manpower; people must serve and if they will not serve voluntarily, they have to be conscripted. But there are some things that disturb me. I have been reading the hearings as much as I could, since coming on the floor. For example, on page 168 and the next few pages thereafter there is the testimony of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CURRIS]. He raised some questions and problems that I cannot answer; and I am not arguing with anyone so much as I am arguing with myself. I am trying to find out. These bother me.

We are disrupting our youth and their education. We are encouraging draft dodging in every possible way, just as though we want them to dodge the draft. Of course, we do not want that. Is this universal military training or is it not? As legislation, this is an extension of a wartime bill. We are affecting many civilian programs and certainly the educational institutions in our country. We are taking 90-percent men who will be noncombatant and do not need to have A-1 physical condition. Take these men who are driving staff cars. They are drafted to do what? Drive cars? Be PX salesmen, clerks, warehousemen, cooks, and countless other services. We need

to get the best men we can and use their civilian skills. These jobs can be done as civilians. Why take a man out of civilian life and make him do something he would do as a civilian?

Has the committee gone into why the Seabee technique was disbanded? Why have they not considered the use of men who do the same jobs, as civilians. They may not measure up physically, but could run bulldozers. This is but one example. That is what we took them in for, to do necessary civilian work. The 90-percent noncombatant men who are not going to fight are going to be doing jobs they might do as civilians. Frequently, today's civilians could do a much better job than men trained as military personnel.

I am asking for information from the chairman, the ranking member of the minority, or anyone, because I am just trying to find answers. Are we trying to get civilian skills through the draft? Do we have any studies that will help us use the Seabee technique and use civilian skills rather than force men into the military? Is there any study about doing this, reinstating the Seabee technique where we take men to do civilian jobs, what they were doing as civilians and did so well? Why do we not re-impose that technique?

Mr. VINSON. Because we do not think we properly should. The gentleman is perfectly right about the use of the military for civilian purposes. A study of that kind has been going on, and we have been trying to eliminate that.

Mr. ALGER. Can the gentleman tell me if we are moving at all toward a more voluntary system by offering better pay and better conditions in order to get men into the service?

Mr. VINSON. We are going to have a pay bill coming up this week, and I certainly hope the House will adopt it. It is a very warranted and justifiable bill. But we must have the selective system to maintain our Armed Forces.

Mr. ALGER. The gentleman said there were 2.7 million men in the Armed Forces, in answer to a question a few minutes ago. We are talking about draftees numbering 100,000 a year. Half of those would be volunteers. They would not all be drafted. Are we talking about getting 50,000 men under this bill for a 2.7-million-man armed force?

Mr. VINSON. Of course, we would not attain the necessary strength if we relied on a voluntary force.

Mr. ALGER. I was referring to page 168 of the hearings and the pages thereafter that were testified before the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON]. I am drawing for this discussion today from that testimony.

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

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

Mr. BECKER. I would like to say this about those who have talked today, that the basic argument is the proper utilization of military manpower. If we did have proper utilization, would we need this draft bill? The distinguished chairman of the Committee on Armed

Services appointed a special committee to investigate this feature. It is a most frustrating procedure to try to get to the bottom of proper utilization.

When we were in executive session discussing the vote on this bill and to vote it out of the committee, I raised this issue again with our good chairman on this proper utilization, and the chairman has stated he was going to reconstitute that committee on proper utilization. I would say to the gentleman from Texas, I would hope this time we may be more successful and probably get to the point where we get the type of utilization out of the men in the service rather than have to get more all the time and have to have a draft and have to do all sorts of things to keep them in, and that we would probably utilize the men we have in the service. This is a frustrating job that you are trying to do and, as has been suggested, I hope the committee under the leadership of the sub-committee chairman will try once again.

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

Mr. ALGER. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. GROSS. The chairman of the House Committee on Armed Services, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON] said or implied that you had been weaned over to the idea of placing reliance on missiles. It seems to me that only a year ago the gentleman from Georgia, after taking his famous walk through the White House rose garden, came back here and went against the RS-70. He placed his faith in missiles, did he not at that time?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 additional minute to the gentleman.

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Chairman, I shall not endeavor to answer the question raised by the gentleman, but I would like to make plain to the chairman as well as to the gentlemen addressing me, I am sure the gentleman from Georgia and the gentleman from Texas both use their best judgment at all times on the problems confronting them. I am not on the Armed Services Committee and there is much that I do not know, I am sure. But I do not mind making inquiry, even to showing my ignorance, in asking questions.

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

Mr. ALGER. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. VINSON. I think it is very important that the Record show this clearly. The committee is deeply concerned about the matter of military personnel being used in occupations that could be performed by civilians, and is planning another complete study on that whole subject matter, and it may be possible that there can be a reduction of military personnel in that regard and that military personnel can be transferred to the support part of the forces instead of being used in commissaries and things of that nature. This committee is going to make a study of this matter. I am satisfied we can do something in this regard. But remember this—that would have no relation whatsoever to the draft

because the bulk of these people are in the Air Force and they are not in the Army, and the Army is the only one that uses the draft.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. ARENDTS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 additional minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. ALGER].

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

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

Mr. FOREMAN. Referring to the remarks of my fellow Texan, do not be alarmed—Texas has not given up. He is not going over to the side to turn over our forces under the Arms Control Act and the Disarmament Act or to go along with the administration and try to roll over and play dead to the Communists. I think he is just raising some questions he has here in his mind concerning this. I feel sure he will be behind us in supporting this draft bill. I think he realizes as well as you and I do that in order for us to maintain freedom for this country and for around the world, we must maintain our military strength. Now, one thing you brought up a while ago on this utilization—it is not the question we are faced with here on extending this draft bill. This is something we have been assured will be brought up in committee later to study more efficient manpower utilization. Further, you stated the draft would only bring in 100,000 and that is right, but for us to be able to continue to get volunteers in the Air Force and in the Navy and the Marines, we have to continue this draft and it has been proven that we continue to bring people in.

Mr. ALGER. I thank the gentleman.

I feel I must reply to the point the gentleman from Texas raises concerning my questions. Some of you may be surprised at my inquisitiveness, but I do take a dim view of shipping American boys overseas to fight and die in a war that is not labeled a war in South Vietnam. If I knew of a way to keep from putting our men in uniform to send them over for death in an undeclared war I would heartily support it.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 1 minute. I do want to congratulate the gentleman from Texas [Mr. FOREMAN], a member of the Armed Services Committee, who is making an outstanding record.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to my distinguished colleague from California [Mr. DOYLE].

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Chairman, with one exception I sat through every session of the Armed Services Committee as a member thereof during the study of this important subject, and while I feel that the draft as such is repugnant to our American way of life—and that has always been my position, that we must not get any thought in mind of making the draft a permanent policy of this Nation, we ought to try to set up some system whereby the American boys who are needed for our national defense and security against aggression are available without being under some compulsory

system except as a last resort—I, of course, shall vote for further extension of the draft the way my committee has recommended it. I voted for the bill in committee and I shall vote for it in the House. It appears to me that there is a real necessity for it for the present.

I wish it were possible safely to reduce the period to 2 years, but I do not believe it is safe under the circumstances in which we find the world at this time. I think the world is in such shape that we in this country should at this time extend the draft for 4 years and not a day less. At any time we wish we can repeal the act or the President of the United States can order ceasing of any age group or all of the ages.

I have in mind one fact that has not been brought out so far in this debate. It is mentioned in our committee report and I call your attention to paragraph 1, page 3, which says:

For the next 4 years, after giving full allowances to the estimates of voluntary recruitments, it is anticipated that the Army will require an annual average of 90,000 inductees to maintain its approved strength.

I again asked some of the top military personnel before our committee at that time, and I have asked the same question frequently, whether or not the Air Force and the Navy needed the draft to get their personnel. At all times the Joint Chiefs of Staff answered me, and the Secretaries answered likewise, that the only segment of the military that needed the draft was the Army, not the Navy or the Air Force. I do hope the time will come before too long when the inducement, the pay, the conditions under which they serve, and other factors, will make it so it is not necessary for the Army even to have the draft in order to obtain the number of men it needed.

When I came to the floor today two Members of this great body asked me, because they knew I was interested especially in the subject of conscientious objectors, the status of the conscientious objectors at the present time. I will not take time to read here what occurred on that subject in the Armed Services Committee, but in that committee I asked General Hershey—you all know who he is—about the subject of conscientious objectors, and whether or not it was a major problem.

I call attention to our committee hearings, page 93, and that brief discussion between General Hershey and myself, in which he stated that the question of conscientious objectors is no longer a major problem but is working out satisfactorily.

He replied as follows:

We have, of course, two kinds: One kind are conscientiously opposed to killing people, but they are willing to go into the service and perform what they can, and do.

We have had several thousand in the last 15 years that have served abroad, and I don't believe you have ever heard much about it, which is a pretty good indication that it is working. The religious groups have paid their way, so the Government hasn't had to worry about the money. I was the person who had to decide and be responsible whether what they were doing was in the national safety and interest. I think my association with the religious groups—I am very proud of it—but they better speak about how well they like it. I think we are getting along

very well indeed, and I think you would hear more about it in the paper if we weren't.

Mr. Chairman, one set of figures my distinguished chairman, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON], did not call attention to and I want to give them to you. These figures are quite shocking. Let me call attention to page 12. There is one item there. The number of men disqualified, on account of physical and related reasons, is 3,598,160. In other words, the greatest number of deferments of applicants or boys called for the draft are disqualified because of physical, mental, or related reasons. It seems to me that we as a nation ought to take notice of the fact that this is not evidence of good national health. It is not evidence of good public health, when the largest number of proposed draftees who are deferred are deferred on account of physical reasons. This needs immediate and adequate provisions against its continuance.

I want to compliment the local draft boards for the work they have done. They have done a magnificent job.

I have also found that, generally speaking, in these hearings before our Committee on Armed Services, you can pretty well believe what the high-ranking military personnel reports to us as the actual facts. The high-ranking military personnel said to our committee they needed this draft, that they need it now, and they need it for 4 years. While I respect the judgment of my colleagues who propose to offer amendments, I feel I cannot go along with these amendments, with the world in the state it is in now, with any recommendations other than what the military has recommended in this case. In this case I feel I must go along with the urgent request of the military, although I recognize these amendments would have some meritorious appeal contained in them.

EXTENDING UNIVERSAL MILITARY TRAINING ACT

Mr. CLANCY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. RHODES] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Chairman, if I were present and voting today I would support House bill 2438 to extend the Universal Military Training Act as a necessary continuation of our all-out effort towards victory in the cold war. I only hope that the sense of duty shown by the American youth today serving under the provisions of this act will be matched by an equal determination on the part of all Americans to continue United States and free world supremacy in a military, an economic, and a political sense over the foe which has sworn to destroy us.

No one regrets more than I the necessity for once again approving a continuation of this legislation. However, the facts of the matter are plainly written for all to see. The Communist enemy can be impressed only by a clear dedication on our part to develop a positive strategy to make America strong.

and adequate strength to make this positive strategy work now and in the future. For these reasons, I today am expressing my support for this legislation, and if I had an opportunity to vote, I would join my colleagues who cast an "aye" vote.

Mr. CLANCY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. CONTE] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask this afternoon for a general discussion on the floor of this House and a continuing discussion in this country regarding the present draft laws and their relationship to the President's theories of youth employment.

This is a serious matter, and I am proud of my colleagues in this House who have been seriously discussing a number of important questions today, and throughout this debate.

I would like to ask whether or not an earlier draft age would help stem the rising tide of juvenile delinquency? I think it would.

We have been receiving reports that one of the prime purposes behind the youth domestic corps is that it would take a number of young men off the streets and place them in meaningful surroundings.

As the present draft laws are constituted, the average age of the draft is in the 21-23 age groupings. It comes at a difficult time for a number of young men who are right in the middle of deciding on a future career. Or, as Members have suggested in this debate, at an age like 25 and 26 when careers have already begun.

The Selective Service Act and system insures that manpower from which military manpower would be mobilized is registered and classified and that it can be delivered to the Armed Forces in numbers limited only by the capacity of the Armed Forces to deliver it.

Since the operation of the system informs each young man that he does have an obligation to serve, why is it not possible to draft at 18? This, I suggest, would go a long way toward easing unemployment of youth.

It would give younger men an opportunity to take up various trades, and obtain course work in valuable subjects. These young men, I feel, would be better soldiers and ideal for career assignments—which the Army wants its young draftees and enlisted men to think about, as soon as they enter the service.

In many cases, people will not hire young men who have finished college and face the draft before they reach 26. With an earlier draft age, these young men will be more conducive to full-time employment.

Another point at issue here, is that many outstanding young men enter the other services when they complete high school as enlisted men. They do not desire to wait until they are 22 or 23 to be drafted, so they enter the Navy, Marines, and Air Force.

It is my opinion, also, that the 6-month program serves no meaningful purpose. By keeping men in a Reserve unit after 6 months of training invariably means that we have weak Reserve units and even weaker training for the 6 months.

It is the theory of the Selective Service people in Washington that the later draft age stimulates younger boys to enlist. This is true, but as I have mentioned, they do not enlist in the Army but in other services.

With a lower draft age, and I understand that the President does have the authority to draft at 18½, I think we could go along toward meeting increasing unemployment among youth and at the same time, strengthen the solid base of the military.

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Chairman, during public hearings conducted by the Armed Service Committee in connection with the extension of the Draft Act in 1959, the Committee on Armed Services became aware of a belief that there would be no necessity for the provisions of the Draft Act if manpower resources available to the armed services were more efficiently utilized.

As a consequence of this assertion, the chairman of the Committee on Armed Services recommended the establishment of a special subcommittee to inquire into the utilization of manpower by the Department of Defense.

The resolution approved by the full committee provided the widest possible jurisdiction to the subcommittee, and authorized it to inquire into every aspect of manpower administration and utilization.

I was given the honor and privilege of being the chairman of that special subcommittee, and I would like briefly today to relate to the Members of the House some of the efforts of that subcommittee together with its findings and recommendations on the subject of military manpower.

Public hearings on this subject were initiated by the subcommittee on the 12th day of May 1959. Because of the desire of the subcommittee to avail itself of the views of the various Members of the House on this subject, a written invitation was extended to every Member of the House to appear before the subcommittee on this subject.

I am happy to advise that a large number of Members availed themselves of this opportunity, and provided the subcommittee with the benefits of their views. The recommendations of these Members was an invaluable adjunct to the efforts of our subcommittee.

The subcommittee also entertained the views of numerous representatives of the executive branch, industry, education, organized labor, and various other private citizens who could make a contribution to the subcommittee's efforts.

The subcommittee completed its hearings on February 4, 1960, after which time it went into executive session to assess and analyze the information made available to it. The subcommittee report was issued on June 15, 1960, and contained four recommendations pertinent to the subject of utilization of military manpower.

The Department of Defense took immediate action to implement the subcommittee's recommendations. In anticipation of an interest in this subject in connection with extension of the Draft Act, I have requested the Department to provide me with an up-to-date summary of the action taken by the Department on the subcommittee's recommendations. If there is no objection, I will insert the letter together with its enclosures, in the RECORD at this point.

Briefly, the Department's letter indicates that on the basis of the subcommittee's recommendations, it has effected a reduction of approximately 2,300 military personnel assigned to commissioners throughout the world. In addition, it has issued a strong directive limiting the use of enlisted personnel on the personal staffs of senior officers.

The Department has also recently completed an extensive study into the rotation base of the various military departments with a view toward identifying those jobs in the military departments which can be filled by civilian personnel rather than military personnel. I understand that this study may ultimately result in the replacement of approximately 15,000 military personnel by civilians.

As I have previously mentioned, the subcommittee hearings and studies were most comprehensive. The printed hearings reflect a portion of the work done by the subcommittee, and consists of more than 800 pages of printed testimony taken by the subcommittee. Despite this intensive effort on the subcommittee's part, it was unable to uncover any evidence which would support the allegation that the more efficient use of military personnel would render unnecessary a continuation of the induction provisions of UMTS.

In that connection, I would like to read to the House the views of the subcommittee on that particular subject:

The subcommittee wishes to make quite clear its views on the relationship of military manpower savings to the continuance of the induction provisions of the Universal Military Training and Service Act.

As is evident throughout this report, the subcommittee is of the opinion that military manpower savings can be achieved by a continued emphasis on the more efficient use of military personnel. However, it should be kept in mind that this saving in military manpower in the support forces will:

(1) Permit the transfer of such personnel from the support forces to the actual operating forces; and

(2) Result in an attendant increase in the manning strength and overall combat capability of the operating forces which, in many instances, are presently undermanned.

Therefore, these savings cannot, and should not, be translated into any overall decreased requirement for military personnel. On the contrary, the subcommittee has become aware that, notwithstanding the popular concept of pushbutton warfare, the

increased complexity of our modern weapons system together with related defense considerations has, in fact, generated increases rather than decreases in the total manpower requirements of our armed services.

Stated another way, the subcommittee was unable to develop, during the course of its inquiry, any evidence which would justify or support the contention that the more efficient use of military personnel would render unnecessary continuation of the induction provisions of universal military training and service.

The report of the subcommittee was unanimous on all of these recommendations including the views relating to continuation of the Selective Service Act.

There has been no development to my knowledge which would justify any change in the stated position of the subcommittee. I therefore recommend that the Members of this House unanimously support an extension of the provisions of the Selective Service Act.

ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF DEFENSE,
Washington, D.C., March 8, 1963.

HON. CARL VINSON,
Chairman, Committee on Armed Services,
House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Frank Slatinshek of your staff requested a report on actions taken to implement the recommendations of the Special Subcommittee on Utilization of Military Manpower, 86th Congress. The Department previously reported on this subject on February 13, 1962.

The subcommittee's four recommendations were on these subjects: (1) The use of enlisted personnel on personal staffs; (2) military personnel rotation requirements; (3) implementation of policies on the use of civilian personnel; and (4) the relationship of manpower provided by contractors to manpower provided by direct Government employment. A copy of the Department's memorandum which initiates implementing actions is enclosed. The Department's actions taken on each of the subcommittee's recommendations are summarized below:

Pursuant to the subcommittee's recommendations, the Department issued Department of Defense Directive 1315.9 on the Utilization of Enlisted Personnel on Personal Staffs. The directive restricts the use of enlisted personal staff to the performance of duties which are within the scope of the military and official responsibilities of the officer to whom they are assigned. A copy of the directive is enclosed.

A review of the rotation requirements of the individual military departments, as recommended by the subcommittee, was completed. The study was made available to the Secretary of Defense for consideration in connection with fiscal year 1964 force level decisions.

The subcommittee's recommendation to institute measures to enforce Department of Defense policies on the use of civilian personnel was carried out by surveys of compliance during July–November 1960, and by reemphasis of the policies in May 1961. In this connection, pursuant to the subcommittee's objective of reducing the number of military personnel in commissaries, the Department has accomplished a total reduction of approximately 2,300 military personnel in these activities between June 30, 1960, and June 30, 1962.

In accordance with the subcommittee's recommendations to develop policies for the use of contract manpower and to consider contract resources in the development of manpower ceilings, the Department has made considerable progress, particularly in such major functions as maintenance and research and development. A copy of policies which govern contracting for mainte-

nance is enclosed. Subsequent to a Government-wide study on contracting for research and development, a comprehensive action program to strengthen the competence of Department of Defense research and development laboratories was directed by the Deputy Secretary of Defense on May 3, 1962. Among the actions taken were an increase in the number of high-level scientific positions and a significant increase in education and training to assure a steady flow of quality personnel in Government laboratories.

I can assure you that the availabilities of contractor, as well as Government resources, are fully considered in developing manpower ceilings.

For your convenience, the enclosures mentioned in my letter are in the attached folder. Please advise me if you desire additional information on this subject.

Sincerely yours,

NORMAN S. PAUL.

ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF DEFENSE,
Washington, D.C., July 22, 1960.

Memorandum for the Assistant Secretary of the Army (M.P. & R.E.), Assistant Secretary of the Navy (P. & R.F.), Special Assistant to the Secretary of the Air Force (M.P. & R.F.).

Subject: Implementation of Price subcommittee report.

References: (a) Report of Special Subcommittee on Utilization of Military Manpower of the House Committee on Armed Services, June 15, 1960. (b) Memo, Assistant Secretary of Defense (M.P. & R.), subject: Price subcommittee report, dated June 27, 1960.

Distribution of the subject report was made under reference (b) and a meeting with your representatives on this subject was held July 6, 1960.

In accordance with the discussion during this meeting, it is requested that action indicated below be taken on each of the cited recommendations and the necessary reports be submitted to this office on or before the dates indicated: (numbers below correspond to recommendations in Price subcommittee report).

1. Each military service is requested to advise this office on or before August 26, 1960, of the actions taken or proposed to implement Price Subcommittee Recommendation No. 1.

2. Each military department is requested to designate a liaison officer as soon as practicable to work with the Office of Manpower Requirements and Utilization, Office of Assistant Secretary of Defense (M.P. & R.) in the planning of a review of rotation base requirements of the military departments, both as to numbers and skills, with the objective of more efficient utilization of military and civilian manpower. In this connection, reports previously made in response to Assistant Secretary of Defense (M.P. & R.) January 8, 1960, request subject: Price subcommittee request for skills and numbers of military personnel involved in the rotation base will be used as a point of departure for development of these plans in order to avoid duplicate reporting.

3. Each military service is requested to review its policies and procedures which implement section IV, Director of Defense Directive 1100.4, as concerns civilian staffing, to determine their adequacy to detect and correct deviations from this policy. Specific consideration should be given to the policies and procedures by which the use of military personnel in civilian-type jobs because of budgetary or manpower ceiling limitations are or can be identified, reported, and considered. A report of the foregoing review is requested no later than November 1, 1960.

4. Each military service is requested to nominate a principal and an alternate member to serve on an ad hoc working group to

develop and assess the manpower implications of contract procurement and to recommend an appropriate statement of policy and implementing procedures. The ad hoc working group will develop, initially, a term of reference for its operation for the approval of the Assistant Secretary of Defense (M.P. & R.). The names of service representatives to serve on this group should be reported to this office not later than August 1, 1960.

CHARLES C. FINUCANE.

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE DIRECTIVE

Subject: Policies governing the use of commercial and military resources for maintenance of military materiel.

References: (a) Department of Defense Directive 3232.1, "Department of Defense maintenance engineering program"; (b) Department of Defense Directive 4100.15, "Commercial and industrial type facilities"; (c) Department of Defense Directive 3232.8, "Industrial and commercial technical services"; (d) Department of Defense Instruction 3232.6, "Commercial and industrial facilities allocation planning to accomplish depot maintenance of materiel during mobilization."

I. PURPOSE

The purpose of this directive is to establish basic management policy and related criteria for the effective and efficient use of commercial and military resources for accomplishment of materiel maintenance requirements of the Department of Defense.

II. APPLICABILITY

This directive is applicable to the Departments of the Army, Navy, and Air Force. The policies and criteria contained herein are in consonance with the policies of references (a) and (b) and serve to further delineate these policies with respect to the accomplishment of maintenance by contract. This directive does not conflict with, or otherwise alter, reference (c).

III. DEFINITIONS

The following terms and definitions are applicable to this directive:

(A) Contract maintenance: That maintenance (i.e., modification, modernization, rebuild, overhaul, repair, or servicing of materiel) performed under contract by commercial organizations (including original manufacturers) on a one-time or continuing basis without distinction as to the level of maintenance, as defined by reference (a). Included within this term is that contracting for services to augment military capability for the direct maintenance support of materiel.

(B) Military maintenance: That maintenance performed by a military department under military control utilizing Government-owned or controlled facilities, tools, test equipment, spares, repair parts, and military or civilian personnel.

(C) Materiel: Materiel consists of all tangible items (including ships, tanks, self-propelled weapons, aircraft, etc., and related spares, repair parts, and support equipment; but, excluding real property, installations, and utilities) necessary to equip, operate, maintain, and support military activities without distinction as to its application for administrative or combat purposes.

(D) Mission-essential materiel: Consists of those weapons, equipments, and systems (including spare components and support equipments) which have been determined to be vital to a primary defense mission; the unserviceability of failure of such materiel to meet design performance would jeopardize a basic defense assignment or objective.

(E) Direct maintenance support: Refers to that maintenance performed to materiel while it remains under the custody of the using military command. Upon restoration to serviceable condition, the materiel normally is returned directly to service.

(F) Indirect maintenance support: Refers to that maintenance performed to materiel after its withdrawal from the custody of the using military command. Upon restoration to serviceable condition, the materiel is returned to stock for reissue, or returned directly to the user under conditions authorized by the military department concerned.

(G) Maintenance capability: Consists of those resources, namely: facilities, tools, test equipment, drawings, technical publications, trained maintenance personnel, engineering support, and an assured availability of spare parts, required to modify, retain materiel in, or restore materiel to, serviceable condition.

(H) Maintenance capacity: Is the quantitative expression of maintenance capability.

IV. BACKGROUND

(A) Materiel maintenance capability is essential to, and is an integral part of, the national defense capability. Two basic sources for materiel maintenance are available to Department of Defense activities; namely, military maintenance, and contract maintenance. It is in the public interest that the use of these sources in peacetime be planned in such manner as to provide maximum effectiveness under emergency or war conditions.

(B) Military maintenance provides a controlled source of technical competence and the necessary resources to assure the operational readiness and sustained operation of military materiel under emergency or war conditions. Such maintenance must be organized and ready to meet the requirements of primary military missions of the Department of Defense in fulfilling the national security objective.

(C) Contract maintenance provides an effective means for augmenting the resources of the Department of Defense in accomplishing maintenance of its materiel. Properly applied and administered, it can: (1) release military maintenance capability and capacity for more essential work; (2) reduce the requirement for Department of Defense investment in facilities, equipment, and training of personnel; (3) provide a cushion of flexibility to maintenance programs; (4) increase the dispersal of maintenance capability; and (5) result in net benefits to the Government without compromising basic military mission responsibilities. However, to be most beneficial, contract maintenance should be planned well in advance of the requirement; its application should not produce uneconomical utilization of existing facilities which must otherwise be retained for the maintenance of mission-essential materiel, nor should it increase overall costs to the Government through the necessity for larger pipeline inventories. Most important, contract maintenance must not prevent the timely attainment of required military maintenance capability.

(D) Contract maintenance has its greatest application for accomplishing indirect maintenance support requirements at the depot (industrial) level of maintenance. For example, original equipment manufacturers have an inherent capability of performing modernization and major modifications to their products. Also, commercial maintenance service companies normally are equipped to perform major repairs and overhauls at their plant locations. Contract maintenance is normally well suited for accomplishing maintenance requirements when quantity size lots are involved, or when a steady maintenance workload can be anticipated.

(E) Contract maintenance has a limited and specialized application for accomplishing direct maintenance support requirements at the intermediate and organizational levels of maintenance. Normally, when used for direct maintenance support at the intermediate and organizational levels, contract maintenance is intended to provide

services to be performed at an operating site, under military control, and to be used to augment military capability.

(F) Interservice support arrangements offer a means of providing maintenance for materiel common to two or more departments, including mission-essential items beyond the required maintenance capability of a using military department, when capacity exists in another department.

V. POLICY

(A) It is the general policy of the Department of Defense to utilize private industry for the accomplishment of maintenance of military materiel to the maximum extent practicable, recognizing that maintenance in support of military missions is a vital part of military capability which shall not be compromised.

(B) Each military department shall develop and/or retain an in-being military depot level maintenance capability for only that mission-essential materiel which would require continuing depot level maintenance to sustain operations under emergency or wartime conditions or which would require such depot maintenance in peacetime to assure operational readiness. This policy should not be construed as requiring a complete capacity when materiel is determined mission-essential. The extent should be only the minimum capacity necessary to insure a ready and controlled source of technical competence and resources to meet military contingencies. Contractual sources or interservice support may be used for the depot maintenance of mission-essential materiel to any extent beyond the established minimum capacity.

(C) Each military department shall determine which of its items shall be designated as mission-essential materiel and shall determine the extent of depot level military maintenance capability to be developed and/or retained to meet minimum requirements for support of mission-essential materiel.

(D) Each military department shall assure an efficient level of operation for that military capacity retained for the depot maintenance support of mission-essential materiel.

(E) Each military department shall attain a self-sufficient military capability and capacity for the direct maintenance support of its tactical elements.

(F) When contract maintenance is to be used for new equipment, it shall be planned well in advance of the equipment introduction into the operating inventory in order that there will be sufficient leadtime for the contractor to obtain the required facilities, tooling, test equipment, and maintenance personnel.

(G) Contract maintenance shall be planned and employed in a manner to provide maximum effectiveness under emergency or wartime conditions, particularly with regard to long-term or continuing-type maintenance contracts. The policies and guidance for planning with industry for maintenance under emergency conditions are provided by reference (d).

(H) Contracts for maintenance shall incorporate, by reference, such work specifications and quality standards as may be required to adequately assure that materiel upon repair and return is fully satisfactory for service.

(I) Contract maintenance shall not be employed when adequate safeguards cannot be effected to protect security information from disclosure in any manner prejudicial to the interests of the United States.

(J) Contract maintenance for requirements beyond the established minimum retained capacity will be considered practicable only when it is available at reasonable price, as provided in the armed services procurement regulation, and when compared

with the estimated cost of military maintenance, if performed at existing military facilities, the contract cost would not be disproportionately higher as computed under the provisions of the Bureau of the Budget Bulletin 60-2, as amended, and as implemented by reference (b).

(K) When contract maintenance is not considered practicable (par. (J) above) interservice support arrangements will be fully considered before the requiring department utilizes additional in-house capacity.

VI. CRITERIA

Within the policy statements above, contract maintenance has its principal applications in the following areas:

(A) For accomplishment of indirect maintenance requirements which exceed the military capacity retained to support mission-essential materiel.

(B) For accomplishment of direct maintenance requirements in support of nontactical elements when the military control and performance of such work is not required for military effectiveness, personnel training, or the maintenance of a rotation base.

(C) For direct maintenance support of materiel as may be necessary to augment the military capacity, normally on a one-time basis to accomplish a specific task.

(D) When it is desirable to augment military maintenance capability for an interim period to attain an earlier operational status for new military materiel being introduced.

(E) When its interim use for analytical overhaul and modification of new military materiel entering the inventory will lead to future effectiveness and efficiency in military maintenance operations by the refinement of requirements for initial spares and repair parts, maintenance tooling, testing equipment, and technical data, or through product improvement of materiel under current production.

(F) For economical quantities of materiel, or when a steady workload of overhaul and/or modification maintenance can be anticipated.

(G) When the extent or complexity of modification or modernization work to be accomplished requires the inherent technical qualifications of the original equipment manufacturer.

(H) When the inherent leadtimes and processes of maintenance by contract would not result in substantially increased cost for procurement of spares to fill an enlarged repair cycle pipeline.

(I) When the administrative cost of contracting for small lots of materiel would not be disproportionate to the cost of the maintenance to be accomplished.

VII. IMPLEMENTATION

(A) It is intended that the redistribution of maintenance workloads between industry and the military departments resulting from the implementation of this directive will produce within the departments the minimum practical levels of manpower and facility requirements for maintenance consistent with military necessity.

(B) The military departments will take action to implement this directive as follows:

(1) Applicable directives, regulations, and instructions within each department will be reviewed and revised for compliance to the policy and intent of this directive.

(2) The guidance expressed herein will be analyzed for adaptability to internal departmental use. Prior to promulgation, it may be restated or expanded as considered appropriate to more effectively carry out the policy and intent of this directive.

(3) Contract maintenance shall be identified in the supporting information for budget estimates and apportionment requests in accordance with the guidance provided by the Assistant Secretary of Defense (Comptroller).

(4) Furnish such reports as may be requested, in accordance with DOD Directive 7700.1, to the Assistant Secretary of Defense (Supply and Logistics) for review and evaluation of contract maintenance program management.

(5) When extenuating or other special circumstances exist which may warrant an exemption or deviation to the policy and intent of this directive, a military department will submit such cases with supporting justification to the Assistant Secretary of Defense (Supply and Logistics) for review and approval of the Office of the Secretary of Defense.

(6) Within 120 days of the date of this directive, two copies of each document implementing the above actions will be transmitted to the Assistant Secretary of Defense (Supply and Logistics).

(C) The Assistant Secretary of Defense (Supply and Logistics) will perform such reviews and evaluations of implementing documents and management by the military departments as to assure the uniform and effective application of the policy and intent of this directive within the Department of Defense.

Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, in these troubled times when Communist aggression is an ever-present possibility, there is no question that our highly qualified and efficient military forces must be maintained in readiness. The United States must be continually prepared to confront such aggression with well-trained and experienced military forces. For this reason I will support extension of the draft law.

Although I support the President and the efforts of the Congress to maintain American military readiness of the highest quality I believe more attention should be given to better manpower utilization.

The experience of the past 12 years has demonstrated that the draft law has not been effective in maintaining the desired pool of trained manpower for emergencies. As far back as 1957, the famous Cordiner report pointed this out. Part of the problem which the Cordiner report referred to stemmed from the unreasonably low rate of military pay. Then, as now, if I understand correctly the arguments for the proposed military pay raise bill before the Armed Services Committee, military pay rates for qualified technicians were too low to attract and retain adequate numbers of the skilled personnel who currently form the backbone of the armed services.

Another weakness of the present draft law is the fact that very few of those who were inducted into the services reenlist. Thus, the existing Universal Military Training and Service Act has not fulfilled one of the major purposes for which it was designed.

An even more serious objection to the UMT is the fact that it is simply not universal. In 1957 well over 60 percent of those of draft age were not being drafted and I understand that the percentage has not decreased.

It seems to me Mr. Chairman, that military service should be made attractive enough to recruit all the manpower required effective for national defense.

New methods of warfare require not only well-trained troops but the development of brainpower to meet the challenge of this nuclear age. A GI bill of

rights would make peacetime service more attractive for many young men.

Many young men who are not able to adjust themselves to military life have the capacity to contribute far more substantially in other ways to our national defense.

Proper manpower utilization therefore, is essential for the most effective national defense.

Each time this act has been renewed serious deficiencies have been well stated and often acknowledged, but the doubts always give way to inertia and the press of immediate military needs. This is a short-sighted approach to a serious and continuing problem. Congress should do everything possible in making conscription unnecessary except in time of emergency.

One obvious course is to increase the attractiveness of military service as a career to people in and out of the service. Thus we should support the new military pay bill which is designed to improve the pay and allowances at those ranks in which men are most likely to make a decision as to their future, and in those jobs which require skills much in demand in private industry.

There is no doubt in my mind that Congress will extend the draft law for another 4 years. But there is no good reason why we should not plan ahead so that we can build an even stronger military force on a voluntary basis.

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Chairman, it is my understanding that an amendment will be presented today proposing that the extension of the Universal Military Training Act be made for only a 2-year period rather than a 4-year period and that a Commission be established to study thoroughly changes that might be advisable in the program.

I also understand that an amendment will be presented to lower the ceiling age limit from 26 to 22 in order that our young men can have 4 years of their lives returned to them in which they can plan for the future and make decisions regarding employment, family and other aspects of normal living which are now denied them.

I shall support these amendments, but feel that they are wholly inadequate and that the whole draft program is wrong. We have departed a long way from the historic principles of a free society upon which the United States was founded.

I do not believe there are any basic reasons which justify the perpetuating of compulsory military service during peacetime by the United States. The two proposed amendments show that there is a great deal of discontent with the present situation.

In spite of this, we will undoubtedly approve a 4-year extension today that will continue the existing system without change—without questioning the wisdom or necessity of our action very strenuously. Neither Canada nor England find compulsory military training to be necessary to maintain their armed forces at desired strength.

The primary excuse given for the present draft is that it serves as a club over the heads of young men in order to force them into enlisting in the armed services.

If it is actually a fact that we cannot fill our needs through enlistments, then the draft is necessary only because we do not provide incentives or conditions of service which are attractive enough. We are substituting compulsory training to avoid our responsibility for allowing our citizens a free choice when we are not in a period of national emergency.

In addition to this basic premise that the entire program is wrong, it is actually creating social problems that require corrective legislation.

The young man who is in jeopardy of being drafted during 8 years of his life is not a good risk for a prospective employer. It is not wise for him to hire a prospective employee who is subject to the draft and then hold this job open for 2 years—as he is required to do—while the employee serves his time.

The young man between the ages of 18 and 26 is left trying to put some order into the loose ends of a life over which he has lost control of some very basic decisions.

In addition to these points I must voice here and now—as I will on many future occasions on this floor—my conviction that almost the entire thrust of our national policy as it involves our security today is destructive of that security. We have put our faith in the power of force, violence and destruction to create a world of peace, freedom and security. These means are incompatible with our goals.

We can neither suppress the ideology of international communism by force nor spread the ideology of freedom for all men by force. To imagine that we can do this merely blinds us to the constructive efforts which we must make to create the world of the future which we seek.

I am more than willing to give my life in the battle for this better world—as I am sure we all are. Yet, to give our lives and still lose our goals is, indeed, the height of folly. This is the course we are pursuing.

I feel that universal military training in peacetime is a part of that destructive thrust which I must oppose.

For these reasons, I shall vote against any extension of the Universal Military Training Act today.

The CHAIRMAN. There being no further requests for time, the Clerk will read the bill for amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 17(c) of the Universal Military Training and Service Act, as amended (50 App. U.S.C. 467(c)), is amended by striking out "July 1, 1963" and inserting in place thereof "July 1, 1967".

Sec. 2. Section 1 of the Act of August 3, 1950, chapter 537, as amended (73 Stat. 13), is amended by striking out "July 1, 1963" and inserting in place thereof "July 1, 1967".

Sec. 3. Section 16 of the Dependents Assistance Act of 1950, as amended (50 App. U.S.C. 2216), is amended by striking out "July 1, 1963" and inserting in place thereof "July 1, 1967".

Sec. 4. Section 9 of the Act of June 27, 1957, Public Law 85-62, as amended (73 Stat. 13), is amended by striking out "July 1, 1963" and inserting in place thereof "July 1, 1967".

Sec. 5. Sections 302 and 303 of title 37, United States Code, are each amended by striking out "July 1, 1963" wherever that date appears and inserting in place thereof "July 1, 1967".

Mr. VINSON (interrupting the reading of the bill). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that further reading of the bill be dispensed with, that it be printed in the RECORD at this point, and open to amendment to any section of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON]?

There was no objection.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. PUCINSKI: On page 1, line 3, after the word "That," insert "(a)", and immediately below line 6 on page 1, insert the following:

"(b) Section 4(a) of the Universal Military Training and Services Act (50 App. U.S.C. 454(a)) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraph:

"After July 1, 1963, no person shall be inducted into the Armed Forces pursuant to this Act except as provided in section 5A and section 6(h) of this title, after he has attained the age of twenty-two years. This paragraph shall not apply during any period of national emergency hereafter proclaimed by the President."

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

Mr. PUCINSKI. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close in 10 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Chairman, under this amendment, which is a very simple amendment, all we are saying is that if this amendment is adopted the draft boards and the Defense Department would have 3½ years in which to select a young man for the military service between the age of 18½ through his 21st birthday; that when he reaches the age of 22 and has not previously been deferred from military service, he is no longer subject to the draft short of a national catastrophe.

Under existing law, young men are subject to the draft over a period of 7½ years, from 18½ to 26 years of age. This amendment, however, does not preclude the President from resorting to this original legislation at any time he feels that such action is in the national interest.

I have heard mention made here of a sense of Congress amendment. However, the fact remains that the draft boards under existing law cannot give priority to young men 18½ to 19, because if you look at your committee report on page 7, section 5, we have six categories of priority under existing law: The first category are delinquents; second, volunteers; third, men between 19 and 26 who are nonfathers; the fourth category, men between 19 and 26, who are fathers;

fifth, men over 26 years of age; sixth, men between 18½ and 19 years of age.

In every draft board in the country there are young men who come to the board and say, "Look, I want to go in now; I want to discharge my responsibility; I want to get it over with." But, these young men cannot be taken, even if the draft board wants to take them, under existing law, because the draft board must take eligibles off the top. My amendment in no way hurts the present draft program; we are in no way denying the Defense Department the impetus it needs to get men to volunteer for the service, because we would continue the existing draft program for 18½ to 22-year-olds. Under my amendment, we would give a young fellow who cannot afford to go to college the same opportunity to serve or not to serve that we are now giving the young man going to college. Today, under this law, a man can take course after course in college; go into postgraduate work, and conceivably, because he has prolonged his college career, escape the draft. In my remarks in the RECORD of March 7, in testimony before the Armed Services Committee, I showed that there are now 126,000 young men in this country not being drafted because they have passed the age of 26 through various deferments. And, they are fully qualified, but the military does not want them only because they are too old. If you accept this amendment, it gives the President the full right to go back to the original law any time he feels that the manpower needs of this country are such that we need this law and take them up to the age of 26. In the meantime, if we really want to give these young Americans an opportunity to plan their lives in an orderly manner, let us exempt them from the draft after they reach their 22d birthday. I am sure that these young men would be willing to serve their country and discharge their responsibility at an earlier age so that they can plan their adult lives in a more orderly manner.

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

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

Mr. BECKER. Does not the President now have the right to reduce the age to 22 or 21?

Mr. PUCINSKI. There are those who claim he does. Let there be no question; I support President Kennedy. I also supported President Eisenhower in his defense efforts. But, this is the legislative branch of Government, and I think the time has come when the Congress ought to assert its own views on what it thinks. In my opinion, if we say the age for selectees should be 18½ to 22 years of age—this is going to be the intent of the Congress.

Mr. Chairman, we give the President all the authority that he may feel he needs if in his judgment this amendment is not going to serve the best interests of the country.

I think if the Congress went on record as stating it is going to give the Department of Defense 3½ years instead of 7½ years to make up its mind as to whether it needs these young Ameri-

cans for military service, I am sure that the administration would not find such a pronouncement objectionable. I strongly urge my amendment be adopted so that we can have a more effective method for filling our Nation's defense needs.

For a more detailed analysis of this entire subject, I should like to refer my colleagues to page 3786 of the RECORD of March 7.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PUCINSKI].

Mr. BECKER. Mr. Chairman, would the gentleman yield just briefly in order for me to finish the question which I previously propounded to the gentleman from Illinois?

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

Mr. BECKER. As I see it, this amendment does nothing than what is the law today. The President has the right—

Mr. VINSON. No—

Mr. BECKER. Now, wait a minute. I mean this: The President has the right to reduce the age at any time. On this he is going to be restricted in his use of it. At the same time the amendment is going to give him the right to increase it. I can see no merit in that method of operation.

Mr. VINSON. That is the reason I am asking the committee to vote it down. The facts and circumstances do not warrant, in my judgment, favorable consideration of the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, what does the amendment which has been offered by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PUCINSKI] do? As pointed out in my statement on the floor of the House it reduces the draft age from 18½ years of age to 22 years of age. The law today is 18½ years of age to 26 years of age. The President, under section 5 of the Draft Act, can exercise the authority given him to call within age groups. Therefore, the President could call in the 22-year age group.

Mr. Chairman, the first I heard of this amendment was when it was sent out in the mail. We had a hearing. It was published before the Congress. Witnesses came here from all over the United States. I want to say that the Committee on Armed Services regrets that the learned gentleman from Illinois did not give us the benefit of time to study his amendment when we were having our hearings. However, I am satisfied we would all have been of the same opinion we are now, and that the proper thing to do is to defeat this amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I therefore ask the committee to vote this amendment down.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PUCINSKI].

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. REUSS: On page 1, line 6, after "place thereof July 1," strike out "1967" and insert "1965."

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

Mr. REUSS. I yield to the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Armed Services.

Mr. VINSON. I would like to see if we could not agree on a time limit on the debate on this amendment since it was debated at quite some length during general debate.

Mr. REUSS. The gentleman has been very generous and I am sure we can agree on a short space of time.

Mr. VINSON. I do not desire to debate it but 5 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. Reuss] be recognized for 5 minutes, and 5 minutes be reserved for the Committee on Armed Services.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I object.

The CHAIRMAN. Objection is heard to the unanimous-consent request of the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment and any amendments thereto be limited to 15 minutes.

Mr. GROSS. Let us see how many desire to be heard on the amendment. Let us not get in too much of a hurry.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close in 25 minutes.

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Chairman, I object.

The CHAIRMAN. Objection is heard. The gentleman from Wisconsin is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Chairman, this amendment would limit the extension of the draft to 2 years. I believe that the draft should be continued now for that period only.

In 1955 and in 1959 I vigorously supported extending the draft for 4 years. Now as then, I stand ready to do anything necessary to build up our strength to combat the Communist drive for world conquest. We must, of course, maintain our military power.

But in 1963, the situation we face is different. The world is unsettled. The Atlantic alliance has been shaken in disputes over trade and defense. The Common Market has grown to be a great factor in world affairs. The European nations have reached new heights in their spectacular economic advances. They speak of conducting more and more their own defense. Nationalisms old and new have asserted themselves. The full impact of these facts has not yet been felt.

No prophetic gift is needed to predict that the period ahead will be marked by rapid and profound changes. One change we would all cheer would be a miraculous increase in the willingness of our European allies to take over a just share of their own defense. That would allow withdrawals of American troops and would go a long way toward ending our bedeviling balance-of-payments deficit. Withdrawal of troops from Europe and many other events that we cannot foresee in a fluid world might also make unnecessary a continuation of the draft.

The world is in a state of flux. Therefore we should limit our commitment to a fixed policy to the shortest reasonable period. In the present situation, a 2-

year extension is long enough. The speed with which H.R. 2438 is moving through the House shows that we can quickly extend the draft if it is still needed in 1965.

If the draft is no longer needed in 1965, we should have the opportunity to get rid of it. If needed, it is a necessary evil; but we should not and cannot long ignore its undesirable effects on our society or cease to look for the day when we can be done with it.

Now what is to be said against a 2-year extension? Not much, apparently. I have looked long and hard to find an explanation of why the draft should be continued for 4 years. I find only this from the Defense Department:

It would create an element of uncertainty in the minds of millions of young men in this country as to the future of their military service liability—as to whether they will be needed.

Does anyone suppose that the youth of this country will be put upon the rack of doubt because of a possibility that none of them will be compelled to service after 1965? Common sense, Mr. Chairman, tells us how much better it is to be uncertain about whether things will get better, than to be certain that there will be no improvement. This type of uncertainty will be cherished by the Nation.

And, in any case, who can believe that this new uncertainty is worse than the uncertainty that haunts our youths now? The uncertainty they know while the draft continues creates real distress, doubt, and distortion of natural bents—as the mail of every Member will reveal.

Is the draft board hot on my heels? Can I beat the system? Can I escape by plunging into marriage or graduate school? Has my draftsmanship put me in the nearly one-half of my age group that will never serve? Will I be the 1 in 10 actually caught in the draft's loose net?

Those are the questions that create the uncertainty that actually, presently hurts our youth and our society. In a continuance of the draft there is not only plenty of uncertainty but also significant injustice and misuse of human resources.

And I would point out that the weight of the inequities of the draft falls most heavily on youths who lack the money or knowledge to practice skillfully the degrading game of draftsmanship.

What is the reason for the draft? Apparently it is not primarily the 90,000 men who would be drafted into the Army in each of the next 4 years. If it lost them, the Army would lose its least effective, worst trained elements. In many cases, their jobs could be done by civilians.

But could the services get the 300,000 volunteer enlistments they need, if the threat of being drafted did not hang over the heads of the Nation's youths? The Defense Department says that recruitment would suffer. In the absence of any other information, we must accept this judgment.

Yet there is reason to think that 300,000 truly voluntary enlistments might be obtained if the effort were

really made to get them. We are to be asked to increase military pay during this Congress. Higher pay could make military service more attractive. Other steps might be taken also to encourage volunteer service.

At a time when military technology demands highly trained, professional soldiers, and allows no time for great mobilizations, we could gain in strength from a switch to all volunteer forces. The machinery of the Selective Service System could be kept in good shape for emergency use in case of need.

Certainly the Congress should give more careful study to this possibility.

Mr. Chairman, to end the draft, if it would weaken our forces, would be inconceivable; but to retain the draft among a free people, beyond a time when it is really needed, would be intolerable.

The 89th Congress—the one that will be sitting in 1965—is entitled to the opportunity to debate and vote on whether the draft then needs to be continued for another period. This Congress should not deny it that opportunity.

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

Mr. REUSS. I yield.

Mr. GUBSER. Mr. Chairman, I am sure the gentleman will agree that if the law is extended for an additional 4 years the 89th Congress will have the opportunity of repealing that law and consequently will have the opportunity of working its will on draft legislation.

Mr. REUSS. No, I regret that I cannot agree with the gentleman. The 37 members of the House Committee on Armed Services, who are all distinguished Members of this House, voted unanimously for a 4-year extension, and I would view it as not within the range of expectation that they would change their mind and bring out a bill in 2 years which would enable us to vote on it. Therefore, the practical alternative to 4 years is 2 years. I hope it will be 2 years.

Mr. LINDSAY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this amendment. If for no other reason, it should be adopted to force a review of the use of manpower, and where the draft fits in and our educational and military needs for the coming decade.

On Friday of last week I tried to get a set of the hearings on this issue, which is one of the most important issues which will be discussed in this session of the Congress. The hearings were not available. I tried again on Saturday and the hearings were not available. The hearings finally became available in printed form at 10:30 this morning. I question whether this is the proper way for the Congress, either on the majority or the minority side, to be debating an issue of such vital importance.

The chief argument for the 4-year extension has been, first, precedent. "We have always done it this way," it is said. I would like to know why precedent is so sacred in the 1960's. With scientific and technological advances in the armed services and in the conduct of warfare this is no time to take refuge in the safe harbors of custom. This is a hydrogen atomic age, a mobilized

mechanized age, and the manpower needs of 8, 6, 4 or even 2 years ago were quite different from what they are today.

The gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. REUSS] has raised the question of an entirely new and different situation in Europe which may impose upon our European armed manpower posture an entirely different focus than it has in the past 2 years. I looked in vain through the hearings to see where I could find a solid discussion before the Committee on Armed Services on manpower needs and the question of the future of the draft. In short, Mr. Chairman, I am not persuaded by the argument of "precedent"—that a 4-year extension of the draft is necessary. We owe it to this country to subject this matter to critical examination in the light of today's conditions at home and abroad.

The second argument that is raised for the 4-year extension is "uncertainty." The Assistant Secretary of Defense for Manpower, in testimony, said that anything less than 4 years "would create an element of uncertainty in the minds of millions of young men in this country as to their service liability." That is the chief reason given for a 4-year extension. This is Alice in Wonderland. What could be more uncertain than the draft lottery that exists today? Boys that ought to be drafted are bypassed; others that ought to be exempt are taken. I think it is necessary to have a thorough and complete review of the whole subject. This has not been done, either in the presentation that has been made today, or in the hearings—hearings which were unavailable to the Members of Congress until 10:30 in the morning of the day a major bill is discussed. When this occurs, it is the function of the minority to object.

It seems to me further that this whole matter is tied into the problem of Reserves. The reason I asked the question earlier as to the future of the 6-month program, is that I believe this is one of the areas of fat and waste that could be cut from a massive budget. The entire reserve program should be reviewed. Everybody knows there is a vested interest in the Reserves in every congressional district in the United States, but it cannot be examined in the abstract. There is a relationship between the draft extension and the reserve program that ought to be examined on the floor right now. I wonder how much the security of the country is being safeguarded by the paunchy reservist who spends one evening a week at the Reserve center chewing the fat with the boys, thereby escaping from the dishes at home and building up a very expensive—to the taxpayers—pension.

I would rather put that money into a bigger, tougher, better paid, technically competent standing army.

It seems to me that starting today and going throughout the week, there should be a complete discussion as to where we are headed in our draft, our posture in Europe related to the draft, the difficulty we have in educating young men to run some of the complicated machinery of the 1960's.

For these reasons, Mr. Chairman, I intend to support the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin, and I hope that it will receive the support of the House. If the amendment fails, I shall vote for the bill convinced as I am that a 4-year extension of the draft is still preferable in these perilous times to no draft at all.

Mr. BENNETT of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, the hearings, in my opinion, are thorough on this subject. The only person quoted so far in regard to the extension for 4 years instead of 2 was the Secretary of Defense. He spoke on technical things in this bill.

On page 87 of the bill you will find General Hershey testified—I think it would be well for the House to hear what he said:

I do really think that we have our adulthood being delayed, and not only that, but there are more and more reasons why the man in the Armed Forces could very well have the addition of college before he serves.

I will get back to some other language he used on page 87 in just a minute, but in amplification of what he said there, at the bottom of page 88 he said:

On the other hand, there is also the problem that the man brings away from training what he brings to it. The more he knows when he comes to training, the more meaningful becomes the training and the more you are integrating training into a personality that has some other capability, where sometimes when we were young we didn't bring much to it and we didn't have many buckets to carry anything away with.

Returning to page 87, the next point General Hershey makes is this:

The second thing is if you are not going to take all of them, if you determine, by lotteries, at 19 or 20, that you are going to take them, as far as any enlistment of people after that you are very much like the girl who said to the boy, when he said, "May I have the last dance?" and she said "You have had it."

That is not a very appropriate way to take them into the service.

Then he goes on in the very next paragraph to say:

Well, you can't recruit, after you have made a determination in an age group of who will serve. I don't like to have people say to a kid after he finishes 2 years, "You are through," because he isn't.

General Hershey also went on to testify to our committee in some fullness about the question of trying to fit the time of the draft in with the total utilization of manpower for what is necessary. He pointed out it is difficult for these young men to have an education in science, developing them in that or some other way, and get them while they are still very young, and find out any ability to work into the service.

Some are deferred so that they can get an education. Some are channeled to scientific development. Anyway many of them come into the armed services with much better training and capacities and knowledge and abilities that are of great interest to the National Government and much more helpful to themselves as far as they individually

are concerned in their ultimate service to their country. It seems to me that after hearing this testimony which was quite thorough, and every Member of the Congress had an opportunity to testify, that General Hershey made a very strong case for the 4-year draft at this time.

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

Mr. BENNETT of Florida. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. REUSS. I would appreciate my friend, the distinguished gentleman from Florida telling me where General Hershey on pages 86 or 87 or 88 or on any other page said that the 4-year extension was essential or said that the 2-year extension would be a bad idea. I cannot find any such testimony.

Mr. BENNETT of Florida. If you read the whole page, starting on page 86, you might be able to see it. He replied where the gentleman from Indiana asked a question whether it would not be better if they could get the men as young as possible. The Secretary showed the need earlier all through his testimony. General Hershey felt, for the reasons I stated, that the system that we now have, even though it delays some people from going into the service, many of these people when they do go into the service have additional attainments and are more valuable to the services. Suppose your son was to be called to the service and he was a man capable of making a real contribution in the field of nuclear physics or something like that. Would it not be better for him to go on to get his education and bring that kind of ability and education to the threshold of the service of our country and to the military rather than coming in as a youngster right out of high school with none of those attainments?

I think the arguments General Hershey made on page 87 are in point, although they were made in response to a question as to coming in earlier into the service and I took it as one of the main reasons for the 2 years instead of 4 was to get them earlier, and that is the reason I quote this from General Hershey:

"After all what would be all of the effects of reducing this bill from 4 to 2 years? One, of course, might be to cast some doubt in the minds of the world that we are being firm in the present dangerous situation, but the point I have been attempting to discuss relates to the quality of service which the young men might be expected to perform. Assume that the amendment would end the draft in 2 years, a 2-year extension only would seem to me to bring pressure on the draft boards to call the young men at an earlier age because otherwise these people in the young age bracket might escape service to their country altogether and calling them earlier might have the adverse effects I have already discussed.

"Our country must not only maintain its present national defense power but must increase it. The chief bulwark for our national security and for international peace is in fact our national defense. We should do nothing that in any way minimizes this. In doing so we should be as fair as possible between

people equally situated, and it seems to me that the 4-year extension would be preferable to the 2-year extension for all of these reasons."

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I listened attentively to the gentleman from Florida. I did not hear him, when asked the question, point to any portion of the hearings or testimony on the part of General Hershey as dealing with the specific question of the extension of the draft for 2 years or for 4 years. This is the issue and nothing else: Are we going to extend conscription of American youth for 2 years or for 4 years? I am in favor of 2 years. I cannot understand for the life of me, with all the stories we hear about unemployed youths in this country, why the military services are unable to get on a volunteer basis the manpower needed. I wonder if somebody on the Committee on Armed Services would tell me why, in view of all the unemployed youths in this country and the furor that is being raised about that, why the military services cannot get the manpower needed on a voluntary basis?

Mr. BENNETT of Florida. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield briefly to the gentleman.

Mr. BENNETT of Florida. We went into that in our committee. We have an actual example of this. In the decade last past, there was a period of some 2 years when there was no draft. The actual result of this was that we did not have enough people.

Mr. GROSS. Will the gentleman tell me why?

Mr. BENNETT of Florida. The gentleman yielded, so I want to answer him. I will not take up too much of his time.

Mr. GROSS. Tell me why. Tell me why you cannot get them. I do not want a recital of past history. Just tell me why you cannot do it now.

Mr. BENNETT of Florida. They did not do it then and the reason I presume is because the young men of our country feel that we people who are sent to the Congress of the United States should have the courage to enact laws to bring the needed manpower into the services at the proper time and that is what I ask you to vote for today.

Mr. GROSS. And I am asking you why the unemployed youth does not volunteer for the military service today?

Mr. BENNETT of Florida. I think, perhaps, the answer might be that they do not like the pay they receive.

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

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. FOREMAN. I think one reason they do not volunteer under the draft —

Mr. GROSS. I am talking about unemployment.

Mr. FOREMAN. One reason they do not volunteer is that, in the first place, they are not paid enough money, and in the second place under our unemployment compensation policy this man can be gainfully unemployed. So they are going to be unemployed rather than to enlist.

Mr. GROSS. I think the gentleman has something. Congress approves the Peace Corps, the Domestic Peace Corps, and organizations like the "Sons and Daughters of I Will Arise To Take Care of Them"; and, of course, they will not do any military service. Furthermore, I cannot understand why with all the enormous increase in prosperity in Europe where we have poured out billions of dollars to get them on their feet—why we cannot withdraw our five or six divisions and bring them back to this country. Can someone tell me why? Some of these countries are abandoning their conscription systems; and others are lowering the obligated service of their conscripts. They are prosperous, their industries are humming. Why can we not withdraw our five or six divisions and let them provide their own troops? Why do they not take care of their own military obligations in Europe?

That is one of the questions for which I get no answer.

I am for an extension of the draft but not for 4 years. Let it be extended until July 1, 1965, and then let Congress take a good solid look to see whether it should be continued. I am opposed to fastening universal conscription on this country and this is what is happening on the basis of these 4-year extensions.

Mr. BECKER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. BECKER. Mr. Chairman, as a member of this committee, I have listened to all the testimony from 1959 to 1963; to all the briefings on the posture of the Military Establishment of this Nation and conditions in the world.

The same arguments have been used here today that were used before the committee in reference to the length of time of the extension and as to whether or not we should have a Selective Service System.

I do not like the draft any more than anyone else, and I am quite sure we would all like to get rid of it if we could. That is not at issue here today.

The issue is 2 years as against 4 years. I believe 2 years is too short a time. I believe 4 years is needed not only from the point of view of the Military Establishment but from the point of view of the young men of this country who go to either high school or college. Then they would know what was ahead of them in the next 4 years; whether they would be subject to military service, whether they could complete college with or without deferment.

I listened to all the testimony of Gen. Hershey and others on this bill and to those who have done the planning. It is not a question of whether we should uphold the Committee on the Armed Services or the chairman of the committee. The question is one of training, and I believe, therefore, we should extend this selective service for the next 4 years.

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

Mr. BECKER. I yield.

Mr. COLLIER. Whatever time it is extended, how different would the man

toward the end of the extended period be than the man who was faced with being drafted a year ago, a year prior to the expiration of the last extension? In other words, he cannot do any planning until he knows what the intent or the action of the Congress will be. Is that a fair statement?

Mr. BECKER. We have had many wars —

Mr. COLLIER. We are now talking about training. A year ago there was no one in the military service nor any young man in the country who could know what the action of Congress would be when the Selective Service Act expired. There can be no certainty until the young men know what the action of the Congress will be.

Mr. BECKER. That is what I am talking about. We are trying to take the indefiniteness out of it and express the intent of Congress. That is exactly what we are doing.

Mr. ARENDTS. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield I think for the information of the gentleman from Illinois that is exactly what Congress did when we extended it in 1951, 1955, and 1959.

I think in all fairness to these boys we should say that this is an extension of the draft for 4 years, not because we want the draft but because of the necessity of the situation, rather than to come back in 2 years and do the same thing all over again.

Mr. BECKER. Mr. Chairman, I would like to make this particularly clear to everyone. Much argument has been raised. Do we need a draft? Why do not more volunteer? We are faced with the fact that they do not volunteer. The draft is a threat. There is no question about that in my mind. I want to be perfectly honest about that. Because we have the draft we are getting a great many more volunteers than we would if we did not have the draft. I believe that. Consequently, we need an extension. I think we would be making a mistake if we did not make it for 4 years.

Mr. GROSS. Should you not then have in here a bill providing for a permanent conscription setup? If that is what you want, why do you not come in with it?

Mr. BECKER. I hope we can sometime, perhaps not in the foreseeable future, eliminate the Selective Service, but we cannot do it now.

Mr. GROSS. Let us take a good hard look at it every 2 years.

Mr. BECKER. I think we are taking a good hard look at it all the time.

Mr. ARENDTS. I was here a few years ago when several of us led the fight against compulsory military training. Nobody wants military training.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pending amendment.

All of us know, certainly anyone who takes the time at all to look at history, that military power is the decisive force in the settlement of world affairs. Certainly we have seen this in our lifetime. Certainly we know that friendship between nations in the final analysis comes down to the point of which nation has the greatest strength in determining the course that smaller nations may take.

As we look at our hemisphere plans, as we see what is happening in Cuba, as the President of the United States begins his trip in just a few days to Central America, it is urgent that we in the Congress be responsible in extending the draft for 4 years and let the nations of this hemisphere know that we are determined to remain strong and the leader for solidarity in this hemisphere against communism. I hope we can allow the President to keep strong the military forces of our country.

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pending amendment.

Mr. Chairman, right now we are living in a very critical and chaotic world. If we attempt to cut this back from 4 years to 2 years, it will mean to the rest of the world we are receding. It will affect the morale of the people of the world. So let us not cut back from 4 years to 2 years at this critical time.

You know after World War I we let down our guard; we sank our battleships, we destroyed our fortifications, and we put our trust in treaties with people we thought were as rightminded as we were, and after that we went down the pathway of pacifistic peace. After they dumped tons of dynamite on our battleships and fortifications and wiped out 50 percent of our fleet and 3,300 lives, we were in another war, and we were again caught with our guard down, not prepared.

We demobilized after bringing World War II to a close; we demobilized our Army and Navy and Air Force, and we went down the pathway of pacifistic peace, and again we found ourselves suddenly thrust into Korea. And, what did we have? We were totally unprepared, and if it had not been for the Reserves who fought in World War II, we would have been in a terrible predicament. We called them back after they had fought in World War II, after they had started to raise their families and started their businesses, we sent them into Korea, and we were very nearly pushed back into the sea at Pusan, the most humiliating incident that ever happened in the history of this Nation. After that we passed this legislation on two different occasions each time extending the law for 4 years. Now you want to cut it back to 2 years, telling the world that we are receding and receding instead of building the greatest national strength that this country has ever known to meet any and all emergencies that may arise at any time anywhere in the world. Let us pass this bill as it is for 4 years. It is needed.

Take a boy at 18 years of age. Supposing he gets out of high school at that age. By the time he gets through with his college, being deferred for college, he is over 22. The gentleman wants to make an exception, but you certainly will have yourselves in a lot of trouble, wanting to make exceptions. Take 18 to 22. So he is deferred. But, it is all right for the boy who has not the means and wherewithal to go to college, to take him and draft him.

Now, this law has worked in a very, very satisfactory manner for a number of years, and I suggest to the Members of this House that we have confidence

in the chairman of this committee who has brought this legislation before us, and let us pass it as it is. I am quite certain that we will then be able to state that we are showing the world that we are not reducing or receding or cutting back in any way, but we are going to build the greatest national defense that this country has ever had.

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

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, I wonder if we can agree on time for debate on this amendment. I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close in 10 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. COLLIER] for 2½ minutes.

Mr. COLLIER. Mr. Chairman, that will be more than ample time.

Mr. Chairman, I have no predeterminations about whether this extension should be 4 years or 2 years. But it seems to me when someone offers an argument in justification of either 2 or 4 years, there should be some validity to the argument.

All I am trying to find out here today is this: If the reasoning which has been offered in support of a 4-year extension is, in fact, valid and if all the things which have been said before in justification of 4 years are valid, then why 2 years ago did not this committee come forward with a bill to extend the draft for 4 years? As of 2 years ago the committee had no more assurance as to what would happen, regardless of the military posture, than it has today if we passed this bill extending it for 2 years.

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

Mr. COLLIER. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. GAVIN. We did not pass it for 2 years. We passed it for 4 years.

Mr. COLLIER. Permit me to tell the gentleman from Pennsylvania that I was here and I voted to extend it for 4 years. I am quite aware of that.

What I am saying is this: If you need a 4-year planning period, then perhaps we were derelict 2 years ago in not having extended it to 4 years, because 2 years ago we were in no different position than you would be today if you passed it for 2 years.

Mr. Chairman, I seek light out of darkness; that is all. If the argument is good for 4 years, then why is not the argument good for 10 years? Then, we would really have a long range planning period.

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

Mr. COLLIER. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. GAVIN. I might say to the gentleman from Illinois that as far as I am concerned I can support it for a period of 10 years, until there is some peace and stability restored to this troubled, discontented world in which we live. I just

want us to remain strong. If this bill passes today providing for a period of 2 years, it will indicate to the Soviets that we are cutting back.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York [Mr. RYAN] for 2½ minutes.

Mr. RYAN of New York. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment. It seems to me we have lost sight of what is proposed by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. REUSS]. The gentleman is simply proposing that the present law as it now exists be extended for a period of 2 years. The committee proposes its extension for a period of 4 years.

Mr. Chairman, the question is not the age at which a young man shall be subject to induction. The question is not whether or not the draft age should be reduced from 26 years to 22 years, which question was disposed of earlier. The question is simply whether or not we are going to extend this law for 2 years or for 4 years. It seems to me that by extending the law for 2 years we at the same time say to the Department of Defense that there should be a thorough review of our military manpower requirements. The important thing is to have a thorough review. By extending the draft for 4 years, we are postponing the day when this review will be undertaken.

The gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KASTENMEIER] has proposed the establishment of a Presidential Commission on the Utilization of Military Manpower to study our military manpower situation and the effectiveness of the draft in meeting our needs in an age of technological revolution. That makes good sense. And Congress should undertake a thorough study of the operation of the draft and gather information from educators, behavioral scientists, trade unionists, military experts and others.

The draft affects more homes and families in our country than almost any other single piece of legislation this Congress will consider.

I am not impressed by the argument that there should be a 4-year extension because of precedent. The world is moving too rapidly for us to be bound by precedent. Nor am I impressed by the emotional appeal that a 2-year extension will be interpreted as a sign of weakness. The real weakness is to cling to precedent and refuse to reevaluate past policy.

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

Mr. RYAN of New York. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. GAVIN. Would the gentleman vote for an extension of 2 years?

Mr. RYAN of New York. I intend to vote for the extension of the draft, if the amendment—

Mr. GAVIN. I am asking the gentleman a direct question which the gentleman can answer "yes" or "no."

Mr. RYAN of New York. If the gentleman will listen, the gentleman will hear the answer. I intend to vote for the extension of the draft for 2 years if that amendment is adopted, and for the committee's bill if the amendment is defeated. But I do believe it is important to have a thorough review of this question.

Mr. GAVIN. If the gentleman will yield further, will the gentleman vote for the bill if the period of extension is 4 years?

Mr. RYAN of New York. I said so.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California [Mr. GUBSER] for 2½ minutes.

Mr. GUBSER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, one of the most striking things about our hearings this year was that they were almost exactly a carbon copy of the hearings on the same bill 4 years ago, and in all probability those hearings were carbon copies of the hearings held 4 years before that.

Mr. Chairman, inevitably the argument is "let us have a thorough review." We gave you a thorough review last year under the able chairmanship of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PRICE]. I devoted days, hours and weeks, just as did every other member of that committee, going into the question of manpower utilization.

Mr. Chairman, the question is this: Are we going to take the hours and weeks of work and labor that went into that report and throw them out the window and start all over with another one?

We plan Polaris submarines 44 months in advance. Is it not wise to plan the utilization of the manpower to man those expensive implements of war at least 4 years in advance?

Mr. Chairman, we conduct a review, and we find nothing new. In my opinion, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GAVIN] has given to the Members of the House a most compelling and persuasive argument: that now of all times we should not say to the world that the United States is receding from its strong position of readiness.

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

Mr. GUBSER. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HALL. Would not the gentleman agree also that there are five additional parts to this extension of the so-called Selective Service and Universal Military Training Act? In addition to the draft law there is the suspension of other laws, the extension of the Dependents Assistance Act, the Doctors Draft Act and the specialist incentive pay. I should think for administrative planning it would be important that the department that has submitted this bill to the Congress have these things finalized as to the length of time in which this can happen. And further, a last point. I would like to point out that the corollary is also true to some of the objections that have been raised here. Many of the advanced technical people who are well trained and seasoned and whom we need in the armed services of today and who are serving us so beautifully need this additional time in which to complete their training, and therefore they must know that they will have a full 4 years of training.

Mr. GUBSER. That is very true.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the distinguished gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON], the chairman of the Committee on Armed Services.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, I trust that the Committee will overwhelmingly reject this amendment. Of all times to talk about letting the world think that we are reducing our forces, this is the wrong hour, this is the wrong time. Every chancery in the world would be astonished and uncertain if the word went out that the House of Representatives today had changed the period for extending the draft. What change has come over the Congress of the United States? they will say. In three different times over a period of 12 years the draft has been extended for 4 years. Now, when no one knows what the morrow will bring, we are asked to come in here and change the period of extension from 4 years to 2 years.

I certainly hope that this House under no condition will change that extension of time. I hope the Committee will reject this amendment overwhelmingly.

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Mr. Chairman, I support the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. REUSS], which would limit the extension of the draft to a period of 2 years, rather than the 4 years proposed in the bill before us.

I most certainly agree that during these most perilous times, it is absolutely necessary that we continue the draft. In this age of manpower versus mechanization, in this nuclear pushbutton age, I agree that we must maintain our military strength, not only for the protection of these United States, but to honor our military commitments in other far-flung areas of the world. If it is necessary that we enlarge our Armed Forces, and increase our military strength to prevent further Communist aggression, I would gladly support such a program.

However, with world conditions as unsettled as they are today, with some of our allies willing to assume additional responsibilities insofar as the defense of their own country is concerned, with so many new nations emerging which are willing and anxious to take their own places in the union of free countries, we cannot be sure of what our manpower or military requirements might be in the future. Certainly an extension of 2 years at the present time would give us the necessary time and an opportunity to thoroughly review and reconsider our military needs in the light of current and future developments. And, if as a result of the investigation and study it is determined that the draft must be continued, then it would be a fairly easy task to ask the Congress in session at that time to extend the appropriate legislation.

If this amendment is defeated, I shall, of course, vote for the committee bill, to extend the draft for a period of 4 years.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. REUSS].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. REUSS) there were—ayes 43, noes 154.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. GOODELL: On page 1, after line 6, insert the following new subsection:

"Section 1 of the Universal Military Training and Service Act is amended by inserting the following subsection (f):

"It is the sense of the Congress that, in the selection of men for induction for training and service under this Act, greater emphasis, consistent with the needs of the individual services, should be given to younger registrant nonfathers who have not entered regular employment or continued their formal education."

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

Mr. GOODELL. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close in 20 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. Chairman, let me emphasize first of all that there is a problem. I am not going to belabor this, but our present selective service laws are in themselves in many instances creating a problem with our young people who reach the age of 18 or 19 years, and they are not under general circumstances going to be called into the draft until they are 23. That is the average age today. Many of these young people are adrift in our city streets. They are not going to enlist in the services.

We are talking about programs in our Committee on Education and Labor to try to take these youngsters off the city streets when they are 18 or 19 years old. One of the few good ways of taking some of these off the streets at a time when they are adrift is through the Selective Service System.

I am not proposing here by this amendment to require that the selective service officials take registrants at any specific age, 18, 19, 20, or any other time. I am simply offering as the sense of Congress that we feel, that where possible and where consistent with the needs of the individual services, they should take more youngsters at the age of 18½ or 19, as the law permits them to take them. This is something that will and can be done for these young people, taking some of the uncertainty out of their lives during this period. There is a job gap for them now. There is no question that at 18, 19, or 20 there is less disruption in the personal lives of these young men to go into the military service than later; there is less disruption in the fabric of our society, if it is possible, all other things being equal, to take them in the service.

This is an amendment to the policy section of the law. It requires nothing of the Selective Service Board or the President. It simply notifies them that this is a problem from our viewpoint, a problem to which we wish they would give some attention. At the moment the last people to be called under the present regulations are those 18½ and 19 who are nonfathers. This would presumably raise that category up to the

third category, after the delinquents and those who volunteer.

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

Mr. GOODELL. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. GUBSER. I have noticed that in the amendment the gentleman offered there was a slight change made from the version he read during general debate. Apparently the new version takes into consideration the individual requirements of the services and implies, as I interpret its meaning, that this could vary from service to service.

For example, the Air Force may need men who are more mature than the Marine Corps. This would allow the service to consider their own individual needs.

Mr. GOODELL. That is right. At the suggestion, which I appreciate, of several members of the Committee on Armed Services, I added that phrase, "consistent with the needs of the individual services." It is not my intention to disrupt in any way the interests of national defense. But I think in our Committee on Education and Labor we wish to notify the people of the country and the Congress that this is a real problem.

The Selective Service Act could be used to take some of these people off the streets and contribute significantly to a solution of this problem.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN].

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, I should like to supplement what the gentleman from New York has brought out. We on the Committee on Education and Labor have been concerned with the so-called Youth Employment Act. This is an effort to see if in some way we might do something about some 700,000 young people who are presently out of jobs and out of work. Many of them are young men. About half of that number are presumably young women, who would not be primarily concerned either with the Selective Service Act or the Youth Employment Act.

It was our feeling that one of the problems in connection with the 18- and 19-year-old group is that they have not found a regular niche for themselves. The jobs available to them are relatively few in number, partly because they do not have sufficient training of a specialized nature. It was felt that one of the reasons why we have juvenile delinquency problems in some of our cities is that these unemployed youths find ways to keep busy which are not desirable.

It is for this reason that I rise in support of the suggestion that we encourage—but we in no sense direct—that we encourage the utilization of this younger age group as participants in the draft.

Mention was made earlier, during the discussion with respect to the length of the program, that there should be no disruption of planning on the part of the Military Establishment.

I would like to point out this resolution gives the feeling of Congress only. It

would in no way disrupt the planning of the individual services. The language reads that it should be consistent with the needs of those services. I do think, if we insert such language, that it suggests there are constructive ways in which these young people may be utilized in our Military Establishment at an earlier age than they are now actually called upon.

When General Hershey was questioned on this, the general said, and unfortunately he was not questioned closely enough, that one of the reasons for the older draft age, and I quote from page 88 of the hearings:

The more he knows when he comes to training, the more meaningful becomes the training and the more you are integrating training into a personality that has some other capability.

Of course, from the point of view of the military, I can see how a well-educated man, who is perhaps a college graduate, is of more value than one who has not received that training. However, that does not mean as a matter of public policy, that there is not a place in the Military Establishment for more young people. For that reason I rise in support of the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. QUIE].

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this amendment to a bill which on the surface extends the draft 4 years from the age of 18½ to 26 years of age. However, at the present time the draft really is between 23 and 26 years of age. If anybody proposed that we should have a draft law in this country between the ages of 23 and 26, you would wonder what was wrong with them. But really that is what we have right now. We are drafting men between 23 and 26 with jobs and leaving younger men who do not have jobs. It says on page 8 of the report:

Should the President determine that the best interest of the country would be served by reducing the national average age of induction, which is now 23, he could, under this provision of law, insert after the second category a new category providing that, following the call of delinquents and volunteers, persons of any particular age group could be called.

We by this amendment say it is the sense of the Congress that he should begin calling younger men. The President sent up to us the Youth Employment Act. He is concerned because young men of an age younger than 23 do not have employment. Some of them need a change of environment so he proposes to send them to forest camps in order to develop at that place better work habits and better study habits and develop some discipline. But we have a going program of the military now which is different from the thirties. In the thirties, we had hardly any military system. Now we have one that is virtually at a wartime level and I think it would be well to permit young men and to induce young men who have not seen fit to enlist at this early age to come into the military.

This is the time they are unsettled, not knowing what they ought to do with

their lives, what kind of vocational schooling they ought to adopt. Many of them do not choose to enlist. Also they find that employers are reluctant to hire or train these young men. We are talking about training. Let us not forget that the employers of this country are doing the biggest job of training, and they are reluctant today to hire those young men who have not performed their military service.

So I think this is an opportunity for us to express a desire to help these young men who because of lack of motivation, lack of help, be it in their homes, their schools, their communities, are unemployed, creating a problem for us through delinquency or getting in some other trouble. If we would draft them under a policy which is clear and understood by all we could be helping them.

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

Mr. QUIE. I yield.

Mr. GOODELL. The gentleman understands we are not saying to the selective service boards: "You have to draft young people."

Mr. QUIE. That is right.

Mr. GOODELL. We are just saying we feel this is a problem which the military should take into consideration since they have the establishment there to utilize these young people at a time when they are adrift in our society. If military requirements changed they do not have to do anything to take these 18½- and 19-year-olds.

Mr. QUIE. That is right. We recognize that the military has need for more highly educated people, who are older; but they can certainly utilize more of the young men rather than take only those aged 23 and above, as they do now.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Georgia, chairman of the committee.

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

Mr. VINSON. I yield.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding, and I would like to ask him this question: Would not the implementation of this amendment make even more severe the disparity between the young man who cannot go to school and the one who can?

Mr. VINSON. The gentleman is absolutely correct; and for that very reason in the various sections of the Draft Act we have refused to put the arm of protection around any group. That is exactly what would happen by this proposed amendment to the policy section, and I will tell you what will happen. More directives and authority will come out of Washington if this amendment is adopted, than do today.

This is the policy section. Nowhere in the policy section is there one line written today about who will be drafted and who will not be drafted. Here is what is said in this section:

It is the sense of the Congress that in the selection of men for induction for training and service under this act greater emphasis shall be given to the selection of the younger registrants, nonfathers, who have not entered regular employment or continued their formal education.

Here is what the gentleman is trying to do by his amendment; he is trying to say that you must not pass a uniform method of drafting, in which we deal with all alike. Congress is very deeply concerned about this. Nowhere in the policy section have we tried to indicate who will be drafted; we want to treat them all fairly and alike.

Mr. Chairman, I think this Committee and this House has made a magnificent record here in the matter of amendments that come to us every 4 years. Similar amendments have been offered, but none adopted, since 1951. They have all gone down to defeat. The House in its wisdom has rejected them. I hope the House in its wisdom rejects this one today. Then we will go before the country with a draft law that has not been changed, a draft law that the country knows, and the country understands.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. GOODELL].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. GOODELL) there were—ayes 59, noes 134.

So the amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. SIKES, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 2438) to extend the induction provisions of the Universal Military Training and Service Act, and for other purposes, pursuant to House Resolution 287, he reported the bill back to the House.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

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

The SPEAKER. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. GROSS. I am, Mr. Speaker, in its present form.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. Gross moves to recommit the bill, H.R. 2438, to the House Committee on the Armed Services with instructions to report the bill forthwith with the following instructions: "On page 1, line 6, strike 1967 and insert 1965, and in sections 2, 3, 4, and 5 of the bill strike 1967 wherever it appears and insert in lieu thereof 1965."

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the motion to recommit.

The previous question was ordered.

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

The question was taken, and the Speaker announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will count. [After counting] 233 Members are present, a quorum.

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 388, nays 3, not voting 43, as follows:

[No. 8]
YEAS—388

Abbitt	Denton	Hutchinson	O'Konski	Roush	Teague, Calif.
Abernethy	Derounian	Ichord	Olsen, Mont.	Royal	Thomas
Adair	Devine	Jarman	Olsen, Minn.	Rumsfeld	Thompson, La.
Addabbo	Dole	Jennings	O'Neill	Ryan, Mich.	Thompson, N.J.
Albert	Donohue	Jensen	Osmers	Ryan, N.Y.	Thompson, Tex.
Alger	Dorn	Johansen	Ostertag	St Germain	Thomson, Wis.
Anderson	Dowdy	Johnson, Calif.	Passman	St. Onge	Thorberry
Andrews	Downing	Jonas	Patman	Saylor	Toll
Arends	Doyle	Jones, Ala.	Pelly	Schadeberg	Tollefson
Ashbrook	Dulski	Jones, Mo.	Perkins	Schenck	Trimble
Ashmore	Duncan	Karsten	Philbin	Schneebell	Tuck
Aspinall	Dwyer	Karth	Pike	Schweiker	Tuten
Auchincloss	Edmondson	Kastenmeier	Plilcher	Schwengel	Udall
Avery	Edwards	Keith	Pillion	Scott	Ulman
Ayres	Elliott	Kelly	Reeuss	Secret	Utt
Baker	Everett	Kilburn	Rhodes, Pa.	Selden	Van Deerlin
Baldwin	Evins	Kilgore	Reifel	Senner	Vanik
Baring	Fallon	King, Calif.	Rich	Shelley	Van Felt
Barrett	Farbstein	King, N.Y.	Riehlman	Sheppard	Vinson
Barry	Fascell	Kirwan	Rivers, S.C.	Short	Waggoner
Bass	Feighan	Kluczynski	Robison	Shriver	Wallhauser
Bates	Findley	Knox	Rodino	Sibal	Watts
Battin	Finnegan	Kornegay	Rogers, Colo.	Sickles	Weaver
Becker	Fino	Kunkel	Rogers, Fla.	Sikes	Weltner
Beckworth	Fisher	Kyl	Rogers, Tex.	Rich	Westland
Beermann	Flood	Laird	Roosevelt	Rivers, Alaska	Smith, Calif.
Bell	Flynt	Landrum	Rosenthal	Smith, Iowa	Smith, Ind.
Bennett, Fla.	Ford	Langen	Rostenkowski	Smith, Wisc.	Widnall
Bennett, Mich.	Foreman	Lankford	Roudebush	Snyder	Williams
Berry	Forrester	Latta	Abele	Roberts, Ala.	Willis
Blatnik	Fountain	Leggett		Robison	Staebler
Boggs	Fraser	Lennon		Rodino	Stafford
Boland	Frelinghuysen	Lesinski		Rogers, Colo.	Staggers
Bolling	Friedel	Libonati		Rogers, Fla.	Steed
Bolton,	Fulton, Pa.	Lindsay		Roosevelt	Stephens
Frances P.	Fuqua	Lipscomb		Rosenthal	Stinson
Bolton,	Gallagher	Lloyd		Rostenkowski	Wyder
Oliver P.	Garmatz	Long, La.		Roudebush	Stratton
Bonner	Gary	Long, Md.			Young
Bow	Gathings	McClory			Younger
Brademas	Gavin	McCulloch			
Bray	Giaimo	McDade			
Brock	Gibbons	McDowell			
Brooks	Gilbert	McFall			
Broomfield	Gonzalez	McIntire			
Brotzman	Goodell	McLoskey			
Brown, Ohio	Goodling	McMillan			
Broyhill, N.C.	Grabowski	MacGregor			
Broyhill, Va.	Grant	Mahon			
Bruce	Gray	Mailliard			
Buckley	Green, Oreg.	Marsh			
Burke	Green, Pa.	Martin, Calif.			
Burleson	Grover	Martin, Mass.			
Burton	Gubser	Martin, Nebr.			
Byrne, Pa.	Hagan, Ga.	Mathias			
Byrnes, Wis.	Hagen, Calif.	Matsunaga			
Cahill	Haley	May			
Cameron	Hall	Meader			
Cannon	Halleck	Miller, Calif.			
Carey	Halpern	Milliken			
Casey	Hanna	Mills			
Cederberg	Hansen	Minish			
Celler	Harding	Minshall			
Chamberlain	Hardy	Monagan			
Chelf	Harris	Montoya			
Chenoweth	Harrison	Moore			
Clancy	Harsha	Moorhead			
Clark	Harvey, Ind.	Morgan			
Cleveland	Harvey, Mich.	Morris			
Cohelan	Hawkins	Morse			
Collier	Hays	Morton			
Colmer	Hebert	Mosher			
Conte	Hechler	Mosk			
Cooley	Hempfill	Multer			
Corbett	Henderson	Murphy, Ill.			
Corman	Herlong	Murphy, N.Y.			
Cramer	Hoeven	Murray			
Cunningham	Hoffman	Natcher			
Curtin	Hollifield	Nedzi			
Dague	Holland	Neisen			
Daniels	Horan	Nix			
Davis, Ga.	Horton	Norblad			
Dawson	Hosmer	Nygaard			
Delaney	Huddleston	O'Brien, N.Y.			
Dent	Hull	O'Hara, Ill.			
		O'Hara, Mich.			

So the bill was passed.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Mr. Keogh with Mrs. Reid of Illinois.
Mr. Walter with Mr. Rhodes of Arizona.
Mr. Rains with Mr. Gurney.
Mr. Morrison with Mr. Miller of New York.
Mr. Fogarty with Mr. Belcher.
Mr. Patten with Mr. Ellsworth.
Mr. Zablocki with Mrs. St. George.
Mr. Daddario with Mr. Derwinski.
Mr. Diggs with Mr. Glenn.
Mr. Powell with Mr. Curtis.
Mr. Joelson with Mr. Tupper.
Mrs. Sullivan with Mr. Bromwell.
Mr. Dingell with Mr. Griffin.
Mr. O'Brien of Illinois with Mr. Clausen.
Mr. Davis of Tennessee with Mr. Watson.
Mr. Macdonald with Mr. Fulton of Tennessee.

Mr. Johnson of Wisconsin with Mr. Wright.
Mrs. Griffiths with Mr. Ashley.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members

may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks on the bill just passed.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

DRAFT LAW EXTENSION

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KASTENMEIER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. KASTENMEIER. Mr. Speaker, I voted today to extend the draft for an additional 4 years. I did so with a heavy heart. I do not know whether we really need the draft in order to meet our manpower defense needs, and I do not believe that anyone in this Congress knows. I had asked the Armed Services Committee to consider a 2-year extension of the draft and a study to determine whether alternative methods of meeting our military manpower needs could be devised—methods that would be less costly, in terms of taxpayers' dollars and interrupted lives, and more equitable. My suggestion was not heeded by the committee.

This Committee of the Whole House has just rejected my Wisconsin colleague's proposal to limit the extension to 2 years. I voted for that amendment. We were left with the simple choice of voting for or against a 4-year extension. In 1959, faced with the same choice, I voted against the 4-year extension. Today, with great reluctance, I voted for it.

The fight that was made on the floor today for a 2-year extension was a good one, as the considerable support for that proposal showed. It was not passed today, but the fight is not over. We in America cannot settle for a permanent system of compulsory conscription. Sooner or later an alternative system must be found. I will do whatever I can to see that the present method of conscription is questioned and challenged constantly, so that a future Congress can find, in its wisdom, that the draft can eventually be terminated.

INDONESIA

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. JARMAN. Mr. Speaker, I read with great interest an article in the March 3 edition of the Washington Post by Chalmers Roberts which described the deep economic troubles of Indonesia. Mr. Roberts had recently spent several days researching the islands of Indonesia, and indicated in some detail the powerful financial and economic problems he found there.

It is with this background that I read, with no little surprise, in the Post on March 6 that President Sukarno has given approval to a contract for the purchase by Indonesia of three luxury American jet aircraft. They will be Convair 990's purchased from General Dynamics Corp., and must be paid for in hard cash, half of which is due by January 1, 1964.

I am not quibbling in the least with the purchase of American equipment—that is to be commended—but it does strike me as downright peculiar that the acquisition of these planes can be justified in the light of Mr. Roberts' findings. The purchase of jet aircraft has proved to be quite a financial burden for even our most prosperous U.S. carriers and an investment which does not begin to pay for itself in the initial years of use.

Obviously, Indonesia expects these new jets to pay off. However, the question arises as to how they can pay for themselves without being put into service over lucrative transatlantic routes. Over routes where our two U.S. international flag carriers must compete with each other, as well as 25 other foreign carriers. These luxury jets are supposed to add to the prestige of Indonesia and to its airline and give it a place of prominence in the field of international aviation. I am wondering whether this is a luxury that either they or we can afford.

Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD the following articles which appeared in the Washington Post of March 3 and March 6, 1963:

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, Mar. 6, 1963]

INDONESIA SIGNS FOR THREE JETLINERS

DJAKARTA, March 6.—Beset by financial woes, Indonesia has nevertheless just closed a \$20 million deal for three luxury American jetliners for its deficit-ridden airline.

The contract for the Convair 990's has prompted critical economic experts to speak of extravagance in the name of national pride. They question the seriousness of the government's recovery program.

President Sukarno gave final approval to the jet contract last week at a meeting with a representative of General Dynamics Corp. The agreement calls for Indonesia to pay the full amount in hard currency, half of it by January 1, 1964.

This week Foreign Minister Subandrio is expected to sign a \$17 million aid agreement aimed at providing emergency first aid for the nation's crippled economy.

Some critics say that the two deals are basically in conflict and raise a question of how determined the government may be in pursuing its announced plan to fight inflation, get industry rolling, and provide adequate food and clothing for 100 million people.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, Mar. 3, 1963]

RICH INDONESIA IN DEEP TROUBLE ECONOMICALLY

(By Chalmers M. Roberts)

DJAKARTA.—Indonesia is in economic trouble so deep that something probably is going to happen, and happen sooner rather than later.

This reporter has spent 10 days in Indonesia, chiefly in Java, where 65 million of the nation's estimated 100 million people live. Few lands are more lush or richer in natural resources. But Indonesia is more frustrating

than most nations when it comes to trying to estimate where it is headed.

In talks with Indonesians, high and low, and with foreign observers of several nationalities, it is evident that economic conditions have greatly deteriorated in the past 6 months. Rice, the basic staple, is in short supply and prices have been rising erratically.

Copra, the coconut product, lies rotting or is burned because of price problems and disorganized transportation. Communists are alleged to be behind the burning of some sugarcane in the fields. People lack sugar and oils, and margarine has about disappeared. Indonesia is the world's No. 1 importer of rice, yet it is the world's fourth largest producer.

AN ELASTIC CURRENCY

The exchange rate of the Indonesian currency, the rupiah, reflects these economic troubles. The official rate is 45 to \$1, the figure at which the United States must spend the rupiah it receives in exchange for the food it sends her under Public Law 480. At the Hotel Indonesia here in Djakarta, the nation's one first-rate hostelry, there is a 500 to \$1 rate for food but room bills for foreigners must be paid in dollars or other hard currencies. The black market rupiah rate both here and in Singapore, however, has advanced in the past 6 months from 600 to \$1 to about 1,300 to \$1.

The result is too much money in circulation, too few goods for the rank and file to buy, inflated prices of rice in the free market (which is used to supplement the absolutely vital rice allowances supplied to Government and many other employees) and a vast amount of smuggling. It has been learned, for example, that half the Indonesian imports into nearby British Singapore are smuggled there from Sumatra or the islands off its coast.

Indonesia is still 80 percent agricultural and rural, only 20 percent industrialized, and few of the industries employ even 1,000 people. Yet industry as a whole is estimated to be running at only around 20 percent of capacity. This means less goods badly needed at home and less for exports to earn dollars to pay for badly needed imports. Smuggling, too, cuts deeply into foreign exchange earnings.

AID HAS BEEN MASSIVE

American aid to Indonesia since independence in 1949 has totaled around \$665 million, of which about 45 percent has been in farm surplus items. Aid from all free world nations (of which Japanese reparations, credits and grants together slightly top the American total) has amounted to more than \$1.5 billion, compared to an estimated \$665 million in economic aid from the Communist bloc. This excludes the massive Soviet military aid.

The U.S.-built cement plant, Indonesia's biggest, is one of the few places now running at 100 percent capacity, and the United States is building a urea fertilizer plant. Each was financed by an Export-Import Bank loan and each will provide about one-third of the national need for its output. The World Bank won't do business here, so poor is Indonesia's credit rating and so shaky its economic structure.

With such a dismal picture so evident, one would expect an explosion of some sort. But Indonesians seem to have a low boiling point; the farmer somehow manages to eat and the city worker frequently resorts to graft and stealing.

A WEST IRIAN SEQUEL

The optimists here, both Indonesian and foreign, argue that these serious economic conditions are about to be faced. They say that the military rebellion against the Government has now been liquidated and the issue of West Irian (West New Guinea) will be finally solved May 1 when that territory comes under Indonesian rule by way of the

United Nations from the Dutch. Hence now is the time to tackle the economic problems.

Indonesian life, of course, is dominated by President Sukarno, as it has been since independence. He recently said that the time had come to concentrate on the economic problem and the Cabinet is reported to have formulated "a basic strategic economic principle for surmounting present economic difficulties."

Critics contend that Indonesia's economic problems are self-made, though they concede that recent floods have added to the woe. Last summer's massive buildup (for a country such as this) for the projected attack on West Irian resulted in commandeering much of the transportation equipment, including the shipping, so vital in a nation of some 3,000 islands stretched across an area the width of the continental United States.

Incidentally, senior military officials have told me that some 30,000 men were within 2 or 3 days of D-day when the Dutch-Indonesian agreement was signed.

Now that some shipping, at least, is coming back to its normal commercial uses, there is an obvious need for a revaluation of the rupiah and a currency stabilization scheme on an international basis. The hopeful think this will happen; the pessimists do not think that Sukarno, whom they rate as an economic illiterate however high they regard his political prowess, will buckle down to the job and enforce the tough decisions, if, indeed, he makes them.

POSSIBLE RED MAJORITY

Such an economic situation, of course, is ready-made for the Communists. The PKI, the Communist Party of Indonesia, and its related labor organization, known as SOBSI, are very powerful. The party now claims 3.5 million members, up from an earlier 2 million claim.

No one knows how strong they really are, but one measure is the fact that a high official remarked to me that if elections were held today, the PKI would win an absolute majority. Some outside observers tend to think he could be right and not merely justifying the lack of elections. At any rate, Indonesia is still under martial law, though it is supposed to be lifted May 1.

Ten political parties are legal, but they operate in something of a vacuum since no election is in sight. Sukarno has talked vaguely of an election in 1963; other officials say perhaps in 1964, but the franker ones concede that date is illusory, too.

As long as Sukarno is alive—he is now 61—he probably will continue to be the boss. Officials here tend to throw up their hands when you ask what will happen if he disappears, but the general view is that the military would take over with a civilian figurehead.

Sukarno has built his "guided democracy" on what we might call the principle of consensus; that is, of getting all rival forces to agree. Since he can enforce a high degree of cooperation, Sukarno has made the Communists keep within bounds.

Of late, Sukarno has been talking a good deal about something he calls NASAKOM, an alphabet soup word meaning nationalism, religion, and communism. The third element used to be socialism; the change seems to reflect the growing power of the PKI. Sukarno's proclaimed aim is to run Indonesia on this three-legged stool principle.

The Communists' aim is to increase the strength of their leg and in due course to upset the stool in their direction. Currently, they are pressing for posts in Sukarno's inner cabinet, from which so far they have been excluded though they hold posts in the so-called outer cabinet.

The Communist Party of Indonesia is said to want the Finance and Information Ministries, and the reason is obvious enough; to make more economic troubles and to con-

trol the already left-tinted public utterances of the Government and the press.

The Communist Party of Indonesia, incidentally, is officially oriented toward Peiping in its ideological dispute with Moscow, but there appears to be no evidence of a split below the Politburo level. The rank and file party members are concentrating on exploiting the economic misery. Nor is there any sign that Peiping is attempting to steer the Communist Party of Indonesia into military opposition to the Sukarno regime, a move which, now at least, probably would be as disastrous for the party as was the Stalin-ordered revolution here in the early post-World War II years.

The press in Indonesia is a disgrace by any democratic standard. News of the outside world is at a minimum and often is quite slanted. Newsprint is imported and publishers are under the Government's heel. In this capital of Djakarta, with a population estimated at 3 million, the 15 papers have a combined circulation of 360,000, of which the five Communist or far left papers have about half the total.

The radio is state-owned. Television, which Indonesia can ill afford but which is a status symbol, has begun in Djakarta, where there are an estimated 10,000 imported TV sets.

This is not a land for dissent by any democratic standard. Dissent runs afoul of the Sukarno philosophy of government, which is based on the ancient village system of consensus and which therefore has wide public appeal.

Marxist terminology abounds. When Sukarno received an honorary degree February 2 at the University of Indonesia here, he was praised for having denounced "individualism, liberalism, capitalism, imperialism, feudalism, fascism as sources of exploitation of man by man." Communism was missing from the list. Any enemy of Indonesia will quickly be branded as an imperialist or neocolonialist or capitalist.

Some of this is explicable for reasons other than the power of the nation's Communist Party. As able American Ambassador Howard P. Jones, a man with 7 years' experience here, recently put it in a speech: "To the majority of Indonesians—in fact to most of the newly emerging peoples of the African and Asian world—the word 'capitalism' brings forth an immediate and vivid picture of foreign control of their economy and not infrequently, of foreign exploitation and oppression."

The Dutch, who exploited the wealth of the Indies during 300 years of rule, are still unpopular although some Indonesians want enough of them to come back to help revitalize the largely Dutch-built farm and factory equipment. The Japanese, who occupied the country from 1942 to 1945, are looked upon as liberators from the Dutch.

Those who worry publicly about communism in Indonesia are accused of having a Communist phobia. The more democratic leaders will tell you, as foreign observers also do, that the PKI's power is balanced by the military, which is rated as highly anti-Communist.

Large numbers of army, navy and air force officers have been to the United States and the resulting friendship, from the sample I have had, is impressive. The same can be said for the several thousand students and technicians who have been sent to the United States.

Indonesians talk a lot about their poorness despite their great wealth of little-tapped resources, which include the biggest oil source in Asia, much rubber, copra, tin and other items. In moments of frankness, they will say they have their hands out to both East and West—and that they expect to have their wants met.

The people, of course, are the greatest resource. They are not as aggressive as the Japanese or as hard working as the many

Chinese among them, on whom they look with suspicion and often with envy despite the official Indonesian friendship with Red China. Yet Indonesians are industrious; they must be to survive, especially in Java, the most crowded major area in the world after Belgium.

They are not naturally very adept mechanically, but they are trying, or at least the upper echelon is trying, to propel the nation into the 20th century industrial revolution. Sukarno has in motion, at least, a massive education program with three shifts in the schools. But the lacks are everywhere—trained teachers, buildings, books, paper. And it costs the university student far more to board than to study.

Indonesia's problem today quite obviously is to get its economic house in order. Perhaps the optimists are right and the necessary moves will now be made. But the pessimists are correct in demanding to see the evidence.

One would be more of an optimist, despite the nation's obvious shortcomings and the massive power of the Communists, if it were not for the lurking suspicion that Sukarno would prefer another foreign policy adventure. The row with Malaya over the British colonial possessions along the northern fringes of Borneo is the subject for another article.

Then, too, the Portuguese hold half of the island of Timor, an anachronism which Indonesians hint they will get around to in due course. To many, Sukarno is a permanent revolutionary who needs such foreign issues to keep his momentum.

In short, this is an attractive yet often baffling nation where many are seeking real progress but where the machinery of government socialism is clearly inadequate to the need. Indonesia's future is questionable, yet it is full of vital people who are trying to shed the colonial past with all its inhibitions in order to come to grips with the future.

CENTENNIAL ANNIVERSARY OF BATTLE OF GETTYSBURG

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Speaker, this year Americans everywhere will observe the centennial of the Battle of Gettysburg and the centennial of Lincoln's Gettysburg Address, two of the most important events in our Nation's history.

Congressman WALTER and I are offering bills today that would authorize the President to appoint a commission of 10 persons to cooperate with the commission appointed by Governor Scranton of Pennsylvania to plan and carry out the ceremonies relating to those events. It also would authorize the Secretaries of the Army, Navy, and Air Force to provide for the participation of the armed services in the observances.

The State of Pennsylvania has already allocated \$105,000 for use by the State commission and this bill authorizes up to \$150,000 for Federal participation.

Pennsylvania's two Senators, CLARK and Scott, are introducing identical measures in the Senate today.

Although the center of activity for these observances is in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, the Battle of Gettysburg and Lincoln's Address at the

battlefield are integral parts of American history. I am hopeful that the Congress will recognize the great national interest in these events and act favorably on these bills.

Mr. Speaker, the Congress in the past has recognized the two events as part of our American history and helped provide funds to implement appropriate commemorations.

Under unanimous consent I insert as part of my remarks, prior actions by the Congress as they apply to the two events:

The following bills and/or legislative enactments relate to the 75th anniversary celebration of the Battle of Gettysburg (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, 75th Cong., 3d sess., Jan. 3, to June 16, 1938):

1. Public Law 518 (H.R. 9784) authorized an appropriation to aid in defraying the expenses of the observance of the 75th anniversary of the Battle of Gettysburg, at Gettysburg, Pa., from June 29 to July 6, 1938.

2. Public Law 501 (H. Rept. 8039) authorized the attendance of the Marine Band at the observance of the 75th anniversary of the Battle of Gettysburg at Gettysburg, Adams County, Pa., on July 1, 2, and 3, 1938.

3. Public Resolution 103 (H.J. Res. 693) appropriated aid in defraying expenses to the observance of the 75th anniversary of the Battle of Gettysburg.

4. H.R. 9265 authorized an appropriation to aid in defraying the expenses of the observance of the 75th anniversary of the Battle of Gettysburg.

Fiftieth anniversary of the Battle of Gettysburg (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, 62d Cong., 3d sess., Feb. 27, to March 4, 1913; 63d Cong., 1st and 2d sess., Apr. 7 1913, to Oct. 24, 1914):

1. Public Resolution 4 (H.J. Res. 103) appropriated \$4,000 to defray traveling expenses of soldiers of the Civil War, residing in the District of Columbia, from Washington, D.C., to Gettysburg, Pa., and return.

2. House Resolution 179 accepted the invitation and appointed a committee from the House to attend the reunion celebration at Gettysburg, Pa., July 1, 2, 3, and 4, 1913 (approved June 20, 1913).

3. Senate Resolution 115 accepted the invitation to attend the reunion celebration at Gettysburg, Pa., July 1, 2, 3, and 4, 1913 and provided for a committee of eight to attend on behalf of the Senate (approved June 21, 1913).

4. S. 570 (H.R. 1742) provided for the erection of a memorial amphitheater in the Gettysburg National Cemetery, Pa.

5. S. 571 authorized the construction of a Lincoln Memorial Highway from the White House, Washington, D.C., to the battlefield in Gettysburg, Pa.

6. S. 8031 provided for the presentation of medals to all surviving soldiers of the Battle of Gettysburg.

7. S. 1751 provided for the presentation of medals to all surviving soldiers of the Battle of Gettysburg.

8. H.R. 5395 appropriated \$2,500 for transportation of soldiers of the Civil War to the celebration of the Gettysburg anniversary.

9. H.R. 5848 provided for the erection of a monument on the battlefield of Gettysburg to commemorate services of the U.S. Signal Corps during the War of the Rebellion.

10. H.R. 5895 appropriated \$3,500 for the transportation of soldiers of the Civil War to the celebration of the Gettysburg anniversary.

11. H.R. 11112 created the Gettysburg Peace Memorial Commission, charged with the duty of locating the memorial on the Gettysburg battlefield to commemorate the 50th anniversary of that battle, July 1, 2, 3, and 4, 1913.

NEED TO SEPARATE KERR-MILLS FROM WELFARE PROGRAMS

Mr. BAKER. 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 Tennessee?

There was no objection.

Mr. BAKER. Mr. Speaker, on March 6, 1963, I introduced a bill—H.R. 4511—to amend the Social Security Act so as to allow the States to administer separately the medical assistance for the aged program under the recent Kerr-Mills law if they so elect. For some time I have had the feeling that the statutory prohibition preventing the program from operating on its own has impeded its success. Earlier in the session I prepared the above bill which I then introduced March 6.

The Kerr-Mills law—also known as medical assistance for the aged—was originally enacted into the Social Security Act in 1960 under the cosponsorship of former Senator Kerr, of the Finance Committee, and Representative MILLS, chairman of the Ways and Means Committee. The Kerr-Mills law provided for a program of medical aid for the aged with Federal matching funds, which could be adopted by any State. Moreover, it provided that where a State had both the old age assistance program—OAA—under earlier legislation and the Kerr-Mills program for medical assistance for the aged—MAA, both programs had to be administered, or at least supervised, by a single State agency. In practical terms, this has meant that in those States which have adopted both OAA and MAA, the programs are being administered by the respective State's department of welfare—or a similar agency.

This has resulted in an extremely undesirable and unintended situation. A State's department of welfare is an agency which, as the name denotes, handles the welfare programs—most of which are Federal-State participating or matching-of-funds programs. Clearly, the MAA program under the Kerr-Mills law is not and was never intended to be a welfare program. While the OAA program, aid to dependent children and the like are programs to aid the indigent, the MAA program is intended to aid those—who although they are not indigent—are medically-in-need due to sudden or catastrophic illness. These individuals are able to meet their day-to-day living expenses, and under no stretch of the imagination can they categorically be classified as indigents.

With MAA being administered by the same State agency that handles the true welfare programs, it has in the eyes of the public taken on the features of a welfare program. This has been bad in that it is not a welfare program. People who avail themselves of its benefits should not be made to feel that they are indigents. In other words, it has been psychologically damaging to have it under a welfare agency.

MAA has had to compete with other programs handled by the agency both as

to money and personnel. Because it is not truly a welfare program, obviously it has not fared too well in competition for the necessary personnel and money with the regular welfare programs within a State department of welfare.

Although I recognize that a separate State agency can administer the MAA program under current law if it is supervised by the State department of welfare, I feel that a change is needed. In those too few States where the department of health administers the MAA program, the department of welfare maintains such control as to seriously weaken any autonomy that could and should exist. This is not the fault of any State so involved, as the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare prefers to work with a single State agency in all Federal-State programs of this sort. Due to the complications and uncertainty involved in establishing a MAA program, almost all States enact simple enabling legislation. The State department of welfare then draws up a contract for Federal participation. If the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare does not see fit to approve the contract, then there can be no program. In the case of MAA, I have been led to understand that unless a high degree of control is vested in the department of welfare where a second State agency is brought into the picture, HEW approval will not be forthcoming.

This means that the details of the MAA program are left to the principal State agency, which in all cases is the department of welfare. It is the position of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare that in all cases where the State enacting legislation does not provide specific provisions, the State department of welfare must set the standards. This means that the department of welfare would determine eligibility, the items of care to be provided, the amount of care—that is, the days of care—and the amount of payment to those eligible. Therefore, where the department of health is involved it is left to provide the services. The best description of the department of health in these situations is that it merely acts as a vehicle of the department of welfare. Thus, although a second agency can participate under present law, it is apparent that such participation is limited.

Other than the fact that MAA is not an indigent program there are other reasons for distinguishing it from OAA and other welfare programs. Even the method of payment in the case of MAA is different. The MAA program is handled entirely by vendor payments—direct payments to the provider of the particular service being compensated for. On the other hand, the OAA program and kindred welfare programs provide for direct payments to the recipients of the aid in addition to vendor payments. Moreover, MAA is under a separate matching of funds arrangement with the Federal Government—both the matching formula and the percentages are different from the other aid programs.

Under title XVI of the Social Security Act, MAA, OAA, aid to the blind, and aid to the disabled may be combined into

a single program under a single State plan. Some might wish to argue that allowing for the separation of MAA in such cases will disrupt the unity or solidarity of the program. However, in anticipation of such, let me state that under that title the aid for the blind program can be separately administered if certain conditions exist; namely, if aid for the blind was separate on the date of the passage of title XVI—January 1, 1962—and on the date the State submits such combined plan to HEW for approval.

Therefore, I cannot possibly see how the separation of MAA could weaken the purposes of title XVI when an exception already exists.

The MAA program under the Kerr-Mills law has the potential to become a program sufficient to meet the medical needs of those not able to provide for themselves and those not eligible for the bona fide welfare programs. In order for it to meet with success it needs to be given a fair chance to operate on its merits—or to stand on its own feet, so to speak.

Apart from the enactment of this bill—H.R. 4511—the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare should face up to the task that it has before it; effective and comprehensive implementation of the Kerr-Mills law in accordance with the express intent of the Congress.

The Kerr-Mills law recognizes the problem of adequate medical care for the aged very definitely exists throughout the Nation and that the individual States are best suited and equipped to determine the most effective types of implementation. It recognizes the broad national scope of the problem by direct appropriations from the Federal Treasury to be matched by State and local contributions.

The logical State agency to administer this program is the department of public health because the Kerr-Mills program is a health program, especially designed to meet the health needs and problems of our aged citizens.

Responsibility for the success of the administration of this program should be placed squarely where it belongs; that is upon the departments of public health of the States, counties, and municipalities.

I believe that the various departments of public health throughout the Nation, State and local governments are ready and willing to assume this responsibility and to efficiently and successfully administer the program of meeting the health needs of our aged population.

UNITED STATES HELPS MAKE COMMUNISM WORK BY SPECIAL FUND ASSISTANCE IN POLAND

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, today I wish to call the attention of the House to a farm problem. Not our American farm problem—although we have a "doozie" on our own hands.

I wish to address myself to the farm problem of Communist Poland. And, I think it may be of some considerable interest to this House and to the American taxpayers to know that we are paying to help improve communism's most colossal failure—a failure they even admit.

My colleagues, under the United Nations Special Fund, American taxpayers are contributing to a project designed to teach Communists how to feed their people adequately. That is something they never have been able to do before.

We Americans are paying to help make communism work.

I refer this House to two projects of the Special Fund of the United Nations now being conducted in Red Poland. One allocates more than \$1 million to aid Polish agriculture; the other allows at least \$700,000 to help Polish industry. Forty percent of those grants equals some \$688,000—the amount American taxpayers are coughing up under a deficit budget to help make communism work.

It might be noted here, Mr. Speaker, that Polish Communist Premier Joseph Cyrankiewicz is right next door in Mexico this week talking to Mexican officials with the announced purpose of pressuring them to lay off of Castro.

Let us also note that this Polish agriculture program is not a food-for-peace plan we Americans are subsidizing. Nor is it a plan whereby our surplus agricultural materials are used to benefit needy persons. It is a program for which we get no credit, into which we put our dollars and by which we are helping the Reds learn how to feed their people—with them getting credit for any improvement.

We are helping the Reds make a success in areas where they never have done so under their own steam. We are helping strengthen Red Cuba in agriculture and in aircraft operations, as I have discussed here. We are helping Red Yugoslavia in nuclear research, as I have shown this House.

Under this amazing second foreign aid plan Americans are giving money to the U.N., letting the U.N. spend it anywhere it wants, and abdicating any chance to check on how our money is spent.

Let us consider in more detail the Polish food project:

POLAND—FOOD PRODUCTION PROJECT

Last January the Governing Council of the U.N. Special Fund approved expenditures in Poland of \$1,020,500 for a 4-year project entitled "Research and Extension Services for Food Production, Processing, and Utilization." The project goal involves establishment of a national center of nutritional research, education, and food extension services, and technical advisory services to the food industry.

The Food and Agriculture Organization—FAO—of the United Nations—

remember that farm project in Cuba?—is the executing agency. The discussion of this project in a Special Fund document marked for "restricted" distribution notes that Poland wishes to bring: "special emphasis to bear on questions of nutritional policy as related to communal feeding."

This document says the Polish Government needs help to provide its people a balanced diet, palatable foods at low cost and high-grade proteins and vitamins.

Poland, the U.N. says: "has embarked on a policy of coordination, extension, and upgrading of the research now being done on food production and processing, with a view to solving the most pressing nutritional problems."

No doubt the Reds are feeling some pressure from the spirited Polish people who are getting a little hungry, but more pointedly—resent being levied on in kind. No doubt the Reds would in this case welcome a few capitalistic dollars to help them over this rough, Red spot. They also ask the U.N. to give them money for revision of courses in food technology at the Warsaw College of Agriculture.

The U.N.—without asking the American taxpayers—has agreed to help solve this Communist problem and has provided for a project to include: "Research on major food problems, nutritional surveys, study of institutional feeding, development of extension services directed toward better family feeding and broad education programs in nutrition, and advisory services to the Government on food production, processing, storage, distribution, and consumption."

The U.N. plan for institutes to carry out food research and to train Poles—no question but that they will be Poles selected by the Communist government—to understand nutritional matters. The U.N. plans to improve facilities in a Department of Food Technology at the College of Agriculture at Warsaw and also to give assistance at separate institutes on meat, fish, fats, fruits, and vegetables.

The special fund will provide 14 man-years of experts including a project manager, 9 man-years of fellowships and equipment.

Then, as a final glorious note, the restricted United Nations document observes that once the United Nations has paid to help get this program and these institutes set up the Red Polish Government will be glad to keep on using them after the U.N. has left.

How considerate that is of the Communists, especially even when Napoleon knew that armies travel on their stomachs.

But, solving the Red food crisis is not the only spending concern of the American-butressed United Nations. Let us see what the U.N. is spending on Red Polish industry:

POLAND—TRAINING CENTER FOR INDUSTRY

In a 3-year project administered by the International Labor Organization—ILO—the Special Fund is providing at least \$700,000 for a project entitled "National Center for Training Supervisory Personnel in Industry."

The American share of that grant—40 percent—is \$280,000. I wonder if there are any American cities which have improvement projects needing \$280,000 worth of help?

This industry project started in 1959 is designed, the U.N. says, in a document marked for "limited" distribution: "To develop a center to provide research, consulting services, and specialized training in supervisory techniques, with initial emphasis on preparing personnel to serve as instructors in regional centers."

We are told that an ILO mission to Poland estimated that there were 140,000 Poles in supervisory grades in industry, who could benefit by having specialized training. In addition the ILO estimated that 15,000 Polish engineers require further training.

Gentlemen, let us remember that it was the United Nations who decided this Communist nation's engineers need more training—not the American taxpayers.

The U.N. tells us that: "The Government of Poland is preparing to establish a series of training centers in productivity and supervisory techniques to meet both the country's short range and longer range needs."

We in the United States have heard about some of the long range goals of communism. They involve world domination and a threat to bury the free West.

The assistance which the Polish Government asked for, and which the U.N. special fund is providing, amounts to

making available foreign exchange to pay for the services of international experts, for fellowships and for equipment. It is much more than total contributions to the special funds from this Red satellite.

The international staff consists of four long-term and three short-term experts a year, over the 3 years. The long-term experts are authorities on industrial cost accounting, work study, materials handling, plant transport systems, and inventory accounting.

And, in a burst of generosity, the special fund reminds us that:

The (Communist Polish) Government will assume full financial responsibility for the maintenance and operation of the center after the special fund's grant has expired.

Is not that just grand. The Reds assure us that not only will they listen politely while we tell them how to whip us, but they also will be glad to keep on using against us all the facilities and intellect we help them to obtain.

Mr. Speaker, would it be too much to suggest that at the very least the American taxpayers may want to take a look at how the United Nations spends their money and to insist upon a careful check to see that it goes where they want it to go?

FINANCIAL PROVISIONS

Polish project—Research and food production

It has been estimated that the total special fund allocation will be as follows:

	Total cost (in U.S. dollars)	Phasing of expenditure			
		1st year	2d year	3d year	4th year
Experts	273,000	39,000	87,750	87,750	58,500
Fellowships	45,000	10,000	25,000	10,000	—
Equipment	637,000	200,000	300,000	137,000	—
Miscellaneous	16,000	3,000	5,000	5,000	3,000
Total project cost	971,000	252,000	417,750	239,750	61,500
Executing agency overhead cost	49,500	—	—	—	—
Total special fund allocation	1,020,500	—	—	—	—

FINANCIAL PROVISIONS

Polish project—Center for Industry Training

The Special Fund's contribution of \$700,000 will be allocated, as follows:

	1st year	2d year	3d year	Total
Experts	\$67,000	\$66,500	\$66,500	\$200,000
Fellowships	28,000	36,000	36,000	100,000
Equipment	250,000	150,000	—	400,000
Total	345,000	252,500	102,500	700,000

THE LATE ROBERT LEE STOWE, SR.

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. WHITENER. Mr. Speaker, on Saturday, March 9, 1963, one of North Carolina's most stalwart sons, Robert Lee Stowe, Sr., of Belmont, N.C., passed from the earthly scene. Mr. Stowe would have attained the age of 97 years had he lived until April of this year.

During the long life of this great North Carolinian much of the Nation's history was written. Robert Lee Stowe helped write that history.

More than 60 years ago he brought about the building of the first textile plant in the city of Belmont, N.C. Later he was at the front in the organization of many other great textile manufacturing companies. Because of the leadership that he gave in the early days in Belmont's industrial growth there are now 27 textile plants in his home community.

Mr. Stowe was not content to merely participate in the industrial development of our area. He was one of the

most public-spirited individuals that I have ever been privileged to know. His service upon the board of education of his home community extended over a period of many years. His interest in government was indicated by his service on the Board of County Commissioners of Gaston County for more than 40 years. His record of service as chairman of the governing board of my home county of Gaston for a period of 33 years is, as far as I know, an unparalleled accomplishment in the State of North Carolina.

Mr. Stowe was a very outstanding Christian layman. The Presbyterian Church, or which he was a member, always had his interest, service, and support. The institutions of that church were the recipients of his philanthropy on countless occasions.

In his private life Mr. Stowe was equally outstanding. The three children born of his marriage to the former Mrs. Nellie Lee Rhyne and their personal accomplishments bear testimony to the quality of leadership which their distinguished father gave in the home. I know of no more outstanding family anywhere.

The passing of Robert Lee Stowe leaves me with a feeling of great personal loss because of the opportunities that I had to know and appreciate his wonderful attributes of character. I have said on many occasions that one of the great privileges that I have had in life was to have had the friendship of this outstanding man. His interest in my activities of a political and personal nature from the time that I returned to my home county as a young man to commence the practice of law was most helpful to me. I shall always remember his many acts of kindness with deep appreciation.

North Carolina and the Nation have lost a great leader in the passing of Robert Lee Stowe.

The newspaper report of the death of Mr. Stowe, which appeared in the Charlotte Observer on March 11, 1963, follows:

R. L. STOWE FUNERAL IS TODAY

R. L. Stowe, 96, pioneer textile industrialist, merchant, and public servant of Belmont, who died Saturday night, will be buried today at 11 a.m. In failing health for several years, he would have been 97 on April 5.

During the more than 60 years of his full productive vigor, Stowe became something of a town and an economy unto himself. A score of Gaston County institutions are the lengthened shadows of this one man.

Twenty-seven textile plants in Belmont, 16 of them cotton-spinning firms, bear his name or organizational imprint. Stowe Mills, Inc., literally made McAdenville. Stowe was the founder and, for more than half a century, the president of the Bank of Belmont.

He was elected to the Gaston County Board of Commissioners in 1914 and became its chairman 8 years later. He was chairman for 33 years.

Stowe was an incorporator of Belmont and served on its town council for many years. For better than half a century he was chairman of Belmont school board.

For 60 years Stowe was treasurer and deacon of Belmont's First Presbyterian Church.

That church's pastor, Dr. Eugene L. Witherspoon, and Dr. W. M. Currie of Greensboro's First Presbyterian Church, will preach graveside services for Stowe at 11 a.m. today at Greenwood Cemetery in Belmont.

He is survived by his wife, the former Nellie Lee Rhyne; a daughter, Mrs. William J. Pharr, of McAdenville; sons, R. L. Stowe, Jr., and Daniel J. Stowe, both of Belmont; a brother, J. W. Stowe, of Belmont; and a sister, Mrs. H. P. Stowe, of Belmont.

THE COTTON TEXTILE INDUSTRY

MR. KORNEGAY. 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 Carolina?

There was no objection.

MR. KORNEGAY. Mr. Speaker, on Thursday, March 7, my distinguished friend and colleague in the North Carolina delegation, the Honorable **BASIL WHITENER**, was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and to include a resolution adopted by the General Assembly of North Carolina memorializing the President and the Congress to take immediate action to eliminate the inequity of the two-price system of cotton cost.

I am sure that all the members of the North Carolina delegation to whom this resolution was sent by our secretary of state, the Honorable Thad Eure, were happy to receive this corroboration of the conviction pervading our State that it is imperative to take action to offset the detrimental effects of this inequitable system in order to preserve the cotton textile industry of this Nation.

As I have said on several occasions on the House floor, through the various news media, and before committees of the Congress, an equalization fee to offset the raw cotton export subsidy is an urgently needed rectification of an inequity which has too long gone uncorrected. Our domestic industry is suffering under an unjust and indefensible penalty placed upon it which violates every concept of reasonable and fair competition.

Recently I had the privilege of presenting testimony to the Cotton Subcommittee of the House Agriculture Committee in behalf of legislation sponsored by the chairman of that great committee, and in the course of my testimony concerning the manifest unfairness of the two-price system, I stated:

This evil is ordinarily associated with the disadvantage which it imposes upon the cotton textile manufacturers in this country, but a careful analysis of the situation reveals that the ill effects of the two-price cotton system permeate the entire cotton business; that is to say, the grower or producer, the ginner, the seller, the manufacturer, the exporter, and finally the consumer himself. Thus the evil is endemic and self-perpetuating.

I repeat these remarks here for the purpose of underscoring my deep con-

cern for the future of the whole cotton culture complex and for the purpose of reiterating—at the risk of being considered repetitious—my unalterable conviction that this Congress should and must take action that will remedy this situation, which in May 1961, was recognized by President Kennedy as comprising one of the items in his seven-point enunciated program for the recovery and preservation of our cotton textile industry in the United States.

In the colloquy which took place on the floor last Thursday, I was heartened and personally gratified that our distinguished Speaker of the House, who is happy to be described as an "urban farmer," took occasion to join with the Members from cotton-producing States in expressing his hope that injustices in the cotton textile industry will be corrected. Our great Speaker described his personal efforts in previous years to have a bill considered which would, to quote his own words, "bring about an equalization so that American industry would receive the same benefits that were given to foreign industry."

So here we have the President of the United States, the Speaker of the House of Representatives, the chairman of the House Agriculture Committee, the chairman of the Cotton Subcommittee, and numerous Members of Congress from cotton-growing and cotton-manufacturing States all in agreement that it is imperative that action be taken to correct what is now an insuperable impediment to a healthy cotton industry. This atmosphere of agreement and mutual conviction should augur well for remedial action and should, it seems, give the "go" sign to such action at the earliest possible time. But still we do not have a measure reported on this vital subject.

I want to commend the chairman of the House Committee on Agriculture for his efforts to put together a measure to report to the House and at the same time to express the hope that there will be no intransigent attitude on the part of any officials in the executive departments to prevent the House from working its will to effect the best possible solution to this entrenched inequity.

And I want to express the further hope that when the committee has concluded its arduous efforts and deliberations, the reported measure will have the most interested attention of my colleagues in the House for the purpose of solving a problem which impedes the welfare of an industry which is the second largest in the United States and which at present is truly a potential giant shackled in the chains forged by the two-price cotton system.

SUMMARY OF NET BUDGET RECEIPT AND EXPENDITURE TRENDS IN CURRENT FISCAL 1963 COMPARED TO FISCAL 1962 AND TO BUDGET ESTIMATES FOR FISCAL 1963

MR. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

THE SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

MR. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, the Committee on Appropriations each month makes a concise summary of current budget results in relation to the previous year and the current budget estimates.

For the information of Members and others who may find it of interest, I ask unanimous consent to include in the RECORD a synoptic tabulation of the trend of net budget receipts and expenditures in the current fiscal year 1963 with comparisons to the official budget estimates for the fiscal year 1963 and to corresponding actual data for the previous fiscal year 1962.

THE SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

BUDGET RECEIPTS

MR. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, budget revenues are officially projected at \$85,500,000,000 for the fiscal year 1963 ending this June 30—an increase of \$4,091,000,000 over fiscal 1962. Through the first 7 months—to January 31, 1963—actual budget revenues exceed the corresponding 7 months of fiscal 1962—to January 31, 1962—by \$3,474,000,000.

BUDGET EXPENDITURES

Budget expenditures are officially projected at \$94,311,000,000 for the fiscal year 1963 ending this June 30—an increase of \$6,524,000,000 over fiscal 1962, of which \$1,901,000,000 is for national defense and \$4,623,000,000 is for other than national defense.

Through the first 7 months—to January 31, 1963—actual budget expenditures exceed the corresponding 7 months of fiscal 1962—to January 31, 1962—by \$4,737,000,000, of which \$2,230,000,000 is for national defense and \$2,507,000,000 is for other than national defense.

AVERAGE MONTHLY EXPENDITURES

Using straight averages in both instances, the table discloses that expenditures during the first 7 months of fiscal 1963 averaged \$7,899,000,000—slightly more than the projected average of \$7,859,000,000 for the full year based on the budget estimate of expenditures—a little less for national defense items but slightly overbalanced for nonnational defense.

BUDGET DEFICIT

The official budget estimate of the deficit for fiscal 1963 is \$8,811,000,000, or \$2,433,000,000 larger than the actual deficit in fiscal 1962.

Through 7 months of fiscal 1963, the actual deficit is \$10,640,000,000, or \$1,263,000,000 larger than the deficit during the corresponding 7 months of fiscal 1962.

The comparisons and the trends will of course vary each month between January and June in relation to the full-year amounts and in relation to each other. The table follows.

Net budget receipts and expenditures (the administrative budget) 7 months of fiscal 1963 versus 7 months of fiscal 1962 and comparison with full year estimates

[In millions of dollars]

	Actual for 7 months			Budget estimates for fiscal 1963 compared to actual for fiscal 1962		
	Fiscal year 1963	Fiscal year 1962	1963 compared to 1962	Budget estimate, 1963	Actual, 1962	Estimate for 1963 over actual 1962
1. Budget receipts (net).....	\$44,658	\$41,184	+\$3,474	\$85,500	\$81,409	+\$4,091
2. Budget expenditures (net):						
(a) National defense (per official budget classification).....	30,501	28,271	+2,230	53,004	51,103	+1,901
(b) Other than national defense.....	24,797	22,290	+2,507	41,307	36,684	+4,623
3. Total expenditures.....	55,298	50,561	+4,737	94,311	87,787	+6,524
4. Net surplus (+) or deficit (-) (line 1 minus line 3).....	-10,640	-9,377	-1,263	-8,811	-6,378	-2,433
5. Average monthly expenditures, actual 7 months of fiscal 1963 versus full year average for 1963 based on budget estimates:						
(a) National defense.....	4,357			4,417		
(b) Other than national defense.....	3,542			3,442		
Total monthly average.....	7,899			7,859		

Sources: Budget for 1964 and monthly Treasury statement for Jan. 31, 1963.

PERMISSION TO INCLUDE STATEMENT EACH MONTH OF THE SESSION

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that we may have leave to insert a similar type of statement each month of the session.

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

There was no objection.

LEGISLATIVE CONFLICT OF INTEREST

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Oregon [Mrs. GREEN] is recognized for 45 minutes.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, for the last 3 weeks while we have had various discussions in this House on abuses of one sort or another, I have remained silent. I have decided I can no longer remain silent. I realize this is not a popular subject to discuss and, yet, it is one which I think needs discussion.

Mr. Speaker, the Congress of the United States has a tremendously important role in the free world's combat against tyranny. In many sectors of the world we are engaged in a wide variety of costly military and economic ventures designed to protect ourselves, our allies and the developing nations of the world against the imperialism of the Soviet Union. Imbedded in the professed ideology of the Soviet Union and the litany of its founding triumvirate, Marx, Engles, and Lenin, is a contempt for parliamentary institutions. In their discussion and in nations where they have seized power, the Communists treat parliamentary institutions as a historical bourgeois apparatus that reflects, they claim, the oppressive forces of capitalistic production. The Communists seek to persuade us and the less sophisticated peoples of the world that parliamentary institutions are a sham, a fraud masking

greed and exploitation, and meaningless in terms of providing economic and social justice for all.

We, on the other hand, are attempting to nurture representative government in lands that have not yet fully developed and to strengthen representative government in industrial lands across which falls the intimidating shadow of Soviet and Chinese power. This, I suggest, is what the ferocious cold war is about. We have appropriated billions—\$98 billion in loans and grants for military and economic foreign aid since World War II—to effect our just cause.

But our larger purpose is to abort tyranny and injustice wherever they are found. And tyranny cannot flourish in any land where there is a healthy, flourishing, responsible parliamentary institution. We are attempting to lead and to demonstrate that, to use a shorthand phrase, "our way of life," is superior. And we are carrying out these vast programs as if situated in a show window along any main street in any village, town, or city of the United States. It is a show window because our proceedings here in the Congress of the United States are, when open, reported, analyzed, and criticized by the constitutionally protected rights of free press, assembly and speech. And this is as it should and must be.

Now the United States cannot, in these circumstances, adopt an attitude of "do as I say, not as I do." And I suggest that our cause is being impaired because of the growing concern both within and without Congress as to how effective our Congress is: with rules of procedure drawn in the horse-and-buggy days, while the demands of the space age press upon us; with more and more questions being asked about possible legislative conflicts-of-interest; with continuing criticisms of unjustified expenditures by Members of Congress traveling overseas and injudicious behavior while there; with the misuse of committee appropriations; with periodic outbursts of disgust about flagrant abuses in the area of nep-

otism. Indeed, I believe that this situation threatens to blunt the effectiveness of our message of democracy and to turn upon the Congress both the derision of the very people we seek to influence and the American people themselves.

To bring about the reform or elimination of "Senator Egoman" or "Congressman Everyone" may be a worthy cause, but not the ultimate goal, because there will be more such ones to take their places. The job for each and every one of us is to so conduct the Nation's business that the confidence of the country in the National Legislature is maintained—yes, and strengthened. And I suggest we must go deeper in order to reach the major underlying problems, and perhaps perform some major surgery instead of applying the "band-aid" to cover and protect the wound that has been inflicted and is so painful at the moment.

None of us is blameless in these developments either because of direct participation in improper activities or by acquiescence. I might say, parenthetically at this point, that some of this criticism about particular Members' performance has been unfair, and, I suspect, is generated not by concern for legislative propriety but rather for other less defensible reasons.

Nevertheless, I believe it is high time that Democrats and Republicans alike here in this Congress clean our own house lest the erosion of public confidence become a real threat to the democratic process and our own people wonder if their Government condones greed and exploitation. How can we ask for greater public interest, larger voter turnout, a more informed citizenry when the image becomes so blurred—and too often the honest, conscientious citizen reacts with "a plague on both your houses." I do not believe the real problem lies with any one Member of Congress or with any one committee. I do not believe the whole problem is resolved by restricting funds available to any one Member or committee. And to treat the current

situation confronting us these days in such isolated fashion is, in effect, to dodge a problem that I feel should and can no longer be dodged.

Others have eloquently spoken of the need to establish guidelines regulating conduct of Members of Congress in cases where their public duties may conflict with their private financial interests—or where the public has cause to wonder if this is or is not the case.

The Bar Association of the City of New York in a "seedbed" report in 1960 spelled out during a 5-year study, entitled "Conflict of Interest and Federal Service," the tangled web of legislative conflict of interest with these melancholy sentences:

The congressional conflict-of-interest problem *** is current, complex, and controversial. It is also largely unresolved.

Today, Mr. Speaker, 3 years later, these statements still hold true.

Inside the Congress, Members are wrestling with the problems. Outside the Congress the questions are being asked: What are the proper limits on the power of a Member of Congress to appoint his staff from among his family? What kinds of outside employment and income are compatible with what kinds of committee assignments? How far should a Member of Congress go in voting on matters in which he has some personal stake?

Now I suppose that no one believes a Member of Congress should disqualify himself from taking part in a housing bill because he owns a house. But what if he is president or a member of the board of directors of a local urban renewal agency or a large residential construction company?

No Member of Congress should disqualify himself from taking part in legislation involving oil or gas because his house is heated by gas or oil. But what if he is a major stockholder or officer in a gas transmission line, or the owner of a dozen oil wells?

No Member of Congress should disqualify himself from taking part in legislation involving our major carriers because he travels to and from his State to Washington by train. But what if he might sit on a committee that deals with this legislation and at the same time maintains connections with a law firm that has a major railroad as a client?

No Member should disqualify himself from shaping commodity legislation because he owns a farm or a ranch. But what if this Member serves as a consultant to an economic interest that seeks to knead and shape the legislation to its own ends?

Members of Congress should not disqualify themselves from accepting campaign contributions or speaking out on legislation before professional and trade organizations. But what if the speaking fee received is so inordinately large that it points to the conclusion the fee is, in effect, a campaign contribution not reported?

What of the Member of Congress who is defeated for election and then suddenly evidences during his lame-duck period a great interest in visiting the countries of the world? Is there legiti-

mate work to justify such an expenditure?

And what of the Member who, ostensibly traveling abroad on congressional business, spends more time seeing night sights than sighting on the business at hand? And using taxpayers' dollars or counterpart funds while doing so, and later has printed at taxpayers' expense a voluminous, vacuous account of his travels?

What of a Member who may represent business interests on a retainer fee, and also is required by committee assignment to vote on tax bills, ostensibly with complete objectivity?

Where should the lines be drawn?

Neither the law nor custom provides many answers, although there are statutes relating to bribery, acceptance of compensation for services in connection with proceedings before Federal agencies and procurement of Government contracts.

The discussions on and off the floor in recent weeks have, I think, been necessary and productive.

But as the sometimes very acrimonious debate continues, I am reminded of a stanza of doggerel that probably came into being during the life of the notorious Enclosure Acts in Great Britain. My memory tells me that it runs this way:

The law locks up the man or woman
Who steals the goose from off the Common
But lets the great felon loose
Who steals the Common from the goose.

By all means let us take action on the individual offenses—let us do our best to see that every dollar is spent as wisely as possible—and I will have more to say about that a little later.

But as we save the dollar, let us not become so engrossed that we overlook the larger problems.

Do we in Congress have a double standard of conduct?

Last fall we passed a major revision of the outmoded conflict-of-interest code to govern behavior of the flood of part-time advisers to our various governmental agencies of the executive branch. It also toughened the restrictions on employment of Federal employees after they leave the Federal service.

President Kennedy in February 1962, in keeping with a campaign speech in October 1960 at Springfield, Ohio, issued a memorandum to all heads of executive departments and agencies directing them to take administrative steps to assure compliance with existing statutes, rules, and regulations governing conflicts-of-interest problems. In recent times, as a condition of confirmation, Congress has required Secretaries of Defense to divest themselves of stock in companies doing business with the Government. But no Senator or Congressman is required to dispose of any stock, even when he becomes a member of a committee particularly concerned with his investments.

Now there are some here among us who believe that continuous surveillance by the press and the election campaigns committee constitute a thorough and continuous discipline of the House and of the Senate and make specific regulations unnecessary. I think that there

have been occasions when the inadequacy of these safeguards is apparent.

The topic of legislative conflict-of-interest has generated bipartisan attention and concern. Others in both the House and Senate have arisen to discuss the matter in detail and with eloquence and insight that I do not have. The suggestions I now put forward, in the form of bills I shall introduce, today or shortly thereafter, are not all new. Senators MORSE, CLARK, and CLIFFORD CASE, to mention the names of those that come most readily to mind, have for years attempted to convince their senatorial colleagues of the wisdom of congressional reform. Another distinguished colleague, Representative JOHN LINDSAY, of New York, this very session has addressed himself to the matter.

Senator CASE 2 years ago noted that Congress is diligent in holding the executive branch to strict accountability but that "at the same time, however, the whole process would be more seemly, in our view, if Members of Congress as well were subject to the requirements of disclosure as officials in the executive branch. The public has a right to know the facts in either case."

Recently, the distinguished Chief Justice of the United States, Earl Warren, proposed a new profession be developed for these complex times—the profession of "ethics counselor," available to advise businessmen, labor leaders, politicians, and others. He said:

The man of character, sensitive to the meaning of what he is doing, will know how to discover the ethical path in the maze of possible behavior.

In the fledgling years of the United States, Thomas Jefferson wrote by hand in 1801 a strict rule of conduct for legislators. It reads in part:

Where the private interests of a Member are concerned in a bill or question, he is to withdraw. And where such an interest has appeared, his voice has been disallowed, even after a division. In a case so contrary not only to the laws of decency, but to the fundamental principle of the social compact, which denies any man to be a judge in his own cause, it is for the honor of the House that this rule of immemorial observance should be strictly adhered to.

Alas, less than a generation later, this "immemorial observance" was breached by Daniel Webster who wrote the Biddle Bank in Philadelphia for money at the height of a battle in the Senate over renewal of the bank's controversial charter. In unminced words, Senator Webster wrote Nicholas Biddle:

I believe my retainer has not been renewed or refreshed as usual. If it be wished that my relation to the bank should be continued, it may well be well to send me the usual retainers.

And, alas, in April 1874, House Speaker, James G. Blaine, ruled that Congressmen can vote their private interests if the measure is not for their exclusive benefit. My understanding is that Blaine's precedent remains in the rule books of the House today.

Now I am not talking about dishonesty in the general way laymen interpret it. But each passing year it becomes

harder for a Congressman with legitimate outside interests to keep his eye on the ethical guideposts.

So many times I have heard Mr. Sam say, "I love this House."

I also love this House—and I count it a great good fortune that I have been allowed to sit here and represent the Third District of Oregon. I have never, never before had the opportunity, the privilege to serve with, to work with so many great people—and I mean just that—great in ability, great in desire to be of service, great in selflessness, and great in dedication to the public interest. The 40-hour week is unknown. The pressures are great. The requests and demands are voluminous. And satisfaction very seldom comes in the form of thank you letters, but only in the realization that perhaps in some small way you have had a part in drafting legislation that may make better the lives of millions, or by law or action you have removed an inequity that is onerous to a single individual.

But the discussions of the last few weeks—and the events leading to the debates have been most painful—because not just individuals have been hurt, but the Congress of the United States has been hurt. With the greatest admiration for the vast majority of my colleagues, and not impugning the motives of a single one, may I make some suggestions.

ETHICS

That there shall be established a Commission on Legislative Ethics to be composed of 15 members: 4 Members of the Senate and 4 Members of the House to be drawn in equal numbers in each body from each of the major political parties, and 7 members from the public at large, at least one of whom shall come from the field of law; at least one from the field of journalism, and at least one from the field of political science.

The Commission shall make a thorough study of conflicts-of-interest problems and relations with executive and other agencies which confront Members of Congress. The Commission, provided with whatever funds are necessary, shall submit a final report of its activities within 18 months. I would think it desirable the Commission be a permanent one with authority to issue progress reports from time to time.

FINANCIAL INTERESTS OF MEMBERS OF CONGRESS

Each Member of the Senate and House and each and every employee of the Congress who receives a salary at a rate of \$12,500 or more, shall file yearly with the clerk of the Senate and Clerk of the House a report which shall be made public containing a full and complete statement of first, the amount and resources of all income and gifts more than \$100 from any one person received during the preceding calendar year. This includes speaking fees, which as I indicated earlier, are sometimes inflated so as to serve as hidden campaign contributions. Second, the value of each asset held by or entrusted to him or by him and to him and any other person, including spouse. Third, the amount and source of all contributions during the preceding calendar year received by

him or by anyone, including spouse and minor children, on behalf of him or subject to the direction or control of the person. Fourth, annual reports listing all dealings in real estate, securities, and commodities by the member or by any person, including spouse, acting on his behalf. Fifth, the name of any relative who is also an employee of the Federal Government.

CLEAN ELECTIONS

Legislation in regard to election has previously been introduced by several, including myself, and given major attention only when scandal becomes public or crisis occurs. I think it is high time and past time the House came to grips with the issues posed by the clean elections bill. I hope the 88th Congress will not adjourn without having given to the people of the United States some assurance that the election of Federal officials will be conducted under better ground rules than the 1925 ones now in force.

The bill covers general, special, primary, preferential primary and convention or caucus of a political party held for the purpose of nominating candidates for President, Vice President, Senator, or Representative. A candidate for Senator or Representative-at-Large may spend up to \$50,000 in each primary, nominating convention, caucus, or general or special election. A candidate for Representative may spend up to \$12,500. Candidates for election as President and Vice President shall not make expenditures in excess of an amount equal to the amount obtained by multiplying 20 cents by the largest number of voters casting votes for presidential electors in any one of the last three preceding elections. This includes expenditures made by or on behalf of either or both candidates. A candidate for nomination for the office of President or Vice President in a nominating campaign shall not make expenditures in excess of 50 percent of the amount permissible in the general election for the position. Political committees which spend or receive more than \$2,500 in any calendar year shall keep a detailed account of all such sums in excess of \$100 for a period of 2 years. Every candidate for House and Senate shall file complete reports of receipts and expenditures with the Clerk of the House or the Secretary of the Senate. All prescribed filings shall be open to public scrutiny and be on file for 6 years.

Violations of any of these provisions of the bill shall carry a fine up to \$5,000, or up to a 5-year jail sentence. Willful violations shall carry a maximum fine of \$10,000 and a maximum of 2-year prison term.

COMMUNICATIONS WITH EXECUTIVE BRANCH

It seems to me we need legislation on the statute books that all written and oral communications made by a Member or a member of his staff to an officer or employee of an executive branch department or agency shall become part of the public record of any case upon which a query is made. The record shall include the name of the caller, the time, the matter queried, the proceeding, if

any, involved and the nature of the inquiry. If the query indicates other than a point of information this, too, shall be noted.

I suggest serious consideration be given to laws prohibiting any use of congressional influence with any regulatory agency. And I also suggest that this would serve to protect the Members of Congress, because then when pressures mount from the homefront from special groups the answer is obvious and can be short and direct: "The law prohibits me from acceding to your request."

And so, I hope, Mr. Speaker, that these proposals engender discussion that gives off light not heat. I am not adamant about the details of these proposals, but I regard them as a provisional framework within which we should enter and assume the overdue task of regulating our own store.

But before I close let me also refer briefly to two other matters. I think we and members of the executive branch have been engaging in a lot of gobbledegook, when we blithely talk about counterpart funds, as somehow not related to tax dollars. I did not realize until this last week, when I asked for a conference with Treasury and State Department people, that there are only eight countries in the world where the United States has an excess of foreign currencies, and where the term "counterpart" might be honestly used and that in all other countries—when Members of the Congress or the executive branch travel—the U.S. Government must go out to buy the foreign currencies with American tax dollars. I undoubtedly should have known, but I believe this misinformation or misunderstanding is shared by many of my colleagues.

This makes it far more incumbent on us to make even more sure that these travel privileges are not abused either by us, or the executive branch, or the military, and if I may say so, I think that any military or State Department transportation that is requested or given to Members of Congress should be required to be reported to the House Administration Committee, the same as so-called counterpart travel is now required. Let me add that I think legitimate travel is to be encouraged.

If, as a matter of national policy, it is desirable to have, in the words of the Fulbright-Hays Act, "a better understanding of the United States and other countries and to increase mutual understanding between the people of the United States and the people of other countries," then I certainly think it is desirable to have the elected representatives visit areas where we have far-flung commitments. And it seems to me, Members of Congress can vote far more intelligently on foreign policy matters if they have some first-hand knowledge, some first-hand experience, with some facets of our foreign operations.

We do not expect the Governor of a State to sit in his State capitol office and not travel to brief himself on matters within his concern. And so with Members of Congress. But let us be sure that funds appropriated for either the executive or legislative branch be spent wisely.

One other matter, Mr. Speaker. The phrase "affluent society" has been facilely accepted by us as a descriptive of the economic state of most Americans. Recent studies show that there are substantial pockets of poverty throughout our country. A recent book entitled "The Other America: Poverty in the United States," suggests that millions of Americans are living in old-fashioned poverty. These are the invisible Americans—the Americans you and I here in the Congress are not effectively representing. They do not write us—indeed, some cannot write or even read. They do not visit our offices—they do not have the money to even take a bus to an employment office. They are atomized, without face, without voice, without well-heeled, supporting lobbies writing us on fancy stationery.

I talked earlier of the "image" that this Congress is creating for the American people and the Communists abroad.

I just received a letter from a 39-year-old resident of my home city explaining in devastating detail his inability to obtain a job. His family without enough food, and about to be a family without shelter. Last Saturday, I received still another letter from an elderly constituent explaining that he was injured in a fall and is trying to keep body and soul together and mend his body as well on a social security allotment of \$71.80 a month.

Will anyone in this body tell me how you and I can justify to these people—and countless others—the expenditure of funds to provide kitchen facilities and refrigerators for every suite in the New Office Building?

I suppose in a budget of billions this is a small matter—but I think a very important one. To so many of our constituents the ringing words of Franklin Delano Roosevelt, spoken during the early years of his Presidency, are still so true:

That poverty walks hand in hand with the most lavish living this world has ever known.

Let us take care of the major problems I referred to earlier, but in putting our own house in order, let us also be sure that other extravagances, other items, do not become a symbol of a bourgeois legislative body that does not care. Let us instead live up to the challenge as the greatest parliamentary body in the world.

Mrs. FRANCES P. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentlewoman from Oregon yield?

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. I yield to the gentlewoman from Ohio.

Mrs. FRANCES P. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, may I thank my colleague from Oregon for bringing these matters to our attention. It is very evident that she has given them vast study, that they have been very close to her heart, that they have troubled her conscience, as they have mine. I am very happy that I was here to hear her very fine contribution to these matters.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. I thank my friend and colleague from Ohio.

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, I, too, want to compliment the gentlewoman from Oregon on her superb presentation here this afternoon. When she says that she loves this House we all know that she speaks the truth and that she is sincerely interested in seeing that this great legislative body be the finest in the world. She looks around the world, as we all do, and sees many parliaments, some of them once proud and of ancient history that in recent years have been brought to their knees. We see legislative bodies of newly fledged countries which at this moment look as if they may not make the grade. For just that reason it is so tremendously important that the Congress of the United States and this coordinate branch thereof be one that all the people of the United States may be fully proud of.

The specific remedies the gentlewoman from Oregon suggests deserve considered attention from the committee to which they will be referred. Without having the opportunity myself to consider the details of them, I can say this right at the outset, that they take advantage of one very wholesome and salutary principle of public life; which is, let the good bright light enter into public affairs, and the public will be the gainer.

I happen to be a member of a very fine subcommittee of the House Committee on Government Operations, the Committee on Foreign Operations and Governmental Information. Our task there is to see that the light and the truth are cast upon the operations of the executive branch. This is very important. This work must continue. What the gentlewoman suggests here is that some of that same light ought to be brought to bear on the affairs of this body. In that general philosophical position I heartily support her. I am glad she brought the matter up today.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. I thank the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. I yield.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. I join in commanding the gentlewoman for her thoughtful remarks and her sound suggestions. I think we do need in the Congress a code of ethics. May I say, Mr. Speaker, that not in a code of ethics itself do you find the soul of dedication and integrity. That is in the soul and the mind of each individual Member.

Since I have been in Congress I have made it a rule to listen to no gossip, and I have requested every person in my office to remember that we have the job of serving our constituents, that another Member may have different problems and different methods. It is for that Member to decide, and if he makes mistakes it is for his constituents to judge and not his colleagues in this body.

May I say, Mr. Speaker, what I think this House needs is someone skilled in public relations. I do not know a Member of this House who does not work hard. I marvel at the work they do. Then I hear some comedian getting a

big salary at a night club making a target of the Congress.

Yes, we are human here. Yes, we make mistakes. But I think there is more integrity, more hard work in this historic body, the House of Representatives, than in any group in government service anywhere in the world. I know that the gentlewoman from Oregon, for whom I have the highest admiration, and if I need not be misunderstood—I may be—the warmest affection, agrees with me on that.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. I thank the gentleman for making his usual good observations.

Mr. EDWARDS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. EDWARDS. I too join my colleague in complimenting the gentlewoman from Oregon on the views expressed here today. I think it can be said as an axiom that where there is a conflict of interest the public suffers, and the public suffers and will suffer even if the affected legislator is completely honest in what he is trying to do, because there is no way to measure the subconscious influence on a man whose personal interests are at stake in a piece of legislation that is pending.

Here in the House of Representatives we are entitled to the truth and when a Member speaks on the floor on a piece of legislation, a portion of the truth is whether or not he has a personal stake in the legislation. Members are entitled to these facts in judging what he says. I am in favor of the principles which the gentlewoman from Oregon has espoused today. I feel very grateful that I have had the opportunity to be here.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. I thank my colleague.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. DUNCAN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. DUNCAN. Mr. Speaker, with her usual courage and directness, the gentlewoman from Oregon [Mrs. GREEN] has put her finger on a problem which I am sure has disturbed everyone who has been closely connected with the legislative process. She is seeking to reestablish the reputation and prestige of the Congress, which many feel has been tarnished.

With her efforts I would like to associate myself, recognizing how easy it is to set the goal but how difficult it is to prescribe the mechanics for achieving that goal. How can we eliminate the conflicts of interest which inevitably must occur in any citizen government without denying ourselves the knowledge and experience which our Members can bring to the solution of a problem? This is much more easily said than done, but again the gentlewoman from Oregon [Mrs. GREEN] has made suggestions which should have the careful consideration of this body.

Without delaying consideration and action on these specifics to which the gentlewoman from Oregon [Mrs. GREEN] has directed our attention, I should like to suggest that this is only one—albeit a most important—aspect of the need for a reexamination of the entire legislative branch of the Federal Government.

As a new Member, I attended the very fine series of indoctrination lectures arranged for us by older Members of the House. Throughout these lectures—by senior and respected Members of both the Senate and the House, by respected members of the press, and others—runs the recurrent theme of congressional reorganization. Few deny the need; few are disposed to take the action required.

The problems raised by my colleague demand immediate attention. Without delaying action thereon, however, I would hope that we could move concurrently toward the appointment of a commission which would include the Members of both Houses together with distinguished laymen—if I may use that term—to make recommendations to this or succeeding Congresses as to how best to meet the problems of governing the largest and most powerful nation on earth during a most critical period of its leadership of the free world.

I hesitate to make this suggestion—and presume to do no more than make it. I would not do so had not similar sentiments been expressed by those with much experience and great knowledge of the traditions and procedures of this body.

The gentlewoman from Oregon [Mrs. GREEN] deserves the thanks and support of all of us as she seeks the solution to these very difficult problems.

NEWS REPORTING

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. JOHANSEN] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. JOHANSEN. Mr. Speaker, the Washington Post made some unique news in its own editorial column this morning.

This unremitting and oftentimes grossly intemperate opponent of the House Committee on Un-American Activities tendered an "unequivocal apology" to the committee's able staff director, Mr. Francis J. McNamara.

In so doing, the Post very properly repudiated a shoddy piece of untruthful reporting and a sneering, venomous and derisive editorial based on the distorted news story.

I welcome this editorial retraction and apology—as I am sure my colleagues on the committee and in this House likewise do.

I entertain the restrained hope that this action augurs a greater degree of accuracy in news reporting and a newly found moderateness in editorial comment as both relate to the committee's compliance with its recently renewed mandate from the House of Representatives.

In any event, I believe the House is entitled to a résumé of the essential facts regarding this incident which has re-

sulted in an embarrassing denouement for the Washington Post.

On February 28, Mr. McNamara addressed the Metropolitan Washington Council of Young Americans for Freedom. In the course of his remarks, the staff director of the House Committee on Un-American Activities stated that top officials of the Department of Justice as well as leading Communist Party officials are agreed that the Communist Party today has approximately 10,000 members.

Mr. McNamara added that it would be a serious mistake, however, to judge total Communist strength, the danger of communism, and the extent of its influence in this country merely on the basis of this figure of 10,000 formally or technically enrolled members.

Thereafter in this speech, Mr. McNamara stated that on the basis of reports filed with the Post Office Department just three Communist publications which could be described as "hard core"—The Worker, People's World, and National Guardian—had a combined average paid circulation per issue of about 50,000 during the year ending October 1961.

Mr. McNamara pointed out that during the same period, domestic foreign-language publications which have been officially cited as Communist had a circulation of about 46,000 and publications of unions which have been found to be Communist-controlled and expelled from the CIO as such, a circulation of about 150,000. The combined circulation of these various categories of publications, he added, is roughly 250,000.

He said that in estimating readership on the generally accepted ratio of three persons per publication, it would appear that between 700,000 and 800,000 persons in this country regularly read either hard-core party literature or party-line publications.

Mr. McNamara further qualified his estimate with the statement that this is not to be considered a gage of Communist strength because many paid subscriptions to these publications are accounted for by Government security agencies and anti-Communist organizations and individuals, and also by the fact that many Communists and fellow travelers would obviously subscribe to more than one Communist or party-line publication.

And Mr. McNamara concluded that even if as much as 25 percent was to be deducted from the total for these types of readership, we are still faced with the fact that several hundred thousand people in this country are apparently sympathetic readers of hard-core and party-line propaganda.

From the foregoing, Mr. McNamara offered the valid observation that it would be obviously unrealistic to judge the totality of Communist strength and influence in this country by the figure of 10,000 members.

Under leave to extend and revise my remarks, I enclose at this point the Washington Post news report on this speech, published the next day, March 1: OVER 700,000 REDS BELIEVED IN UNITED STATES

Francis J. McNamara, staff director of the House Committee on Un-American Activities, said last night there was reason to believe

there are 700,000 to 800,000 Communists in the United States.

McNamara said he arrived at these figures by totaling the circulation of publications officially cited as subversive and then tripling this number.

He tripled the number in line with standard advertising practice, which estimates there are three readers for every copy, he said.

McNamara admitted this method was vague and nebulous and said the committee did not know for sure the exact number of Communists in the United States.

He pointed out, however, that the figure of 10,000 generally cited as the total of registered Communists, was misleading.

Addressing a meeting of the Metropolitan Washington Council of Young Americans for Freedom, McNamara acknowledged that there was a growth in sentiment to abolish the Un-American Activities Committee. But he cited recent House votes to show the committee was in no danger of being abolished.

The first Washington Post editorial, based on this false news story, appeared March 6. It was as follows:

SEEING REDS

Francis J. McNamara, the staff director of that remarkable research organization, the House Un-American Activities Committee, let it be known recently that there are 700,000 to 800,000 Communists in the United States. This is in rather striking contrast to assertions by J. Edgar Hoover, Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, that the Communist Party reached a top strength of 80,000 in 1944, has declined every year since then and nosedived in 1961 to between 8,000 and 10,000.

Before anyone gets excited and starts talking about tossing Mr. Hoover out of his job as an incompetent, it might be worth while to look critically at Mr. McNamara's computations. He said he arrived at his estimate by totaling the circulation of all publications officially cited as subversive and tripling this number in accordance with the usual advertising hypothesis that there are three readers for every subscriber.

Estimates of this kind used to be arrived at, somewhat haphazardly, by looking at tea leaves or examining the entrails of sheep or multiplying the ambyranth of Q by the coefficient of means square contingencies. But there was always an element of error in such calculations; and anyway the Communists kept complaining that they were being underestimated. Mr. McNamara's method is much more scientific. Naturally it costs a little more money. This, evidently, is why the House of Representatives last week voted, 385 to 20, to give the House Un-American Activities Committee \$360,000 for its scientific investigations this year. The 20 dissenters seem content to hobble along with that old-fashioned FBI.

Meanwhile, 2 days prior to the appearance of this editorial, the following letter to the editor of the Washington Post was mailed by Mr. Vernon W. Holloman, Jr., chairman, Metropolitan Washington chapter of Young Americans for Freedom, protesting the distorted news report.

This letter was published in this morning's Washington Post, in the "Letters to the Editor" column adjoining the editorial of retraction and apology, and is as follows:

COMMUNISTS IN THE UNITED STATES

The headline and lead paragraphs of your March 1 report about the February meeting of the Metropolitan Washington Council of Young Americans for Freedom were completely false and grievously misleading. You quoted Francis McNamara, staff director of

the House Committee on Un-American Activities, as asserting there is reason to believe that there are "700,000 to 800,000 Communists in the United States."

This is not the truth and it is not what Mr. McNamara said at the meeting. What he did say was that there are approximately 250,000 people in this country who subscribe to Communist publications like the Sunday Worker, foreign-language pro-Soviet publications, Communist-front publications, and party-line publications.

Taking the normal ratio of three readers for one subscriber he estimated that the readership of hard-core Communist publications, plus those who read general party-line material, totaled about 750,000. Mr. McNamara emphasized that some of these readers were anti-Communist, some were teachers and students, some were American security personnel; but that even discounting as much as 25 percent there were still a good many thousands of Americans reading the party line every week or month.

Granted his calm, analytical talk was not a "sensational" one, but it was warmly applauded by YAF members in search of the truth—which, unfortunately, they did not find in the Washington Post the next morning.

VERNON W. HOLLEMAN, JR.

The editorial of apology—acknowledging, in effect, that the distortion in the news report and the admitted bias, venom, and irresponsibility of the early editorial were too much even for the Washington Post to attempt to defend—was carried this morning. It reads as follows:

SEEING RED FACES

A letter from Vernon W. Holleman, Jr., appearing elsewhere on this page today asserts that the Washington Post did an injustice to Francis McNamara, staff director of the House Un-American Activities Committee, in reporting a recent speech by him. A subsequent editorial, Seeing Reds, based on the news story, compounded the injustice. Inquiry has satisfied us that the news story and the editorial were mistaken in imputing to Mr. McNamara the implication that all readers of Communist publications are Communists. We genuinely regret the imputation and the derisory tone of our editorial comment concerning it, and we tender to Mr. McNamara an unequivocal apology.

Mr. JOHANSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include a news story from the Washington Post, two editorials from the Washington Post, and a letter to the editor.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

CUBAN REFUGEE SITUATION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. PEPPER] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, today I have introduced in the House the following resolution as a declaration of the sense of this House:

Resolved by the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States, That it is the sense of the House that the entry of Soviet armed forces into Cuba was and the continued presence of such Soviet armed forces in Cuba is a violation of the Monroe Doctrine and a menace to the security of the United States; that the entry of such armed

forces into Cuba was and the continued presence there is in violation of the principles of the Organization of American States and a menace to the security of all the American States; that the entry of Soviet armed forces into Cuba was and the continued presence of such forces in Cuba is in violation of the Charter of the United Nations because the presence of such armed forces in Cuba constitutes a threat to the peace of the world:

Wherefore the Government of the United States, in such manner as the President shall determine, should call upon the Organization of American States and the United Nations to join the United States in a demand that the Soviet Union shall forthwith remove all of its armed force from Cuba.

I have also introduced the following joint resolution having to do with the resettlement forthwith of the excess of Cuban refugees now living in Dade County, Fla., which includes my district:

JOINT RESOLUTION TO PROVIDE FOR THE ESTABLISHMENT OF A COMMISSION ON CUBAN REFUGEES

SHORT TITLE

SECTION 1. This Act may be cited as the "Cuban Refugee Commission Act".

ESTABLISHMENT OF COMMISSION ON CUBAN REFUGEES

SEC. 2. (a) There is hereby established a commission to be known as the Commission on Cuban Refugees (hereinafter referred to as the "Commission").

(b) The Commission shall be composed of the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, the Secretary of Labor, and the Secretary of Commerce. The Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare shall serve as Chairman.

(c) The members of the Commission shall serve without compensation in addition to the compensation for their services as head of a department, but they shall be reimbursed for travel, subsistence, and other necessary expenses incurred by them in the performance of the duties of the Commission.

(d) The Commission may utilize the facilities and personnel of the departments under the respective jurisdictions of the members of the Commission.

Duties of the commission

Sec. 3. (a) The Commission shall establish, operate, and maintain a program for the orderly relocation of refugees from Cuba from the Dade County, Florida, area to such other areas within the United States as may be appropriate. Such program shall be conducted with due regard to the job opportunities, housing facilities, public educational facilities, and other pertinent factors existing in each relocation area to the end that an excessive burden shall not be placed on any one relocation area.

(b) The Commission shall initiate and conduct a study, on a continuing basis, of the respective problems involved in the relocation and resettlement within the United States of refugees from Cuba. Such study shall devote particular attention to the economic and social factors involved in such relocation and resettlement with particular reference to job opportunities, housing facilities, educational facilities, and opportunities and facilities in general for adaptation of such refugees in each relocation and resettlement area to the way of life in the United States. The Commission shall submit an annual report to the President for presentation to the Congress of the results of such continuing study together with such recommendations as the Commission deems advisable.

Sec. 4. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated annually to the Commission, to remain available until expended, such sums

(not to exceed the amount of \$25,000,000 annually) as may be necessary to carry out the purposes of this Act.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that those who have criticism to offer about the present threatening and disturbing situation in Cuba owe it to the country to try to do something constructive or to offer criticism which will be helpful in the solution of the grievous burdens respecting that unhappy island which our President now has to bear. We all know the awesome responsibility the President has had to bear to meet the challenge of communistic imperialism in Cuba and to remove from power in the unhappy island of Cuba that creature whose regime has been the source of aggression and subversion against all the American States. The President deserves the commendation of the country—indeed he has received the acclaim of the Nation—for the courageous and effective manner in which he confronted aggressive communistic imperialism in Cuba and forthwith required before the observing eyes of the world the removal of the offensive missiles and planes which constituted a dangerous threat to the safety of the American people. And the President has received and continues to enjoy the gratification of the country that he is steadily bringing about the removal of Soviet armed forces from Cuba and in his announced determination that the remainder of such forces shall be withdrawn as the spearhead of communistic imperialism in the Western Hemisphere.

But the coming of such Soviet armed forces into Cuba and their continued presence in Cuba is a matter of concern not only to the United States, but to every state in the Western Hemisphere and to every peace-loving nation in the world. Such forces strengthen the hand of communistic subversion and aggression in the Western World; they constitute a dire menace and threat to the security of every American State; their presence in Cuba constitutes a distinct and dangerous threat to the peace of the world. That is the reason, Mr. Speaker, I have introduced today a resolution expressing the sense of this House that the Government of the United States in such manner as the President should determine should call upon the Organization of American States and the United Nations to join us in a demand that the Soviet Union forthwith remove all of its remaining armed forces from the island of Cuba. The added strength of the Organization of American States and the United Nations to our own demand will give it greater force and power and abate the breach of the Monroe Doctrine, the breach of the principles of the Organization of American States and the breach of the United Nations Charter which their presence in Cuba constitutes.

Mr. Speaker, on the first day this House met in the 88th Congress, I introduced a resolution declaring it to be the sense of this House, among other things, "that the fair isle of Cuba must and shall be freed of the curse of Castro and communism." I have been assured of an early hearing by the subcommittee of the House Foreign Affairs Committee upon this resolution. It does not attempt to

prescribe for the President of the United States the method by which this high purpose shall be achieved but it does unreservedly and irrevocably declare the sentiment of the Congress of the United States that Castro and communism must go from Cuba and that we shall never falter in our determination that this isle formerly called the jewel of the Caribbean shall be freed of this curse and the Western Hemisphere of this menace.

I am sure when our President speaks shortly in Costa Rica among those most endangered by the threat of Castro and communism from Cuba he will spell out many ways by which the American States can cooperate with other freedom-loving and peace-loving nations of the world in eradicating Castro and communism from Cuba. It would seem to me that other of the American States would wish to break all diplomatic relations with Cuba as the United States has done; close their ports to Cuban ships and Cuban exports; require the closing of all Cuban embassies, ministries and consulates in the respective American countries to stop them from continuing to function as hotbeds and spawning grounds of communistic aggression and subversion in the several American States; that the several Latin American nations should cooperate more closely with the United States in the coordination of their political, economic and military policies respecting Cuba as long as Castro's or any Communist government shall be in power; that the United States should also call upon all friendly states everywhere in the world to stop commerce with Castro or communistic Cuba and if such states persist in giving aid, strength, and comfort to our enemy in Cuba that we should advise them that neither their ships nor their commerce can enter the United States; that we should not extend economic assistance or cooperation even through international financial institutions to states which manifest that they prefer the friendship of Castro and communistic Cuba to that of the United States. I know we can depend upon our President to do what is the best thing to accomplish the objective upon which we are all united to free Cuba, the Western Hemisphere and the free world from the curse of Castro and communism and to remove the bridgehead of communistic, imperialistic aggression from the Western Hemisphere.

Mr. Speaker, Castro and communistic tyranny in Cuba have brought to Dade County, Fla., some 200,000 Cuban refugees fleeing from communistic terror; many already robbed of all their possessions before they departed, others giving up everything they had in order to breathe the air of freedom in America. Our Government has willingly and gladly given sanctuary to these exiles from communistic persecution and horror; more than that we have been glad and proud to give them succor and sustenance in our country; we have extended to them the hand of fellowship in freedom and given them words of encouragement that we shall hasten the day when they may return to a free Cuba again. But, Mr. Speaker, the congregation of over 200,000 of these refugees in Dade County has im-

posed a very serious economic burden upon the people of our county. In spite of the some \$70 million a year the Federal Government has given for the sustenance and care and education of the children of these refugees, they still have felt it necessary in order to enjoy a higher level of living or subsistence than the funds federally provided enable them to enjoy to go into our economy and take by responsible estimate some 30,000 jobs. We already had a labor surplus in Dade County. It is inevitable that the refugees willing to work at almost any wage have not only taken the jobs of many of our local citizens, but have lowered the wage scale for all of the people who work in our county. I wish we had jobs enough for our people and a surplus adequate to meet the needs of the refugees.

I have striven in every way I could to induce the Federal Government to help us to provide more jobs in Dade County; to provide funds to assure Federal participation in Interama which would immediately provide thousands of additional jobs for the people of our county; to aid us in getting defense contracts for which we are in so many ways so much suited; to declare us eligible for the benefits of the area redevelopment program; to aid our small business and otherwise. We are striving to get space-age industries located in Dade County, a natural and highly desirable location for them; we have labored to increase social security benefits, welfare assistance, educational aid and, in short, we have been trying in every way we could to assist our people in the hope that after our own citizens had gainful employment of suitable character there would be a surplus of jobs for the Cuban refugees. But we have not yet reached that point.

The Federal Government has not yet given us the assistance which we feel we are entitled to receive in giving jobs to the unemployed among our own citizens let alone the refugees. We are continuing to struggle to achieve this end. But meanwhile, thousands of our people are out of work, many of them having had their jobs taken by Cuban refugees. Until we can provide enough jobs for our own people and a surplus for the refugees, it is imperative that we immediately institute a resettlement program which will remove to other parts of America—which, I am sure, will also hospitably receive them—the surplus refugees beyond our ability to absorb them in jobs not required by our local people.

The agencies have been working upon the problem, but too little has been done and what has been done has been done too late. Accordingly, I have today introduced a resolution to set up a high level Cabinet committee to institute and immediately to effectuate a resettlement program for the Cuban refugees which will relieve this excessive burden and pressure upon our own people. I hope the Congress will take prompt action upon this resolution and give our people the relief to which we have been long entitled and avoid an unhappy increase in tension which has grown up in Dade County between our displaced citizens and the Cuban refugees on account of their natural effort

to better themselves above the level of bare subsistence almost which the bounty of our Government provides.

Mr. Speaker, before I conclude, I want to commend to every Member of this House and the Congress a letter entitled "A Communication," appearing in the Sunday, March 10, issue of the Washington Post by the Honorable John C. Wiley, former Ambassador of the United States to Columbia, Iran, Portugal, and Panama, and who, though in retirement, remains an able and wise counselor of his country:

A COMMUNICATION

The public parade of Soviet missiles into Cuba and the complacently public parade of the same missiles out of Cuba appear too obvious for a simple explanation. The Soviet missile operation clearly had ulterior purposes.

The Soviet Union in Cuba is faced with a variety of problems, but the Cuban thorn in the Soviet foot is Castro himself. He is probably not more popular in the Kremlin than in the White House. Impossible to get along with, it has so far been impossible for the Kremlin to get along without him.

Soviet armed forces are in Cuba neither to attack the United States nor to defend Cuba against the United States. They are not even a saber to rattle. Actually they are a sword over Castro's head.

Monolithic communism exists only when sheltered by Red bayonets. This explains why Soviet garrisons were established in the Baltic States for "mutual security" months before the takeover. It also explains the successful rejection by China, Yugoslavia, and Albania of the primacy of the Kremlin.

The first schismatic was Trotsky. A refugee in a foreign country, armed only with ideas, he was easily disposed of. Mao Tse-tung is no Trotsky. His elimination, were it possible, would not close the chasm with China. Mao represents a massive, organized movement in a great country. When he disappears from the scene his cadres will survive.

But can the Soviet garrisons in Cuba in this late date successfully impose the Kremlin's authority in a remote island under a native leader, a self-anointed Communist and domineering authoritarian who achieved power, like Mao and Tito, without active Soviet assistance?

In Cuba, Soviet authority is, of course, great but it is limited. It has long been clear to Moscow that Castro has quietly become the ally of Mao. Throughout Latin America, the young, fiery Communists are much more attracted by the revolutionary ardor of both Mao and Castro than by, to them, the staid coexistence of Khrushchev. True, Castro's Cuba is dependent on the Soviet Union for desperately needed economic aid and for arms, munitions and military support. In this area, Mao Tse-tung can neither replace nor compete with Khrushchev, but at the same time, Moscow cannot prevent the covert financing of Castroism by China and the clandestine collaboration of Castro with Mao throughout Latin America.

Effective foreign policy is based on alternative courses of action. This is a principle followed by the Soviet Union as demonstrated over long years by frequent zigzags. What alternative policies can the Kremlin pursue toward Castro; what zig and which zags?

Only three alternatives seem to exist. The first would be for the Soviet Union to wash its hands of the whole Cuban affair. This is obviously out of the question, if only for compelling reasons of prestige. The second alternative would be for the Soviet Union and Communist China to divide the world into two noncompetitive geographical

spheres of influence. Such a pact would be difficult to negotiate and still more difficult to carry out. Neither could trust the other. The third alternative is draconian, the harsh decision to eliminate Castro and replace him with someone subject to monolithic Kremlin discipline. This move is doubtless the only feasible choice, but it is one that requires subtle and careful preparation and great operational skill.

The elimination of Castro would not be foreign to Soviet procedures, but it would now be premature. First, Castro is still an asset internally in Cuba and his departure might precipitate the open break with Peiping that Moscow wishes to postpone until the moment arrives for a still harsher decision: what to do to prevent Communist China from developing sophisticated atomic weapons, and when to do it.

However, the Soviet Union is certainly preparing the elimination of Castro at the opportune moment, namely when it becomes either convenient or unavoidably necessary. This would probably be accomplished by one of two techniques: (1) a connived military coup by trusted elements of the Cuban Army and militia, or (2) to have Castro suddenly and officially declared insane, to which an element of plausibility would not be lacking. Then Castro would be immediately incarcerated in padded luxury on the shores of the Caspian.

Hopes rampant among Cuban refugees that disaffection in the Cuban armed forces will lead to the overthrow of Castroism are as illusory as the conception that led to the fiasco of the Bay of Pigs. Without a simultaneous invasion by the United States, any anti-Castro initiative within Cuba, not contrived by the Kremlin, could and would be quickly suppressed.

But what about the Soviet missile bases in Cuba? Surely Khrushchev did not need missile bases within Cuba itself in order to keep Castro in line.

Obviously not, but they have served as a supremely astute stratagem with Castro for the introduction of Soviet armed forces into Cuba, not merely forces to defend the Communist regime against internal disaffection, but primarily to deal with Castro whenever desirable or necessary.

The missile bases in Cuba were indeed a magnificent multipurpose example of Soviet guile. They were a tit for the tat of American missile bases on the very fringes of Russia. Moreover, in addition to their intrinsic military value, they constituted excellent bargaining pawns for the removal of our bases from Italy and Turkey. And whether the missiles introduced into and removed from Cuba were genuine or Potemkin stage settings, they were excellent weapons for psychological (political) warfare. Now, the only effective opposition to Castro in Cuba is the Soviet Union itself. In any event, Khrushchev deserves credit for having perpetrated the most brilliant stroke of international chicanery of the present century.

The Soviet Union continues to threaten war on the American mainland if the United States attacks Cuba. This is putting dry froth on stale beer. The Soviet Union knows perfectly well that the United States has no intention of attacking Cuba, just as we know perfectly well that the Soviet Union has no intention of attacking us with nuclear weapons should we do so. However, there is always the dangerous possibility that American activities with regard to Cuba might help to incite the old, perhaps compulsive urge of the messianic Russians to seek new pastures—pastures and warm waters—and serve as a precedent for so doing. This possibility has not been diminished by developments in Iraq and Yemen.

Middle East petroleum, or rather the threat of its denial to the West, could easily press the button of the holocaust. Under existing circumstances, Cuba does not involve the vital interests of any, except the Cubans

themselves. On the other hand, the Middle East touches the vital interests of many. A cradle of civilization, it could be its deathbed.

JOHN C. WILEY,

Former Ambassador to Colombia, Iran, Portugal, and Panama, who retired from the Foreign Service in 1956.

UNIVERSAL MILITARY TRAINING AND SERVICE ACT

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, the action of the House this afternoon in approving the extension of the Universal Military Training and Service Act serves a necessary and practical need. With world tensions growing rather than lessening, our Armed Forces remain the protectors of peace in the world, serving as they do not only in defense of the United States but also protecting the security of all free world nations.

The Soviet Union, in its consistent propaganda, attempts to don the mantle of peace but their policies remain clear to observers, that is, the hope for world domination.

America is free, America maintains leadership in the world because of our tremendous military establishment. The extension of the draft is necessary, and I commend my colleagues of the House Armed Services Committee for the rapid manner in which they processed this proposal, the first major legislation approved by the House.

AIDING RUSSIA AND NEWS MANIPULATION

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. HARSHA. Mr. Speaker, the news managers are back in rare form. They have left no stone unturned in trying to hoodwink the public. The Brazilian Government previously announced it was sending a mission, headed by Finance Minister San Thiago Dantes, to Washington to seek liberalized terms on existing loans and \$1.5 billion in new U.S. loans and investments over a 3-year period. Part of the 3-year plan the United States would be asked to help finance was a \$160 million per year long-term agreement between Brazil and Russia, but this fact is being cleverly concealed.

Previously, a meeting between the State Department and the Brazilian mission was scheduled for March 4. This meeting was postponed until today. I had previously requested an explanation from Secretary of State Rusk as to why the U.S. Government would en-

tertain any transaction or negotiation for any sum, whether it be \$1.5 billion or \$1, to enhance trade negotiations between Brazil and Russia. To date, I have received no answer.

The State Department's foreign policy with Latin America is "an exercise in futility." The administration is calling for \$11 billion to be spent in curtailing the Communist threat in Latin America and now the State Department is entertaining negotiations with Brazil to help finance and expand a trade program with that country and Communist Russia. The result of such a deal would enhance the Reds' position in Latin America and make our expenditures futile.

Last Monday, a release was issued that the U.S. Government and Brazil were planning to start high level, economic talks in Washington, March 11, to determine America's disposition toward new aid commitments to Brazil. Nothing in the release indicated that any part of U.S. funds would be used to help finance the trade agreement between Brazil and Russia, although State Department officials knew this to be true.

I have made inquiries to the State Department concerning this matter and have been told that Brazil probably would not get as much as she was asking for. Subsequent to this, another release was issued pointing out that Brazil's finance minister would be here today to negotiate further loans and a "qualified source" indicated the sum would be in the neighborhood of \$450 to \$500 million. Here again, nothing was said as to what plans had been developed for the expenditure of this money. Whether it is \$1.5 billion, \$450 million, or \$1 makes no difference. The American taxpayer does not want his money used to expand Russian trade with any country.

The camouflaged releases prove once again that the news managers are working at their best. A commitment like this is preposterous and to delude the American taxpayer by deliberately managing the news, when the officials in the State Department know that portions of these funds will be used to help finance and expand Communist trade with Brazil, is not in the best interests of our national security and under no circumstances can it be justified.

Not only is any negotiation that would enhance Red trade foolhardy and detrimental to our national security, but in direct conflict with the stated purposes of our tremendous defense budget and foreign aid outlays. Managing the news is most dangerous and detrimental to our national security, and it is done for one purpose and one purpose only and that is to control our thinking.

We should not be treated as a mass unable to comprehend. The American taxpayer is entitled to know where his money is going, he's paid enough tuition. News manipulators should be ferreted out along with those who are advocating such a disastrous loan. I believe Congress should take a long, hard look at any such policy. The administration should state publicly that it does not advocate a policy of enhancing the Soviet economy and call a halt to such ludicrous negotiations.

SPEND, SPEND, SPEND TODAY SO YOU CAN SPEND TOMORROW, TOO

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I think I would be naive indeed to say that we in Congress are not aware of the unwritten law of bureaucracy that requires the spending of all appropriations so that future requests for larger appropriations can thus be justified.

Seldom, however, do we find that this unwritten law has been put down in writing. But I have at hand a column written by Maj. Gen. Frederick M. Warren which appeared under the title "The Chief's Column," in the February issue of the Army Reservist.

General Warren, who is Chief of Army Reserve and ROTC Affairs, exhorts all unit commanders to draw all equipment to which they are entitled on paper, apparently without regard to the needs of the units or whether they are at full strength or half strength.

Writes General Warren:

Failure to draw this equipment not only could have an adverse effect on future equipment budgets, but also on programs for increased storage facilities, maintenance technicians, spare parts and tools.

The important thing, according to this message, is to draw the equipment so that it will all be used up and therefore justified. I suggest that the Appropriations Committees will want to examine this activity most closely, especially since we were told that high school ROTC had to be sacrificed due to budget needs. General Warren is in charge of Reserve and ROTC. It is apparent to me that ROTC was to be sacrificed to the bureaucratic habit of drawing all equipment, spending all the money, and making a good justification in the ledger books on which to base future budget requests.

I understand the Pentagon has backed down some on its plan to abolish high school ROTC. Indeed they had better do that and also see that the old army game of "spend today so you can get more tomorrow" is given even closer attention.

The article referred to will be inserted at the end of my remarks, but I would call the attention to two other passages which clearly indicate to me that the instructions in this case are based solely on the desire to show Congress that there is a need for more money because all the previously appropriated money was used up.

Note these two passages:

An additional danger in the conversion of functional use of space is that failure to use space for functions prescribed in approved space criteria, can bring about the elimination of that space on the basis that it is not required since it is not used for the designated purpose.

In the end, by having the equipment on hand, the need for additional supporting technicians, spare parts and the required extension of facilities will be clear for all to see.

Copies of this material will be directed to the Armed Services and Appropriations Committees. I am certain it will be of value and interest in both committees.

The entire article is as follows:

THE CHIEF'S COLUMN

A matter of vital concern to all of us is the amount of equipment available to support the Army Reserve. Equipment must be available in Army Reserve centers to conduct proper home station training on a year-round basis.

Additional equipment is essential to meet the expanded requirements of summer camp training. The Berlin callup emphasized the need for equipment to meet mobilization requirements.

As a direct result of the Berlin callup, additional funds have been provided in Army budgets for acquisition of equipment for the Army Reserve to meet these requirements.

Unit commanders are therefore encouraged to draw their full complement of organizational equipment for home station training; that is, to the level specified in "Organizational Equipment Guides" (OEG's).

Failure to draw this equipment not only could have an adverse effect on future equipment budgets, but also on programs for increased storage facilities, maintenance technicians, spare parts and tools.

For the future improvement of the Army Reserve program, unit commanders should draw and accept equipment, unless it is infeasible rather than merely inconvenient or difficult to store and maintain it.

Where absolutely necessary, because of extreme limitation at home stations, arrangements may be made, on an interim basis, to store unit OEG equipment at summer camp training sites.

A related subject is the management of space in Reserve centers. It is extremely important that unit commanders conserve use of administrative space in Reserve centers. Reserve center design is predicated upon scheduled, overlapped use of administrative space in Reserve centers, not upon individual offices for each Reserve unit.

Maximum use should be made of field desks and tables. Encroachment on the unit supply areas reduces the capability to draw equipment needed for training. Elimination of lockers to create administrative space forces storage of individual equipment, which should be stored in lockers, into the already overcrowded unit supply rooms.

An additional danger in the conversion of functional use of space is that failure to use space for functions prescribed in approved space criteria, can bring about the elimination of that space on the basis that it is not required since it is not used for the designated purpose. This applies particularly to space provided for double tier lockers in the present series of standard plans.

Now is the time to build up the stocks of Reserve equipment to meet requirements. In the end, by having the equipment on hand, the need for additional supporting technicians, spare parts and the required extension of facilities will be clear for all to see. Upon attainment of equipment goals an immeasurably stronger Army Reserve will result.

FREDERICK M. WARREN,
Major General, U.S. Army, Chief, U.S.
Army and ROTC Affairs.

THE NORTH DAKOTA 38TH LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY URGES INVESTIGATION OF THE DEPARTMENT OF STATE

Mr. CLANCY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. SHORT] may ex-

tend his remarks at this point and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, I have received from the North Dakota Legislature, House Concurrent Resolution Q-1, passed unanimously, to all intents and purposes, by both houses of the legislature, urging that a full-scale investigation be launched of the Department of State's role in developing and executing foreign policy and how the Department has functioned in carrying out this vital role. Under unanimous consent I insert this resolution in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, so as to bring it to the attention of my colleagues in the House, since there are several resolutions providing for such study and investigation introduced in the 88th Congress; among them, House Resolution 67, House Concurrent Resolution 60, House Resolution 104, and House Resolution 210:

HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION Q-1
A concurrent resolution requesting Congress to investigate and study the policymaking procedures, methods of assessing foreign developments, and personnel practices of the U.S. Department of State

Whereas all Americans are disturbed about conflicting reports and contradictory policies emanating from the State Department of the United States in these times of recurring crisis;

Whereas the U.S. House of Representatives has before it for consideration House Resolution 104 authorizing and directing their Committee on Foreign Affairs to conduct a full and complete investigation and study of the policymaking procedures, methods of assessing foreign developments and the personnel practices of the Department of State; Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives of the State of North Dakota, the Senate concurring therein, That the 38th session of the Legislature of the State of North Dakota respectfully requests the 88th Congress of the United States, to authorize its House Foreign Affairs Committee to conduct an investigation and study the policymaking procedures, methods of assessing foreign developments, and personnel practices of the U.S. Department of State; and be it further

Resolved, That the secretary of state forward copies of this resolution to our congressional delegation, and to the chairman of the House of Representatives Rules Committee.

STANLEY SAUGSTAD,
Speaker of the House.
GERALD L. STAIR,
Chief Clerk of the House.
FRANK A. WINSTROM,
President of the Senate.
HOWARD F. DOHERTY,
Secretary of the Senate.

Mr. Speaker, there is no question that many people feel there could well be a greater order, competence, and efficiency in the Department of State, to erase the image brought to light by "The Ugly American," some of which was fiction and as such exaggerated, but still possessing a lot of truth.

My mail reveals an ever-increasing number of people seriously disturbed and concerned over what seems to be State Department policy, and I agree with their contention that it is downright ridiculous to pursue a policy of seeming

concern for the welfare of foreign nations above that of our own country.

An investigation and study would do one of two things—dispel doubts now existing in the minds of many people as to the effectiveness of our present foreign policy, or it will vividly point up the need for a more realistic approach in the handling of our foreign policy.

CRITICISM AGAINST REPUBLICANS

Mr. CLANCY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. YOUNGER] may extend his remarks at this point and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Speaker, apparently the reaction over the country to Senator MANSFIELD's recent criticism against Republicans has not been well received as evidence by the following editorial in the March 10 issue of the Washington Star and Abe Mellinkoff's article in the San Francisco Chronicle on February 27 which is also inserted:

FACTS WANTED

Senator MANSFIELD, in our opinion, is a man of great integrity and competence. Nevertheless, we think he missed the real point in his impassioned appeal to the Senate to refrain from "politicking" on the Cuban question.

The majority leader has suggested that recent Republican attacks were based on a news story that was published on May 5, 1961. He also has expressed the belief that these attacks are injurious to the national interest—that to "toy" with such things as the details of who bungled the Bay of Pigs operation "is to toy with the life of the Nation."

This is an argument which overlooks a basic point. The American people have been encouraged to believe that "no U.S. forces" were involved in the Cuban invasion, and that President Kennedy would not permit them to be involved under any condition. In the strictest sense, this is true. But it also strikes us as the finest kind of hairsplitting—if news reports in addition to those mentioned by Senator MANSFIELD are correct.

These additional reports, coming from presumably responsible and informed individuals, indicate that the May 5, 1961, news account told only a small part of the story. These reports suggest that 16—not 4—Americans were involved as pilots or in training capacities in the Cuban invasion. Some of them certainly were National Guard officers, evidently recruited by the Central Intelligence Agency on some kind of informal or "civilian" basis. If this is so, the statement by Attorney General Kennedy that "no U.S. forces" took part in the invasion needs very careful scrutiny.

Our feeling about this matter is not that it was wrong to use Americans to train the Cubans, or even to fly combat missions. It is a great pity, we think, that the effort at the Bay of Pigs failed because too few Americans were used, and because their equipment, including planes, was inadequate to the task.

What disturbs us is that this continuing leakage of information which, if true, casts doubt on the accuracy of former official statements, can hardly fail to make most Americans wonder whether their Government is telling the truth or is trying to brainwash them. Certainly it is necessary to protect our intelligence structure. At the very least, this means that the public can-

not be told all. But when a mish-mash of conflicting information gets into the public domain, it is desirable that all of the facts—consistent with protecting national security—be put on the record. We do not believe that this has been done in the Cuban affair. On the contrary, we think that facts, undoubtedly known to Castro, are being covered up or distorted to protect individuals in this country from their responsibility for the monumental blunder at the Bay of Pigs. This is unwise and—within the limits of legitimate security considerations—unnecessary.

MORNING REPORT

Senator MIKE MANSFIELD is getting after the Senate for not voting on any of President Kennedy's legislative programs. I'm not sure the lawmakers are goofing off. Maybe they're just too busy reading it.

So far they have been given programs for the sick, the aged, those overtaxed and undertaxed, commuters, wheat growers, teachers, pupils, our friends and enemies abroad, young people who need work in the cities, and also those who could better work in the woods.

But even if Congress takes none of his advice, President Kennedy hasn't wasted his time. He can always use those messages as campaign speeches in 1964.

ABE MELLINKOFF.

FISCAL NEEDS OF VA MEDICAL PROGRAM

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, the Independent Offices Subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee has recently spent a week with Mr. Gleason, the very able Administrator of Veterans' Affairs and his competent staff, reviewing their financial needs in all departments for 1964.

Administrator Gleason and his staff have done a tremendous job in all fields of VA activities. Perhaps one of the most outstanding accomplishments of the VA Administrator has been the great success of the VA medical program with its 170 hospitals. It is true the cost of the medical program will be over \$1 billion in 1964; and that the cost of the medical program has increased about \$300 million over the last 5 years; and during that time there has been a bed limitation in the system of 125,000 beds. But in the last 2 or 3 years an increase of at least 10 percent in bed occupancy has occurred, which means more veterans have received medical service than in years past. It is generally recognized that VA medicine throughout the entire system is excellent. In fact, no better hospitals exist in our country or any other.

The Administrator has a vast responsibility. The act of September 2, 1958, revising and codifying the laws relating to veteran benefits, states:

The Administrator, under the direction of the President, is responsible for the proper execution and administration of all laws administered by the Veterans' Administra-

tion and for the control, direction, and management of the Veterans' Administration.

In each of the VA programs, including veterans' benefits, insurance, medicine and the others, the Administrator is continuing to move them forward. In exercising his responsibilities, Mr. Gleason receives help from many sources. In matters relating to medical care the Administrator relies on outstanding professional help and advice both within and without the VA. He works hand and glove with his Chief Medical Director in all professional and other medical matters, but he does not attempt to practice medicine. The rapport that exists between the Administrator and his medical experts is one of the reasons the VA has such a successful medical program.

The committee has urged the Administrator for several years to decentralize the medical department. Hospital managers are in a far better position on a day-to-day basis to run their respective hospitals than anybody sitting in an area office or the District of Columbia. If a hospital manager is incapable of running his hospital on a day-to-day basis under general guidelines from the Administrator and his medical chief, the manager should be replaced by someone who is. The one big complaint the average hospital manager offers is that his day-to-day operation of the hospital is slowed down, hampered, and restricted by the regional and the District of Columbia offices.

The VA in recent years has had a regional medical setup of seven offices. The staff in the area medical offices has grown year by year. In 1963 the cost will be \$3,710,000 for 286 positions. This is an unnecessary layer of administration and paper shuffling, which is not an asset but a hindrance, to the practice of medicine in each of the local hospitals. As the matter recently stood, before a hospital manager could make a decision on even trivial matters such as travel, he must contact the area office and get the area office manager's approval. In most instances the area officer had to contact Washington before a final decision could be given. The result is delay, delay, delay.

The Administrator has recently moved the area medical directors and their staffs into Washington. This is a good first step, but does not go far enough. This layer should be eliminated entirely and the area medical directors and their staffs should be reassigned to the various hospitals so that they can practice medicine. The veterans throughout the country will profit by this move.

GOLD MEDAL TO EDDIE CANTOR

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. ROOSEVELT] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, on Thursday, February 21, 1963, I introduced House Joint Resolution 276, which

would authorize the President of the United States to express the high esteem and appreciation of the American people through the issuance of a gold medal to Eddie Cantor.

Twenty-five years ago my father, who suffered so severely from polio himself, called upon Mr. Cantor to help inaugurate a campaign to combat infantile paralysis. Mr. Cantor suggested that every American send in one dime to the White House and coined the phrase "March of Dimes." That first campaign in 1938 successfully focused public attention to the terrible tragedy of polio and got the national foundation underway.

Now on the silver anniversary of the March of Dimes, polio has been virtually eradicated as a public health problem. Since the introduction of the Salk vaccine in 1955 the number of persons struck down by polio has been reduced by 97 percent, and the national foundation has been able to turn its energies and funds to attack virus diseases, arthritis, birth defects, and central nervous system disorders.

All through the years Mr. Cantor has helped to raise funds for the March of Dimes. How large a part his efforts have played in the achievements of the national foundation cannot even be measured.

Mr. Cantor's humanity and love for his fellow man is always radiated through his wonderful wit and humor, which have entertained so many millions of people all over the world. His activities for all kinds of charitable and religious organizations are almost too numerous to mention. But perhaps his feeling about his giving of his time, talent and energy can best be summed up in something he once wrote:

I have learned that service is the rent we pay for our room on earth, and I try to be a good tenant. I have learned that he who believes that charity begins at home is right, but he is wrong if it ends there.

Certainly Mr. Cantor's life has been an example of what he preaches. At this stage of his life, though, Mr. Cantor is not a well man and has been so weighed down by the loss of his wife, his devoted companion and childhood sweetheart.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to urge that the Committee on Banking and Currency act favorably and expeditiously on House Joint Resolution 276, authorizing the Secretary of the Treasury to strike a medal in recognition of such outstanding humanitarian service of someone who has a permanent place in all of our hearts, Mr. Eddie Cantor.

YOUTH EMPLOYMENT OPPORTUNITIES BILL, H.R. 1890

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. MULTER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I was pleased and honored to submit the fol-

lowing statement in support of the administration's Youth Employment Opportunities Act to the general Subcommittee on Education on March 5, 1963:

Thirty years ago on March 4, 1933, in his first inaugural address President Franklin Roosevelt said:

"This Nation asks for action and action now. Our greatest primary task is to put people to work. This is no unsolvable problem if we face it wisely and courageously. It can be accomplished in part by direct recruiting by the Government itself, treating the task as we would treat the emergency of a war, but at the same time through this employment, accomplishing greatly needed projects to stimulate and reorganize the use of our natural resources."

Less than 1 month ago in his youth message, President Kennedy, after surveying our current economic trends, found it necessary to nearly echo the words of President Roosevelt:

"This bill (the youth employment opportunities bill) is a measure of the first priority. The effects of unemployment are nowhere more depressing and disheartening than among the young. Commonsense and justice compel establishment of this program, which will give many many thousands of currently unemployed young persons a chance to find employment, to be paid for their services, and to acquire skills and work experience that will give them a solid start in their working lives."

I urge the speedy enactment of the Youth Employment Opportunities Act, H.R. 1890.

The Youth Employment Opportunities Act is a double-barreled proposal. Simultaneously, it will fire strength back into the economy in two areas—the training and utilization of idle manpower and the preservation of our somewhat neglected natural resources and the achievement of neglected public works projects.

As a powerful nation, we cannot afford a backlog of undone conservation and public works.

In a publication, "Social Dynamite," of the National Committee of Children and Youth which addresses itself to the young urban, unemployed high school dropout, the following remark is made:

"In 1950 youth unemployment was relatively minor. Many young men of 20 and under had been drafted for the Korean war. The country had practically full employment. Automation was a term only just coming into use, no more than handwriting on the wall. In the records of the Midcentury White House Conference (on Children and Youth) the word 'dropout' is not to be found (this latter absence probably because a high school diploma was not yet a near exigency for obtaining a good or steady job.)"

Or more directly in terms of the job market is a statement in an analysis of youth unemployment published last January by the Center for Information on America in its publication entitled "Vital Issues":

"The long-term trend has been toward the expansion of occupations which require college education or technical training, while jobs which require no prior education or skill have actually been declining. There are today about 16 professional and technical jobs for every 10 that existed in 1950; but only about 8 jobs for unskilled laborers for every 10 that existed 12 years ago."

Yet, while the complexity of the economy increases to the point where in 1970 only 5 percent of all jobs will be in the unskilled classification, the output of high school graduates (often a minimum requirement) is still below 70 percent of all youth and increases only slowly each decade.

Thus, the 1961 and 1962 figures stack up like this: one of every four dropouts was unemployed of the group that dropped out

between January and October 1961; one-sixth were unemployed for one-half year or longer; 20 percent of the dropouts employed, moreover, are employed only part time.

Saddest of all, however, is one-tenth of this group have even faded from the statistical picture. Because they are no longer looking for work or desiring to work, they are not even classified as unemployed; they just exist and only very special and thorough surveys uncover them.

Title I of H.R. 1890 would get these boys out of the city, the only environment they know, and place them with new friends in radically different and serene surroundings—our parks and open spaces. Moreover, it would place these young people in a daily routine where work and study are the staples.

It must be remembered, these boys to be reached are not hardened delinquents. At worst, they will be sometime offenders or potential delinquents. We must assume some latent eagerness on their part, which will manifest itself when listlessness no longer suits their new environment.

There is precedent for those who need further proof. The Attorney General mentioned in his testimony the Lane County, Oreg., project of 1961 for potential dropouts not yet delinquent. After a summer working for the State forestry department and achieving one-third more work than the adult crews, they all returned eagerly to school.

And, in West Virginia, some 95 already delinquent boys performed \$200,000 worth of conservation work. To enable this production, the State had to invest \$50,000—an investment incidentally far less than would have been necessary to keep the same 95 youths confined.

The question raised here, of course, is why send them to camps after they're delinquent. We should enact this bill and do it before that happens.

As for title II, the success of one public urban youth work project in New York struck me as my most cogent argument in favor of it.

The summer teen work project in 1961 in uptown Manhattan placed delinquent and predelinquent boys in various public work capacities—painting, plastering, simonizing, and repairing. Although only boys were involved, delinquency dramatically subsided in the neighborhood (the two leaders of rumbles participated in the project).

Sheldon Seller, the director, reported his evaluation in the following manner:

"The best worker a Puerto Rican boy, evaluated his experience, saying, 'I used to think I was lazy.' Two boys were helped to find part-time jobs and one a full-time job. Two boys were encouraged to remain in school, and a third enrolled in night school. One boy for the past 5 months has been tutored. Two boys left school and refused counseling, but one recently returned for counseling. We found a job for him with a city brokerage firm, and other boys now want jobs with the same firm."

To me this is a success story. The Youth Employment Opportunities Act must be passed now by the 88th Congress. It offers the prospect of more such success stories and quickly, before we form a backlog and hard core of youth who have not only never worked, but who will be inured to the impossibility of ever learning.

THE NATIONAL EDUCATION IMPROVEMENT ACT, H.R. 3000

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. MULTER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I was pleased to demonstrate my support for the proposed general education bill by submitting the following statement to the Education and Labor Committee on March 5, 1963:

Mr. Chairman, thank you for the opportunity to present my views on H.R. 3000, the proposed National Education Improvement Act of 1963.

This bill is unique in its field in both its comprehensiveness, and in its intelligent selectivity of areas in our educational structure which most need assistance and which are most eligible for improvement. A very successful precedent exists, however, for an omnibus education bill; the National Defense Education Act was passed in 1958 and its multipurpose measures have been praised ever since. But praiseworthy as its provisions may be, it should be noted that they were aimed at remedying mainly the technological shortages of our schools.

When one speaks of the responsibility for education, most often the subject is the local school district or the State education department. But I would suggest that the responsibility lies with the people, and that we have chosen the more local political bodies as a matter of historical necessity and also as the method best calculated to leave the maintenance of responsibility with the people. It does not follow that the revenues collected by the Federal Government either should not or cannot be returned to those administrative bodies for the benefit of those who have paid the taxes. It is the minds of our children that will suffer from the refusal to so act, and, collectively, it is our Nation whose intellectual development will otherwise be stunted.

H.R. 3000 recognizes the need and the importance of improving education at all levels. It will help correct, for example, the fact that in the elementary and secondary school systems in 1962 there was an excess of 1,666,711 students over the classroom capacity; it will help accommodate the 7 million college students expected by 1970, double the 1960 enrollment; it will go a long way toward making up the current additional \$1 billion annually which institutions of higher education should be spending for the improvement and expansion of their physical plants. These institutions should be investing \$2.3 billion annually instead of the current \$1.3 billion.

The vision of H.R. 3000, and the potential of the educated energies it would unleash, can only be realized by a review of its provisions.

Title I of H.R. 3000 provides an extension of the student loan program initiated by the National Defense Education Act. Its \$90 million ceiling is increased to \$135 million or "necessary sums," in order to meet the demands not satisfied under the previous program. To encourage a greater number of students to enter the teaching profession, up to 50 percent of the loans may be forgivable for all who become teachers.

To provide an additional source for student financial assistance, the bill provides for the encouragement of commercial loans to students, by authorizing the Federal guarantee of such loans. Still another source of financial assistance to the undergraduate is to be provided by authorizing the payment of up to 50 percent of the wages to the needy student employed on campus in work of an educational character. Graduate fellowships and summer session fellowships also begun under the NDEA, are to be increased in num-

ber, thus assuring the continuation and magnification of the number of competent teachers returning to the college and university campus.

Pleased as I am by this bill's provisions for loans to full-time students, I would encourage the part-time student who, usually by financial necessity, is restrained from undertaking a full-time course of study. In 1962 it was estimated that it cost, on the average, \$1,480 for a student to attend a public institution of higher education; of this amount, it was estimated that \$370 came from student earnings. This indicates to me that there is a great source of initiative among our college students, and I can find no reason to stifle that initiative or to penalize it by discriminating against the part-time student. The terms of the NDEA loan program and those of the new insurable loan program should be amended to encourage our ambitious part-time students.

Such an amendment should provide that part-time students receive the same loan and loan insurance benefits as full-time students if they meet the criteria in all other respects save the fact that they are not pursuing a full-time course of study. The Association of University Evening Colleges supports this proposal and informs me that at the present time 50,000 undergraduate and more than 40,000 graduate students are enrolled in part-time evening programs.

To deprive these students of the benefits of the proposed legislation appears to be wholly unjustified and I might point out that it is a discrimination that many of the States do not practice. In New York, for example, there is a program established to guarantee the repayment of student loans from private banks. Part-time students qualify for these loans on the basis of a formula keyed to the limits fixed for full-time students.

Title II of H.R. 3000 provides for the expansion and improvement of educational facilities at institutions of higher education, both public and nonprofit private, and provides for the development of a new program of assistance to institutions of higher education for 2-year college level programs to train semiprofessional technicians in engineering, science, and health occupations.

The modern foreign language area centers and studies program of title VI of the NDEA is to be extended, and its authorization of funds is to be increased.

Title III of H.R. 3000 is aimed at the improvement of educational quality with emphasis placed on the preparation and continuing education of teachers. Through the teacher institutes, preparation programs, cooperative research programs and specialized training programs of this bill, we will reflect the value that all of us place on the teaching profession and on its continued improvement. The extension of the NDEA programs in new educational media research and demonstration, and in the improvement in the States' collection of educational statistics, and tools available to the teacher and the school administration will be strengthened.

For the fall of 1962 the States reported to the Office of Education that there was a shortage of 121,235 classrooms in their public elementary and secondary schools. In the administration's fact sheets on the National Education Improvement Act, it was pointed out that teacher salaries in many of our Nation's school districts are insufficient to attract and retain good teachers.

As I said earlier, I believe the States and the school districts have performed an excellent job in the establishment and financing of our tremendous system of public education. But areas of inadequacy still exist and unfortunately these are not equitably spread throughout the United States. The

administration's fact sheets state, "National defense, population mobility, and our interdependent economy make these disparities cause for national concern." Title IV of H.R. 3000 accurately reflects this necessary concern.

Under title IV, a 4-year, \$1.5 billion program for "the selective and urgent improvement of public elementary and secondary education" would be begun. The funds would be used to increase maximum teacher salaries, raise low starting salaries and raise low average salaries in economically disadvantaged districts. The funds would also support critical classroom construction needs, caused by overcrowding, and fire and health hazards. Special projects would also be financed to improve educational quality, particularly in disadvantaged rural and urban areas. The funds authorized for teachers' salaries are to be phased out over a period of 4 years, so that in each State, the areas of most urgent need may receive the needed assistance, while the State stabilizes and develops its own resources to carry on independently after the Federal assistance comes to an end.

Title IV of H.R. 3000 also recognizes the special needs and duties of our country by authorizing the 2-year continuation of titles III and IV of the NDEA, and the 4-year extension, with some equitable and purposeful modifications such as the inclusion of the District of Columbia, of the federally impacted areas legislation, of Public Laws 815 and 874.

Vocational education, long an accepted and needed program in our country, is treated in title V. Today's program enrolls 4 million young people and adults in courses that train them in skills necessary to our changing economy. The bill would increase the authorization of appropriations to \$73 million in 1964, and necessary sums thereafter, this Federal contribution being somewhat closer to the \$206 million invested yearly by the States and local communities in the program.

Title V also authorizes a program of Federal grants for assistance in the training of teachers for America's 6 million handicapped school-age children who need special education.

Title VI of H.R. 3000 concludes the complementary program of assistance envisioned in the bill. It authorizes grants for the expansion of university extension courses, for the basic education of adults up to the level of the eighth grade, and the expansion of the Library Services Act to encompass assistance to public libraries in all areas of the States.

The importance of the continuing education of our citizens cannot be overemphasized—whether in complex skills at the university, in basic knowledge at the grade school, or in the knowledge of the world and the ages at our local public libraries.

H.R. 3000 will certainly motivate the continuance of the debate over the need or lack of need of our Nation's schools, teachers, and students. I am hopeful, however, that its new approach will foster new insights into what the United States can and should accomplish—in short, emphasize what we can do and not that what we have done is good enough.

A nation's investment in its education is its most certain means of obtaining a nationwide return in development and enlightenment of its people, and in an appreciation of the working principles of the democracy that made it possible.

The argument is that which Thomas Jefferson once made in support of a proposal for student scholarship assistance: "But of the views of this law, none is more important, none more legitimate, than that of rendering the people the safe, as they are the ultimate, guardians of their own liberty."

"HONESTY TODAY AND TOMORROW": THE VIRGINIA JUNIOR CHAMBER OF COMMERCE INITIATES A PROGRAM TO DISCOURAGE CLASSROOM CHEATING AND ENCOURAGE HONESTY AMONG STUDENTS

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BRADEMAS] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, I rise to commend the members of the Junior Chamber of Commerce of the State of Virginia and, in particular, the Jaycees of Richmond, Va., for initiating a program worthy of the attention and, I believe, support of all Members of Congress.

The Virginia Jaycees are showing splendid leadership in offering a fresh approach toward meeting what is unfortunately an apparently widespread problem, cheating by students in the classrooms of our country.

The Virginia Jaycees have launched a program entitled "Honesty Today and Tomorrow," aimed at encouraging high schools throughout the State to undertake programs for stimulating honesty among students.

I should point out that theirs is a positive program for developing honesty and not simply a negative "stop cheating" program.

Clearly the project proposed by the Virginia Jaycees is not the complete answer to this problem but it does provide the impetus for an attack on classroom cheating. The Virginia program is directed at helping individual high schools develop their own appropriate solutions for encouraging honesty among their students.

The originator of the honesty today and tomorrow program and its most articulate advocate is a dedicated and outstanding Richmond, Va., businessman, David R. White.

VIRGINIA NEWSPAPERS SUPPORT PROGRAM

Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent I include in the RECORD several articles and editorials from Virginia newspapers describing and endorsing the program:

[From the Richmond (Va.) Times-Dispatch, Dec. 18, 1962]

A CAMPAIGN AGAINST CHEATING

Given the national administration's open defense of "the right to lie," the admirable campaign against cheating in school and college being waged by a committee chairman of the Virginia Junior Chamber of Commerce takes on added importance. David R. White, Richmond businessman, is the originator of this program and its director. He hopes it will become national in scope—and so do a lot of other people.

Thousands of Virginians, and other Americans are appalled by the open acknowledgment of cheating in the classrooms of this country. A Gallup poll early this year reported that "American youngsters are not really convinced that classroom cheating is dishonest."

But as a matter of fact, the word "cheat" means to "practice fraud" or "to swindle." Isn't it astonishing that so many young people regard this as something of a game—instead of something to be deeply ashamed of? What is the difference between cheating on a test or examination and cheating at cards? The principle is the same; yet some of those who unhesitatingly condemn cheating at cards seem to think cheating in class is almost a sign of sophistication.

An article published a few years ago in This Week magazine said that "cheating is often the first step to delinquency." Even when it isn't, it is a practice that undermines the moral fiber of anyone who indulges in it.

Richmond area high schools, and high schools in other sections, have active and positive programs to promote honesty. The problem is that cheating is so widespread in so many high schools, as well as institutions of higher learning, that a long period of education is essential if significant results are to be had. There is no gainsaying the difficulties in the way.

A minority of secondary schools, as well as of colleges and universities, have effective and smoothly working honor systems. Persons who desire to see these systems adopted elsewhere would do well to study carefully the manner in which they have been made to function successfully at a limited number of institutions.

An honor-system tradition is an important element here, and this cannot be created overnight. The first prerequisite is to get the idea across that cheating in school is on a par with cheating anywhere else.

Parents can do a great deal to help. A parent who chisels on his income tax or tells untruths to his children about this or that, can't expect to influence those children to be strictly honest themselves. Fathers and mothers must set the proper example for their sons and daughters, if they expect those sons and daughters to be upstanding citizens.

So, David White will have to appeal to parents, as well as to their children, and the teachers of those children, in his campaign to combat the nationwide practice of classroom cheating. He has undertaken a formidable task, indeed. Yet its very difficulty makes it doubly worthwhile. We wish him every success.

[From the Richmond (Va.) Times-Dispatch, Dec. 10, 1962]

STATE PROJECT—JAYCEE FIGHTS SCHOOL CHEATING

(By Lon Savage)

A young Richmond businessman, working as a committee chairman for the State junior chamber of commerce, has set out to help solve what he describes as a widespread problem of classroom cheating.

He is David R. White, 33, securities salesman for Mason-Hagan, Inc. He originated and directs a statewide Jaycee project which he hopes will become national in scope, focusing the attention of 250,000 Jaycees on the problem.

Cheating, White said, goes on in Richmond area high schools as well as nearly everywhere else in the country.

He based that conclusion upon reading, on conferences during the past 3 months with area school officials, and upon conversations with students.

White's program including mailing of a pamphlet, which he prepared, to all Jaycee chapters in the State. It outlined the causes of cheating and programs to combat it.

He also sent out a questionnaire to 26 leading high schools in the State to find out what they are doing to promote honesty among students.

He and his committee plan to assemble the answers in a booklet and send it to educators to show them honesty programs that are working.

The State Jaycee organization, he said, plans to submit the project for consideration by the national Jaycees as a nationwide project.

White, a VMI graduate and former Marine officer, said he has approached many students in area schools and questioned them about the cheating problem.

Speaking to them, he said, he has taken the position that nearly everyone, being human, has done things he considers somewhat dishonest.

After he spoke to them in this vein, he said, an "impressive percentage" of students told that they had cheated in class.

"They were not proud of it," he added.

What causes a student to cheat?

Most reasons, White said, fall into one of these categories: "To get into college"; "the teacher didn't prepare us properly"; "family pressure"; "to avoid memorizing a lot of useless details"; "to make the grade," and "everyone was doing it."

The last reason—that "everyone does it"—is the one "we have to fight the most," White said. In his pamphlet sent to Jaycee chapters, he wrote of his contacts with Virginia teenagers:

"Among all the teens we talked to *** the same statement came up over and over again in different words, different schools: Everybody cheats a little.

"A girl panics in an exam and looks at the paper in front of her to 'check the answer.'

"A boy afraid of flunking sticks a crib sheet down his sock 'just in case.'

"A friend signals for help in a quiz and though you think it's wrong to give her the answer, you also think it's wrong not to; so you casually hold up your paper."

There are other factors, he said: Emphasis on grades; parents who expect too much from their children; a teacher's laxity about the problem.

In addition, he wrote in the pamphlet, "adults have often been accused of teaching you to cheat by a 'nibbling dishonesty' that has become so common it's hardly even considered dishonest any more."

"The little bit of hedging on the income tax return, the occasional speeding on the highway, the fibbing to get a 13-year-old into the movies for half price."

What can be done about it?

RICHMOND PROGRAMS

Richmond area high schools, he said, have active and positive programs to promote honesty.

Some involve teacher counseling with students caught cheating. Others involve student honor groups serving as judges of cheating cases and recommending courses of action. (In this program, the offenders remain anonymous to the student-judges.)

Some area students, he said, have reported fellow students for cheating, although many students—and their parents—believe this is wrong.

One Norfolk teacher, White said, has told his class that anyone caught cheating flunks the course. "There is no cheating in that class," he added.

"That is one man's answer," he said. But he added that there is no single answer for all classes or schools.

[From the Petersburg, Colonial Heights, and Hopewell (Va.) Tri-City News, Nov. 13, 1962]

JAYCEES HONESTY IN CLASSROOM PROGRAM GIVEN WIDE APPROVAL

A junior chamber of commerce program to encourage honesty in high school classrooms was met with approval in Colonial Heights last night when a four-man Jaycee committee presented the program to C. G. Smith, Jr., city school superintendent.

The project, called "Honesty—Today and Tomorrow," is being sponsored statewide by the Jaycees State committee on education

and school development. The purpose of the project is to have each Jaycee chapter work with local high school students, teachers, and parents, in an effort to cut down on classroom cheating. The Jaycees and local school authorities are cooperating on the program in which the students are encouraged to be honest in their work.

The Jaycees are attempting to help local schools provide preventive measures against dishonesty and to promote the honest approach. They are acquainting students and parents of the serious consequences of cheating and are suggesting courses of action.

Smith said, "Any effort on the part of any person or group to promote personal integrity is very gratifying. I would commend the Jaycees for their work which you offer to our school age citizens. I shall be happy to pass the idea and materials to our schools. I believe that our students will be impressed by the fact that your organization has taken the time and energy to present these ideas and ideals to them."

Commenting on cheating in city schools, Smith stated that no specific problem had been brought to his attention. He said, however, that school officials were making every effort to cut down the size of classes so that teachers will have more opportunity to work individually with students.

Last night, the Colonial Heights Jaycees recommended that their program be made known in the high school newspaper, that their committee work with the student honor society, and that pamphlets be distributed to teachers, and parents.

[From the Richmond (Va.) Times-Dispatch, Nov. 13, 1962]

PROGRAM OF JAYCEES IS LAUDED

The endorsement came after a four-member committee of the Colonial Heights Jaycees met the superintendent to outline the statewide project of cautioning students against cheating and make them aware of the consequences.

Smith told them, "Any effort on the part of any person or group to promote personal integrity is very gratifying. I commend the Jaycees for this program which you offer to our school-age citizens and I will be happy to pass this idea and material to our high school."

"I believe that our students will be impressed by the fact that you are taking the time and energy to present these ideas and ideals to them."

The Colonial Heights High School has an honor code and Jaycee officials said their program to make students aware of cheating "would be an aid to the code."

[From the Harrisonburg (Va.) Daily News-Record, Dec. 11, 1962]

VIRGINIA JAYCEES LAUNCH DRIVE TO CURB CLASSROOM CHEATING

RICHMOND.—"Everybody does it" and the Virginia Junior Chamber of Commerce is out to stop it.

The "it" refers to classroom cheating.

The Jaycee project was originated and is headed by David R. White, a 33-year-old securities salesman who is a graduate of Virginia Military Institute and a former Marine Corps officer.

White said he hopes to bring the widespread problem to the attention of the 250,000 Jaycees in this country and make it a national project.

He recently completed a 3-month study of the problem, which included reading, conferences with school officials, and conversations with students.

In approaching the students, White said, he has taken the position that nearly everyone has done things he considers somewhat dishonest. He said an "impressive percentage" admitted they had cheated in class.

"They were not proud of it," he said. What causes a student to cheat?

White said he found most reasons fall into one of these categories:

"To get into college"; "the teacher didn't prepare us properly"; "family pressure"; "to avoid memorizing a lot of useless details"; "to make the grade"; and "everyone does it."

White and his committee have prepared a pamphlet which was mailed to Virginia Jaycees. It outlines the causes of cheating and how to combat it.

White also plans to issue a booklet on the promotion of honesty programs based on answers to a questionnaire sent to 26 high schools.

[From the Newport News (Va.) Daily Press, Dec. 18, 1962]

CHEATING UNDER JAYCEES' FIRE

The Virginia Junior Chamber of Commerce has set itself to an important and imposing task in its campaign to eradicate cheating or "cribbing" in the classroom. The group holds that though "everybody does it" there's no good reason why anybody should and will endeavor to see that nobody does.

It is hardly to be expected that the Jaycees will succeed fully in their undertaking. The pressure to cheat to make a good showing is too heavy on fond parents who want to see their children get along—at least appear to get along—as well as or better than their associates. Moreover, many parents are not above a bit of cheating on their own and set poor examples to their young. The cheater in school also is under similar pressures including those from parents who insist on junior bringing home top grades and when he doesn't put pressure on him or run to his teacher to complain that Johnny hasn't had a fair shake.

But some pressure can be put on also by the Jaycees who hope to make their anti-cheating crusade national for the 250,000 members of Jaycee chapters throughout the country. Already David R. White, who heads the movement, has consulted with school officials and students to develop a background for action and to determine the scope of his project. His approach to students is that almost everyone has done things he deems somewhat dishonest and cites an "impressive percentage" of students who admit cheating in class, but they are not proud of it, he adds, and that, we think, holds out hope for developing a good climate for reform.

Most frequent reasons for cheating were found to be to get into college, family pressure, seeking to avoid having to memorize a lot of useless details, to make the grade whether they deserved it or not—and finally the resort of most people who do not want to take responsibility—"everybody does it."

The subject is most aptly chosen. Every cheater and potential cheater would do well to remember the almost invariable fate of his kind. He may cheat to get into college, cheat to make grades high enough to stay there but when he gets out into the world as a breadwinner and cheats there he soon goes into the discard for lack of basic knowledge that he would have had if he had studied rather than cheated. And finally, he is a failure because of the distrust of those with whom he deals.

That is just the material side of cheating. It does not include the moral value of being honest and able to live with respect and clear conscience with one's self. Which, of course, is the greatest of all the values of honesty.

URGE NATIONAL JAYCEE CONSIDERATION OF THE VIRGINIA PROGRAM

Mr. Speaker, as a member of the junior chamber of commerce in my home city of South Bend, Ind., I want to salute the Jaycees of Virginia and to express the hope that local and State junior chamber chapters throughout the United States will encourage similar

programs in their own jurisdictions. It is this kind of local leadership in working with young people that I think is heartily to be applauded.

I want also to say that I hope that delegates attending the National Convention of the U.S. Junior Chamber of Commerce in Tulsa, Okla., in a few days will give serious consideration to adopting the Virginia Jaycee "Honesty Today and Tomorrow" program as a national project of the U.S. Junior Chamber of Commerce.

CHEATING: WHO'S TO BLAME?

Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent I insert at this point in the RECORD an article from the magazine, Seventeen, "Classroom Cheating: Who's to Blame?"

CHEATING: WHO'S TO BLAME?

Is it the teacher? your parents? society? college pressures? or you?

During final exam week last year several teenagers in three large schools had their friends sit in and take their tests for them. In one suburban school, students who helped mimeograph the tests took copies home. In another high school, teenagers paid A students to ghostwrite their term papers. In other schools, students sold history papers to the class behind them or paid to have book reports written.

Shocking? Scandalous? Is paying someone to write a book report for you so very much worse than using a hand-me-down from a friend in an upper class? Is bringing crib sheets to an exam so different from taking a copy of the test home? Among all the teens we talked to, in piecing together the puzzle of high school cheating, the same statement came up over and over again in different words, different schools: Everybody cheats a little. A girl panics in an exam and looks at the paper in front of her to "check the answer." A boy afraid of flunking, sticks a crib sheet down his sock "just in case—for an emergency." A math teacher has the class correct one another's papers and everyone fills in the right answers. Book reports are handed down from class to class. Homework copied or bartered: "I'll do English tonight if you do algebra." A friend signals for help in a quiz and though you think it's wrong to give her the answer, you also think it's wrong not to; so you casually hold up your paper.

"I don't think it's cheating if you help someone who knows the subject but just can't think of an answer," one honor student told us. "You give a little and take a little. It's friendship." "I'd be ashamed to cheat—to have my friends know I did," a 15-year-old from a suburban girls' school reported. "Well, cheating's never right, but when you see other kids doing it," a teen said, "you think, 'Why should they get a higher mark than I do?'" "Cheating is justified if the test isn't fair," was the attitude of one pretty sophomore from Tennessee. "It's never justified," a young West Point candidate said. "Your work should be a record of what you can do, whether it's homework or a test, a term paper—it doesn't matter. Cheating is cheating."

Perhaps one of the teens described or quoted above feels just as you do, perhaps not. If you're bursting to interrupt here with a "that's not it at all," we couldn't be less surprised. Attitudes and statistics about cheating vary not only regionally but from school to school and even from class to class. In two schools we visited, cheating was widespread among certain students and almost nonexistent throughout the rest of the school. "They all do it sometimes," one teacher informed us. There is no clear-cut, across-the-State picture, no neatly pigeonholed pattern of behavior, no tidy percentages

of those who cheat and those who don't. And it really doesn't matter. The important thing, we think, is not how many teenagers cheat, or how, but:

THE REASONS WHY TEENAGERS CHEAT

Betty, 14, feels pressure from home is the main reason for cheating in her school. "Some parents say, 'If you fall, you can't go out for a month.' I know one boy whose father keeps threatening to take him out of the school if he doesn't do better."

"All the kids are afraid of what their families say if they don't get good marks."

Evelyn, 16, admits her class cheats regularly. "Kids get in a tight spot and cheat once. If they're not caught, they do it again and again. It's an atmosphere. No one cheated freshman year; then it started, very little at first, but it spread tremendously. I was kind of shocked in the beginning. Everyone does it, though. It grows on you. First, it's a glance at somebody's paper, then giving answers, then crib notes."

Once in a while a teenager gave a reason like laziness or spite for cheating. Some teens said they cheated "to put something over on the teacher" or "just for kicks—to see what I could get away with." But most of the reasons fell into these categories: "To get into college." "The teacher didn't prepare us properly." "Family pressure." "To avoid memorizing a lot of useless details." "To make the grade." "Everyone was doing it."

More significant perhaps than the reasons you have for cheating, if you do, are the reasons that cropped up repeatedly for not cheating. Boys, girls, seniors, freshmen—almost everyone we talked to started with the same six words: It all depends on the teacher.

"If the teacher's strict, no one cheats." An English teacher in junior high school made it clear at the beginning of the year that he would give anyone who cheated a zero in the test, call in the parents, and put it on the student's record. No one cheated. A Spanish teacher cracked down on the weekly test cheating and made anyone caught stay for Saturday detention. After the first few Saturdays, no one cheated. A science teacher told his class that no one who tried her best would fail; anyone who cheated would automatically flunk. No one cheated. Is the system to blame?

"There's too much emphasis on grades and tests, not enough on individual ability. Lots of kids cheat because they just can't do the work." Though that may sound like a teenager talking, it's a high school teacher.

Some students are hustled up from grammar school with barely third-grade reading ability. Others reach freshman class in high school with college-level reading ability. One teenager has an IQ of 150, the boy or the girl at the next desk has an IQ of 90. And yet, in many schools everyone is expected to do the same work, take the same tests and progress at an equal pace.

ARE PARENTS TOO DEMANDING?

Some are, and even the most understanding parents often exert hidden pressure simply by expecting too much. But the pressures aren't always hidden. Few parents can be objective enough to admit the limitations of their children: If marks are poor, parents are always sure their teens could do better if they tried harder. Perhaps they could. Perhaps not. Often, an honest appraisal of a student's capabilities could clear the air at home but many teachers complicate the situation by giving parents soothing clichés instead of facts. Impossible standards are raised, then privileges are denied—the pressures pile up. In some communities where the "name" colleges are part of the

status symbols, parental pressure for high scholastic averages becomes one of the major reasons given—by teens and educators—for cheating problems.

ARE COLLEGE PRESSURES TO BLAME?

For many of you, the answer would seem to be "Yes." The demands of college with all the tensions and outside pressures are undeniable—but often unrealistic. Or at least avoidable. This year there were about 50 schools turning away qualified applicants and about a thousand that still had room for qualified students, according to Mr. Douglas Dillenbeck of the College Entrance Examination Board. "The competition for college admission has been overestimated and overpublicized. And any student bright enough to profit from college," adds Mr. Dillenbeck, "should be bright enough to realize you can't bluff your way in."

The most widely used college entrance exam is the college board's scholastic aptitude test, which measures a student's potential, his ability, his capabilities. About a hundred colleges use the board's achievement test, too. In either case, it's ability and real knowledge that count.

WHAT IS SOCIETY'S RESPONSIBILITY?

Adults have often been accused of teaching you to cheat by a nibbling dishonesty that has become so common it's hardly even considered dishonest any more. The little bit of hedging on the income tax return, the occasional speeding on the highway, the fibbing to get a 13 year old into the movies for half price, the payola, the expense account padding—the list is endless. "In the last 10 years something has happened to the American public," Juvenile Court Judge Philip B. Gilliam of Denver, Colo., said recently. "People claim it's all right to be a little bit of a thief, to do a little wrong. It's a new kind of crime that's sweeping the country." What's to be done about it? You, as teenagers, can't reform the adult delinquents, but you can change the ethics of your own generation. And whether you do it or not is going to make a difference in the world for a long time to come. The standards you set, good or bad, are the standards your children will live by and pass to their children.

ON YOUR HONOR

In spite of society and the system, in spite of poor teachers, bad examples, pressures, temptations, and tensions, the final responsibility for cheating rests with you. And there are many ways that only you can stop it. Honor systems are one. Only 36 percent of the high school students in a recent national survey had tried honor systems. Did they work? "Yes," said 65 percent. In the other 35 percent lies the crux of the honor system problem: It can't work unless you want it to. The report clause (students must report other students for cheating) is one of the principal reasons most students don't want an honor system. But the report clause is not always necessary. At Scarsdale High School in New York's Westchester County, the pledge system is used instead. No student is required to inform on another. If a student hands in an unsigned pledge—"I did not cheat nor did I witness any cheating"—after an exam (none are proctored) the teacher simply reports it to the Student Honor Committee. The committee reports the violation to the class; if the class votes 100 percent to try the honor system again, it gets one more chance.

The basic problem in preventing cheating is the attitude of teenagers, which among many students, is "What's so wrong about it?" To answer the question: It's a problem of personal integrity and honesty. When teenagers pull up their averages by

cheating and win a scholarship or honors that other students really deserve, there is clearly an injustice involved.

JUVENILE DELINQUENCY IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. STAGGERS] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Speaker, juvenile delinquency is not a bad dream; it is a reality and we cannot ignore it.

Many men and women of this Nation, especially of the District of Columbia and in particular of Capitol Hill, have been personally confronted with this terror.

On February 26, 1963, the well-known and reliable WMAL TV-radio commentator and respected member of the House of Representatives radio and TV gallery, Mr. Joseph McCaffrey, presented to the public his "Joseph McCaffrey's Commentary."

This timely and forthright broadcast regarding "juvenile delinquents but their delinquency is adult" is herewith made a part of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD with the hope it will aid our leaders in formulating plans and laws to combat and erase the causes of juvenile delinquency:

JOSEPH McCAFFREY'S COMMENTARY, WMAL-TV, FEBRUARY 26, 1963

Good evening. The joint congressional hearings on District crime will probably explore many of the back alleys of Washington before sitting down to write some firm legislative recommendations.

As yet the committee hasn't dug into one of the worst problems—the young offender. They are called juvenile delinquents but their delinquency is adult.

In the fiscal year of 1962 the total crime in the District dropped a little more than 1 percent. Yet during those same 12 months juvenile delinquency increased more than 17 percent. Almost half of the increase was due to repeaters.

A curb on the young criminal in Washington would sharply reduce the local crime record. The best way to curb the young criminal might be to redefine the term juvenile delinquent. For example, at the present time juvenile operators are tried in juvenile court for traffic violations. Some who have studied the District crime situation believe this is ridiculous. The juvenile driver has been given an adult privilege, but he is given special handling when he breaks the law.

Juvenile delinquency is judged now on age. It might be well if the laws were rewritten to determine whether a youth goes before the juvenile court judge or an adult court judge on the basis of the crime involved. Bringing yokers, knife wielders, and rapists into juvenile court is making a mockery of justice.

The joint congressional hearing should explore the role of the so-called juvenile in rocketing District crime to its present high level.

It should seriously question the value of bringing repeaters 16 and 17 years of age back, again and again, to juvenile court.

But most important, the committee should consider whether it is time to redefine the term "juvenile delinquent."

Our problem is that there is nothing, nothing juvenile about the delinquency which is blackening the reputation of the Nation's Capital.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. PATTEN, for March 11, 12, 13, and 14, on account of official business away from Washington with the Subcommittee on Manned Space Flight.

Mr. DADDARIO (at the request of Mr. GIAIMO), for Monday, March 11, through Thursday, March 14, on account of official business.

Mr. GURNEY (at the request of Mr. HALLECK), for today, on account of official business.

Mr. HEALEY (at the request of Mr. MURPHY of New York), for Monday, March 11, 1963, on account of illness.

Mrs. SULLIVAN (at the request of Mr. ALBERT), for Monday, March 11, 1963, on account of official business in her district.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon, for 45 minutes, today, instead of the 30 minutes previously granted her.

Mr. JOHANSEN, for 30 minutes, today.

Mr. HEMPHILL (at the request of Mr. SMITH of Iowa), for 30 minutes, on Wednesday, March 13, and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida (at the request of Mr. SMITH of Iowa), for 30 minutes on Tuesday, March 12, and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mr. HALPERN, for 1 hour on Wednesday, March 13.

Mr. CAHILL, for 30 minutes on Tuesday, March 12.

Mr. PEPPER, for 10 minutes, today.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

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

Mr. HAYS and to include an article.

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

Mr. HOSMER.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM.

Mr. SHORT.

Mr. NYGAARD.

Mr. ALGER.

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

Mr. COHELAN.

Mr. EVINS.

Mr. BURKE.

Mr. EVERETT.

SENATE BILL REFERRED

A bill of the Senate of the following title was taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 816. An act for the establishment of a Commission on Science and Technology; to the Committee on Science and Astronautics.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 4 o'clock and 52 minutes p.m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, March 12, 1963, at 12 o'clock noon.

REPORTS OF EXPENDITURES OF FOREIGN CURRENCIES AND APPROPRIATED FUNDS INCURRED IN TRAVEL OUTSIDE THE UNITED STATES

Mr. BURLESON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House

for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. BURLESON. Mr. Speaker, section 502(b) of the Mutual Security Act of 1954, as amended by section 401(a) of Public Law 86-472, approved May 14, 1960, and section 105 of Public Law 86-628, approved July 12, 1960, require the reporting of expenses incurred in connection with travel outside the United States, including both foreign currencies expended and dollar expenditures made from appropriated funds by Members, employees, and committees of the Congress.

The law requires the chairman of each committee to prepare a consolidated report of foreign currency expenditures and also dollar expenditures from appropriated funds within the first 60 days that Congress is in session in each calendar year, covering expenditures for travel outside the United States during the previous calendar year. The consolidated report is forwarded to the Committee on House Administration which, in turn, prints such report in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD within 10 legislative days after receipt. The deadline for filing expenditure reports for travel during the calendar year 1962 was March 9, 1963.

House Committees on the District of Columbia, House Administration, Interior and Insular Affairs, Post Office and Civil Service, Rules, Un-American Activities, and Select Committee on Small Business have stated that no Members or employees traveled outside the United States on committee business during 1962.

There are submitted herewith the reports from the House committees which were received within the prescribed time limit: Agriculture, Appropriations, Armed Services, Banking and Currency, Education and Labor, Foreign Affairs, Government Operations, Interstate and Foreign Commerce, the Judiciary, Merchant Marine and Fisheries, Public Works, Science and Astronautics, Veterans' Affairs, and Ways and Means.

Report of expenditure of foreign currencies and appropriated funds, Committee on Agriculture, U.S. House of Representatives, expended between Jan. 1 and Dec. 31, 1962

Name and country	Name of currency	Lodging		Meals		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Harold D. Cooley: France, April and November	Franc	3,000	-----	1,658.75	-----	-----	-----	1,360.10	-----	6,018.85	1,228.00
Harold B. McSween: France	do	950	-----	750.00	-----	2,000.00	-----	1,043.67	-----	4,743.67	968.10
Italy	Lire	70,000	-----	45,000	-----	83,917	-----	185,000	-----	383,917	918.20
United Kingdom	Pound	110	-----	42	-----	80.17.6	-----	48	-----	280.17.6	786.98
Total											3,601.61

Report of expenditure of foreign currencies and appropriated funds, Committee on Appropriations, expended between Jan. 1 and Dec. 31, 1962

Name and country	Name of currency	Lodging		Meals		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Defense Subcommittee	Dollar		998.01		1,247.28		3,211.85		1,066.77		6,523.91
Foreign Operations Subcommittee	do		939.00		673.65		7,796.20		351.75		9,760.60
Labor, Health, Education, and Welfare Subcommittee	do		272.00		181.40		457.40		46.60		957.40
Interior Subcommittee	do		241.66		266.23		1,819.54		193.06		2,520.49
State, Justice, Commerce, and Judiciary Subcommittee	do		797.00		568.60		5,357.37		156.45		6,879.42
Full Committee	do		943.65		921.22		7,774.74		419.20		10,058.81
Survey and Investigations Staff	do		2,248.68		2,671.97		11,069.00		222.98		16,212.63
Total			6,440.00		6,530.35		37,486.10		2,456.81		62,913.26

CLARENCE CANNON,
Chairman, Committee on Appropriations.

MARCH 8, 1963.

Report of expenditure of foreign currencies and appropriated funds, Committee on Appropriations, U.S. House of Representatives, Subcommittee on Department of Defense, expended between Jan. 1 and Dec. 31, 1962

Name and country	Name of currency	Lodging		Meals		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
George H. Mahon:											
United States	Dollar		35.00		20.18		408.73		12.50		421.23
Mexico	do		16.50		6.65		.80		4.00		59.98
Guatemala	do		16.50		17.50				1.75		24.90
Costa Rica	do		45.00		17.70				4.05		38.05
Panama	do		28.00						3.30		66.00
Jamaica	do								2.00		32.40
Subtotal			141.00		62.03		411.93		27.60		642.56
D. J. Flood:											
United States	Dollar		19.40		411.50		1,071.41		463.79		1,966.10
Peru	do		61.46		97.24		91.06		227.34		477.10
Ecuador	do				2.50		20.00		7.00		29.50
Canal Zone	do		12.00		4.13				15.56		31.69
Colombia	do										12.00
Subtotal			92.86		515.37		1,194.47		713.69		2,516.39
Harold C. Ostertag:											
United States	Dollar		55.15		69.05		198.15		29.00		351.35
Jamaica	do		15.00				2.40		6.00		23.40
Haiti	do		13.20		19.25				10.25		42.70
Subtotal			83.35		88.30		200.55		45.25		417.45
William E. Minshall:											
United States	Dollar		71.40		61.33		509.55		54.45		696.73
Mexico	do		35.00		30.20		2.00		6.29		73.49
Guatemala	do		16.50		19.90				8.75		45.15
Costa Rica	do		16.50		22.80		2.00		5.60		46.90
Panama	do		45.00		33.00				4.50		82.50
Jamaica	do		28.00		4.25		2.90		3.15		38.30
Haiti	do		13.20		21.00				13.00		47.20
Subtotal			225.60		102.48		516.45		95.74		1,030.27
Robert L. Michaels:											
United States	Dollar		73.40		67.50		431.70		47.65		620.25
Mexico	do		35.00		29.20		4.00		4.15		72.35
Guatemala	do		16.50		19.10				7.14		42.74
Costa Rica	do		14.50		22.90		2.00		4.35		43.75
Panama	do		45.00		30.10				6.00		81.10
Jamaica	do		28.00		4.50		2.90		2.40		37.80
Cuba	do		2.00		.50						2.50
Haiti	do		13.20		13.00				10.25		36.45
Subtotal			227.60		186.80		440.60		81.94		936.94
Samuel R. Preston:											
United States	Dollar		73.40		73.30		431.95		61.25		639.90
Mexico	do		35.00		28.85		11.50		4.25		79.60
Guatemala	do		16.50		19.10				9.10		44.70
Costa Rica	do		14.50		23.90		2.00		2.50		42.90
Panama	do		45.00		31.90				5.95		82.85
Jamaica	do		28.00		5.00		2.40		6.50		41.90
Cuba	do		2.00		.50						2.50
Haiti	do		13.20		19.75				13.00		45.95
Subtotal			227.60		202.30		447.85		102.55		980.30
Grand total	Dollar		998.01		1,247.28		3,211.85		1,066.77		6,523.91

GEORGE H. MAHON,
Chairman, Subcommittee on Department of Defense.

Report of expenditure of foreign currencies and appropriated funds by the Committee on Appropriations, U.S. House of Representatives—Subcommittee on Foreign Operations, expended between Jan. 1 and Dec. 31, 1962

Name and country	Name of currency	Lodging		Meals		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Hon. Otto E. Passman (includes 1 trip to Western Europe and 1 trip around the world):											
Italy	U.S. dollar		54.00		27.20		4.75		20.60		106.55
Switzerland	do		64.00		48.35		6.50		39.30		158.15
Spain	do		90.00		76.55		20.75		77.00		264.30
Lebanon	do		36.00		25.95		4.75		5.15		71.85
Thailand	do		54.00		33.65		5.90		8.25		101.80
Hong Kong	do		100.00		87.65		17.25		47.80		252.70
Japan	do		30.00		27.45		5.50		11.25		74.20
United States	do		48.00		33.35		12.50		9.30		103.15
Transportation (2 trips)	do						3,425.30				3,425.30
Subtotal			476.00		360.15		3,503.20		218.65		4,558.00
Kenneth Sprinkle:											
Italy	U.S. dollar		36.00		22.80		2.75		5.95		67.50
Switzerland	do		24.00		19.45		4.30		7.20		54.95
Spain	do		36.00		18.65		2.80		8.30		65.75
United States	do						4.50				4.50
Transportation	do						1,100.80				1,100.80
Subtotal			96.00		60.90		1,115.15		21.45		1,293.50
Francis G. Merrill (includes 1 trip to Western Europe and 1 trip around the world):											
Italy	U.S. dollar		36.00		21.80		3.00		6.25		67.05
Switzerland	do		57.00		39.25		6.25		12.25		114.75
Spain	do		87.00		50.20		11.50		38.05		186.75
Lebanon	do		33.00		27.25		3.50		7.50		71.25
Thailand	do		48.00		31.20		4.80		9.50		93.50
Hong Kong	do		80.00		55.60		6.75		15.90		158.25
Japan	do		26.00		17.55		3.50		8.20		55.25
United States	do				9.75		25.00		14.00		48.75
Transportation (2 trips)	do						3,113.55				3,113.55
Subtotal			367.00		252.60		3,177.85		111.65		3,909.10
Grand total			939.00		673.65		7,796.20		351.75		9,760.60

OTTO E. PASSMAN,

Chairman, Subcommittee on Foreign Operations.

Report of expenditure of foreign currencies and appropriated funds by the Committee on Appropriations, U.S. House of Representatives—Subcommittee on Labor-Health, Education, and Welfare, expended between Jan. 1 and Dec. 31, 1962

Name and country	Name of currency	Lodging		Meals		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
John E. Fogarty:											
Switzerland	U.S. dollar		144.00		99.25				11.20		254.45
Israel	do		128.00		82.15				35.40		245.55
Transportation	do						457.40				457.40
Total			272.00		181.40		457.40		46.60		957.40

JOHN E. FOGARTY,

Chairman, Subcommittee on Departments of Labor, and Health, Education, and Welfare.

Report of expenditure of foreign currencies and appropriated funds by the Committee on Appropriations, U.S. House of Representatives—Subcommittee on Interior and Related Agencies, expended between Jan. 1 and Dec. 31, 1962

Name and country	Name of currency	Lodging		Meals		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Michael J. Kirwan:											
United States	U.S. dollar		66.83		90.70		43.55		68.97		270.05
Panama	do		18.00		18.45		4.00		8.75		49.20
Mexico	do		36.00		41.50		5.00		36.08		118.58
Round trip transportation	do						874.22				874.22
Subtotal			120.83		150.65		926.77		113.80		1312.05
Eugene B. Wilhelm:											
United States	U.S. dollar		66.83		68.60		18.55		41.36		195.34
Panama	do		18.00		12.30				5.90		36.20
Mexico	do		36.00		34.68				32.00		102.68
Round trip transportation	do						874.22				874.22
Subtotal			120.83		115.58		892.77		79.26		1208.44
Total			241.6		266.23		1819.54		193.06		2520.49

MICHAEL J. KIRWAN,

Chairman, Subcommittee on Interior and Related Agencies.

Report of expenditure of foreign currencies and appropriated funds, Committee on Appropriations, U.S. House of Representatives, Sub-committee on State, Justice, Commerce, the Judiciary, and Related Agencies, expended between Jan. 1 and Dec. 31, 1962

Name and country	Name of currency	Lodging		Meals		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Hon. John J. Rooney:											
Italy	Dollar		72.00		53.90				23.00		148.90
Austria	do		36.00		24.60				13.40		74.00
Poland	do		82.50		58.45				12.60		153.55
Germany	do		65.00		54.60				6.75		126.35
England	do		40.00		38.00				18.30		96.30
Transportation	do						1,157.90				1,157.90
Subtotal			295.50		229.55		1,157.90		74.05		1,757.00
Hon. Frank T. Bow:											
Japan	Dollar		35.00		20.65						55.65
Hong Kong	do		45.00		22.60				3.60		71.20
Thailand	do		64.00		32.15				4.65		100.80
India	do		32.00		16.80				2.15		50.95
Italy	do		36.00		19.60						55.60
Transportation	do						3,033.37				3,033.37
Subtotal			212.00		111.80		3,033.37		10.40		3,367.57
Jay B. Howe:											
Italy	Dollar		60.00		52.50		2.90		19.25		134.65
Austria	do		28.00		19.00				5.25		52.25
Poland	do		72.50		55.25				14.50		142.25
Germany	do		45.00		43.50		1.70		11.50		101.70
England	do		84.00		57.00		3.60		21.50		166.10
Transportation	do						1,157.90				1,157.90
Subtotal			289.50		227.25		1,166.10		72.00		1,754.85
Total			797.00		568.60		5,357.37		156.45		6,879.42

JOHN J. ROONEY,
Chairman, Subcommittee on State, Justice, Commerce, the Judiciary, and Related Agencies.

Report of expenditure of foreign currencies and appropriated funds, Committee on Appropriations, U.S. House of Representatives, expended between Jan. 1 and Dec. 31, 1962

Name and country	Name of currency	Lodging		Meals		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Hon. John M. Slack, Jr.:											
United States	Dollar		92.48		80.53		16.50		47.50		237.01
Japan	do		60.57		58.84		22.84		25.94		167.19
Korea	do		4.00		17.10				8.00		29.10
Okinawa	do		4.50		15.68		4.50		8.80		33.48
Taiwan	do		25.00		17.25		4.00		11.75		58.00
Hong Kong	do		43.07		47.70		21.50		22.90		135.17
Thailand	do		67.94		57.80		24.71		31.59		182.04
Vietnam	do		34.86		29.22		7.50		6.90		78.48
Transportation	do						2,503.21				2,503.21
Subtotal			332.42		323.62		2,604.26		163.38		3,423.68
Hon. George E. Shiple:											
United States	Dollar		61.54		58.58		10.50		42.26		172.88
Japan	do		28.03		27.21		10.59		15.30		81.13
Korea	do		4.00		17.10				8.00		29.10
Okinawa	do		4.50		15.68		4.50		8.80		33.48
Taiwan	do		25.00		19.08		4.00		11.00		59.08
Hong Kong	do		53.07		42.83		19.70		23.89		139.49
Thailand	do		52.71		43.81		116.80		23.02		136.34
Vietnam	do		34.86		28.65		7.50		7.39		78.40
Guam	do		15.10		29.40		10.00		16.60		71.10
Transportation	do						2,619.60				2,619.60
Subtotal			278.81		282.34		2,703.19		156.26		3,420.60
George A. Urien:											
United States	Dollar		92.48		79.50		10.25		23.33		205.56
Japan	do		60.57		57.34		12.69		16.68		147.28
Korea	do		4.00		16.60				8.00		28.60
Okinawa	do		4.50		15.25		4.50		8.80		33.05
Taiwan	do		25.00		16.58		4.00		5.05		50.63
Hong Kong	do		43.07		46.39		12.50		15.42		117.38
Thailand	do		67.94		56.10		12.64		15.69		152.37
Vietnam	do		34.86		27.50		7.50		6.59		76.45
Transportation	do						2,403.21				2,403.21
Subtotal			332.42		315.26		2,467.29		90.56		3,214.53
Total			943.65		921.22		7,774.74		419.20		10,058.81

Report of expenditure of foreign currencies and appropriated funds, Committee on Appropriations, U.S. House of Representatives, surveys and investigation staff, expended between Jan. 1 and Dec. 31, 1962

Name and country	Name of currency	Lodging		Meals		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Curtis O. Booher:											
Japan	Dollar	88.00		127.00		1.80		5.00			221.80
Germany	do	92.00		114.00				3.00			209.00
Spain	do	75.00		99.00		1.95		3.00			178.95
Transportation	do					1,293.13					1,293.13
Subtotal		255.00		340.00		1,296.88		11.00			1,902.88
Rowland C. Halstead, Japan	Dollar	91.50		132.50		1,036.75		7.25			1,268.00
Willie C. Law:											
Japan	do	51.08		62.42		2.65		54.90			171.05
Okinawa	do	34.31		41.94							76.25
Germany	do	104.40		127.60		25.12		5.20			262.32
Italy	do	41.85		51.15		17.90		2.15			113.05
France	do	56.10		45.90		11.65					113.65
Transportation	do					1,268.35					1,268.35
Subtotal		287.74		329.01		1,325.67		62.25			2,004.67
E. Huyett Magee:											
England	Dollar	63.00		56.50		4.30		1.20			125.00
France	do	73.50		42.75		2.10		3.15			121.50
Mexico	do	64.80		54.45		3.10		1.40			123.76
Transportation	do					629.90					629.90
Subtotal		201.30		153.70		639.40		5.75			1,000.15
Hugh B. McGahey:											
Japan	Dollar	86.00		129.00		6.80		11.00			232.80
Germany	do	82.00		124.00				1.00			207.00
Spain	do	70.00		104.00		5.30					179.30
Transportation	do					1,270.15					1,270.15
Subtotal		238.00		357.00		1,282.25		12.00			1,889.25
Joseph N. Millic:											
Japan	Dollar	60.98		74.52		4.80		3.00			143.30
Okinawa	do	25.31		30.94							56.25
Germany	do	100.80		123.20		5.83		3.00			232.83
Italy	do	41.85		51.15		16.15		6.18			115.33
France	do	47.70		58.30		6.10		3.00			115.10
Transportation	do					1,263.70					1,263.70
Subtotal		276.64		338.11		1,296.58		15.18			1,926.51
William B. Soyars, Jr.:											
France	Dollar	33.75		39.30		5.15		4.65			82.85
Germany	do	16.90		36.90		6.10		4.20			64.10
Spain	do	42.00		44.40				4.25			90.65
Transportation	do					619.20					619.20
Subtotal		92.65		120.60		630.45		13.10			856.80
Eugene W. Vahey:											
Japan	Dollar	94.95		116.05		4.65		7.00			222.65
Germany	do	91.25		111.50				2.90			205.65
Spain	do	79.65		97.35		4.65					181.65
Transportation	do					1,278.80					1,278.80
Subtotal		265.85		324.90		1,288.10		9.90			1,888.75
Virgil R. Walker:											
Japan	Dollar	45.70		54.80		9.90		13.00			123.40
Okinawa	do	31.50		41.70				3.50			76.70
Germany	do	73.80		123.65		19.87		8.60			225.92
Italy	do	43.70		56.90		17.90		6.75			125.25
France	do	57.60		52.25		18.90		13.90			142.65
Transportation	do					1,268.35					1,268.35
Subtotal		252.30		329.30		1,334.92		45.75			1,962.27
Leonard M. Walters:											
England	Dollar	36.00		27.00		10.25		1.05			74.30
France	do	102.50		72.00		15.85		27.95			218.30
Germany	do	12.00		62.10		13.30		4.60			92.00
Italy	do	64.40		33.85		19.20		6.05			123.50
Transportation	do					651.00					651.00
Subtotal		214.90		194.95		709.60		39.65			1,159.10
Harold D. Watkins, Mexico	Dollar	72.80		51.90		228.40		1.15			354.25
Grand total		2,248.68		2,671.97		11,069.00		222.98			16,212.63

Report of expenditure of foreign currencies and appropriated funds, Committee on Armed Services, U.S. House of Representatives, expended between Jan. 1 and Dec. 31, 1962

Name and country	Name of currency	Lodging		Meals		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
James A. Byrne: Appropriated funds: United States.....	Dollar.....				21.20			1,324.14		208.30	
Ireland..... do.....					4.74			5.70		51.73	62.17
Great Britain..... do.....										11.00	11.00
Germany..... do.....		17.50			51.57			8.02		55.50	132.59
Italy..... do.....					2.62			12.13		21.53	36.28
Greece..... do.....								10.00		10.00	20.00
Spain..... do.....					5.02					13.81	18.83
Madeira..... do.....					1.25					4.85	6.10
Total appropriated funds (Army).....		17.50			86.40			1,359.99		376.72	1,840.61
Counterpart funds: Ireland..... do.....	Pound.....	8-0-0 34-14-3	22.80 98.82	1-13-3	4.74	33-16-3	96.36	18-4-0	51.79	61-13-6	175.69
Great Britain..... do.....						3-0-0	8.55	6-7-6	18.05	44-1-9	125.42
Germany..... do.....		56.00	14.07	168.00	42.21	93.00	23.26	402.33	100.24	719.33	179.78
Italy..... do.....		23,000	36.80	15,434	24.70	7,200	11.52	64,831	103.73	110,465	176.75
Greece..... do.....		990	33.00	482	16.07			1,432	47.73	2,904	96.80
Spain..... do.....		720	12.00	3,665.58	61.10	720	12.00	5,594.42	93.24	10,700	178.34
Total counterpart funds.....		217.49			148.82			151.69		414.78	932.78
Total funds expended by Mr. Byrne.....		234.99			235.22			1,511.68		791.50	2,773.39
Jeffery Cohelan: Appropriated funds: United States.....	Dollar.....		127.00								2,204.52
Fiji..... do.....			15.24					1.00		3.58	26.43
Australia..... do.....					1.92			1.64		1.12	4.68
Indonesia..... do.....			53.24							5.69	66.83
Singapore..... do.....					2.58						2.58
Malaya..... do.....			15.84					5.96		25.03	49.80
Thailand..... do.....					40.00					1.93	41.93
Vietnam..... do.....								1.25		3.20	3.20
Hong Kong..... do.....								.03		4.50	6.75
Philippines..... do.....								2.50		8.90	12.03
Total appropriated funds (Army).....		211.32			155.80			1,938.98		112.65	2,418.75
Counterpart funds: Australia..... do.....	Pound.....	23-2-0 1,800	51.97 2.25	8-5-6 2,063.75	18.62 2.60	8-18-0 12,050	20.02	4-1-7 15.07	9.17	44-7-1 5.71	99.78
Indonesia..... Rupee.....		45	14.85	16.08	5.31			43.92	14.52	21,686.75	27.13
Singapore..... do.....										105.00	34.68
Thailand..... Baht.....		400	19.37	715.59	34.66	200	9.64	749.41	36.33	2,065	100.00
Vietnam..... Plaster.....		2,700	38.57	3,239	46.27	1,500	21.43	3,681	52.58	11,120	158.85
Cambodia..... Riels.....		565	16.22	508	14.58	750	21.53	1,451	41.66	3,274	93.09
Hong Kong..... Dollar.....		120	21.13	127	22.36	125	22.01	528	92.95	900	158.45
Philippines..... Peso.....		140	35.90	42.25	10.83	10	2.56	47.75	12.25	240	61.54
Total counterpart funds.....		200.26			155.23			112.26		266.67	734.42
Total funds expended by Mr. Cohelan.....		411.58			311.03			2,051.24		379.32	3,153.17
John J. Courtney (counsel): Counterpart funds: Sweden..... do.....	Kroner.....	386	74.37	939	180.92	160	30.82	175	33.71	1,660	319.82
Austria..... Schilling.....		1,400	54.44	1,300	50.54	700	27.21	780	30.32	4,180	162.51
Italy..... Lira.....		20,000	32.13	10,000	16.64			2,000	3.18	32,000	51.95
Greece..... Drachma.....		1,800	60.00	1,900	63.10	900	30.00	600	20.00	5,200	173.10
Turkey..... Lira.....		275	30.55	225	25.00	100	11.11	115	12.77	715	79.43
Lebanon..... Pound.....		80-0-0	26.15	73-0-0	23.57	41-0-0	13.40	20-0-0	6.53	214-0-0	69.95
Jordan..... do.....		5-0-0	17.77	8-0-0	28.44	7-0-0	15.64			20-0-0	61.85
Israel..... Lirat.....		25	8.33	32	10.66	55	18.33	48	16.00	160	53.32
France..... Franc.....		150	30.61	185	37.76	50	10.20			385	78.57
Total funds expended by Mr. Courtney (counterpart).....		334.35			436.93			156.71		122.51	1,050.50
Durward G. Hall: Appropriated funds: United States.....	Dollar.....		90.68		164.04			833.51		95.46	1,183.69
Japan..... do.....					39.18			2.39		26.31	67.88
Korea..... do.....			2.70		8.84					12.13	23.67
Ryukyu Islands..... do.....			2.00		.45					12.60	15.05
Philippines..... do.....			1.50		3.11					11.78	16.39
Total appropriated funds (Army).....		96.88			215.62			835.90		158.28	1,306.68
Counterpart funds: Japan..... do.....	Yen.....	23,908	67.16	36,643	102.93			91,724	257.65	152,275	427.74
Hong Kong..... do.....		88.00	15.49	247.00	43.49	185.74	32.70	322.51	56.78	843.25	148.46
Saigon, Vietnam..... do.....		1,799.70	25.71	1,791	25.58			3,927	56.10	7,517.70	107.39
Total counterpart funds.....		108.36			172.00			32.70		370.53	683.59
Total funds expended by Mr. Hall.....		205.24			387.62			868.60		528.81	1,990.27

Report of expenditure of foreign currencies and appropriated funds, Committee on Armed Services, U.S. House of Representatives, expended between Jan. 1 and Dec. 31, 1962—Continued

Name and country	Name of currency	Lodging		Meals		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Porter Hardy, Jr.:											
Appropriated funds:											
Italy	Dollar				24.00				19.06		43.06
France	do				17.79						17.79
United States	do						1,085.60				1,085.60
Total appropriated funds (Army)					41.79		1,085.60		19.06		1,146.45
Counterpart funds:											
Italy	Lira	49,941	80	80.42	25,042	40.33	18,717	30.14		93,700	150.89
France	Franc			16.23	126.4	25.63			23.6	4.80	230
Total counterpart funds					96.65		65.96		30.14		4.80
Total funds expended by Mr. Hardy					96.65		107.75		1,115.74		23.86
Philip W. Kelleher (counsel):											
Appropriated funds:											
United States	Dollar										568.00
Austria	do				30.30		15.08		8.00		59.38
Denmark	do				36.00		20.00		6.00		67.00
Sweden	do				12.40		7.25				19.65
Norway	do				7.60		9.00				18.10
Total appropriated funds (Air Force)					83.60		51.33		582.00		732.13
Counterpart funds:											
Denmark	Kroner	68.80		10.00	144.48	21.00	55.04	8.00	41.28	6.00	45.00
France	Franc	490.00		100.00	343.00	70.00	171.50	35.00	171.50	35.00	240.00
West Germany	Deutsche mark	68.83		17.25	141.65	35.50			2.99	.75	53.50
Sweden	Kroner	46.67		9.00	51.85	10.00					19.00
Total counterpart funds					136.25		136.50		43.00		41.75
Total funds expended by Mr. Kelleher					222.55		187.83		625.00		54.25
Alvin E. O'Konski:											
Appropriated funds:											
United States	Dollar										166.38
Ireland	do				59.94		49.00				157.69
Total appropriated funds (Air Force)					59.94		49.00		166.38		48.75
Counterpart funds:											
Denmark	Kroner	2,900		414.00	1,500	218.00	700	100.00	350	50.00	5,600
Sweden	do	290		58.00	170	34.00	60	12.00	80	16.00	412
Norway	do	196		39.00	125	25.00	100	20.00	100	20.00	500
Poland	Zloty	960		40.00	480	20.00	480	20.00	960	40.00	3,000
France	Franc	1,900		380.00	900	180.00	200	40.00	200	40.00	640.00
Germany	Deutsche mark	400		100.00	200	50.00	100	25.00	100	25.00	800
Netherlands	Guilder	260		60.00	130	30.00	45	10.00	45	10.00	359
Total counterpart funds					1,091.00		557.00		227.00		201.00
Total funds expended by Mr. O'Konski					1,150.94		606.00		363.38		249.75
L. Mendel Rivers:											
Appropriated funds: (Air Force)											
England	Dollar				72.31		36.00		9.15		19.00
Germany	do				6.00		45.00		4.30		12.00
Total appropriated funds					78.31		81.00		13.45		31.00
Counterpart funds: England	Pound	46-12-2		130.50	22-15-5	63.75	26-10-0	74.20	14-2-7	39.55	110-0-0
Total funds expended by Mr. Rivers					208.81		144.75		87.65		70.55
Total funds expended by House Committee on Armed Services					2,865.11		2,417.13		6,810.00		2,220.55
											14,312.79

RECAPITULATION

		Amount
Foreign currency (U.S. dollars equivalent)		6,340.34
Appropriated funds:		
H. Res.		
Other		
Government Department: (identify each)		
Department of Army		6,712.49
Department of Air Force		1,259.96
Total		14,312.79

CARL VINSON,
Chairman, Committee on Armed Services.

MARCH 5, 1963.

Report of expenditure of foreign currencies and appropriated funds, Committee on Banking and Currency, U.S. House of Representatives, expended between Jan. 1 and Dec. 31, 1962

Name and country	Name of currency	Lodging		Meals		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Hon. Seymour Halpern: Argentina	Argentine peso	5,400	53.00	5,800	57.00			5,600	55.00	16,800	165.00
Hon. James J. Harvey: Japan	Yen	30,000	83.33	35,280	68.00	8,800	24.44	10,200	27.78	84,280	233.55
	New Taiwan dollar	1,000	25.00					586	14.65	1,586	39.65
Philippine Islands	Yen			12,720	35.33					12,720	35.33
Hong Kong	Peso	51.28	12.82	120	30.00	36	9.00	42.32	10.58	249.6	62.40
	Hong Kong dollar	340	59.64	453.72	79.66	143.28	25.14	155	27.20	1,092	191.58
Thailand	Baht	352	17.05	315	15.25	1,032.5	50.00	100.5	4.87	1,800	87.17
India	Rupee	287.87	60.78	160	34.04	52.70	11.11	111.43	24.54	612	130.47
Turkey	Turkish lira	207	23.00	332	36.88	69.98	7.75	62.64	6.96	671.2	74.59
Italy	Lira	30,106	48.48	50,922	82.00	16,320	26.28	13,103	21.10	110,451	177.86
West Germany	Deutsche mark	290.9	72.91	316	79.00	78	19.50	57.1	14.09	742	185.50
Do.	Lira							6,113	9.84	6,113	9.84
Spain	Peseta	1,800	30.00	3,606	60.10	900	15.00	891	14.85	7,197	119.95
Portugal	Escudo	1,600	55.94	1,344.2	47.00	1,075.8	37.61	270	9.45	4,290	150.00
Hon. Leonor K. Sullivan: Austria	Schilling	2,036	81.03	1,210	47.05	509	19.79	375	14.59	4,180	162.46
	Lira	85,000	136.88	65,620	105.67	22,000	35.42	10,000	16.10	182,620	294.07
Germany	Deutsche mark	410	102.50	325	81.25	180	45.00	85	21.25	1,000	250.00
Belgium	Belgian franc	2,250	45.00	2,100	42.00			900	18.00	5,250	105.00
Do.	Lira			10,000	16.10	9,00	14.50			19,000	30.60
France	New franc	449	91.63	269.81	55.06	124	25.31	75	15.31	917.81	187.31
Do.	Lira			12,000	19.30					12,000	19.30
England	Pound	38	106.40	357/4	99.03	15/12/8	43.77	11	30.80	10	280.00
Hon. Charles A. Vanik: Brazil	Cruzeiro			19.00		15.00		5.00			39.00
Argentina	Peso			78.20		40.00		15.00			142.50
Hon. Harold M. Ryan: France	New franc	93.75	19.13	73.50	15.00			20.34	4.15	187.59	38.28
	Drachma	378.25	12.60	1,753.80	58.46	465.25	15.50	302.70	10.09	2,900	96.65
Turkey	Turkish lira	222.50	24.72	321.10	35.68	349.90	38.88	202.50	22.50	1,096	121.78
Italy	Lira	41,290.30	66.49	47,537.55	76.55	6,210	10.60	9,962.15	16.04	105,000	169.68
Germany	Deutsche mark	320.63	80.16	371	92.75	65.06	16.25	63.37	15.84		205.00
Spain	Peseta	2,202.60	36.71	3,448	57.47	378	6.30	1,271.40	21.19		121.67
Portugal	Escudo	1,890.00	66.09	1,329	46.48	208	7.28	863	30.15		150.00
Hon. Edward R. Finnegan: Japan	Yen	41,672	116.00	61,138	169.83	8,650	24.03	9,240	25.67	120,790	335.53
	New Taiwan dollar	2,066	51.65	1,438	63.95			680	26.00	4,184	141.60
Philippines	Peso	49.72	12.43	212	53.00	48.52	12.13	94	23.50	404.24	101.06
Hong Kong	Hong Kong	812.40	142.53	1,008.70	176.97	146.40	25.68	142.50	25.00	2,110	370.18
Thailand	Baht	358	17.34	96	4.80	900	43.57	250	11.99	1,604	77.70
India	Rupee	472.50	94.50	102.50	20.50	160	32.00	60	12.00	795	159.00
Turkey	Turkish lira	282.25	31.36	355.75	39.53	192	21.35	140	15.56	970	107.80
Italy	Lira	46,863	75.47	62,905	101.30	84.20	13.55	10,200	16.42	128,388	206.74
Germany	Deutsche mark	521.20	130.30	604.80	151.20	1,292	23.00	220	55.00	2,638	659.50
France	New franc	160.18	32.69	131.61	26.86	134.26	27.40	73.95	15.09	500	102.04
Spain	Peseta	860	14.17	2,712	45.20	34,014	566.90	2,116	35.26	49,702	661.53
Hon. William A. Barrett: Japan	Yen	46,230	128.42	62,950	174.83	8,500	23.63	8,120	22.56	125,800	349.44
	New Taiwan dollar	2,102	52.55	3,328	83.20			1,370	34.25	6,800	170.00
Philippines	Peso	10,480	26.20	241.20	60.30			100	25.00	446	111.50
Hong Kong	Hong Kong dollar	1,101.60	193.30	1,056.60	185.40	204.10	35.85	202.70	35.58	2,565	450.13
Thailand	Baht	352	17.06			900	43.56	233	11.30	1,485	71.92
India	Rupee	448.50	89.70	77.50	15.50	134	26.80	50	10.00	710	142.00
Turkey	Turkish lira	338.25	37.59	345.60	38.38	288	32.00	117	13.00	1,088.75	120.97
Italy	Lira	53,830	86.69	63,500	102.25	9,100	14.65	3,570	5.75	130,000	209.34
Germany	Deutsche mark	334.73	83.69	360.87	90.21	190	25.00	84.40	21.10	880	220.00
Spain	Peseta	2,328.45	38.81	3,516	58.60			930	15.50	6,774.45	112.91
Portugal	Escudo	1,948	68.12	1,682	58.83			660	23.05	4,290	150.00
Robert R. Poston: Japan	Yen	26,464	73.45	42,300	117.50	2,460	6.91	3,376	9.37	74,600	207.23
	New Taiwan dollar	1,320	33.00	628	15.70	1,610	40.25	130	3.25	3,688	92.20
Philippines	Peso	41.80	10.40	223.20	55.80	30.60	7.70	47.40	11.85	343	85.75
Hong Kong	Hong Kong dollar	570.20	101.60	710.80	124.70	119.80	21.00	89.20	15.70	1,499	263.00
Thailand	Baht	365	17.68	159	7.71	900	43.57	210	10.16	1,634	79.12
India	Rupee	459.25	91.85	25.20	5.00	69.75	13.95	12.80	2.60	567	113.40
Turkey	Turkish lira	236	26.22	100.50	11.17			322	35.78	658.50	73.17
Italy	Lira	39,386	63.42	44,539	71.66	5,525	8.95	12,050	19.42	101,500	163.45
Germany	Deutsche mark	279.40	69.85	310.60	77.65	90	22.50	40	10.00	720	180.00
Spain	Peseta	1,398	23.30	2,821	47.02	890	14.83	744	12.40	5,853	97.55
Portugal	Escudo	1,780.70	62.28	1,552.30	54.25	206	7.20	687	24.02	4,225	147.7
Orman S. Fink: Japan	Yen	24,000	66.67	48,000	133.33	3,600	10.00	10,400	28.88	86,000	238.88
	New Taiwan dollar	1,573.80	39.35	1,350	33.75	320	8.00	986.20	24.65	4,230	105.75
Philippines	Peso	43.22	10.81	200	50.00	24	6.00	120.68	30.17	387.90	96.98
Hong Kong	Hong Kong dollar	390.20	68.46	776	136.14	120	21.05	200.80	35.23	1,487	260.88
Thailand	Baht	352	17.05	200	9.68	929.25	45.00	40.75	1.97	1,522	73.70
India	Rupee	240.57	50.78	120	25.35	100	21.11	18.43	3.89	479	101.13
Turkey	Turkish lira	207.50	23.06	200	22.22			57.50	6.39	465	51.67
Italy	Lira	24,355	39.22	61,000	98.23	11,000	17.71	10,645	17.14	107,000	172.30
Germany	Deutsche mark	178.68	44.67	380	95.00	80	20.00	111.32	27.83	750	187.50
Spain	Peso	1,782	29.70	3,500	58.34	600	10.00	818	13.63	6,700	111.67
Portugal	Escudo	1,615.50	56.49	1,900	66.43	390	13.64	384.50	13.44	4,290	150.00
Robert G. Stephens: England	Pound	10-0-0	27.44	41-7-8	115.60	17-17-4	50.00	13-3-0	38.00	82-10-8	231.04
	New franc	325	76.28	425	85.00	150	30.00	99	20.00	1,031	211.28
France	Lira	35,000	55.96	62,000	99.00	16,000	25.00	9,400	15.00	123,850	194.96
Germany	Deutsche mark	343	87.18	352	88.00	80	20.00	63	16.00	838	211.18
Spain	Peseta	2,155	35.93	3,694	61.60	600	10.00	480	8.00	6,926	115.53
Portugal	Escudo	2,315	80.86	2,270	79.20	599	20.00	345	12.00	5,217	192.50

Report of expenditure of foreign currencies and appropriated funds, Committee on Banking and Currency, U.S. House of Representatives, expended between Jan. 1 and Dec. 31, 1962—Continued

Name and country	Name of currency	Lodging		Meals		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Abraham J. Multer:											
Japan	Yen	47,708	133.00	35,280	98.00	30,960	86.00	11,044	30.70	124,092	347.70
Taiwan	New Taiwan dollar.	4,599.50	115.00	2,810	70.25	3,650	91.25	1,300	33.50	1,235.95	310.00
Hong Kong	Hong Kong dollar.	1,232	216.09	567	99.50	233.70	41.00	165.70	29.00	2,198.40	385.59
Philippines	Peso	1,188	297.00	386.72	96.68	4,825.12	1,206.53	204	51.00	6,604.84	1,651.21
Guam			23.50		8.00				6.00		37.50
Hawaii			49.68		60.02		33.60		39.18		182.48
Los Angeles			124.25		65.00		22.00		32.64		243.89
Thomas L. Ashley:											
England	Pound	70/0/3	207.20	23/4/1	65.00	9/9/0	26.49	3/19/4	11.56	110/14/7	310.25
France	New franc	980	200.00	882	180.00	490	100.00	148	30.20	2,500	510.20
Total				5,797.74		5,865.17		3,936.77		1,695.35	17,295.03

¹ Includes cost of converting airplane transportation from tourist to 1st class.

NOTE.—Check for \$518.38 has been forwarded to State Department for counterpart drawn in excess of that charged.

WRIGHT PATMAN,

Chairman, Subcommittee on Banking and Currency.

MARCH 9, 1963.

Report of expenditure of foreign currencies and appropriated funds, Committee on Education and Labor, U.S. House of Representatives, expended between Jan. 1 and Dec. 31, 1962

Name and country	Name of currency	Lodging		Meals		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Powell, Adam C.:											
Great Britain (9 days)	U.S. dollar		80.00		70.00		15.00		276.50		
France (5 days)	do	110.00		87.50					312.00		243.50
Italy (6 days)	do	150.00		99.00					448.00		245.50
Greece (11 days)	do	192.50		181.50		75.00			64.00		313.00
Spain (4 days)	do	72.00		66.00		710.00		710.00	88.00		547.00
Zelenko, Herbert:									310.00		195.00
Italy	Lire	52,164	84.00	37,260	60.00			19,872	32.00	109,296	176.00
France	Franc	563.5	115.00	392.0	80.00			147.0	30.00	102.5	225.00
Dent, John H.:											
Japan	Yen	44,000	122.67	41,000	114.33	14,706	41.00	2,510	7.00	102,216	285.00
Hong Kong	Hong Kong dollar.	915.50	160.63	715	125.40	380.50	66.76	96.90	17.00	2,107.90	369.79
Philippines	Peso	216	54.00	260	65.00	64	16.00	108	27.00	648	162.00
Giamo, Robert N.:											
Japan	Yen	45,000	125.00	41,133	115.00	8,467	23.52	5,400	15.00	100,000	278.52
Hong Kong	Hong Kong dollar.	868	155.00	740	125.00	308	55.00	84	15.00	2,000	350.00
Rome	Lire	99,468	162.00	110,520	180.00	55,260	90.00	34,384	56.00	300,000	488.00
Brademas, John:											
Switzerland	Franc	269.35	54.97	125.00	25.51	107.80	22.00	50	10.20	552.15	112.68
France	do	807.70	164.84	1,176.00	240.00	1,077.10	11219.80	387.05	79.00	3,447.85	703.64
Poland	Zloty	4,229.25	176.22	3,049.40	127.06	2,088.00	87.00	4,241.90	176.75	13,608.55	567.03
Kearns, Carroll D.:											
Great Britain	Pound	68-5-0	191.10	30-5-0	84.70	20-0-0	56.00	41-0-0	114.80	159-10-0	446.60
Netherlands	Guilder	314.10	93.41	295.00	82.09	100.00	27.83	300.00	83.49	1,009.10	286.82
Denmark	Kroner	600	87.00	500.00	72.50	150.00	21.75	550.00	77.75	1,800.0	261.00
Returned										300.00	-43.50
Total										1,500.00	217.50
Germany:											
West Berlin	Deutsche mark	304.19	76.05	204.00	51.00	100.00	25.00	200.00	50.00	808.00	202.05
Munich	do	631.90	157.97	250.00	62.50	100.00	25.00	308.00	77.00	1,289.90	322.47
Austria	Schilling	7,000.00	273.00	2,800.00	109.20	1,200.00	46.80	3,000.00	117.00	14,000.00	546.00
Returned										2,990.00	-116.61
Total										11,010.00	429.39
Switzerland	Franc	318.90	73.83	190.00	43.98	320.00	74.08	200.00	46.30	1,028.90	238.19
Returned										-200.00	-46.30
Total										828.90	191.89
Wingate, Livingston L.:											
Jamaica	Pound	55	155.00	34	95.40	28	78.40	58.95	165.09	175.95	493.89
Argentina	Peso	11,572.10	78.65	5,200	35.37	4,704	32.00	10,916.56	72.60	31,345	218.62
Brazil	Cruzeiro	26,000	193.30	20,500	219.33	19,300	143.49	25,200	185.87	100,000	741.99
Wall, Tamara J.:											
Great Britain, (4 days)	Pound	100.00		85.00		23.00			72.00	100	280.00
France (5 days)	New franc	110.00		82.50		12.00			45.50	1,250	250.00
Italy (9 days)	Lira	205.00		148.50		25.00			71.50	286,300	450.00
Greece (4 days)	Drachma	80.00		70.00		15.00			35.00	6,000	200.00
Austria (5 days)	Schilling	65.00		52.50		12.00			22.50	3,800	152.00
Germany (3 days)	Deutsche mark	55.00		51.00		14.00			30.00	600	150.00
Denmark (5 days)	Kroner	75.00		62.00		8.00			26.00	1,200	171.00
Berens, Donald F.:											
England	Pound	17.3	48.56	16.9	47.42	9.9	27.90	7.9	21.72	52	145.60
Germany	Deutsche mark	205	51.25	438.00	109.50	137	34.25	110	27.50	890	222.50
France	New franc	286	57.20	590.00	118.00	190	38.00	184	36.80	1,250	250.00
Switzerland	Lira	170	42.50	255.00	63.75	71	17.75	104	26.00	600	150.00
Italy	Lira	86,730	139.66	108.150	174.15	95,368	155.18	23,630	38.05	313,880	507.04

See footnotes at end of table.

Report of expenditure of foreign currencies and appropriated funds, Committee on Education and Labor, U.S. House of Representatives, expended between Jan. 1 and Dec. 31, 1962—Continued

Name and country	Name of currency	Lodging		Meals		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Kearns, Carroll D.:											
Italy	Lira	33,577	50.03	40,000	64.00	46,132	73.81	38,758	62.85	158,467	250.69
France	New franc	1,361.55	272.31	696	139.20	160	32.00	400	80.00	2,617.55	523.51
Dargans, Louise Maxienne:											
United Kingdom	U.S. dollar		15.50		12.00		6.25		16.00		49.75
Spain	do		32.00		22.50		17.75		11.50		83.75
Italy	do		35.00		30.50		40.00		14.00		119.50
France	do		25.00		18.50		20.00		17.00		80.50
Morocco	do		15.00		10.00		8.00		4.00		37.00
Portugal	do		14.50		12.00		12.00		15.00		53.50
Gamser, Howard: ¹²											
Japan	Yen	43,044	120.00	39,457	110.00	15,065	42.00	2,434	6.52	100,000	278.52
Hong Kong	Hong Kong dollar	855	150.00	684	120.00	370.50	65.00	91.20	16.00	2,000	351.00
Philippines	Peso ¹⁴										
Huff, Corrine A.:											
Great Britain (4 days)	U.S. dollar		80.00		17.50		28.00		168.00		293.50
France (5 days)	do		110.00		82.50		12.00		46.00		250.50
Italy (5 days)	do		150.00		99.00				56.00		305.00
Greece (11 days)	do		192.00		181.50		75.00		84.00		532.50
Spain (4 days)	do		72.00		76.00				37.00		185.00
Denmark (4 days)	do		72.00		66.00				37.00		175.00
McNeal, E. Zelda:											
England	Pound	32	90.00	45	126.00	13	36.00	6	16.00	96	268.00
France	Franc	2,000	400.00	1,600	320.00	1,000	200.00	400	80.00	5,000	1,000.00
Italy	Lira	70,000	112.00	65,000	104.00	15,000	24.00			150,000	240.00
Bullard, Theo H. Jr.:											
Denmark	Kroner	160	24.00	200	28.00	140	20.00	180	26.00	694	98.00
Russia	Ruble	157	165.00	82	90.00	48	56.00	61	69.00	348	380.00
Austria	Schilling	500	22.00	650	27.00	350	11.00	600	24.00	2,100	84.00
Italy	Lira	3,600	56.00	3,200	48.00	2,800	40.00	3,200	48.00	128,000	192.00
France	New Franc	900	168.00	780	144.00	660	132.00	960	180.00	3,240	624.00
England	Pound	18	48.00	18	48.00	12	36.00	15	42.00	63	174.00
Total			6,768.65		5,677.89		2,620.32		3,400.79		9,208.02

¹ Taxi fare: District of Columbia, \$3; New York, \$2.

² Tips: Between District of Columbia and Great Britain. District of Columbia Skycap, \$1; New York Skycap, \$1; pier porter, \$2; deck steward, \$3; cabin steward, \$15; waiter, \$15; dining room captain, \$10; night steward, \$5; dockside porter, \$2; hotel bellman, \$4; hotel doorman, \$1; hotel waiter, \$10.50; wine steward, \$5; London Skycap, \$2.

³ Telephone.

⁴ Tips in France: Meals, maitre d'hotel concierge, \$30; Skycap, bellman and doorman, \$8; miscellaneous, \$10.

⁵ Tips in Italy: Skycap, bellman, and doorman, \$16; meals, capo cameriere, portinaio, \$36; miscellaneous, \$12.

⁶ Tips in Greece: Skycap, bellman and doorman, \$88.

⁷ Taxi.

⁸ Tips in Spain: Skycap, bellman, and doorman, \$8; meals, majordomo, portero, \$24; miscellaneous, \$5.

⁹ Paid staff expenses in Philippines. No funds drawn by staff, 2 days for staff (\$91.00).

¹⁰ Transportation—Stuttgart-Basel.

¹¹ Transportation—Paris-Warsaw-Paris.

¹² Includes railroad transportation throughout Italy; and from Rome, Italy, to Paris, France.

¹³ Travelling with Ad Hoc Committee on Impact of Exports and Imports on Domestic Employment, Dec. 1-14, 1962.

¹⁴ All foreign currency expenditures met by subcommittee chairman.

RECAPITULATION

Foreign currency (U.S. dollar equivalent)	Amount
	18,963.52

MARCH 8, 1963.

ADAM C. POWELL,
Chairman, Committee on Education and Labor.

Report of expenditures of foreign currencies and appropriated funds, Committee on Foreign Affairs, U.S. House of Representatives, expended between Jan. 1 and Dec. 31, 1962

Name and country	Name of currency	Lodging		Meals		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Thomas E. Morgan:	Franc	1,804.70	368.31	732.55	149.50	298.90	61.00	147	30.00	2,983.15	608.81
France	Mark	732.15	183.03	228	57.00	100	25.00	84	21.00	1,144.15	286.03
Germany	Lira	45,610	73.56	39,215	63.25	37,510	60.50	11,160	18.00	133,495	215.31
Italy	Peseta	4,200	70.00	2,880	48.00	5,601.80	93.33	480	8.00	13,161.80	219.33
Spain	Pound	38.12	108.50	15	42.00	6.10	18.60	10.10	46.32	76.12	215.42
Wayne L. Hays: Bermuda											
Leonard Farbstein:											
Spain	Peseta	5,628	93.80	4,734	78.90	9,360	156.00	918	15.30	20,640	344.00
Italy	Lira	110,500	177.94	75,630	121.79	116,748	188.00	7,670	12.35	310,548	500.08
Israel	Pound	589.46	196.49	564.19	188.06	675	225.00	83.35	27.78	1,912.00	637.33
France	Franc	380	77.39	295.45	60.17	667.76	136.00	168.49	34.32	1,511.70	307.88
United States	do					4,382.67	892.60			4,382.67	892.60
Cornelius E. Gallagher:											
Switzerland	do	233.26	54.00	149.89	34.70	340.38	78.80	46.40	10.74	769.93	178.24
France	do	196.40	40.00	116.36	23.70	268.67	54.72	48.12	9.80	629.55	128.22
Italy	Lira	89,424	144.00	54,753	88.17	37,198	59.90	16,801	27.20	198,266	319.27
Germany	Mark					4,381.18	1,100.80			4,381.18	1,100.80
John S. Monagan: Bermuda	Pound	35	98.56	14	39.42	5	14.08	14.15	41.63	68.15	193.59
Robert B. Chipperfield:	Peso	850	68.00	748	59.84	468.75	37.50	367.38	29.39	2,434.13	194.73
Mexico	Guuilder					1,074.72	298.70			1,074.72	298.70

Report of expenditure of foreign currencies and appropriated funds, Committee on Foreign Affairs, U.S. House of Representatives, expended between Jan. 1 and Dec. 31, 1692—Continued

Name and country	Name of currency	Lodging		Meals		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Chester E. Merrow:											
France	Franc	2,604	530.34	376.03	76.18	129.20	26.32	63.15	12.87	3,172.38	646.11
Netherlands	Guilder					1,999.34	556.30			1,999.34	556.30
Walter H. Judd: Bermuda	Pound			12.50	34.49	3.00	8.45	13.00	36.60	28.50	79.54
William S. Broomfield: Bermuda	do	35.00	98.56	14.00	39.42	5.00	14.08	22.00	61.95	76.00	214.01
Robert R. Barry:											
France	Franc			825.00	168.02	389.17	79.26	522.17	106.34	88.88	18.10
Netherlands	Guilder					1,686.58	469.80			1,686.58	469.80
Philip B. Billings: Bermuda	Pound	33.00	92.93	13-6-10	37.45	6.00	16.90	53.43	150.08	105.10.13	297.36
Total				2,643.43		1,321.70		4,698.72		611.33	
											9,275.18

RECAPITULATION

Foreign currency (U.S. dollar equivalent) Amount 9,275.18

THOMAS E. MORGAN,
Chairman, Committee on Foreign Affairs.

MARCH 7, 1963.

Report of expenditure of foreign currencies and appropriated funds by the Committee on Foreign Affairs, U.S. House of Representatives, Subcommittee on Europe, expended between Jan. 1 and Dec. 31, 1962

Name and country	Name of currency	Lodging		Meals		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Hon. Edna F. Kelly:											
Austria	Schilling	2,088	80.39	1,320	50.82	2,085.23	80.28	410	15.78	5,903.23	227.27
Italy	Lira	83,350	137.44	55,150	88.81	76,050	122.47	20,330	32.74	236,880	381.46
Germany	Deutsche mark	253.05	63.26	236.95	59.24	135	33.75	95	23.75	319.19	180.00
Belgium	Franc	1,860	37.20	3,650	73.00	2,400	48.00	1,115	22.30	9,025	180.50
France	do	450	91.65	246.75	50.26	177	36.05	125	25.46	998.75	203.42
United Kingdom	Pound	40-10-0	113.40	25-5-8	70.79	60-19-0	170.66	19-4-4	53.81	145-19-0	408.66
Netherlands	Guilder					3,766.54	1,037.90			3,766.54	1,037.90
Hon. John S. Monagan:											
Germany	Deutsche mark	141.45	35.36	116.28	29.07			48.55	12.14	306.28	76.57
Denmark	Kroner	161	23.30	92	13.31	47.19	6.84	32	4.63	331.74	48.08
U.S.S.R.	Danish kroner	831.74	120.35	150	21.71	72	10.42	78	11.29	1,131.74	163.77
Poland	Zloty	295	12.30	349	14.54	2,477	103.30			3,121	130.14
Austria	Danish kroner	224.50	33.93	120.40	17.42					354.00	51.35
Spain	Schilling	2,094	80.62	1,210	46.58	2,018.82	77.72	463.57	17.85	5,786.39	222.77
Portugal	Peseta	4,556	75.93	4,930	82.17	10,630	177.17	1,434	23.90	21,580	359.17
Hon. Peter Frelinghuysen, Jr.:	Escudo	1,337	46.91	523	18.35	40	1.40	301	10.57	2,201	77.23
Italy	Lira	20,308	32.70	53,600	86.31	76,050	122.47	16,092	25.91	166,050	267.39
Germany	Deutsche mark	251	62.75	240	60.00	105	26.25	64	16.00	660	165.00
Belgium	Franc	909	18.18	3,570	71.40	1,515	30.30	1,120	22.40	7,114	142.28
France	do	404	82.28	225	45.82	170	34.62	110	22.40	909	185.12
United Kingdom	Pound	29-6-6	82.11	24-10-0	68.60	53-14-0	150.36	8-2-0	22.68	115-12-6	323.75
Netherlands	Guilder					3,709.93	1,022.30			3,709.93	1,022.30
Hon. Robert R. Barry:											
Austria	Schilling	2,094	80.62	1,310	50.43	2,085.23	80.28	380	14.63	5,869.23	225.96
Italy	Lira	54,461	95.75	54,400	87.60	71,050	114.41	22,000	35.43	206,911	333.19
Germany	Deutsche mark	291.1	72.78	282	70.50	220	55.00	164.29	41.07	957.41	239.35
Belgium	Franc	1,272	25.44	2,930	58.60	2,046	40.92	985	19.70	7,233	144.66
France	do	400	81.46	384.75	78.36	260.92	53.12	141	28.72	1,186.67	241.66
United Kingdom	Pound	30-12-0	85.68	24-15-0	69.30	238-14-0	668.36	7-1-6	19.81	301-2-6	843.15
Hon. Harris B. McDowell, Jr.:											
Germany	Deutsche mark	497.03	124.26	527.70	131.92	5,479.80	1,369.95	336	84.00	6,840.53	1,710.13
Denmark	Kroner	161	23.30	104	15.05	835	120.82	329	47.61	1,429	206.78
U.S.S.R.	Danish kroner	831.74	120.35	150	21.71	72	10.42	78	11.29	1,131.74	163.77
Poland	Zloty	1,499	62.46	1,667.70	69.52	5,019	209.13	1,188	49.49	9,373.70	390.60
Austria	Danish kroner	157.50	22.79							157.50	22.79
Spain	Schilling	2,094	80.62	2,948	115.46	5,013.92	195.82	1,624	63.82	11,680.92	455.72
Belgium	Lira	58,178	93.68	54,700	88.08	102,105	164.42	52,052	83.82	267,035	430.00
France	do	1,417	28.34	3,620	72.40	2,100	42.00	2,143	42.86	9,280	185.60
United Kingdom	Pound	736.60	148.97	534	107.80	471.85	95.41	475.50	96.44	2,217.95	448.62
Hon. Chester E. Merrow: Belgium	Franc	52.18	148.12	32-18-0	92.12	208-7-1	585.45	35-18-0	100.52	330-1-1	924.21
Hon. William S. Broomfield:		2,337	46.74	2,283	45.66	351	7.02	567	11.34	5,508	110.76
Franklin J. Schnipp, staff consultant:											
Netherlands	Guilder	34.75	9.66	57.60	15.96	3,834.40	1,065.11	15.20	4.23	3,941.95	1,094.96
Denmark	Kroner	87.25	12.65	119.72	17.35	218.08	31.06	89.70	13	513.75	74.06
Sweden	Swedish kroner	125.60	24.38	203.55	57.50	118.66	17.80	32.19	6.25	570	105.93
Germany	Deutsche mark	195.50	48.88	324	80.25	350.50	87.50	52	13	918	229.63
Marjan A. Czarnecki, staff consultant:											
Germany	do	390.50	97.63	716.40	179.04	5,642.10	1,410.62	127	31.75	6,876	1,718.94
France	Franc	737.50	149.28	507.22	102.35	457	92.40	178.70	36.09	1,880.42	380.12
Austria	Schilling	1,742.95	68.15	2,187.5	85.96	2,923.87	113.48	1,053.57	41.52	7,97.89	309.11
Poland	Zloty	849	35.38	1,375.70	57.32	3,830	159.58	863.30	35.97	6,918	288.25
Poland	Danish kroner	117.25	16.97	100	14.47					217.25	31.44
Sweden	Swedish kroner	146	28.61	306	59.98	308	60.37	63	12.35	823	161.31
Netherlands	Guilder	29.90	8.28	62.10	17.20	4,095.68	1,128.78	24	6.65	4,211.68	1,160.91

Report of expenditure of foreign currencies and appropriated funds by the Committee on Foreign Affairs, U.S. House of Representatives, Subcommittee on Europe, expended between Jan. 1 and Dec. 31, 1962—Continued

Name and country	Name of currency	Lodging		Meals		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total		
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	
Marian A. Czarnecki, staff consultant—Continued												
Belgium	Franc	1,077	21.54	3,510	70.20	1,525	30.50	902	18.04	7,014	140.28	
Italy	Lira	32,290	52.00	52,900	85.18	77,650	125.04	16,195	26.08	129,035	288.30	
United Kingdom	Pound	29,6-6	82.11	21-0-0	58.80	61-0-0	170.80	8-16-6	24.71	120-3-0	336.42	
Denmark	Kroner	138	39.97	106.65	15.43	180.19	16.07	27	3.91	451.84	66.38	
U.S.S.R.	Danish krone	831.74	120.35	150	21.70	64	9.27	76	11.00	1,121.74	162.32	
John P. White, State Department escort officer:												
Germany	Deutsche mark	78.20	19.55	104.52	26.13	20	5.00	46	11.50	248.72	62.18	
Denmark	Kroner	70	10.13	95	13.75	117.19	16.96	30	4.34	312.19	45.18	
U.S.S.R.	Danish krone	831.74	120.35	150	21.70	74	10.71	80	11.58	1,135.74	164.34	
Poland	Zlote	295	12.30	420	17.50	2,777	111.54	259	10.79	3,651	152.13	
Do	Danish krone	76.36	11.05	120.40	17.42					196.26	28.47	
Austria	Schilling	1,047	40.31	1,050	40.42	2,518.82	96.97	316.57	12.19	4,932.39	189.89	
Spain	Peseta	2,898	48.30	4,620	77.00	10,537	175.62	625	11.25	18,730	312.17	
Portugal	Escudo	380	13.33	405	14.21				145	5.08	930	32.62
Total			4,044.67		3,565.75		12,456.04		1,579.65		21,646.11	

RECAPITULATION

Foreign currency (U.S. dollar equivalent) Amount
21,646.11

EDNA F. KELLY,
Chairman, Subcommittee on Europe.

Report of expenditure of foreign currencies and appropriated funds, Committee on Foreign Affairs, U.S. House of Representatives, Special Study Mission to Latin America, expended between Jan. 1 and Dec. 31, 1962

Name and country	Name of currency	Lodging		Meals		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Hon. Armistead I. Selden, chairman:											
Peru	Sol	1,328	49.48	296	11.04	6,931.75	258.65	338.62	12.63	8,894.37	331.80
Ecuador	Sucre	841	38.23	397	18.05			202	9.18	1,440	65.46
Colombia	Peso	640	60.95	135.50	12.89			66.50	6.35	842	80.19
Panama	U.S. dollar		68.00								68.00
Costa Rica	do		60.00								60.00
Hon. William S. Mailliard:											
Panama	do		34.00								34.00
Costa Rica	do		60.00								60.00
Guatemala	do		64.00								64.00
Netherlands	Guilder					758.93	211.40				211.40
Hon. Marguerite Stitt Church:											
Peru	Sol	657.27	24.50	954.62	35.63	6,913.75	257.99	208.23	7.75	8,733.87	325.87
Ecuador	Sucre	283.40	12.88	175.50	7.98			81.10	3.69	540	24.55
Columbia	Peso	640	60.95	57.50	5.48			22.50	2.14	720	68.57
Panama	U.S. dollar		68.00								68.00
Costa Rica	do		60.00								60.00
United States	Dollar							131.09			131.09
Hon. Laurence Curtis:											
Peru	Sol	817.4	30.50	931.3	34.75	6,931.82	258.65	239.86	8.95	8,920.38	332.85
Ecuador	Sucre	585.31	26.13	294.24	17.60			203.84	9.10	1,407.39	52.83
Colombia	Peso	673.50	60.95	133.6	12.09			68.5	6.20	875.6	79.24
Mexico	do	1,031.25	82.50	926.12	74.09	551.25	44.10	231.25	18.50	2,739.87	219.19
Panama	U.S. dollar		68.00								68.00
Costa Rica	do		60.00								60.00
Guatemala	do		96.00								96.00
United States	Dollar							63.42			63.42
Albert O. F. Westphal (staff consultant):											
Panama	U.S. dollar		34.00								34.00
Costa Rica	do		60.00								60.00
Netherlands	Guilder					758.93	211.40				211.40
Rosita Rieck Bennett (staff assistant):											
Peru	Sol	322.22	12.03	761.13	28.40	6,913.75	257.99	157.50	5.87	8,154.60	304.29
Ecuador	Sucre	863.10	39.23	181.80	8.26			79.51	3.61	1,124.41	51.10
Colombia	Peso	582.75	55.50	85.7	8.16			23.1	2.20	691.55	65.86
Panama City	U.S. dollar		68.00								68.00
Costa Rica	do		60.00								60.00
Total			1,413.83		274.42		1,694.69		96.17		3,479.11

RECAPITULATION

Foreign currency (U.S. dollar equivalent) Amount
2,424.60
Appropriated funds: H. Res. 61, 87th Cong. 1,054.51

Total 3,479.11

Report of expenditure of foreign currencies and appropriated funds, Committee on Foreign Affairs, U.S. House of Representatives, Subcommittee for Review of the Mutual Security Programs, expended between Jan. 1 and Dec. 31, 1962

Name and country	Name of currency	Lodging		Meals		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Bullock, Roy J., senior staff consultant:											
France	Franc	1,453.30	296.60	1,044.50	213.16	313.50	63.97	154.38	31.51	2,965.68	605.24
Netherlands	Guilder	88.25	24.51	49.58	13.77	4,123.71	1,145.47	0	0	4,261.54	1,183.75
Denmark	Krone	848	122.72	799.75	115.73	291.83	42.23	66.91	9.68	2,006.49	290.36
Norway	do	697.37	97.53	595.86	83.33	379.33	53.05	82.33	11.51	1,754.89	245.42
Germany	Deutsche mark	384.26	96.06	457.81	114.45	57.33	14.33	30.66	7.66	930.06	232.50
Italy	Lira	151,592	242.54	146,721	234.75	33,668	53.86	17,311	27.69	349,292	558.84
Belgium	Franc	4,088	81.76	2,228	44.56	475	9.50	0	0	6,791	135.82
United States	Dollar	(1)		132			139.22	0	0		171.22
Brandt, Robert F., investigator-consultant:											
France	Franc	1,453.40	296.60	1,044.50	213.17	233.50	47.66	154.39	31.50	2,885.79	588.93
Netherlands	Guilder	88.25	24.52	49.59	13.77	3,906.88	1,085.24	0	0	4,044.72	1,123.53
Denmark	Krone	848	122.72	799.75	115.75	291.84	42.24	66.93	9.69	2,006.52	290.40
Norway	do	697.39	97.55	595.87	83.35	379.34	53.06	82.34	11.52	1,754.94	245.48
Germany	Deutsche mark	384.28	96.08	457.81	114.46	57.34	14.34	30.67	7.68	930.10	232.56
Italy	Lira	151,594	242.56	146,721	234.76	33,668	53.88	17,311	27.71	349,294	558.84
United States	Dollar			132.00			39.72				71.72
Chile	Escudo	173.99	123.39	303.38	215.16	131.76	93.44	47.87	33.95	657.00	465.94
United States	Dollar						971.63		2.00		973.63
Iran	Rial	2,760	36.30	1,406	18.50	152	2.00	182	2.41	4,500	59.21
Jordan	Dinar	26,300	73.90	22,334	62.76	8,142	22.88	5,083	14.27	61,859	173.81
Lebanon	Pound	131.10	43.88	233.60	73.83			22.66	7.58	374.35	125.29
Afghanistan	U.S. dollar	(2)					27.02				415.02
Germany	Deutsche mark						7,526.14	1,886.25			1,886.25
United States	Dollar						10.25		2.50		12.75
Harry C. Cromer, staff consultant:											
France	Franc	1,453.30	296.60	1,044.50	213.16	233.50	47.65	154.38	31.51	2,885.68	588.92
Netherlands	Guilder	88.25	24.51	49.58	13.77	3,906.77	1,085.21			4,044.60	1,123.49
Denmark	Krone	848	122.72	799.75	115.73	291.83	42.23	66.91	9.68	2,006.49	290.36
Norway	do	697.37	97.53	595.86	83.33	379.33	53.05	82.33	11.51	1,754.89	245.42
Germany	Deutsche mark	384.26	96.06	457.81	114.45	57.33	14.33	30.66	7.66	930.06	232.50
Italy	Lira	151,592	242.54	146,721	234.75	33,668	53.86	17,311	27.71	349,294	558.84
United States	Dollar			132.00			42.72				174.72
Total			3,387.18		2,836.45		7,110.29		326.91		13,660.83

12 days per diem.

22 days per diem, Kabul, at \$16; 4 days per diem other than Kabul, at \$9; \$388.

RECAPITULATION

Foreign currency (U.S. dollar equivalent)	Amount
Appropriated funds:	12,041.77
H. Res. 60 and 61, 87th Cong.	1,204.04
Government department: Department of State	415.02
Total	13,660.83

THOMAS E. MORGAN,

Chairman, Committee on Foreign Affairs.

MARCH 6, 1963.

Report of expenditure of foreign currencies and appropriated funds, delegation to 8th NATO Parliamentarians' Conference, expended between Jan. 1 and Dec. 31, 1962

Name and country	Name of currency	Lodging		Meals		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Anfuso, Victor L.:											
France	Franc	1,371.31	279.86	630	128.57	170	34.69	700	142.86	2,871.31	585.98
United States	Dollar						44.50				44.50
Arends, Leslie C.:											
France	Franc	1,371.31	279.86	630	128.57	170	34.69	680	138.77	2,851.31	581.89
Germany	Deutsche mark	280	70.00	136.84	34.21	100.23	25.06	93.47	23.36	610.54	152.63
Italy	Lira	29,127	46.89	16,382	26.26	37,677.40	60.77	11,320	18.26	94,506.4	152.18
Spain	Peseta	3,427.20	57.12	1,929	32.15	5,200.20	86.67	380.40	6.34	10,930.60	182.28
United States	Dollar	64.00					112.42				176.42
Denton, Winfield K.:											
France	Franc	1,340.8	273.63	639.45	130.50	172	35.10	685	139.80	2,837.25	579.03
Germany	Deutsche mark	280	70.00	140	35.00	110	27.50	105	26.25	635	158.75
Italy	Lira	29,210	47.11	17,150	27.66	37,677.4	60.77	10,511	16.95	94,548.4	152.49
Spain	Peseta	3,610	60.17	2,150	35.83	5,000	83.33	328	5.47	11,088	184.80
United States	Dollar	64.00					99.98				163.98
Devine, Samuel L.:											
France	Franc	1,350.31	275.57	600.8	134.86	201.8	41.10	661	134.90	2,873.91	586.43
Germany	Deutsche mark	280	70.00	138.8	34.70	118	29.50	101	25.25	637.8	159.45
Italy	Lira	29,190	47.08	16,790	27.08	37,677.4	60.77	11,619	18.74	95,276.4	153.67
Spain	Peseta	3,508	58.46	2,079	34.65	5,400	90.00	420	7.00	11,407	190.11
United States	Dollar	16.00					57.54				73.54
Hays, Wayne L.:											
France	Franc	1,713.51	349.69	765.15	156.15	2,009	41.00	700	142.86	3,379.56	689.70
Germany	Deutsche mark	296	74.00	126.44	31.61	100.23	23.06	95.2	23.80	617.87	154.47
Italy	Lira	71,291.60	114.98	40,290.6	64.98	37,677.4	60.77	12,517	20.18	161,776.6	200.91
Spain	Peseta	3,678	61.30	1,958.4	32.64	5,600	93.33	398.30	6.64	11,634.7	193.91
United States	Dollar						1,208.41				2,108.41
Lindsay, John V.:											
France	Franc	1,350.31	275.57	625	127.55	185	37.55	646.8	132.00	2,807.11	572.67
Germany	Deutsche mark	275	68.75	138.75	34.69	95	23.75	91.8	22.95	600.55	150.14
Italy	Lira	27,132	43.69	15,190.8	24.46	37,677.4	60.70	11,285	18.17	91,285.2	147.02
United States	Dollar						1,938.39				938.39

See footnotes at end of table.

Report of expenditure of foreign currencies and appropriated funds, delegation to 8th NATO Parliamentarians' Conference, expended between Jan. 1 and Dec. 31, 1962—Continued

Name and country	Name of currency	Lodging		Meals		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Rodino, Peter W., Jr.:											
France	Franc	1,340.02	273.59	570.90	116.51	185	37.76	700	142.86	2,795.92	570.72
United States	Dollar						22.35				22.35
Smith, Frank E., United States	do						976.87				976.87
Westland, Jack:											
France	Franc	1,350.31	275.57	664.34	135.58	187.43	38.25	670	136.73	2,872.08	586.13
Germany	Deutsche mark	275	68.75	135.8	33.95	115	28.75	95.7	23.92	621.5	155.37
Italy	Lire	18,130	29.24	10,127.7	16.33	18,888.7	30.38	7,950	12.82	55,046.4	88.77
Spain	Peseta	1,350	22.50	565.8	9.43	1,800	30.00	375.8	6.26	4,691.6	68.19
United States	Dollar		32.00				309.95				341.95
Crawford, Boyd:											
France	Franc	1,371.31	279.86	630	128.57	170	34.69	700	142.86	2,871.31	585.98
Germany	Deutsche mark	280	70.00	126.44	31.61	100.23	25.06	81.63	20.41	588.30	147.08
Italy	Lire	29,127	46.89	29,760	48.00	37,677.4	60.77	10,630	17.15	107,194.4	172.81
Spain	Peseta	3,427.20	57.12	2,349	39.15	2,750	45.83	290	4.83	8,816.2	146.93
Billings, Philip B.:											
France ¹	Franc	1,773.60	361.96	703.85	162.01	315.56	64.40	864.99	176.53	3,748	764.90
Germany	Deutsche mark	280	70.00	126.44	31.61	100.23	25.06	81.63	20.41	588.3	147.08
Italy	Lire	47,500	76.61	53,754	86.70	37,677.4	60.77	74,462	120.10	213,393.4	344.18
United States ²	Dollar		159.75		49.25		1,190.17				1,499.17
Drakert, Marcelle:											
Germany	Deutsche mark	250	62.50	130.84	34.21	100.23	25.06	39.80	9.95	526.87	131.72
Italy	Lire	23,132.25	37.25	15,525	25.00	37,677.4	60.77	6,751	10.87	83,085.65	133.89
Spain	Peseta	3,060	51.00	1,800	30.00	2,200	36.67	247.8	4.13	7,307.8	121.80
United States	Dollar		32.00				39.94				71.94
Krim, Marie H.:											
France	Franc	1,340.02	273.59	570.9	116.51	170	34.69	500	102.04	2,580.92	526.83
Germany	Deutsche mark	280	70.00	136.84	34.21	100.23	25.06	80	20.00	597.07	149.27
Italy	Lire	11,000	17.74	4,950	7.98	19,061.2	30.74	6,200	10.00	41,211.2	66.46
Litten, Jean:											
France	Franc	1,340.02	273.59	570.9	116.51	170	34.69	515	105.09	2,595.92	529.88
Germany	Deutsche mark	280	70.00	136.84	34.21	100.23	25.06	47.92	11.98	564.99	141.25
Italy	Lire	23,132.25	37.25	15,525	25.00	37,677.4	60.77	8,689	14.01	85,023.65	137.03
Spain	Peseta	3,060	51.00	1,800	30.00	2,750	45.83	306	5.10	7,916	131.93
Peak, Patricia E.:											
France	Franc	1,340.02	273.59	570.9	116.51	170	34.69	600	122.45	2,680.92	547.24
Germany	Deutsche mark	280	70.00	136.84	34.21	100.23	25.06	51.35	12.84	598.42	142.11
Italy	Lire	23,132.25	37.25	15,525	25.00	37,677.4	60.77	9,237	14.87	85,571.65	137.89
Spain	Peseta	3,060	51.00	1,800	30.00	2,200	36.67	297	4.95	7,357	122.62
Delegation expenses:											
Hotel office, France	Franc							3,109.78	634.65	3,109.78	634.65
Gratuities, France	do							250	51.02		51.02
Transportation, France	do						462.39	94.37		462.39	94.37
NATO reception, France	do								92.16	18.81	18.81
Overtime costs, France	do								1,144.04	233.48	1,144.04
Official luncheons and meals, France	do									1,749.3	357.00
Total			5,999.33			3,187.17		8,125.25		3,281.67	
											20,593.42

¹ Includes attending meetings of NATO Parliamentarians Conference Standing Committee.

² Includes NATO Parliamentarians' visit, U.S. bases.

RECAPITULATION

Amount

Foreign currency (U.S. dollar equivalent) 14,175.90
Appropriated funds: Other, Public Law 689, 84th Cong. 6,417.52

Total 20,593.42

WAYNE L. HAYS,

Chairman, Delegation to the 8th NATO Parliamentarians' Conference.

MARCH 8, 1963.

Report of expenditure of foreign currencies and appropriated funds, delegation to Canada-United States Interparliamentary Group, expended between Jan. 1, and Dec. 31, 1962

Name and country	Name of currency	Lodging		Meals		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Broomfield, Hon. William S.: Canada	Dollar		39.00		12.34				53.00		104.34
Curtis, Hon. Laurence: Canada	do		39.00		9.02		41.86				89.88
Gallagher, Hon. Cornelius E.: Canada	do		157.50		13.19				14.35		185.04
Giaimo, Hon. Robert N.: Canada	do		70.50						3.54		74.04
Harvey, Hon. James: Canada	do		52.50								52.50
Inouye, Hon. Daniel K.: Canada	do		56.00						2.75		58.75
Johnson, Hon. Harold T.: Canada	do		70.50		7.69				13.12		91.31
Murphy, Hon. William T.: Canada	do		73.50		14.71				1.25		89.46
Robison, Hon. Howard W.: Canada	do		39.00		8.03				1.85		48.88
Slack, Hon. John M., Jr.: Canada	do		71.50		4.12				1.84		77.46
Tupper, Hon. Stanley R.: Canada	do		52.50		14.81				.51		67.46
Jellison, Mr. Fred: Canada	do		48.00		5.48				7.00		60.84
O'Brien, Mrs. Mary L.: Canada	do		50.00		5.52				3.25		58.77
Westphal, Mr. Albert C. F.: Canada	do		47.00		36.59				4.91		88.50
Delegation expenses, Canada	do								833.33		833.33
Total			866.50		131.86		41.86		940.34		1,980.56

RECAPITULATION

Amount
1,980.56

Appropriated funds: Public Law 86-42

CORNELIUS E. GALLAGHER,

Chairman, House Delegation, Canada-United States Interparliamentary Group.

Report of expenditure of foreign currencies and appropriated funds, Mexico-United States Interparliamentary Group, expended between Jan. 1 and Dec. 31, 1962

Name and country	Name of currency	Lodging		Meals		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Hon. Harris B. McDowell, United States	Dollar		138.15		19.23		194.10		12.88		364.36
Hon. Edward J. Derwinski, United States	do		144.20		31.38		436.39		5.50		617.47
Hon. Robert B. Chiperfield, United States	do		54.00				205.10				259.10
Hon. Ben Reifel, United States	do		60.00		9.75		399.95		1.08		470.78
Delegation expenses (host expenses such as meals, interpreters, official visits, etc.).	do								7,333.26		7,333.26
Total			396.35		60.36		1,235.54		7,352.72		9,044.97

RECAPITULATION

Appropriated funds: Public Law 86-420, 86th Cong.

Amount
\$9,044.97D. S. SAUND,
Chairman, House Delegation, Mexico-United States Interparliamentary Group.

Report of expenditure of foreign currencies and appropriated funds, U.S. Group, Interparliamentary Union, U.S. House of Representatives, expended between Jan. 1 and Dec. 31, 1962

Name and country	Name of currency	Lodging		Meals		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Hon. Harold D. Cooley: Italy	U.S. dollars		137.50		41.91		609.60		5.16		794.17
Hon. Martha W. Griffiths: Italy	do		45.83		65.00		1,104.40		60.00		1,275.23
Hon. W. R. Poage: Mexico	do			1.00					1.50		2.50
Peru	do		28.68		4.03		1.50				34.21
Argentina	do		35.07		104.09				18.37		157.53
Brazil	do		86.82		130.64		9.03		75.71		302.20
Trinidad	do		10.53		4.60				1.60		16.73
Hon. Paul C. Jones: Mexico	Mexico		69.63		18.21				6.00		93.84
Peru	do		31.09		58.80				5.00		94.89
Argentina	do		35.07		58.08				10.39		103.54
Brazil	do		96.38		128.12		3.22		40.64		268.36
Trinidad	do		16.05		10.05				1.60		27.70
Hon. Lucien Nedzi: Mexico	do		48.03		10.72				17.90		76.65
Peru	do		32.00		13.38						45.38
Argentina	do		35.07		85.83				34.88		155.78
Brazil	do		92.79		164.39		8.89		137.66		403.73
Trinidad	do		16.05		42.88				1.60		60.53
Hon. Thomas Downing: Mexico	do		32.02		13.61				.16		45.79
Peru	do		48.03		52.00		9.32		8.80		118.15
Argentina	do		35.07		61.98				16.50		113.55
Brazil	do		92.79		163.68		6.45		130.55		393.47
Trinidad	do		16.05		6.78				1.60		24.43
Hon. Phil Weaver: Mexico	do		48.03		38.99				16.00		103.02
Peru	do		30.84		18.08		6.80		10.26		65.98
Argentina	do		35.07		18.07		1.20		13.68		68.02
Brazil	do		96.38		213.98		3.22		33.08		346.66
Trinidad	do		16.04		21.00		5.00		1.60		43.64
Total			1,266.91		1,549.90		1,768.63		650.24		5,235.68

Report of expenditure of foreign currencies and appropriated funds, Committee on Government Operations, U.S. House of Representatives, expended between Jan. 1 and Dec. 31, 1962

Name and country	Name of currency	Lodging		Meals		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Foreign Operations and Monetary Affairs Subcommittee			360.32		252.81		1,315.83		100.51		2,047.47
Total			360.32		252.81		1,315.83		100.51		2,047.47

RECAPITULATION

Foreign currency (U.S. dollar equivalent)

Amount
2,047.47WILLIAM L. DAWSON,
Chairman, Committee on Government Operations.

Report of expenditure of foreign currencies and appropriated funds, Committee on Government Operations, U.S. House of Representatives, Subcommittee on Foreign Operations and Monetary Affairs, expended between Jan. 1 and Dec. 31, 1962

Name and country	Name of currency	Lodging		Meals		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Robert P. Griffin:											
Germany	Deutsche mark	135.70	33.93	105.00	26.25	45.00	11.25	48.30	12.08	334.00	83.51
Denmark	Kroner	161.00	23.30	97.00	14.04	151.19	22.02	47.00	6.80	457.19	66.16
U.S.S.R.	do	831.74	120.35	150.00	21.70	68.00	9.84	82.00	11.87	1,131.74	163.76
Poland	Zloty	295.00	12.30	419.00	17.46	2,577.00	107.38	380.00	15.83	3,671.00	152.97
do	Kroner	76.37	11.05	120.40	17.42					196.77	28.47
Austria	Schilling	2,094.00	80.62	1,370.00	52.74	2,224.82	85.66	603.57	23.24	6,292.39	242.26
Spain	Peseta	3,988.00	66.47	5,150.00	85.83	10,699.00	175.32	1,766.00	29.43	21,603.00	360.05
Portugal	Escudo	607.00	21.30	495.00	17.37	190.00	6.66	292.50	10.26	1,584.50	55.59
Total			369.32		252.81		421.13		109.51		1,152.77

RECAPITULATION

Amount

1,152.77

Foreign currency (U.S. dollar equivalent)

WILLIAM L. DAWSON,

Chairman, Committee on Government Operations.

MARCH 5, 1963.

Name and country	Name of currency	Lodging		Meals		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Mr. Albion Ross (American citizen presently residing in Beirut, Lebanon) c/o American Embassy, Beirut, Lebanon.								894.70			894.70
(Mr. Albion Ross was summoned in April 1962, through the American Embassy, Beirut, Lebanon, to come to Washington, D.C., to appear before the Foreign Operations and Monetary Affairs Subcommittee for pertinent testimony. Arrangements were made through the Secretary of State, Washington, D.C., for round-trip economy jet air transportation to be purchased from 19FT561 funds for this purpose, pursuant to the provisions of Section 602(b) of the Mutual Security Act, as amended.)											

RECAPITULATION:

Amount

894.70

Foreign currency (U.S. dollar equivalent)

WILLIAM L. DAWSON,

Chairman, Committee on Government Operations.

MARCH 5, 1963.

Report of expenditure of foreign currencies and appropriated funds, Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, U.S. House of Representatives, expended between Jan. 1 and Dec. 31, 1962

Name and country	Name of currency	Lodging		Meals		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Oren Harris:											
France	Franc		48.00		36.54		11.75		5.75		102.04
Germany	Deutsche mark		27.50		46.00		17.55		7.75		98.80
England	Pound		58.80		38.87		50.46		6.00		154.13
Total			134.30		121.41		79.76		19.50		354.97
Walter Rogers:											
France	Franc		290.00		120.00		80.00		30.00		520.00
Italy	Lira		101.06		114.10		106.36		32.60		354.12
England	Pound		140.00		112.00		50.40		28.00		350.40
Total			531.06		346.10		236.76		90.60		1,204.52
William L. Springer:											
France	New franc		20.40		22.84						43.24
Switzerland	Franc		32.48		32.58						65.06
Germany	Deutsche mark		29.00		32.14						61.14
Total			81.88		87.56						169.44

Report of expenditure of foreign currencies and appropriated funds, Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, U.S. House of Representatives, expended between Jan. 1 and Dec. 31, 1962—Continued

Name and country	Name of currency	Lodging		Meals		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Peter F. Mack:											
France	Franc	56.05	—	44.20	—	64.22	—	39.61	—	204.08	
Italy	Lira	76.25	—	93.70	—	195.33	—	71.59	—	436.87	
Austria	Shilling	55.00	—	57.21	—	58.36	—	24.29	—	194.86	
Total		187.30	—	195.11	—	317.91	—	135.49	—	835.81	
Milton W. Glenn:											
England	Pound	126.00	—	98.00	—	28.00	—	28.00	—	280.00	
Germany	Deutsche mark	100.00	—	125.00	—	12.50	—	12.50	—	250.00	
Italy	Lira	150.00	—	80.00	—	26.00	—	16.00	—	272.00	
Spain	Peseta	90.00	—	140.00	—	50.00	—	25.00	—	305.00	
Greece	Drachma	66.00	—	66.00	—	13.00	—	20.00	—	165.00	
Total		532.00	—	509.00	—	129.50	—	101.50	—	1,272.00	
Morgan Moulder:											
Colombia	Peso	295.00	—	285.49	—	60.40	—	28.00	—	668.89	
Mexico	do	288.20	—	276.12	—	65.00	—	21.00	—	650.32	
Total		583.20	—	561.61	—	125.40	—	49.00	—	1,319.21	
James C. Healey:											
France	Franc	437.00	—	63.94	—	138.00	—	21.00	—	659.94	
Germany	Deutsche mark	75.00	—	124.94	—	—	—	50.00	—	249.94	
Total		512.00	—	188.88	—	138.00	—	71.00	—	909.88	
Hastings, Keith:											
Mexico	Peso	15.00	—	20.00	—	—	—	—	—	35.00	
Peru	Sol	—	—	—	—	—	—	76.49	—	76.49	
Total		15.00	—	20.00	—	—	—	76.49	—	111.49	
Samuel L. Devine:											
Italy	Lira	—	—	47.50	—	17.00	—	16.00	—	80.50	
Spain	Peseta	—	—	42.00	—	27.00	—	23.00	—	92.00	
Total		—	—	89.50	—	44.00	—	39.00	—	172.50	
W. E. Williamson:											
France	Franc	72.00	—	103.50	—	16.50	—	12.08	—	204.08	
Germany	Deutsche mark	27.50	—	39.26	—	8.75	—	8.15	—	83.66	
England	Pound	58.80	—	48.40	—	7.80	—	11.00	—	126.00	
Total		158.30	—	191.16	—	33.05	—	31.23	—	413.64	
Andrew Stevenson:											
Japan	Yen	107.40	—	12.35	—	31.57	—	8.40	—	159.72	
Hong Kong	Dollar	52.26	—	15.42	—	6.84	—	4.02	—	78.54	
Philippines	Peso	6.67	—	7.10	—	2.57	—	3.33	—	19.67	
Australia	Pound	143.66	—	71.55	—	25.31	—	6.98	—	247.50	
Total		—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	
Andrew Stevenson:											
Thailand	Baht	29.24	—	6.83	—	6.78	—	4.12	—	46.97	
India	Rupee	44.52	—	7.14	—	7.77	—	2.52	—	61.95	
Lebanon	Pound	37.95	—	12.54	—	4.95	—	2.97	—	58.41	
Jordan	do	8.68	—	1.12	—	13.72	—	4.48	—	28.00	
United Arab Republic	do	19.32	—	3.68	—	12.65	—	3.45	—	39.10	
France	Franc	54.59	—	16.74	—	13.67	—	10.61	—	95.61	
Spain	Peseta	65.95	—	33.38	—	21.18	—	13.80	—	134.71	
Total		570.24	—	187.85	—	147.41	—	64.68	—	970.18	
Torbert H. Macdonald:											
Australia	Pound	205.00	—	150.95	—	46.00	—	15.00	—	416.95	
Hong Kong	Dollar	130.00	—	154.18	—	61.00	—	14.00	—	359.18	
Indonesia	Rupiah	30.00	—	15.11	—	6.00	—	—	—	51.11	
Singapore	Dollar	40.00	—	25.48	—	6.00	—	—	—	71.48	
Vietnam	Piaster	75.00	—	40.45	—	11.00	—	—	—	126.45	
Total		480.00	—	386.17	—	130.00	—	29.00	—	1,025.17	
Dan Rostenkowski:											
Australia	Pound	140.00	—	105.00	—	28.00	—	5.64	—	278.64	
Hong Kong	Dollar	80.00	—	60.00	—	20.00	—	15.46	—	175.46	
Indonesia	Rupiah	24.00	—	20.00	—	4.00	—	3.00	—	51.00	
Singapore	Dollar	18.00	—	15.00	—	7.00	—	4.76	—	44.76	
Vietnam	Piaster	75.00	—	40.00	—	7.00	—	4.45	—	126.45	
Total		337.00	—	240.00	—	66.00	—	33.31	—	676.31	

OREN HARRIS,
Chairman, Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

MARCH 8, 1963.

Report of expenditure of foreign currencies and appropriated funds by the Committee on the Judiciary, U.S. House of Representatives expended between Jan. 1 and Dec. 31, 1962

Name and country	Name of currency	Lodging		Meals		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Hon. Francis E. Walter:											
United Kingdom	Pound	34-6	96.04	38/4	106.96	10/9	29.26	9-0	25.20	91-19	257.46
France	New franc					4,991.40	1,018.66			4,991.40	1,018.66
Switzerland	Franc	696.20	163.80	994.24	222.17	249.56	58.72	210	49.41	2,100	494.10
Walter M. Besterman:											
United Kingdom	Pound	34-18	97.72	28/2	78.68			7/0	19.60	70-0	196.00
France	New franc	893	178.60	741	148.20	5,645.30	1,129.06	185	37.00	7,464.30	1,492.86
Switzerland	Franc	571	134.40	418	98.40	272	64.00	136	32.00	1,397	328.80
Hon. Michael A. Feighan:											
Japan	Yen	41,254	114.60	42,999	119.44	9,547	26.52	5,987	16.63	99,787	277.19
Taiwan	New Taiwan dollar.	1,280	32.00	1,208	30.20			598	14.95	3,086	77.15
Manila	Peso	38	9.50	274.40	68.60	20	5.00	91.60	22.09	424	106.00
Hong Kong	Hong Kong dollar.	817.20	143.36	787.70	138.20	208.60	36.60	109.85	19.27	1,923.35	337.43
Thailand	Baht	310.70	15.05	296.95	14.38	900	43.57	306.35	14.85	1,814	87.85
India	Rupee	418.50	83.70	86	17.20	122.50	24.50	60	12.00	687	137.40
Turkey	Lira	253.75	28.20	233.98	25.98	49.65	5.52	109.80	12.20	647	71.90
Italy	do	41,024	66.05	55,575	91.10	12,141	19.55	13,630	21.96	123,360	198.65
Germany	Deutsche mark	341.91	85.48	338.89	84.72	88	22.00	98.20	24.55	867	216.75
Spain	Peseta	2,335.20	38.92	3,157.20	52.63	600	10.00	1,200	20.00	7,292.40	121.55
Portugal	Escudo	2,096.40	73.30	1,573	55.00	1,327	46.40	620.60	21.70	5,617	196.40
Hon. Peter W. Rodino, Jr.:											
Switzerland	Franc	420	97.19	448	103.77	110	25.45	22	5.01	1,000	231.42
Do	Deutsche mark				4,035.89	1,011.50				4,035.89	1,011.50
Hon. Byron G. Rogers:											
France	New franc	350	71.40	368	75.08	112	22.85	22	4.49	850	173.82
Belgium	Franc	4,200	84.45	495	99.50	550	11.00	300	6.19	10,000	201.14
Germany	Deutsche mark	340	84.96	364	91.00	50	12.50	46	11.48	800	199.94
Italy	Lira	40,000	64.00	50,500	81.00	15,000	24.00	7,500	12.00	112,500	181.00
Hon. Frank Chelf:											
France	New franc	159	31.80	66	13.20			25	5.00	250	50.00
Netherlands	Guilder					3,932.76	1,093.00			3,932.76	1,093.00
Switzerland	Franc	626.80	147.24	765.50	179.80	888	209.00		238	56.00	2,518
Italy	Lira	81,351	131.00	58,374	94.00			15,525	25.00	155,250	250.00
Hon. George Meader:											
Austria	Schilling	1,964	76.20	2,830	109.80	1,933	75.00	773	30.00	7,500	291.00
France	New franc	116.20	23.24	108.80	21.76			25	5.00	250	50.00
Germany	Deutsche mark	250	62.50	312	78.00	137	34.50	80	20.00	780	195.00
Netherlands	Guilder					19,321	532.00			1,913.21	532.00
Switzerland	Franc	462.19	108.75	538.26	126.65	529.55	124.60	170	40.00	1,700	400.00
							300				300
Hon. James F. Battin:											
France	New franc					4,996.90	1,019.78			4,996.90	1,019.78
Switzerland	Franc	433.50	102.00	140.25	33.00			63.75	15.00	637.50	150
Miss Ruth Miskell:											
Netherlands	Guilder					3,971.13	1,102.40			3,971.13	1,102.40
France	New franc	163	32.60	207	41.40	80	16.00	50	10.00	500	100.00
Switzerland	Franc	325.57	76.60	110.50	26.00	100.18	23.57	63.75	15.00	600	141.17
Italy	Lira	72,036	116.00	67,689	109.00			15,525	25.00	155,250	250.00
Hon. Peter W. Rodino, Jr.:											
Belgium	Franc	4,200	84.45	4,900	98.54	600	12.09	300	6.04	10,000	201.12
Holland											
Germany	Deutsche mark	340	84.96	360	89.98	56	14.00	44	11.00	800	199.94
Greece	Drachma	1,350	45.01	1,500	50.02	540	18.00	310	10.30	3,700	123.33
Italy	Lira	100,000	161.03	120,000	193.24	52,260	84.18	23,150	37.32	295,410	475.77
Spain	Peseta	3,000	50.03	3,600	60.03	1,500	25.01	1,200	20.00	9,300	155.07
Portugal	Escudo	1,500	52.45	2,000	69.95	500	17.48	220	7.70	4,220	147.58
Do	Lira					70,000	112.72			70,000	112.72
Do	Franc					4,373.20	892.49			4,373.20	892.49
Charles J. Zinn:											
Italy	Lira	31,550	50.50	24,400	39.00	7,810	12.50	6,240	10.00	70,000	112.00
Germany	Duetsche mark					4,392.19	1,100.80			4,392.19	1,100.80
Hon. Francis E. Walter:											
France	New franc	178	35.60	192	38.40	80	16.00	50	10.00	500	100.00
Netherlands	Guilder					4,517.24	1,259.90			4,517.24	1,259.90
Switzerland	Franc	555.90	130.80	845.07	198.84	796.49	187.41	212.50	50.00	2410	567.05
Italy	Lira	91,163	146.80	48,662	78.20			15,525	25.00	155,250	250.00
Walter M. Besterman:											
France	New franc	1,175.90	235.18	1,144.10	228.82	380	76.00	300	60.00	3,000	600.00
Netherlands	Guilder					4,184.25	1,161.60			4,184.25	1,161.60
Italy	Lira	86,071	138.60	3,132.32	4,504.40	340,929	4,549.00	80,730	130.00	820,962	1,322.00
Switzerland	Franc	649.66	152.86	779.74	183.47	192.10	45.20	178.50	42.00	1,800	423.53
Hon. Roland V. Libonati:											
Germany	Deutsche mark			1,097.25	275.00	305.23	76.50	240.04	60.16	1,642.52	411.66
France	Franc			327.07	66.75	173.95	35.50	267.20	54.53	768.22	156.78
Switzerland	do					448.23	78.50	236.68	41.45	110.89	19.42
Hong Kong						948.67	45.50	625.50	30.00	490.81	23.54
Thailand	Baht					5,566.90	76.50	1,523.81	20.94	2,909.35	39.98
Vietnam	Piaster									10,000.06	137.42
Total				4,038.92		5,009.96		13,965.28		1,266.37	
											24,280.53

¹ Invited as congressional observer to Geneva Disarmament Conference.

² Air passage from United States and return.

³ Approximate cost of return transportation. Exact figure and foreign currency not immediately available.

⁴ Including expenses for transportation and meals for self, committee members and other staff members.

EMANUEL CELLER,
Chairman, Committee on the Judiciary.

Report of expenditure of foreign currencies and appropriated funds, Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, U.S. House of Representatives, expended between Jan. 1 and Dec. 31, 1962

Name and country	Name of currency	Lodging		Meals		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
John D. Dingell, Bimini, The Bahamas (Per diem in lieu of actual expenses, \$192.00.)	Dollar						207.06				399.06

RECAPITULATION

Appropriated funds: H. Res. 99, 87th Cong. \$399.06

H. C. BONNER,

Chairman, Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

MARCH 5, 1963.

Report of expenditure of foreign currencies and appropriated funds, Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, U.S. House of Representatives, expended between Dec. 24 and 31, 1962

Name and country	Name of currency	Lodging		Meals		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
John D. Dingell, Bimini, The Bahamas (Per diem in lieu of actual expenses, \$192.00.)	Dollar						207.06				399.06

RECAPITULATION

Appropriated funds: H. Res. 99, 87th Cong. \$399.06

JOHN D. DINGELL,

Acting Chairman, Subcommittee on Oceanography, Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

MARCH 4, 1963.

Report of expenditure of foreign currencies and appropriated funds, Committee on Public Works, U.S. House of Representatives

Name and country	Name of currency	Lodging		Meals		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Frank E. Smith:											
France	Franc	545	111.09	272	55.45	410	83.57	103	21.01	1,330	271.12
United Kingdom	Pound	33/6	93.87	26/4	73.81	28/7	79.90	12/3	34.26	100/0	281.84
T. A. Thompson:											
Spain	Peseta	12,140	202.33	14,270	237.84	23,800	396.67	8,870	147.84	59,080	984.68
Italy	Lire	143,575	231.20	97,310	156.70	59,802	96.30	59,915	96.48	360,602	580.68
France	Franc	985	201.03	695	141.84	910	185.73	172.08	35.10	2,762.08	563.70
United Kingdom	Pound	97/0	272.57	45/0	126.45	308/12/6	866.73	34/2	95.82	484/14/6	1,361.57
Richard J. Sullivan: Spain	Peseta	2,700	45.00	4,890	81.00	12,200	203.70	5,440	90.66	25,200	420.36
Joseph R. Brennan: Spain	Peseta	7,837	130.62	10,200	170.00	20,650	344.17	2,963	49.38	41,650	975.50
Clifton W. Enfield: Spain	do	7,924.50	132.08	9,765.50	162.76	20,525	342.00	3,310	55.17	41,525	694.17
Total			1,419.79		1,205.85		3,574.27		625.72		6,825.63

1 Transportation paid in German currency.

RECAPITULATION

Foreign currency (U.S. dollar equivalent) \$6,825.63

CHARLES A. BUCKLEY,

Chairman, Committee on Public Works.

MARCH 8, 1963.

Report of expenditure of foreign currencies and appropriated funds, Committee on Science and Astronautics, U.S. House of Representatives, expended between Jan. 1 and Dec. 31, 1962

Name and country	Name of currency	Lodging		Meals		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Victor L. Anfuso:											
Portugal	Escudo	2,657.20	92.80	1,227	43.82	787	28.10	286.30	10.00	4,957.50	174.72
Spain	Peseta	12,730	212.20	6,850	114.26	1,920	32.00	1,800	30.00	23,300	388.46
Italy (transportation)	Lira	243,760	392.60	139,500	225.00	315,055	507.33	16,740	27.00	715,055	1,151.93
Netherlands	Guilder					837.31	233.00			837.31	233.00
Total			697.60		383.08		800.43		67.00		1,948.11

Report of expenditure of foreign currencies and appropriated funds, Committee on Science and Astronautics, U.S. House of Representatives, expended between Jan. 1 and Dec. 31, 1962—Continued

Name and country	Name of currency	Lodging		Meals		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Corinne Riley:											
Great Britain	Pound	18	50.40	6	16.80	21	58.80	6	16.80	30	142.80
France	New franc	458	91.60	190	38.70	120	24.50	87	17.70	855	172.50
West Germany	Deutsche mark	183	45.75	100	25.60			168	40.50	450	111.25
Austria	Schilling	3,411	137.00	1,300	52.00	909	35.36	1,163	47.00	6,783	271.36
Italy	Lira	65,000	105.00	24,490	39.00	74,300	112.50	30,380	49.00	119,870	305.50
Spain	Peseta	472	8.00	720	12.00			600	10.00	1,792	30.00
Bermuda (transportation)	Pound	35	98.00	9	25.20			9	25.20	53	148.40
Netherlands	Guilder					4,317.95	1,201.43			4,317.95	1,201.43
Total			535.75		208.70		1,432.59		206.20		2,383.24
Raymond Wilcock:											
Great Britain	Pound	17	47.60	7	19.60			6	16.80	30	84.00
France	New franc	458	91.60	190	38.70	120	24.50	87	17.70	855	172.50
West Germany	Mark	183	45.75	100	25.60			168	40.50	450	111.50
Austria	Schilling	3,410	136.00	1,300	52.00			1,162	46.00	5,872	234.00
Italy	Lira	65,000	105.00	24,490	40.00			30,380	49.00	119,870	394.00
Spain	Peseta	472	8.00	720	12.00			600	10.00	1,792	30.00
Bermuda (transportation)	Pound	35	99.00	9	25.20			9	25.20	53	148.40
Netherlands	Guilder					4,317.95	1,201.43			4,317.95	1,201.43
Total			532.95		213.10		1,225.93		205.20		2,177.18
Charles F. Ducander:											
Austria	Austrian schilling	3,003	116.79	1,525	59.32	800	31.12	552	21.40		
Greece	Drachma	248	8.27	150	5.00	52	1.73	0	0	450	15.00
Italy	Lira	30,100	48.47	28,600	46.05	12,200	19.65	1,200	1.93	72,100	116.10
France	New franc	542	110.62	405	82.66	117	23.88	186	37.96	1,250	255.12
England (transportation)	Pound	25-0-0	70.01	16-0-0	44.80	6-0-0	16.80	2-0-0	5.60	49-0-0	137.21
Germany	Deutsche mark					5,154.80	1,288.70			5,154.80	1,288.70
Total			354.16		237.83		1,381.88		66.89		2,040.76
Frank R. Hammill, Jr.:											
Austria	Austrian schilling	2,965	115.28	1,552	60.35	835	32.47	508	19.75	5,860	227.85
Greece	Drachma	205	6.83	490	16.33	260	8.67	45	1.50	1,000	33.33
Italy	Lira	29,200	47.02	30,200	48.63	14,100	22.70	2,100	3.38	75,600	121.73
France	Franc	515	105.12	422	86.13	110	22.45	143	29.18	1,190	242.88
England (transportation)	Pound	25-0-0	70.01	1-60-0	44.80	4-0-0	11.20	2-10-0	7.00	47-10-00	133.01
Germany	Deutsche mark					5,154.80	1,288.70			5,154.80	1,288.70
Total			344.26		256.24		1,386.19		60.81		2,047.50
Emilio Q. Daddario:											
Italy (transportation)	Lira	218,240	352.00	119,040	192.00	49,600	80.00	21,520	34.70	408,400	658.70
France						5,438	1,109.79			5,438	1,109.79
Total			352.00		192.00		1,189.79		34.70		1,768.49
Emilio Q. Daddario:											
United Kingdom	Pound	50	140.00	25	70.00	17.7	49.80	7.3	20.20	100	280.00
France (transportation)	Franc	696	142.00	294	60.00	205.8	42.00	89.1	18.00	1,176	262.00
Germany	Deutsche mark					2,061.63	516.70				516.70
United Kingdom	Pound					38.7	107.45				107.45
Total			282.00		130.00		715.95		38.20		1,166.15
Grand total			3,098.72		1,620.95		8,132.76		679.00		13,531.43

RECAPITULATION

Foreign currency (U.S. dollar equivalent) Amount 13,531.43

GEORGE P. MILLER,
Chairman, Committee on Science and Astronautics.

MARCH 9, 1963.

Report of expenditure of foreign currencies and appropriated funds, Committee on Veterans' Affairs, U.S. House of Representatives, expended between Jan. 1 and Dec. 31, 1962

Name and country	Name of currency	Lodging		Meals		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Hon. Horace R. Kornegay:	New franc	821.25	176.78	515	110.58	9-5	1.97	120-75	27.70	1,552	317.03
France	Lire	58,840	94.78	75,500	120.95	46,627	75.26	9,460	15.60	190,427	306.59
Germany	Deutsche mark	386	96.17	540	135.06	72	18.14	95	23.94	1,003	273.31
Great Britain	Pound	22-3-9	62.22	25-0-0	70.00	3-10-0	9.80	3-6-3	9.28	54-0-0	151.30
The Netherlands	Dutch guilder					49.21	196.25			49.21	196.25
Total counterpart funds			420.95		436.59		301.42		76.52		1,244.48
Appropriated funds (Defense)	Dollar							305.60			305.60
Total expenditures, Mr. Kornegay.			420.95		436.59		607.02		76.52		1,550.08

Report of expenditure of foreign currencies and appropriated funds, Committee on Veterans' Affairs, U.S. House of Representatives, expended between Jan. 1 and Dec. 31, 1962—Continued

Name and country	Name of currency	Lodging		Meals		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Hon. Robert F. Ellsworth:											
France	New franc	535	109.18	755	154.28	35	7.08	180	36.90	1,505	307.44
Italy	Lira	27,745	30.67	52,750	89.94	44,127	75.04	64,007	108.05	188,627	303.70
Germany	Deutsche mark	304	75.61	576	145.15	241	59.52	150	37.52	1,271	317.80
The Netherlands	Dutch guilder					49.21	196.25			49.21	196.25
Total, counterpart funds		215.46		389.37			337.89		182.47		1,125.19
Appropriated funds (Defense)	Dollar						330.40				330.40
Total expenditures, Mr. Ellsworth		215.46		389.27			668.29		182.47		1,455.59
Billy E. Kirby:											
France	New franc	475	97.32	350	71.45						
Italy	Lira	31,557	45.78	71,409	120.00	34,128	54.96	21,534	34.64	158,628	255.38
Germany	Deutsche mark	262	62.25	225	56.20	93	23.25	40	10.75	610	152.45
Great Britain	Pound	6-7-0	17.78	5-8-0	15.20			2/0/0	5.60	13-5-0	38.58
The Netherlands	Dutch guilder					49.21	196.25			49.21	196.25
Total, counterpart funds		223.13		262.85			274.46		86.56		847.00
Appropriated funds (Defense)	Dollar						314.40				314.40
Total expenditures, Mr. Kirby		223.13		262.85			588.86		86.56		1,161.40
John R. Holden:											
France	New franc	471-75	96.41	492	100.36	90	18.45	133/25	27.32	1,187	242.54
Italy	Lira	32,259	50.94	87,467	140.00	43,500	69.46	17,902	31.22	181,128	291.62
Germany	Deutsche mark	309/88	77.51	197/12	49.17	133	33.52	30	7.26	670	167.46
Great Britain	Pound	6-14-8	18.89	6/0/0	16.80		1-5-4	3.59	14-0-0	39.28	
The Netherlands	Dutch guilder					49.21	196.25			49.21	196.25
Total, counterpart funds		243.75		306.33			317.68		69.39		937.15
Appropriated funds (Defense)	Dollar						314.40				314.40
Total expenditures, Mr. Holden		243.75		306.33			632.08		69.39		1,251.55
Total		1,112.29		1,395.14			2,496.25		414.94		5,418.62

RECAPITULATION

	Amount
Foreign currency (U.S. dollar equivalent)	\$4,153.62
Appropriated funds: Department of Defense	1,264.80
Total	5,418.62

OLIN E. TEAGUE,
Chairman, Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

FEBRUARY 27, 1963.

Report of expenditure of foreign currencies and appropriated funds, Committee on Ways and Means, U.S. House of Representatives, expended between Jan. 1 and Dec. 31, 1962

Name and country	Name of currency	Lodging		Meals		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Hon. Herman T. Schneebeli:											
Belgium	Franc	2,400	48.00	2,000	40.00						
England	Pound	30.7	85.00	14.6	40.00	3.12	10.00	600	13.20	5,060	101.20
Total			133.00		80.00		10.00		21.70		244.70

RECAPITULATION

	Amount
Foreign currency (U.S. dollar equivalent)	\$244.70

W. D. MILLS,
Chairman, Committee on Ways and Means.

FEBRUARY 20, 1963.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS,
ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

524. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to promote the cause of criminal justice by providing for the representation of defendants who are financially unable to obtain an adequate defense in criminal cases in the courts of the

United States"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

525. A letter from the Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting the 1962 Report of the Federal Crop Insurance Corporation, U.S. Department of Agriculture, pursuant to the Federal Crop Insurance Act; to the Committee on Agriculture.

526. A letter from the Deputy Secretary of Defense, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, relating to the appointment, promotion, separation, and retirement of members of the Armed Forces, and for other

purposes"; to the Committee on Armed Services.

527. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on the audit of the U.S. Study Commission on the Neches, Trinity, Brazos, Colorado, Guadalupe, San Antonio, Nueces, and San Jacinto River Basins and intervening areas, State of Texas; to the Committee on Government Operations.

528. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on the review of selected purchase orders issued by Sandia Corp., Albuquerque,

N. Mex., under contract AT(29-1)-789 with the Atomic Energy Commission; to the Committee on Government Operations.

529. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting the annual report of the activities of the U.S. General Accounting Office for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1962, pursuant to the Budget and Accounting Act of June 10, 1921; to the Committee on Government Operations.

530. 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 improve the administration of transfers and conveyances of certain real property for various public uses, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Government Operations.

531. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to increase the authorization for appropriation for continuing work in the Missouri River Basin by the Secretary of the Interior"; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

532. A letter from the Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill for the relief of certain officers of the naval service erroneously in receipt of compensation based upon an incorrect computation of service for basic pay"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

533. A letter from the Director, Administrative Office, U.S. Courts, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to amend section 1825 of title 28 of the United States Code to authorize the payment of witness' fees in habeas corpus cases and in proceedings to vacate sentence under section 2255 of title 28, for persons who are authorized to proceed in *forma pauperis*"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

534. A letter from the Deputy Administrator, National Aeronautics and Space Administration, transmitting a report to the Committee on Science and Astronautics of the House of Representatives pursuant to section 3 of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration Authorization Act for the fiscal year 1963 (76 Stat. 383); to the Committee on Science and Astronautics.

535. A letter from the Deputy Administrator, National Aeronautics and Space Administration, transmitting a report to the Committee on Science and Astronautics of the House of Representatives pursuant to section 3 of the act of July 21, 1961 (75 Stat. 216, 217); to the Committee on Science and Astronautics.

536. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, U.S. Department of Justice, transmitting copies of the orders entered in the cases of certain aliens who have been found admissible to the United States, pursuant to the Immigration and Nationality Act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

537. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, U.S. Department of Justice, transmitting reports concerning visa petitions which this Service has approved according the beneficiaries of such petitions first preference classification under the act, pursuant to the Immigration and Nationality Act, as amended; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

538. 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) was exercised in behalf of such aliens, pursuant to the Immigration and Nationality Act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1963, the following bills were reported on March 8, 1963:

Mr. McMILLAN: Committee on the District of Columbia. H.R. 682. A bill to amend the act of March 3, 1901, to permit the appointment of new trustees in deeds of trust in the District of Columbia by agreement of the parties; without amendment (Rept. No. 74). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. McMILLAN: Committee on the District of Columbia. H.R. 1933. A bill to amend the act of February 9, 1907, entitled "An act to define the term 'registered nurse' and to provide for the registration of nurses in the District of Columbia," as amended, with respect to the minimum age limitation for registration; without amendment (Rept. No. 75). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. McMILLAN: Committee on the District of Columbia. H.R. 1935. A bill to authorize the acquisition, training, and maintenance of dogs to be used in law enforcement in the District of Columbia; without amendment (Rept. No. 76). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. McMILLAN: Committee on the District of Columbia. H.R. 1937. A bill to amend the act known as the "Life Insurance Act" of the District of Columbia, approved June 19, 1934, and the act known as the "Fire and Casualty Act" of the District of Columbia, approved October 3, 1940; without amendment (Rept. No. 77). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. McMILLAN: Committee on the District of Columbia. H.R. 1982. A bill to amend section 10 of the District of Columbia Traffic Act, 1925, as amended, so as to require reports of collisions in which motor vehicles are involved; without amendment (Rept. No. 78). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. McMILLAN: Committee on the District of Columbia. H.R. 2485. 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 and preventable diseases," approved August 11, 1939, as amended; without amendment (Rept. No. 79). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, pursuant to the order of the House of March 6, 1963, the following resolutions and bills were reported on March 8, 1963:

Mr. TRIMBLE: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 287. Resolution providing for the consideration of H.R. 2438, a bill, to extend the induction provisions of the Universal Military Training and Service Act, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 80). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. COLMER: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 288. Resolution providing for the consideration of H.R. 2440, a bill, to authorize appropriations during fiscal year 1964 for procurement, research, development, test, and evaluation of aircraft, missiles, and naval vessels for the Armed Forces, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 81). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. McMILLAN: Committee on the District of Columbia. H.R. 39. A bill to amend the act of June 4, 1948, as it relates to the appointment of the District of Columbia Armory Board; with amendment (Rept. No. 82). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. McMILLAN: Committee on the District of Columbia. H.R. 3537. A bill to increase the jurisdiction of the Municipal Court for the District of Columbia in civil actions, to change the names of the court, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 83). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

[Submitted March 11, 1963]

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. ROGERS of Texas: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H.R. 131. A bill to provide for the renewal of certain municipal, domestic, and industrial water supply contracts entered into under the Reclamation Project Act of 1939, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 84). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. PATMAN: Committee on Banking and Currency. H.R. 3872. A bill to increase the lending authority of the Export-Import Bank of Washington, to extend the period within which the Export-Import Bank of Washington may exercise its functions, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 86). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar as follows:

Mr. JONES of Missouri: Committee on House Administration. House Joint Resolution 234. Joint resolution to provide for the reappointment of John Nicholas Brown as Citizen Regent of the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution; without amendment (Rept. No. 85). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina:

H.R. 4696. A bill to amend title 37, United States Code, to increase the rates of basic pay for members of the uniformed services, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. ASPINALL (by request):

H.R. 4697. A bill to amend section 2455 of the Revised Statutes, as amended (43 U.S.C. 1171), and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. DORN:

H.R. 4698. A bill to provide for the establishment of the Old Ninety-six Star Fort National Monument in the State of South Carolina; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. DULSKI:

H.R. 4699. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to increase from \$1,200 to \$2,400 the amount of outside earnings permitted each year without deductions from benefits thereunder; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HARRIS:

H.R. 4700. A bill to exempt certain carriers from minimum rate regulation in the transportation of bulk commodities, agricultural and fishery products, and passengers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 4701. A bill to provide for strengthening and improving the national transportation system and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 4702. A bill to establish a uniform system of time standards and time measurement for the United States and to require the observance of such time standards for all purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, pursuant to the order of the House of March 7,

By Mr. JARMAN:

H.R. 4703. A bill to amend the Federal Trade Commission Act, to promote quality and price stabilization, to define and restrain certain unfair methods of distribution and to confirm, define, and equalize the rights of producers and resellers in the distribution of goods identified by distinguishing brands, names, or trademarks, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. LIBONATI:

H.R. 4704. A bill to establish a basic work-week of 35 hours for Government employees, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. McDOWELL:

H.R. 4705. A bill to amend the provisions of law relating to the disposition of surplus real property for park and recreational area, historic monument, and fish and wildlife conservation purposes, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. MILLER of California:

H.R. 4706. A bill to amend the act redefining the units and establishing the standards of electrical and photometric measurements to provide that the candela shall be the unit of luminous intensity; to the Committee on Science and Astronautics.

H.R. 4707. A bill to designate the Veterans' Administration hospital at Martinez, Calif., as the Charles C. McGonegal Memorial Hospital; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. PEPPER:

H.R. 4708. A bill to amend section 18 of the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937 to provide free transportation on any railroad carrier subject to that act for individuals receiving pensions or annuities under that act, and for their dependents, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. QUIE:

H.R. 4709. A bill to provide assistance to certain States bordering the Mississippi River in the construction of the Great River Road; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. ROUDEBUSH:

H.R. 4710. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to provide that service of a veteran in any campaign or expedition involving armed conflict shall be considered wartime service for the purposes of all laws granting benefits to veterans and their dependents; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. SHRIVER:

H.R. 4711. A bill to amend section 312 of title 38, United States Code, to provide that Parkinson's disease developing a 10-percent degree of disability after separation from the service shall be considered to be service connected; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. ASPINALL:

H.R. 4712. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to set aside certain land within the National Capital Parks System in Washington, D.C., for construction of a building by the Bureau of Water Resources of the National Rivers and Harbors Congress, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia:

H.R. 4713. A bill to amend section 103, title 31, of the District of Columbia Code of 1961, as amended; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

H.R. 4714. A bill to amend section 207, title 31, of the District of Columbia Code of 1961, as amended; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. CELLER:

H.R. 4715. A bill to incorporate the Eleanor Roosevelt Memorial Foundation, Inc.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DENTON:

H.R. 4716. A bill to provide for the striking of medals in commemoration of the 150th anniversary of the statehood of the State of Indiana; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H.R. 4717. A bill to provide for the issuance of a special postage stamp in commemoration of the 150th anniversary of the admission of the State of Indiana to the United States to be celebrated in 1966; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 4718. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to increase the amount of outside income which a blind individual may earn without suffering deductions from his or her benefits thereunder; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 4719. A bill to amend titles X and XVI of the Social Security Act to prohibit any State from imposing a lien on a blind individual's property as a condition of aid or assistance thereunder; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DEROUNIAN:

H.R. 4720. A bill to amend subsection (b) of section 512 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (dealing with unrelated business taxable income); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DORN:

H.R. 4721. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide, for individuals who have spent substantially all of their working lives in one trade or industry, a more realistic definition of "disability" for purposes of entitlement to disability insurance benefits and the disability freeze; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DOWNING:

H.R. 4722. A bill to provide for the appointment of one additional district judge for the eastern district of Virginia; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FINO:

H.R. 4723. A bill to provide coverage under the old-age, survivors, and disability insurance system (subject to an election in the case of those currently serving) for all officers and employees of the United States and its instrumentalities; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 4724. A bill to amend the Social Security and the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide that a fully insured individual may elect to have any employment or self-employment performed by him after attaining age 65 excluded (for both tax and benefit purposes) from coverage under the old-age, survivors, and disability insurance system; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 4725. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to grant an additional income tax exemption for a taxpayer supporting a dependent who has attained age 65 or is blind; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GILBERT:

H.R. 4726. A bill to provide under the social security program for payment for hospital and related services to aged beneficiaries; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GRABOWSKI:

H.R. 4727. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide an additional income tax exemption for a taxpayer or dependent taking advanced training in a Reserve Officers' Training Corps; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HARVEY of Indiana:

H.R. 4728. A bill to provide for the striking of medals in commemoration of the 150th anniversary of the statehood of the State of Indiana; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H.R. 4729. A bill to provide for the issuance of a special postage stamp in commemoration of the 150th anniversary of the

admission of the State of Indiana to the United States to be celebrated in 1966; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. HUDDLESTON:

H.R. 4730. A bill establishing a presumption of death where an individual is shown to have been near the site of a nuclear explosion in time of war and no evidence of his existence has been found or received for at least 1 year after such explosion; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MACDONALD:

H.R. 4731. A bill to amend section 402(d) of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. MACDONALD (by request):

H.R. 4732. A bill to change the name of the U.S. Olympic Association to the U.S. Olympic Committee; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. NEDZI:

H.R. 4733. A bill to provide under the social security program for payment for hospital and related services to aged beneficiaries; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. O'HARA of Illinois:

H.R. 4734. A bill to provide for the establishment of the Indiana Dunes National Lakeshore, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. PATMAN:

H.R. 4735. A bill to permit Federal employees to purchase shares of Federal or State chartered credit unions through voluntary payroll allotment; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. PIKE:

H.R. 4736. A bill to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, to provide for marketing quotas on Irish potatoes through establishment of acreage allotments; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina:

H.R. 4737. A bill to amend chapter 5 of title 37, United States Code, to provide special career incentive payments for enlisted members of the uniformed services; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H.R. 4738. A bill to amend chapter 7 of title 37, United States Code, providing for quarters allowances when husband and wife are members of the uniformed services; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H.R. 4739. A bill to amend section 406 of title 37, United States Code, with regard to the advance movement of dependents and baggage and household effects of members of the uniformed services; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. ROUSH:

H.R. 4740. A bill to provide for the striking of medals in commemoration of the 150th anniversary of the statehood of the State of Indiana; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H.R. 4741. A bill to provide for the issuance of a special postage stamp in commemoration of the 150th anniversary of the admission of the State of Indiana to the United States to be celebrated in 1966; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 4742. A bill appropriating the sum of \$4,647,467.67 to satisfy the final decree of the Indian Claims Commission against the United States in favor of the Miami Tribe; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. SIKES:

H.R. 4743. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to set aside certain land within the National Capital Parks System in Washington, D.C., for construction of a building by the Bureau of Water Resources of the National Rivers and Harbors Congress, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. STAGGERS:

H.R. 4744. A bill to repeal section 13a of the Interstate Commerce Act; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. STRATTON:

H.R. 4745. A bill to establish on a 1-year emergency basis a program of incentive payments to dairy farmers who voluntarily reduce their milk production below their 1962 production levels; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. WALTER:

H.R. 4746. A bill to amend chapter 223 of title 18, United States Code, to provide for the admission of certain evidence, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. GREEN of Oregon:

H.R. 4747. A bill to revise the Federal election laws, to prevent corrupt practices in Federal elections, and for other purposes; to the Committee on House Administration.

H.R. 4748. A bill to amend chapter 2 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to extend the period within which certain ministers, members of religious orders, and Christian Science practitioners may elect coverage under the old age, survivors, and disability insurance system; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 4749. A bill to establish legislative standards for the guidance of Members of Congress and to promote public confidence in the integrity of Congress thereby; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. HALPERN:

H.R. 4750. A bill to improve, strengthen, and accelerate programs for the prevention and abatement of air pollution; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. ANDERSON:

H.J. Res. 314. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GOODLING:

H.J. Res. 315. Joint resolution establishing a commission to participate in the 100th anniversary of the Battle of Gettysburg and the 100th anniversary of Lincoln's Gettysburg Address; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KING of New York:

H.J. Res. 316. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States pertaining to the offering of prayers in public schools and other public places in the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LONG of Maryland:

H.J. Res. 317. Joint resolution to establish a Joint Committee on Foreign Information and Intelligence; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. PEPPER:

H.J. Res. 318. Joint resolution to provide for the establishment of a Commission on Cuban Refugees; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. QUIE:

H.J. Res. 319. Joint resolution designating the 6-day period beginning April 15, 1963, as "National Harmony Week," and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SCHADEBERG:

H.J. Res. 320. Joint resolution designating the 6-day period beginning April 15, 1963, as "National Harmony Week," and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WALTER:

H.J. Res. 321. Joint resolution establishing a commission to participate in the 100th anniversary of the Battle of Gettysburg and the 100th anniversary of Lincoln's Gettysburg Address; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RYAN of New York:

H. Con. Res. 110. Concurrent resolution authorizing the printing as a House document of a Spanish edition of "Infant Care"; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. WALTER:

H. Con. Res. 111. Concurrent resolution providing for the annual observance of the

Liberty Bell anniversary; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PEPPER:

H. Res. 289. Resolution creating a nonlegislative select committee to conduct an investigation and study of the aged and aging; to the Committee on Rules.

H. Res. 290. Resolution calling upon the Organization of American States and the United Nations to join the United States in demanding the Soviet Union to remove its armed forces from Cuba; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

MEMORIALS

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

By Mr. BERRY: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of South Dakota, relative to the so-called right-to-work laws of the respective States of this Union; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of South Dakota, to provide financial relief either through amending Public Law 81-874 or direct grants to the Fort Pierre Independent School District, Stanley County, S. Dak.; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of South Dakota, to allow singing at Mount Rushmore by nonprofessional student workers and to remove the restrictions imposed in 1962 which caused this to cease; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of South Dakota, urging the construction of the Crazy Horse Memorial near Custer, S. Dak.; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. HARRISON: Memorial of the House of Representatives, 37th State Legislature of the State of Wyoming, a joint memorial, memorializing the Congress of the United States of America with reference to limiting and reducing the threat of communism in the Western Hemisphere; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. LIBONATI: Memorial of the 73d General Assembly of the State of Illinois, Senate Joint Resolution 4, proposing an amendment to the Constitution; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. REIFEL: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of South Dakota, memorializing the Congress of the United States to amend the Federal statutes in order to provide for payments in lieu of property taxes imposed on land prior to acquisition by the Federal Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife and Wildlife Agency; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of South Dakota, requesting the Congress of the United States of America to propose an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to provide for the appointment of electors of the President and Vice President on a basis similar to the election of the Congress of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of South Dakota, memorializing Congress to take all necessary steps in promoting the sale of grain and to guarantee continuing access of U.S. wheat to the Common Market countries; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Alaska, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to the promotion of State commercial fishery research and development projects; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Hawaii, memorializing the President

and the Congress of the United States relative to ratifying a proposed amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to the qualification of electors; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Idaho, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to give early consideration to the continued investigation and construction of the Mountain Home division, Snake River project, Guffey plan of development; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Idaho, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to call a convention for the purpose of proposing an amendment for a national debt limit of \$350 billion; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Illinois, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to call a convention for the purpose of proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Minnesota, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to ratifying a proposed amendment to the Constitution of the United States to outlaw the poll tax; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of South Dakota, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to amend the Federal statutes in order to provide for payments in lieu of property taxes imposed on land prior to acquisition by the Federal Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife and Wildlife Agency; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of West Virginia, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States, relative to making Sir Winston Churchill an honorary citizen of the State of West Virginia; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mr. BOGGS:

H.R. 4751. A bill for the relief of Dr. Louis van den Berghe; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BRADEMAS:

H.R. 4752. A bill for the relief of Reni Varaldis Skoufis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4753. A bill for the relief of Theodora Vlahakis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4754. A bill for the relief of Mehmet Ozguler; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4755. A bill for the relief of Azizah Abdallah Ayoub; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BRUCE:

H.R. 4756. A bill for the relief of Jesse J. Locke; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CAREY:

H.R. 4757. A bill for the relief of Giuseppe Basile; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DENTON:

H.R. 4758. A bill for the relief of George A. Grabert; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DOWNING:

H.R. 4759. A bill for the relief of W. V. Grimes, James A. Powell, and Frank Groves; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DOYLE:

H.R. 4760. A bill for the relief of Elizabeth Mary Martin; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FASCELL:

H.R. 4761. A bill for the relief of Dr. Olga Marie Ferrer; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FINO:

H.R. 4762. A bill for the relief of Loreto and Giuseppina Puccia and their two minor children, Carmelo and Lucia; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4763. A bill for the relief of Louisa Victoria Arledge; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. GRIFFITHS:

H.R. 4764. A bill for the relief of Gabriela C. Arnold; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JONES of Alabama:

H.R. 4765. A bill to authorize and direct the Administrator of the Farmers Home Administration to quitclaim certain property in Jackson County, Ala., to Skyline Churches

Cemetery, a corporation; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. KORNNEGAY:

H.R. 4766. A bill for the relief of the Boren Clay Products Co.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McDOWELL:

H.R. 4767. A bill for the relief of Hee-Sa Kim; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MONAGAN:

H.R. 4768. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Gertrude Reskin; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MURPHY of Illinois:

H.R. 4769. A bill for the relief of Maria Loncaric; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROYBAL:

H.R. 4770. A bill for the relief of Efstahia Giannos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RYAN of New York:

H.R. 4771. A bill for the relief of Yonah Maabari; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. THOMPSON of Texas:

H.R. 4772. A bill for the relief of Dr. Tao Ping Li; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WILLIS:

H.R. 4773. A bill for the relief of referee in bankruptcy; 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:

63. By Mr. HANNA: Petition of the (1) Committee for the Monroe Doctrine and (2) Llesure World Democratic Club; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

64. By the SPEAKER: Petition of Henry Stoner, Avon Park, Fla., relative to employers making income tax deductions; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Secretary Dillon Emphasizes Small Business Provisions of President's Tax Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOE L. EVINS

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 11, 1963

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Speaker, as chairman of the House Small Business Committee, I am deeply interested in the effect of the President's tax proposals on the small business segment of our economy. Tax reductions and revisions which are of benefit to small business are long overdue.

The Treasury Department has submitted to me as chairman of the House Small Business Committee a memorandum which summarizes the principal points in the President's tax program, which affect small business. It appears that the benefits to small business under the proposed program will be extensive.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that Secretary Dillon's letter and the Treasury Department's memorandum be reprinted in the RECORD.

The letter and memorandum follow:

THE SECRETARY OF THE TREASURY,
Washington, March 11, 1963.

HON. JOE L. EVINS,
Chairman, House Select Committee on Small Business, House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: I am enclosing pursuant to your request a memorandum which summarizes the principal points in the President's tax program which affect small business. Since small business plays a part in virtually every segment of the economy, all the proposals in the President's program may have some direct or indirect effect, but I believe the memorandum covers the major provisions and provides a good starting point for those interested in the impact of the program on small business.

I understand that John E. Horne, Administrator, Small Business Administration, will shortly submit a more detailed analysis of the proposal as it affects small business to the Committee on Ways and Means. This

statement, when it is released, may also be of use to you and the committee.

Sincerely yours,

DOUGLAS DILLON.

The 4½ million small business enterprises in the United States are very important to the economy. They account for about 95 percent of all business organizations, employ about 30 million people, and are responsible for about 40 percent of total business volume.

President Kennedy's proposed tax program would benefit small business directly in a number of ways. The most important one is lower taxes. Under the program small business enterprises, whether they are corporations, partnerships or sole proprietorships, will enjoy substantial rate reduction.

Corporate income tax rates for companies with a net income of \$25,000 or less will be reduced this year from 30 to 22 percent. In 1963, corporations with taxable incomes of \$25,000 or less will get reductions of about 27 percent, compared with reductions of about 10 percent at \$50,000 and 4 percent at \$100,000.

The overall reduction in corporation tax rates will be proportionately larger for small companies. Reductions in the surtax paid by large corporations will go into effect in 1964 and 1965. But even when all three steps of the corporate tax cut are in effect, the tax reduction for small companies would be greatest. The reduction for companies with profits of \$25,000 or less would amount to about 27 percent; for those earning \$100,000 to \$1 million, it would amount to about 11 percent; and for those earning more than \$1 million annually, it would be about 10 percent. For the 467,500 corporations with incomes of \$25,000 or less, the annual tax saving would total about \$233 million.

Small business will also benefit directly from the individual income tax rate cuts, which will average considerably more than 20 percent. The reductions will be made over a 3-year period and will scale down the present range of 20 to 91 percent to a range of 14 to 65 percent. These rate cuts will help particularly the millions of individual proprietors and partners whose main, and sometimes only, source of income is from a business.

The tax program will also benefit small business indirectly in a number of ways. The reductions in individual tax rates will release a large volume of additional consumer purchasing power. More than 90 percent of the tax reduction will quickly find its way into consumer buying, boosting retail sales

and, then, in turn, wholesalers' and manufacturers' sales. The resulting improvement in the business climate and confidence should be an important factor in sustaining an expanding economy.

The corporate and individual tax cuts would result in higher after-tax profits and retained earnings. The tax program will thus help remove one of the most persistent deterrents to the growth of small business—a lack of adequate capital. Because of their inability to obtain conventional long-term financing for expansion and modernization, small businesses are forced to rely on costly short-term credit, which they must continually refinance, to supplement their limited internally generated funds. Tax reduction would increase the volume of earnings which can be plowed back into small businesses to sustain their healthy growth. Tax cuts would also attract new investment to small businesses, since the profitability of such enterprises would increase. At the same time, increased profit prospects would improve their borrowing power.

Inequities which now discriminate against small business will be removed by the tax program. For example, a small business may be competing with a wholly-owned subsidiary of a large corporation; the subsidiary is a legal entity, hence able to take advantage of the benefits of the \$25,000 surtax exemption. A company with a number of such wholly owned subsidiaries can reduce substantially its effective tax rate compared with enterprises that have equal income but are organized as a single corporate entity. Chains of multicorporate units are in effect paying small business tax rates, yet benefiting from economies inherent in large businesses. The new law would allow only one surtax exemption to multicorporate enterprises, and thus improve the competitive position of small enterprises.

OTHER TAX PROPOSALS THAT INFLUENCE SMALL BUSINESS INCLUDE

Income averaging: If a taxpayer's individual income in a given year should rise materially compared with previous years, he may find himself in a higher tax bracket. Under the administration's proposal, a taxpayer in this situation could average his current income with that of the past 4 years and if the current income amounts to more than 133 percent of the average, he would be allowed in effect to treat the excess over 133 percent as though it were earned over a 5-year period. Thus he would be taxed at a considerably reduced rate. Incomes of small unincorporated businesses, farmers, ranchers, writers, and artists vary widely

from year to year; they would benefit especially from the averaging provision.

Cost of research and development machinery and equipment to be treated as current expense deduction: Present law requires capitalization of such assets, although other business expenses for R. & D. may now be deducted as incurred. The proposed law would allow a company to treat as a current expense deduction all expenditures for machinery and equipment used directly in research and development.

Special provisions are included in the proposal to meet the needs of some small businesses with moderate R. & D. budgets that would not otherwise qualify for the current expense treatment. For larger enterprises claiming the R. & D. deduction, equipment used only part time for research and development purposes, or used in the performance of a Federal contract, would not qualify. Under the special provisions for small business, any expenditures for equipment used directly for research and development could be expensed in an amount up to 4 percent of \$500,000 of total expenditures for research and development. For purposes of the special small business provision, equipment used only part time but at least 50 percent of the time for research and development would qualify to the extent of 50 percent of its cost. Moreover, research and development equipment not used exclusively in the performance of a Federal contract would qualify. The maximum deduction under this small business provision would be limited to \$20,000 annually.

The proposed changes in the tax treatment of capital gains will also directly and indirectly aid small firms. The capital gains changes include:

Rate reduction: Under the program, 30 percent of long-term capital gains of individuals, instead of the present 50 percent, is includable in taxable income. Combined with the individual tax reductions this means that capital gains would be taxed at an effective rate of 4.2 percent, instead of the present 10 percent, in the lowest bracket and progress to a maximum of 19.5 percent, instead of the present 25 percent. In addition, the corporate rate on capital gains would be reduced from 25 to 22 percent.

These reductions should increase investment in small companies as investments which are now retained solely for tax reasons become "unlocked" and as the overall tax program increases the prospects for profitable investment in small business.

Extension of the holding period: The holding period for long-term capital gains would be increased from the present 6 months to 1 year. Small business investments typically require several years to mature. This change would limit long-term capital gains to bona fide investors, rather than short-term speculators, and would encourage investors to devote more funds to investment in small firms.

Taxation of capital gains at time of death or gift: Under the program, net gains on capital assets would be taxed at the time of transfer at death or by gift. This change would increase the mobility of capital by reducing the tax inducement to hold assets until death.

Since the principal estate asset of a small businessman is often his business, special provisions have been included to insure that estates will not be forced to liquidate a small business to pay a capital gains tax. The first \$15,000 of gain would be excluded from tax as would the gain on any property transferred to a surviving spouse, up to a maximum of one-half the gain in the estate. These exclusions are expected completely to eliminate payment of capital gains tax upon death for all but 3 percent of those who die each year. For those who would become subject to some tax, a 5-year averaging provision would reduce the effective rate of tax on

the gain and the tax could be paid in installments over a period of 10 years. Redemption of stock in the company to pay the capital gains tax would be allowed without additional tax.

Unlimited capital loss carryover: The present 5-year limitation on carryover of capital losses against capital gains and up to \$1,000 of ordinary income would be eliminated. The change would especially help the small investor who may not have the portfolio diversity that would make it feasible to match capital gains and losses in only 5 years. The extension of time would mean greater opportunities to offset losses, with a tax saving, for those who make substantial investments in small business, and thus increase the supply of risk capital for such enterprises. Moreover, the unlimited capital loss carryover should encourage risk investment generally, which would benefit small business.

Just as small business stands to gain in a special way from tax reforms which encourage economic growth, it stands to lose more heavily from inaction on the tax front, which would increase the chances of an early recession or continued slack in the economy. Small business lacks the resources available to larger companies to withstand an economic downturn. Therefore, the mortality rate among small firms in a recession would be heavy. The President's 1963 tax program will make a major contribution toward providing an environment that will foster the vigorous growth of the small business sector as part of a strong and expanding economy.

Fair Housing for All

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JEFFERY COHELAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 11, 1963

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Speaker, on this centennial year of the Emancipation Proclamation, the city of Berkeley, in the Seventh California District which I have the privilege to represent, is facing a significant test of whether "all men are created equal," of whether "they are endowed by their Creator with certain inalienable rights."

These are, of course, promises of our Declaration of Independence; they are promises which are guaranteed by the Constitution of the United States. But Berkeley, like too many cities throughout our country, is confronted with the fact that our practices do not always match our precepts, that our deeds are not always as good as our words.

On April 2, the residents of Berkeley will vote on an ordinance recommended by a distinguished and representative 18-member citizens committee, and adopted by the city council, to establish a fair housing ordinance—to establish an ordinance prohibiting discrimination in the sale, rental, or lease of housing because of race, color, religion, national origin, or ancestry.

This ordinance is sound because it is designed to correct a demonstrated inequity. As the citizens committee stated in its report:

Accumulated evidence shows that discrimination in housing within the city is widespread and general, in both rental and sale of housing.

This ordinance is sound because it stresses the moderate approach of education, conferences, conciliation, and persuasion, with only final resort to public hearings and court action.

This ordinance is sound because it does not mean that an individual must sell or rent to a minority group member because he is a member of that group. It means rather, that housing cannot be withheld only because the applicant is a member of a minority group.

Finally, this ordinance is workable on the actual experience of 10 States and 3 cities which have similar laws.

Mr. Speaker, discrimination is economically wasteful. It is dangerous to our position in the world community. It is contrary to the standards upon which this country has risen to greatness. Above all, it is morally wrong.

As President Kennedy stated it so clearly in his civil rights message last month:

Let it be clear, in our own hearts and minds, that it is not merely because of the cold war, and not merely because of the economic waste of discrimination, that we are committed to achieving true equality of opportunity. The basic reason is because it is right.

Mr. Speaker, the citizens of Berkeley have an opportunity with this fair housing ordinance to make a major attack on the dread disease of discrimination. They have an opportunity to further insure the basic civil rights promised and guaranteed by the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution. They have an opportunity to practice one of the fundamental precepts of America—the equal worth of every human being regardless of his race or color.

As an advocate of home rule, as a resident of Berkeley—one of our pioneering American cities in the field of good government—and as an American citizen, I am supporting this fair housing ordinance as an important step toward true equality of opportunity.

I urge my fellow Berkeleyans to continue their great tradition of leadership in the field of social justice and approve overwhelmingly the fair housing ordinance.

Activities of the Department of State

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HJALMAR C. NYGAARD

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 11, 1963

Mr. NYGAARD. Mr. Speaker, at another point in the RECORD today, Congressman DON L. SHORT is including in his remarks, House Joint Resolution Q-1, passed by both houses of the North Dakota State Legislature without a dissenting vote.

The resolution requests Congress to investigate and study the policymaking procedures, methods of assessing foreign developments, and personnel practices of the Department of State. In other words it calls for an investigation of the activities of the State Depart-

ment as it relates to our foreign policies as they in turn affect our internal welfare.

This opinion is shared by many people in and out of the Congress, and it is hoped, therefore, that for the good of this Nation and the good of the State Department the problems can be reviewed and aired in order that there may be a complete understanding among the State Department, the Members of Congress, and the citizens of this country.

Washington Post Article Recalls Adaptation of Kipling's "On the Road to Mandalay" by Senator Ernest Gruening, of Alaska

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JENNINGS RANDOLPH

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, March 11, 1963

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, in the Washington Post of March 8, there was an article "United States and Burma Reach Accord on Working Road to Mandalay." Apparently this project, about which there was considerable discussion several years ago, is being reactivated.

During a hearing in May 1960, on Alaska highways before the Subcommittee on Highways of the Senate Committee on Public Works, a witness from Alaska was telling of the difficulty in getting Federal cooperation in a highway program for Alaska. The consultant the Alaskans wished to employ was being sent to Asia to cooperate in the building by the International Cooperation Administration of a road from Rangoon to Mandalay, a matter of 450 miles.

At that point Senator GRUENING said:

I have been so touched by this foreign aid project for a road to Mandalay paid for by American dollars which recalls "On the Road to Mandalay" by Rudyard Kipling, which has been famed in verse and song, that I was tempted to bring it up to date, and if it would not be undue levity, I would like to read it at this point.

I asked Senator GRUENING "Have you composed a parody?" to which he replied "I have an adaptation." Senator COOPER of Kentucky said he would be glad to listen. Senator LONG of Hawaii suggested that the adaptation should be sung and not merely recited. But as an accompanist was not present the Senator from Alaska read the poem, which, I feel, deserves to be immortalized in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Possibly the poem should be brought up to date. Since the Administration for International Development has replaced the International Cooperation Administration, perhaps Senator GRUENING's second verse, written 2 years ago, should read "Where the AID'ers play" rather than "Where the ICA'ers play." In any event, American dollars are now being used to build this highway. I ask unanimous consent that the article from

the Washington Post of March 8, 1963, be inserted in the RECORD, followed by Senator GRUENING's adaptation of Kipling's verses.

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

[From the Washington Post, Mar. 8, 1963]
UNITED STATES AND BURMA REACH ACCORD ON
WORKING ROAD TO MANDALAY

The United States and Burma yesterday announced agreement on rebuilding a part of the road to Mandalay.

Engineering studies are to begin immediately on a 42-mile stretch from north of Pegu, it is hoped that construction will start with the Burma dry season which begins in December.

Funds for the road, once the cost is determined, will come from some \$28 million the United States set aside to assist the road to Mandalay as long ago as the spring of 1959.

For the past year, agreement on a go-ahead has been held up by General Ne Win's government because of differing views on which route the road should take north of Pegu and on to Pyu.

Ne Win has wanted to follow the foothills along the Sittang River valley to avoid flood dangers. The United States suspects this route would be far more costly than a route along the valley floor and bypass all the population centers along the old Road to Mandalay.

Under the agreement reached yesterday, Burma and the United States decided to confine their attention to the Rangoon-Pegu stretch and face up to their Pegu-Pyu differences at a later date. Agency for International Development officials want the Pegu-Pyu stretch to follow whichever route is found to be most economical and technically feasible.

**MANDALAY—1960 (WITH APOLOGIES TO
RUDYARD KIPLING)**

By the old Mulmein Pagoda, lookin' eastward to the sea,
There's a Burma project settin', and I doubt it works for me.
But the White House says we've got to, and the foreign echoes say
Come you back, you Yankee dollar, come you back to Mandalay.
On the road to Mandalay,
Where the ICA'ers play,
Can't you hear their 'dozers chunkin' from
Rangoon to Mandalay?
On the road to Mandalay
Just another giveaway
And the dough comes up like thunder from
the good old U.S.A.

**Detection and Inspection or
Deception and Destruction?**

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. CRAIG HOSMER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 11, 1963

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, this is what the Eisenhower test ban position was in 1958 when the Geneva test ban negotiations began, any treaty would include only a ban on the kinds of testing which would be subject to detection, identification, location, and verification.

It was recognized that underground testing which produced seismic shock

signals of less intensity than 4.75 on the Richter seismic scale could not be detected reliably, let alone identified as possible cheating, located and then verified by on-site inspection.

Therefore, only events of greater magnitude were to be prohibited by the treaty.

This was in accordance with President Eisenhower's declaration:

We can have no confidence in any treaty to which the Communists are a party unless that treaty contains within itself self-enforcing mechanisms.

Notwithstanding the above, this is what the Kennedy test ban position was on August 27, 1962, when at the Geneva Conference table—the administration proposed signing a treaty that would ban all underground tests, whether or not cheating could be detected and policed in the low-yield ranges.

This is what the AEC's Director of Military Applications, Maj. Gen. A. W. Betts, U.S. Army, told the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy on March 7, 1963, could be developed by cheat testing in the low-yield ranges below which neither individual tests nor a whole series of them could even be detected by any seismic detection system, let alone identified or located:

First. Relatively low-yield weapons of the tactical type.

Second. Higher yield tactical weapons up to a much larger yield—by extrapolation—"almost any tactical weapon one has in mind"—with such confidence that proof testing of the weapon would not be required.

Third. Much higher yield battlefield tactical weapons by extrapolation from events as small as 1 kiloton with such confidence as not to require proof testing before safely placing the new weapons in stockpile.

Fourth. At least one-half of all tactical weapons of all yields and types of interest to the military, also with such confidence as not to require proof testing before stockpiling.

Fifth. A substantial fraction of all large-yield strategic weapons of interest, by the simple expedient of testing in underground cavities which muffle explosions down to seismic effects below the 3 kiloton threshold of detectability by "decoupling" their shock from the surrounding earth.

Although not discussed by Betts at the hearings, U.S. Ambassador Arthur Dean at the Geneva talks has affirmed that development of the pure-fusion, neutron bomb can be carried out below the threshold of detectability. The military significance of this new weapon has been described as "equal to or greater than" development of the H-bomb. Naturally, the remaining one-half of all tactical weapons of interest which could not be tested without decoupling could be tested using the technique.

What the Kennedy administration proposes to do, even in the new draft treaty presently under preparation by the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency for offer to the U.S.S.R. within a few weeks, is wholly to forgo U.S. testing and advances in all such weapons categories and simply to trust the Soviets

to keep their word not to test them and develop them clandestinely underground.

This is what President Kennedy said about such unpoliced test ban situations on March 2, 1962, just a few days more than a year ago:

A nation which is refraining from tests obviously cannot match the gains of a nation conducting tests.

The basic lesson of some 353 negotiating sessions at Geneva is this—that the Soviets will not agree to an effective ban on nuclear tests as long as a new series of offers and prolonged negotiations, or a new uninspected moratorium, or a new agreement without controls would enable them once again to prevent the West from testing while they prepare in secret.

If all testing can be halted—then the nuclear arms race would be slowed down at last. But this must be a fully effective treaty. We know enough now about broken negotiations, secret preparations and the advantages gained from a long test series never to offer again an uninspected moratorium.

This is what President Kennedy said on March 6, 1963, last Wednesday:

We would not accept a test ban which did not give us every insurance that we could detect a series of tests underground. That is the administration's position. We would not submit a treaty which did not provide that assurance to the U.S. Senate.

So, what is the administration's position today?

Notwithstanding what Mr. Kennedy says his administration's position is, notwithstanding Mr. Kennedy's denunciation of uninspected moratoriums, that is exactly what the administration's position is today. It is not proposing a fully effective treaty. It is proposing one full of obvious cheating holes.

This inconsistency between actual position and described position is great cause for concern. It should be quickly resolved.

Americans have a right to an answer to the test ban question:

Detection of Soviet cheating and inspection of Soviet soil or deception by Soviet duplicity and destruction by Soviet nuclear superiority?

ABCD Mail Service

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT A. EVERETT

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 11, 1963

Mr. EVERETT. Mr. Speaker, on February 25, 1963, Postmaster General J. Edward Day inaugurated a new major postal service innovation—ABCD, standing for accelerated business collections and delivery—in the Washington metropolitan area.

This new service will provide 4-hour delivery of local first-class mail in the downtown business area from Monday through Friday. By the end of this calendar year, 273 cities in this country will have the advantages of accelerated business collections and delivery service, a step forward in mail service comparable in importance to the start of free city delivery a century ago.

In launching the accelerated business collections and delivery service here in Washington, Postmaster General Day paid richly deserved credit to the architect of this innovation in mail service, Assistant Postmaster General Frederick C. Belen, by presenting him with the Post Office Department's first annual Benjamin Franklin Award.

As head of the vitally important Bureau of Operations of the Post Office Department for the past 2 years, Mr. Belen is publicly credited with an impressive record of accomplishments that have resulted in numerous major improvements of national significance in the Post Office Department. His imaginative and dynamic approach to problems that have long beset the Postal Establishment has brought about improved efficiency, lower cost, and, most important, better service. He has played a major role in developing a number of progressive programs, similar to accelerated business collections and delivery designed to maintain our postal service as the most modern and efficient in the world.

I am sure my colleagues will be interested in the tribute paid to Mr. Belen by Postmaster General Day, which follows:

EXCERPT FROM THE ADDRESS BY J. EDWARD DAY, POSTMASTER GENERAL

Introduction of the accelerated business collections and delivery program here in the Washington area provides an ideal occasion for special recognition of the architect of this very successful program of 4-hour business mail service.

It is my genuine pleasure to honor Assistant Postmaster General Frederick C. Belen as the first Post Office Department official to receive the Department's esteemed Benjamin Franklin Award.

The Benjamin Franklin Award is a new top honor award of the Department reserved for officials in noncareer positions whose outstanding leadership and accomplishments have resulted in major improvements of national significance in the work of the postal service.

I am rather unusual among Postmasters General, because I have never been national chairman of my party or even particularly active in politics at all. In fact, when President Kennedy announced my appointment—as the first Cabinet member ever from Southern California—he emphasized that it was not because of my very incidental past political activity but because of my management experience, in State government and in business.

I was associated for a number of years with one of the largest and finest law firms in the country. After that I was a senior officer for 8 years of a giant insurance company which is the third largest private corporation in the world.

And yet I can state unequivocally that I have never been surrounded with such talent as I am right now that I am serving in the Federal Government. Every day I work with Federal executives who demonstrate superb imagination, energy, good judgment and practical idealism. With few exceptions I have found that the Federal executive sees himself in context with the great complicated world we live in, he has a lively interest in new ideas and in wider horizons—and he does not take himself too seriously.

Fred Belen has all these qualities. He has been Assistant Postmaster General heading the Department's key Bureau of Operations since the beginning of President Kennedy's administration and for the past 8

months he has additionally carried, with distinction, many of the responsibilities of the Office of Deputy Postmaster General.

Before assuming his present post in January 1961, Mr. Belen had been counsel and chief counsel of the House Post Office and Civil Service Committee for 14 years and was already widely acknowledged as one of the Nation's foremost authorities on postal administration.

In developing and spearheading major programs of service improvement and economy, Mr. Belen has brought imaginative new approaches to the solution of longstanding problems of the postal service. Accelerated business collections and deliveries is but one example.

He has shown outstanding leadership in enlisting the cooperation of the Nation's large volume business mailers, and has demonstrated that such cooperation benefit both the mailer and the Department.

He has provided expert and energetic direction to the Post Office programs of cost reduction and management improvement, giving concrete expression to the President's goals of economy and manpower utilization. He has been a major contributor at the executive level to the Department's accomplishments in holding to a minimum manpower increases in the postal service, in the reduction of Christmas temporary employees from 295,000 in 1960 to approximately one-half that number in 1962, in the return of \$37 million of our Department appropriation to the Treasury in fiscal 1962, and in the Department's capacity to absorb this year \$40 million of the recent postal employee pay increase.

Mr. Belen first inaugurated the accelerated business collection and delivery program on a pilot basis last August 14 in his home city of Lansing, Mich.

In designating Frederick C. Belen as the first official to be honored with the Benjamin Franklin Award, I am proud to recognize Mr. Belen's exceptional contributions to the operation of the postal service. I now present to him this beautiful plaque of unusual three-dimensional design featuring an inset bust of the first Postmaster General, Benjamin Franklin, and a genuine specimen of the very first postage stamp issued by the U.S. Government—in 1847.

The stamp carries Benjamin Franklin's portrait—and it is interesting to note that it is a 5-cent stamp.

Classroom Teachers Medals Awarded

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES A. BURKE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 11, 1963

Mr. BURKE. Mr. Speaker, Freedoms Foundation at Valley Forge, Pa., has singularly honored Hyde Park High School, Boston, Mass., in awarding classroom teachers medals to two of the school's staff. Miss Marie E. A'Hearn was presented with the medal for her work during the school year 1961-62, and Dr. William J. Reid, head of the history department, received his award for 1960-61.

Miss A'Hearn teaches the principles of democracy course at Hyde Park High School. She conducts her classes on the theory that participation is the key to both knowledge and citizenship. Her classes learn about democracy in prac-

tice as well as in theory. When issues of a national scope are considered, the class invites its Congressman, Hon. JAMES A. BURKE, to speak to them. On State issues the representatives to the general court are asked to come and talk. On local issues, a member of the city council discusses city matters with them.

These sessions are not the usual high school assembly talks. These are working sessions. The class invites the speaker and suggests the topics to be discussed. The guest presents his talk and then is subjected to a barrage of questions. The result is some increase in knowledge, some enlightenment on the issues and, most important, increased respect by the students for our public office holders.

Arrangements for these visits are made by the students. They choose the moderator, secretary, photographer, class hostess, and all who have anything to do with the program. The students develop questions and topics and decide who should be invited.

No student passes a principles of democracy course unless he has actually worked in a political campaign. Some students who are most reluctant to participate in practical politics become some candidate's most enthusiastic workers. Concerned about the failure of more women to participate in politics, the class contacted various persons in public life, including all the ladies in the U.S. House of Representatives and the Senate, to find out why this was so. The class secretaries summarized and mimeographed the results. The pupils then discussed the issue on a Boston radio program. Under the strong guidance of Miss A'Hearn, Hyde Park students are learning that democratic government depends on effective participation.

Dr. Reid's contribution lies in a somewhat different area. The Boston public schools began teaching about the menace of communism, as well as fascism and nazism, in 1939. In 1941, the Boston schools published one of the first documents about the isms used in any school system. After the war the program was expanded.

Concerned about the fact that too many youngsters leave high school before graduation and may become easy prey to the glib teachings of others, the Boston schools, in 1954, began development of a program to increase patriotism and knowledge of our democratic republican government in grade nine. This program was instituted on an experimental basis. A committee under Dr. Reid's leadership, developed material that would help pupils to understand our government on the local, State, and national levels. It also produced a curriculum guide for the ninth grade, that would make our American boys and girls aware of the menace of communism. As the preliminary projects proved successful, the program was extended to include every ninth grade student in the Boston school system. In his position as coordinator of civic education for the Boston public schools, Dr. Reid is responsible for the effectiveness and growth of the program.

At special assemblies of the student body and the faculty, Mr. Charles J. Keelon, headmaster of Hyde Park High School, congratulated the recipients on the honor they had brought to the school by their contributions to furthering our American ideals. Assistant Superintendent of Schools Frank J. Herlihy, on behalf of the Freedoms Foundation, presented the Classroom Teachers Medal to Dr. Reid on Flag Day, 1961, and Deputy Superintendent William H. Ohrenberger awarded Miss A'Hearn her medal on October 10, 1962.

such witness was Roswell Magill who, 25 years ago, was Under Secretary of the Treasury in Franklin Roosevelt's Cabinet. Mr. Magill's statement substantiated my own challenge to the President's tax program. He said: "President Kennedy's tax program is contradictory to its announced objectives in four basic ways. First, the investment capital incentive is penalized because consumer purchasing power is overly stressed; second, the structural reforms defeat rate cuts; third, the timing is bad, there being no immediate stimulus as intended; fourth, the budget is further imbalanced through lack of expenditure control."

CONSTRUCTIVE RECOMMENDATIONS

Mr. Magill listed a constructive program, sensible as I see it. (1) Lower individual income tax to 50 percent for highest bracket and 16 percent in the lowest bracket; (2) Let Korean taxes expire—corporate tax drop from 52 percent to 47 percent; (3) Study structural reforms separately; (4) Lower Federal spending, balance the budget.

G. Keith Funston, president of the New York Stock Exchange, under my cross examination developed these constructive recommendations: (1) Eliminate double taxation; (2) Eliminate capital gains tax, and redefine capital gains; (3) Relate Federal spending to income—balance the budget. These recommendations are much more likely to prevent recession, of which the President warns, than the President's recommendations.

ECONOMICS PROFESSOR HITS PROGRAM

William H. Peterson, associate professor of economics, Graduate School of Business Administration of New York University, was more blunt: He said: "In this statement I seek to make but three points: First, to demonstrate the nonscientific and anti-economic growth deficiencies of rate progression in general. Second, to show how the President's tax proposals reflect these deficiencies and are hence self-defeating of their stated goal of economic growth. And thirdly, to give support to maximum correction at this time of the deficiencies of graduation." Professor Peterson pointed out again that the President's program is self-defeating. The steepness in individual income tax rate progression, especially when linked to the proposed 5 percent rule on itemized deductions affords virtually no tax relief to the middle and little to the upper brackets. The professor said he regards the middle and upper brackets as prime sources of America's capital formation and hence of economic growth. An amazing figure in this testimony showed that tax rate progression beyond 50 percent of taxable income yields the Treasury only about \$1 billion (out of a \$98 billion budget) or about enough to run the Government for 4 days. So the excessive rate is not designed to raise revenue, but to penalize and, in effect, stifles initiative or, in Professor Peterson's words, "Incentive is the thing. It accounts for enterprise and ingenuity. It is the secret of American prosperity."

REDISTRIBUTION OF INCOME HURTS OUR SYSTEM

The theory of the social planners around President Kennedy upon whose judgement his tax proposals are based, would have us believe our free economy can best be developed by a redistribution of income (the theory of equalization). But redistribution assumes a standard of distributive justice different from the standards of our market economy. "It assumes," Peterson said, "that the market knows least and Government knows best." He then reminds us, "This democratic market system, this incentive system, is precisely the means by which we have become the richest and freest people in all the world."

The only way we can insure the health of the economy is to insure the rate of capital

Washington Report

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 11, 1963

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following newsletter of March 9, 1963.

WASHINGTON REPORT

(By Congressman Bruce Alger)

NEW FRONTIER PROGRAMS IGNORE TECHNOLOGY

President Kennedy completely ignores technology in the social and welfare programs he is trying to impose on the country and therefore fails to understand they cannot work. In a major speech on the floor of the House this week I pointed out that in the programs he has submitted to Congress, the President seems to be acting on impulse rather than on any sound technical basis. I focused attention on the welfare part of the New Frontier program, which, in spite of suggestions to the contrary, is being expanded at a faster rate than most other segments of the budget, including national defense. The justification for this expansion is political rather than logical or reasonable. The New Frontier is trying to capitalize on a formula developed by the New Deal—a formula that reads (1) Many persons are in need, (2) The Nation has resources with which to meet the need, (3) The Federal Government should use the resources to meet the need.

It is my contention that points 1 and 2 do not justify the conclusion implied by point 3. Technologically, no standards or criteria can be developed by which to administer Federal social welfare programs to produce the results which the administration promises when it proposes Federal financial involvement. The only reasonable way to measure the effectiveness of public services is to measure them only in terms of results achieved. In my speech I outlined where desired or promised results have fallen far short in such programs as urban renewal, area redevelopment, advancing civilian technology, and in studies in connection with Federal aid to education. In order to get some idea of the complexity of trying to impose Federal participation in the social and welfare fields, try to write a formula for Federal aid which will work and which will come within the framework of the Constitution.

EXPERT WITNESSES QUESTION PRESIDENT'S TAX PROPOSALS

Some of the best tax minds in the Nation appeared before the Ways and Means Committee this week. The development of their testimony clearly indicates the fallacies of President Kennedy's tax proposals. The first

formation—that is, in the rate of investment. This is the theory of the Alger-Baker-Herlong bill. A number of witnesses, including Professor Peterson, believe this bill is the only fiscally feasible and responsible alternative to our present income tax structure. It stresses investment, whereas the Administration stresses current consumption. In sharp contrast to the Administration's program, it would reform the present steep schedule of rate graduation while, over a longer period of time, provide substantially as much tax relief as the Administration at the lower income tax levels. Capital formation is clearly the road to growth. There is no other way. Without capital, there will be no goods for consumers to purchase.

OVERCAPACITY RESULT OF INEFFICIENCY

The administration planners stress the overcapacity of American industry. Professor Peterson points out the administration's stress on overcapacity misses the point. The real point is not simply overcapacity, but the nature and causes of excess capacity. A careful study of all the factors shows that basically, overcapacity is a matter of inefficiency. The principal criticism of the President's proposals, brought out by many witnesses in their direct testimony and in my discussion with them under cross-examination, is the lack of confidence and knowledge of our system displayed by the President, his continued efforts to downgrade the United States. Unfortunately, the results are the President's statements of problems and legislative solutions that downgrade the system and successes of the United States.

A fine representation of Dallas and Texas was made to the site subcommittee of the Republican National Committee in an effort to get the 1964 Republican Convention in our city. The Chamber of Commerce would have been proud of the quality of the presentation. John Leedom, Peter O'Donnell, Mrs. Ike Kampmann, Harry Bass, Al Fay, Senator Tower, and Ed Foreman created a remarkable impression on the committee. All Dallas is proud of this effort to bring a meeting to our community which will result in \$5 to \$6 million in revenue. This presentation was in the true spirit of Dallas that our people can accomplish any job, no matter how tough or how big. It is this spirit that built our city.

Meaningful Suggestions for Action Against Cuba Short of War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GLENN CUNNINGHAM

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 11, 1963

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I reject the idea advanced by high administration officials that the only choice is to do nothing in regard to Cuba or to go to war. I believe there are a number of effective and positive alternatives. I believe further that the vast majority of Americans support these alternatives, because they know that regardless of whether there are "defensive" or "offensive" jet fighters and missiles in Cuba, it is a base for exporting of communism into the other American countries.

We cannot simply let the situation drift; all reports from our own Government and other American governments

clearly show that Cuba is being used as a vast training ground for Communist agents. We need only to read the report by the Organization of American States, entitled "Subversion in the Western Hemisphere" to learn what is taking place. This report says hundreds of Latin American youths have attended Cuban training centers where they have received instructions not only in Marxist-Leninist theory, "but also in propaganda techniques, the use of arms and explosives, sabotage, guerrilla warfare, and so on."

There is danger from Cuba right now to the Governments and peoples of Venezuela, Peru, Brazil, Guatemala, and other nations. The leaders of the other American countries are far ahead of our own in seeking action against Castro. We simply cannot afford to wait until Castro's henchmen and their Kremlin-oriented brothers in arms have established themselves in Central or South America before we act.

I suggest that the following steps be given serious consideration. They are not especially original with me or with my party; they come from the Nation's responsible press, from the people, and from our friends in South and Central America who are looking and waiting for action.

Many of the following suggestions are related to the serious economic situation in Cuba and would frankly be intended to increase unrest by the people there due to the continued shortages of basic goods.

First. Close the Panama Canal to any ship trading with Cuba.

Second. Close all U.S. ports to any ship trading with Cuba.

Third. Use the pressure of cutting off foreign aid to countries whose ships trade with Cuba.

Fourth. Encourage concerted action through the Organization of American States to cut off all trade with Cuba in this hemisphere.

Fifth. Encourage OAS nations to act against Communist propaganda as recommended in the OAS report.

Sixth. Demand onsite inspection of missile sites and storage areas, the sixth of President Kennedy's requirements in his October 22, 1962, speech.

Seventh. Demand fair compensation for American property seized by Castro.

Eighth. Seize all Cuban assets in this country.

Ninth. Notify Castro that we will not permit any expansion of his form of dictatorship in this hemisphere.

Tenth. Furnish arms and training to Cubans in this country and other countries so they can aid other hemisphere governments in rejecting armed force used by Castro-trained guerrillas.

Eleventh. Recognize a Cuban Government-in-exile.

Twelfth. Demand that Russian troops leave Cuba.

Thirteenth. Reinstate the blockade or quarantine of Cuba.

The last two points are strongly supported by the American people, according to pollster Samuel Lubell, writing in the *Washington Star* earlier this month. Points seven, eight, and nine

were suggested by the President himself during the 1960 campaign.

Other suggestions could no doubt be added to this list, for there are many ways available to put pressure on a nation when it is desired to do so. But, to repeat, it is time to do something.

President Kennedy has pledged to act when the Communist revolution is exported from Cuba to the rest of the hemisphere. Is not the time for action now?

Let's Keep the Record Straight—A Selected Chronology on Castro and Cuba, January 2 to January 14, 1963—Part 12

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DON L. SHORT

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 11, 1963

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, my last remarks on "Cuba in 1933" appeared in the February 21 RECORD and served as a sequel to the previous chronologies parts 1 through 10. The "Cuba in 1933" speech was to serve as part 11, preceding today's part 12. Part 11 was a kind of flashback in history and I hope a pointed reminder that our problem with the Communists in Cuba did not originate—as many seemed to feel—with the overthrow by Fidel Castro of the Batista regime in Cuba. Instead, it could be traced back to the time when the Communists failed in their efforts to subvert Germany and cast around for a more profitable base of operations from which to spread their deadly doctrine of dialectical materialism, or as some term it materialism opposed to idealism or state opposed to God. Never has there been a more materialistic doctrine preached than that of communism and never a more idealistic doctrine preached—if admittedly not always practiced to the letter by individual believers—than the Sermon on the Mount. In comparing that inspired writing with the hate motif of the Communist materialism, it is clear that something far deeper than a mere political philosophy or type of ideology is involved in the struggle between Communist and free nations of the world for the minds of men.

The beginning of the year 1963 brought disheartening reports to the American people. Instead of victory, we found containment. Instead of a relaxing of tension we found increased tension, following publication of reports that on the island of Cuba there remained, in addition to the thousands of Soviet troops described in part 10, 500 Russian antiaircraft missiles, 144 missile launchers, 24 bases at different spots on the island, 60 surface-to-surface short-range missiles, over 100 Mig jet fighters, some 3,000 antiaircraft guns, mortars, field artillery pieces, and assault guns, 350 medium and heavy tanks, 34 sub-chasers, and missile and motor torpedo boats, as well as 70 helicopters.

We were threatened once again by the Soviet Union with war if we made any attempts to stage provocations around Cuba. Castro displayed ground-to-air missiles during his fourth anniversary celebration in Cuba. Our President was called a vulgar pirate chief by the acknowledged pirate of all pirates. The ransom paid by American citizens and businessmen for the Bay of Pigs invasion prisoners was thrown back into our faces—not literally, but verbally—by Castro. And again the Communists—this time the Chinese Communists—proved themselves past masters at twisting facts by virtuously announcing that they strongly opposed—the sacrifice of another country's sovereignty as a means of reaching a compromise with imperialism. They accused the Soviets of 100-percent appeasement, a Munich pure and simple in withdrawing missiles from Cuba.

By this time the American people were not at all sure that our triumph was anything of the sort. Instead it began to appear what Khrushchev himself termed it, a triumph of the Soviets, in that while some 40 missiles may have been removed, the island of Cuba had been successfully turned into a bristling arsenal, and any Cubans remaining who might wish to throw off the yoke of Castro's communism would find themselves in the same predicament as the Hungarians who tried to throw off communism in Hungary.

Although on January 6 both the United States and the Soviet Union requested the United Nations to close the book on the Cuban controversy. It did not seem possible to do this. Some of the Cuban exiles even accused President Kennedy of being politically motivated in his Orange Bowl appearance on December 29 of last year. And the Cuban Government set aside 10 percent—213.7 million pesos—of its record 2 billion peso budget for 1963 for national defense and public order. While Cuba was planning to defend the Castro regime against its own unhappy citizens, our American citizens were once again digging down into their jeans to raise from \$10,000 to \$15,000 to pay the ransom still being demanded by Castro for uninterrupted return of Cuban invasion prisoners. And an unknown donor was rumored to have been urged successfully by Attorney General Kennedy to donate \$1 million for this cause.

We then found ourselves in the peculiar position of being maneuvered at the same time into helping build a \$30 million agricultural experiment station in Cuba, through the United Nations voluntary Special Fund, 40 percent which was provided by the United States. This project, approved in 1961, would allocate something over \$1.1 million to the Food and Agricultural Organization of the United Nations for a 5-year project in Cuba. Cuba was to put up \$1.8 million, and the uneasy suspicion began to spread that not only were we to provide 40 percent of the aforesaid fund, but our ransom money would provide the other \$1.8 million as well. The collective blood pressure of thousands of Americans began to rise, along with the num-

ber of protesting letters to congressional offices about the Cuban agricultural deal.

As in most Soviet-bloc countries, it became apparent that for some reason communism and agricultural abundance had nothing in common. Adlai Stevenson admitted that although the United States opposed this agricultural aid to Cuba, there was apparently nothing we could do about it and of the \$1.2 million, the U.S. taxpayers probably would find themselves paying \$480,000. However, the United Nations later postponed, although temporarily—the controversial agricultural survey project for Cuba, much to the relief of the congressional Members who had been hearing some pretty strenuous objection from the American people.

Senator KEATING, known now as the man who was right last fall about Cuba, contended that Castro was now 10 times better equipped militarily than he was last spring and stated that 20,000 troops were in Cuba, along with 144 missile launchers, 24 bases, and some 500 anti-aircraft missiles.

President Kennedy stated that while a danger continued, a deadly threat has been removed from Cuba. He praised the United Nations for its value in serving the cause of peace for its use as a forum in the Cuban crisis and for its task of unification in the Congo—none of which seemed to convince a goodly segment of the American people.

A chronology follows:

A SELECTED CHRONOLOGY ON CUBA¹
(Jan. 2, 1963 to Jan. 31, 1963)

January 2, 1963:

An article by David Kraslow in the Miami Herald stated that "Cuba has 500 Russian antiaircraft missiles and 144 missile launchers at 24 bases ringing the island.

"The list is current and is based on what the U.S. Government believes to be solid intelligence.

"Other items include over 60 surface-to-surface short-range missiles; over 100 MiG jet fighters; some 3,000 antiaircraft guns, mortars, field artillery pieces, and assault guns; 350 medium and heavy tanks; 34 sub-chasers and missile and motor torpedo boats, and 70 helicopters."

January 2, 1963:

The Soviet Union's leading theorist, Mikhail Suslov, pledged today that his country would "actively resist any attempts to stage provocations around Cuba," Tass news agency reported.

Communist Party Secretary Suslov told a Moscow audience that "the forces of peace and socialism must vigilantly watch over the scrupulous observance by the United States of its commitment not to attack Cuba and to restrain its allies from doing so."

January 2, 1963:

The ground-to-air missile, not generally known to have been in Castro's possession, came into view at the tail end of an hour-long display of military hardware, part of the celebration of the bearded Prime Minister's fourth anniversary of power.

In a 90-minute anniversary speech, Castro referred briefly to the missiles, saying that "today, the first ground-to-air rocket artillery crews in training have paraded past here."

He said the rockets would be used to keep Cuban airspace free of intruders.

¹ Unless otherwise stated excerpted from the Washington Post and the Washington Star; reproduced with the permission of the Washington Post and Washington Star.

Castro assailed President Kennedy as a "vulgar pirate chief," and claimed he forced Washington to pay indemnity for the release of Bay of Pigs invasion prisoners who were liberated for \$53 million worth of food and drugs sorely needed by the Cuban regime.

"They call it ransom, but the fact is that they had to accept the payment of indemnifications. For the first time in its history, imperialism paid an indemnification of war."

Castro repeated his demand that the United States get out of its Guantanamo Bay Naval Base at the eastern tip of Cuba, but he did not intimate that any other than legal means would be employed to oust the United States.

The Prime Minister also repeated that Cuba would never accept inspection on its soil to verify the removal of land-based offensive Soviet missiles, as the United States has demanded. He made no criticism of Moscow for the withdrawal of the missiles and jet bombers, but stressed Cuba's sovereignty.

January 2, 1963:

An editorial in the Peking People's Daily stated that "Those who accuse China of opposing peaceful coexistence also attack the Chinese people for supporting the just stand of the Cuban people in their struggle against U.S. imperialism. When the heroic Cuban people and their revolutionary leader Premier Fidel Castro resolutely rejected international inspection as an infringement on Cuba's sovereignty and advanced their five just demands, the Chinese people held gigantic mass demonstrations and parades throughout the country in accordance with their consistent stand for proletarian internationalism, and firmly support the Cuban people's struggle in defense of their independence, sovereignty, and dignity."

"How can one possibly interpret the resolute support which the Chinese people gave to the Cuban people in their struggle against international inspection and in defense of their sovereignty as meaning that China was opposed to peaceful coexistence or wanted to plunge others into a thermonuclear war? On more than one occasion we have made it clear that we neither called for the establishment of missile bases in Cuba nor obstructed the withdrawal of the so-called offensive weapons from Cuba. We have never considered that it was a Marxist-Leninist attitude to brandish nuclear weapons as a way of settling international disputes. Nor have we ever considered that the avoidance of a thermonuclear war in the Caribbean crisis was a 'Munich.' What we did strongly oppose, still strongly oppose, and will strongly oppose in the future is the sacrifice of another country's sovereignty as a means of reaching a compromise with imperialism. A compromise of this sort can only be regarded as 100 percent appeasement, a 'Munich' pure and simple. A compromise of this sort has nothing in common with the policy of peaceful coexistence of the socialist countries."

January 4, 1963:

A split within the Cuban invasion brigade broke into the open today with charges by one of its members that the liberated prisoners were being used as political fodder.

The charges revealed for the first time that 100 prisoners boycotted President Kennedy's Orange Bowl appearance on December 29.

Enrique Llaca, Jr., one of the invaders recently released from Castro's prisons, singled out Manuel Artme, civilian commander of Brigade 2506, and Joe Miro Cardona, head of the exile Cuban Revolutionary Council, for criticism.

"They are using the brigade for their personal benefit," declared Llaca, 27-year-old former Cuban attorney. Both Artme and Miro Cardona denied it.

Llaca attacked President Kennedy's Orange Bowl visit to meet the brigade members as politically motivated.

January 6, 1963: Time magazine today listed the U.S. companies that contributed to the \$53 million ransom paid to Premier Fidel Castro for the 1,113 Cuban invasion prisoners.

The list, including pledges, accounts for most of the \$53 million ransom although in some cases only the value of goods already shipped rather than the company's full commitment, is known.

The United States and the Soviet Union asked the United Nations today to close the book on the Cuban controversy.

The two powers made their request in a terse, joint letter sent to U.N. Secretary General U Thant and signed by U.S. Ambassador Adlai E. Stevenson and Vassily V. Kuznetsov, the Soviet First Deputy Foreign Minister.

Today's message made no effort to conceal the deadlock in American-Soviet negotiations. But it hailed the fact that war had been avoided and expressed hope other tensions might be eased.

Stevenson and Kuznetsov suggested that the Cuban item be wiped off the Security Council agenda "in view of the degree of understanding reached" and "the extent of progress in the implementation of this understanding."

The statement ended on a note of hope:

"The Governments of the United States and of the Soviet Union express the hope that the actions taken to avert the threat of war in connection with this crisis will lead toward the adjustment of other differences between them and the general easing of tensions that could cause a further threat of war."

Carlos M. Lechuga, Cuban Ambassador to the U.N., delivered Cuba's objections in another letter 2 hours earlier.

The Cuban objections were summarized in one paragraph:

"As you know, Mr. Secretary General, the negotiations carried on with your generous intervention have not led to an effective agreement capable of guaranteeing, in a permanent way, the peace of the Caribbean and in liquidating the existing tensions."

Lechuga repeated the Cuban attacks on American "aggressive and interventionist policy."

January 7, 1963: The Cuban Government today announced a record 2 billion peso budget for 1963. About 10 percent of it—213.7 million pesos—was earmarked for "national defense and public order."

American business made a substantial contribution to Fidel Castro's last minute demand for \$2.9 million in cash to assure uninterrupted return of the Cuban invasion prisoners.

A check of 25 of the Nation's largest companies indicated today that individual contributions to the special cash fund raised by Gen. Lucius D. Clay ranged from \$10,000 to \$150,000 and more.

Castro claimed the \$2.9 million was owed him for the release of 60 prisoners in April. Of the total, \$1 million was pledged by an unknown donor solicited by Attorney General Robert F. Kennedy.

The cash fund was separate from the \$53 million in drugs and food pledged to Castro.

The Kennedy administration set up special machinery yesterday to handle future policy toward Cuba.

Sterling J. Cottrell, a veteran Foreign Service officer who formerly headed a task force on the Vietnam question, was named coordinator of Government activities dealing with Cuba. He was given the title of Senior Deputy Assistant Secretary of State for Inter-American Affairs.

As part of its economic squeeze on Cuban Premier Fidel Castro, the United States will demand that the United Nations cancel a

project to help build a \$3 million agricultural experimental station in Cuba.

U.S. sources said today that Ambassador Adlai E. Stevenson has been instructed to fight right down the line to halt previously approved plans under which the U.N. Special Fund would grant more than \$1 million for the project. The United States, which contributes 40 percent of the money spent by the Special Fund, voted against the grant on the grounds that the project could not be carried out because of the large number of Cuban agricultural technicians fleeing the country. U.S. sources said this situation was even more complicated now because of Soviet technicians in Cuba.

Under the plan approved in 1961, the Special Fund would allocate something over \$1.1 million to the Food and Agricultural Organization (FAO) to finance the U.N. part of the project over a 5-year period. Cuba would put up \$1.8 million.

The United States argues that Castro is neglecting the economic and social development of the country to concentrate on political problems and has, therefore, forfeited any right to U.N. aid.

January 8, 1963: Cuba was pictured as a land plagued by growing food shortages "where tightening of the vest is now a normal way of life."

This view of the Cuban food situation was contained in a U.S. Foreign Agriculture Service report that said the Premier Fidel Castro regime has just about wrecked the island's agriculture in 4 years.

The report described the food situation there as the poorest in years and added that it may get worse this year. Farm production, it reported, has fallen off 20 percent since Castro took over.

January 8, 1963:

United Nations Ambassador Adlai Stevenson said today the United States has opposed from the beginning a plan to send Cuba \$1.2 million in U.N. funds for an agricultural project.

But if the U.N. governing board approves the plan there isn't much that can be done about it, Stevenson said.

Of the \$1.2 million, \$480,000 probably would come from U.S. taxpayers.

January 9, 1963: President Kennedy talked for an hour yesterday with Vasily Vasilevich Kuznetsov, First Deputy Foreign Minister of the Soviet Union. They discussed the settlement of the Cuba crisis and took a look at disarmament and Berlin as problems that remain to be solved. The conversations, it was said, were held in a very cordial atmosphere.

January 10, 1963:

After a 2-day delay, 100 American citizens will leave for the United States Sunday on the return flight of an airliner carrying ransom supplies to Havana, a Swiss diplomat reported today.

The diplomat had no word on whether a score of Americans held in Cuban jails would follow. Thousands of Cuban relatives of the freed Bay of Pigs invasion prisoners also are anxious to leave.

Between 500 and 700 Soviet troops left Cuba during the last day or so aboard the Russian passenger ship *Baltika*, it was reported here yesterday.

Several thousand other Soviet forces are reported to have left Cuba since the end of the October missile crisis. But U.S. officials believe some 16,000 to 17,000 remain in Cuba. About 6,000 of these are known to be organized in combat units.

The reports were made as official sources said the United States is expected soon to ask the Organization of American States to consider almost total isolation of Cuba.

January 11, 1963:

Cuba trade perils aid, U.S. warns.

The United States has served notice on countries whose ships go to Cuba that they risk losing American aid.

State Department press officer Joseph W. Reap disclosed yesterday that the warnings have been conveyed in line with the new foreign aid law. Congress last October attached a proviso that aid shall be cut off to countries whose ships carry goods to Cuba.

January 11, 1963:

Secretary of State Dean Rusk advised the Senate Foreign Relations Committee that even the possibility of a U.S. no-invasion pledge on Cuba no longer exists.

The administration has made clear repeatedly that President Kennedy's offer of such a pledge was conditioned on on-site inspection to verify removal of Soviet missiles and bombers from the Communist-ruled island. It has been apparent for weeks that there would be no such inspection even though negotiations to that end were not concluded until this week.

Rusk appeared before the committee yesterday, and after the closed session Chairman J. WILLIAM FULBRIGHT, Democrat, of Arkansas, told reporters the Secretary covered the point like this:

"Any commitment was contingent on the exchange of letters (between Mr. Kennedy and Soviet Premier Nikita S. Khrushchev) which required on-site inspection as well as the removal of missiles and other offensive weapons."

"In view of the failure to get the inspection, the commitment no longer exists."

FULBRIGHT said Rusk assured the committee that U.S. intelligence is convinced all offensive weapons of nuclear capability have been removed from Cuba.

Cuba and East Germany will establish diplomatic relations at the ambassadorial level, the Government press reported today.

The Government newspaper *El Mundo* said the decision to elevate the present East German-Cuban trade mission to embassies "was due to the close and friendly present relations between our two nations and will contribute to formalize and consolidate even more the bonds of friendship between our peoples."

A newspaper editor charged today that the Kennedy administration, by "manipulating" news as a cold war weapon, is imperiling the American people's right to full and accurate information on how public affairs are being handled.

The charge was made by John H. Colburn, managing editor of the *Richmond Times Dispatch*, in a speech before the Arizona Newspapers Association.

The editor said the American press must shoulder much of the blame for controlled news from Government because it has too often "been complacent about its responsibility to zealously seek out the truth."

"The press today could do much more to inform the public about the open and insidious efforts to keep the truth from the public," he said.

"As the result of the furor over news manipulation during the Cuban crisis last October, thoughtful people are more concerned about truth in news. Their right to truthful news is in jeopardy because the news manipulators have grown more confident as the result of their recent successes."

The Communist daily *Hoy* says Cuba's 1963 sugar harvest is off to a poor start. The mills are not getting enough cane to grind, a *Hoy* reporter complained.

The report, covering the central Province of Camaguey, said crop work at the *Fatia o Muerte* (fatherland or death) mill Thursday, the start of the season, was below last year's level. It said the mill would have to close Monday or Tuesday unless it got more cane.

January 12, 1963: 89 Cuban-Americans, including elderly people and children clutching toys, arrived here today on a freedom flight from Havana. (*Miami Herald*).

January 13, 1963: A controversial agricultural survey proposed for Cuba has been

temporarily postponed by the United Nations Special Fund. * * *

The decision not to act now on the Cuban project avoided a fight threatened by the United States, which puts up 40 percent of the Special Fund's resources.

Senator KENNETH B. KEATING, Republican, of New York, contended yesterday that Fidel Castro is "10 times better equipped" militarily now than he was last spring.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

TUESDAY, MARCH 12, 1963

The House met at 12 o'clock noon. The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Ephesians 3:17: That Christ may dwell in your hearts by faith and that ye may be rooted and grounded in love.

Almighty God, as we grope our way through these ongoing days, which often seem so dark and dismal, may we cultivate a closer communion with Thee and gain a clearer conception of Thy gracious promises and generous purposes.

Grant that, as finite beings, we may be more sensitive and responsive to the appeals and pressures of Thy infinite grace and truth, which alone can transfigure us and transform us from what we are to what we ought to be.

May we yearn to have Thy spirit dwell in our spirit and may the light and love, the joy and peace of our blessed Lord become kindled and personalized in our human souls.

Hear us in His name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday, Monday, March 11, 1963, was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. McGowen, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed a bill of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 20. An act to promote the coordination and development of effective Federal and State programs relating to outdoor recreation, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the President of the Senate, pursuant to section 1, Public Law 87-883, had appointed Mr. LAUSCHE, Mr. YOUNG of Ohio, Mr. KEATING, and Mr. SCOTT to be members of the Battle of Lake Erie Sesquicentennial Celebration Commission.

The message also announced that the President of the Senate, pursuant to section 1, Public Law 86-420, appointed Mr. McINTYRE and Mr. MILLER to be members of the U.S. group of the Mexico-United States Interparliamentary Group, vice Mr. SMATHERS and Mr. ALLOTT, resigned.

THE UNIFORM ALLOWANCE ACT OF 1954

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

He said Castro "has 144 missile launchers, 24 bases, and 500 antiaircraft missiles, some of them the most modern in existence, and 20,000 troops."

KEATING made the comments on a program taped for New York television stations.

January 14, 1963: In his state of the Union message to Congress, President Kennedy said that while danger continues, a deadly threat has been removed from Cuba.

While we shall never weary in the defense of freedom, neither shall we ever abandon the pursuit of peace.

In this quest, the United Nations requires our full and continued support. Its value in serving the cause of peace has been shown anew in its role in the West New Guinea settlement, in its use as a forum for the Cuban crisis, and in its task of unification in the Congo.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, the Uniform Allowance Act of 1954 provided for the first time that the Government pay the cost of uniforms required by law or administrative order to be worn by employees in the performance of their official duties. That act limited the Government's share of the cost of such uniforms to \$100 annually.

Even at that time this amount did not begin to meet the actual cost of the prescribed uniforms in many instances. Since that time the cost of uniforms has gone up along with other commodities. Thus, today, many of our employees are forced to use an unjust portion of their hard-earned wages for the purchase of uniforms prescribed by law or administrative order, and which cannot be worn or used except in the performance of their official duties. This is patently unfair.

The bill I have introduced is designed to alleviate this inequity by raising the amount the Government can pay to \$150 annually, except where overcoats or other special garments are required for protection against the weather, in which cases an additional \$50 annually may be allowed.

BRAZIL

Mr. HARSHA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. HARSHA. Mr. Speaker, I am again calling on the U.S. Government to deny any financial aid to Brazil which would in any way be used to develop trade with Russia. Brazil has a delegation here headed by Finance Minister Dantas which seeks an \$84 million loan from the United States to help develop a trade program between Brazil and Russia. Minister Dantas admitted in Washington yesterday that one of the purposes of the loan is to develop Brazil-Soviet trade. Although I have not been able to obtain such an admission from our State Department, he also is asking postponement of a \$450 million loan repayment. Brazil is scheduled to make this year to the United States.

Today we are voting on a record military construction bill calling for an expenditure of \$15.8 billion designed to help the United States contain communism and protect the security of this Nation, and for the State Department to authorize loans to Brazil for purposes

of developing Communist trade is patently ridiculous. We appear to be spending money in both directions. The enhancement of Red trade will only serve to strengthen the Communist economic and military posture. It will undermine our own economic and defensive efforts. Such a loan will enable Russia to take over our markets with Brazil. This will aggravate the balance-of-payments problem and our own unemployment dilemma. A loan for any such purpose is detrimental to the best interests of this Nation and cannot be justified under any circumstances. The American taxpayer does not want his money used to aid a government dedicated to the destruction of our American way of life.

FOREIGN EXPENDITURES BY ALL GOVERNMENTAL EMPLOYEES—LIMITATIONS AND REPORTING

Mr. KYL. 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 Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. KYL. Mr. Speaker, on Thursday, the Subcommittee on Accounts of the Committee on House Administration will consider House Joint Resolution 245, introduced by the chairman of that full committee, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BURLESON]. This is a resolution which deserves attention of every Member of this body. It deals with the matter of foreign expenditures by all Government employees—their limitations and reporting.

On yesterday the gentleman from Texas inserted in the RECORD the report on foreign expenditures by the House which is required by law and by rule. Most Members have made full, accurate reports. But even a casual study of the RECORD indicates the necessity for adoption of the Burleson resolution.

Some of the reports are not signed. One report shows that more committee staff members traveled abroad than did members of the committee. One staff member, according to the report, spent \$104 on transportation in spite of the fact that the original ticket assigned to this person was for an amount in excess of \$1,400.

Members of Congress cannot perform their proper duties without firsthand examinations of foreign programs, problems, and expenditures. Trips by staff members can be completely legitimate and beneficial. But the citizens we represent have a right to know how their money is being spent by all branches of