

A. Julia J. Norrell, 1332 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Gerald G. Wagner, G.M.I. Associates, 1332 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. William B. O'Connell, 400 First Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Brotherhood of Railroad Signalmen, 2247 West Lawrence Avenue, Chicago, Ill.

A. Joseph O. Parker, 531 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.

B. American Feed Manufacturers Association, Inc., 53 West Jackson Boulevard, Chicago, Ill.

A. Hart Perry, 10 MacDougal Alley, New York, N.Y.

B. International Telephone & Telegraph Corp. and International Telephone & Telegraph Credit Corp., 320 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y.

A. Howard A. Prentice, 1717 Pennsylvania Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. The Proprietary Association, 1717 Pennsylvania Avenue, Washington, D.C.

A. L. C. Pyle, 1410 L Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Pitney-Bowes, Inc., Stamford, Conn.

A. Robert H. Reiter, 1311 G Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Standard Kollsman Industries, Inc., 2085 North Hawthorne Avenue, Mcrose Park, Ill.

A. C. C. Rouse, Jr., 1410 L Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Pitney-Bowes, Inc., Stamford, Conn.

A. Edmond F. Rovner, 1126 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. International Union of Electrical, Radio & Machine Workers, 1126 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Daniel I. Sargent, 200 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y.

B. Houston Chemical Corp., 200 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y.

A. Steptoe & Johnson, 1100 Shoreham Building, Washington, D.C.

B. International Telephone & Telegraph Corp., 320 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y.

A. Steptoe & Johnson, 1100 Shoreham Building, Washington, D.C.

B. National Association of Motor Bus Owners, 830 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Steptoe & Johnson, 1100 Shoreham Building, Washington, D.C.

B. Royal Globe Insurance Cos., 150 William Street, New York, N.Y.

A. Stitt & Hemmendinger, 1000 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.

B. National Council of American Importers, 111 Fifth Avenue, New York, N.Y.; Japanese Chamber of Commerce of New York, Inc., 30 Church Street, New York, N.Y., and Japan Rubber Footwear Manufacturers' Association, Tokyo, Japan.

A. Strasser, Spiegelberg, Fried, Frank & Kampelman, 1700 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Metlakatla Indian Community, Post Office Box 142, Metlakatla, Alaska.

A. Supersweet Feeds, Division of International Milling Co., 1200 Investors Building, Minneapolis, Minn.

A. Richard E. Vernor, 213 Slade Run Drive, Falls Church, Va.

B. Known heirs of Levi B. Gritts.

A. T. M. Walters, 400 First Street, Washington, D.C.

B. Order of Railway Conductors & Brakeman, O.R.C. & B. Building, Cedar Rapids, Iowa.

A. F. S. Wardwell, 130 Holmes Avenue, Darien, Conn.

B. Pitney-Bowes, Inc., Stamford, Conn.

A. Dr. Frank J. Welch, 3724 Manor Road, Chevy Chase, Md.

B. The Tobacco Institute, Inc., 808 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

THURSDAY, JANUARY 10, 1963

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Colossians 3: 15: *Let the peace of God rule in your hearts.*

Almighty God, constrained by divine love, we are approaching Thy throne of grace and mercy where none has ever been repelled or sent away empty hearted.

Inspire us, during this year, with the rapture of the upward look and the joy of seeing our highest aspirations brought to fulfillment and fruition.

May we feel the thrill and throb of lofty promises and purposes as we daily confront unknown events and unforeseen experiences.

Show us how to cultivate our faculties of confidence and courage, of effort and enthusiasm and at the close of each day may we merit and receive the blessings of Thy praise and peace.

Hear us in Christ's name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication from the Clerk of the House of Representatives:

JANUARY 9, 1963.

The Honorable the SPEAKER, House of Representatives.

SIR: I have the honor to transmit herewith a sealed envelope addressed to the Speaker of the House of Representatives from the President of the United States, received in the Clerk's office at 4:21 p.m. on January 9, 1963, and said to contain a message from the President accompanied by copies of trade agreements negotiated with the United Kingdom and Japan.

Respectfully yours,

RALPH R. ROBERTS,

Clerk, U.S. House of Representatives.

TRADE AGREEMENTS—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 34)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the Presi-

dent of the United States, which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Ways and Means and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

I transmit herewith to the Congress copies of a trade agreement negotiated with the United Kingdom to compensate for the increased import duties placed on certain carpets and glass in an escape clause action which affected concessions previously granted by the United States on these products. I am also transmitting an agreement negotiated with Japan to correct the inadvertent omission of part of one concession previously negotiated. The agreement with the United Kingdom was signed on behalf of the United States on December 10, 1962, and that with Japan on December 18, 1962.

The agreements are submitted in accordance with section 4(a) of the Trade Agreements Extension Act of 1951 which requires that the President report to the Congress his reason for breaching any peril point findings of the Tariff Commission. Annex A, attached to this message, lists those instances in which I decided to accord tariff concessions at levels below those found by the Tariff Commission, together with reasons for my decision.

In the agreement with the United Kingdom, the United States granted tariff concessions to compensate for the increases in United States tariffs on certain carpets and glass. The action to increase the carpets and glass tariffs was taken under section 7 (the escape clause) of the Trade Agreements Extension Act of 1951. Under the commitments in the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade the United States is obligated to consult with contracting parties adversely affected by the escape clause action and to accord compensation for impairment of such country's trade as a result of the action.

The consultations with the United Kingdom began shortly after the United States had completed large-scale, multilateral negotiations in the 1960-61 tariff conference, in which it had nearly exhausted the authority for reducing tariffs contained in the Trade Agreements Extension Act of 1958 on the products on which public notice had been issued, except for a number of products on which the Tariff Commission had found that rates could not be reduced without in its judgment causing or threatening serious injury to the domestic industry concerned. These consultations began against the background of unsatisfactory consultations concerning the carpets and glass action with the European Economic Community which decided to make compensatory withdrawal of concessions against imports from the United States rather than to continue negotiations to obtain new compensatory concessions from the United States.

An agreement with the United Kingdom is clearly desirable not only to sustain our record as a country recognizing its obligations but also to avoid a possible "snowballing" of withdrawal actions.

The only feasible way that agreement could be achieved within the framework of authority existing at the time consultations were held was by granting concessions below the peril point levels found by the Tariff Commission.

As explained in my message of March 7, 1962, the Tariff Commission in preparation for the 1960-61 tariff conference was required to make hurried predictions as to future market conditions for thousands of individual articles. This necessarily resulted in the establishment of peril points at the existing tariff level, for a large number of products.

In preparation for the compensatory negotiations with the United Kingdom, the agencies concerned examined with care these earlier findings of the Tariff Commission on products of interest to that country to determine whether there then appeared to be valid reasons for excluding all of these products from negotiations or whether in fact some could be offered as concessions to compensate the United Kingdom without threatening serious injury to the domestic industry. In selecting products as possible offers, two main criteria were used: their value in reaching settlement with the United Kingdom and the extent of competitive adjustment likely to be placed on American industry by tariff reductions. In applying the second of these criteria, the interdepartmental organization determined that the items selected all met one or more of the following conditions: they are not produced in the United States or are not produced in significant quantity; the ratio of imports to domestic production is small; imports in recent years have declined, have been stable or have increased very slightly; they consist of raw or semifinished materials required for United States industries or a reduction in the rate of duty could be expected to have relatively little effect on imports.

In the agreement with Japan, the United States corrected an error consisting of the omission of a part of a concession it had agreed to grant Japan in the 1960-61 tariff conference but which it had inadvertently failed to include in either the relevant preliminary agreements with Japan or the United States schedule to the tariff conference protocol. It was necessary either to correct this error by including the concession, which involved breaching a peril point finding of the Tariff Commission, or granting Japan another concession of equivalent value. The latter course would have complicated already difficult negotiations in progress concerning compensation for increased United States tariffs on carpets and glass. It was the opinion of the interdepartmental trade agreements organization that the concession was justified on economic grounds since United States imports of the item in question (discharge lamps) are less than 1/2 percent of domestic production and imports have declined while consumption is increasing.

Both agreements were entered into pursuant to section 257(c) of the Trade Expansion Act which extends until December 31, 1962, the period for concluding, under section 350 of the Tariff Act of 1930, trade agreements based on pub-

lic notices issued in connection with the 1960-61 tariff conference.

JOHN F. KENNEDY.

THE WHITE HOUSE, January 9, 1963.

PRIVILEGES OF THE FLOOR DURING JOINT SESSION TO HEAR ADDRESS BY THE PRESIDENT

The SPEAKER. The Chair desires to make an announcement.

After consultation with the majority and minority leaders, and with their consent and approval, the Chair announces that on Monday, January 14, 1963, the date set for the joint session to hear an address by the President of the United States, only the doors immediately opposite the Speaker and those on his left and right will be open. No one will be allowed on the floor of the House who does not have the privileges of the floor of the House.

APPOINTMENT OF MEMBERS TO HOUSE OFFICE BUILDING COMMISSION

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of 40 United States Code 175 and 176, the Chair appoints the gentleman from Georgia, Mr. VINSON, and the gentleman from New Jersey, Mr. AUCHINCLOSS, as members of the House Office Building Commission to serve with himself.

ANNOUNCEMENT OF DEMOCRATIC CAUCUS AT 10 A.M. MONDAY, JANUARY 14

Mr. ALBERT. 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 Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I take this time to advise Democratic members that a caucus of Democratic Members of the House of Representatives is called to meet in the Hall of the House on Monday, January 14, 1963, at 10 a.m. for the purpose of nominating two members of the Committee on Ways and Means.

ADJOURNMENT OVER TO MONDAY NEXT

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet on Monday next.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object—and I shall not object—because this matter has been cleared with me, I wonder if the gentleman can tell us anything first as to the program for next week and, second, when we on the minority side having in mind such matters as representation on the Committee on Rules, the Committee on Ways and Means, the Committee on Appropriations, and the Committee on House Administration, and so forth,

when our holdover members of those committees might be submitted to the House for approval.

Mr. ALBERT. I would advise the gentleman from Indiana that there is no problem as to that being done next week.

Mr. HALLECK. That is, in the forefront of next week?

Mr. ALBERT. I would think so.

Mr. HALLECK. In respect to the program for next week, I take it that that is probably getting underway?

Mr. ALBERT. The President's message will be the major program next week. We hope to proceed with the general legislative program as quickly as possible.

Mr. HALLECK. I thank the gentleman.

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

There was no objection.

PERSONAL ANNOUNCEMENT

Mr. WHITE. 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 Idaho?

There was no objection.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Speaker, I wish to state that my vote on the enlargement of the House Committee on Rules would have been "yea" at the time of the roll-call yesterday had I been able to vote. But, unfortunately, I was called away from the floor of the House between rollcalls due to the illness of my wife and was unable to return to the floor in time to have my affirmative vote recorded.

APPLICATION OF EFFECTIVE, REASONABLE, AND FAIR PRODUCTIVITY STANDARDS WHEREVER PRACTICABLE THROUGHOUT THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, although we are a new Congress, we bring with us problems which our people already face. I am confident that under the present administration and the leadership of this Congress 2 years from now we will be able to look back with justifiable pride on the record of the 88th Congress toward alleviating some of these problems.

One of the most vexing problems we must consider during this Congress is the continuation of a disturbingly high rate of unemployment. Five or six percent unemployed may not sound important to some but it is critically important to those families without income; and unemployment is critically important to the economic health of the entire Nation.

We must find further ways to accelerate the economic growth and progress of America and we must find ways to better

utilize the precious man-hours of work being wasted, unrecoverable, each day that a man or woman who wants to work cannot find a job. Full employment must be a full partner of democratic government and we of the Congress must carry a large share of responsibility to make this partnership a reality.

The 88th Congress will consider, I believe, a number of proposals intended to stimulate the economy of our country and offer full opportunities for jobs for all our people. None of these proposals can be more important than effective relief from the tax burden of families who depend principally on wages and salaries for their livelihood. One of the most important criteria for effective tax relief is to give relief where the dollars saved from taxes will be used immediately for the needs of the families earning them.

Mr. Speaker, I am offering for the consideration of the House of Representatives today a bill which would increase the personal income tax exemption for individuals from \$600 to \$800 per year. The Joint Committee on Internal Revenue estimates this proposal, if enacted into law, would provide a saving of approximately \$6 billion to our Nation's taxpayers. The largest part of this \$6 billion would be immediately directed into the retail trade of this country and can thereby furnish a genuine stimulus to the economy.

Each of us, however, Mr. Speaker, knows that responsible representation demands that we find further effective ways of reducing the administrative costs of our National Government at the same time we are seriously considering tax reductions to stimulate the economy. Each of us wants a full dollar's worth of good service and good government out of every tax dollar we pay and we may be sure that the taxpayers we represent feel the same way.

Last summer the Subcommittee on Government Activities of the House Government Operations Committee initiated a series of hearings to point up ways that some Federal agencies might make new efforts to encourage greater economy and more efficient service for our people. These hearings will continue and full reports are being submitted for more detailed consideration.

It is clearly apparent from these hearings thus far, Mr. Speaker, that significant steps can be taken at this time and without further study to save many millions of dollars in tax funds by the agencies of our National Government. One of the most significant steps would be the increased development and use of work productivity standards in every Federal activity in which such standards can be practically applied.

Each individual worker, union member or not, must meet every day his work standards of productivity and competence. Each supervisor and executive must answer for his work. Each competitive business can succeed or fail depending on its productivity reflected continually by a profit and loss statement.

There is no profit and loss measure of productivity in Government. Demo-

cratic government is a service, but the citizens who pay taxes and receive service are certainly entitled to ask that employees of Government meet similar standards of productivity that the citizens themselves meet in earning their living.

The President, the Bureau of the Budget and the Civil Service Commission have already voiced their support for more economical and more efficient service to our people from Federal agencies. At this time the Bureau is conducting a pilot project on productivity standards. Some agencies—notably the Social Security Administration and the Veterans' Administration—have been using productivity standards on a limited basis for some time.

Mr. Speaker, it seems entirely appropriate that the Congress take united and specific action in supporting the President and further encouraging the agencies of the executive branch of our Federal Government to develop and apply at the earliest possible time effective, reasonable, and fair productivity standards throughout the Federal Government.

Not only will such standards result in cash savings in the operation of the Federal Government, but such standards can be made available to State and local governments for cash tax savings on these levels of taxation. There is no reason why the Federal Government cannot be the model of economy and efficient service for the entire Nation and I believe standards of productivity can be a most important step toward this goal.

In order to express the sense of Congress in support of more efficient service, Mr. Speaker, I am introducing for the consideration of the Congress a concurrent resolution calling for the application of effective, reasonable, and fair productivity standards wherever practicable throughout the Federal Government.

The resolution reads:

Whereas provision for adequate defense of the Nation and other essential governmental services to the public may continue to be a heavy burden on the taxpaying citizens; and

Whereas in free, competitive enterprise the individual worker, supervisor, executive, and the business with which they are employed must maintain a high standard of productivity to compete successfully; and

Whereas the taxpaying citizen can rightfully expect an equally high standard of productivity, economy, and efficiency in all Government operations as the taxpayer himself is required to meet in his own work: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That it is the sense of Congress:

That efforts of the Executive to increase Government economy and efficient service to the public through the development and use of effective, reasonable, and fair productivity standards should be maintained and that such standards be extended and applied to as many Federal activities as may be practicable.

HON. ERNESTO RAMOS ANTONINI

Mr. FERNÓS-ISERN. 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 Puerto Rico?

There was no objection.

Mr. FERNÓS-ISERN. Mr. Speaker, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico is mourning the death of its very able speaker of the Puerto Rico House of Representatives, the late Ernesto Ramos Antonini, who departed from us suddenly yesterday afternoon.

His passing leaves a great void that will be most difficult to fill, for he was a noble patriot, a formidable leader, and one of the most eloquent orators that Puerto Rico ever produced. With his boundless energy and brilliant mind, Mr. Ramos Antonini was a devoted and effective public servant, and a firm believer in the people and in democracy. He was my friend, a fine person, and a courageous crusader for what he believed was right.

Mr. Ramos Antonini served the people of Puerto Rico with dedication and eminent distinction, having been elected to the house of representatives in 1932 and having served continuously since 1940, during which time he served ably as majority leader and as the speaker. He held the latter post from 1948 to the present time. In addition, he was a member of the Constitutional Convention of Puerto Rico 1951-52, where his contributions as chairman of the committee in charge of the judiciary provisions of the Constitution of the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico will always stand as his monument.

While his strong and persuasive voice has been stilled, the spirit of Ernesto Ramos Antonini will live on in Puerto Rico, and his example through a critical period in our development will continue to inspire the Puerto Rican people toward ever greater achievement in the principles of economic and political advancement within the democratic system.

Mr. RYAN of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. RYAN of New York. Mr. Speaker, I am saddened to learn of the passing of Ernesto Ramos Antonini, the late speaker of the House of Representatives of the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, and I want to join my colleague, the distinguished Resident Commissioner from the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, the Honorable ANTONIO FERNÓS-ISERN, in paying tribute to the late Ernesto Ramos Antonini. He was a great speaker and a brilliant leader who made a major contribution to the remarkable development of the island. Puerto Rico has sustained a great loss, and I extend my deep sympathy to the family of the late speaker and the people of Puerto Rico.

TAX REDUCTION AND TAX REFORM

Mr. RYAN of New York. 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 New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. RYAN of New York. Mr. Speaker, one of the major problems facing the Nation and the Congress is the state of the economy and the relation of taxation to our economic growth. The President plans to send to Congress a program of tax reduction and tax reform. There is widespread agreement that some form of tax reduction is vitally necessary. There is also general agreement that tax reform is long overdue. Within this area of agreement, however, there are different views as to what kind of tax cut and reforms are best suited to aid the economy.

I have introduced a bill which provides for the kind of tax relief which not only will have immediate effects on our economy, but will also be equitable. This proposal should be incorporated in the general program of tax relief and tax reform.

My bill would increase the personal income tax exemption from the present \$600 to \$1,000, effective January 1, 1963. I propose this increase for two inter-related reasons. First, \$600 is inadequate in terms of today's cost of living. Second, the increase in personal income tax exemption will provide a much needed stimulus to the economy.

The exemption has been at \$600 since 1948. Since 1948 the overall cost of living index has increased 26.5 percent. The price of food has risen 17 percent; rent has increased 44 percent; gas and electricity 26 percent; transportation 48 percent; and the cost of medical care is 63 percent more than it was in 1948. In spite of the substantial increase in these necessary expenses the personal income tax exemption has remained at \$600.

An increase in the personal income tax exemption will increase consumer purchasing power by putting more money into the hands of those who need it most. This is a measure to provide tax relief for the low and moderate income groups which will benefit the most.

The \$400 difference in exemption will give greater tax relief proportionately to a low income taxpayer than to a high income taxpayer. For example, suppose taxpayer A has a taxable income of \$1,000 and taxpayer B has a taxable income of \$50,000. A is taxed at a rate of 20 percent, B at a rate of 72 percent—assuming neither A nor B has dependents—an increase in the exemption from \$600 to \$1,000 will save A \$80 or 40 percent of his tax. It will save B \$288 or 1 percent of his tax.

Tax relief for low and moderate income taxpayers is needed to stimulate the economy. Business expansion and investment will follow increased consumer demand. Maximum impact from tax reduction occurs in the lower income brackets where the marginal propensity to consume is close to 100 percent. If, as some economists have estimated, gross national product is falling short of reasonably full employment by about \$30 to \$40 billion, then a tax cut of perhaps \$10

billion concentrated in the lower brackets might well increase gross national product by \$25 to \$30 billion through the multiplier effects of repeated responding.

I urge my colleagues to support this bill and hope that the administration will include an increase in personal income tax exemptions as part of the overall tax program for this year.

SOUTH GATE CITY COUNCIL, SOUTH GATE KIWANIS CLUB, SOUTH GATE REPUBLICAN WOMEN'S CLUB SUPPORT HOUSE COMMITTEE ON UN-AMERICAN ACTIVITIES AND SENATE INTERNAL SECURITY SUBCOMMITTEE

Mr. DOYLE. 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 California?

There was no objection.

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, since on yesterday the distinguished gentleman from California [Mr. ROOSEVELT] announced to the House that there were a number of the Members of the House who had planned to offer an amendment to the House rules that would undertake to transfer the jurisdiction of the House Un-American Activities Committee to the Committee on the Judiciary, but that on account of the parliamentary situation then existing, their resolution for this purpose would be presented to the House Rules Committee at an early date and that the chairman of the House Committee on Un-American Activities, the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALTER], had already agreed with him that he would join in the request of the group that their resolution be heard by the Rules Committee, I think it appropriate at this time to present to the House three of the many communications which I have recently received on the announced intention of the Communist Party to undertake to have congressional support sufficient in this session of Congress to abolish the House Committee on Un-American Activities of which I have been a member now for about 15 years, upon which committee I accepted member appointment at the request of the distinguished then Speaker of the House, the Honorable Sam Rayburn, and his Democrat associates in the House at that time.

So I am proud, Mr. Speaker, to present the resolution by the Kiwanis Club of the city of South Gate adopted January 3, 1963, which city, by the way, is the city of my residence. Said resolution speaks for itself.

Mr. Speaker, I also am proud to present the resolution by the City Council of the City of South Gate adopted on December 17, 1962.

Furthermore, Mr. Speaker, I am proud to present the resolution by the South Gate Republican Women's Club Federated of the city of South Gate dated December 17, 1962.

Mr. Speaker, granting that according to the announced statement by the distinguished gentleman from California

[Mr. ROOSEVELT] that the purport of his proposed resolution be heard before the Rules Committee may only go to the point and extent of asking transfer of the present work and jurisdiction of the House Committee on Un-American Activities, I wish to make it crystal clear that Committee Chairman WALTER has made it clear that while he felt it appropriate to cooperate to the end that the announced resolution should have its hearing before the Rules Committee, he was and is opposed to the purpose of the Roosevelt-and-associates resolution.

The second thing I wish to make crystal clear at this date, is that I believe the incontrovertible evidence shows that for several years last past, the Communist Party in the United States and many of its avowed followers have sponsored and financed and tirelessly worked throughout our Nation to their purpose and determination to abolish or destroy the effectiveness of the House Committee on Un-American Activities. Communications received by myself and those received by many Members of this House in the last 30 days are concrete evidence of this fact together with other evident activity by persons in Washington lobbying for the abolition of the House committee since the opening of this 88th Congress. I have heard say, that these Communists and their followers have concluded that for the present, they would again prove unsuccessful and fail in their longtime-standing intention to have the committee abolished.

Mr. Speaker, having been asked by a number of my colleagues in this great legislative body as to my position on the proposed move to transfer the duties and jurisdiction of the present House Committee on Un-American Activities to the House Judiciary Committee, I wish to publicly state that I am dead sure that the Communists, having again failed to gain sufficient support in Congress to abolish the House committee, will no doubt dance in glee at any action whatsoever in the U.S. Congress through any of its Members, or any of its committees, which will in any way discredit the House Committee on Un-American Activities and its work of many years duration, or which will lessen the extent of or emphasis upon the work which has been and is presently being effectively accomplished by the House committee and its able staff. However, under the circumstances, I think it is well that the basic issue involved in the Roosevelt and associates resolution to be submitted to the House Rules Committee be fully discussed.

Mr. Speaker, in closing these remarks, I wish to call the attention of your own distinguished self and other Members of this body, to the fact that on January 9 I filed H.R. 475 which is a bill designed to amend the Subversive Activities Control Act of 1950 so as to provide penalties for becoming or remaining a member of Communist-action or Communist-front organizations, and further advise you that this bill was referred by the distinguished Speaker to the Committee on Un-American Activities. The ultimate purpose of this bill, therefore, is to outlaw the Communist Party in the United States, Mr. Speaker, since the Supreme

Court has over a year ago declared that the Communist Party of the United States is and always has been part of an international controversy emanating from a foreign soil. I think there is no question but that the Congress has the legal right and duty to outlaw such conspiracy. This is the intent of my bill and I will have more to say about it shortly.

RESOLUTION OF THE KIWANIS CLUB OF SOUTH GATE, CALIF.

Whereas the House Committee on Un-American Activities and the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee have been heretofore established by the Congress and Senate of the United States for the purpose of protecting our national security against the threat of communism; and

Whereas since their inception said committees have worked tirelessly to discover and destroy subversive elements in our Government; and

Whereas it appears that certain attempts are being made to discredit and destroy these committees: Now, therefore, the Kiwanis Club of South Gate, Calif., does hereby resolve, declare, determine, and find as follows:

1. The Kiwanis Club of South Gate, Calif., does hereby declare its support of said committees and does hereby request the Members of the Congress and Senate to support the continuance of such committees and to urge them to continue their vital activities.

Passed, approved, and adopted this 3d day of January 1963.

LEONARD H. WOODARD,
President.

RESOLUTION 2533 OF THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF SOUTH GATE, CALIF.

Whereas the House Committee on Un-American Activities and the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee have been heretofore established by the Congress and Senate of the United States for the purpose of protecting our national security against the threat of communism; and

Whereas since their inception said committees have worked tirelessly to discover and destroy subversive elements in our Government; and

Whereas it appears that certain attempts are being made to discredit and destroy these committees: Now, therefore, the City Council of the City of South Gate, Calif., does hereby resolve, declare, determine, and find as follows:

SECTION 1. The City Council of the City of South Gate, Calif., does hereby declare its support of said committees and does hereby request the Members of the Congress and Senate to support the continuance of such committees and to urge them to continue their vital activities.

SEC. 2. That the city clerk shall certify to the passage and adoption of this resolution; shall cause the same to be entered in the book of original resolutions of said city; shall make a minute of the passage and adoption thereof in the records of the proceedings of the city council meeting at which the same is passed and adopted; and shall forward certified copies thereof to the city's representatives in the Federal and State Legislatures, League of California Cities, and to Mr. Floyd Wakefield, chairman, Americanism for South Gate Committee.

Passed, approved, and adopted this 17th day of December 1962.

LELAND R. WEAVER,
Mayor of the City of South Gate,
Calif.

Attest:

DOROTHY MCGAFFEY,
City Clerk of the City of South Gate,
Calif.

**STATE OF CALIFORNIA,
COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES,
CITY OF SOUTH GATE.**

I, Dorothy McGaffey, city clerk of the city of South Gate, Calif., do hereby certify that the whole number of members of the city council of said city is five; that the foregoing resolution being Resolution 2533, was duly passed and adopted by the said city council, approved and signed by the mayor of said city, and attested by the city clerk of said city, all at an adjourned regular meeting of the said council held on the 17th day of December 1962 and that the same was so passed and adopted by the following vote:

Ayes: Councilmen Dellmann, Sawyer, Hardy, Henville, Weaver.

Noes: Councilmen, none.

Absent: Councilmen, none.

Not voting: Councilmen, none.

Witness my hand and the seal of said city this 17th day of December 1962.

DOROTHY MCGAFFEY,
City Clerk of the
City of South Gate, Calif.

I, Dorothy McGaffey, city clerk of the city of South Gate, Calif., do hereby certify that the foregoing is a full, true, and correct copy of original Resolution 2533 on file in my office. Dated this 28th day of December 1962.

[SEAL] DOROTHY MCGAFFEY,
City Clerk of the
City of South Gate, Calif.

**RESOLUTION OF SOUTH GATE REPUBLICAN WOMEN'S CLUB FEDERATED
To the Honorable CLYDE DOYLE:**

Whereas a report read before the South Gate Republican Women's Club Federated on December 14, 1962, which stated that the Communist Party, U.S.A., acting on orders from Moscow, have intensified their efforts to abolish the House Committee on Un-American Activities and the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee, when Congress convenes in January 1963; and

Whereas the Communist Party, U.S.A., has been declared subversive by the Supreme Court, and is a threat to the security and welfare of this great Nation: Be it therefore

Resolved, That the South Gate Republican Women's Club Federated believes in order to keep America a free nation, under God, it is our duty to urge the Congress of the United States to support the House Committee on Un-American Activities and the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be sent to the Congress of the United States; and be it finally

Resolved, That we remind the Congress of the United States of their duty to uphold and preserve the Constitution of the United States, and to keep in trust our American heritage which was bought with blood, sweat, and tears, by men who were willing to give their lives and fortunes that America would forever remain free under God.

GLADYS G. BLONDIN,
President.

VIRGINIA L. BLACK,
Secretary.

**TIMING OF WORK PERFORMANCE
OF POSTAL EMPLOYEES**

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, in its December 14, 1962, publication "Wash-

ington Report," the National Postal Union expressed very adequately the feeling of nearly every postal employee with respect to the guidelines distribution system. The article follows:

CHRISTMAS AND "GUIDELINES"

As the Nation's half-million postal workers struggle with the largest volume of mail in history, postal patrons in the 200 largest cities should know delivery of their mail is being slowed by an extravagant, wasteful personnel procedure titled "Guidelines." Through this time wasting operation, postal officials believe they can achieve efficiency and increased productivity. However, under this program emphasis is placed on counting and weighing the mail rather than delivering same.

MEASUREMENT SYSTEMS TO OTHER AGENCIES

According to Washington Daily News Columnist John Cramer, the Bureau of the Budget has launched a new project to measure Federal employee productivity. Cramer reported "five agencies—Treasury, Federal Aviation, Interior, Veterans' Administration, and Post Office—have been designated to cooperate with Budget in the project. With Budget assistance, each will attempt to develop productivity measurement systems suitable to its own programs. This is to be completed no later than March 31."

The Bureau of the Budget has been fully aware of the Post Office Department's work measurement system from its inception during the early part of 1959. As a matter of fact, Budget, on several occasions, was asked by the House Subcommittee on Appropriations for Post Office and Treasury, to submit an opinion on the benefits of work measurement system. Budget recommended continuation of the program with less emphasis on the paper work involved.

**WORK MEASUREMENT SYSTEM LOCAL SURVEY NO
IMPROVEMENT**

When the new postal administration took office during January 1961, employee union leaders were promised individual local surveys of all offices using work measurement systems or guidelines with a view to developing "proper and accurate standards acceptable to management and employees." A thorough and objective job was promised even though it might take some 30 months to complete.

The effect of such surveys in several local offices are now evident. For instance, in Baltimore, Md., where the previous unscientific standard, requiring distribution of four trays of mail in the incoming section an hour had provoked considerable criticism, the new standard set by the survey team is five trays of mail per hour. The installation of new standards at Milwaukee, Wis., elicited the following remark from President Jerry Krajewski, hard-hitting leader of the Milwaukee Postal Union:

"It is evident that the whole program will result in a system that is equally as bad or worse than the one it replaces. The survey, as we see it, spent a great deal of time and labor to meticulously record all sorts of allied labor, accurately or otherwise, with the impression that it would benefit the distribution clerk. In actual practice, the beneficiary happens to be management itself as it can now take credit for so-called allied labor associated with production."

CONGRESSIONAL SUPPORT ESSENTIAL

National Postal Union resident officers have been mandated to seek elimination of "guidelines" as the paramount issue during the next session of Congress. State, area and local unions are again requested to make personal contacts with their Congressmen and Senators to acquaint them with the facts on work measurement system. The 88th Congress will reconvene on January 9,

1963. It is essential that Members of Congress fully understand this costly procedure and the need for early action to eliminate same.

I am today introducing a bill which will prevent the use of stopwatches or any other system designed to time or measure the work performance of a postal employee. As a member of the Post Office and Civil Service Committee, and who is concerned about practices such as this within the framework of our Government, it is my every hope and wish that legislation to eradicate this system will be given an early hearing so that an obnoxious practice such as this will be abolished completely.

THE STRIKE IN THE MARITIME INDUSTRY

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Speaker, it is with profound regret that I rise for the first time in this Congress to call the attention of my colleagues to the disastrous labor-management relations in the maritime industry which presently create a 17-day-old strike—as of Wednesday, January 9, 1963—on our waterfront from Maine to Texas. As chairman of the Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee, I and my colleagues have looked into labor-management relations in this industry several years ago, and recently again last year. On the most recent occasion, the Secretary of Labor, appearing before us, pointed out that of the 19 times the emergency provisions of the Taft-Hartley law had been used, 7 involved the shipping industry; 4 of these involved east coast longshoremen and 3 strikes by seagoing unions.

It is becoming more and more obvious to me that while our committee calls upon Congress to enact legislation for the salutary effect of creating a more healthy, modern American merchant marine, much of these efforts will remain in a vacuum unless the basic labor problems of this industry are reasonably and promptly resolved. Work stoppages, in addition to weakening investor confidence in the private maritime industry, are clearly contrary to our national interest at this vital time in our country's history.

Americans have reached a pathetic stage in their development when union leaders are unresponsive to requests by the President for work continuation in hopes that a solution to particular negotiations can be found.

A work stoppage across more than half the sea coast flies in the face of our commitments abroad, our modernized trade policy, and accentuates our balance-of-payments problems which are threatening the very sanctity of the dollar. With a crying need for our country to become more competitive in world trade, it is impossible that labor leaders should make such demands as to raise the prices

of American commodities abroad to the stage where we are made far less, rather than more competitive in free world markets.

This situation cannot be allowed to continue. I am persuaded that the problem now is ours of the Congress. We must promptly, in the public interest, provide the authority to the administration to prevent labor-management disturbances grievously affecting our shipping and foreign commerce.

Mr. Speaker, a statement by Lawrence C. Gayle, director of labor relations of the New Orleans Shipping Association, and an advertisement of Friday, January 4, of the New York Shipping Association which detail the facts involved in the current longshore strike and emphasizes some of its implications, follow:

STATEMENT BY LAWRENCE C. GAYLE

I am sure that all of you are aware of the contract negotiations taking place since midsummer between the New Orleans Steamship Association and International Longshoremen's Association.

You've undoubtedly read how the two factions were unable to reach an agreement on a new contract by the September 30 deadline. You may have been affected by the strike which followed. And so, you were probably relieved when the President invoked the Taft-Hartley law, feeling that this would solve the problem.

Now, you undoubtedly have the same question in your mind as the little boy who was standing near a gold course one day, watching a duffer try to get out of a sand trap. The duffer had flailed away at the sand for a full 5 minutes. He had showered the green with sand—but to no avail.

Finally, the little boy turned to his mother who was watching with him, and tugged at her hand.

"Mommy," he said, "hasn't he killed it yet?"

The answer to the question then is no, we haven't killed our problem, we're not out of the trap. Since August 9, when the first meeting was held, we've swung hard at the ball. But the ball—the problem—is still buried deep in the trap. We've strewn a lot of sand. But we're not yet on the green.

And, unless labor leadership faces up to economic reality, it's going to be a long time before we get on the green, with a mutually agreeable contract.

Briefly, I want to tell you where we've been and where we stand now. If my crystal ball were in good working order, I might be able to tell you where we're going. But right now, that crystal ball is cloudy. It's cloudy because labor has shown no inclination—from the very first day contract negotiations began—to remove the clouds.

The parties agreed to their first meeting on August 9, at which time the unions had indicated they would present their demands. But these demands were not presented, as had been promised.

All we heard was much speech making. But no demands. As the meeting was concluding, I expressed management's grave concern and disappointment over this development. Further, I urged the unions to submit their demands quickly, in order that a new contract could be completed before the September 30 deadline.

The union proposal was finally submitted on August 17. After careful consideration, members of the Steamship Association concluded that the demands were entirely impractical, both from economic and operational standpoints of the industry. In a moment I'll tell you why.

But we wanted the unions to begin bargaining. We therefore submitted a counter-proposal on August 29, just 12 days after

the union demands were made. We offered them a 27 cents per man-hour money package, to be spread over a 3-year period. I'll show you, in a moment, why this is a reasonable, realistic offer.

The unions delayed 3 weeks before requesting further clarification on this relatively simple management proposal. We immediately provided this clarification on September 20.

At the next meeting on September 27 the unions rejected the association's proposal. Further, they refused to bargain on any points or to withdraw or modify any of their own demands. We left the door open for them to come back with another proposal. It has never been received.

The unions struck on October 1 and ended their walkout 5 days later with the invocation of the Taft-Hartley law. Following this, the union took no steps to begin bargaining. And so the Steamship Association tried again. We filed charges with the National Labor Relations Board on November 1 against the ILA locals for refusing to bargain. These charges were filed because it had now become apparent that the local certified union representatives had no intention of bargaining on a local basis. Their efforts were being directly controlled by the international in New York and they had no intention of trying to work out a New Orleans agreement, unless permitted to do so by their New York officers. But, under the law, they are required to bargain locally.

Following the filing of these charges, the unions agreed to meet. The first meeting was held on November 14 with the assistant to the Director of the Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service, Mr. S. I. Schlossberg, in attendance. After this meeting, Mr. Schlossberg urged the association to withdraw the NLRB charges on the grounds that, in his opinion, the action would help assure genuine bargaining. The association withdrew its charges without prejudice.

On November 16 the parties met and agreed to review the expired agreement, to determine the points which were mutually agreeable or controversial. Following this, a second meeting was set by the Mediation Service for November 26. But this was postponed until November 30 at the request of the unions to accommodate other commitments on the part of the union representatives.

At the November 30 meeting, the parties continued to review the contract. But the story was the same. The union refused to bargain on any major operational matters, scorned the association's offer, and instead adopted a frivolous attitude toward the entire problem.

As you know, under the Taft-Hartley law, management is required to submit a last offer to the unions by the 60th day of the 80-day cooling-off period. This offer is then voted on by the entire union membership in an election under the NLRB supervision.

The 60th day would have been December 3. But at the meeting on November 30, it became readily apparent that the attitude of the union delegates was unchanged. There was absolutely no willingness to work toward a mutually satisfactory agreement. And so we submitted our last offer at this meeting—3 days ahead of time.

I apologize if I have been tedious in recounting these events, but I felt it would impart to you a better feeling of the atmosphere in which these negotiations have been conducted.

Now where do we stand at the present time?

The last offer by the association has been made. Both Alfred Chittenden and Clarence Henry, the presidents of the ILA locals, have said already that they will recommend to their membership that this offer be refused.

The vote on this offer is scheduled for next Monday and Tuesday—December 17 and 18. If it is either accepted or rejected, we have 5 days left to reach an agreement before the Federal injunction expires. If an agreement is not reached by midnight, December 23, then the union has two choices. It can continue to work under the old contract, while the parties endeavor to hammer out a new one, or, it can go out on strike again.

And this time, the President cannot resort to the injunctive powers of the Taft-Hartley law again. Under that law, this power is available once—and once only. If the union strikes on December 23, it would bring on a national calamity as the wheels of the country's ports on the Atlantic and gulf coasts come to a stop, with the resulting effect on U.S. foreign commerce.

Unions, sooner or later, must face the reality that management has faced. This industry, like many others, is facing the crisis brought on by steadily rising wage costs without a corresponding increase in productivity or income.

Now, we have reached the point where we can no longer afford exorbitant wage increases. And realistically, you people in the audience—and the businesses and companies you represent—can't afford them either.

I must emphasize here that it's not only the future of the steamship industry that's at stake in these present negotiations, it's yours, too. For any extraordinary increase in the cost of ocean-going commerce has a direct effect on 50 to 70 percent of businesses and industries in this area and an indirect effect on every one of them.

The reasons are many and complex. To try and explain all of them would tax your time and patience. But just think for a moment. Exorbitant increases in wages mean exorbitant increases in costs of operations. If the steamship industry retreats from its present stand, and grants labor's exorbitant demands, then sooner or later, the industry will have to seek increased freight rates or face financial collapse.

Did I hear a moan from the freight forwarders when I mentioned increased rates? Gentlemen, I assure you there is no alternative if we retreat.

Did I hear an anguished cry from the manufacturer struggling to compete for overseas markets? I know that steadily rising labor costs have already forced the prices of your products up. In some cases, industries in this country have all but priced themselves out of foreign markets because of this. Increased freight rates would only make it more impossible for you to compete overseas.

And so, your industry becomes limited to the U.S. market only. But you find the demand isn't there. And your only alternative is to reduce production. Others do the same. Thus, the economic ball starts rolling down the hill, faster and faster, gathering momentum until it spins toward economic chaos.

Do I present a bleak picture? I intended to, for it's just that bleak. But, you ask, How exorbitant are union demands? Perhaps you're magnifying them.

Well let me warn you first not to misinterpret what I'm going to tell you.

Actually, we don't know, positively, how exorbitant they really are. We've tried vainly since they were first made on August 17 to compute them accurately. But some of them are so wild that we can't put a price on them without operating experience.

But, based on the best costs we can arrive at which can be computed, we estimate that—if granted—they would amount to an increase of a minimum of 150 percent in labor costs over presently existing ones.

To illustrate, the industry paid dockworkers in New Orleans approximately \$30 million in wages and fringe benefits last year.

Based on union demands, the industry would have to increase this payroll by a minimum of \$45 million annually.

That would bring dockwork labor costs in the port of New Orleans to at least \$75 million annually and that doesn't count the cost of insurance and taxes that also have to be paid.

The industry cannot afford this. It would cause the economic collapse of every company. That's why I told you before—and I say again—the future of this industry is at stake in these present negotiations, and the economic future of this country in foreign trade is at stake as well.

In essence, the union demands would—

1. Impose extraordinary cost increases that are neither justified nor reasonable.

2. Lead to increased featherbedding in the handling of cargo.

3. Impose more bonds on management's fundamental right to utilize manpower most efficiently, thus causing rapid declines in productivity.

4. Assess outlandish penalties on management efforts to improve service through use of modern methods of handling cargo.

5. Expand pension, welfare, vacation, and paid holiday plans beyond all reason.

Let me take one of the demands to illustrate what effect it would have on costs—the union demand for 8 hours' pay for 6 hours' work. (Incidentally, this demand didn't say "8 hours' pay for 6 hours' work" at the current New Orleans rate of \$2.96 per hour or \$23.68 per day. They ask for \$24.16 per day—the rate paid in the North Atlantic ports. Remember, I mentioned that influence earlier.)

Nevertheless, comparing the union's demands with existing basic rates, the costs would look like this:

	Present rate per hour (including fringe)	Union demand per hour (including fringe)	Increase per hour (including fringe)
Basic time.....	\$3.44	\$4.51	\$1.07
Time and a half..	4.92	6.53	1.61
Double time.....	6.40	8.56	2.16

This, in itself, is substantial. But, because of one of the peculiarities of our industry, it's far more damaging than this would appear.

As you know, we require 24-hour-per-day cargo handling operations. Usually, you think of time and a half or overtime being paid after an individual has worked 8 hours in a day or 40 hours in a week. But in our industry that doesn't hold true. Any hour worked after 5 p.m. and before 8 a.m. on weekdays and all day Saturday and Sunday is paid at the time-and-a-half rate—no matter if the individual hasn't worked a single straight time hour.

Under this demand of 8 hours' pay for 6 hours worked, the time-and-a-half rate would go into effect at 3 p.m. in the afternoon instead of 5 p.m. Sunday rates would jump to double time, rather than present time and a half.

A recent study we made shows that at the present time, 35.5 percent of the hours were worked at time and a half, 64 percent at straight time, and half a percent at double time. But under this demand, our industry would work 51 percent of its time at at least the time-and-a-half rate. And part of that 51 percent would be at the double-time rate.

Converting to dollars, this demand alone would increase the annual costs by \$17 million.

Other demands are just as staggering. For instance, the unions are demanding further featherbedding, by increasing the size of gangs handling general cargo from a minimum of 18 to 20 men, and those handling bulk cargo from 10 to 14 men. They would

impose unnecessarily low limits on loads moved mechanically, thus requiring more loads for a given cargo and unnecessarily increasing the time required to work such cargo.

They would penalize management efforts to improve cargo handling methods by assessing extra fees for loading or discharging cargoes moving on pallets or in containers. They would tax bulk cargoes—like grain.

Some of these assessments would include: \$1.50 per ton for all cargo moving in containers under 17 feet in length; \$2 per ton for cargo in containers 17 to 34 feet; \$3 per ton for cargo in containers above 34 feet; \$1.50 per ton for cargo banded before coming on the docks; \$1.50 per ton for cargo palletized or glued before coming on docks; \$1 per ton for cargo banded on docks and shipped as units; \$1 per ton for cargo palletized on docks and shipped as units; \$1.50 per ton for heavy lifts up to 10,000 pounds; \$2 per ton for heavy lifts 10,000 to 20,000 pounds; \$3 per ton for heavy lifts above that weight; \$1 per ton for loading or discharging grains, fertilizers, soybeans, etc.; \$1.50 per ton for ore, scrap iron, and similar products; \$1.50 per ton for sugar; and \$1.50 per ton for all other bulk cargo.

In other words, as our industry develops ways to provide better, faster service, we have to pay a penalty to the unions to do it. Thus, any savings that we might effect would be dissipated immediately.

And, mind you, we're not causing anyone to work any harder or take any greater risks by using these methods.

By now, I think you have an idea of the unreasonableness of the union demands. I haven't gone into all of them, but certainly this should be sufficient to illustrate my point.

The association is convinced that the unions must agree on a reasonable wage rate and work with the industry toward greater flexibility in work rules. Only in this way can our industry survive and the public welfare be protected.

To try and reach this goal, the association has offered the unions a 27-cent-per-man-hour wage increase spread over a 3-year period. This would amount to a 9.1-percent increase, adding \$3 million annually to the present waterfront payroll, and bring the basic per man-hour rate, including fringe benefits, to \$3.71. All work performed between 5 p.m. and 8 a.m. would be paid at the rate of \$5.32. And remember, I pointed out earlier that 35 percent of all hours worked are at the time-and-a-half rate of \$5.32. Incidentally, this rate does not include the differential dock workers are already receiving for handling many special cargoes moving through the port.

The association has further proposed the elimination of featherbedding in grain gangs. Efficient, economical size grain gangs would neither impose extra workloads on individuals nor displace the present permanent work force. Such a move would place the port in a more competitive position, and, by stimulating more grain shipments, actually increase the number of available jobs.

The labor force in other ports work in inclement weather, fully protected from the elements by necessary shelter. Yet, here in New Orleans, despite management willingness to provide complete protection, work halts completely during periods of rain, even when the men are sheltered, and workers draw the full rate of pay.

Incidentally, one of the major problems we have is determining what is rain. Now, we've reached the point that one drop in a puddle of water is sufficient to cause work to halt. Again, in an effort to maintain New Orleans' competitive position, the association has proposed that standby time for rain be established at one-half the existing rate.

The unions are demanding that we eliminate the grievance and arbitration machinery established 3 years ago. This we refuse to do. This machinery assures union members and management representatives that all disagreements as to good faith in keeping the contract can be settled quickly and any wrongs corrected without resorting to wildcat strikes which plagued the industry previously.

In these last few minutes, I want to show you some charts [not printed in the RECORD] that give a broad picture of what has happened in the shipping industry and why we have been forced to take our present position. They are the result of research and analysis done prior to and during the current negotiations.

In conclusion, let me say that the members of our association are firmly convinced that there can be no retreat. We must maintain reasonable wage rates. We must have the opportunity to utilize manpower more efficiently. We must be able to install more modern methods of cargo handling without paying a penalty. Only in this way can management fulfill its obligations to its employees, its stockholders, its customers, and to the general public.

[From the New York Journal of Commerce, Jan. 4, 1963]

THE STRIKE THAT PERILS THE NATION

The issues involved in the longshoremen's strike that has paralyzed Atlantic and gulf coast ports are of serious concern to everyone because they involve the economic welfare of our entire country.

They are so serious that President Kennedy personally made proposals to avoid the impasse by continuing work while the issues were studied and a contract negotiated.

The employers readily accepted the President's recommendations—the leaders of the International Longshoremen's Association (ILA) rejected them out of hand.

A \$300-MILLION ADDED BURDEN

Think what will happen to our foreign-trade—the jobs it supports, the new jobs it can create—if the cost of loading and unloading ships from Maine to Texas is increased by \$300 million a year?

Yet that would be the additional cost if the demands submitted by the ILA were to be accepted.

Obviously, if this additional assessment were to be levied on the steamship industry the increase, of necessity, would be passed along to shippers and receivers of cargo in increased freight rates.

The prices of things we sell abroad would go up and our competitive position in world markets would suffer.

A THREAT TO THE U.S. DOLLAR

In 1961 the United States had an excess of exports over imports of about \$5.4 billion. But that was not sufficient to compensate for the heavy drain of military expenditure (\$3 billion) and foreign aid (\$3.8 billion). Consequently, we ended 1961 with an overall deficit of about \$2.5 billion in our international balance of payments.

This process of spending more abroad than we receive troubles the administration, influential groups in Congress, responsible labor leaders and business alike. The reason is a simple one. The settlement of our international accounts results in a flight of gold from this country and this, in turn, threatens our national currency.

The administration, in cooperation with labor and industry, has been waging a vigorous campaign to sell more American goods abroad because this will help to reduce the Nation's deficit while expanding job opportunities.

A THREAT TO OUR EXPORTS

Foreign trade is a tough, highly competitive field. When U.S. companies receive

inquiries from abroad—as from India or South America for new plants, machinery or bridges—bids are requested on a delivered cost basis, including ocean freight charges. Similar bids are also requested by buyers from the highly industrialized countries of Western Europe and from Japan.

If the cost of shipping such cargoes from the United States is increased by an estimated \$300 million annually in handling charges alone, it becomes more difficult for American companies to sell abroad in competition with other foreign producers who also seek to expand their exports and have the advantage of lower cargo-handling costs.

A THREAT TO JOBS

No matter how efficient American industry may be—no matter how fast or efficient modern ships may be—the increased shipping charges will make our products non-competitive. We lose the business—our industries lose orders—their workers lose jobs.

Our loss is a gain to our vigorous competitors in other countries.

A THREAT TO LONGSHOREMEN

Dwindling export cargoes mean loss of work for the longshoremen themselves. Also manufacturers for export and their employees, plus the employees of truck lines, railroads, steamship lines and all the allied industries will feel the effects quickly in reduced employment opportunities.

The Nation cannot afford this chain of events to occur: Periling the Nation, strangling the economy, threatening the currency, threatening our exports, threatening national employment, and threatening the jobs of the longshoremen themselves.

NEW YORK SHIPPING ASSOCIATION, INC.

UNITED STATES SAYS DOCK STRIKE THREATENS FOREIGN AID

NEW YORK, January 8.—Assistant Secretary of Labor James J. Reynolds warned shippers and longshoremen today the dock strike is threatening the Nation's foreign-aid program and is a source of extreme concern to President Kennedy.

Reynolds said the 17-day walkout at east and gulf coast ports has hurt the Nation's trade and foreign relations.

"President Kennedy is extremely concerned because of the awkward position in which this strike places our foreign-aid program," Reynolds said. "But I regret to say there has been no progress whatsoever toward a settlement."

White House sources have said that Mr. Kennedy might ask Congress for antistrike legislation if the dispute is not settled soon.

The walkout has thrown an estimated 100,000 men out of work and has cost more than \$425 million—an estimated \$25 million a day in lost wages, sales, transportation fees, storage costs, and pier rentals.

Alexander P. Chopin, chairman of the Labor Policy Committee of the New York Shipping Association, said today that "there is no possibility of movement unless the International Longshoremen's Association changes its demands to a reasonable level."

Reynolds said that the union claims its demands come to a package of 55 cents an hour for the average longshoreman. But the shippers, who have offered a 22-cent package, claim the actual additional cost of the demands come to much more.

Reynolds met separately with the two sides today. He said there would be no joint talk until one side or the other modifies its position enough to justify face-to-face negotiations.

A TRIBUTE TO THE SPEAKER

Mr. AVERY. 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 Kansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. AVERY. Mr. Speaker, last night, and again this morning, the airways were filled, as I anticipated, with voluminous commentary on the vote in the House yesterday in connection with the packing of the Rules Committee. Without exception, it sounded something like this: A great victory for the President. President Kennedy wins the Rules Committee fight.

Mr. Speaker, as one who was on the losing side and as one who was personally affected, I would like to say that this was not a victory for President Kennedy. It was a victory for the gentleman from Massachusetts, Speaker McCORMACK, and I deplore the fact that the Speaker's name was not even mentioned in these reports.

I pay this tribute to you, Mr. Speaker, as one who has met the power of your persuasion. We will now proceed under the guidance that we hope you will provide for the now packed Rules Committee.

TREASURY BACK DOOR MUST BE LOCKED TIGHT

Mr. PELLY. 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 Washington?

There was no objection.

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, I have addressed a letter to House Members of both parties, inviting joint bipartisan sponsorship of a resolution to change the rules of the House so as to strengthen congressional control over appropriations.

The resolution is the same as one which failed by 1 vote to be reported by the Rules Committee in 1961. It would tighten House rules by providing that legislation carrying language that would permit the withdrawal of money from the Treasury or authorize contract obligations in advance of appropriations, must be reported by the Committee on Appropriations, nor would any amendments proposing Treasury withdrawals be in order in the House unless the legislation being considered had been reported by the committee having jurisdiction over appropriations.

Mr. Speaker, all spending should be a responsibility of one committee of the House which was established to weigh the need and urgency of Federal programs as against the amount of Government revenue in the Treasury and available. Congress cannot control Government expenditures or exercise fiscal responsibility unless and until the device authorizing agencies of the Government to finance programs from Treasury borrowing is outlawed. My resolution would curb a practice under which the Treasury has been compelled to advance more than \$130 billion to various agencies, of which \$16 billion thus far has had to be canceled. In addition, further losses in the future amounting to billions will

likewise have to be forgiven. As of June 30, 1962, \$26.9 billion was still available for borrowing under old authorizations and the national debt ceiling is the only limitation under law of such Treasury withdrawals.

In these critical times, Mr. Speaker, control over spending by Congress is essential. It is time to lock the Treasury back door and compel Government agencies to go before congressional Appropriations Committees to justify their expenditures of the taxpayers' money.

AMERICA STANDS AT THE CROSSROADS TODAY

Mr. JENSEN. 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. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, America stands at the crossroads today.

Are we, the elected representatives of the people, ready, willing, yes and more, are we determined to keep our oath of office inviolate, by taking the well-charted American road which leads to safe, sane, government? That, my colleagues, as you well know, is the question uppermost in the minds of an overwhelming majority of deep-thinking Americans today.

These are the people who know full well that, for the past three decades America has to a very great degree lived on the fruitful, honest labors of past generations. By hard work, right living, and right doing under laws fair to all, adopted by Congress free of dictation by the Executive, which were easily understood and honestly administered, they builded here during a century and a half, a Nation of the happiest, freest people on the face of this earth. How? By their Congress and their President's strict adherence to the precepts clearly spelled out in our U.S. Constitution. The framers of that world-renowned instrument, established for us our competitive, free private enterprise system of government, with its clearly defined checks and balances between Federal and State Governments and the people, by spelling out the duties and responsibilities of each with the other, but specifically placing the greatest authority and responsibility on the people, in order that they would be, not the servants but the masters of their own destiny, assured by the process of free elections of their public servants at stated intervals, without coercion or corruption.

But something happened, when almost exactly three decades ago the President of these United States ordered a subservient Congress, under control of his own party, to pass a number of laws irrespective to their constitutionality.

The records prove conclusively that from that day to this, our economy has constantly floundered from one national and international crisis to the next, both in peace and war, to the end that, at this very minute, we live under a cloud of national and international emergencies

and uncertainties as to how, where, and when it will all finally end. Yes, America is clearly at the crossroads today.

Now Mr. Speaker, having been a Member of Congress for the past 24 sessions, and a member of the Committee on Appropriations for the past 20 sessions, I feel duty bound at the opening of this 88th Congress to express my deep, studied convictions concerning the pitfalls along the road which we must evade in order to avert permanent disaster to our Nation and hence to every American living today, and to those who will come after us.

First of all, unnecessary, wasteful spending of our taxpayers' dollars, and constant Federal deficits with its certain aftermath of uncontrolled dollar devaluation to a mere fraction of even its present value in the purchase of every needed commodity, including food, clothing, medicine, and shelter must stop, and now. We need only to know of the starvation, misery, and strife that befall every nation across the seven seas that traveled the full length of the reckless, wasteful spending road on which we have been traveling full speed ahead for these past three decades to clearly see the fate which will be ours to suffer at the end of that road. Should that evil day come as it did in so many foreign lands as far back as history records, we the Members of this Congress will to a great degree be held responsible, by an enraged American public. Pray God such a fate will never befall our blessed land.

You may say, oh, well, that can't happen here. The answer is: It will happen here, unless we make an about face. What happened to those unfortunate people was this: The fatal day came, and fast, when there was not any market for their government bonds, because the people had lost faith in the stability of their governments, to the end that the people could not or would not risk their money to purchase such paper. The governments then had but one recourse; they started their printing presses turning out paper currency by the tons; soon it took a big handful of this almost worthless currency just to buy a loaf of bread. You can easily imagine the suffering it caused, especially to the working class, those on a fixed income, and the older people.

Oh, yes, Mr. Speaker, it can happen here; all you need to do is to take note of the flight of many, many billions of dollars worth of our gold supply, which backs up the American dollar in your pocket. The flight of our gold is, of course, due to the fact that many foreign countries have lost considerable faith in the stability of the American dollar, hence for many years past those nations have demanded gold instead of dollars in payment for the goods sold to the United States. Why? Because they know we have spent our taxpayers' dollar wastefully and recklessly and that in due time unless very soon stopped, we will go the same way suffered by every nation that followed the reckless, spending route to the end of the road.

My colleagues, I am certain that most of you who are listening, regardless of party, are well aware of all these facts,

as are a majority of the American people. The big question is, Will Congress and the President act in time to head off the impending crash? My purpose in calling these facts to your attention today, and in doing so as forcibly and sincerely as is in my power to do, is purely and simply in the hope of stirring you to awaken to realities facing us now.

I am also certain that I need not point out how best to avoid the impending crash, for any average first grader knows full well that two and two make four, just as you know, my colleagues, that the preservation of our American institutions lies in stopping the spending of billions more of our taxpayers' dollars each year than is taken in by our U.S. Treasury, especially in peacetimes, even though it be a shaky peace. Hence now is the appointed time to stop unnecessary, wasteful spending, not next session or the next, but during this session of Congress, as the next or the next may be too late.

I said at the outset of these remarks that for almost three decades to a great degree America has lived on the fruitful labors of past generations. Let us analyze that statement for a moment. Three decades ago our national debt was \$27 billion. At that time, President Roosevelt assured us that the United States could safely afford a national debt of \$75 billion. But look at us today—our national debt is over \$303 billion, and still climbing by leaps and bounds.

A \$7 billion Federal deficit in fiscal year 1962, a larger deficit in fiscal year 1963, and now a still larger deficit for fiscal year 1964 is in the offing.

Mr. Speaker, dare I ask, are we of this generation really worthy of our wonderful American heritage, and are we of this Congress as a whole, worthy of being the representatives of the most blessed nation on the face of this earth? If we continue forever to pile debt upon debt for our children and their children to pay with sweat and possibly with blood, while we of this age ride merrily on, where will it all lead?

Our President must stop listening to these theoretical, unrealistic economic advisers who have little or no business experience and who erroneously believe they are capable of creating here a utopian form of government. American commonsense and basic economics cry out for the removal of all bureaucratic roadblocks to national progress, as was done in West Germany immediately after World War II and which brought about there a prosperous, flourishing economy within 6 years after the close of that war.

These book-trained economists have also convinced some of our recent Presidents that huge Federal deficits are good for the country. They contend that these huge Federal expenditures are necessary to put dollars in the hands of the people in order to keep buying power at a higher level. Apparently they believe the Government is more capable of spending your own money than you are yourself. But these economists must surely forget these facts, which are

that the dollar spent by the Federal Government pyramids itself on an average into national income a little less than twice, while on the other hand, a dollar earned and spent by the people pyramids itself on an average into national income over three times, as statistics have shown.

Of course, these book-trained economists also contend, but not for public conception, except those who are dyed-in-the-wool Socialists, that huge Federal expenditures are a must in order to force the rich, the well-to-do, and the near well-to-do, to pay heavy taxes on their property and income from every source in order to provide the so-called little people with the fruits of their own labor by the process of wealth distribution, commonly and correctly called "soaking the rich to help the poor." But it just does not work that way.

Let us take a look at that theory and see exactly how it operates. The ultimate consumer of all goods, whether here or abroad, must of necessity, now or in the future, pay every dollar spent by the local, State, and Federal government, under any form of government. The consumer, who is every person who buys goods, has no place and no way to add or to escape the multiple taxes placed on every commodity and on every service they purchase that had to be paid by the producers of raw materials, the transporters, the processors, and marketers of the finished products. The latter all must add the taxes they pay to the price of the goods they sell and the services they render, or soon be forced to close shop due, of course, to greater outgo than income. Would that our book-trained economists take a leaf from that book of truth and reality.

To develop the facts further, just as they exist, more than 70 percent of all finished commodities are purchased by citizens whose annual income is less than \$6,000; hence over 70 cents of every dollar spent by your local, State, and Federal government is paid by our so-called little people.

In light of these facts it is only fair to ask, Who among our public servants, local, State, and Federal, are the real true friends of the so-called little people? Surely not the reckless, wasteful spending liberals who are in fact liberal only with your inherent American liberties and your pocketbook.

Mr. Speaker, in closing I now promise that in due time, after the President sends his 1964 fiscal year appropriation request to Congress, I shall carefully analyze it, after which I will specifically point out to the Congress and to the people how and where reductions can and must be made, since we have already been informed that the President intends to send a budget request to Congress amounting to \$100 billion, using round figures.

In the meantime, let us be ever mindful of the fact that no one can deny; millions of our finest American youth have served in our Armed Forces, have fought, bled, and died to preserve our competitive free private enterprise system of government, wherein we find all our cherished freedoms, the freedom of speech, press, vote, and worship. Every

Member of Congress must ask themselves this question: Will I keep my oath of office inviolate?

It might be well if all of us would read it again and again:

I do solemnly swear that I will support and defend the Constitution of the United States against all enemies, foreign and domestic; that I will bear true faith and allegiance to the same; that I take this obligation freely, without any mental reservation or purpose of evasion; and that I will well and faithfully discharge the duties of the office on which I am about to enter, so help me God.

CRIME SITUATION IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. BECKER. 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 New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. BECKER. Mr. Speaker, last year I introduced legislation to try to bring about some correction of the terrible crime situation in the District of Columbia for which this Congress is responsible. Actually no action was taken and no hearings were held.

Mr. Speaker, I sincerely hope that the Members of the House read the speech delivered by J. Edgar Hoover on crime in the United States, in certain areas. Now, we cannot do very much about this in certain areas of the country, but we are responsible here in Washington, D.C., to see to it that American citizens, not only those who live here but tourists who come to this great Capital, are protected. When this Congress adjourned in October, crime was on the increase. Now people cannot walk the streets; they are not safe in their homes; they are not safe in the churches; they are not safe anywhere in the city. I repeat again what I said last year, we are going to wait until one of our daughters or wives or Members of the Congress is killed or raped or injured in the city, and then we will take drastic action. I will introduce this legislation in the next few days and I hope we will get action in this Congress to show the people of America that we will get rid of crime in the District and I hope that the Nation as a whole will take adequate steps.

POULTRY FIASCO

Mr. HALL. 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. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I am alarmed at recent events which suggest that the Kennedy administration is "acting chicken" instead of "talking turkey" in its efforts to recover our lost poultry market in the European Common Market—ECM—trade area.

The new variable tariff instituted by the Common Market virtually eliminates

a market for American poultry which was developed under the Eisenhower administration and which, until this past year, had expanded to a \$50-million-a-year market providing hope for an industry in great distress.

Last year the American people were treated to a propaganda deluge originating from the White House extolling the benefits which this country would accrue through passage of the President's Trade Expansion Act.

By the time the massive publicity campaign reached its climax, anyone who questioned whether our generosity in offering to lower tariffs would be politely and promptly reciprocated was regarded as a throwback to Neanderthal man. But now the "chickens are coming home to roost," and ironically, our domestic broiler industry is the first to suffer although wheat problems loom next on the horizon.

Within a few weeks of passage of the administration bill, the bill that was to open up new vistas of trade for American products, the Common Market announced its new variable tariff on poultry. The effect of this new tariff was to string a chicken-wire fence around our previous European market for American poultry. It is protectionism more restrictive in intent than anything we have had on the books for generations. And this, within days after the New Frontier sold the American public on the benefits of the trade bill.

I do not suggest, Mr. Speaker, that this was a deliberate deception on the part of the President. But it indicates another degree of the New Frontier's naivete and I fear on the part of a great many network TV commentators who helped sell the Trade Expansion Act.

Furthermore, the felony has been compounded. The Kennedys have not seen fit to give agriculture a representative on the Herter Committee that is our chief negotiating agency with the Common Market. The Chief Executive has thus far ignored even the suggestion of his House Agriculture Committee chairman that the Nation's agricultural interests be given a voice on this top-level negotiating team.

It seems amazing that the administration would attempt to negotiate farm tariff matters without utilizing the services of a farm expert with some qualities of Yankee bargaining.

Although American farmers are able to deliver broilers at Hamburg at some 31 cents a pound, there is a duty that is, in effect, a 12½-cent tariff to be paid on the birds before they can even enter Common Market territory. Mr. Speaker, I have tried to order chicken in Europe in the past year and can certify they need access to our broilers and preparation know-how.

And that 12½ cents can go even higher. The Common Market's complex system of tariffs on farm products permits duties to range up and down as costs move up or down on domestic farm production. The purpose of the levies is to make up the difference between European production costs of farm produce, like poultry, and the price of identical products when imported.

The result is to discourage American imports and to encourage production in their home areas. While we politely talk about lowering tariffs, the Common Market methodically proceeds to raise them.

During a recent excursion to sunny Palm Beach, Secretary Freeman said he is making every effort to protect agricultural interests in our talks with the Common Market. It is going to take more than glowing speeches in sunny Florida to save our foreign poultry markets. One cannot help but wonder whether imposition of an additional tariff on Volkswagens, Renaults, and a few other foreign cars, would not accomplish more than a dozen speeches in Florida. Or perhaps we can suggest repayment of some of our past foreign aid.

Mr. Speaker, I call attention to a report just published by the Poultry Subcommittee of the Select Committee on Small Business. In its recommendations, the report notes on page 24:

The following practices should be considered:

(a) Expand sales abroad where the consumption is far below that of the United States; and

(b) In connection with the above, make every effort to protect agricultural interests when negotiations are conducted with the Common Market nations and the governments of other nations.

The failure to anticipate the Common Market variable tariff, and the failure to appoint an agriculture member of our trade negotiation team belie these recommendations. Has our no-win policy been extended to the field of trade?

If this administration is in water over its head, perhaps the Congress should ruffle its own feathers and develop guidelines for firmer policy.

Our Ozark broiler producers know only too well what it is to be saddled by the regimentation-or-ruin controls of the New Frontier Agriculture Department. They will have no stomach for having their livelihood regimented also by the whims of our State Department.

REPEAL OF THE 10-PERCENT AUTOMOBILE EXCISE TAX

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. 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 Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. Speaker, in view of the reports in national magazines and newspapers that tax cuts rank No. 1 on the President's legislative program, I want to avail myself of the earliest possible opportunity to call the attention of my colleagues to the bill I have reintroduced to repeal the 10-percent automobile excise tax. This outgrowth of the Korean war emergency has penalized purchasers of new automobiles and prohibited the full growth of the economy long enough. The temporary tax was imposed to dampen the demand and production of nonmilitary cars and trucks while we concentrated

on Communist aggression in Korea. But as any makeshift tax arrangement produces results detrimental to the long-term growth of the Nation, today, 10 years after the settlement of the war, the tax serves as an atrocious inequity in our tax system, and an anchor to the free movement of our economy.

The repeal of this levy will not only redeem a punitive tax inequity, it will go a long way toward filling the sails of the economy. The importance of the automobile in our economic life is reflected by the fact that \$1 out of every \$5 spent for goods at retail prices is spent on automotive products. If we sincerely want to reform our tax system and get this country sailing again, economically, we have no better embarkation point than the repeal of this depressive tax.

I earnestly urge the members of the Ways and Means Committee, who share the responsibility for providing this country with equitable and economically sound taxes, to give their most careful consideration and attention to this matter.

SPORTS SPECTACULAR

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, it is my privilege today to bring to the attention of my colleagues in the House the scheduling of a tremendously worthwhile sports spectacular on CBS television this coming Sunday, January 13, at 2:30 p.m. This 90-minute show will cover an event in the new and thrilling "Olympics of the Air," the world sport parachuting championships held at Orange, Mass., during August and September of 1962.

The parachuting championships at Orange were the first full-scale Olympics of the Air event ever to be held in the United States. Two hundred and fifty contestants from 24 nations, including Russia and several Iron Curtain countries, participated. The U.S. women's team placed first, the U.S. men's team placed second, and a U.S. parachutist won the title of "World Champion."

Not only was the event significant because it was a first for the United States, but also because of the momentous problems which were encountered in its conduct. Though officially sponsored with the full verbal support of the U.S. Government, Federal cooperation and assistance, with a few exceptions, ended right there. This is just an example of the conflicts which are involved each time the United States participates in the World Olympics. We are in definite need of a solution, especially to the financial requirements of our teams.

Nevertheless, to see how such an exciting event, bringing together competitors from all over the world for an amazingly precise sport, can be brilliantly conducted with a minimum of resources, I commend the CBS sports spectacular to your viewing pleasure.

CULTURAL DEVELOPMENT ACT

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, the Cultural Development Act originally was introduced in the House of Representatives on July 17, 1962. Since the introduction of this bill I have received such an abundance of support and encouragement from every section of the country that I am convinced more than ever before of the need, the rightness, the timeliness, and the potential contribution to the Nation's well-being of this proposed legislation. Because of this I have today reintroduced the legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I submit for the Record at this time a partial list of the organizations and institutions, with the officer or representative of each, which have responded favorably to me as of this time:

PARTIAL LIST OF REPRESENTATIVES FROM ORGANIZATIONS OR INSTITUTIONS WHICH HAVE RESPONDED FAVORABLY TO THE BASIC PROVISIONS AND PURPOSES OF THE CULTURAL DEVELOPMENT ACT OF 1962 (H.R. 12560)

Legislative representative, Actors Equity Association, New York, N.Y.

Director, American Association of Museums, Washington, D.C.

General secretary, American Association of University Professors, Washington, D.C.

President, American Federation of Musicians, New York, N.Y.

President, Blackburn College, Carlinville, Ill.

President, Brown University, Providence, R.I.

President, Central State College, Edmond, Okla.

President, Colorado State University.

President, Dana College, Blair, Nebr.

President and chairman, Department of English, Duke University, Durham, N.C.

President, Duquesne University, Pittsburgh, Pa.

President and chairman, Department of Fine Arts, East Tennessee State College.

Assistant to the president, Franklin and Marshall College, Lancaster, Pa.

President, Gallaudet College, Washington, D.C.

President, Gonzaga University, Spokane, Wash.

President, Grinnell College, Grinnell, Iowa.

President, Hamline University, St. Paul, Minn.

President, Idaho State College.

President, Indiana State College.

Professor of art, Kansas State University.

President, Kent State University, Kent, Ohio.

President, Knoxville College, Knoxville, Tenn.

President, Lambuth College, Jackson, Tenn.

Acting president, Luther College, Decorah, Iowa.

President, Marymount College, Tarrytown, N.Y.

President, Montana State College.

Executive secretary, National Commission on Accrediting, Washington, D.C.

Dean, New Mexico Highlands University, Las Vegas, Nev.

Acting president, New Mexico Western College.

Chairman, Fine Arts Department, Plymouth Teachers College, Plymouth, N.H.

President, Northeast Missouri State Teachers College.

Vice president for academic affairs, Ohio University.

Director, Otis Art Institute of Los Angeles County, Calif.

Dean, Pratt Institute, Brooklyn, N.Y.

Assistant to the president, Princeton University, Princeton, N.J.

President, Regis College, Denver, Colo.

Provost and vice president, Rutgers University, New Brunswick, N.J.

President, St. Augustine's College, Raleigh, N.C.

President, St. Benedict's College, Atchison, Kans.

President, St. Mary's Dominican College, New Orleans, La.

Editor, "School Arts" magazine.

President, Smith College, Northampton, Mass.

President, State College of Iowa.

President and director, art education division, State University College, Buffalo, N.Y.

Acting president, Susquehanna University, Selinsgrove, Pa.

President, Trinity College, Washington, D.C.

Executive secretary, the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, Washington, D.C.

President, the Pennsylvania State University.

Dean, the University of Oklahoma.

Heads, Departments of Journalism and Creative Writing, and Speech and Drama, University of Alaska.

Chancellor, University of California.

President, University of Illinois.

Vice chancellor and dean of faculties, University of Kansas.

Dean, Graduate School, University of Minnesota.

President, University of Oregon.

President and dean of arts and sciences, University of South Carolina.

Dean, University of Tennessee.

President, Ursinus College, Collegeville, Pa.

Dean, Utah State University.

Chairman, humanities division, Washburn University of Topeka, Topeka, Kans.

Chairman, Department of Music, Washington University, St. Louis, Mo.

President, Western Illinois University.

President, Westminster College, Fulton, Mo.

President, Wheelock College, Boston, Mass.

President, William Penn College, Oskaloosa, Iowa.

Dean, Yale University School of Art and Architecture, New Haven, Conn.

President, University of Arizona.

President and chancellor, the University of California.

Provost, the University of Rochester, Rochester, N.Y.

President, University of Texas.

President and chairman, English Department, East Texas State College.

President, Bethany College, Lindsborg, Kans.

Vice president, Bowling Green State University, Bowling Green, Ohio.

Vice president and dean, College of St. Teresa, Winona, Minn.

President, Delaware State College, Dover, Del.

President, Dickinson College, Carlisle, Pa.

President, Elmhurst College, Elmhurst, Ill.

President, Moorhead State College, Moorhead, Minn.

President, North Central College, Naperville, Ill.

President, University of Miami, Miami, Fla.

President, Western Reserve University, Cleveland, Ohio.

President, Whitman College, Walla Walla, Wash.

Mr. Speaker, I am happy to report that the response of the higher education community to the proposals contained in the bill has been overwhelmingly favorable.

It is evident that the need for programs such as those contained in the legislation is very keenly felt by the heads of colleges and universities and other educators generally throughout the country. We are indeed facing the danger of a critical imbalance in our education programs unless we begin to give attention to the arts and humanities at least in some small measure comparable to that now being given to the sciences and technology.

I am reinforced in my conviction that this legislation is needed by the fact that, while some have suggested changes in emphasis, functions or organization, not a single dissenting voice has been raised as far as the primary objectives of the bill are concerned. It is also significant to note that coming as they do from all sections of the country and representing many facets of the education community, they are almost unanimous in emphasizing that the Federal Government must act to support the arts and humanities to a far greater degree than heretofore.

Among the foremost supporters of Federal recognition and programs in the arts and humanities is Barnaby C. Keeney, president of Brown University. On February 7, 1962, Dr. Keeney wrote me as follows:

It has seemed to me for a long time that it would be well if we had a National Foundation for the Arts and Humanities to perform a function similar to that of the National Science Foundation, which has benefited the country greatly. There is no question but that advancements in science and technology have a greater immediate utility in the international and national situation in which we exist today. On the other hand, the whole shape of our lives in the future, and our whole attitude toward life will be strongly formed by our achievements or lack thereof in the arts and humanities.

It was President Keeney's letter that stimulated my interest to introduce the proposed Cultural Development Act of 1962:

Again in response to the proposed legislation, Dr. Keeney has advised me in his letter of October 7, 1962, as follows:

I am very much pleased that you have taken the leadership in another important area and I hope very much that your efforts will succeed. If I can help, I should like to.

Another staunch supporter of the proposed legislation is Francis H. Horn, president of the University of Rhode Island. Dr. Horn has written me in part as follows in his letter of August 16, 1962:

As I think you know, I have been concerned about the advancement of the arts and humanities for many years. * * * So all I can say is, keep fighting for this good cause. * * * in the end the logic of your position, and the need for the services which your legislation provides, will win the necessary support. * * * the possibility that the Office of Education will be working on a major program in this area adds considerably to the attractiveness of the matter * * *.

Many other Rhode Islanders prominent in the arts and education have indicated their strong support. Among these are Francis Madeira, musical director of our Rhode Island Philharmonic Orchestra; Arlan Coolidge, chairman of the department of music at Brown Uni-

versity; Louis Pichierri, director of music for our department of public schools in Providence; and John Nicholas Brown, renowned Providence art patron and collector.

In an article in the Providence Journal-Bulletin of July 17, 1962, under the heading, "College Heads Praise Humanities Move," other outstanding Rhode Island educators voiced their support. William C. Gaige, president of Rhode Island College, was quoted as follows:

Such an agency is important to put back into balance the emphasis on science and the humanities. * * * It is extremely important that we understand the nature of man, and keep in balance the educational and cultural forces which society makes available to him, and which so much influence his thinking, and through him the society of our country and of the world.

Albert Bush-Brown, president of the Rhode Island School of Design, was quoted in these words:

We ought to have an agency that is supporting performing arts through established institutions in local communities. At this time when our thinking is directed to space programs, communications systems, new power sources and computers, we have tended to neglect the necessity to reshape the communities in which we live. Unless our physical environment is qualitatively improved to sustain the social and cultural institutions that families need we shall have gained little by touching down on other planets.

Typical of the support for the objectives of this measure given by the Rhode Island press is the editorial of June 22, 1962, in the Providence Visitor, which makes an effective analysis of the objectives and need for the legislation. It also gives clear evidence of the wisdom of placing this new responsibility within the U.S. Office of Education. The entire editorial, entitled "Support for Arts and Humanities," is submitted for the RECORD:

[From the Providence (R.I.) Visitor, June 22, 1962]

SUPPORT FOR ARTS AND HUMANITIES

Speaking at the commencement of Rhode Island College earlier this month, Congressman JOHN E. FOGARTY proposed the establishment of a National Institute of the Arts and Humanities. As envisioned by Mr. FOGARTY, this Institute would stand on an equal footing with the National Science Foundation. Its functions would include supporting research, providing a national clearinghouse for educational materials, and developing a program of fellowships for students in the arts or the humanities. In addition, there would be established a Federal Advisory Council on Arts and Humanities. The members of this council would be chosen for their eminence and would advise the Government as to the ways in which it might encourage the development of the cultural life of the Nation.

We believe that this proposal has great merit, although some might question the advisability of Mr. FOGARTY's plan to set up the new Institute within the U.S. Office of Education. It should, however, be noted that this office has undergone important structural changes. Under Commissioner Sterling M. McMurrin, a former professor of philosophy, the horizons of the U.S. Office of Education have widened considerably beyond the traditional function of compiling educational statistics. More and more in recent years we have seen a closer communication between the academic world of humanistic studies and the creative world of the

various arts. The moment that one realizes that each art has its laws and its disciplines, it becomes clear that as the Committee on the Visual Arts of Harvard University put it, "The great artist is great both as an artist and as an intellectual." The relation between the performing arts, such as music and drama, and the world of education has also long been recognized.

It is, of course, true that the history of the relations between Government and cultural pursuits has not been altogether without causes for criticism in those instances where that relation has taken on an official character. Recent discussions of the shortcomings of our own State legislature in this regard come immediately to mind. Yet we have many examples of Government activity in cultural matters that are most excellent illustrations of how things can be done with due regard to the highest professional standards. The National Gallery of Art combines public and private efforts very well, and the Library of Congress has long been an important center of artistic and scholarly activity. If the National Institutes of Health and the National Science Foundation can be maintained, as they are, on a level which is well above petty political considerations there is no reason why we cannot also have an equally excellent National Institute of the Arts and Humanities.

As Mr. FOGARTY pointed out, there is a growing concern among scientists and educators over the danger of the loss of important creative human values as a result of an overemphasis on science. The Soviet Union has abandoned what we know as the liberal arts educational program. Its technically proficient dictatorship fears the liberating power of the humanities. An American institute devoted to cultural interests would further mark the difference between tyranny and freedom in the nuclear age.

Mr. Speaker, a subsequent editorial from the July 27, 1962, edition of the Visitor, which gives eloquent backing to the need for Federal support of the arts and humanities as proposed in this bill, is also submitted in its entirety for the RECORD:

[From the Providence (R.I.) Visitor, July 27, 1962]

SUPPORT FOR AMERICAN CULTURE

Speaking at the commencement exercises of Rhode Island College last month, Congressman JOHN E. FOGARTY proposed the establishment of a National Institute of the Arts and Humanities. Sharing Mr. FOGARTY's concern over the imbalance which has developed as a result of necessary stress on science in education, we expressed our general approval of the Congressman's proposal. Now that he has introduced a bill to make his plan a practical reality, we are pleased to note that such leading educators as the president of Brown University have expressed their belief that this kind of legislation is welcome. Certain matters of the public good are involved to such a wide extent that it is not surprising to find that the idea of a National Institute of the Arts and Humanities does have the backing of men who know our educational and cultural needs. The vast sums of money and the abundant graduate awards which have been made available to science students are, no doubt, fully justified by the defense needs and other requirements of our society. Students who wished to prepare themselves through the equally long, difficult, and expensive processes of the humanities have, however, been offered very little such aid, when compared with the grants available in the sciences.

One consequence of this imbalance has been a decline in the enrollments in art and music schools. Another result of the heavy aid given to science has been that the number of Ph. D. candidates preparing to take their places as teachers in higher education has not kept pace with the Nation's projected needs. The American Historical Association, for example, recently pointed out that there will not be enough qualified Ph. D.'s in history alone to meet the expected needs of higher education in 1946. Under the graduate fellowships provisions of Mr. FOGARTY's Cultural Development Act, this situation would be at least partially improved.

But it is not only in the world of the universities that there is need for programs of information, advisory service, and financial help on a national scale. Statistics show that more of our people are going to concerts and other productions of the performing arts than ever before. More visitors are venturing into the Nation's museums. Both museums and producers of artistic enterprises are, however, finding that getting money to cover their operating expenses—to say nothing of their expansion—is increasingly difficult. The time is long past when the world of the arts was the special preserve of wealthy patrons. Cities and universities alike, faced with the fact that many of our libraries are increasingly inadequate and obsolete, cannot expect to meet the costs of the future with the help of private donors alone. Mr. FOGARTY's bill at least makes a start in facing these difficulties. More tax relief to wealthy art patrons, as proposed by the Providence Evening Bulletin is no solution. Museums and libraries which have been the special preserves of a few wealthy donors in the past are, in some instances, barely surviving today.

Mr. FOGARTY's plan was criticized by the Evening Bulletin as an attempt to buy culture for the American people, with the Government setting the critical standards. Not only does the bill specifically prohibit Federal interference of this kind, but it also assumes that we already have a culture which deserves public recognition and support.

These comments so far have focused on the strong support of this proposed legislation in behalf of the arts and humanities by key persons, organizations, and institutions within the State of Rhode Island. However, support from the other geographical areas of the Nation has been equally enthusiastic.

Chancellor York, of the University of California, has put it this way:

As for myself, I find your bill and the proposal for a national organization of arts and humanities a most encouraging step forward. It is important that the welfare of arts and humanities be taken seriously, for we cannot continually perpetuate and seek a high standard of excellence in the sciences to the exclusion of other areas of learning. I am convinced that a balance must be struck between the technical and the arts and humanities that will provide this country with well-rounded individuals whose abilities in any given area have only been enhanced by their knowledge of, and education in, the arts and humanities. Your bill also lends itself to the furtherance of the arts and humanities, by assuring, through scholarships and fellowships, the education of those persons pursuing study in these areas. This is a strong point in its favor.

Dean Peltason, of the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences of the University of Illinois, confirms the existence at his in-

stitution of a situation which we know to be widespread throughout the country. Here is the way Dean Peltason describes it:

What is happening is that the availability of research support for the sciences, as much as it is welcomed, is forcing the universities to divert more and more of their own resources to the sciences at the expense of the other areas of our concern. Not only is this because we must divert university resources to cover indirect costs of Government-sponsored science research, but since matching funds are available for science buildings and programs, there is an unavoidable tendency to give these items high priorities.

In addition, research support for science is creating even greater disparities in the rewards to scientists in contrast to those working in fields where Federal funds are not available. Research grants permit scientists to acquire equipment they need and to attend international conferences. Scientists are paid during summer months to do research. Scholars in other fields do not have these opportunities so that in effect the salary of almost every university scientist is at least two-ninths more than that of comparable scholars in other fields.

The president of Trinity College, Washington, D.C., has pointed out that we must be concerned with "the development of a man as man, as a human person"; and further, that "our architecture, music, sculpture, literature and painting must represent the very best of which we are capable, just as our scientific development does."

President Hart of Duke University has written to me, stating:

I think it is highly important for the student, the universities and the country as a whole that the humanities not be neglected in our emphasis on the sciences.

Former Commissioner of Education, Dr. Sterling M. McMurrin, has responded to the presentation of my bill in the Congress in the following words:

The need for superior attainment in the sciences to guarantee our national security in the face of grave international crises has long been recognized by most Americans. There is an equal need for superior attainment on a very broad scale in the arts and humanities if Americans generally are to gain a full understanding of their rich cultural heritage and a genuine commitment to their ideals of individual freedom and human dignity. Only with such understanding and such commitment on the part of all of its citizens will this Nation have the resources in personal and public creativeness and courage to meet successfully the continuing international struggle between freedom and tyranny.

Stanley A. Czurlies, president of the Eastern Arts Association, representing some 3,000 art educators in the northeastern part of the United States, has recorded that organization's support of my bill. He has called it "very realistic in its approach to the problem" and "in line with several developments which institutions and organizations working in the art field have been seeking to bring about."

On a broader scale, the National Council of the Arts in Education, representing over 150,000 persons concerned with the arts at all levels of education, has re-

cently concluded the first National Conference on the Arts in Education at Lake Erie College in Painesville, Ohio. Dean Norman L. Rice, of the College of Fine Arts, Carnegie Institute of Technology, who served as chairman of this conference, has recently written to the U.S. Office of Education as follows:

Of major importance to the conference was a realization of the urgent necessity for strong, enlightened Federal support in the arts. Indeed, this need may be said to have occupied the prime position in the conference's survey of the arts today.

Dean Rice goes on to present specific recommendations from the Council in the areas of conferences, research, services of specialists, and publication in the field of the arts. Each one of these needs would be met under the provision of this bill.

President Clark Kerr, of the University of California, has written to me in these words:

The purposes intended by your bill are of great importance to our national life which can most surely advance with security and strength only if we develop the full potentials of our intellectual resources, both humane and scientific.

Dean J. A. Burdine of the College of Arts and Sciences of the University of Texas has stated:

Representative FOGARTY's bill to create a National Institute of Arts and Humanities represents an excellent balance to the imbalance that has been created by the recent emphasis on science. It seems to me that the heart of the matter is the provision for scholarships and fellowships to be awarded to outstanding students.

Dean E. W. Doty, of the College of Fine Arts of the same university, has made the following comment concerning this proposed legislation:

Of all the bills which have been introduced which I have studied, this seems a more fruitful approach than trying to set up a separate national agency.

The chairman of the music department at Washington University in St. Louis sums up his conviction this way:

The arts are no longer a frill or the preoccupation of a fringe group of eccentrics; rather, they are basic, fundamental to meaningful living in the contemporary world.

He further states that—

only the Federal Government can attack the problems of the arts on a scale large enough and at a level high enough to be meaningful and effective.

And of course, this is the fundamental need which my bill proposes to meet. However, while it is broad and flexible enough to attack the needs and problems in the arts at the Federal level, my bill provides specifically that there shall be no Federal control over the policies and the functions of the institutions, organizations, associations, and individuals which it seeks to assist.

At this point, I should like to submit for the RECORD a letter to the editor of the Providence Evening Bulletin which appeared on August 1, 1962. It was written by Dr. Gustav O. Arlt, president of the Council of Graduate Schools

in the United States, in reply to the Bulletin's editorial of July 20 entitled, "Buying Public Culture With Federal Subsidies." This letter makes several facts abundantly clear. First, the enlightened scientist agrees that full value and support must be given to our artistic, literary, and scholarly efforts as a Nation if our science itself is to reach its fullest potential. Second, the gross disparity in relative support by our educational institutions of scientific programs on one hand, and of programs in the arts and humanities on the other, has been heightened by our own actions in the Congress in behalf of our defense, as essential as these have been. And finally, the experience in recent years of educational institutions which have received substantial Federal support through agencies such as AEC, NIH, NSF, and NDEA proves beyond question that Federal assistance is possible without Federal control.

THE COUNCIL OF
GRADUATE SCHOOLS
IN THE UNITED STATES,

Washington, D.C., July 25, 1962.

To the Editor,
Providence Evening Bulletin,
Providence, R.I.

Your editorial of Friday, July 20, 1962, entitled "Buying Public Culture With Federal Subsidies," requires a reply, not so much to let you and your readers know that the universities and colleges of the country heartily support Representative JOHN E. FOGARTY's Cultural Development Act of 1962, but chiefly to point out certain distortions of fact and erroneous conclusions in the editorial.

I need not waste time and space to prove that a great imbalance exists in favor of the natural sciences over the humanities. You yourself admit it. But I do wish to quote a few sentences from the now-famous Seaborg Report of November 15, 1960, a statement by the President's Science Advisory Committee.

"Much of the basic argument for the strengthening of American science applies equally to other fields of learning. * * * Even in the interests of science itself it is essential to give full value and support to the other great branches of man's artistic, literary, and scholarly activity. The advancement of science must not be accomplished by the impoverishment of anything else, and the life of the mind in our society has needs which are not limited by the particular concerns which belong to this Committee and this report."

These sentences were not written by Representative FOGARTY or by a professor of arts or humanities, but by 14 of the most distinguished scientists of the Nation. Granted that the expenditure of vast sums in the advancement of the sciences was dictated by the needs of national defense, the fact remains that this advancement was accomplished by the impoverishment of the arts and the humanities. This impoverishment resulted not only from the direct absence of Federal support but also from the fact that many universities have had to siphon off funds from their arts and humanities programs to pay the indirect costs of federally sponsored science programs. In other words, the imbalance which exists today was created both directly and indirectly by the Federal Government.

I am sure that you must have had tongue in cheek when you wrote that the remedy for the plight of the humanities and the arts lies on the campus of each college along with the responsibility for poorly trained

teachers. Even a professor of the arts or humanities has to be paid—not as much as a chemist, to be sure—and he needs space, equipment, books, museum materials. Who is going to buy these necessities when the budgets of humanities departments are cut to the bone to provide overhead costs for the sciences?

No, Mr. Editor, the remedy for the imbalance lies with the same agency that created it—the Federal Government. And the remedy does not consist of curtailing subsidies to the sciences so that we can all be poor and mediocre together. It consists of reasonable, not extravagant, intelligently allotted aid to the undernourished areas. Then, and only then, can the universities and colleges improve the deficiencies in their arts and humanities departments. And I don't know where you got the notion of a "crash program"—an anomalous term in itself; how can anything that crashes be constructive? Certainly there's nothing in Mr. FOGARTY's bill to suggest a crash program.

Finally, I wish to object most strongly to your statement that this bill implies that the Government "can and should decide what has and what has not cultural value, and that it can and should shape humanities programs in American colleges." In the first place, section 102 of the bill expressly prohibits any Government supervision or control of educational policy. More impressive, however, is the record of the past. In the last 20 years, the Government has invested billions of dollars in higher education, through such agencies as AEC, NASA, NDEA, NIH, NSF, and others, and there still has to be found a single instance in which Government has attempted to formulate, supervise, control, or shape programs, curriculums, or policies of universities and colleges. Believe me, sir, we, the administrators and faculties of the universities and colleges, would be the first to raise our voices in protest against such interference.

You cannot, indeed, "buy public culture with Federal subsidies," but you can buy the personnel, the facilities, and the equipment by means of which the universities and colleges can produce the teachers and practitioners of the arts and letters in a favorable cultural climate. For the first step in this direction we thank Mr. FOGARTY.

GUSTAVE O. ARLT,
President, the Council of Graduate
Schools in the United States.

Financial statistics clearly show that present Federal programs in institutions of higher education are heavily weighted to the natural and physical sciences. The effects of this emphasis on these institutions has recently been analyzed in a study of 36 colleges and universities. The study was performed by Harold Ordans of the Brookings Institution under contract with the Office of Education. It is part of the "Survey of Federal Programs in Higher Education." Some of the findings of this study follow:

The effects which Federal programs have had on the quality and nature of higher education have been varied and uneven: pronounced in some areas but virtually undetectable in others where one would expect a marked effect. On the whole the effects have been decidedly good.

They have been most striking and direct in scientific research and education at a few leading graduate and professional schools and institutes of technology, and most imperceptible and indirect in scholarly work and teaching in the arts and humanities at 4- and 2-year liberal arts colleges. We have not explored either the tenuous effects at the latter institutions or the pronounced effects

at professional schools of medicine, engineering, and agriculture, but have focused on the impact on liberal arts education at a broad group of public and private universities and a select group of private colleges.

Federal programs have aided these institutions to improve the quality, increase the numbers, improve the salaries, and reduce the teaching loads of their faculty in the sciences and some social sciences * * *.

Perhaps the most unfortunate consequence of Federal science programs has been the cleavage they have engendered between the status and rewards of faculty in the sciences and humanities. Surely this is the major problem posed for educational institutions by the unbalanced nature of present Federal policies and expenditures, and it suggests the desirability of either counterbalancing programs in the humanities or of broader forms of institutional aid.

Faculty members in the 36 institutions were asked their opinion on the wide difference in Federal support between the sciences and humanities. Their response follows:

A small majority of scientists believe that the concentration of Federal funds in the natural sciences and relative neglect of the humanities is in the present national interest, but over two-thirds of the social scientists and a still larger proportion of humanists affirm that it is not. Some 70 percent of the scientists, however, state that the present pattern is neither in the long-run national interest nor in the best interest of their institution, and nine-tenths or more of their colleagues in the social sciences and humanities agree.

Asked further, "If you could redistribute the Federal funds presently available, what would you do?" over 70 percent of the respondents indicate that they would, "Give the humanities somewhat more and the sciences somewhat less, but still the major portion." It is worthy of special note that 67 percent of the scientists at universities now receiving the largest sums from the Federal Government also subscribe to this position, and the comments of many suggest that an even larger proportion would favor a policy which gave both humanists and scientists more money, or at any rate which did not penalize the sciences in order to help the humanities.

In summary, I would say only this: Seldom, if ever, in my experience as a legislator, have I observed a more clearly felt need for appropriate legislation such as that represented by the comments and convictions of these leaders in the fields of the arts, sciences, and the humanities which I have shared with you in part. I believe my bill, the Cultural Development Act of 1963, makes a comprehensive yet reasonable beginning of Federal support in this area. I feel certain the Congress will accept this nationwide surge of united opinion as an unequivocal mandate for forthright action.

URBAN MASS TRANSPORTATION ACT

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. SHELLEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise to urge that the 88th Congress enact the

Urban Mass Transportation Act of 1963. This day I have introduced legislation providing Federal grants and loans for the development of comprehensive and coordinated mass transportation systems. This measure will authorize the Administrator of the Housing and Home Finance Agency to provide additional assistance for mass transportation systems in metropolitan and other urban areas in the Nation.

It is my firm belief that if our urban areas, both large and small, are to escape strangulation by traffic congestion, the efforts of all levels of government are needed to solve the critical transportation problems now confronting them.

The transportation problems of the urban areas are of true national concern. Seventy percent of the Nation's population live in urban areas and it is here that the highest rate of population growth is occurring. It is evident that because our Nation is predominantly an urban nation, the solution of urban problems is very much a part of the current worldwide race for economic, scientific, and cultural leadership. The strength of our very Nation will be demonstrated in the cities. These core cities of 50,000 or more and their surrounding urban and suburban territory have been the fastest growing sections of the country since the start of the century. Over two-thirds of the population of the Nation today resides in urban areas.

One of the key and unique pressures that faces the city today is the burden of handling a daytime population 30 to 50 percent greater than the residential population. The continuing decline in the use of mass transit facilities is making this task enormously more difficult. Within recent years heavy emphasis has been placed on building or planning freeways to the central cities and by adding to the supply of parking spaces. It strikes me as apparent that a highway program alone will fail to solve the problem of accessibility for many cities as they are constituted today. The question of accessibility has a great deal to do with the decision of the businessman to stay downtown or the decision of the shopper to go there. In fact, the very question of accessibility to the modern city is closely tied to the question of the survival of the central city.

Mr. Speaker, I believe it to be a fact that the movement of the great masses of people into and out of the central city can be accomplished only by a mass rapid transit program. Nationally, it makes little difference what form this transport takes—elevated trains, subways, surface trains, buses, or a combination of any or all of them. What is clear is that the fact of galloping congestion in our urban areas must be met—and with dispatch.

Our highway programs, our urban renewal projects, and all urban planning assistance programs will become more effective with the enactment of the Urban Mass Transportation Act of 1963. Under this act Federal aid will be given to State and local government agencies. They are in the best position to keep abreast of the trends which indicate need for specific transportation facilities and the best ways to meet local problems.

Mr. Speaker, I feel we have come to a point in the development of our Nation at which neither the Federal Government nor the American economy as a whole can afford the expense and damage if metropolitan areas fail in their productive function. Enactment of the Urban Mass Transportation Act will do much to insure the good health of the American city.

THE NEED FOR A COMMITTEE ON CAPTIVE NATIONS

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, nearly 3 years have passed since I introduced in the 86th Congress, 2d session, a House resolution on a Committee on the Captive Nations. Referred to the Rules Committee, the resolution has never been discharged, in spite of numerous bipartisan companion resolutions, statements on the floor, and letters from constituents, scores of which were published in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. The primary reason for pigeonholing the measure lies in the strong opposition of the State Department.

As stated in Mr. Dean Rusk's letter of August 22, 1961, to the gentleman from Virginia, Chairman HOWARD W. SMITH, the State Department objected to House Resolution 211 for two reasons: First, identifying certain nations, such as Armenians or Georgians, as captive nations weakens our position, since we appear "advocating the dismemberment of an historical state"; second, a Committee on Captive Nations would "form a pretext for Soviet actions interfering with the resolution of the Berlin crisis."

As to the first reason, one is at a loss to understand how our position could be weakened if we were to insist on the universal application of national self-determination rights. Brought to its logical conclusion, Mr. Rusk's argument would mean that our position in Africa is being steadily weakened, since we consistently support independence aims of every nation on that continent, sometimes even at the cost of chagrining our allies.

Conversely, it is not easy to comprehend how our position could be strengthened if we keep silent on the Russian denial of self-determination to the numerous non-Russian nations, which Congress, after an exhaustive study, found captive—Public Law 86-90, sponsored by, among others, Speaker JOHN W. MCCORMACK—and if we apply a double standard in this respect in Africa and Russia.

One also fails to understand how our theoretical support of independence for Armenia, Georgia, or Turkestan would contribute to the dismemberment of historical Russia, if our endorsement of independence for Algeria, Congo, or Angola makes no contribution to the dismemberment of historical France, Belgium, and Portugal. If one speaks in historical

categories, France and Belgium acquired their African possessions at about the same time Russia expanded on the Caucasus, while her acquisition of Turkestan took place 40 years after France's acquisition of Algeria and more than three centuries after Portugal's acquisition of Angola.

As to the second reason in the letter, although Mr. Rusk's hands have not been tied by such a committee, he has failed to resolve the Berlin crisis in the more than a year since he wrote that letter. Conversely, it would be safe to assume that world war III would not have erupted over Berlin because of the committee, even if we had had one.

Speaking of further opposition to House Resolution 211, it also was voiced in unmistakable terms by the House Foreign Affairs Committee. Invited to state his views before the Rules Committee, the gentleman from Pennsylvania, Chairman THOMAS E. MORGAN, insisted that his committee was taking good care of the captive nations, and no changes in the setup were necessary. The gentleman from Connecticut, JOHN S. MONAGHAN, who chaired the hearings on nine European captive nations last summer, asserted that "there was feeling in the Foreign Affairs Committee the question of jurisdiction of matters like this lay with this committee and the objectives might be reached in the way we are attempting to do it here," that is, without any special committee on captive nations. The gentlewoman from New York, EDNA F. KELLY, chairman of the Subcommittee on Europe, likewise claimed that the captive nations were her category and that her subcommittee practically covered all the nations of the world.

It cannot be denied that the committee did not endorse the dismemberment of Russia. It never questioned Russia's right to hold captive 40 million Ukrainians, 10 million Belorussians, 10 million Caucasians, and millions of other non-Russian people in Europe alone, listed in Public Law 86-90. The committee's only concern were nine smaller captive nations—Albania, Bulgaria, Czechoslovakia, Estonia, Hungary, Latvia, Lithuania, Poland, and Rumania—with combined population of about 90 million. As the committee, for some reason, was not concerned about nearly 20 million East Germans, it disregarded more than 100 million captive people in Europe alone—including the European part of the Soviet Union.

Only this year did the committee recognize the inadequacy of its approach to the captive nations problem. The excuse was that the subcommittee had been prevented from doing a good job by the practical limitations of jurisdiction and time. As a result of this soul-searching, the subcommittee recommended on October 29 that a consideration be given to the establishment of a Subcommittee on Captive Nations under the House Foreign Affairs Committee.

While such a subcommittee conceivably could deal with matters pertaining not only to the European captive nations, but also to the captive Cubans,

Chinese, Tibetans, Mongols, North Koreans, North Vietnamese, Kazakhs, Uzbeks, and other non-Russians in the Asiatic part of the Soviet Union, numbering some 700 million people, that is, nearly four times as many as in Europe, no favorable results are likely to spring from such a subcommittee. The fact that it would remain subordinated under the Foreign Affairs Committee raises grave doubts in this respect.

In its report of October 29, 1962, the committee was unable to list a single measure in behalf of captive nations it had sponsored or carried out. All the committee could do was to refer to the hearings, held 8 years earlier by the Kersten committee, and list the latter's publications. Had it not been for my resolution, House Resolution 211, introduced on March 6, 1961, and the ensuing interest in this proposal, the committee, most probably, would not have held any such hearings as were held last summer. Actually, it was only 10 months ago that the committee took initiative, in an apparent effort to forestall the passage of House Resolution 211 and keep the matters as they had been heretofore.

The House, for example, has not investigated the wisdom of discounting 1 billion people behind the Iron, Bamboo, and Sugar cane Curtains as our friends. It has not questioned the replacement of liberation or rollback policy by containment, coexistence, disengagement, evolution, and nonpredetermination policies. It has not investigated the full implication of the powerful tide of self-determination running throughout the captive nations, nor looked in to the vulnerabilities of the Russian Communist empire, including the Red army, as a consequence of a reborn spirit of national independence.

The House has not assessed the results of our containment policy, which has alienated 1 billion captive people and gained no new allies among either the captive or nonaligned nations. It has not asked itself whether such policy is serving our purposes, and what changes would be advisable in view of our witnessing the disappearance of East Berliners behind the Concrete Curtain, the Cubans behind the Sugar cane Curtain, the Tibetans and the North Lao behind the Bamboo Curtain, and the vacillation of several nations in Asia, Africa, and Latin America.

The House has not brought to the surface the vested interests at the State Department that vociferously advocate Russian nationalism, although precisely the same line is being pursued by the Kremlin, and evidently is serving its purposes. It has not given a thought to the puzzling circumstances that both the Russian emigres and Russian Communists equally violently oppose the Captive Nations Week commemorations and try to prevent a congressional inquiry into the captive non-Russian nations in the Soviet Union.

The House has not examined the prudence of our open alinement with the supernationalist Russians, in spite of their disregard of all the ideals we cherish, as exemplified in their century-

old policy of militant expansionism at the expense of their weaker neighbors, racial and religious intolerance—anti-Semitism, anti-Catholicism—forcible Russification, denial of self-determination rights to the non-Russian nations, and colonial exploitation of more than a score of captive nations for the benefit of the Russian heartland.

If the State Department wants to win the friendship of 96 million Russians at the cost of alienating over 100 million non-Russians, the House has not determined whether the Department sincerely believes the Russians could be bought without compromising the principles for which we stand, and without opening the United States to the defeating criticism that, wherever it suits our selfish purposes, we forsake our principles and support the philosophy of tyranny and the violently antidemocratic regimes.

The House has done nothing to ascertain whether it is in our own interest to support the Russians and alienate the non-Russians in view of the possibility of an armed conflict with the Red army, where we could have all non-Russians lined up for us and all Russians lined up against us, since the Soviet Union, after all, is a Russian Empire, its rulers and privileged class are Russian, and its primary beneficiaries are Russian. The House has not brought out the fact that a disproportionate share of rank-and-file members in the Soviet Communist Party are Russian, while a shockingly disproportionate share of political prisoners in Soviet jails and concentration camps are non-Russian.

The House has not weighed the fact that over 100 million non-Russians in the Soviet Union, if told clearly and well beforehand of our favorable disposition toward their national aspirations, would become invaluable allies in case of an armed conflict with the Soviets. It is the non-Russians who hold strategical important positions on land and sea approaches to Moscow and control most of the wheat, coal, oil, and raw materials sustaining Russia's heartland.

Nor has the House dwelt on the reasons why the Germans in World War II were greeted as liberators in the non-Russian borderlands of the Soviet Union, why non-Russian troops laid down arms and offered full cooperation in defeating imperial Russia, and why whole non-Russian towns and districts were taken over by nationalist guerrillas long before the Germans arrived. Had the Nazis not refused the extended hand and replaced Communist slavery by Nazi slavery, our task in liquidating them would have been much more difficult.

The House has not requested an explanation from the State Department for its lukewarm support of the United Nations inquiry into Russian colonialism. It has not asked the Department whether the ruthless Russian colonialism is considered as different from the enlightened colonialism as still practiced by some Western nations, and which the Department so vigorously opposes.

Finally, the House has not scrutinized on its merits the State Department's untouchable policy of opposing the Soviet Union's dismemberment nor evaluated

advantages that may result from, first, breaking up the biggest war machine in history which menaces our own security; second, reestablishing the balance of power in Europe; third paving the way toward a community of free, democratic nations; and, fourth, abolishing mankind's most ruthless imperial dictatorship.

The failure of the House to do all these things actually denies the leadership of Congress that enacted Public Law 86-90. It also deprives the American people of their right to open public inquiry on a vital issue. The failure of the House to show interest in the captive nations on the same subject serve as proof that no changes may be anticipated even if a subcommittee were established under the Foreign Affairs Committee.

Therefore, the only effective solution is to establish a new House Committee on Captive Nations. Completely dissociated from the present policies on captive nations and bearing no responsibility for their endorsement in the past, such a committee would be a proper congressional instrument for examining the problem in its entirety and suggesting to Congress ways and means to communicate with and aid our true friends behind the Communist curtains, aiding thereby our own security and leadership position in the world. We live in a climactic period of history. It is high time that something was done to put the U.S. Congress on the alert in regard to the danger caused by our passive attitude toward 1 billion captive people all over the world.

In his address before the United Nations General Assembly over a year ago, President Kennedy condemned the new Soviet colonialism and interjected this warning: "The tide of self-determination has not yet reached the Communist empire." It stands to reason he believes that the tide will reach the Russian prison of nations. Hence, our State Department lags far behind our President in understanding the tide of nationalism which moves toward the Communist empire. Congress must not lend itself to the State Department's errors in strategy and policy. Rather Congress should move ahead with the President, preparing for the day when the riptide on national independence dismembers the Russian empire.

While communism is experiencing internal dissent and difficulty in achieving its objectives, both at home and abroad, the free world must mount a vigorous political offensive on all fronts. The Captive Nations Week resolution, that has caused so much commotion in the captors' world, must be followed by proper measures that would implement its moral objectives, instead of remaining a meaningless repetition of annual declarations. The centennial of the Emancipation Proclamation is a fitting date for action.

THE FEDERAL ROLE IN EDUCATION TODAY

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. ULLMAN] may extend

his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. ULLMAN. Mr. Speaker, on Tuesday night of this week, my colleague, the gentlewoman from Oregon, Representative EDITH GREEN, delivered the 1963 Burton lecture on education at Harvard University. I find Mrs. GREEN's speech, entitled "The Federal Role in Education Today," a valuable contribution to the discussion of the need for Federal assistance to colleges and universities. In the speech the gentlewoman from Oregon [Mrs. GREEN] makes a major proposal for legislation in this area—the creation of cooperative educational centers in 15 areas of the United States. I know that my colleagues will be most interested in reading this fine paper.

The speech follows:

It is a very special privilege to be here tonight and for several reasons: Dr. Burton, whose career in education and whose leadership has been so outstanding, is now a resident of my State. Then, too, my home in Portland is about six blocks from Reed College—and so I feel very pleased to be invited to speak at the Reed College of the East.

Then I feel especially pleased to be on the campus of Dr. Pusey whose demands for academic excellence and academic freedom have been a source of great encouragement—great inspiration to many of us in the Congress. Those of us on the Education Committee of the House have appreciated his expert testimony, his wise counsel, and we will continue to look to him for facts on the state of higher education today—and its future needs.

I also look forward to a very close working relationship with your former dean, our new Commissioner, Francis Keppel. His appointment was very enthusiastically received; his responsibilities are staggering in a country—in a world where education is the key not only to military success—but also international understanding; where not a rocket thrust—but a national education thrust of massive proportions may determine who wins the race to the moon; in a world where—as Agnes Meyer said, "the cold war has been shifted by the astute leaders of the Kremlin from a competition in physical strength to a competition in brains; and in a world where there are still many who believe that education is not the mere training of shoemakers and tanners and nuclear physicists—but is for the formation of the complete individual, his curiosity stimulated, his abilities fully developed and his potential made clearer and more available to him."

For generations we have talked of the importance of education—George Washington, Thomas Jefferson, Alexander Hamilton, Dwight D. Eisenhower, John F. Kennedy. But now there is new urgency, because not just our way of life but our life, our very survival, may depend on its degree of excellence. I found it very difficult to decide on a theme for this lecture. I'm not an expert in education. Almost every one of you in this audience has specialized in this field.

I know the Burton lectures have been established for a discussion of problems in elementary education, but as a member of the House Education Committee I find it difficult to divorce the needs of the colleges from the needs of elementary and secondary schools.

Our public educational structure is the foundation on which our higher education

institutions must rest, and the colleges and universities provide the area in which the work of the elementary and secondary schools is brought to fruition. Essentially we have to look upon the entire educational process as a single process in which the Federal Government and the people of the entire Nation have a deep and continuing interest. Therefore, I hope I will be forgiven if in this Burton lecture the comments are not limited to elementary education.

In discussing the role of the Federal Government in education, the question is not Should there be Federal aid. That was decided over 100 years ago. The questions of importance today are what kind of Federal aid, and where and how the Federal dollars should be spent and why.

How much Federal aid will be determined by the priority we give to education. There is no unanimity here, nor has there been since 1787 when the Northwest Ordinance was established.

Every time a crisis in education has occurred we have marched forth boldly to meet it by establishing a new commission to study and make recommendations. And so in 1929 Herbert Hoover's Commission issued the report that "The Federal Government has no inclusive and consistent public policy as to what it should or should not do in the field of education. There are national responsibilities for education which only the Federal Government can adequately meet. * * * Federal aid should be given to education as a whole rather than to particular types of training. * * * Requiring the matching of Federal funds with State or local is an undesirable policy in the field of education. * * *

"The Committee recommends establishment of a Department of Education with a Secretary in the President's Cabinet."

The Wall Street crash occurred; the depression slammed the doors of our colleges to thousands and thousands of men and women who today are in the age bracket of the Werner Von Brauns, Glenn Seaborgs, the Tom Dooleys.

And in 1936 Franklin Delano Roosevelt appointed a commission. Twenty-one volumes were published. With the exception of the National Youth Administration and Civilian Conservation Corps, no bills were passed. They reported that the "inadequacy of local programs in education is increasing and recommended general aid to elementary and secondary education, improved preparation of teachers, construction of school buildings, Federal aid for students from 16 to 24 years of age." War clouds gathered; another crisis.

In 1939 the National Resources Planning Board was established. In 1943, among their recommendations for the postwar period, they said that "The Office of Education should be expanded to offer educational leadership in the Nation. * * * That equal access to general and specialized education be made available to all youths of college and university age—according to their abilities. * * * And that the increases in expenditures for education in postwar period must be financed principally by Federal funds."

In 1946 President Truman's Commission on Higher Education studied the situation and reported:

"The Federal Government recognizes the desirability of providing financial aid to students in higher education because of the public benefits which accrue. * * *

"A national program of Federal scholarships in the form of grants-in-aid should be provided for at least 20 percent of all undergraduate nonveteran students—based on need and ability."

No bills passed.

In 1947 the Hoover Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government reported—surprisingly—"the U.S.

Office of Education has not been properly equipped to perform its appropriate function."

In 1953 the Second Hoover Commission and its report.

In 1955 the White House Conference on Education.

In 1956 the President's Commission on Education beyond the High School, the National Commission for the Development of Scientists and Engineers, and several non-governmental conferences and commissions.

No one could say that the educational needs have not been studied, and no one could argue that in the postspunk period there is not an increased amount of Federal aid; but with the exception of the Federal impact bill, the National Defense Education Act, and the college housing program, I think it can be said that Federal activities in support of education have been incidental to other national objectives.

As a result we still do not have a national policy; the Office of Education administers fewer than half the educational programs and the words of the Hoover Commission are more descriptive of conditions today than in 1929 when they said: "The multitudinous Federal educational activities are scattered throughout the various Federal departments and independent agencies, among which there is little evidence of cooperation in the discharge of educational responsibilities having the same major purpose."

Today, excluding the in-service training programs of many departments and agencies, there are nine agencies and subdivisions of the Government that have major programs involving education in the United States:

1. Department of Agriculture.
2. Atomic Energy Commission.
3. Department of Defense.
- 4-7. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare; Office of Education; Office of Vocational Rehabilitation; Public Health Service proper; Public Health Service, National Institutes of Health.
8. National Aeronautics and Space Administration.
9. National Science Foundation.

In addition there are six agencies and departments which have programs smaller in scope—or less clearly identifiable with education—or directed toward a highly specialized project. They are:

- Department of Commerce.
- Housing and Home Finance Agency.
- Department of the Interior.
- Department of Justice.
- Department of the Treasury.
- Veterans' Administration.

In international education, in addition to the Atomic Energy Commission, Department of Defense, Space Agency, National Institutes of Health, and the National Science Foundation, the following agencies have major programs:

- Department of State.
- Agency for International Development.
- Peace Corps.
- U.S. Information Agency.

It should be noted too that in addition to these 9—some 16 other departments and agencies of the Government participate in training foreign nationals in their particular fields—largely through a transfer of funds from AID—and in sponsoring research abroad through the use of foreign currency.

There are, however, only two agencies of Government specifically charged with concern for education; these are the Office of Education and the National Science Foundation.

The programs in education of all other major agencies are in total considerably more extensive than those of the two just mentioned. They have a special mission, and since this must be their overriding concern very little consideration is given to the educational needs as a whole and the impact the particular program might have. And yet, in this last year, these several agencies spent

\$926 million for education and another \$545 million for research in educational institutions; it is obvious that these agencies must have a major impact on the educational system in the United States.

The Department of Defense and its component parts are more heavily involved in the educational process than any other department or agency of the Government. The budgets for the operation of its schools, when calculated by the same ground rules used by civilian institutions, exceed those of most of the largest private and public universities. The budgets for research contracted with universities and associated research centers exceed those of any other department except the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare with its enormous program in the Institutes of Health. The Department of Defense is supporting more students working full and part time toward baccalaureate and postgraduate degrees than any other agency. Its expenditures for training under the Government Employees Training Act exceeds the amount expended by all other agencies of the Government combined. It operates the largest and almost the only Federal system of elementary and secondary schools and is responsible for the staffing, the curriculum, and the direction of that system. It operates all but two of the Federal degree-granting institutions in the country and is expanding its operations in this field. It operates, independently of the State Department, a program of international education under the military assistance program.

To consider the involvement of the Federal Government in education without reference to the Department of Defense is impossible. And yet the questions raised, the arguments used, against general education programs are never used against education by the Pentagon—"Segregation-integration," "Church-state issues," "Federal control," "This is just the beginning," "Don't let the camel get its nose under the tent," "We can't afford it," "Taxes are too high." With the education program in the Department of Defense, these arguments are never made. The money is appropriated with little question.

What college or university president wouldn't like to have the operating budgets of the three academies: West Point, \$11,261 per student per year; Air Force Academy, \$13,037 per student per year; U.S. Naval Academy, \$7,354 per student. None of these include capital outlay. Some questions, but not many on why—in terms of Federal dollars spent—it costs from 400 to 600 percent more to produce a career officer through the service academies than through the ROTC programs in public or private universities.

I'm not sure how many people know the full scope of the program at Madison, Wis., under the U.S. Armed Forces Institute. It is designed to meet the educational needs of all branches of the service in all parts of the world; correspondence courses are produced and distributed in various academic disciplines at secondary and higher education levels. In 1961, 116,000 students were taking correspondence courses; 189,000 were studying in groups and 10,600 were in participating colleges and universities. The Department of Defense operates a foreign language program considerably larger than that of the State Department or the Office of Education under title VI of the National Defense Education Act. The Department of Defense spent on research on various college and university campuses this last year \$197.9 million. In total amount spent on research on college campuses by all agencies we were able to identify expenditures of \$613 million. And it is here where duplication and overlap is most probable. It is here that expenditures have grown most rapidly and the degree of duplication cannot be ascertained. There are several reasons; but a major one is that research projects, research findings, have far outstripped the Nation's ability to

store, catalog, report, and disseminate the knowledge. An illustration of this may be found in the fact that a large percentage of the Defense Department research findings have not at this time been reported to the Armed Services Technical Information Agency which was specifically created to serve as a clearinghouse for such information.

Leaving the Defense Department—and I've only touched on a few of their education programs—another illustration of the probability of overlap in research programs may be found in the fact that the following agencies were engaged in medical research and research directly related to the health sciences, varying in amounts from \$1,870,000 to over \$500 million:

- Atomic Energy Commission.
- Federal Aviation Agency.
- National Science Foundation.
- Office of Emergency Planning.
- Veterans' Administration.
- Department of Agriculture.
- Department of Defense.
- Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.
- Department of Interior.
- Department of State (AID).

In oceanography alone—in 1962—research was carried on by the Navy, the Army, the Departments of Commerce and Interior, the Atomic Energy Commission, the Public Health Service, the Office of Education, and the National Science Foundation.

There is no question but that better inter-agency cooperation and coordination of existing programs is desirable.

I have touched on only a few of the education programs in which the Federal Government is involved. Because of the many departments and agencies which are involved and because of the jurisdiction of committees in the Congress, I do not believe there is any one person in either branch who really knows and understands the overall role of the Federal Government in education.

We, in Congress, must certainly share part of the responsibility. Nearly every committee in the Congress has jurisdiction over some type of education legislation. This leads to some inconsistencies and overlapping.

For example, legislation to provide assistance for construction of college classrooms, when introduced as an amendment to the College Housing Act, was referred to the Banking and Currency Committees. But similar legislation, introduced separately, was considered by the Senate Labor and Public Welfare and the House Education and Labor Committees.

Likewise, legislation amending the student loan program of the National Defense Education Act to provide additional loans to medical and dental students was referred to the House Education and Labor Committee in the 87th Congress. At the same time, the House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee was considering a separate program of financial assistance to medical and dental students. It may be noted further that the National Science Foundation has had authority to grant medical scholarships under legislation in existence since 1950. Although this authority has not been used, consideration of it falls within the jurisdiction of a third House committee—Science and Astronautics.

Numerous bills to provide income tax deductions or tax credits for college expenses were introduced in the 87th Congress and referred to the Ways and Means Committee in the House and Finance Committee in the Senate. These proposals would have an effect akin to granting of Federal scholarships, yet direct scholarship legislation came under the jurisdiction of the Education and Labor and Labor and Public Welfare Committees. Also, while legislation to permit tax deductions for college or other educational expenses remained under the jurisdiction of

the Ways and Means and Finance Committees, legislation to rebate to the States for educational purposes a percentage of their Federal income or cigarette tax collections was referred to the Education and Labor and Labor and Public Welfare Committees.

In the House, general scholarship legislation was considered by the Committee on Education and Labor, while separate proposals for scholarships for veterans came under the jurisdiction of the Veterans' Affairs Committee, scholarships for medical students and nurses were considered by the Commerce Committee, scholarships for medical training for the Armed Forces were referred to Armed Services Committee; scholarships for agricultural research were referred to the Agricultural Committee and scholarships in the sciences to the Science and Astronautics Committee.

Furthermore, while nurses scholarship legislation comes before the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee because of its general jurisdiction over public health matters, legislation to assist in training practical nurses was handled by the Education and Labor Committee because of its general jurisdiction over vocational education.

Both the school lunch and school milk programs are administered by the Department of Agriculture. But in the House, school lunch legislation is the province of the Education and Labor Committee, while the school milk program is under the Agriculture Committee's jurisdiction.

Donations of surplus Government property, which include many pieces of equipment, are considered by the Government Operations Committees in the Congress. Yet the furnishing of new equipment to educational institutions may be considered by several committees—the Space, Education, Defense, or Health Committees of either House.

As I stated earlier, the diffusion of responsibility for educational programs in the Congress makes it difficult for any one committee, subcommittee, or individual Member to ascertain the overall achievements of the Government's existing educational programs or the overall effects of proposals for changes in them.

My Subcommittee on Higher Education has been making a detailed study. I hope we will have recommendations and the printed report ready sometime in February. There are many questions we are asking:

Over 90 percent of all the research funds are spent in 100 institutions. Is this necessary? What does it do to the other 1,900 institutions? The President's Science Advisory Committee has recommended a widening circle of centers of excellence. How can the Government help to bring this about?

What effect does the matching-grant requirement have on the local college or university? For example: A small college decides that top priority should be given to a general library—but then an agency of Government offers to provide \$1 million for a science building if the institution will match it. Because such a high percent of the funds are in the science field, does this create a further imbalance?

Is the emphasis on research undermining the importance of teaching? Are we drawing our best scholars away from the classroom and into the research lab, and decreasing the time they spend in educating the next generation?

Is the concentration of Federal funds in the sciences creating a serious imbalance in our academic system? Except for the GI bill which is being rapidly phased out, the National Defense Education Act loan program and the Reserve Officers Training Corps programs—nearly all of the direct student aid is at the graduate level and most of it is in the physical and life sciences and engineering. Nine agencies sponsor fellowship programs. Are we producing enough people at the baccalaureate level to fill up these

places? Should the National Science Foundation and the Office of Education be combined? Is our race to the moon and the inevitable competitive emphasis on science decreasing the interest in and the training of people in the humanities? Freedom is not going to be won or maintained by bombs alone.

In the Inglis lecture of 1945, George F. Zook discussed the role of the Federal Government in education. He must have been looking into the crystal ball at that time when he said:

"It behooves us—as educators to acquaint ourselves with its many complexities and ramifications and to exercise such leadership as we can in its consideration and solution. Otherwise we may some day wake up to find—at the end of our generation—as the result of patchwork and piecemeal legislation, a distorted and disjointed national policy in education which represents neither the considered judgment of educational leaders nor the needs of our country."

The needs of our country are very great. Van Allen has said that our ambitions in outer space already exceed our scientific competence. We're told that we need 13,000 additional scientists and engineers on the man-on-the-moon project alone. We desperately need teachers, social workers, medical doctors, nurses.

Our country has shown, time and time again, that we can do whatever we must do—we can do what our times demand of us. We can, whenever we set our minds to it, amaze the world, and even surprise ourselves by what we can achieve. But the achievements that loom before us—the challenges that beckon us on—will require above all, an education program carefully planned—an educational system not only equal to our foreseen need, but far in excess of anything this country, or any country, has ever known.

We must prepare our young people not for the 20th century, but for the 21st century in which they will be living most of their lives and give them the kind of an education which will help them find the answers to questions which today we cannot even imagine.

We will have to invest in education, as we now invest in dams and flood control projects, as a utilization of public—and private—funds, with a guaranteed return far in excess of cost. To put it another way—we shall have to abandon the kind of thinking that reckons education in terms of costs, and not in terms of value.

Schools are faced with a decade of tremendous responsibility and need for growth and improvement.

A half century ago, 1 out of every 20 high school graduates entered college. Today, one out of three goes on to college. And this is wonderful. But many Members of Congress are very much concerned about the 60,000 to 100,000 capable young men and women who should be graduating this year but are not.

There have been several studies at the State level, and one study at the national level, which indicate that between 25 and 40 percent of our most capable students do not now go beyond high school—and largely because of financial need.

I am talking now of students with IQ's of 120 and above, who have maintained high academic records during their high school years and who would like to go to college. In addition, there is another group of 60,000 to 100,000 extremely capable high school graduates each year who are not properly motivated and do not attend college. In other words, we have between 150,000 and 200,000 students of outstanding ability who do not go beyond the high school level. This is in addition to the million who drop out during their high school years, and too often become the unemployed.

So, on one side of the national ledger we have a shortage of trained manpower in al-

most every area—and on the other side we have a huge reservoir of untrained people, from whom come most of the unemployed, and to whom we are apparently willing to pay unemployment compensation benefits or spend over \$1,000 per person under manpower retraining. But, apparently, we are unwilling as a matter of national policy, to help make it possible for them to obtain the highly skilled and professional first training that this Nation so desperately needs.

We have always considered education a private matter—something to be determined entirely by the individual, and perhaps his parents. I think this can no longer be considered as a private matter, but rather as a matter of great public concern.

This year, I will again introduce legislation to provide Federal funds for academic facilities for higher education. I am sure that you are familiar with the statistics on college enrollments. Today we have about 4.2 million students; by 1970 we will have almost 7 million. We're talking not about a situation that may or may not occur. It most certainly will occur and no amount of wishful thinking will alter the course of events. In this decade our colleges and universities will be asked to provide the equivalent in facilities of those it has taken them 150 years to build. Our competition with the Soviet world, perhaps, is making us understand what Aristotle said a long time ago: "The destiny of an empire depends upon the education of its youth."

And there is growing evidence that not only the leaders in the Kremlin, but also the leaders in Red China, are familiar with the history of other countries and other empires. It was a professor of philosophy at the University of Berlin 160 years ago who said, "Education is not a function of the state. It is the function of the state if it wishes to survive."

Bismarck came along and is credited with the statement that "The nation that has the schools has the future."

For many years we were unwilling to admit that the Russians could develop a school system anywhere near as good as ours. Then Sputnik jarred us out of our complacency. Today we know that they are graduating two or three times as many engineers as we are—and that the quality of their education is at least as good and maybe better.

But what we refuse to look at is the startling projection of figures for the 1970's which indicate that in Communist Europe and Communist China there will be far more students enrolled in their colleges and universities than in the colleges and universities of the United States and Western Europe.

All of the studies—all of the reports—all of our leaders who know of the manpower needs of this country have told us that time and time again we must do more in the way of providing educational opportunities.

Admiral Rickover has said, "To talk of the necessity of more engineers, more scientists, more doctors, more teachers and not provide facilities for learning is a kind of cynical nonsense this Nation cannot afford."

Where do we go from here?

As I have outlined earlier, we do have many educational programs for a specific purpose—with the largest part of the Federal dollar spent in research in 100 institutions of higher education.

We have no across-the-board program of Federal support of school construction or teachers' salaries at the elementary or secondary level. We have no across-the-board program of Federal aid for construction of academic facilities at the college level.

For years the Federal Government has helped to provide places for the students to eat and sleep—dormitories and dining halls—and also student lounges—but we have not been willing to provide the financial

help to build classrooms, libraries, and laboratories where the students can work.

We have several Federal programs for student assistance at the graduate level—in fact so many that we have advertised for applicants for Fellowship programs—but we have no scholarship programs at the undergraduate level.

This year, the Education Committees in the House and the Senate will be asked to review, expand, and extend the Federal Impact bill and the National Defense Education Act.

In the National Defense Education Act—I would predict that the ceiling on the loan provision would be raised considerably, that the forgiveness feature would either be extended to all teachers in colleges as well as secondary schools and in both public and private schools—or that it would be removed altogether. I would predict that the Fellowship program would be expanded.

This year, I also propose a new program of support in addition to the higher education bill of which I spoke a few moments ago; the establishment of a cooperative education center.

We are aware of the tremendous explosion of knowledge. The National Science Foundation tells us that of all the scientists who have ever lived since the dawn of history over 70 percent are living and working today. Of all the research that has ever been printed—over 50 percent has occurred since 1950. We are also told that every major executive must acquire the equivalent of an additional college education every 10 years just to keep abreast of his competition.

This outpouring stream of knowledge courses through our lives. Its implication is obvious—we must all run faster just to stay in the same relative place.

When I was graduated from college, not even the most imaginative science fiction writers ventured to prophesy that man actually would sail through space. Now we are literally and physically "reaching for the stars." Those who cannot, or will not, stay abreast of these new developments will find that—not the world—but the universe will pass them by.

To provide an adequate research library is often beyond the financial capabilities of many of our 2,000 colleges and universities.

Fully equipped science buildings and laboratories to serve the space age are becoming more and more costly.

Educational television offers great hope—great opportunities—but an individual educational TV station on each campus is out of the question.

A computer system would be of great help to most universities—even though it was not used or needed full time.

In several places—Harrisburg, Pa., in the Amherst, Mount Holyoke area in Massachusetts, in Claremont, Calif., cooperative programs have been started. Tomorrow, I will introduce a bill which will provide Federal assistance for the construction of cooperative educational centers where institutions of higher education in the same locality can share the specialized facilities of such centers and thus develop programs that are beyond the resources of single institutions. This may not be of the greatest help to Harvard and the 100 other institutions which are the recipients of over 90 percent of the Federal research dollar. But, I believe it would help to accomplish what the President's Science Advisory Committee has recommended—an increase in the number of centers of excellence in this country.

The national interest requires an expansion of national support of research in a widening circle of institutions and an expansion of programs designed to increase the supply of highly trained people and college and university teachers.

The bill I am sponsoring will authorize \$75 million for the first year and \$150 million

for the second year in Federal funds to construct cooperative educational centers in 15 areas throughout the country. It is frankly an experimental approach, which has not been considered before in Federal legislation to assist educational institutions. But I believe that it has great possibilities in producing the "centers of excellence" which the President's Science Advisory Committee has recommended.

No institution would lose its identity, and an institution which had made for itself a unique place in the American educational scene because of an outstanding program would find that its whole program would be strengthened, not weakened. It is not designed to create centers of mediocrity, but rather centers of excellence, made possible through the cooperative effort of several colleges and universities.

I am told that college librarians estimate that the number of books in college libraries doubles approximately every 20 to 25 years—not including the proliferation of learned and professional journals and pamphlets. Would it not contribute to academic excellence if two or more higher education institutions cooperatively built a research library, where the faculty and students would have facilities never available at a smaller college?

Through cooperative effort, the curriculums of all colleges participating in an educational center might be broadened and enriched through the offering of courses which no single institution could afford, or could justify. Perhaps a center might provide an engineering laboratory, with its expensive equipment. Or perhaps it might offer the facilities, and attract the learned faculty, for instruction in the languages, culture, and history of some of the newly emerging countries of the world.

And might not a cooperative center raise the quality of education in its participating institutions by enabling outstanding scholars to devote their full teaching time to the specialized field of their choice.

If we are to progress as a nation, we must devote more attention and resources to the education of our youth. And at the same time, we must insure that we are providing quality education.

Philosopher Alfred North Whitehead stated the case for education quite clearly when he said:

"In the conditions of modern life the rule is absolute: The race which does not value trained intelligence is doomed. Not all your heroism, not all your social charm, not all your wit, not all your victories on land or at sea, can move back the finger of fate. Today we maintain ourselves. Tomorrow science will have moved forward yet one more step, and there will be no appeal from the judgment which will then be pronounced on the uneducated."

PAY INCREASE FOR THE MILITARY

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. Bob Wilson] 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 Vermont?

There was no objection.

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, for many months I have been extremely concerned at the delay of the Kennedy administration in pushing for a pay increase for the military, despite the fact that other governmental employees have benefited from pay raises on two occasions since the last general military pay increase in 1958.

Last fall I pledged to introduce, if necessary, and support legislation calling for a substantial pay increase. Included was to be a section correcting the inequities in the pay scales for those retired personnel who left the service prior to July 1958. These retired persons were discriminated against and a great inequity has existed for over 4 years as a result.

A few weeks ago I was heartened to learn that the Defense Department was supporting a pay increase measure amounting to as much as 14 percent in some categories, and also correcting the inequities I mentioned previously.

Rather than introduce my version of a pay bill I have decided to defer such action until the administration's measure comes before the Personnel Subcommittee of the Armed Services Committee. As a member of the subcommittee, I recognize that legislation as introduced by the administration is merely the raw material from which a truly effective and meaningful pay bill can be molded by our subcommittee and subsequently by the Congress.

It is the responsibility of the Congress to act with dispatch on a substantial and constructive pay bill for active duty and retired personnel of our military service and I am looking forward to helping to expedite this much-needed legislation.

MUST WE ALLOW OUR MAILBOXES TO BE INVADED BY UNWANTED OBSCENE MATERIAL?

Mr. STAFFORD. 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. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Vermont?

There was no objection.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, a new flood of objectionable and possibly obscene material is being sent to persons across the country from New York and other places. An article in the Washington Star recently stated that over 25,000 protests had been received by the Post Office Department, and I am sure that most Members have also received similar complaints.

The core of the problem in this field is the attitude of the courts. Repeatedly in recent years court decisions have struck down State, local, and Federal statutes designed to afford a measure of protection against such filthy material, especially protection against such unsolicited material sent through the postal system.

This is not an easy problem to solve, in view of this situation. Yet I think we would all agree that we should seek an answer within the framework of court decisions and constitutional guarantees.

Accordingly, I am introducing today a bill prepared at my request by the staff of the House Post Office Committee in cooperation with the House legislative counsel. It is similar to a bill I introduced in the last Congress in that it

gives certain recourse to the citizen whose mailbox is invaded by unsolicited and unwanted obscene material. The provisions of the bill will also apply to unsolicited and unwanted Communist propaganda.

This bill would allow a citizen who receives unsolicited matter which is obscene or Communist propaganda to notify his postmaster that he does not want to receive any future mail from the sender. The Post Office Department so notifies the mailer, and if additional mail is sent to the person in question, the sender stands to lose his special bulk mailing privileges and permits.

I believe this approach will give partial solution to the problem of this new flood of material. It will not solve the whole problem until we have on the law books an effective antiobscenity law which is upheld in the courts.

The gentleman from Arizona [Mr. UDALL] has a companion measure which he is also introducing today. It is aimed at this same problem but varies in degree. We serve together on the House Post Office Committee and will jointly seek action against this matter.

INCREASE IN AMOUNT OF OUTSIDE EARNINGS ALLOWED RECIPIENTS OF SOCIAL SECURITY RETIREMENT BENEFITS

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. SCHADEBERG] 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 Vermont?

There was no objection.

Mr. SCHADEBERG. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing a bill to increase from \$1,200 to \$1,800 the amount of outside earnings allowed recipients of social security retirement benefits.

This bill would materially assist our retired folks by letting them provide for themselves additional income many of them so desperately need. I introduced similar legislation in the 87th Congress but it was not taken up by the Ways and Means Committee to which it was referred.

My bill would permit the increased earnings without loss to the individual of any of his entitlement to benefits under social security. Moreover, the bill does not add to the cost of the social security program.

Most retired persons who are able to work desire to do so, to be both productive and independent. In this they should be encouraged, not discouraged as so many are by the restrictions imposed on them by the present unrealistic law.

One of the major problems facing our country today is the difficulty our older citizens encounter in trying to provide for themselves on small fixed incomes a decent and dignified life—incomes which remain constant while the cost of living continues to rise.

These citizens paid toward their retirement—through social security assessments and other means—in years

when the dollar had not depreciated to the extent to which it has declined in purchasing power today. Many contributed toward retirement on the basis of a 100-cent dollar and now are being repaid on the basis of a 45-cent dollar.

The earnings limitation of \$1,200 a year penalizes people for living long lives, for having the spirit to want to go on working and being useful and productive, and for having the ability to do so.

Raising the earnings limitation to \$1,800 is not a panacea, but there are plenty of persons I know who would appreciate being allowed to help themselves to that extent.

The Government continues to study and plan ways and means of aiding our retired and older citizens. This to me seems to be one of the best ways and means.

DR. AND MRS. JAE H. YANG

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CURTIS] 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 Vermont?

There was no objection.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced legislation for the relief of Dr. Jae H. Yang and his wife, Jeong S. Yang. The Yangs are natives of Korea who came to this country in the mid-1950's. Through previous action on the administrative level, arrangements were made to change the status of Dr. and Mrs. Yang to immigrants. The legislation which I have now introduced would refer their entry as immigrants back to the date when they actually arrived in this country so that Dr. Yang may obtain his citizenship and qualify for the practice of medicine in the State of Missouri, where the Yangs now reside.

Without this legislative relief, it would be some 7 or 8 years before Dr. Yang could enter the practice of medicine and his talents would be wasted during that time. General legislation to assist those among the top quota immigrants, which was passed last year, did not cover the group of which Dr. Yang and his wife are a part, but the underlying philosophy of the general legislation applies to the Yangs case as well. I would urge early action to determine the eligibility of the Yangs for relief and the merits of their case.

TO MEET THE SOVIET ECONOMIC CHALLENGE

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CURTIS] 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 Vermont?

There was no objection.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, the battles of the cold war are fought on many fronts, in space technology, the minds of men and the complexities of international trade and economics. These are

difficult battles in which the advantage goes not to brute strength but to ideas. One of the most important of these cold war battles is fought in the field of international commerce, and this was one of the bases for the enactment last Congress of the Trade Expansion Act. To win in the area of international economics, we and our free world allies must keep strong the trade links which bind us and those which harmonize the economics of the uncommitted nations with the economics of the Western alliance.

The use of international trade as a weapon in international relations is as old as commerce itself. It is a refined game, played for high stakes. We must master it if we are to be secure against the threat of the international Communist movement.

The United States and its allies have some important advantages in this contest. We are far stronger than our opponents economically. In this context, I should like to make note of the excellent work which has been done by the Joint Economic Committee in bringing the facts of the comparative economic strength of the United States and the Soviet Union to light. Through the efforts of this committee, and the generous cooperation of experts throughout the country, much valuable information in this field has been brought to a focus. And the inevitable conclusion to be drawn from this information is the superiority of the United States and the free world's economy over that of the Soviets.

This is not to dismiss the threat which the Soviet Union poses, however. The Soviet economy is strong, overwhelming unless matched by the economic force of the free world leaders. And, as a controlled economy, it can be used in ways which are not open to the economic or political leaders of our free economy. The Soviet economy is subject to manipulation for the ends of the political state. There need be no economic justification for these acts; their political impact is the profit they seek. Thus the Soviet economy can be used effectively in spot situations, concentrating its strength in predetermined areas, even against the stronger and sounder Western economies.

The examples of such use are a legion. Basically they come down to a pattern not unlike that of the classical monopoly. The monopolist, or the Soviet international trader, chooses a market within which to operate and by cutrate, cutthroat tactics drives all competition from the market. Then each seeks his own profit: The monopolist by forcing prices up where there is no longer any competition to keep them down and the Communist by infiltrating the economic and political structure of the trade partner it has chosen and welding it irrevocably to the Communist bloc. Or the Communist goal may be merely to disrupt a mutually advantageous trade relationship between two countries outside of the Communist bloc. In either event the result is detrimental to the goals of the free world.

The immediate targets of the Soviets in such a spot economic invasion are the free world companies doing business in

a particular place. It is only through driving them from the market that the Soviet goals can be achieved, and they cannot long stand against the concentrated strength of the Soviet economy, which is willing to weaken itself overall for the chance of a particular victory.

To effectively counteract this threat of Soviet economic pressure, I have today introduced a bill to establish a U.S. Trading Corporation. This bill would create a corporate body under the aegis of the U.S. Government which would provide assistance to private enterprises against whom the weight of Soviet economic might is asserted in particular market areas. It would help nullify the short-range competitive advantage of the Soviet controlled economy and place American businesses in a position to compete successfully with the tactics of the Soviets in this phase of cold war battling. The powers of the Corporation are made broad in the bill for great flexibility will be necessary to counter the broad range of challenges in the complex field of international commerce. Basically, however, the Corporation will be a service unit for American business, not controlling or coercing it but standing ready to assist when the challenge of concentrated economic power is placed against our firms.

This will not end the competition with the Soviet Union in the world's market-places. There is no one easy way in which we can achieve victory. This is one step, however, which will help strengthen the position of the United States and the free world in meeting the Communist threat.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CURTIS] 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 Vermont?

There was no objection.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, it is quite fitting, in light of the protracted 2d session of the 87th Congress which scarcely sputtered to a halt before election day, that the Congress turn its attention on the day it convenes to the question of when it shall adjourn. For this reason I have today reintroduced a bill which I offered in the closing days of the last Congress in the hope that by raising the point now, rather than next autumn, we can spare ourselves the unhappy experience of another 10-month session this year.

My bill is quite simple, it merely calls upon the Congress to abide by the decision which was made in the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946; that is, to adjourn by July 31. This decision was based upon sound reasoning, I believe. It recognized that if the Congress would put its mind to its work it could finish its business by that date. If, instead of wasting the first 3 months of the legislative year in sessions whose most important and most time-consuming business was the opening prayer, this time could

be put to use, we could shorten the time the Congress must meet and do the same amount of business.

It also recognized that the Congressman, to do an adequate job of representing his constituency, must be a part of the community he represents and it was designed to give him a chance to keep his roots firmly settled among the people of his district. I have been taken to task from time to time when I say that the job of the Congressman should be a part-time job. This is not to say that a Congressman should not give the best he has to the job; far from it, it means that to do the job here he must keep himself current with the thoughts and feelings of those he represents. He cannot represent his district when he lives in and feels himself a part of the Washington area. He must keep his interests and his contacts in his home area alive. He must be a part-time Congressman and devote the rest of his time to maintaining the liaison between his constituency and himself.

Certainly the majority of the Congress itself has no desire to spend ever more weeks and months in session every year.

As I noted, the July 31 date is fixed by law as the date upon which the Congress is to adjourn. Yet it does not do so, for the law provides also, and with good reason, that the Congress may stay in session beyond that date in years when there is a war or national emergency. And we are, according to the record, living in a period of national emergency, so proclaimed by President Truman on December 16, 1950, to meet the Korean crisis. I contend the crisis which brought about this proclamation of a national emergency has ended insofar as it bears upon the adjournment date of Congress and my bill so states.

Certainly, should other grave national emergencies arise, requiring the Congress to meet beyond the July deadline, provision can then be made for continued meeting by the proclamation of an emergency or by vote of the Congress, another procedure authorized in the Reorganization Act for lengthening the congressional session. But I believe we should recognize that, for purposes of holding the Congress in session past a reasonable date, the Korean war is over.

It may seem early in the session to worry about adjournment, but if we do not think about it now and if we do not put our shoulders to the wheel from the very beginning, we shall once again be forced to stay in session long past the Reorganization Act's appointed adjournment date.

DR. NARAYAN CHANDRA GUPTA

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CURTIS] 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 Vermont?

There was no objection.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, I have today reintroduced a bill for the relief

of Dr. Narayan Chandra Gupta, a doctor presently residing in the St. Louis, Mo., area who entered this country under our exchange program.

It is the policy of the Congress and of the executive agencies who administer our immigration statutes to look with disfavor on all but the very rare cases in which a visitor to this country under an exchange program wishes to alter his status to that of immigrant while residing in the United States. Our exchange program is based upon the idea that Americans will go abroad and foreign nationals come to this country, each spending some time absorbing the culture and learning of the other so that they might return to their homes and enrich the understanding between the countries.

There must be flexibility in these programs, however, and private legislation is one means of providing it. Dr. Gupta is a Hindu, a native of an area which was incorporated into Pakistan at the time of the division of the Indian subcontinent. It is out of the question for him to return to his home and he has no place in the present country of India to which he can return as a home. I believe that this is the type of case which should be given consideration by the proper congressional authorities to see if a special exception, in the form of private legislative relief, is justified.

MEDICAL CARE INSURANCE

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BOW] 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 Vermont?

There was no objection.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a new version of my voluntary plan for medical care of all Americans over the age of 65.

The Bow bill provides Federal Government assistance for the payment of premiums for medical care insurance, either through the issuance of a certificate which may be used by those of little income to pay their premiums or by a tax credit for those of higher income.

The new bill raises the amount of premium that will be covered through either kind of Government assistance from \$125 to \$150, with corresponding increases in the benefits specified as minimum essentials of a satisfactory medical care insurance contract.

Also included is an income limitation restricting benefits of the bill to individuals age 65 with incomes of \$4,000 per year or less, and married couples with incomes of \$8,000 per year or less.

I estimate that the income limitation would leave some 14.7 million Americans over 65 eligible to participate in the insurance program.

I believe this is the best solution to the problem of medical care for persons over 65. It preserves their freedom of choice, it encourages improvement in the policies offered by insurance carriers of

all classes, it offers incentive to relatives and former employers to give assistance, and it eliminates any possibility of Government interference with the hospital or medical establishments of this country.

I hope it will have widespread support in Congress, in both parties. The experience of some 35 Members of Congress who introduced the 1962 bill indicates that it has widespread popular support.

THE IOWA PLAN FOR PROGRESS AND GROWTH IN EDUCATION

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. SCHWENGEL] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, yesterday I introduced a bill on higher education which I believe holds out more promise for real solutions in this area of education, that we need to come to grips with, than any proposition yet offered. Because this bill was pretty largely conceived and evolved through a program of study and research at the University of Iowa we have chosen to call this the "Iowa Plan for Progress and Growth in Education."

I had hoped that this bill would have a very low number; in fact, I had hoped it could have No. 1 billing on our schedule. I had hoped that because I think education is the No. 1 problem of America. Obviously this is not going to be possible but it seems I do have the first opportunity to speak, under a special order, in this Congress; so in that way at least education is getting No. 1 billing here in the Congress.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to point out that the greatest need of our Republic, I believe, is an educated constituency, citizens with a thorough understanding of the basic philosophies on which our system is built, with the ability to choose intelligently leaders to govern itself. It is my firm belief that the answer to our Nation's problems and the challenge of freedom everywhere is more and better education for all people everywhere.

Education in America, and I think in most places of the world, is now geared to and lays great stress on scientific pursuits of our age. The pursuit of scientific achievement is certainly not wrong, but we must also learn to control this knowledge and to learn to live with each other more intelligently and more adequately. In order to assure this, we must also encourage putting great stress on the teaching of the basic philosophies that deal with man's human relations.

I believe it is a paradox of our time that we live in a time when we can create and control missiles that reach 54 million miles from the earth but, as is evident in so many of our recent experiences in society, still not reach the hearts and minds of people on the basic principles of human decency.

I believe our Nation was founded by a multitude of different people with a multitude of different ideas. From the amalgamation of these men and their ideas came the great Nation we are pleased to call America. This diversity of ideas is reflected in our system of

higher education, in which the student can choose from a great variety of colleges and universities and, once in those schools, choose from a great variety of subject material, making for a diversity of opportunity and ideas which serve both to encourage growth and to give us strength and stature as a nation and as a people.

Compare this to the authoritarian selection and appointment to specific courses of study in the Soviet system, which, because of this, has a built-in weakness, a weakness which I think we should avoid. Certainly the preservation of our system of freedom in higher education and the opportunity afforded the individual regardless of his status must be preserved, encouraged, and extended, if our system is to survive. Our system will not survive by an imitation of the singleminded system of the Communists. Rather, I think to remain great, to progress and grow, we must adhere to the principles that made us great.

The value of and the need for higher education, I repeat, is inestimable. The individual involved gains a lifetime earning power as well as ability to understand and appreciate his society and the societies of others.

Mr. Speaker, the whole Nation thus benefits in that higher education better prepares an individual to participate in his society and, more importantly, to contribute to the solution of the problems of that society. It may be accurate to say that the future success of our Nation and the continued existence of our way of life depends on making the benefits of higher education available to the greatest possible number of people.

However, the cost of obtaining college and university education has steadily increased. Today the cost of obtaining such an education is prohibitive for many and will become so for an increasing number in the years ahead. For those faced with the prospect of financing an education for more than one child, especially at the same time, the dilemma is oftentimes compounded.

Certainly, there is no business in my thinking more important than the business of education. At a time when every person and the Nation is expected to find and apply the very best of its talents in order to compete with and defeat those who would destroy freedom, it is imperative that we show some interest in the 27 percent of the parents of college age students, capable of doing college level work, who are unable to send their children to college because their budget will not permit including this expense without lowering of their own standard of living.

Making it possible for all of these young people to get a college education will do much to fulfill the demands made on us in these very critical and challenging times in which we live.

In this decade, our system and way of life has put a greater emphasis on the values of higher education than ever before. As a result, college enrollment figures have shown a greater increase than the growth of our population. During this period, the population of the United States grew only 18.5 percent or only about one-third the rate of growth of our

colleges and universities in America. Between the falls of 1958 and 1959 there was an increase of 143,741 or 4.5 percent in the enrollment of universities, liberal arts colleges, teachers colleges, technological schools, religious schools, and junior colleges in the United States. During that period a total enrollment of 3,402,297 full- or part-time students compared with 3,258,556 in the previous year. Between 1957 and 1958 the enrollment increase was an additional 5.5 percent. A more alarming figure, perhaps, is the increasing number of freshmen entering our colleges and universities each year. The number of freshmen enrolling in the fall of 1959 was 5.6 percent above the total freshman enrollment of 1958. For the year 1962-63 it is anticipated by the U.S. Office of Education that enrollment in institutions of higher learning will increase 300,000.

There can be no doubt that powerful social, industrial, and population factors are not only putting tremendous pressures on our institutions of higher learning, but on the individual, and his family, who desires a college education. Let me cite some facts to substantiate this and to give stress to what I am trying to talk about today:

First. A distinguished scientist reminds us that we are doubling our knowledge in science each 10 years—think of that.

Second. Then ponder the implications of this one by an authority on science: 90 percent of all of the scientists who ever lived are living today.

Third. For all of those interested in the health of our people: 90 percent of all drugs used today were unknown 10 years ago.

Fourth. The implications of automation are reflected in this one: 90 percent of all of the light bulbs produced today are manufactured by only 12 men.

Fifth. As to the efficiency of the American farmer is noted when I tell you that today a smaller percent of the population is producing more food for the whole population today than ever before, and that percentage is going down every year.

Sixth. Labor leaders and economists need to know that three-fourths of the working force which will be employed in our plants and factories in 1975—and that is only 13 years away—will be turning out products which have not yet been invented.

Seventh. The future burden of our schools is reflected in this one: By the year 2000—only 37 years away—the average person now in high school will need to be retrained vocationally three times before he retires.

Eighth. It is hard to imagine but they say by the year 2000 travel by rockets will be as commonplace as travel by jets is today.

Ninth. That we are living in a period of revolution becomes certain when I tell you that there have been 63 generations of people since the time of Christ and more changes have occurred in the past 1½ generations than in all the rest of time.

I think, in addition, that it is obvious in view of all this that we are going to have to know something about the hu-

manities if we are to enjoy the benefits of science.

Recent studies point out that in all probability this trend will continue or even accelerate during the decade ahead. In 1940 only 15 percent of all Americans between the ages of 18 and 24 were enrolled in institutions of higher learning.

By 1950, this proportion had reached 30 percent, or double the percentage in only 10 years. However, this financial increase can in some measure be attributed to the large number of ex-servicemen receiving financial aid through the GI bill. By 1960 this figure reached 40 percent, and it is expected that fully one-half of the persons in this age group will be attending college by 1970, if the present trends continue.

As could be expected from these figures, more students from lower income families are attending colleges and universities now than in the past, and an increasing number from these families are expected in future years. However, there are still a great many potentially excellent students who are unable to obtain educations above the high school level. A recent study has revealed that approximately 50 percent of the students graduating in the upper one-fourth of their high school classes do not go on to college. Of that 50 percent, lack of the necessary funds prevents the majority from attending.

A survey in the April 1960 issue of *Scholastic Teacher* pointed out that 63 percent of the high school students taking part in the survey said they planned to go on to college. The survey also showed that only 22 percent, or only about one-third of those interested in attending college, have the funds necessary to finance a college education.

Elmer Roper in a recent survey for the Ford Foundation found that 69 percent of the parents interviewed say they expect to send their children to college, but only three-fifths of these families feel that they can afford to do so. The U.S. Office of Education estimates that by 1970 the cost of obtaining a college education will be double that of today if the present economic spiral continues.

To be in harmony with our heritage it is certainly imperative that we seek sound answers to these crises in higher education. None of the Federal planning or programing will meet this challenge. Because of this, and the challenge set forth in the book, "Decisions for a Better America," by the Republican Committee on Program and Progress headed by Charles H. Percy, which among other things predicts that by the year 1976—the bicentennial year—there will be—listen to this—12 million young Americans seeking a college education—1976. As we look to the future there will be 12 million boys and girls wanting to go to college compared to 3,400,000 in college today. Think of that a little.

So this is the reason that I directed my research team of college students at the State University of Iowa Law School under the direction of professors Dr. Deil Wright and Dr. Rosell Ross of the political science department to make a thorough study of the problems of higher education.

The result of this study and program is what we choose to call the "Iowa Plan for Growth and Progress in Higher Education"; in short, the "Iowa plan."

After further study and refinement of bills I introduced in the 87th Congress I have combined into one bill two-thirds of the Iowa plan. It is my belief that this, along with phase 3 yet to be written, and the Iowa plan, comes closer to meeting the real needs of higher education than any plan I have seen or has been presented in the Congress.

Section 1 of the Iowa plan would grant to the parents or guardian or their designee a \$50 tax credit each year for each child up to the age 18 or entrance into college—whichever is first—providing that an investment certificate was purchased at a private savings and loan company, a bank, an insurance company, or any other financial institution meeting the requirements of law. These certificates, which would be negotiable only at an institution of higher learning, would create a loan fund upon which colleges and universities could borrow. The handling of these funds is not at this time in bill form; this will involve the formation of State policy and authorization boards to handle the funds on deposit from the purchase of investment certificates. In case the child did not attend college the account established for him would revert to the Treasury, or perhaps into a special fund, which would be used to make grants to educational institutions.

These certificates, at \$50 a year, plus interest, would amount to approximately \$1,400 at the time of college entrance. In addition to this the student attending a recognized and approved institution of higher learning could apply for a loan from the revolving fund created by these investment certificates.

Section 2 of the Iowa plan would grant a \$100 tax credit to the person sustaining the major burden of the student's expense in school, or his designee. This would bring the total fund to \$1,800, distributed over a period of 4 years. Again, the student would have access to this revolving fund in the form of a loan, should his financial status be such that he needs additional funds and if he or she attended an approved institution of higher learning.

Mr. Speaker, a nation that finds it good business to sustain a revenue loss of \$11.3 billion a year due to depreciation allowances—and this figure does not take account of the estimated further revenue loss of \$1.5 billion resulting from the latest liberalization—should find it good business to grant a tax credit to parents who have ambitions for their children in higher education.

A nation that finds it wise in the interest of free enterprise, and apparently it is, to support laws on expense accounts that prevent between \$1 and \$2 million revenue from entering our Treasury can support laws that grant a tax credit of \$50 a year to parents who desire to send their children to college.

An administration that feels business will be aided by an investment tax credit that will cost the Treasury an estimated

\$1,340 billion should show some interest in a tax credit to extend the opportunities for a higher education to our citizens. A Government that finds it in the national interest to grant depletion allowances that result in a loss of revenue close to \$2 billion, of which approximately \$1 billion involves gas and oil, should find it in the national interest to grant a tax credit aiding those on whom our future depends; indeed, upon which our future system depends.

Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, what this Nation cannot afford is to neglect the freedom and well-being of our educational institutions.

Our studies indicate that the Iowa plan would be an investment in higher education of approximately \$2 billion a year. However, this figure would be reduced by the fact that the Iowa plan would replace some of the Federal programs now in existence.

It is estimated that over a period of years a revolving fund of \$20 billion would result from the purchase of educational certificates. This \$20 billion would do a great deal to stabilize and to expand the private sector of our economy. This leads me to say just a few words about phase 3 of the Iowa plan. This phase is still in the research stage. This, however, is what it would involve. As I mentioned, a revolving fund of \$20 billion would build up in just a few years. A State board, made up of about 25 members representing the major interest groups of the State—labor, business, various leaders in the field of education, the professions, and so forth—would be set up. This board would be a policy committee to study the major problems of higher education in that particular State. The board would also be authorized to make loans to institutions of higher learning and to individual students if they can prove the need and ability to repay. This would mean a fund that would enable the expansion of the school's physical plant, its library, or whatever the individual institution felt its need to be.

Mr. Speaker, this is a tax credit proposal that gives a fairer distribution of benefit than does the administration's tax credit for business program.

This is a plan which would greatly stimulate and encourage our economy, though that is not its major objective.

This is a plan which avoids the church-state issue.

This is a plan which avoids Federal control and allows those closest to the individual problems of higher education to work on them as they see fit.

This is a plan which looks to the future and builds for that future.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. McGown, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment a concurrent resolution of the House of the following title:

H. Con. Res. 1. Concurrent resolution establishing that the two Houses of Congress assemble in the Hall of the House of Representatives on January 14, 1963, at 12:30 o'clock in the afternoon.

TELECASTING PUBLIC HEARINGS OF HOUSE COMMITTEES

Mr. MEADER. 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 Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. MEADER. Mr. Speaker, yesterday I introduced two resolutions relating to telecasting, broadcasting, and still and motion photography of public hearings of House committees.

The first resolution is essentially the same as one I have introduced in previous Congresses. It would amend rule XI of the House rules to authorize committees to permit radio, TV, and photographic coverage of their public hearings.

The second resolution would contain the same provisions as the first with the exception that it would be limited to the sessions of the 88th Congress and would be a special resolution, rather than an amendment to the House rules.

I was encouraged to adopt this alternative approach by a passage in a speech delivered at the fall conference of the National Association of Broadcasters by NAB President Leroy Collins, October 25, 1962. It reads as follows:

In the past few weeks Howard Bell and I have consulted with House Speaker JOHN MCCORMACK and the chairman of the House Rules Committee, Representative HOWARD SMITH, about the possibility of the House modifying its bar to broadcast coverage of its committee hearings. And I am pleased to report that these conversations were "most cordial and useful"—to borrow a phrase from the State Department.

Specifically, Judge SMITH, with no commitment of his ultimate position, has agreed that the Rules Committee will hear us early in the next session on a proposal to modify—at least on an experimental basis—the so-called Rayburn rule barring broadcast coverage of House hearings.

My resolution on this subject in the 87th Congress—House Resolution 173—was narrowly defeated in the Rules Committee by a vote of 8 to 6 on February 22, 1961.

There seems to be a good prospect of this reform being adopted, at least on a temporary basis, if the public and trade associations and others concerned with news of House committee hearings would make that interest known and request an opportunity to present facts and arguments before a hearing of the Rules Committee. I was the only witness testifying on my resolution at the hearing 2 years ago.

The text of the resolutions follows:

Resolved, That rule XI26(g) of the Rules of the House of Representatives is hereby amended by inserting "1" immediately after "(g)", and by adding at the end thereof the following:

"(2) Each committee may, upon such terms and conditions as it deems advisable, permit the broadcasting and telecasting of its public hearings by radio and television, and the dissemination of news of such hearings by such methods and by other methods and media of communication."

Resolved, That, during the Eighty-eighth Congress, each standing or select committee of the House of Representatives may, upon

such terms and conditions as it deems advisable, permit the broadcasting and telecasting of its public hearings by radio and television, and the dissemination of news of such hearings by such methods and by other methods and media of communication.

THE LARSEN REPORT ON THE STATE DEPARTMENT'S CULTURAL PRESENTATIONS PROGRAM

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. WIDNALL] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Speaker, a Department of State press release of December 21, 1962—press release No. 744—reports that four major recommendations to improve the U.S. program of overseas cultural presentations were made in a report submitted on that date to the Department of State by the U.S. Advisory Commission on International Educational and Cultural Affairs.

The 30-page report was based on a survey conducted by Mr. Roy E. Larsen, Vice Chairman of the Advisory Commission and chairman of the executive committee of Time, Inc., and Mr. Glenn G. Wolfe, a veteran Foreign Service officer, at the request of Mr. Lucius D. Battle, Assistant Secretary for Educational and Cultural Affairs of the Department of State.

Mr. Battle, we are advised by the press release, said he accepted the conclusions and recommendations of the Larsen report "in general," and noted that some points in it would require further study before being acted upon.

The Larsen report, based on interviews with more than 50 persons and study of all available documents on the program since its inception in 1954, described this record as "a paradox of inspiring achievement on the one hand and troublesome obstacles on the other."

In recommending reconstitution of the Advisory Committee on the Arts, the Larsen Commission said that the Committee, authorized by law in 1956, has not been effectively used by State Department officials in conducting the cultural presentations program, and added:

So greatly had its functions diminished that it has not even been reappointed since the passage of the Fulbright-Hays Act of 1961.

The function of the revitalized Committee would be, according to the Larsen Commission, "to provide overall policy-level guidance and counsel" to the administrators of the program.

In a related recommendation, the Larsen report said the State Department should assume the functions now discharged under contract by the American National Theater and Academy—ANTA—and a subordinate branch, the International Cultural Exchange Service—ICES.

The Larsen Commission noted that:

ANTA's role was to appoint and bring together panels of experts to pass only on the artistic caliber of performers and, through ICES, to make all tour arrangements with performers selected by the Department.

The arrangement with the American National Theater and Academy, though

undoubtedly essential in the early days of the program, has proved to have inherent shortcomings, according to the Larsen Commission, "not because of a lack of devotion or competence on the part of the people involved, but because of the inadequacy of the organizational arrangement itself."

Observing that long-range planning could "dissipate a great many complaints and annoyances," the Larsen Commission suggested a "3-year forward projection of the program." It said that some of the time required to prepare the 3-year plan could be gained by withholding commitment of the balance of fiscal year 1963 program funds until late in the fiscal year, which ends June 30, 1963.

The Larsen report says that:

While this may have the unfortunate consequences of not having any attractions abroad during the spring season of 1963, it is our opinion that such a sacrifice at this time will greatly enhance the potentials of the program's future.

As a feature of long-range planning, the report suggested that consideration be given to selection of amateur groups by a system of competitions.

In recommending increased recognition for participating artists and groups, the Larsen Commission cited the need for "increased psychic incentives." The existing incentives—travel, opportunity to serve the national interest, monetary compensation, enhancement of professional reputation—are important but not enough, according to the Commission which stated that:

The ideals and aims of the program are such that there should also be about it an aura of greater value, and the distinction that springs from the recognition of excellence.

The Larsen Commission reported without comment a suggestion that participants be issued a cultural certificate by the Secretary of State and that an honor award from the Secretary or the President be conferred on those judged by the Advisory Committee on the Arts to have completed the most successful tours.

The effort to enhance the atmosphere surrounding the cultural presentations program, the Larsen report stressed, should be directed "not only toward potential artistic representatives, but also toward their environment—the American public."

On this latter point, the Larsen report said that:

Perhaps one of the great weaknesses, as well as a major source of uninformed criticism, is the lack of broad knowledge or understanding by the American people of the program and its purposes. * * * What seems to be vitally needed is full knowledge of the nature, purpose and character of the cultural presentations program among Americans—knowledge that, properly presented, could result in an image with a strong appeal to American pride.

As to the purpose of the cultural presentations program, the Larsen Commission offered its own appraisal:

It is to reflect abroad the state of the performing arts in America, both in terms of creative cultural vitality and of the desire and capacity of a free people to support the development of a flourishing national culture.

Mr. Speaker, little publicity has been given this report to date, a fact which, I am told, has concerned the Department of State. Yet it is one of the more important documents of our time in its through-going analysis of a highly significant part of our foreign policy.

I am, therefore, including it in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD as a part of my remarks so that it will be generally available.

At the same time, I should like to point out that I introduced yesterday a joint resolution to carry out the major recommendations made in the Larsen report and to implement those recommendations by a number of steps which, I hope, will meet with the approval of my colleagues.

The time is auspicious to bring our country's cultural presentations program up to date, especially in view of the impetus given to cultural exchange by the enthusiastic welcome extended to the Mona Lisa in the Nation's Capital by the American people.

The joint resolution I have introduced would advance peaceful relations between the United States and other nations by strengthening and expanding the Mutual Educational and Cultural Exchange Act of 1961 by such steps as:

First. Implementing the recommendations of the Larsen report.

Second. Establishing biennial art competitions similar to those in European countries which give the arts a status equal to that provided athletics by the international Olympic games.

Third. Coordinating those cultural exchange and cultural presentations programs carried on with Latin America with the Organization of American States and the Pan American Union.

Fourth. Providing at mainland colleges and universities centers for technical and cultural interchange similar to that at the University of Hawaii which was established with Federal aid.

As to the art competitions which my joint resolution provides, let me say that Pierre Salinger suggested the establishment of such competitions together with an American music and art prize in a speech on March 8, 1961, to a National Symphony Orchestra luncheon in Washington, D.C.

Mr. Salinger said at that time that the President was very interested in establishing an American music and art prize. National prizes are, of course, well known abroad where they have made major contributions to the discovery, encouragement, and advancement of young artists and thus have served important national purposes.

In the spirit of bipartisanship I sent a draft of my proposed joint resolution to President Kennedy's special consultant on the arts and received, under date of December 27, 1962, a letter containing a number of helpful suggestions which I incorporated in the joint resolution which I have introduced.

At the same time some excellent suggestions were made by the Secretary of the Interior; among them, first, that the upper age limitation for award winners should be 30 years of age rather than 25 as I had originally proposed, and second,

that the chairmanship of the President's Special Interagency Committee—such interagency committees are authorized in the Mutual Educational and Cultural Exchange Act—should rotate among the Secretaries of State, Interior, and Health, Education, and Welfare. I have adopted these most excellent suggestions in toto.

Encouragement and suggestions came also from Adelyn D. Breeskin, director of the Washington Gallery of Modern Art; Prof. Jack Morrison, of the Department of Theater Arts of the University of California at Los Angeles, a founding member of the National Council of the Arts in Education; and Dr. Carl F. Hansen, Superintendent of Schools of the District of Columbia.

I have been told that deLesseps S. Morrison, Ambassador Representative of the United States of America on the Council of the Organization of American States, had indicated some support for an enlarged role for the OAS and the Pan American Union in the cultural exchange programs between the United States and Latin America.

I should like to conclude my remarks by recalling the following statement by President Eisenhower, from his speech at Delhi University in India in December 1959, which I regard so highly that I included it in the preamble to my joint resolution:

More enduringly than from the deliberations of high councils mankind will profit when young men and women of all nations and in great numbers study and learn together. In so doing, they will concern themselves with the problems, possibilities, resources and rewards of their common destiny.

Through the centuries nations have sent their youth armed for war to oppose their neighbors. Let us in this day look on our youth, eager for a larger and clear knowledge, as forces for international understanding; and send them, one nation to another, on missions of peace.

THE WHITE HOUSE,

Washington, D.C., December 27, 1962.

HON. WILLIAM B. WIDNALL,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: Thank you for sending me the draft of the proposed joint resolution.

This seems interesting to me. The idea of a festival has been much discussed. The idea of limiting it to young artists is a good one. Would it not be better, however, to plan to hold it biennially rather than annually? An advisory council for the recognition of young artists is a new suggestion. I would hope in any case that the role of the young artist—his training and opportunities—would be one of the important areas which an Advisory Council on the Arts would consider.

Up until now, we have not had the personnel or the organization necessary to create such a festival as you have in mind. The National Cultural Center would seem a normal channel through which this could be done—perhaps working in cooperation with the President's Consultant on the Arts. I do hope that the National Cultural Center will begin activities of this sort even before its buildings are completed.

I hope these comments may be of some interest.

Sincerely yours,

AUGUST HECKSCHER,
Special Consultant on the Arts.

[From Newsweek magazine, Jan. 14, 1963]

EXCHANGE EXAMINED

When the United States began shipping out culture on an official level 8 years ago, the purpose, apparently, was to show the world that American musicians, dancers, actors, and athletes were as gifted as their touring Russian counterparts. The keynote seemed to be competition. Now, according to a survey and report released by the State Department last week, the cultural presentations program "is neither designed nor suited to carry on cultural competition with the Sino-Soviet bloc, nor any other country or bloc."

A more realistic appraisal of purpose, the 30-page document continues, "is to reflect abroad the state of the performing arts in America, both in terms of creative cultural vitality and of the desire and capacity of a free people to support the development of a flourishing national culture."

The report grew out of an investigation started 3 months ago at the request of Lucius D. Battle, Assistant Secretary of State for Educational and Cultural Affairs. Battle's action was prompted by sharp criticism, especially in Congress, of both the purpose and the administration of the cultural presentations program. Battle suspended the program, except for those attractions already committed to overseas contracts, pending the results of the inquiry conducted by Roy E. Larsen, chairman of the executive committee of Time, Inc., and Glenn G. Wolfe, a Foreign Service officer familiar with administrative problems in Government.

GUIDANCE

After praising culture as a force in international goodwill, the report made specific recommendations for improving the program itself. The most significant was that the State Department should take over the managerial functions previously assigned to the American National Theater and Academy, ANTA, which has been paid \$110,000 a year as the program's administrator, was "commended" for its past services, but a change was recommended "because of the need to eliminate duplication, to clarify responsibilities, and to provide direct policy guidance."

The report suggested that proper policy guidance might be best obtained through revitalizing the now inactive Advisory Committee on the arts with new membership, and retaining the panels of experts set up by ANTA to screen talent for overseas. It also pointed out that "what seems to be vitally needed is full knowledge of the nature, purpose, and character of the cultural presentations program among Americans—knowledge that, properly presented, could result in an 'image' with strong appeal to American pride."

[From the Evening Star, Mar. 20, 1961]

MOVE FOR ART, MUSIC PRIZES

President Kennedy is very interested in establishing an American music and art prize, according to his press secretary, Pierre Salinger.

Mr. Salinger said the President had asked him to explore the possibilities of such a prize and had put him in charge of preliminary plans.

In a taped interview over WGMS yesterday, Mr. Salinger said that within the next 2 weeks a forming committee will be organized. He said the prize idea had received an overwhelming reaction and pledges of large amounts of money for the project have been received at the White House.

Mr. Salinger first suggested such a prize during a National Symphony Orchestra sustaining fund luncheon earlier this month, together with an idea borrowed from violinist Isaac Stern for a national youth orchestra.

[From the Washington Post, Mar. 20, 1961]
**MUSIC-ART PRIZE GETTING BIG SUPPORT,
 SALINGER SAYS**

Presidential Press Secretary Pierre Salinger said yesterday there has been overwhelming response to the idea of a White House-sponsored American music and arts prize and the project is going forward.

Salinger said pledges of large amounts of money have been among the many communications received and within 2 weeks a forming committee will be organized. He said President Kennedy is very interested.

Salinger said also in a radio interview (WGMS) that there will be White House representation at the National Symphony Orchestra concerts, including the President and Mrs. Kennedy when their schedules permit.

The idea for such a national prize was first suggested by Salinger at a National Symphony fund luncheon early this month. The press secretary is an accomplished pianist and has played many concerts.

[Press release from the Department of State,
 Dec. 21, 1962]

**U.S. ADVISORY COMMISSION SUBMITS REPORT
 ON CULTURAL PRESENTATIONS PROGRAM**

Four major recommendations to improve the U.S. program of overseas cultural presentations are contained in a report submitted today to the Department of State.

The report was based on a survey conducted by a nongovernmental commission at the request of Mr. Lucius D. Battle, Assistant Secretary for Educational and Cultural Affairs.

Mr. Battle said he accepted the conclusions and recommendations of the report "in general," noting that some points would require further study before being acted upon.

The 30-page report of the U.S. Advisory Commission on International Educational and Cultural Affairs was turned over to Mr. Battle by Dr. John W. Gardner, Commission Chairman and president of the Carnegie Corp. of New York.

In laying the foundation for its recommendations, the Commission stressed three points: artistic excellence as the preeminent criterion of the program; the strong roles played by both professionals and amateurs; and the importance of "offstage" activities, such as clinics and student workshops, in gaining appreciation of America's cultural strength. To achieve these and other aims, the report recommended:

1. The role of the Advisory Committee on the Arts be revitalized and expanded to include selection of program attractions.
2. The State Department reassume full responsibility for direct management of all phases of the program, which consists of the sending abroad of American performers in music, drama, the dance, and sports.
3. Long-range planning to meet objectives in various areas of the world be adopted as formal policy and practice.
4. Increased recognition be given those who participate in the program.

Mr. Battle said he concurred in early appointment of members of the Advisory Committee on the Arts, with whom he would discuss implementation of the report.

The Commission's 9-week survey was conducted by Mr. Roy E. Larsen, vice chairman of the Advisory Commission and chairman of the executive committee of Time, Inc., and Mr. Glenn G. Wolfe, a veteran Foreign Service officer. In thanking the Commission, Mr. Battle said:

"I am especially grateful to Mr. Larsen, who devoted so much time and effort in spite of his many heavy responsibilities, and to Mr. Wolfe, whose long Government experience was indispensable to this study."

The report, based on interviews with more than 50 persons and study of all available documents on the program since its incep-

tion in 1954, describes the record as "a paradox of inspiring achievement on the one hand and troublesome obstacles on the other."

In recommending reconstitution of the Advisory Committee on the Arts, the Commission said that the Committee, authorized by law in 1956, had not been effectively used by State Department officials in conducting the cultural presentations program, adding: "So greatly had its functions diminished that it has not even been reappointed since the passage of the Fulbright-Hays Act of 1961." The function of the revitalized Committee would be "to provide overall policy-level guidance and counsel" to administrators of the program.

In a related recommendation, the report says the State Department should assume the functions now discharged under contract by the American National Theatre and Academy (ANTA) and a subordinate branch, the International Cultural Exchange Service (ICES).

"ANTA's role," the Commission noted, "was to appoint and bring together panels of experts to pass only on the artistic caliber of performers and, through ICES, to make all tour arrangements with performers selected by the Department."

The report had high praise for the panel members and recommended they be formally reappointed by the Advisory Committee on the Arts and continue their work as consultants to the Committee. To eliminate overlapping and conflicts, the Department of State would take over the job of tour management, including contract negotiation, and continue the present system of overseas management through U.S. diplomatic missions.

The ANTA arrangement, though undoubtedly essential in the early days of the program, proved to have inherent shortcomings, the report said, "not because of a lack of devotion or competence on the part of the people involved, but because of the inadequacy of the organizational arrangement itself." It continued:

"Having fulfilled so well its assignment over the past 8 years, ANTA richly deserves the thanks and commendation of the Government."

Observing that long-range planning could "dissipate a great many complaints and annoyances," the Commission suggested a "3-year forward projection of the program." It said some of the time required to prepare the 3-year plan could be gained by withholding commitment of the balance of fiscal year 1963 program funds until late in the fiscal year, which ends June 30, 1963.

"While this may have the unfortunate consequence of not having any attractions abroad during the spring season of 1963," the report said, "it is our opinion that such a sacrifice at this time will greatly enhance the potentials of the program's future."

As a feature of long-range planning, the report suggested that consideration be given to selection of amateur groups by a system of competitions.

In recommending increased recognition for participating artists and groups, the Commission cited the need for "increased psychic incentives." The existing incentives—travel, opportunity to serve the national interest, monetary compensation, enhancement of professional reputation—are important but not enough, according to the report: "The ideals and aims of the program are such that there should also be about it any aura or greater value, and the distinction that springs from the recognition of excellence."

The Commission reported without comment a suggestion that participants be issued a cultural certificate by the Secretary of State and that an honor award from the Secretary or the President be conferred on those judged by the Advisory Committee on

the Arts to have completed the most successful tours.

The effort to enhance the atmosphere surrounding the cultural presentations program, the report stressed, should be directed "not only toward potential artistic representatives, but also toward their environment—the American public." On this point, it also said:

"Perhaps one of the great weaknesses, as well as a major source of uninformed criticism, is the lack of broad knowledge or understanding by the American people of the program and its purposes. * * * What seems to be vitally needed is full knowledge of the nature, purpose, and character of the cultural presentations program among Americans—knowledge that, properly presented, could result in an image with a strong appeal to American pride."

As to the purpose of the program, the Commission offered its own appraisal: "It is to reflect abroad the state of the performing arts in America, both in terms of creative cultural vitality and of the desire and capacity of a free people to support the development of a flourishing national culture."

**REPORT OF SURVEY, CULTURAL PRESENTATIONS
 PROGRAM, FOR THE U.S. ADVISORY COMMISSION
 ON INTERNATIONAL EDUCATIONAL AND
 CULTURAL AFFAIRS**

(Prepared by Roy E. Larsen, chairman of the executive committee, Time, Inc.; Vice Chairman, Advisory Commission; and Glenn G. Wolfe, Foreign Service officer)

WASHINGTON, D.C.,
 December 17, 1962.

Mr. JOHN W. GARDNER,
 Chairman, U.S. Advisory Commission on International Educational and Cultural Affairs, Department of State, Washington, D.C.

DEAR JOHN: On October 9 you and Assistant Secretary Battle requested that the undersigned conduct a survey of the State Department's cultural presentations program for the U.S. Advisory Commission.

The purpose of this survey has been to examine all phases of this important part of the State Department's educational and cultural programs and to submit recommendations for its improvement.

We have concluded the survey and attach our report of findings, conclusions, and recommendations. The survey has provided us with an immense appreciation of the program's accomplishments over the past 8 years and an intense admiration for the many individuals—citizens and Government officials—who have so unselfishly devoted their efforts to this program.

We are deeply indebted to many persons for their assistance in this study, but we particularly wish to thank Mr. Heath Bowman, director of the cultural presentations program, for his patience, tolerance, and helpfulness in this survey of the program for which he has been responsible over the past 2 years.

Sincerely,

ROY E. LARSEN,
 GLENN G. WOLFE.

**REPORT OF SUBCOMMITTEE OF U.S. ADVISORY
 COMMISSION ON INTERNATIONAL CULTURAL
 AND EDUCATIONAL EXCHANGE**

**U.S. cultural presentations—a world of
 promise**

In a very succinct summary of the U.S. cultural presentations program to date, Assistant Secretary of State Lucius D. Battle said in September 1962:

"I have been deeply impressed by the record of positive contributions this program has made and by the number of dedicated artists and performers who have participated throughout the world. But I have also been increasingly aware of the difficulties inherent in the program and of the criticism these have inevitably produced."

This has indeed been the record of the program—a paradox of inspiring achievement on the one hand and troublesome obstacles on the other.

In the 8 years since it was started, the U.S. cultural presentations program in its best moments has done a remarkably effective job, and the Department of State owes great thanks to all the people who have made it possible. It has revealed to audiences in some parts of the world the breadth and depth and vitality of American cultural achievement. Our great symphonies from the east coast, the west coast, and the Middle West have brought a new and exciting picture of Americans and the American scene to audiences abroad. Student orchestras and chorales have enraptured their peers on the university campuses of many nations. The performers themselves have frequently been real ambassadors without portfolio in an assignment unprecedented in formal U.S. international relations.

But not all of this has been without pain, without unfortunate incidents, or even without occasional basic misapprehensions about the nature and goals of the program itself. At times, we believe, those responsible for the program have erred in seeking to make it all things to all men, and have not always profited from experience. Today, however, we find among those in government—at home and abroad—and among those in the artistic world who have shared responsibilities for the program a considerable measure of agreement on how the program can now go on to achieve greatness in the annals of our foreign affairs.

This study and report was undertaken because of some critical questions that have been raised about the specifics of the program and its policies and implementation. We believe that there has been no important mistake in the program that could not have been forestalled by better organization, which would include a strong functioning Advisory Committee on the Arts, and by proper implementation of policies agreed upon by the representatives of the arts and government.

A strong and respected Advisory Committee on the Arts (a committee called for in Public Law 860 and continued by the Fulbright-Hays Act of September 1961) can do much to insure the maintenance of excellence of artistic performance that this program must always represent, and to insure, as well, excellence in the management of the program.

There is a wealth of artistic talent in the United States, both professional and non-professional, and of institutions and of small groups that make it their function to encourage and foster the growth of such talent. Thus there exist resources that make it wholly unnecessary to compromise at any time the highest standards of quality of performance, both in terms of artistry and of the character of the performers chosen to go abroad.

To this proposition, the subcommittee has found unanimous agreement among all those whose opinions are relevant, and therefore conducted its study on the basis that this was a valid premise. Most of the other points made in this report stem from similar consensus. In fact, the area of agreement among those familiar with the program was found to be extremely widespread.

I. Purpose and Objectives

Our study of the operation of the U.S. cultural presentations program to this point suggests that the time is opportune for a clarification and restatement of the program's basic and long-range purpose.

Although the original impetus for the program was a competitive one, the record now indicates that competitive displays of cultural accomplishment tend to be wasteful and inappropriate. Part of the essence of

culture rests in its communication and in its being shared, rather than being regarded as the exclusive property of a limited number of individuals, communities, or nations. From this standpoint, and from the standpoint of what has been demonstrably useful and effective in the program, it is possible to make a more realistic appraisal of purpose: it is to reflect abroad the state of the performing arts in America, both in terms of creative cultural vitality and of the desire and capacity of a free people to support the development of a flourishing national culture. A nation can disclose important aspects of its total character through the manner in which it seeks to develop the highest peaceful arts.

In the words of the congressional legislation, the purpose is to "demonstrate the cultural interests, development and achievements of the people of the United States . . . and the (U.S.) contributions being made toward . . . a more fruitful life . . . (and) to promote international cooperation for . . . cultural advancement."

These are words of the broadest kind of intent, and they evidence the wisdom of the Congress in providing a stage that permits maximum flexibility in carrying out the program. Such flexibility has made possible a wide variety of efforts and experiments, with a great diversity of kinds of attractions, kinds of audiences reached and with broad geographical spread.

This is not to say that the administration of the program has been indiscriminate. However, at the conclusion of 8 years of experience with the program, it is possible to review it in perspective and to attempt to set new patterns from a summation of all the lessons that have been learned.

In demonstrating "the cultural interests, developments and achievements" of the American people, it is obvious that the point of the demonstration is to communicate effectively these achievements to other people. Any demonstration or exhibition communicates, some more successfully than others; the high point of communication, however, can be reached only with the establishment of complete rapport between performer and audience. It is for this reason that the nature of the audiences reached becomes a matter of major concern.

A program designed to reflect cultural achievement often demands a very special kind of audience. In any nation or community, including our own, there are still relatively few people able to appreciate fully the highest cultural attainments, and thus capable of full rapport with and understanding of the performers. But the influence of such witnesses extends far beyond their numbers, in intellect, in leadership, and in the establishment of the highest standards of taste. So audiences of this kind, wherever they can be gathered together, offer benefits in fulfilling the purpose of the program far greater than their size would indicate.

The goal of influencing intellectual leadership abroad presupposes another important aspect of the program: its most telling effects are long range, rather than immediate. The filtering down of impressions from a society's taste makers to the point where they become generally accepted is a slow and painstaking process. Old myths, fictions and stereotypes die very hard. It is, therefore, necessary to convey and re-convey, time and time again, the reality of the American cultural condition, until it finally replaces legend.

The long-range aims of the program readily suggest a second ideal audience: the youth of any nation, or that segment of its youth that shows greatest promise of eventual leadership. The natural place to seek out such youth abroad, even more than in the United States, is in the colleges and universities.

Here again experience has shown how to achieve the greatest measure of rapport.

While the best in our culture can carry a great deal of influence with university audiences everywhere, as well as with the most sophisticated and culturally mature audiences, another effective way to communicate with young people abroad is through our own college students and young professionals who are most talented in the fields of the arts. The sharing of discovery and enthusiasm by youth can do much "to promote international cooperation for . . . cultural advancement."

It is these young people who look for fresh impressions, rather than accept old ones, who are often more prone to pay heed to their peers from abroad than to their older compatriots. As Thornton Wilder said several years ago, in discussing what he had observed about the best young minds of the 20th century:

"The young person today . . . sees himself not as one of many hundreds, not as one of many millions, but as one of billions. . . . He has . . . a realization that the things that separate men from one another are less important than the things they have in common."

Whether the performers are professional or amateur, the purpose of the program cannot be realized unless the quality of the performers is the very best that we can send. The various forms of art are universal communication, whether they are language arts or extralingual; the higher the quality of art, the more complete and lasting is the thing that it communicates. Art breaks down social and political barriers and speaks in a language that can be as forceful as it is unique.

In this sense the cultural presentations program is apolitical, and while the program as a whole does have broad political purposes, these purposes must not be permitted to delimit or to misuse artistic excellence. In discussing "The Role of the Arts and the Humanities," W. McNell Lowry, director of the Ford Foundation's arts program, said this:

"If the arts and the humanities are of any use at all to the Government's objectives, they are of use only to those of the longest range and concerned with the most basic intellectual and cultural currents running among peoples of varying political and economic origins. The assumptions that underlie the international objective we share with Western Europe have to do with the values people live by. And here the arts and the humanities, if not distorted from their own realities, have a role to play."

Finally, in any discussion of the purposes of the program, it is perhaps appropriate to point out what are not its purposes.

The program is neither designed nor suited to carry on cultural competition with the Sino-Soviet bloc, nor with any other country or bloc. The knowledge that the Sino-Soviet nations were making significant headway with their own cultural presentations certainly served as a strong incentive to establish the U.S. program; but such incentive does not translate into a purpose for the program in being. It might well, in fact, act as a denigration of all culture, and of American culture in particular, to specifically assign to it this or any other purely political end.

In another consideration of purpose, we should not lose sight of the fact that the program does assist the development of the arts in the United States by providing a stability and continuity to some artistic groups that they might otherwise not have had. Nevertheless, the program does not exist simply to provide employment to artists. Such encouragement of the arts is an extra dividend. It should in no sense influence the selection of performers or constitute an excuse for compromising standards of excellence. The primary criterion must always be artistic value.

II. The Record: Achievements and Problems

The cultural presentations program began in 1954 as the President's special international program, with an initial authorization to take part in foreign fairs and festivals. Authorization was also granted to assist privately sponsored attractions in the performing arts to represent the United States in overseas tours.

Although the United States had had long experience in international educational exchanges, it was one of the last of the countries in the free world to engage in a formal program of exporting cultural presentations. This program was one of many new types undertaken in the postwar years by the Department of State—activities that increased as American isolationism diminished.

The President's Special International Program for Cultural Presentations operated on an emergency basis until August 1, 1956. That was the date the 84th Congress passed Public Law 860, the International Cultural and Trade Fairs Participation Act of 1956, giving full legislative sanction to the program.

A series of reorganizations over the years resulted in the establishment of a Bureau of Educational and Cultural Affairs (CU), directed by an Assistant Secretary of State.

On September 21, 1961, the Fulbright-Hays Act was approved, encompassing all the essential elements of previous legislation, as well as broadening the authority and scope of government sponsorship of the cultural presentations program.

As the stature of the overall program grew, so did the organization for cultural presentations develop from a Special Projects Branch to the present Office of Cultural Presentations.

Coordination with the arts

The legislation provided for an Advisory Committee on the Arts to advise and assist the Secretary of State in carrying out his responsibilities under the program. We find that while State Department officials have sought the advice of various artistic experts on implementation of the program, they have not effectively used the Arts Committee to secure advice and guidance on program plans and policies. The Arts Committee was in being during the early years of the program, but so greatly had its functions diminished that it has not even been reappointed since the passage of the Fulbright-Hays Act of 1961. While each of the past six semi-annual reports has stated that "the Committee meets periodically to carry out its responsibility," there is a little indication that the Committee had been confronted with important problems or any request to participate in formulating policies effecting this program.

This failure to give the Committee a major role undoubtedly stemmed from the fact that other arrangements had been made for artistic counsel. In 1954, because the professional aspects of dealing with the arts, artists and artistic directors were strange and unfamiliar to those in the State Department, a group already involved in the arts was invited to become a major participant in the program. A contract was signed with the American National Theatre and Academy (ANTA) to provide for the evaluation of performers and through a subordinate branch organized for the purpose, the International Cultural Exchange Service (ICES), to handle arrangements with the performing artists.

ANTA's role was to appoint and bring together panels of experts to pass only on the artistic caliber of performers and, through ICES, to make all tour arrangements with performers selected by the State Department. But in time it became apparent that, in addition to the selection of performers, the State Department had to approve in detail all arrangements made by ICES.

The original arrangement with an outside group was undoubtedly essential to the start

of the program. But over the years it has proved to have certain inherent shortcomings, not because of a lack of devotion or competence on the part of the people involved, but because of the inadequacy of the organizational arrangement itself. One vital element that has been missing throughout has been much needed high-level coordination between Government and the arts.

Instead, there has been a diffusion of responsibilities, along with a minimum of firm policy guidance. This has led to a variety of ad hoc decisions, to the yielding to assorted pressures, and to a failure of effective communication among the several groups concerned with the program.

Shifts in emphasis

The 8 years of the program have seen many changes in emphasis as new circumstances and new problems arose. The organization of the program proved to be anything but ideal for meeting and resolving the inevitable realities with which the program would have to cope in the field.

Very early in the program it became evident that the original concept of using fairs and festivals as the foci of the program was unrealistic and impractical. With few exceptions, they did not provide ideal settings for demonstrations of culture, and offerings were considered not so much manifestations of American cultural development as they were thought of as entries in a cultural sweepstakes competition.

In a shift away from festivals, emphasis quickly moved toward bringing some of our most notable performing arts to audiences in the great capitals of the world. The New York Philharmonic Orchestra toured Europe in 1955 and Japan in 1961. The Boston Symphony visited Europe in 1956 and the Far East in 1960. The Philadelphia Orchestra has gone to Europe twice, the Cleveland Orchestra once. Latin America has been toured by the National and New Orleans Symphonies; the Far East by the Los Angeles and Symphony of the Air, the Near East by the Minneapolis Symphony. Among those representing the field of the dance have been the New York City Ballet, the American Ballet Theatre, and the Martha Graham and Jerome Robbins dance groups. So enthusiastically have the dance groups been acclaimed abroad that their overseas tours have had an important effect on the reception that the ballet has since had in the United States.

The appearances of these and other fine artists have left behind memorable impressions of American culture. In the case of the symphony orchestras, however, the average cost of an overseas tour amounted to approximately a fourth of the annual budget of the program. This made it impossible to export more than two orchestras a year, so that even major capitals were unlikely to have more than one concert over an interval of several years.

Response to demands

Jazz groups, which have averaged two tours a year since 1956, represent a musical idiom that is a truly American contribution. For the most part—and particularly where they appeared before the right audiences—they have been enthusiastically received, especially by the youth. In many places, including the Soviet bloc countries, vocal public opinion has forced acceptance of jazz performances. Most jazz performers have been outstanding in their willingness to take part in demonstration and clinic sessions outside of their scheduled appearances. Jazz is certainly no substitute for the great symphonies, but must be kept in its own context in presentations in all the performing arts.

As the program's record of major successful tours mounted, the demand for presentations from other posts increased. Many of these were filled by sending smaller groups or individual performers. Where these were

first-rate artists, their tours were almost uniformly successful.

As independence and nationhood spread to new areas of the world, there was demand for American cultural representation there as well. But musical traffic to these new countries was limited by costs, and sometimes by the lack of a suitable concert hall or other facilities. Meanwhile, pressures mounted from a number of sources, including posts, for attractions with primarily entertainment, rather than cultural, values. There were many requests, for instance, for variety shows, to offset similar Soviet presentations, which had received enthusiastic responses from mass audiences.

In response to field requests, some variety shows were sent on tour. While these were often favorably received by mass audiences and by the local press, some posts seriously questioned this shift away from a supposed policy of presenting only the highest forms of our performing arts. These questions pointed up the need for a clarification of the purpose and philosophy behind the cultural presentations program—a clarification that is still needed for its most effective operation.

There is evidence that some in the newer nations may be offended by the nature of attractions sent them, since a growing number of intellectual leaders, as well as expatriates, are sophisticated people who would appreciate top quality presentations, and "who are being led to believe in some cases that the United States has no such presentations."

Youth's contribution

While it has been clear over the years that the contribution of high quality professional performers was a vital one, the experience of privately sponsored tours of amateur and academic groups made it evident that they could also achieve significant impact, especially at the youth level. Among the early outstanding successes confirming this were the Juilliard String Quartet (1955), the Juilliard Orchestra (1958), and the Westminster Choir (1957).

In more recent demonstrations of the effective use of amateur performers, the Eastman Philharmonia has toured Western Europe, the Near East, Russia, and Poland. The Harvard-Radcliffe Orchestra not only gave highly successful performances in its 1962 summer tour of Mexico, but reached out in workshop sessions among secondary and preparatory schools, by splitting up into small ensembles, string quartets, wind quartets and quintets, and percussion groups.

The roster of professional and amateur performers who have taken part in the cultural program reads like a listing of a considerable segment of the best American talent in the field of the performing arts.

Expanding world

Since 1956 the annual appropriation for the cultural presentations program has remained unchanged at \$2,500,000 per year. Meanwhile, there has been a progressive expansion of the number of countries and capitals which the program has attempted to reach, including the U.S.S.R. and Soviet satellites, as well as the growing roster of the world's independent nations.

The program has covered every continent, most of the major capitals, and 192 of the world's 256 major population centers (those with populations of 250,000 or more). Its reach has expanded from the fiscal year 1955, when presentations toured 48 countries and 90 cities, to the most recent fiscal year (1962), when attractions went out to 306 cities in 92 countries.

Lessons from achievement

To help make judgments as to the kind of cultural attractions that are worthwhile and the kind that are not, there are now available a large quantity of reports from the diplomatic posts about the effectiveness of various

performances for various audiences in their areas.

There is no dissent from any important source to the proposition that the quality of an attraction is a key consideration, or that any second-rate offering does violence to the purposes of the program. This does not, however, exclude all possibility of using presentations with mass audience appeal. The question hinges not so much on the breadth of appeal of an attraction as it does on the intrinsic artistic qualities of the presentation itself. Ice shows, it would appear, have made highly favorable impressions at all audience levels, combining entertainment features with skill, grace, and beauty approaching that of some of the finer dance presentations. The available funds, however, will almost certainly act as a limiting factor on the number and kind of such mass entertainment presentations that can be sent abroad.

It is perhaps a fair generalization that athletic or sports groups touring under the program are among the most universally liked by posts, most widely accepted by audiences and among the least troublesome in making arrangements. But the questions arise of whether a sports demonstration by two teams contributes significantly to the program's objectives, and of whether a poorly matched competition between an American team and a foreign team does not in fact detract from the values of the program. It is difficult to see how sports exhibitions can have a real part in a cultural presentations program, unless they are followed by coaches and groups of athletes to hold demonstration and clinic sessions. And in that event, it may even be that such demonstration groups might be equally valuable without a prior sports exhibition. Careful consideration should be given to the question of whether sports actually belong in the cultural program, or whether they should, instead, be given a larger role in the specialists program.

Another key lesson learned is that it is frequently not enough merely to tailor a program to an area, or even to a country. Each presentation must be regarded primarily as a means of reaching a specific kind of audience. In planning a tour, consideration must be given to the audience level that will be encountered in capital cities, large cities outside capitals, university cities, and even smaller cities and villages.

It has also been learned that there is great value to setting aside enough time for off-stage appearances of the performers. They should be given as much opportunity as possible to engage in such activities in relaxed and leisurely circumstances, rather than in the hurried and peremptory manner often imposed by tight schedules. The great majority of the performers have been willing to give generously of their time off-stage for meeting with local artists, leaders, and students, for workshops and demonstration sessions, for interviews and radio and television appearances. It is obviously their intent to so contribute to mutual understanding, but they have too often been frustrated in their efforts to do so by limitations of time. Without question, this aspect of the program has made an important contribution, and could make a much greater one with better advance preparation.

It has also been learned that there is an added dimension of value when tours have some private financial support. In the "Salute to France," a 3-month exposition of American culture that took place just before the formal start of the cultural presentations program, there were invaluable overtones in the fact that it was made possible largely by private subscription in the United States, and was thus a gift of the American people. Similarly, Mexican citizens were highly impressed when they learned that the Harvard-Radcliffe Orchestra members had not only given up their summer, but were paying a large part of their own expenses.

The original legislation encouraged the extension of commercially sponsored overseas cultural tours. However, the failure to gather available information far enough in advance has kept the program from taking greater advantage of this valuable resource. Such tours most often appear in capitals, and it would be possible to send them out to provincial cities, as well, under government auspices. The expenses involved would be small, compared to the cost of originating a tour in the United States. And sponsoring their appearance outside the capitals would serve as recognition of the intellectual and cultural leadership of other cities, especially where there are large universities.

One of the most important segments of American performing arts is the drama, and certainly no American cultural presentations program would be honest or complete without it. Our discussions with some of those most interested in this field of the performing arts have brought out certain difficulties in connection with drama tours. Much of our most advanced achievement in the field is in the professional theater, and in the New York City professional theater on Broadway, in particular. Producers, however, are understandably disinclined to break a show for a tour in the middle of a successful run. There have been instances where such single performers as Margaret Webster and Hal Holbrook have been outstandingly successful, but, where a large cast is required, it has been necessary to form an ad hoc company to present American productions abroad.

Many in the theater world would look very favorably, as we do, on the greater development of professional repertory theaters across the country, opening up possibilities for the future that we have not had in the past. The very possibility of selection for the program might act as a spur to such development.

The drama, experience shows, can sometimes present very special problems that deserve careful study. Whereas, in most of the performing arts, the performance speaks for itself, the drama speaks in two voices—that of the performers and that of the vehicle they select. For that reason, special heed must be given to both the ability of the dramatic company and to the cultural image given by the vehicle. There is no problem where the theme of a production is universal. But drama is often created as a slice of its background in time and place; for that reason it can be understood best by those fully familiar with the context in which it is presented and, conversely, it can be most readily misunderstood by those unfamiliar or only partially familiar with that context.

III. The Future: Challenge and Opportunities

The cultural presentations program has already built a reservoir of understanding abroad of U.S. cultural accomplishments and aspirations. Even with no increase in appropriations, there exists a great potential for adding to that reservoir.

The great continuing challenge and opportunity for the program lie in the maintenance of excellence—the selection and use of truly outstanding attractions. To be sure, excellence is not an unlimited commodity, but there are ever-increasing resources of American talent from which an impressive and honest cultural image of America can be reflected. Private funds in this country now support a great many repertory theaters, regional opera groups, ballet companies, creative music projects in schools, and so forth. Their numbers alone are no guarantee of quality of achievement, but numbers in a free society are something of a guarantee of cultural competition as an added stimulus toward the achievement of excellence. The cultural presentations program itself should serve as a further stimulus

through recognition of the most outstanding performers.

The full potential of the presentations program cannot be attained, however, without management and administration geared to make the most effective use of our cultural resources. Because of the need to eliminate duplication, to clarify responsibilities, and to provide direct policy guidance we recommend that the Department of State reassume full responsibility for direct management of all phases of the program, including all services now performed under contract with ANTA and its subsidiary organization, ICES.

Having fulfilled so well its assignment over the past 8 years, ANTA richly deserves the thanks and commendation of the Government. In the hope that the State Department will take full advantage of the talents and experience of the panel chairmen and ICES staff, we recommend that Mrs. H. Alwyn Inness-Brown, president of the Greater New York chapter of ANTA, and Miss Rosamond Gilder, vice president of the International Theatre Institute, be appointed special consultants to the Assistant Secretary of State for Cultural Affairs; and that Cultural Affairs give consideration to the retention of the ICES staff with their valuable experience through contract or direct employment.

We recommend that, parallel with the above change in the administration of the program, three major steps be taken, which we believe are vital to the success of the program:

1. Revitalize and expand the role of the Advisory Committee on the Arts: continue panels with revised selection procedure; arrive at administrative decisions leading to better character investigations; policy on ticket pricing, timing of amateur tours, and policy on reverse flow.

(a) Committee on the arts

A distinguished group from the arts charged with the responsibility for advising Cultural Affairs on policies and implementation of policies would provide something that has been missing from the administration of the cultural program to date. There have been and should continue to be several Panels of Experts, each concerned with a particular field of the performing arts (music, dance, drama, academic), and each evaluating and recommending performers from its field. This is, of course, a role that should be performed by respected people in the arts rather than by Government officials. But there has been no similarly functioning group from the arts to provide overall policy-level guidance and counsel to Cultural Affairs. This would include advice as to types of attractions that would be most effective in meeting specific objectives in various areas of the world.

This is a function which the Advisory Committee on the Arts was, we believe, expected to perform, and which experience shows is essential. We recommend the reconstitution of the Arts Committee with this important function in mind. With the clear understanding that this is to be its role, there should be no difficulty in securing as members of the Arts Committee a group of highly respected, knowledgeable, and statesmanlike individuals from the world of the arts.

The language of the Fulbright-Hays Act of 1961 is clear in calling for the continuation of the Advisory Committee on the Arts. The act states:

"The members of the committee shall be individuals whose knowledge of or experience in, or whose profound interest in, one or more of the arts will enable them to assist the Commission, the President, and other officers of the Government in performing the functions described. * * * The committee shall * * * advise and assist the Commission in the discharge of its responsibilities in the field of international educational

exchange and cultural presentations with special reference to the role of the arts in such fields (and) advise other interested officers of the Government * * * in connection with other international activities concerned with the arts."

(b) Panels and selection

The committee and Cultural Affairs should get specific information on availability and quality of artists for the program from the present panels of experts, working under the committee's guidance. These panel members should be formally reappointed by the Committee on the Arts, as consultants to the committee. The secretariat functions for the panels should be provided by Cultural Affairs.

In our opinion, the individual members of these panels are deserving of special mention in this report. Four panel meetings have been observed in the process of this survey, and without question the members are dedicated to their work; they are highly respected experts in their field; they have been faithful and hard working, performing their service with a minimum of recognition.

In connection with the panel operations, we find that the practice has been to accept applications from individual performers and groups for participation in the program. This has made it necessary for the panels to pass on literally hundreds of applicants, qualified and unqualified, and has not ensured that some of the very best talent has received consideration. For a number of reasons, it appears advisable that this be changed to a system of nominations, based on first-hand observation of performers encompassing broad search for talent in all fields and regardless of whether applications have or have not been submitted. Especially in view of the need for tailoring the program to specific places and audiences, we recommend also that the panel groups be called upon to pick for the department performers or groups for a known area, country, or pattern of countries. In the few instances where this has been done, it has added an important dimension to the value of the panel's contribution.

In the case of amateur groups consideration might be given to final selection by competition among the highest rated nominations within a specified type of attraction.

It would seem necessary for the Committee on the Arts to hold frequent meetings during the early stages of reorganization of the program—perhaps for the first 6 months or 1 year. Thereafter, its meetings might be held quarterly or oftener. Panels should be asked to meet prior to a meeting of the Committee on the Arts.

(c) Administrative decisions

The officers of Cultural Affairs should work closely with the Committee on the Arts in making a number of administrative decisions and setting management policies in connection with the program. Some of these involve screening performers for character, policies on pricing of tickets for performances, seasonal timing of amateur tours and, possibly, the establishment of a reverse flow program for bringing cultural presentations from abroad to the United States.

Inadequate investigations of the character of performers has at times resulted in mistakes that have been both embarrassing and destructive of the program's objectives. Traveling performers whose conduct abroad has been improper or less than exemplary have reflected discredit on both the program and the Government they presume to represent. Fortunately, these have been rare occurrences, but the program cannot afford to have any.

Pricing of tickets for performances, particularly for college audiences, has yet to become the subject of a firm and clear policy. Experience to date has indicated that per-

haps the wisest policy might be to charge no admission for college audiences, or even for all amateur performances.

Among the problems that have appeared to have no easy solution is the timing of student tours. It has been thought that students generally are available for tour purposes only during the summers, which except for subequatorial countries, is the period of smallest interest in tours. However, from our discussions with educators and others, we find that practical solutions can be evolved for touring student groups in other than the summer vacation periods. This, like the solution to so many other problems connected with the program, can be met by sufficient advance planning. There is a well-known trend toward overseas educational programs. Many an institution would welcome the opportunity to have its especially talented students in the performing arts perform abroad under a Government program. We are told that the problem of study programs could be easily handled in connection with such tours.

The advisability of setting up a "reverse flow" cultural presentations program is one that merits further and thorough study. It has perhaps been a fair criticism that the program has been too much of a one-way street. It appears to us that a first step in this direction has been suggested by private sponsors, who have undertaken projects in collecting and exhibiting the cultural heritages in the visual arts of some of the developing countries. In the field of the performing arts, it would seem unwise to initiate such a program without comprehensive planning, consultation with the appropriate private organizations and branches of the Government. The earliest date at which such a program could be begun, even on a pilot basis, would seem to be fiscal year 1964.

2. Establish a formal policy of long-range planning; review by arts committee and posts involved; eliminate ad hoc decisions, minimize complaints, take advantage of commercial presentations, provide adequate briefing of performers, and resolve other policy issues.

(a) The most effective use of our cultural resources in a presentations program abroad requires long and careful advance planning. On the basis of the experience behind us, it does not seem unreasonable to suggest a 3-year forward projection for the program. With the funds available, and with the increased number of areas in which cultural presentations could be useful, 3 years might well be a minimum period for forward planning, in order to insure that the most important areas, or even all areas, of the world will be reached in that time with the best and most appropriate presentations.

Such a plan should certainly begin with gathering all information relevant to the program for the period to be covered. The time is now especially appropriate for a start on this. At the time this survey was announced, Assistant Secretary of State Battle declared a moratorium on any further commitment of fiscal year 1963 funds (except to meet international agreements), pending receipt of the Commission's recommendations. A byproduct of this action has been to provide time for planning ahead. A contribution to advance planning could be made by withholding the commitment of the balance of fiscal year 1963 funds until late in the fiscal year, thus providing additional time for the development of a sound plan. While this may have the unfortunate consequence of not having any attractions abroad during the spring season of 1963, it is our opinion that such a sacrifice at this time will greatly enhance the potentials of the program's future. Moreover, it is suggested that consideration be given to requesting Congress to extend into fiscal year 1964 any unobligated fiscal year 1963 funds.

This would offer an opportunity to begin a 3-year program with a clear statement jointly prepared by State Department and USIA to all diplomatic posts on what it is hoped that the entire program will accomplish, along with a request to supply complete information about their areas in the light of this overall purpose. There needs to be a continuing flow of information from the field about possible audiences and timing, and to the field about American cultural groups and their availability. In addition, all possible information and evaluation on planned commercial tours should be assembled and distributed to the posts.

All this information would need to be digested, analyzed and worked into a 3-year master plan carefully coordinated between the State Department and USIA. It should take into account the priority of areas or countries to be reached; desired audiences; political factors, use of capitals, university cities, provincial cities and possibly non-urban sites; types of attractions best suited for each place; use of professional and amateur groups, anticipated reception of performers; frequency of visits, and logistical limitations. In each case, there should be a realistic appraisal of the total exploitation possibilities and the value of such exploitation; it should then be noted what funds should be earmarked for the purpose of exploitation.

(d) Ad hoc decisions

One of the consequences of the failure to operate on such a long-range basis has too frequently in the past been that decisions affecting specific situations and areas have been made on an ad hoc basis, e.g.:

- (a) A repertory group must be sent abroad.
- (b) The Far East wants a variety group.
- (c) This attraction is available. Where can it be sent?

Decisions of this kind are obvious resorts to expediencies, and as such have no validity in the program.

This is not to say that a long-range plan need be so firm as to be inflexible. Political factors, audience characteristics, availability of performers—all these and many other factors are subject to change. Plans for commercial tours may not be known for more than 1 year ahead. A long-range program must have built into it the means and methods of change, thus providing more sense-making flexibility than exists at present.

(e) Byproducts of planning

An adequate long-term plan could dissipate a great many complaints and annoyances that have been expressed about the program in the past. It could be the basis of effective two-way communication with the field.

The posts have participated very little in any program planning until now. In fact, posts have many times been notified at such a late date that attractions were coming to their areas that there has not been enough time to make proper provisions for travel and accommodations, not to mention ability to exploit attractions, within the area. Finally, reports have been solicited from the posts and then gone unheeded, or at times even unacknowledged. In terms of effective communication, this amounts to an exercise in futility.

A long-range plan would also make it far easier to take maximum advantage of commercial presentations. The presently little-used technique of financing extensions of commercial tours in a given area might be greatly extended, if it were seen that the commercial group could fulfill the overall plan objectives for that area. This would represent a substantial saving over the cost of sending a completely new tour to the same area.

The posts and the performers alike have repeatedly complained about the inadequacy

of briefings prior to departure from the United States. This problem, like many others, is primarily one of lead time and preparation, and can be solved far more easily through advance planning. Every performer, particularly those touring a country for the first time, needs thorough orientation on the political, economic and sociological background of the country, lists of key individuals he may be expected to meet, and specific conditions of transportation, lodging and food. Where there has been sufficient time in the past to brief performers fully about conditions and customs they would encounter abroad, their reactions, almost without fail, have been exemplary and a credit to their country.

(d) Policy questions

Finally, the very conditions of drawing up a long-range plan would confront the committee with questions that need clear policy determination. Some questions have been raised, for example, about the inclusion of Western Europe is already very similar to our program, on the premises that the culture of Western Europe is already very similar to our own and that we are given adequate representation in those countries through a large number and variety of commercial attractions. In 1961 the American Embassy in Denmark raised doubts about the value of the program there, reporting:

"The events which have been staged in Denmark during the past 2 years under this program have been generally successful, but the question remains as to whether the net increment to the United States is worth the expense and the work involved. Established nongovernmental channels afford the Danes a fairly rich diet of comparable events. . . . The time which a USIS mission the size of the one in Copenhagen must devote to President's Fund presentations and the funds expended are not generally justified by the results achieved."

Members of other Western European embassies have made the same point, if less emphatically. Nevertheless, there remain obvious and strong arguments that might point toward an increase, rather than diminution, of cultural representation in Western Europe.

The report of Mr. Lowry called for an expansion of international cultural activities, "and primarily in Western Europe." He pointed out that "now we are beginning to see that the new nations, once they are free, are still in need of Europe and in fact wish to import many of their ideas and values from her, including their evaluation of U.S. culture." This opinion is given added credence by the large number of foreign students attending universities in Western Europe. England has approximately 60,000 such students and France some 30,000, a high proportion of both from the new and newly independent nations, an emphatic sign that these new nations look to Western Europe as the arbiter of modern culture.

Thus, whatever the influence of American cultural presentations in Western Europe, it would most certainly be reflected in time on a wider world screen.

(e) Back to festivals?

Another area of inquiry that the committee might well reopen would be the possibility of sending attractions to fairs and festivals, but on a basis different from that originally planned.

It might be useful to grade festivals according to the effectiveness that any presentation sent from the United States might have there. The very best events—perhaps six or eight of them—might well merit our participation as often as funds will permit, which might be no more often than once in 3 years under the present appropriation. Other good festivals might be classified as

"targets of opportunity," to be fitted in either at the beginning or end of an appropriate touring attraction. Certainly a great many of the fairs and festivals could be dismissed offhand as inappropriate to the program.

Another possibility—should the appropriation one day be increased—might be programs patterned on the "Salute to France," which would in effect be cultural saturation of a specific country or area, the effects of which might linger for many years.

3. Increase importantly the recognition given those who participate in the program.

The program's underlying effort to seek greater understanding of the United States abroad may have obscured the need for achieving full understanding here in the United States of the cultural presentations program. Perhaps one of the great weaknesses, as well as a major source of uninformed criticism, is the lack of broad knowledge or understanding by the American people of the program and its purposes.

Where such a vacuum of understanding exists, it is all but certain that the program is foregoing some of the force and efficacy it might otherwise have. What seems to be vitally needed is full knowledge of the nature, purpose and character of the Cultural Presentations program among Americans—knowledge that, properly presented, could result in an "image" with a strong appeal to American pride.

Understandably, those Americans most fully aware of the program are the ones who see some potentiality of taking part in it. And many of these, the amateurs in particular, think of it in terms of an opportunity to make a contribution to their Nation's interests. Some others, however, seem to think of it in terms of opportunities for desired travel, enhancement of professional reputation, and monetary compensation.

All these are values that the performers often do and should derive from taking part in the program. But they are not enough. The ideals and aims of the program are such that there should also be about it an aura of greater value, and the distinction that springs from the recognition of excellence.

Some effort needs to be made to create around the program an atmosphere that would provide such increased psychic incentives for the participants. And that effort should be directed not only toward potential artistic representatives, but also toward their environment—the American public.

The program has at various times come under criticism for the high salaries paid to a few performers. The payment of high salaries to outstanding artists can, in our opinion, be justified on the basis of extraordinary artistic talent and their value to the program. However, such factors as the performer's normal income, the prestige to be gained through participation in the program, and the value to the individual of a guaranteed tour should be taken into account in considering any salary contract. It should also be noted that some of our most highly paid artists have served in the program without salary.

We have stressed that the maintenance of the highest artistic standards is vital to the program, in carrying out its purpose. The reputation for such standards should be able to serve other purposes as well, if properly and fully exploited. All the many means for doing this should be explored.

It has been suggested, for instance, that there might be a cultural certificate issued by the Secretary of State to those who take part in tours, and a cultural honor award from the Secretary of State or the President for those attractions judged by the arts committee to have completed the successful tours.

THE LATE HONORABLE ROBERT S. KERR, A U.S. SENATOR FROM THE STATE OF OKLAHOMA

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. STEED].

Mr. STEED. Mr. Speaker, I ask for recognition at this time in order to make a few remarks and to call the attention of the House again to the very sad and distressing loss of the distinguished and able senior Senator from Oklahoma, the Honorable ROBERT S. KERR, on January 1.

The untimely and shocking passing of this great statesman not only is a very heavy personal loss to me and to my colleagues from Oklahoma, as well as to our State, but it is my firm conviction that the Nation and the world also has lost the services of one of its finest public servants.

Senator KERR was born in the congressional district which I have the honor to represent. The famed log cabin from where he first saw the light of day still stands in my district.

I first knew Senator KERR in 1923 when as a newspaper reporter it was my duty to interview him at a time when his first business venture had been destroyed by fire. As the years went by I knew and watched him in his struggle to achieve his goals in life, and while in his time of great renown and fame here at the National Capitol he was known as a man of considerable wealth, we knew him first in Oklahoma as a man of very strained circumstances. He literally clawed his way up from the bottom in all fields in which he achieved success.

Senator KERR served as the chief executive of the great State of Oklahoma at a time when our country was at war. He made a very distinguished record in that capacity. He was elected to the U.S. Senate in 1948 in the same campaign in which I won my first election to the House of Representatives.

Mr. Speaker, I have had the honor and pleasure to work with him all these years here in Washington. He had been the senior Senator and head of our delegation for the last 12 years. Of course, there are no words that we can find which will describe the distress and the loss that we have suffered because of his untimely passing.

There is one thing I would like to say that may not be known by many people even though the whole world knows a lot about this great man; that is that all during the time he served in the U.S. Senate he always put more of his own means into the job, by far, than he received in financial remuneration from the Government.

His interest and his zeal to acquit himself, to serve his State and do his job in the very best way it could be done, made him happy that he had the means over and above what the Government made available to pour into his work, so that these successes that meant so much to the land of his origin could be achieved.

Mr. Speaker, Senator KERR was laid to rest in Oklahoma on January 4.

Mr. Speaker, at the funeral services for Senator ROBERT S. KERR at Oklahoma City, January 4, an eloquent and fitting tribute was paid by one of his closest friends, Dr. John W. Raley, chancellor of Oklahoma Baptist University.

For almost 30 years Senator KERR and Dr. Raley was coworkers, building together for the future of Oklahoma and at the same time performing tremendous work for the Baptist denomination.

As Dr. Raley has brought about one achievement after another on the campus of Oklahoma Baptist University at Shawnee, Senator KERR as a distinguished Baptist layman was always in the forefront of the accomplishment.

It was truly appropriate that Dr. Raley was among those delivering tributes at the services when Oklahoma lost its most outstanding statesman.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that Dr. Raley's tribute may be included at this point as part of my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. GONZALEZ). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

The matter referred to follows:

TRIBUTE TO ROBERT SAMUEL KERR, SENIOR
SENATOR OF OKLAHOMA
(By John Wesley Raley)

ROBERT SAMUEL KERR, son of the red soil of frontier Oklahoma, humbly born, found his way to national leadership through the complex maze of the 20th century.

Caught up in the impatient velocity of our time, he matched his day and climaxed his career by probing the very edges of space.

His lifework and his interests define him in many frames of reference—a school-teacher, lawyer, soldier, rancher, oil man, industrialist, statesman, humanitarian, author, orator, and churchman.

It is my deep honor to speak of him today as I knew him best, Oklahoma's beloved Baptist layman. Senator KERR was not only "Mr. Oklahoma" at home and around the world, he was "Mr. Oklahoma Baptist Layman" as well. Though he did not limit his good deeds to Baptist enterprises, he did earn this title by right of conquest through dedicated service to Baptist causes. The strategy of his religion was also the strategy of his life. He would look his interest and strength on to something much greater than any resources he could muster alone. By such a process he merged with greatness. Following this basic strategy of sublimating the level of his own interests to that of great enterprises and religious causes, he shared in the rewards of a just providence and increased his strength for yet greater tasks ahead. He possessed the quality of intensity of concentration on any given problem and unrelenting drive toward any given objective. By this discipline he was enabled to serve in many capacities.

While he relied on brainpower and drive, Senator KERR was humble, apt to learn, and dedicated—in the words of his business partner, Dean McGee—"a Christian gentleman." The Senator brought all these personal powers into a beautiful synthesis with his concern for people. All humanitarian causes have been strengthened by his hands; orphaned children have been fed, clothed, and sheltered; the aged, sick, and the unfortunate given care; the education of youth upgraded; and all the resources of Oklahoma enriched because Senator KERR cared. At the present moment the strength of his life is applied to double the facilities of the Baptist Memorial Hospital in Oklahoma City.

On a more personal note, Senator KERR is OBU's greatest benefactor. Most of the buildings on the OBU campus, including the

beautiful Mrs. W. S. Kerr Memorial Dormitory which honors his mother, bear in part the Kerr image. His gifts through the Endowment Fund of the Baptist Foundation make beneficiaries of all the OBU faculty members for all time to come. Our loss can be measured only by the sustaining greatness of the days of his strength. OBU has lost her most generous friend, and I have lost another lifetime partner in dreams and accomplishments.

To conclude this tribute to my old friend and partner in Christian service, I should like to recall his final statement to me after a tour of the new chapel at OBU a little over a month ago. He had studied it carefully—the great auditorium with its beautiful tones of soft colors in brick and wood and the dramatic art windows. Then standing in the foyer, he read word by word the memorial tablet of bronze projecting the dreams of such a building into the purposes of the Baptists of Oklahoma. Having read every word he nodded approval then said, "A worthy dream beautifully stated, happily realized, and though many years of hard work came between the dream and its realization, the chapel is worthy of both the dream and the dreamer and laborer." Then with a twinkle in his sharp blue eyes he said, "Now that you have got the chapel, I suppose you are going to let me in on your next big enterprise at OBU."

My answer then can be repeated today to him and all his loved ones in full Christian faith. "Yes, Senator, you will always be in on every adventure of faith I shall undertake. Your life is forever linked to God's cause at OBU."

Mr. STEED. Mr. Speaker, at this time I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. ALBERT].

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, on January 1 the new year was launched in a day of tragedy for the people of Oklahoma and the Nation. The most able son of Oklahoma soil took his departure. As a builder of Oklahoma, BOB KERR was a thousand men in one. Oklahoma has produced many men of competence, many men who have added to the sum total of happiness and opportunity of our people, but all of them pale in the shadow of this great man who was born in a log cabin in the blackjack country of Pontotoc County 13 years before Oklahoma became a State.

All in all, Senator KERR was the most remarkable man I have known in my lifetime. He had that rare quality of having absolute confidence that he could achieve as big as he could think—and he always admonished his fellows to think big.

He and his fine partner, Dean A. McGee who recently became a director of the Federal Reserve bank in Kansas City, built a business and industrial empire; he had one of the finest ranches in America in LeFlore County in my own congressional district; he was perhaps the largest individual owner of coal properties in the United States; he was a major producer of uranium and helium; and near the end of his career he became one of the strongest legislative leaders in the United States in this generation.

Senator KERR was at one time a candidate for President of the United States. It was my honor to place his name in nomination. At that time the Nation was unaware of his potential as a national leader. While he was strong in

Oklahoma, he had not attained the countrywide prestige necessary to make him a formidable candidate.

During the past few years I have often thought, as I watched him soar on the wings of his tremendous intellect, that what he had hoped he would do directly might ultimately come to him without a major direct effort. He was a potential President of the United States.

He loved President John F. Kennedy, and I am sure the President himself would be the first to say that Senator KERR had those qualities of mind and character which would have equipped him to perform the duties of the highest office in the land.

Senator KERR was a great friend of the Vice President of the United States. When LYNDON JOHNSON was majority leader working closely with Senator KERR, he learned what an anchor he was in hours of trouble and difficulty.

Senator KERR was my close friend. He has befriended me a thousand times and in a thousand ways. I have had many private conversations with him, the contents of which after his death are known only to me. These moments of consultation and conversation are among the richest experiences of my life.

Some people thought that BOB KERR pushed too hard. He was like a great engine powered by super fuel as he drove to every task. Sometimes he made his own job hard for himself. He never worried about finesse. He could accomplish almost any task he undertook by main strength—by the sheer weight of his intellect, by his rock-like determination, and his vast energy.

He often consulted with me about his political problems. I was always flattered that he generally took my advice.

His great love was the Arkansas and Red River Basins. He set in motion and carried far enough toward conclusion the development of these watersheds that without doubt they will some day be famous in the industrial and commercial life of this Nation.

"Land, Wood, and Water," the slogan under which he campaigned and lived, was not to him just a political gimmick. It was the summary of a determination that he did more about than anybody in the country.

He was preeminent in many, many fields. He probably did more for his church than any layman in Oklahoma.

He was responsible for more worthy young men and women getting through school or into business than anybody in the history of our State, so far as I know.

A product of the frontier of Indian territory, he was an inspiration to little people everywhere, thousands of whom he helped during his lifetime.

He probably built up the greatest business organization and the biggest personal political organization in the history of our State, and was one of its most illustrious Governors.

He was the center of everything that he undertook. Those who worked with and for him were not only coworkers and employees, they were disciples. To be an active part of the Kerr organization was a way of life to hundreds of people.

He commanded the most devoted loyalty from those closely associated with him. Senator KERR's death has brought home to me the frailty of life. So many times he and I had talked of discussing certain things and going more into detail on some of our plans, but we just never did get around to all of them. Often, also, he had said to me that he hoped to ride the first boat to go up the Arkansas when it became a navigable stream. He failed in this but he died at the zenith of his greatest success in this area. He will be there in spirit when the first boat is launched.

To paraphrase Edwin Markham in his great poem on Abraham Lincoln, and to quote almost directly from Senator KERR's funeral oration delivered by his pastor, Dr. Herschel H. Hobbs—when he went down he did not leave just another stump in the forest. He fell like a kindly cedar tree and left a lonesome place against the sky.

To Mrs. Kerr and their fine children and grandchildren, to his brothers and sister, to his friends who are legion, I extend my deepest sympathy. Oklahoma has lost her greatest and most effective advocate. America has lost one of her noblest sons.

Mr. STEED. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. EDMONDSON].

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, it is a sad occasion that brings all of us in the Oklahoma delegation to the floor together this afternoon to pay tribute to a man who was great not only in the field of statecraft but great also in the field of industry and finance and in the field of church leadership.

Senator ROBERT S. KERR was appropriately saluted at the services in Oklahoma City last week as the great lay leader of the Baptist Church, which he loved so much.

For Oklahoma he has indeed left many monuments. Of all those great monuments none exceeds in importance in the future of our State the great waterway about which he dreamed for so many years and to which he had given so much of his time and his energy during his public career. The greatest dream of Senator KERR undoubtedly was navigation on the Arkansas River and the great industrial potential which would follow that development.

I think that for him a real milestone was realized last fall when in separate meeting at Muskogee and at Catoosa in Oklahoma further historic steps were taken to advance the cause of navigation on the river.

Senator KERR was there to break the ground for the first port to be located in Oklahoma on the Arkansas River at Muskogee. He was at Catoosa to help celebrate the progress that had been made on the river leading to the establishment of the great terminal port of that system in Oklahoma on the Verdigris River.

I think that when the final measuring stick is applied to the lives of the men who played a part in the history of our State, there will be no challenge to Senator KERR in the role that he has played as a leader of our State, in devel-

oping its great resources and in helping to make possible a brighter industrial future for the people of our State.

Because this navigation system was so close to the Senator's heart, I introduced yesterday as the first of the measures which I will sponsor in this Congress, a House joint resolution which would authorize the naming of the navigation route on the Arkansas River as the Robert S. Kerr Seaway. I earnestly hope that measure will have united support in both the House and the Senate from all who are interested in the development of that great river because no man did more to earn this honor than did Senator KERR.

Senator KERR was always kind, always considerate, always helpful to his colleagues. His strong arm was available to help the poor and the unfortunate just as it was available to help friends and colleagues. I feel I have lost a dear friend, a constant and helpful colleague. My wife joins me in sending to his lovely wife and to his brothers and his sons and daughter our deepest sympathy in their great loss.

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

Mr. STEED. I yield to our distinguished Speaker.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I am deeply grieved by the passing of my dear, close and valued friend, the late Senator BOB KERR. Between BOB KERR and me there existed for years a close relationship that I treasured very much and which I shall always treasure in connection with his memory.

Senator BOB KERR was one of the great Americans of all time and one of the outstanding legislators in the Halls of Congress. He was a man of commanding views; a man of definite mind; a kind man always, as the majority leader well stated, doing good things for others. Senator BOB KERR was not only a great man but a good man. He was a leader in business, a leader in government in his State, a leader in Government on the national level. BOB KERR possessed the qualities of leadership. He was as others of our colleagues have said—a man of deep faith. He was a man who lived up to the spiritual truths that he believed in. He had an intense love of country and an intense love of his fellow man. His life was like a Horatio Alger story. The story of his life shows what can be done in America, the land of opportunity, if one has the will, the ambition and the determination to carry out their ambitions. BOB KERR always used his wealth as a trust. He always served his State and his country as a trust.

The country could ill afford to lose the services of BOB KERR at this time, but God has acted. We, his friends, will always remember that great man. The memory of his life, his deeds, his actions, his contributions on the State and Federal level are a permanent part of the record of the Nation and the State.

I extend to Mrs. Kerr, her sons and daughters, and to the other loved ones left behind my deep sympathy in their great loss and sorrow.

Mr. STEED. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. WICKERSHAM].

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Mr. Speaker, New Year's Day was a bleak one for Oklahoma. We were shocked to learn of the unexpected death of Oklahoma's greatest Senator, ROBERT S. KERR, affectionately known to his friends as "BOB."

His death shocked all of Oklahoma, as well as the Nation. We were indeed hopeful and praying that the Senator would recover from his illness of the previous weeks and continue his powerful role in the U.S. Senate and the 88th Congress, in many fields of successful private enterprise, as well as his work as a Baptist leader and guiding light.

Reports of the past few days had indicated he would soon be back in the Senate ranks. His death confused and stunned his followers in Oklahoma, the Nation, and admirers in Congress.

BOB KERR rose from a humble beginning to become the most powerful man in the U.S. Senate because he was a human locomotive, a driving man. Time after time he demonstrated his capacity to handle great responsibilities. He roared into debate with his Senate colleagues like an Oklahoma tornado, with effective results.

BOB KERR lost only one major political battle, his drive for the presidential nomination. After he gave up hopes of ever being in the White House he continued his upward move into power.

In committee he was powerful because he carefully studied each move and arrived prepared for action, armed with information about the problem at hand. Public works, space, finance—all controlled by the hand of BOB KERR.

For Oklahoma, his death came at a time when the State is really beginning to move forward. BOB KERR was the captain of the Oklahoma congressional team. He called the signals and helped to bring home one-tenth of the total public works appropriations in the last Congress.

His work greatly benefited Oklahoma, yet Tennessee, Arkansas, Kansas, and other States can attest to his work with glowing pride. Senator KERR took the lead in the development of land, wood, water, and space. His greatest dream was the completion of the Arkansas River development project, a program that is now far enough along so that completion is assured.

Yes, BOB KERR was a great man, an ideal family man, a most outstanding church layman, and a true Christian gentleman. We shall miss him.

I wish to take this opportunity to once again express my deepest sympathy to his entire family.

Mr. STEED. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from California [Mr. MILLER].

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, I want to join with the delegation from Oklahoma and other friends of Senator KERR in paying my humble tribute to him for his great accomplishments in the Congress of the United States.

It was my privilege to work rather closely with Senator KERR in my capacity as chairman of the House Committee on Science and Astronautics since he

was chairman of the Senate Aeronautical and Space Sciences Committee. We were frequently together in conferences and exchanged ideas relative to the space program. He was always kindly, he was always considerate, and you could approach him with confidence, because you knew that you were going to be well received. I never remember a time when he became dictatorial or refused to listen to reasonable arguments.

The great space effort of this country which he helped to initiate will miss the drive and the force that he brought to it. I, for one, appreciate what this loss means to our space effort.

Mr. Speaker, I join with others in extending to his wife and family my deepest sympathy.

Mr. STEED. Mr. Speaker, Senator KERR started from such humble beginnings and during his busy life achieved so many successes in so many fields in so many ways with so many people that it is almost impossible to write a true eulogy of the man.

I think he wrote his own epitaph in his own lifetime when he adopted as the motto and the guiding principle of his whole career of public service a slogan he chose to call land, wood, and water.

So long as there remains any interest in this land, and in the world for that matter, in the field of conservation and natural resources, I know the name of Senator KERR will always rank in the highest of its missionaries.

Mr. Speaker, my wife and I extend to the Kerr family, our warm and dear friends, our deep and heartfelt sympathy in their great loss.

Mr. JARMAN. Mr. Speaker, it is a great privilege to me to join my colleagues in paying tribute to the memory of one of Oklahoma's most distinguished sons, the late Senator ROBERT S. KERR. The Senator's untimely death is a tremendous loss to our Nation and our State. Our Oklahoma congressional delegation has lost a great leader.

Senator KERR was an unusually able man with boundless energy. He was a great American and a champion supporter and developer of his native Oklahoma. He took pride in his heritage and few men have worked so unceasingly to serve their State and her citizens. His keen intellect and sound judgment were demonstrated in all his decisions—a mark of a great statesman. The people of Oklahoma and the Nation are most fortunate in having had a man of such high character and outstanding ability to represent their interests in the Congress of the United States.

Senator KERR's colleagues already miss him and will continue to miss him for a long time to come. The people of the State of Oklahoma will never forget him.

Mr. BELCHER. Mr. Speaker, our hearts are heavy today at the untimely loss of a friend and a colleague, ROBERT S. "BOB" KERR who was Bob to all of his friends. He was a Democrat; I a Republican. My respect for him as an individual and as a U.S. Senator transcends those party lines.

Although at times we differed on national issues, these differences never af-

fected our friendship or our working together for the interest of our constituents and the State of Oklahoma.

The life of BOB KERR is the great American success story. Starting from absolute scratch as the son of a man who worked hard to support six children, by his own drive, ability and intelligence, he rose to be one of the most successful businessmen in America, one of the outstanding Senators of the U.S. Senate, and one of the greatest supporters of his beloved church, the Southern Baptist Church.

It was my privilege to work with BOB KERR rather closely for the past 12 years. In all of these years never once did he fail to fulfill his promises to the fullest extent. He was my friend and I was his friend; we admired and respected each other. BOB KERR loved Oklahoma and was one of its greatest boosters. He fought with a passion to see that Oklahoma secured those things that were rightfully hers.

A test of a man's character can usually be judged by the attitude of those people who work with him day by day. I have known many of his employees for a couple of decades; I have never heard of one that did not admire, respect and love him, and usually remain in his service. He had the ability to select good, capable people; and he loved and respected them as part of his family.

I have heard BOB say on many occasions, "Do not be afraid to dream big dreams, but be careful of what you pray for, as your prayers might be answered." BOB dreamed big dreams; most of them through blood, sweat, and tears came true.

Oklahoma and the Nation are going to miss him. I am going to miss him.

BOB KERR is gone. He died in the harness, in the service of his beloved State and his country. He has left a mark which will never fade but will continue to be a monument to his hard work and strenuous effort.

Mr. Speaker, Mrs. Belcher joins me in extending to Mrs. Kerr and the Kerr family our heartfelt sympathy. We share with them their great loss.

Mr. LIBONATI. Mr. Speaker, Senator ROBERT S. KERR lived in surroundings in the true tradition of the pioneer. He was born of humble parentage in a log cabin, in what was then Indian Territory, at Ada, Okla. Throughout his life he never forgot the religious teachings of his youth and the inherent compassion for those striving against great odds to gain success in life—whether in the business, educational or vocational fields. He later made it financially possible for hundreds of the citizens of his native State to realize their life's ambition.

He learned at an early age that, in order to become successful in life, one must receive an education. Even though his problems were many—he completed his liberal education, at Shawnee Baptist University, and was graduated in law at Oklahoma University.

As a man of decision which marked his entire life—he started prospecting for oil as a drilling engineer. His success in this field was attested to by the expansive

Kerr-McGee Industries, Inc., one of the largest oil companies in the Nation. With the increase of his wealth, this great humanitarian expanded the finances supporting his many charitable, civic and educational programs.

Senator KERR was a very religious man and, as a true Christian, endeavored by example to influence the lives of his many followers. He was considered to be one of the leading national churchmen of the Baptist Church.

As a leader in the civic and business affairs of the State of Oklahoma, and his humanitarian interest in the life attainments of its citizens, it was inevitable that he would enter the political lists to press his progressive ideas and mold public opinion in order to insure legislative enactment.

Through these efforts he was selected as Democratic national committeeman. And, later, he became the Governor of his State, January 1943 to January 1947. In 1948, he was elected to the U.S. Senate, reelected in 1954 and 1960.

As a Senator, KERR became a powerful force in the enactment of legislation. He was respected by his colleagues for his keen and resourceful mind. His honesty of purpose was never questioned. His word was never broken. He was blessed with a great foresight for predicting the future problems of the Nation. His analytical mind, together with a fondness for meticulous research on a question, gave him the factual knowledge required to determine the core of the problem. His indefatigable persistence to arrive at a solution gained for him a reputation for being able to settle highly controversial matters affecting legislation of national importance to future generations.

He was active in American Legion affairs, serving as State commander in 1925. He received many honors for his serving, including the Legion's Distinguished Service Award. He served as a second lieutenant in the 1st Field Artillery in World War I.

He was the perfect American of his time—a product of a true democracy—of humble birth, schooled under adverse conditions, and trained in the business world by experience, seasoned in his high sense of Americanism in the service of his country, and lived to serve in the highest tribunal of the land—a man loved by his neighbors and colleagues and feared by his enemies, and respected and honored by the people of his State and Nation.

We, the members of the Illinois delegation, regret his passing and extend to his dear wife and sons our heartfelt condolences. May the good Lord bless him for the many kindnesses he extended to his fellow man during his lifetime. May his family glory in his fine record.

For he that followeth the path of kindness and giveth to others happiness follows the sacred footsteps of Him that bringeth good tidings that publisheth peace.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, the profound shock which came to all of us on learning of the sudden and tragic passing of ROBERT S. KERR cannot be ex-

pressed in words. This sad and distressing news reached us as the new year was dawning, but the impact of the tragic event will be felt for years to come.

From the wellsprings of the earth of the Oklahoma frontier a towering oak arose. This giant of the forest was Bob KERR. He arose from humble beginnings to great heights. From the log cabin of the western frontier to the highest councils of State and Nation ROBERT S. KERR blazed a trail of leadership which few have ever matched. In conflict and in peace, on the battlefields of World War I and during the cold war of these last decades, he rendered devoted service to his Nation.

BOB KERR's passing is a profound personal loss to me. He was my close friend. I came to know him quite intimately, particularly so in recent years. I have worked with him on literally hundreds of legislative projects, both large and small. The most recent of these was the Revenue Act of 1962. The extent of his contributions to the public interest cannot be described here today. Who can, in the metes and bounds of a few words, show how this great man labored over the minute details of legislation and refused to face even the possibility of defeat? I can with sincerity and vigor offer my testimony wholeheartedly to all those qualities and characteristics which have been associated with him by those who have spoken before me. Above all, I can testify to his character, his complete dedication and singleness of purpose in accomplishing great objectives, and the enormous capacity for successful leadership which was his.

The tremendous power of his intellect and innate brilliance of mind, combined with his driving energy, his diligence and great strength of character, propelled him to the forefront of every endeavor which he ever undertook. His legislative talents and his enormous capacity for reaching solutions in the public interest—matters to which he had devoted himself especially since coming upon the national legislative scene in 1948—are known to all his colleagues and especially those of us who were privileged to work with him on particular projects of great significance and importance to the Nation.

The loss to the Nation in the passing of BOB KERR can only inadequately be described by those of us who speak today. Historians will, I am confident, accord him a very large place and high stature in the account of these years in the life of our great Nation.

To his family I offer sincere and heartfelt condolences. They can take solace from the abiding knowledge that his life and works contributed great and good gifts to the lasting service of mankind.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND REMARKS

Mr. STEED. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have permission to extend their remarks on the subject of Senator KERR in the RECORD today, and that all Members

may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

Mr. SCHWENGLER, for 30 minutes, today.

Mr. PUCINSKI (at the request of Mr. ALBERT), for 1 hour, Wednesday, January 23.

Mr. WIDNALL (at the request of Mr. STAFFORD), today, for 1 hour, to revise and extend his remarks and to include extraneous matter.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

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

Mr. ROUSH.

Mr. HERLONG and to include extraneous matter, notwithstanding the fact that the extension exceeds the limit of two printed pages and is estimated by the Public Printer to cost \$480.

Mr. HOSMER in two instances and to include extraneous matter.

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

Mr. RYAN of New York.

Mr. BRADEMANS.

Mr. ROGERS of Texas.

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

Mr. CELLER in two instances.

Mr. NIX.

Mr. DONOHUE.

Mr. POWELL in five instances.

Mr. GILBERT.

Mr. SLACK.

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

Mr. BOB WILSON in two instances.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin.

Mr. PELLY.

Mr. MARTIN of Nebraska.

Mr. QUIE.

ADJOURNMENT

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

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 1 o'clock and 29 minutes p.m.) under its previous order, the House adjourned until Monday, January 14, 1963, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

168. Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, a letter from the national adjutant, Disabled American Veterans, transmitting the reports and the proceedings of their national gathering, held in Atlantic City, N.J., August 19 through 24, 1962, pur-

suant to Public Law 249, 77th Congress (H. Doc. No. 35) was taken from the Speaker's table, referred to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs and ordered to be printed with illustrations.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ULLMAN:

H.R. 1575. A bill to provide for Federal assistance for the construction and expansion of public community junior colleges; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. AUCHINCLOSS:

H.R. 1576. A bill to provide an elected commission form of government for the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. BERRY:

H.R. 1577. A bill to change the name of the Big Bend Reservoir in the State of South Dakota to Lake Sharpe; to the Committee on Public Works.

H.R. 1578. A bill to change the name of the Fort Randall Reservoir in the State of South Dakota to Lake Francis Case; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. BROOKS:

H.R. 1579. A bill to increase from \$600 to \$800 the personal income tax exemptions of a taxpayer (including the exemption for a spouse, the exemption for a dependent, and the additional exemptions for old age and blindness); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BURKE:

H.R. 1580. A bill to amend the Tariff Act of 1930; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CASEY:

H.R. 1581. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow a deduction for expenses incurred by a taxpayer in making repairs and improvements to his residence, and to allow the owner of rental housing to amortize at an accelerated rate the cost of rehabilitating or restoring such housing; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CURTIN:

H.R. 1582. A bill to prohibit the granting of military decorations to civil or military officers who are employees of foreign governments except with the express consent of the Congress; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H.R. 1583. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide 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.

H.R. 1584. A bill to amend the act of August 21, 1935, to provide for a determination of whether certain sites, buildings, or other objects are of national historical significance, and to prohibit the use of Federal funds for highway purposes which damage or destroy national historical sites, buildings, or other objects; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H.R. 1585. A bill to provide for the establishment of national cemeteries in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H.R. 1586. A bill to provide a 1-year moratorium on FHA-insured and VA-guaranteed mortgages, with the Federal Government assuming the required mortgage payments (both principal and interest) for mortgagors in economically depressed areas who are unemployed and unable to make such payments through no fault of their own, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H.R. 1587. A bill to amend title XI of the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 to provide that certain provisions of liability insurance contracts entered into by air carriers shall be null and void; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 1588. A bill to amend section 744 of title 38, United States Code, to provide that where a veteran has paid in premiums an amount equal to or greater than the face value of a policy of U.S. Government life insurance, the policy of such insurance shall be paid up; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. DERWINSKI:

H.R. 1589. A bill to increase the maximum amount of an insured deposit under the Federal Deposit Insurance Act from \$10,000 to \$25,000; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H.R. 1590. A bill to increase the maximum amount of insurance applicable to accounts in savings and loan institutions under title IV of the National Housing Act from \$10,000 to \$25,000; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H.R. 1591. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 so as to exclude from gross income gain realized from the sale of his principal residence by a taxpayer who has attained the age of 60 years; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DULSKI:

H.R. 1592. A bill to prevent the use of stop-watches or other measuring devices in the postal service; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. FALLON:

H.R. 1593. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954, relative to taxes on property subject to redeemable ground rent; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 1594. A bill to establish within the Housing and Home Finance Agency a new program of mortgage insurance to assist in financing the construction, improvement, expansion, and rehabilitation of harbor facilities for boating and commercial craft; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. FINO:

H.R. 1595. A bill to authorize the establishment of Federal mutual savings banks; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. FISHER:

H.R. 1596. A bill to repeal the authorization for the furnishing of foreign currencies in connection with local currency expenses of Members and employees of the Congress traveling outside the United States; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. FRIEDEL:

H.R. 1597. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code to provide a deduction for payment of redeemable ground rents; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 1598. A bill to amend title I of the Housing Act of 1949 to permit loss of goodwill to be taken into account in computing the amount of the relocation payment which may be made to a business concern or non-profit organization displaced by an urban renewal project, and to increase the maximum amount of such payment; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H.R. 1599. A bill to increase the personal income tax exemptions of a taxpayer, including the exemptions for a spouse and dependents and the additional exemptions for old age and blindness from \$600 to \$1,000; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 1600. A bill to repeal the excise tax on amounts paid for communication services or facilities; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 1601. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security to increase the amount of outside earnings permitted each year without deductions from benefits thereunder; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 1602. A bill to amend the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937 to increase the

amount of outside income which a survivor annuitant may earn without deduction from his or her annuity thereunder; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. GLENN:

H.R. 1603. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct two modern stern ramp trawlers to be used for research, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

H.R. 1604. A bill to amend the act of June 12, 1960, for the correction of inequities in the construction of fishing vessels, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

H.R. 1605. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act to grant retirement credit for certain service in the U.S. merchant marine in World War II, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 1606. A bill to provide for stabilization and orderly marketing in the poultry industry; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H.R. 1607. A bill to amend section 40 of the Federal Employees' Compensation Act with respect to the determination of monthly pay; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 1608. A bill to amend section 308 of the Tariff Act of 1930 to provide that aircraft engines and propellers may be exported as working parts of aircraft, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GONZALEZ:

H.R. 1609. A bill to increase from \$600 to \$900 the personal income tax exemptions of a taxpayer (including the exemption for a spouse, the exemption for a dependent, and the additional exemptions for old age and blindness); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GOODLING:

H.R. 1610. A bill to amend the Federal Deposit Insurance Act to increase the amount of a deposit which may be insured under that act; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H.R. 1611. A bill to authorize the coinage of 50-cent pieces in commemoration of the 100th anniversary of the delivery of Lincoln's immortal address at Gettysburg; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H.R. 1612. A bill to amend chapter 15 of title 38, United States Code, with respect to eligibility for special pension in the case of individuals awarded the Congressional Medal of Honor; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. GUBSER:

H.R. 1613. A bill to amend title I of the Housing Act of 1949 to authorize relocation payments in the case of certain parts of a business concern located outside an urban renewal area where they are interdependent with parts of such concern displaced from within such area; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H.R. 1614. A bill to exempt regular and classified substitute employees in post offices of the first, second, and third classes from residence requirements governing appointment and service of postmasters at post offices to which such employees are assigned; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 1615. A bill to provide that the President shall designate one agency of the Federal Government to conduct all security investigations of civil officers and employees of the United States, and of persons who apply for employment as such officers and employees; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 1616. A bill to provide for the establishment of rates of compensation for positions in the Federal Government in appropriate relationship to local prevailing rates for similar positions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 1617. A bill to create the Freedom Commission for the development of the science of counteraction to the World Communist conspiracy and for the training and development of leaders in a total political war; to the Committee on Un-American Activities.

H.R. 1618. A bill to amend the Tariff Act of 1930 to provide that bagpipes and related items used in bagpipe bands shall be admitted free of duty; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 1619. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide that the Secretary of the Treasury shall be bound by decisions of certain Federal courts; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 1620. A bill to permit an individual to obtain coverage under title II of the Social Security Act on the basis of service which was not covered employment at the time it was performed, if service of that type has since become covered employment and such individual makes payment of the applicable social security taxes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 1621. A bill to provide that those persons entitled to retired pay or retainer pay under the Career Compensation Act of 1949 who were prohibited from computing their retired pay or retainer pay under the rates provided by the act of May 20, 1958, shall be entitled to have their retired pay or retainer pay recomputed on the rates of basic pay provided by the act of May 20, 1958; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H.R. 1622. A bill to provide for a joint study by the Administrator of the Federal Aviation Agency and the Secretary of Defense of the disposal and future use of military airports found to be surplus to the needs of the Department of Defense; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. HALPERN:

H.R. 1623. A bill to prohibit discrimination in employment because of race, religion, color, national origin, or ancestry; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 1624. A bill to prohibit discrimination on account of sex in the payment of wages by certain employers engaged in commerce or in the production of goods for commerce and to provide for the restitution of wages lost by employees by reason of any such discrimination; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 1625. A bill to provide a program of technical and financial assistance to communities to help effectuate desegregation of schools; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 1626. A bill to amend section 213 of the National Housing Act to place the Federal Housing Administration cooperative housing mortgage insurance program on a mutual basis, and to authorize loans to cooperatives under such program for replacements, improvements, and repairs; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H.R. 1627. A bill to amend title II of the National Housing Act to authorize the creation of mutual mortgage funds for the FHA premiums paid by cooperative corporations established under the act; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H.R. 1628. A bill to authorize the establishment of Federal mutual savings banks; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H.R. 1629. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1630. A bill to enable the courts more effectively to deal with the problem of narcotic addiction; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1631. A bill for the better assurance of the protection of citizens of the United States and other persons within the several States from mob violence and lynching, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1632. A bill to create a Community Relations Service; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1633. A bill to establish a Commission on Equal Job Opportunity Under Government Contracts; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1634. A bill to amend title 18 of the United States Code relating to threats or injury to Federal officers in the discharge of their duties; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1635. A bill to protect the right to vote in Federal elections free from arbitrary discrimination by literacy tests or other means; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1636. A bill to make unlawful deprivations of rights guaranteed under the 14th amendment, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1637. A bill to make the Civil Rights Commission a permanent agency; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1638. A bill to amend part III of the Civil Rights Act of 1957; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1639. A bill to provide for the general welfare by assisting the States, through a program of grants-in-aid, to establish and operate special hospital facilities for the treatment and cure of narcotic addicts; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 1640. A bill to establish the Department of Urban Affairs and prescribe its functions; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. HOEVEN:

H.R. 1641. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow a deduction from gross income for certain amounts paid for the education of the taxpayer, his spouse, or his dependents; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. JOELSON:

H.R. 1642. A bill to provide for the sale of the U.S. Animal Quarantine Station, Clifton, N.J., to the city of Clifton to provide for the establishment of a new station and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. JOHANSEN:

H.R. 1643. A bill to amend the Internal Security Act of 1950; to the Committee on Un-American Activities.

H.R. 1644. A bill to amend the Internal Security Act of 1950 to provide for the protection of classified information released to or within U.S. industry, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Un-American Activities.

H.R. 1645. A bill to amend the Internal Security Act of 1950; to the Committee on Un-American Activities.

H.R. 1646. A bill to amend the Subversive Activities Control Act of 1950 so as to authorize the Federal Government to guard strategic defense facilities against individuals believed disposed to commit acts of sabotage, espionage, or other subversion; to the Committee on Un-American Activities.

H.R. 1647. A bill to amend the Subversive Activities Control Act of 1950 so as to provide that any Federal officer or employee who willfully fails or refuses to answer, or falsely answers, certain questions relating to Communist activities or national security, when summoned to appear before any Federal agency, shall be removed from his office or employment; to the Committee on Un-American Activities.

H.R. 1648. A bill to amend the Subversive Activities Control Act of 1950 to provide for a procedure under which certain final orders of the Subversive Activities Control Board with respect to Communist organizations may be made applicable to successor organizations; to the Committee on Un-American Activities.

H.R. 1649. A bill to amend the Subversive Activities Control Act of 1950 with respect to the granting of bail to defendants in criminal cases pending appeal or certiorari; to the Committee on Un-American Activities.

H.R. 1650. A bill to amend section 11 of the Subversive Activities Control Act of 1950; to the Committee on Un-American Activities.

H.R. 1651. A bill to amend the Internal Security Act of 1950, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Un-American Activities.

H.R. 1652. A bill to amend section 1651 of title 28, United States Code, so as to require the concurrence of not less than five Justices in the granting of writs of certiorari by the Supreme Court; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1653. A bill to amend section 1108 of the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 to prohibit certain foreign air carriers from operating aircraft within the United States; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 1654. A bill to amend section 243 of the Immigration and Nationality Act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JONES of Alabama:

H.R. 1655. A bill to amend section 1613 of title 38, United States Code, to extend beyond 8 years the period within which veterans may pursue education and training where the pursuit of such education and training has been interrupted by reasons beyond the control of the veteran; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. KARTH:

H.R. 1656. A bill to authorize the withholding from the pay of civilian employees of the United States the dues for membership in certain employee organizations; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 1657. A bill to prevent the use of stopwatches, work-measurement programs or other performance standards operations as measuring devices in the postal service; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. KEOGH:

H.R. 1658. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Act of 1954 to define the terms "manufacturer" and "producer" for purposes of the excise tax on automotive parts and accessories; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KING of California:

H.R. 1659. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to grant an additional income tax exemption for a taxpayer supporting a dependent who is blind; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LINDSAY:

H.R. 1660. A bill to provide a deduction for income tax purposes, in the case of a disabled individual, for expenses for transportation to and from work; and to provide an additional exemption for income tax purposes for a taxpayer or spouse who is physically or mentally incapable of caring for himself; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MEADER:

H.R. 1661. A bill to establish a Commission on Research and Development; to the Committee on Science and Astronautics.

H.R. 1662. A bill to establish rules of interpretation governing questions of the effect of acts of Congress on State laws; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1663. A bill to permit the construction of certain public works on the Great Lakes for flood control, and for protection from high water levels, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. MONTAÑA:

H.R. 1664. A bill to extend for 2 years the temporary provisions of Public Laws 815 and 874, 81st Congress, which relate to Federal assistance in the construction and operation of schools in areas affected by Federal activities; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. MORGAN:

H.R. 1665. A bill to require the Secretary of the Army to confine within a conduit a portion of Dunlap Creek in Brownsville, Pa.; to the Committee on Public Works.

H.R. 1666. A bill to amend the Federal Coal Mine Safety Act so as to provide further for the prevention of accidents in coal mines; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 1667. A bill to establish quota limitations on imports of foreign residual fuel oil; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 1668. A bill to amend the Social Security Act to provide that, for the purpose of old-age and survivors insurance benefits, retirement age shall be 60 years; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MORRISON:

H.R. 1669. A bill to make the civil service retirement and disability fund available for annuity benefits authorized by law; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 1670. A bill to amend the Federal Employees' Group Life Insurance Act of 1954, as amended, so as to provide for an additional unit of life insurance; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 1671. A bill to modify the decrease in group life insurance at age 65 or after retirement; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 1672. A bill to extend health benefits to the survivors of retiree annuitants who died before April 1, 1948; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 1673. A bill to amend provisions relative to compensatory time in the Postal Field Service Compensation Act; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 1674. A bill to amend the District of Columbia Barber Act; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

H.R. 1675. A bill to amend provisions relative to overtime in the Postal Field Service Compensation Act; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. O'HARA of Michigan:

H.R. 1676. A bill to require air carriers to inspect for destructive substances all articles taken aboard certain aircraft operated by them in air transportation; to permit persons injured by failure of an air carrier to so inspect to bring an action for damages against the air carrier, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 1677. A bill to amend the National Defense Education Act of 1958 in order to extend the provisions of title II relating to cancellation of loans under such title to teachers in private nonprofit elementary and secondary schools and in institutions of higher education; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 1678. A bill to provide wage standards for persons engaged by Federal contractors or subcontractors to furnish services or maintenance work to Federal agencies, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 1679. A bill to provide Federal assistance for the establishment, expansion, and improvement of programs of technical education at the college level; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 1680. A bill to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938, as amended, to improve the act's overtime standards; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 1681. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide that an amount equal to the manufacturers excise tax on passenger automobiles shall be paid to persons who purchase such automobiles during periods of high unemployment; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 1682. A bill to amend section 4063 (a) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide an exemption from tax in the case of mobile homes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. OLSEN of Montana:

H.R. 1683. A bill to authorize the withholding from the pay of civilian employees of the United States the dues for membership in certain employee organizations upon

consent of employee; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 1684. A bill to extend the benefits of the Retired Federal Employees Health Benefits Act to certain retired employees entitled to deferred annuity; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 1685. A bill to amend provisions relative to overtime in the Postal Field Service Compensation Act; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 1686. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act with respect to the designation of individuals to receive survivor annuities under such act; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 1687. A bill to create a presumption that certain impairment of health caused by hypertension or heart disease of a Federal or District of Columbia employee is incurred in line of duty for purposes of certain retirement and disability compensation laws or systems; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 1688. A bill to provide for certain survivors' annuities in additional cases under the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. O'NEILL:

H.R. 1689. A bill to amend the Annual and Sick Leave Act of 1951, to increase the annual and sick leave which may be earned and accumulated by officers and employees of the Federal Government; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 1690. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act to increase to 2½ percent the multiplication factor for determining annuities for certain Federal employees engaged in hazardous duties; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. OSTERTAG:

H.R. 1691. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to permit an individual to waive his right to receive benefits thereunder in order to preserve his right to receive benefits under other laws; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 1692. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide that an individual's entitlement to child's insurance benefits shall continue, after he attains age eighteen, for so long as he is regularly attending school; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 1693. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to permit the payment of disability insurance benefits to an individual from the beginning of his disability; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PASSMAN:

H.R. 1694. A bill to provide for the establishment of the Poverty Point National Monument in the State of Louisiana, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. PELLY:

H.R. 1695. A bill to amend the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, to provide for the duty-free entry of certain kinds of limestone; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. POAGE:

H.R. 1696. A bill defining the interest of local public agencies in water reservoirs constructed by the Government which have been financed partially by such agencies; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina:

H.R. 1697. A bill to provide that any Federal employee who refuses to answer a question of a committee of the Congress with respect to Communist, Communist-front, or subversive affiliations, shall be removed immediately from the position or office held by him; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 1698. A bill to amend the Railway Labor Act so as to authorize the President to establish boards to resolve jurisdictional disputes in the air transportation industry,

and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 1699. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to provide more efficient dental care for the personnel of the Army, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H.R. 1700. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to provide more efficient dental care for the personnel of the Air Force, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H.R. 1701. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to provide for the rank of lieutenant general or vice admiral of officers of the Army, Navy, and Air Force while serving as Surgeons General; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H.R. 1702. A bill to provide that the Department of Defense shall enter into contracts for air transportation with air carriers as defined by the Federal Aviation Act of 1958; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H.R. 1703. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to provide for the identification of a military airlift command as a specified command, to provide for its military mission, and to eliminate unnecessary duplication in airlift; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H.R. 1704. A bill to make certain exceptions to the appellate jurisdiction of the Supreme Court of the United States and of the U.S. courts of appeals and to the jurisdiction of the district courts of the United States in actions relating to the public schools; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1705. A bill to require that all agreements and understandings respecting the importation of foreign goods, entered into with foreign countries or their citizens, shall be reduced to writing and made public; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ROOSEVELT:

H.R. 1706. A bill to amend the Packers and Stockyards Act, 1921, to strengthen independent competition by providing for competitive enterprise in the retail sales of meat, meat food products, livestock products, and other food items; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. ROUDEBUSH:

H.R. 1707. A bill to amend section 1498 of title 28, United States Code, to authorize the use or manufacture, in certain cases, by or for the United States of any invention described in and covered by a patent of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SHELLEY:

H.R. 1708. A bill to authorize the Housing and Home Finance Administrator to provide additional assistance for the development of comprehensive and coordinated mass transportation systems, both public and private, in metropolitan and other urban areas, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H.R. 1709. A bill to establish a Federal commission on the disposition of Alcatraz Island; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ULLMAN:

H.R. 1710. A bill to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act as reenacted and amended by the Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act of 1937; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H.R. 1711. A bill to amend the Employment Act of 1946 to establish policies with respect to productive capital investments of the Government; to the Committee on Government Operations.

H.R. 1712. A bill to amend the act authorizing the Crooked River Federal reclamation project to provide for the irrigation of additional lands; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H.R. 1713. A bill to approve an order of the Secretary of the Interior canceling irrigation charges against non-Indian-owned lands under the Klamath Indian irrigation project, Oregon, and for other purposes; to

the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H.R. 1714. A bill to authorize civil actions for the review of certain administrative determinations as to the use of lands of the United States for grazing purposes to be instituted in judicial districts in which such lands are situated, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1715. A bill to authorize the establishment of a Youth Conservation Corps to provide healthful outdoor training and employment for young men and to advance the conservation, development, and management of national resources of timber, soil, and range, and of recreational areas; and to authorize pilot local youth public service employment programs; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. WILLIAMS:

H.R. 1716. A bill to amend section 1002 of the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 to authorize the Civil Aeronautics Board to suspend certain rates relating to foreign air transportation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 1717. A bill to amend section 402 of the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 to require approval by the Civil Aeronautics Board of certain schedules of foreign air carriers; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. YOUNG:

H.R. 1718. A bill to provide for the establishment of a veterans hospital in south Texas; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. CURTIN:

H.R. 1719. A bill to provide that compensation of an individual for services performed while engaged in commerce, or as an officer or employee of the United States, shall be subject to State and local income taxes only in the State and political subdivision in which such individual is domiciled, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. COHELAN:

H.J. Res. 113. Joint resolution authorizing the Secretary of the Army to receive for instruction at the U.S. Military Academy at West Point two citizens and subjects of the Republic of Vietnam; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. CURTIN:

H.J. Res. 114. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States empowering the Congress to authorize the President to approve and disapprove separate items or provisions in appropriation bills; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.J. Res. 115. Joint resolution designating the American marigold (*Tagetes erecta*) as the national floral emblem of the United States; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. FALLON:

H.J. Res. 116. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to permit the use of prayer in public schools; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. MAY:

H.J. Res. 117. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to equal rights for men and women; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina:

H.J. Res. 118. Joint resolution declaring Good Friday in each year to be a legal public holiday; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.J. Res. 119. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution relating to the offering of prayers in public schools; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BROOKS:

H. Con. Res. 35. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress that the development and use of productivity standards should be extended and applied to as many

Federal activities as may be practicable; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. GUBSER:

H. Con. Res. 36. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress as to a study and investigation concerning a nationwide program of remunerative occupational training for youth; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. O'NEILL:

H. Con. Res. 37. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress that all of our U.S. naval shipyards and facilities be maintained on a fully manned operational basis performing essential Navy or other Department of Defense work in the interest of our national defense, and that the President of the United States be urged to instruct the Secretary of Defense to take all necessary steps to insure this end, including the immediate cancellation and withdrawal of any and all instructions or orders issued or contemplated by the Department of the Navy incompatible with this purpose; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. ASPINALL:

H. Res. 79. Resolution to authorize the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs to make investigations into any matter within its jurisdiction, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. DAWSON:

H. Res. 80. Resolution providing for the expenses of conducting studies and investigations authorized by rule XI(8) incurred by the Committee on Government Operations; to the Committee on House Administration.

H. Res. 81. Resolution to amend the Rules of the House of Representatives with respect to the location of activities of the Committee on Government Operations; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. FALLON:

H. Res. 82. Resolution opposing the seating of Communist China in organs of the United Nations; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania:

H. Res. 83. Resolution amending the Rules of the House of Representatives so as to restore the 21-day rule; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. VINSON:

H. Res. 84. Resolution authorizing the Committee on Armed Services to conduct a full and complete investigation and study of all matters relating to procurement by the Department of Defense, personnel of such Department, laws administered by such Department, use of funds by such Department, and scientific research in support of the armed services; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. WESTLAND:

H. Res. 85. Resolution expressing the sense of the House with respect to the need of Point Roberts in the State of Washington for Federal assistance to combat its economic problems; to the Committee on Public Works.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mr. BROWN of California:

H.R. 1720. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Eugenia H. Tucker; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia:

H.R. 1721. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Clorinda (Frattini) Iacangelo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CLANCY:

H.R. 1722. A bill for the relief of Stephen and Simone Grignet; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1723. A bill for the relief of Agnese Brienza; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1724. A bill for the relief of Vita Maria Colucci; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1725. A bill for the relief of Elisabeth Werner; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CURTIN:

H.R. 1726. A bill for the relief of William H. Woodhouse; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1727. A bill for the relief of Richard G. Green, Jr.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1728. A bill for the relief of Sayhan Husnu Bilbasar and Suheyra Bilbasar; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1729. A bill for the relief of Almerinda Tedesco Bernardo, Adella Bernardo, and Grace Bernardo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DEROUNIAN:

H.R. 1730. A bill for the relief of Yin-Chio Ton; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FISHER:

H.R. 1731. A bill for the relief of Eva Baker; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HAGAN of Georgia:

H.R. 1732. A bill for the relief of James Hubert Rhoden and Marjorie Joyce Rhoden; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1733. A bill for the relief of Dr. Chen-Tsuan Su and Angela Su; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JOELSON:

H.R. 1734. A bill for the relief of Luba Siedlecki Simon; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1735. A bill for the relief of Maria Nessim Djedjah De Aides; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1736. A bill for the relief of Assunta DiLella Codella; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MORRISON:

H.R. 1737. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Josefina V. Guerrero Leauxmax; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JOELSON:

H.R. 1738. A bill for the relief of Maria Giuseppa Fantauzzi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1739. A bill for the relief of Elsa H. Walkowiak; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1740. A bill for the relief of Maria Marcella Tang and Maria de Fatima Tang; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KEOGH:

H.R. 1741. A bill for the relief of Filippa Fucarino; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MOORE:

H.R. 1742. A bill for the relief of the Wetzel County Hospital, New Martinsville, W. Va.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MORRISON:

H.R. 1743. A bill for the relief of Mary M. Kavas; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1744. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Esther Aboud and her children, Samuel Eliahou, and Rahamin Aboud; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1745. A bill for the relief of Dr. John P. Chlason and his wife, Alice Chlason, and their minor children, Louis, Marc, Marina, and Nicole Chlason; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1746. A bill for the relief of Bahira Sutton, Ovadia Sutton, and Ruth Sutton; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1747. A bill for the relief of Elias Oeder; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1748. A bill for the relief of Antonio Ingrassia, his wife, Alfonsa Monteleone Ingrassia, and their minor son, Salvatore Ingrassia; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MORSE:

H.R. 1749. A bill for the relief of Mary Barbadian; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MULTER:

H.R. 1750. A bill for the relief of Rahmi Sengul; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. O'HARA of Michigan:

H.R. 1751. A bill for the relief of Gino Fanelli; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1752. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Franciszka Andres Beregsasi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1753. A bill for the relief of Brother Antonio Testori; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1754. A bill for the relief of Dr. Mamdouh S. Younes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1755. A bill for the relief of Sister M. Augustina (Teresa Cattaneo), Sister M. Francesca (Rina Tagliaferri), Sister Maria Silvia (Natalina Da Dalt), and Sister Maria Angela (Rosa Colombo); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1756. A bill for the relief of George Zammit; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. O'NEILL:

H.R. 1757. A bill for the relief of Mario Ruggiero; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. POFF:

H.R. 1758. A bill for the relief of Selma Gokhan and Selcuk Gokhan; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina:

H.R. 1759. A bill for the relief of Rebecca K. Clayton; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1760. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Gertrude L. Rice; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TUCK:

H.R. 1761. A bill to confer jurisdiction on the Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of R. Gordon Finney, Jr.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SENATE

THURSDAY, JANUARY 10, 1963

(Legislative day of Wednesday, January 9, 1963)

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

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Our Father, God, hallowed be Thy name. Give us to see that if the radiance of that name above every name does not touch with luster and reverence the tasks Thou dost give us to accomplish as we deal with our fellows, our lip professions of faith are futile and vain. With the assurance of Thy undergirding, O Lord, deliver us from the sullenness of temper that clouds the sunshine from other faces and from the gloom that makes life harder for those who walk by our side. In all the national deliberations that loom in the days that hasten, keep our motives clean, our vision clear, our patriotism undefiled, our speech guarded, our judgments fair, and our consciences unbetrayed. We ask it in the Redeemer's name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Wednesday, January 9, 1963, was dispensed with.

ADMINISTRATION OF OATH

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair is informed that the distinguished Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT] is available and is ready to take the oath. If he will come forward and present himself, the oath will be administered at this time.

Mr. FULBRIGHT, escorted by Mr. McCLELLAN, advanced to the Vice President's desk; the oath prescribed by law was administered to him by the Vice President; and he subscribed to the oath in the official oath book.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

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

TRADE AGREEMENTS WITH UNITED KINGDOM AND JAPAN—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT (H. DOC. NO. 34)

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, which, with the accompanying papers, was referred to the Committee on Finance:

To the Congress of the United States:

I transmit herewith to the Congress copies of a trade agreement negotiated with the United Kingdom to compensate for the increased import duties placed on certain carpets and glass in an escape clause action which affected concessions previously granted by the United States on these products. I am also transmitting an agreement negotiated with Japan to correct the inadvertent omission of part of one concession previously negotiated. The agreement with the United Kingdom was signed on behalf of the United States on December 10, 1962, and that with Japan on December 18, 1962.

The agreements are submitted in accordance with section 4(a) of the Trade Agreements Extension Act of 1951 which requires that the President report to the Congress his reason for breaching any peril point findings of the Tariff Commission. Annex A, attached to this message, lists those instances in which I decided to accord tariff concessions at levels below those found by the Tariff Commission, together with reasons for my decision.

In the agreement with the United Kingdom, the United States granted tariff concessions to compensate for the increases in United States tariffs on certain carpets and glass. The action to increase the carpets and glass tariffs was taken under section 7 (the escape clause) of the Trade Agreements Extension Act of 1951. Under the commitments in the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade the United States is obligated to consult with contracting parties adversely affected by the escape clause action and to accord compensation for impairment of such country's trade as a result of the action.

The consultations with the United Kingdom began shortly after the United States had completed large-scale, multilateral negotiations in the 1960-61 tariff conference, in which it had nearly exhausted the authority for reducing tariffs contained in the Trade Agreements Extension Act of 1958 on the products on which public notice had been issued, except for a number of products on which the Tariff Commission had found that rates could not be reduced without in its judgment causing or threatening serious injury to the domestic industry concerned. These consultations began against the background of unsatisfactory consultations concerning the carpets and glass action with the European Economic Community which decided to make compensatory withdrawal of concessions against imports from the United States rather than to continue negotiations to obtain new compensatory concessions from the United States.

An agreement with the United Kingdom is clearly desirable not only to sustain our record as a country recognizing its obligations but also to avoid a possible "snowballing" of withdrawal actions. The only feasible way that agreement could be achieved within the framework of authority existing at the time consultations were held was by granting concessions below the peril point levels found by the Tariff Commission.

As explained in my message of March 7, 1962, the Tariff Commission in preparation for the 1960-61 tariff conference was required to make hurried predictions as to future market conditions for thousands of individual articles. This necessarily resulted in the establishment of peril points at the existing tariff level, for a large number of products.

In preparation for the compensatory negotiations with the United Kingdom, the agencies concerned examined with care these earlier findings of the Tariff Commission on products of interest to that country to determine whether there then appeared to be valid reasons for excluding all of these products from negotiations or whether in fact some could be offered as concessions to compensate the United Kingdom without threatening serious injury to the domestic industry. In selecting products as possible offers, two main criteria were used: their value in reaching settlement with the United Kingdom and the extent of competitive adjustment likely to be placed on American industry by tariff reductions. In applying the second of these criteria, the interdepartmental organization determined that the items selected all met one or more of the following conditions: they are not produced in the United States or are not produced in significant quantity; the ratio of imports to domestic production is small; imports in recent years have declined, have been stable or have increased very slightly; they consist of raw or semi-finished materials required for U.S. industries or a reduction in the rate of duty could be expected to have relatively little effect on imports.

In the agreement with Japan, the United States corrected an error consisting of the omission of a part of a concession it had agreed to grant Japan in the 1960-61 tariff conference but which it had inadvertently failed to include in either the relevant preliminary agreements with Japan or the United States schedule to the tariff conference protocol. It was necessary either to correct this error by including the concession, which involved breaching a peril point finding of the Tariff Commission, or granting Japan another concession of equivalent value. The latter course would have complicated already difficult negotiations in progress concerning compensation for increased U.S. tariffs on carpets and glass. It was the opinion of the interdepartmental trade agreements organization that the concession was justified on economic grounds since U.S. imports of the item in question (discharge lamps) are less than one-half percent of domestic production and imports have declined while consumption is increasing.

Both agreements were entered into pursuant to section 257(c) of the Trade Expansion Act which extends until December 31, 1962, the period for concluding, under section 350 of the Tariff Act of 1930, trade agreements based on public notices issued in connection with the 1960-61 tariff conference.

JOHN F. KENNEDY.

THE WHITE HOUSE, January 9, 1963.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Kent, one of its clerks, informed the Senate that a quorum of the House of Representatives had assembled; that JOHN W. McCORMACK, a Representative from the State of Massachusetts, had been elected Speaker, and Ralph R. Roberts, a citizen of the State of Indiana, Clerk of the House of Representatives of the 83rd Congress.

The message announced that the House had agreed to a concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 1) establishing that the two Houses of Congress assemble in the Hall of the House of Representatives on January 14, 1963, at 12:30 o'clock in the afternoon, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message also announced that a committee of three Members had been appointed on the part of the House to join with a committee on the part of the Senate to notify the President of the United States that a quorum of each House had been assembled, and that Congress was ready to receive any communication that he may be pleased to make.

The message further announced that the House had adopted the following resolution (H. Res. 11), relating to the death of the late Senator Dennis Chavez, of New Mexico:

Resolved, That the House has heard with profound sorrow of the death of the Honorable Dennis Chavez, a Senator of the United States from the State of New Mexico.

Resolved, That the Clerk communicate these resolutions to the Senate and transmit a copy thereof to the family of the deceased Senator.

Resolved, That as a further mark of respect the House do now adjourn.

The message also announced that the House had adopted the following resolution (H. Res. 12), relating to the death of the late Senator Robert S. Kerr, of Oklahoma:

Resolved, That the House has heard with profound sorrow of the death of the Honorable Robert S. Kerr, a Senator of the United States from the State of Oklahoma.

Resolved, That the clerk communicate these resolutions to the Senate and transmit a copy thereof to the family of the deceased Senator.

Resolved, That as a further mark of respect the House do now adjourn.

ORDER FOR RECESS UNTIL MONDAY, AT NOON

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that at the conclusion of its session today, the Senate take a recess until 12 o'clock noon, on Monday.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE MEETING DURING SENATE SESSION

On request of Mr. DIRKSEN, and by unanimous consent, the Subcommittee on Internal Security of the Committee on the Judiciary was authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

JOINT SESSION ON JANUARY 14, 1963

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask that the Chair lay before the Senate a concurrent resolution coming over from the House of Representatives, and I ask unanimous consent for its present consideration.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair lays before the Senate a concurrent resolution of the House of Representatives, which will be read.

The concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 1) was read as follows:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That the two Houses of Congress assemble in the Hall of the House of Representatives on January 14, 1963, at 12:30 o'clock in the afternoon, for the purpose of receiving such communication as the President of the United States shall be pleased to make to them.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the concurrent resolution?

There being no objection, the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 1) was considered and agreed to.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Montana will state it.

Mr. MANSFIELD. At this time is it in order that statements be made concerning the anniversaries of service of our colleagues, and also that insertions be made in the Record; and if such statements are in order and are made, do I correctly understand that they will not

affect the parliamentary situation prevailing at the commencement of the Congress?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Parliamentarian informs the Chair that such statements would not affect the parliamentary situation in the least, insofar as it pertains to the rules of the Senate.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, for the information of the Senate, let me state that today there will not be a morning hour.

THIRTIETH ANNIVERSARY OF SENATE SERVICE OF SENATOR RUSSELL

Mr. TALMADGE. Mr. President, it is a distinct pleasure for me today to pay tribute to my beloved senior colleague and friend, the distinguished Senator from Georgia, RICHARD B. RUSSELL, who on Saturday will enter his 30th year of service in the Senate of the United States.

For three decades Senator RUSSELL has tirelessly and devotedly dedicated himself to service to his Nation and to his native State of Georgia.

No other Member of the Senate in modern times has risen to such high prominence or won the genuine respect of his fellow Senators achieved by Senator RUSSELL.

In the preservation of the Senate as a great deliberative body fulfilling its constitutional responsibilities, no other Member in recent history has had a more significant role or has exerted a greater influence.

The Nation and every citizen are indebted to Senator RUSSELL for his devotion to duty, for his genius, courage, imaginative foresight, and insatiable love of hard work.

Senator RUSSELL is a valiant defender of the individual liberties of all the people of this country.

He is without peer as a vigorous and outspoken advocate of our republican form of government. With unexcelled diligence and determination, the senior Senator from Georgia has led efforts to insure for the future of the Nation the separation of powers of the three branches of Government.

Senator RUSSELL has served his country with great distinction in still another area vital to our national security. For 12 years, as chairman of the Senate Armed Services Committee, he has been at the forefront of maintaining the military supremacy of the United States.

He has seen that this Nation remained the mightiest in the world, serving notice that certain destruction awaits any would-be aggressor.

Every man, woman, and child of this country can look to a happier and more secure future because of the efforts of Senator RUSSELL to give the United States a strong and alert Defense Establishment.

Farmers especially have good reason to be grateful to Senator RUSSELL. They have in him a champion of their well-being, a fighter to see that they have a better life and a fair share of the national income.

As chairman of the subcommittee on Agriculture of the Senate Committee on Appropriations, Senator RUSSELL has waged an unending battle for a sounder farm program and has sponsored such significant legislation as the rural electrification program, the Farmers Home Administration, and the school lunch program.

His statesmanlike conduct and parliamentary prowess have won wide acclaim. Yet, Senator RUSSELL is a modest and unassuming man. He wants only to serve the people.

Georgians and every American can be proud of his 30 years in the U.S. Senate, and we who serve with him share their pride.

I affectionately thank Senator RUSSELL for a job well done and wish for him many more significant, illustrious, and fruitful years to come.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator from Georgia yield?

Mr. TALMADGE. I am delighted to yield to my friend, the distinguished majority leader.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, on January 12, the distinguished senior Senator from Georgia, the assistant dean of the Senate, will have completed 30 years of service in this body, service to the Senate, and to the Nation.

During these three decades, Senator RUSSELL has given his great legislative talents and has applied his profound capacity for reason to the design of the military defenses of the Nation, as well as to the exacting tasks of appropriation of public funds. Yet he has also found time to make major contributions to the Nation's agriculture and conservation, as well as many other fields.

That he has come to have such competence in so many matters is not surprising. He came to Congress 30 years ago already possessing both experience and a passion in the field of government. Out of this background he has developed into the exceptional statesman and master parliamentarian that he is.

RICHARD RUSSELL is a great Senator. He gives inspiration to those of us who have had the privilege of associating with him during part of his distinguished career. He acts with calmness and kindness. He can act with a fiery tenacity. But always he acts with reason and deliberation, with modesty, and with scrupulous fairness. He asks for no quarter that he does not grant to any other Senator in the great legislative battles of our time.

We share in the great debt which the Nation owes to him for his diligent and persevering attention to the Nation's defenses. That and the State of Georgia have been his great passions. But we in the Senate owe him a unique debt. He is also a teacher. He is the Senate's outstanding authority on the Senate's own procedures.

He commands our respect for his mastery of the Senate rules and his complete dedication to the Nation. But he has the admiration and the affection of the Senator from Montana and, indeed, of all who know him, for his never-failing patience, decency, and understanding.

He is a great American, a great Senator, and a great Democrat.

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

Mr. TALMADGE. I am delighted to yield to the distinguished minority leader, the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, at the time that the senior Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] was lifting his hand to take the oath in this body 30 years ago, I, as a freshman Member of the House of Representatives, was lifting my right hand in the Hall of that great body to take the oath of office.

By all the circuitous routes whereby one lands first on one committee, and then on another, I finally became a member of the House Appropriations Committee, and particularly the Subcommittee on Agriculture of that committee.

At that time I had a deep conviction and, in fact, a fixation, that if our Republic was ever to be saved, it would be saved by the House of Representatives. I carried that conviction into the committee room. I remember so well that, as a member of the conference committees from the House that sat down with conference committees of the Senate, I sought to impress the Members of this body who were members of the conference committee on agriculture with the fact that most of the wisdom reposed in the House of Representatives. There I first intimately encountered the distinguished Senator from Georgia.

Mr. President, I learned some things from the Senator from Georgia that have abided with me from that day to this. I discovered, first, that he did his homework, and whenever one contended with him in a conference, he should be sure that he likewise had done his homework.

I discovered also that he had a rare fidelity to the traditions and the institutions of this country, which was likewise his guiding star. For that he contended with a courage and a tenacity that in my book has been unmatched by anyone that I have ever seen come to the House of Representatives or to the Senate.

So out of long and intimate association I say to him today that I am delighted by the spirit of dedication that has marked his public course from the day I first knew him. He has made a great contribution to the country, and it could be said of him in even greater measure than was once written in a New Jersey newspaper about him. The newspaper stated that he gave more than he got. DICK RUSSELL, I say, has given infinitely more than he ever got, and his name will be enshrined as one of the great and courageous statesmen of our time.

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

Mr. TALMADGE. I am happy to yield to the distinguished Senator from Vermont.

Mr. AIKEN. During the years I have been a member of this body I have at all times been privileged to be associated on one or more committees with the senior Senator from Georgia. Therefore I think I am in a position to judge his work and his worth to this body. We have worked together on the Subcommittee on Ap-

propriations for the Department of Agriculture and the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

I should like to add to what the Senator from Illinois has said about the Senator from Georgia knowing his homework. When the senior Senator from Georgia speaks, he knows what he is saying and why he is saying it.

He has at all times been a devoted and effective servant of the State of Georgia. But he has also known the circumstances of any situation as it has pertained to the other States in the Union. For that we have been very, very grateful indeed.

I merely wish to say that I hope he will remain a Member of this body for a long time in the future, because there is a great deal of work left for him to do, starting right now.

I do not know of anything more I could say except to add my word of appreciation to him for his service to the State of Georgia and to the United States.

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

Mr. TALMADGE. I am happy to yield to the senior Senator from Texas.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. In congratulating the senior Senator from Georgia on his long service in the Senate, I wish to mention one other aspect of his service which I do not believe has been touched on. I do so even though my period of service is short—only 5½ years. In personal conversations with him I have formed the opinion that he has read, digested, and remembers more volumes of American history than has any other Member of the Senate with whom I have had any conversation. His knowledge of the lives of the great men of America is almost limitless. He can relate instances without number of their lives and experiences that are a marvel and a charm to hear. His broad historical knowledge is a great asset to the Senate as well as to him.

In my youth I heard of the Russell family. His first cousin, Gordon Russell, went to Texas and settled in the neighboring county of Van Zandt, whose boundary was only 3 miles from the town in Henderson County, Tex., in which I was reared.

Gordon Russell became county judge of Van Zandt County. Then he came to the Congress from my home district in East Texas. While he was representing my home district he was appointed U.S. district judge for the eastern district of Texas. My father served as a juror under Federal Judge Gordon Russell. He came back home and told us of what a great judge Gordon Russell was.

I became acquainted first, not with Senator RUSSELL, but with his father 26 years ago. Then a judge in Texas, I was attending sessions of the American Law Institute here in Washington. Senator RUSSELL's father, who was a judge of the Supreme Court of Georgia at that time, was also attending those sessions. At that time, I heard Senator RUSSELL's father comment with great lucidity at the American Law Institute on some of the problems that were being worked on in connection with a restatement of American law.

While we are now hearing a tribute to our colleague, DICK RUSSELL, on his 30

years of distinguished service in the Senate, I should like to point out that he has many cousins and other relatives in my State, many of them engaged in the field of education, who are rendering a fine service there. He comes from a large family. Some of the other members of the Russell family have larger families than has our distinguished senior Senator from Georgia. He has many relatives in Texas. I see them in different parts of my State. We hear more about him, from the large number of his relatives and friends that have moved out to Texas, than we do about Senators from many other States.

While we in the Senate know of Senator RUSSELL's knowledge of the Senate rules, American Constitutional Law, and his outstanding leadership in the Senate, I feel that the present occasion would not be quite complete in paying tribute to him without letting him know that we, too, know of his great family background and the heritage from which he comes. I think that this family heritage of leadership has molded and influenced DICK RUSSELL's life here. There have been and are many leaders in the Russell family. Our distinguished colleague is the most distinguished of them all. He has earned for himself a permanent place in American history, and has the happy experience of seeing it recognized by his fellow man while he is in the prime of his intellectual faculties. It is a pleasure for me to say a word about the man whom I consider to be the greatest historian in the Senate, as well as its acknowledged parliamentary genius.

Mr. BIBLE and Mr. CARLSON addressed the Chair.

Mr. TALMADGE. Mr. President, I yield first to the Senator from Nevada [Mr. BIBLE], and I shall then yield to the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON].

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, I thank the junior Senator from Georgia.

Mr. President, I should like to add my word of congratulations to the distinguished senior Senator from Georgia. The Senator from Georgia is held in particularly high esteem and in great affection in my State of Nevada.

I first met Senator RUSSELL in 1948. An effort was being made at that time to move his residence further up Pennsylvania Avenue. I am very proud of the fact that my State of Nevada supported him in that effort both in 1948 and in 1952.

I have the same personal affection, high admiration and great respect for him that my State voiced in those 2 years, 1948 and 1952. He has been a tower of strength to me in guiding me in my attempt to do a better job for my State and for my Nation. I salute him today on the very great distinction of reaching 30 years of service this coming Saturday.

Mr. TALMADGE. Mr. President, I now yield to the distinguished senior Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON].

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, I would not want this opportunity to pass without expressing my sincere appreciation of and high regard for the distinguished Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL]. I have always looked upon

him as not only a leader of the Senate, but also a great leader in this Nation.

The distinguished Senator from Nevada [Mr. BIBLE] made a statement with which I am in full accord—that Senator RUSSELL is a tower of strength not only in this body, but also in our Nation.

I can truthfully say that I have made many speeches in my State and in other States of this Union in which I have stated that I thought the most influential and substantial leader in the U.S. Senate was DICK RUSSELL. I made that statement because those of us who have the privilege of serving with him know that he does not go about making great numbers of speeches, but he is our greatest parliamentarian; and when he makes a statement, as was well stated this morning, he knows his facts.

We regard him very highly, and the Nation does also, as a leader in these fields. We need men like DICK RUSSELL in the U.S. Senate. We have been fortunate to have had his services for 30 years. I sincerely hope that the State of Georgia and our Nation will be privileged to have a continuance of his splendid service in this body for many years to come.

It has been a personal privilege to me to have served with him for many years.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I am deeply grateful for the very fine tributes which have been uttered here today. Of course, no one knows better than this humble servant that many of them are not deserved.

It has been a high privilege to have served in the Senate of the United States for 30 years. Many events of great moment in the lives of the American people have occurred in that time.

When I look back over the events of the past 30 years, I cannot think of any other similar period in history in which have transpired so many momentous events that have changed the course of history. Indeed, these events have affected the very manner of living and habits of thinking of the American people.

This has been a period which has witnessed the greatest war the world has ever seen, with more men engaged in it than engaged in any other of the hundreds of wars which have bloodied the pages of human history.

This period has seen the splitting of the atom and a complete revolution in the weapons systems of mankind, which have greatly increased the responsibilities of statesmen who seek to find that path to peace which has eluded mankind for so many generations.

This period has witnessed the exploration by man of space, the feat men only dreamed of but a few years ago. Men now talk solemnly of and make realistic plans for visits to the moon and to the other planets of the heavens and returning to this planet.

It has been a period of tension. It has been a period when every Member of this body has been challenged almost every day of a session—and many of us have been challenged when the Congress was not in session.

The past three decades have been a tremendously eventful and meaningful

period in the history of mankind; and I am very grateful indeed to a benign providence and to a kindly, understanding, and forgiving electorate in the State of Georgia for having been permitted to serve in the Senate of the United States during this time.

The friendships that we make here—and our associations—are undoubtedly the greatest compensation which flows to us for our services.

The Senate has been called a club. Someone has called it a "rich man's club." I am sure no person would make that statement who has had an opportunity to examine the bank accounts or the lack thereof of a great many Members of this body. But it is a body of men who have been recognized for their capacity in their own States or who have been able to convince the people, whether true or not, that they were capable of serving here and the membership is limited to 100.

This service has given me an acquaintanceship over this Nation and many sweet friendships which would more than compensate me for all the effort I have put forth and the hours I have spent.

I think it is unnecessary for me to say in this presence that I have an almost sublime faith in the Senate of the United States as an instrumentality of Government and as the last protection and bulwark of the rights of the American people. It has served this country well since the Constitution was first framed. Its creation solved the great problem which threatened to disrupt the Constitutional Convention and to send our country back to that hapless and helpless conglomeration known as a confederation, which labored under the Articles of Confederation.

It is a great body, Mr. President, but even as great men have their weaknesses, the Senate has its weaknesses. One of its weaknesses is what I call this habit of laudation in the Senate of the United States—when we praise our colleagues because they have been spared here for a long time, or because they have birthdays, or because of other events of note. This morning we have seen a demonstration of it. The Members of the Senate become quite extravagant in their speeches on these occasions. It does not harm anything. It does not injure the Government. It does not hurt the Senate. And it does the object of the praise or laudation a great deal of good. It makes him feel that, after all, perhaps he may have contributed a little something to the age in which he has lived, to the people of these United States; for the hope of the future and the hope of mankind rests upon the people of the United States. It makes him feel that, after all, perhaps he may possess some few attributes of greatness that he had not yet been able to discover. I have not discovered those that have been attributed to me here today, but I appreciate the fact that my colleagues have attributed them to me. It makes me feel better. I will undertake to find in the future some of these fine characteristics that my colleagues have so generously attributed to me.

I thank them.

TRIBUTES TO SENATOR LISTER HILL, OF ALABAMA

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I wish to invite the attention of the Senate to the fact that tomorrow will mark the 25th anniversary of the service in the U.S. Senate, of my colleague, LISTER HILL the senior Senator from Alabama. Even before coming to the Senate, he had had rather long service in the Congress, having entered the House of Representatives in August 1923. In other words, in August of this year he will have completed 40 years of service in the Congress of the United States.

I may point out that there are only four persons in the Congress, in both Houses, who have a longer term of service than does the senior Senator from the State of Alabama.

I think, in calling attention to his long term of service, we ought to point out that he was first elected to Congress when he was a very young man. As a matter of fact, when he first came to Congress, he was the youngest Member of the House of Representatives. In fact, I have heard my colleague tell the story as to how he really got started in politics. I do not think he was quite frank about it, because he actually got started in politics when he was a student in the University of Alabama, having been elected president of the student body there. So politics was inherent in him. But he was called upon at one time, while he was just a beginning lawyer, to write a paper for some young man as to the contributions that youth could make. He started doing a little research about youthful characters in history who had accomplished great things. That research created in his thinking the idea that, even though he was a young man, he might start doing such things.

He got into politics while he was a youngster in the city of Montgomery, in connection with the school board. Then, when a vacancy from that district occurred in the House of Representatives, while he was still barely old enough to be eligible for membership in Congress, he entered the race and won. And he has been here ever since.

I must point out something everyone knows, that in spite of long service in the Congress of the United States, he is still youthful in heart, in mind, in ideas, and in thinking.

Senator HILL was a member of the Military Affairs Committee of the House of Representatives, and became chairman of that committee. In his capacity as ranking member of the Military Affairs Committee of the House, he became the floor manager and the chief advocate of the bill that established the Tennessee Valley Authority. He became manager of the bill, because the chairman of the committee was not in favor of the legislation. So he has often been referred to, and properly so, as the "Father of the TVA."

Senator HILL was also one of the earliest advocates, while he was a Member of the House of Representatives, of the development and use of airpower in our Armed Forces. He knew quite well Gen.

Billy Mitchell, who did so much to demonstrate the utility of the airplane as a part of our national defense.

In 1938, 25 years ago tomorrow, Senator HILL came to the Senate of the United States. Here he has served wonderfully, as Members of the Senate know. I shall certainly not try to go into the list of the great pieces of legislation he has sponsored, but I think a few should be pointed out.

I have often said the greatest monument which can be left to a person is something he himself has created. If that is true, nobody can have a greater monument than my colleague can have, in the form of hundreds—yes, thousands—of hospitals, medical centers, health clinics, that are scattered throughout the entire United States, which were constructed under a bill that was thought up and sponsored by my colleague, in conjunction with the distinguished former Senator from Ohio, Senator Burton. The Hill-Burton Act has done untold good to the people of America.

There is another measure we may not consider often, but I think it should be thought of as one of the great acts of Congress. It was conceived and put through by Senator HILL. I refer to the bill which provided for rural telephones. That measure, again, has done tremendous good for the people in the rural sections of the United States.

He was one of the supporters of rural electrification, and so many other programs that I could name. He has been known here in the Senate, and throughout the United States, as the Senator for health. He has taken the lead in setting up grants for research in so many of the baffling diseases that have thwarted mankind in the past.

My colleague is a statesman. He is a humanitarian. He is a great Senator. And, furthermore, Mr. President, I feel it a privilege, on this day before his 25th anniversary here in the Senate, and nearing his 40th anniversary in the Congress of the United States, to call attention briefly, as I have done, to his great service.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, another Congress has begun. With its opening, there has been a great emphasis on the new faces and relative youthfulness of many of the newcomers to this body. This is as it should be. The fresh viewpoints and vigor which new Members bring to the Senate are well-springs of its continuing vitality. Their contributions will commingle with those of older Members as the years go by in the continuous processes of the Senate. Tomorrow, there will be an anniversary which gives stress to this continuity.

January 11 will mark the completion of 25 years of service in the Senate, of our distinguished colleague, LISTER HILL, of Alabama.

Lest this figure appear overly imposing, let me point out that Senator HILL is as young in spirit today as the legislation which he has sponsored over the decades. I could not begin to cover even the major items which have felt his guidance. He presides over a committee which is intimately connected with the

health, security, and well-being of every citizen in the Nation. And in that office he has discharged his responsibilities in the highest tradition of this body. He is also a member of the Appropriations Committee, and in that capacity has applied himself with great diligence to the exacting task of assuring the prudent use of public funds.

But it is in matters of public health and medical research that he is best known and most admired by the people of this Nation. He is the Senate's foremost authority in this field. There has not been a single important legislative measure involving the health of the Nation in the last two decades which has not felt his personal stamp. He is indeed the Nation's "Mr. Public Health." His list of honorary degrees and other awards for these services make him the envy of the foremost medical practitioners in this country. The awards are testimony to his dedication to service to the American people in the most universal sense of the term. No single man of our times has done more to make this Nation a healthier place in which to live. No single man has done more to stimulate the medical and other sciences to find the answers to the scourges—old and new—which have claimed years of life, unnecessarily, from countless human beings at home and throughout the world. His State, the Nation, and, indeed, all mankind are in debt to Senator LISTER HILL for a continuous service to humanity far beyond the call of duty.

Those of us who have known him through the years will understand why he has given that kind of service. He is that kind of man. LISTER HILL is a Senator of quiet but profound wisdom, of humanity, and of compassion. There is no more sincere, honest, affable, able, and hard-working member of this body than the Senator from Alabama. And it is a tribute to the enlightenment and intelligence and humanity of the people of his State that they have seen fit to keep him in the Senate for a quarter of a century, and in the Congress as a whole for 40 years.

All of the Members of this body, old and new alike, can draw great inspiration from the exemplary legislative career of this great Senator. I extend to him my best wishes on this occasion and hope that his many, many years of future service will be as rewarding to him as I know they will be to his State and to the Nation.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, although I am on the opposite side of the aisle from the two Senators we are honoring today, I would be remiss if I did not say a word on this occasion, because they are my good friends. They serve on the same committees on which I serve.

Speaking first of the senior Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], I should say he and I have worked together now for 18 years on the Armed Services Committee. I know what part he played in the enactment of the Military Services Unification Act, by which the Department of Defense was set up. I know how

that act was modified under his leadership at least on two occasions.

We have had problems in the Armed Services Committee with respect to pay fringe benefits, which are always difficult to work out. He gave us many hours of his time in working out those problems satisfactorily.

Then, too, there is the problem of procurement by the armed services, which is a very important subject from the standpoint of the security of our Nation, and has always been a subject for great study by him and by our committee under his leadership.

Then, too, he is a member of the Appropriations Committee, on which I serve also. Therefore, I have seen him work there not only on defense matters but also on agricultural problems from the appropriation point of view.

I join with his colleagues in congratulating Senator RUSSELL upon his 30 years of service, and I look forward to serving with him, I hope, for at least 4 years more.

Senator HILL, of Alabama, worked with me on the Armed Services Committee until he left that committee for other work. I have worked with him also on the Appropriations Committee. As his colleague from Alabama has so well said, Senator HILL will always be recognized as one of the experts on the subject of the health of our citizens, the usefulness of our hospitals, and the general welfare of our citizenry as a whole.

I know how hard he has worked to make the hospitals working units for better health of our citizens. I know he has worked for changing laws which, with the cooperation of the States, have strengthened the welfare of our citizens, and, thus, the welfare of the Nation.

So I join with his colleagues in commending Senator HILL for his services conducing to the welfare of our citizens and of our Nation, and wish him many more years of helpful service.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, I desire to join my colleagues on this happy occasion of the 25th anniversary of Senator HILL's service, including the marking of the beginning of 40 years of service in Congress itself.

First I pay particular tribute to him for the great contribution he has made to the strengthening of our armed services through the years, first as chairman of the House Armed Services Committee and then as the senior member of the Appropriations Subcommittee on Military Appropriations.

I wish to address myself particularly to the great work he has done as chairman of the subcommittee which handles appropriations for the Department of Labor, the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, and related agencies, on which I have been honored and privileged to serve with him for the past several years. I doubt that there is any man in American history who has made a greater contribution to the improvement of American health in the fight against the diseases that beset mankind than has the senior Senator from Alabama, LISTER HILL.

The Hill-Burton Act has dotted our country with well equipped, well de-

signed hospitals, which are located in counties which, before the act was passed, did not have a medical doctor within the limits of the county. The drift that was occurring away from the rural areas and into the cities of the young graduates of our medical schools, to become specialists in city hospitals, was slowed down and retarded by the Hill-Burton Act. These young medical graduates had been trained in the latest techniques of medical care and treatment. They knew they could carry on their profession only in a modern, adequately equipped hospital. With matching moneys which LISTER HILL was instrumental in having provided, and which are now provided in the annual appropriation bills that come through LISTER HILL's Subcommittee on Appropriations, this drift away from the rural areas of our country of trained medical doctors has been halted, and has brought about a reversal of the trend toward concentration of these young graduates in the big cities. Today the smaller communities of our Nation are able to have the best skilled medical graduates that come out of our medical schools.

Even as great has been his contribution in establishing the National Institutes of Health, which carry on research in our effort to stamp out the great killers of mankind, like cancer, arthritis, and the myriad of diseases and ailments which have taken such a ghastly toll of American lives. In this field Senator HILL has pioneered and carried on his valiant efforts for many years.

It is an honor to serve on his committee. He is considerate and understanding, and he knows his subject as no other man could possibly understand it.

Senator HILL is an authority in this difficult field and sometimes knows more about the subject than do some of the doctors. With it all he sees to it that adequate funds are furnished in the effort to find cures for these diseases.

I therefore pay tribute to him for the contribution he has made, first, in the field of the security of our country, and then in protecting the Nation against the diseases and ailments that have been great plagues to our people. I am proud to join my colleagues in recognizing the great services he has rendered, not only in the Senate, but also in the House, during his 40 years of service.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, in all that has been said about the distinguished senior Senator from Alabama in connection with the services he has rendered, there is one subject which has not been noted, and I hope that he will pardon my taking the floor to mention it, even though I am entering now only my fifth year of service on the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare under his chairmanship. I would be remiss if I were not to call attention to the fact that he was the principal coauthor and the driving force in the holding of long hearings which resulted in the National Defense Education Act of 1958. Under the student loan provision alone of that act, 180,000 students are attending American universities each year who would not otherwise be in college. That loan provision is only one segment of

many principal segments in that very beneficial educational act.

Senator HILL has many other accomplishments in the field of education—too many to mention as we hear of all that he has—we may erroneously obtain the impression that this man is a driver. He is not a driver, but a leader. But as a member of the Labor and Public Welfare Committee, I have never seen a more patient chairman in any legislative body—and I have been before several—than the distinguished senior Senator from Alabama. No bill is railroaded through; no bill is ramrodded through; no member of the committee is cut off; no Member of the Congress is cut off; no witness is cut off. I have never heard the Senator from Alabama bang the gavel on any witness, whoever he was. All of his presiding talents reflect a combination of patience, kindness, and tolerance which bespeak great credit to the Senate and to Congress as a whole.

Mr. President, I have an idea that these characteristics are a result of generations of training in the Hill family. I recall once, while visiting the State museum at Montgomery, Ala., seeing exhibited there the wedding dress of the grandmother of Senator HILL. He comes from a distinguished family, whose members have given generations of leadership and distinguished service to the American people.

Not only is it a great privilege to serve with such an outstanding Senator in this body; it is an even greater privilege to be a member of the committee over which he presides as chairman with such distinction, such courtliness, such fairness, and such honor.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I am more happy than I can say to salute two senior Members of the U.S. Senate who are my friends and who on this unique occasion celebrate, in one instance—that of the distinguished senior Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL]—30 years of service to his State and to his Nation, and in the other instance, that of the distinguished senior Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL], a quarter of a century of service in this body.

Over the years, many persons have referred to the U.S. Senate as a club. In some respects it is a club, for every Member of the Senate during the sessions of the 88th Congress will see far more of his colleagues than he will of his family. He will be joining his colleagues in debate, sometimes agreeing, sometimes disagreeing with them. He will be having lunch with them. On those occasions when night sessions will be held, he will be having dinner with his colleagues. With the passage of days, months, and years, an affection and an affinity grow among all 100 Members of the Senate, where there is no line or aisle which divides Democrats from Republicans or, indeed, which divides any of us, regardless of what our ideological agreements or disagreements may be.

In the last 10 years, which have flown by with great rapidity, I have come to know both of these distinguished American Senators by the high devotion to duty which has characterized them and by the

vigor and courage with which they have discharged their responsibilities.

They have left their mark—an honorable mark—not alone upon the labors performed by the U.S. Senate, but also upon the book which demonstrates what this country has stood for from its inception.

I have had the honor to serve on the Committee on Appropriations, on which both of these distinguished American Senators have long served. I am happier than I can say to salute two friends, to salute two distinguished Senators, as they reach one more notable milestone in their honorable service to the people of the States which they represent and to the people of the United States.

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, I wish to add my words of appreciation and admiration for the distinguished senior Senator from Alabama. I consider him one of my closest and dearest friends in the Chamber. He has been a tower of strength to me, particularly in the Committee on Appropriations. I have the high privilege to serve on his subcommittee, which is concerned with the health of the Nation.

I shall not repeat what the distinguished junior Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN] has previously said, except to add to my good friend the senior Senator from Alabama that he has been a source of inspiration to me. He is a great leader, a worthy chairman, and a distinguished Senator. The State of Alabama is to be commended for using good judgment in returning him to continue his career of dedication to the public service.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HART in the chair). Will the Senator from Alabama and the membership of the Senate be so gracious as to permit the Chair to comment? The Chair feels uncomfortable at a time like this, because as a Senator he, too, wishes to join in saluting two distinguished Members of the Senate.

The Chair, as a junior Member of the Senate, wishes to pay tribute to the skill with which the senior Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] and the senior Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL] have advanced the causes in which they believe so deeply, the interests which they believe are so important to the survival of this great institution. The Chair happens to disagree with them often; but he shares the respect for them which has been expressed by other Senators during the period of his occupancy of the chair.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, one of the outstanding statesmen in the entire history of the Senate observes today his 25th anniversary of service to his State and to the Nation. LISTER HILL, who began his work here in January 1938, has given his colleagues and his fellow citizens an enduring, magnificent demonstration of legislative knowledge and human understanding.

In his quarter century as a Member of the Senate, and during his years in the House, LISTER HILL has affirmed that Government has a duty to fight human misery while it helps advance human

progress. The Tennessee Valley Authority became a reality largely because LISTER HILL was among those in Congress who fought for it. The Hill-Burton Act has made it possible for communities of widely varying sizes to accelerate much-needed hospital construction. In recent years, Senator HILL has, more than ever, been identified as the "Mr. Health" of the U.S. Senate. Our great national effort in medical research is a reality today largely because Senator HILL has been foresighted enough to see the need for it. Our National Defense Education Act is another expression of that same sympathetic understanding.

Mr. President, many tributes have been paid today to the senior Senator from Alabama. It is a pleasure and a great privilege to join by paying my tribute to a man who has been a teacher, a leader, and a good friend to so many who have served in this body.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I desire to express my heartfelt appreciation to my colleagues for their most generous words spoken of me. I cannot believe that I am worthy of the very kind and generous expressions which have come from my colleagues, but I am most grateful to them and to the people of Alabama, who have given me the honor and the privilege of serving in this body for the past 25 years, and of serving in Congress for some 40 years.

I am also grateful to the good Lord for having permitted me to enjoy this service and to be here today.

Mr. President, in my long years in Congress, I have heard many tributes paid; but unfortunately—I might say tragically—in most cases those to whom the tributes have been paid were not privileged to be here to listen to them; they had passed on to another place. So it is with a heart full of gratitude that I express my thanks and my appreciation today.

As my colleague, Senator RUSSELL, has said, the years during which he and I have served in Congress have been years of momentous, history-changing, and world-shaking events. I often think of the trip around the world which was made by the late Wendell Willkie at the close of World War II. When he returned, he told the story of that trip, recounted his observations, and related the conclusions he had reached as a result of the trip. He captioned his book "One World."

At the end of World War II, we of the United States, who had had the two best friends in the world, the Atlantic Ocean on the one side and the Pacific Ocean on the other side, and who had thought ourselves absolutely protected by those two oceans from any aggressive intent on the part of any nation across the seas, found that those two friends had lost their capacity for our defense. We found that we were in truth in one world and in a new world, with all the problems, challenges, and burdens this new world of ours has brought to us, has brought to Congress, and has brought to the Senate of the United States.

When I came to the Senate, I thought it was the greatest legislative body in the

world. After having served here for 25 years and after having seen the operations of the Senate and having seen the results of the work of Senators and of the work of this body, I now know that the U.S. Senate is indeed the greatest body in the world.

Mr. President, to receive such words of praise from my friends and associates in this body, to know that I shall continue to be privileged to serve with them, to have my day-by-day contacts with them, my associations and my most helpful work with them, fills my heart with gratitude; and I can but say, in the words of Tiny Tim, "May God bless each one of us."

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, a few moments ago, while in my office, in conference, word came that on the floor of the Senate two very prominent Members were being praised by their colleagues; so I hastened here. I cannot permit this opportunity to pass without adding at least a few words in commendation, tribute, and praise of these two very distinguished Members, Senator RICHARD RUSSELL, of Georgia, and Senator LISTER HILL, of Alabama.

Mr. President, I came to the Senate 12 years ago. At that time I had not yet met these two outstanding Americans. I soon learned the meaning of the phrase "To know them is to love them." During my service here, we have not always agreed on every issue which has come before this body; that is only natural. But although one may disagree with LISTER HILL or with my able friend, RICHARD RUSSELL, of Georgia, certainly one cannot dislike either of them. Far from it. In the years that I have been here, Mr. President, my admiration, my affection, and my respect for these two gentlemen have multiplied a thousandfold each day.

Mr. President, I wish to adopt the prayer uttered a few minutes ago by the distinguished Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL]: May the good Lord see fit to give to these two gentlemen many more years of good health and service, not only to the people of their States, but also to the people of the United States of America.

We of the Senate truly honor ourselves in honoring our colleagues at this hour.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, let me express to the Senator from Rhode Island my very deep and heartfelt appreciation for his generous words.

OREGON LEGISLATURE FACES TEST OF NEW CONSTITUTION

Mrs. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, with the coming of the new year, the people of Oregon face one of the most important tasks that confront a self-governing people—Oregon is now considering a new State constitution.

In the Congress, we often hear concern expressed about the loss of vitality of our State and local governments, while the Federal Government is forced to assume constantly growing domestic functions. Many of us have come to Congress, as I have, from service in State governments, and we appreciate and

share this concern. For that reason I believe that Members of the Senate may be interested to know how Oregon is trying to bring its basic governmental framework up to the needs of the future.

Oregon's record in State government is good. It can be even better. Our present constitution, adopted with statehood in 1859, is more than a century old. A revision undertaken today must be designed to serve a century to come, a century which may bring as many changes as those which occurred from the pioneer days of 1859 until now.

Eight years ago, the Commission on Governmental Relations, appointed by President Eisenhower, reported that the States could not halt or reverse the drift of State functions to Washington, D.C., unless they faced the task of strengthening State and local governments. The report to the President stated that the key step toward this goal must be the modernization of State constitutions.

Even before the Kestnbaum Commission made that report, the first steps had been taken in Oregon toward giving our State a 20th-century constitution. In 1951, when my husband and I were serving in the Oregon Senate and House of Representatives, respectively, we sponsored a proposal to call a constitutional convention, the first since the original convention of 1857. Our cosponsors included two legislators who subsequently became Governor of Oregon: Senator Robert D. Holmes and Representative Mark O. Hatfield. In 1955, a legislative interim committee, after 2 years of study, recommended a constitutional convention; but none was called. Instead, the Oregon Legislature in 1959 proposed, and the people adopted, an amendment to the present constitution that permits the legislative assembly itself to submit a revised constitution to the people for a vote.

Under this new provision, Oregon is now engaged in a great experiment in progressive government. It is trying to determine whether the people of a State can accomplish the urgent and solemn task of constitutional reform by this new method.

THE CONSTITUTIONAL REVISION COMMISSION

A proposed revised constitution has now been placed before the legislative assembly, for submission to the people of Oregon. This revised constitution has been prepared over the past 1½ years by the Oregon Constitutional Revision Commission, which was created for this purpose by the 1961 session of the legislature.

The constitutional revision commission had 17 members, drawn from all branches of the State government and from private life. The chairman, Representative George Layman, is a veteran of five terms in the State legislature. The members included two former Governors—Robert D. Holmes, a Democrat, and Charles A. Sprague, a Republican; and a former State treasurer, Senator Walter J. Pearson, of Portland. Two justices of the Oregon Supreme Court and one circuit judge served on the commission. Three newspaper publishers and a leader in the League of Women Voters were public members of the commission.

The chairman of the commission's drafting subcommittee was once my husband's legislative assistant here, Prof. Hans Linde, of the University of Oregon Law School.

Among the leaders in establishing the Oregon Constitutional Revision Commission and appointing its members was Representative ROBERT B. DUNCAN, of Medford, speaker of the Oregon House of Representatives, and now the new Congressman from Oregon's Fourth District. The newly chosen speaker of the House for the present session, Representative Clarence Barton, of Coquille, was a member of the commission, along with four other members of the present legislative assembly. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that biographical notes about the members of the Oregon Constitutional Revision Commission, from the commission's report, be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered. (See exhibit 1.)

THE REVISED CONSTITUTION

Mr. President, the revised constitution which the Constitutional Revision Commission has proposed for Oregon is the product of 1½ years of thorough, non-partisan, deliberative study and debate within the commission. Every individual section had to win the support of at least 9 members of the commission, and the final proposal carries the endorsement and backing of all but 2 of the 17.

The revised constitution is consistent both with Oregon traditions and with the best developments in modern State constitutions. In the legislative article, it further improves Oregon's system of apportioning legislative seats, which already is among the fairest in the Nation. It unifies Oregon's court system, and provides for periodic ballot review of judges' records, without the inappropriate indignities of contested judicial election campaigns. It consolidates the Governor's responsibility in the executive branch; but it subjects this branch to the scrutiny of a watchdog—an independent, nonpolitical, long-term controller, patterned on the Comptroller General of the United States, the office which has proved so valuable to us in the National Congress.

At the same time, the revised constitution retains the familiar landmarks of the Oregon system—the initiative, referendum, and recall; home rule for cities and counties; popular control over public debt and taxes; and it significantly strengthens Oregon's bill of rights for the protection of individual liberties. No group is deprived of any rights that it enjoys under the existing constitution; no interest or party, economic or social, liberal or conservative, Democratic or Republican, is given any special advantage under the revised constitution.

Mr. President, I have said that Oregon's present undertaking to achieve a modern constitution by this method is an experiment. Constitutional reform is sometime attempted, as a last resort,

in haste and in the political controversy of partisan conventions, when decades of neglect have led to financial crisis, political or administrative scandals, popular revolt against legislative malapportionment, or bogged-down judicial systems.

Oregon's experiment is to see whether a State can make necessary reforms while the record is still good, and to do so on the basis of the careful consideration of the constitution as a whole by an expert, nonpartisan citizens' commission.

Perhaps this cannot be done. Perhaps only the spur of immediate crisis can overcome inertia, disinterest, and preoccupation with day-to-day problems. And a proposal for constitutional change is inevitably a tempting target for political attack. But I prefer to hope that Oregon's legislative assembly, in which I was proud to serve, will rise to the occasion.

A CHANCE FOR LEADERSHIP

The revised constitution proposed by the Constitutional Revision Commission would give Oregon one of the three or four best State constitutions in the country. Sixty years ago, Oregon became nationally famous for the reforms of the Oregon system, adopted under the leadership of W. S. U'Ren. In the fate of the current experiment to achieve a modern constitution through the commission method lies Oregon's present opportunity for national leadership. If the effort fails, the cynicism of self-styled political realists will gain new evidence. If the effort succeeds, I predict that a score of States will seek to follow where Oregon has pointed the way.

Mr. President, the fate of Oregon's experiment with constitutional reform will depend on the efforts of many people. The revised constitution has won widespread support in Oregon's press, including newspapers covering the entire political spectrum. Many citizens' groups have begun sympathetic study of the proposal. Much of the continuing lead toward keeping attention on the constitutional forest, rather than the special-interest trees, should come from Governor Hatfield, whose office inescapably makes him the responsible spokesman for the State as a whole. I am glad to offer my own continued support, as I have today, to this cause for which I worked in the Oregon Legislature a decade ago.

But finally, of course, the fate of the revised constitution must be the ultimate political decision of the men and women of Oregon. And I have confidence that, as they study the proposed new text, people will tell their elected representatives in Oregon's legislative assembly that they want the opportunity to cast their vote on the revised constitution substantially as now proposed, and that they will then vote to make it the new constitution of our State.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD with these remarks the text of the revised constitution prepared by the Oregon Constitutional Revision Commission.

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

THE REVISED CONSTITUTION OF OREGON ARTICLE I—BILL OF RIGHTS

SECTION 1. The people of Oregon ordain this constitution for their government, and by it guarantee to all persons liberty, dignity, and equal rights under the laws of the State. The rights enumerated in this constitution are independent of and supplementary to those guaranteed under the Constitution of the United States.

SEC. 2. The right of free expression of opinion and to speak, write or print freely on any subject may not be restrained, but every person shall be held responsible under law for injury done by abuse of that right.

SEC. 3. The right of the people peacefully to assemble and to petition the government may not be abridged.

SEC. 4. Every person shall be secure in the right to worship God according to the dictates of his own conscience. No law may restrain the free exercise and enjoyment of religious opinions or interference with the rights of conscience.

SEC. 5. No public money may be appropriated or spent for the benefit of any religious institution or for the payment of any religious service in either house of the legislative assembly.

SEC. 6. No religious test may be required as a qualification for any public office or employment, nor may any witness or juror be questioned about his opinions on matters of religion. Oaths or affirmations administered to any person shall be in the mode most consistent with and binding upon his conscience.

SEC. 7. The right of the people to be secure in their persons, houses, and other property, papers and effects, against unreasonable searches and seizures may not be violated; and no warrant may issue but upon probable cause, supported by oath or affirmation, and particularly describing the place to be searched and the person or thing to be seized. No person may be compelled to give testimony that might tend to incriminate him.

SEC. 8. In a prosecution for any crime or any offense punishable by loss of liberty, the accused has:

(1) The right to a timely and public trial in the county in which the crime or offense is committed.

(2) The right to be tried by an impartial jury, except when he elects to be tried by the judge of the court alone or when he is charged with contempt of court. Verdict by five-sixths of a jury may be authorized by law, except in case of offenses punishable by death.

(3) The right to know the nature and cause of the accusation against him and to have a copy thereof, to be heard in his own behalf, to meet witnesses face to face and to have compulsory process for obtaining witnesses.

SEC. 9. Every person has the right to assistance of counsel in all official proceedings and dealings with public officers that may materially affect him. If he cannot afford counsel, he has the right to have counsel appointed for him in any case in which he may lose his liberty.

SEC. 10. No court may be secret, and justice shall be administered openly and without purchase or delay. No person may be deprived of any right or privilege by any unlawful or unfair procedure, or be deprived of life, liberty, or property, or of remedy for injury done him in his person, property or reputation, without due process of law.

SEC. 11. Every person, before judgment of conviction, is entitled to bail by sufficient surety, but excessive bail may not be required. Bail may be denied to persons charged with offenses punishable by death or life imprisonment, giving due weight to

the evidence and to the nature and circumstances of the event. Bail may, in the discretion of the court, be allowed after judgment of conviction. No person arrested or confined may be treated with unnecessary rigor.

Sec. 12. Excessive fines or cruel and unusual punishments may not be imposed. Punishment may not be disproportionate to the nature of the offense. No conviction may cause corruption of blood or forfeiture of estate.

Sec. 13. No person may be subjected unnecessarily to several prosecutions for the same conduct, or be put in jeopardy twice for the same offense.

Sec. 14. Imprisonment for debt may not be imposed, except in case of fraud or absconding debtors.

Sec. 15. The privilege of the writ of habeas corpus may not be suspended. The operation of the laws may not be suspended, except by the authority of the legislative assembly.

Sec. 16. Treason against the State consists only in levying war against it or adhering or giving aid or comfort to its enemies, and may not be otherwise defined under another name. No person may be convicted of treason except on the testimony of two witnesses to the same overt act or on confession in open court.

Sec. 17. The people have the right to bear arms for the defense of themselves and the State.

Sec. 18. The military shall be subordinate to the civil power. In time of peace no member of the Armed Forces may be quartered in any house without the consent of the owner or occupant, or in time of war except as provided by law.

Sec. 19. Private property may not be taken or damaged for public use, or the particular services of any person be demanded, without just compensation; or, except as provided by law, without just compensation first assessed and tendered.

Sec. 20. No law may grant to any person or class of persons privileges or immunities that, upon the same terms, do not equally belong to all persons.

Sec. 21. No ex post facto law or law impairing the obligations of contracts may be enacted. The taking effect of any law may not be made to depend upon any nongovernmental authority.

ARTICLE II—SUFFRAGE AND ELECTIONS

Sec. 1. A person is qualified to vote in any election by the people if he:

- (1) Is a citizen of the United States;
- (2) Is 21 years of age or older;
- (3) Has resided in this State for at least 6 months next preceding the election; but provision may be made by law to permit a person who has resided in this State less than 6 months next preceding the election, but who is otherwise qualified, to vote in the election for candidates for nomination or election for President or Vice President of the United States or elector of President and Vice President of the United States;

(4) Is registered before the election as provided by law; and

(5) Is able, except for physical disability, to read and write the English language.

Sec. 2. A person who is mentally incompetent or who has been convicted of a felony may be prohibited by law from voting in any election. For that purpose, mental incompetency and conviction of a felony may be defined by law.

Sec. 3. A person may not be required to pay any tax or to be an owner of property in order to be qualified to vote in any election.

Sec. 4. Provision shall be made by law for insuring secrecy in voting, absent voting, administering elections, nominating candidates and, subject to subsection (3) of section 1 of this article, requiring a uniform

residence qualification for voters and defining the residence required.

Sec. 5. In all elections to fill an office, the candidate therefor receiving the highest number of votes shall be declared elected, except as provided by law in case of a tie vote.

Sec. 6. The regular general election by the people in the State shall be held on the first Tuesday after the first Monday in November in each even-numbered year.

ARTICLE III—INITIATIVE AND REFERENDUM

SECTION 1. (1) The people reserve to themselves the initiative power, which is to propose laws and amendments to the constitution and enact or reject them at an election independently of the legislative assembly.

(2) An initiative law may be proposed only by a petition signed by a number of qualified voters equal to 6 percent of the total number of votes cast for all candidates for Governor at the election at which a Governor was elected for a term of 4 years next preceding the filing of the petition.

(3) An initiative amendment to the constitution may be proposed only by a petition signed by a number of qualified voters equal to 8 percent of the total number of votes cast for all candidates for Governor at the election at which a Governor was elected for a term of 4 years next preceding the filing of the petition.

(4) An initiative petition shall include the full text of the proposed law or amendment to the constitution. A proposed law or amendment to the constitution shall embrace one subject only and matters properly connected therewith.

(5) An initiative petition shall be filed not less than 4 months before the election at which the proposed law or amendment to the constitution is to be voted upon.

Sec. 2. (1) The people reserve to themselves the referendum power, which is to approve or reject at an election any act, or part thereof, of the legislative assembly that does not become effective earlier than 90 days after the end of the session at which the act is passed.

(2) A referendum on an act or part thereof may be ordered by a petition signed by a number of qualified voters equal to 4 percent of the total number of votes cast for all candidates for Governor at the election at which a Governor was elected for a term of 4 years next preceding the filing of the petition. A referendum petition shall be filed not more than 90 days after the end of the session at which the act is passed.

(3) A referendum on an act may be ordered by the legislative assembly by law.

Sec. 3. (1) Petitions or orders for the initiative or referendum shall be filed with the chief election officer of the State.

(2) Initiative and referendum measures shall be submitted to the people as provided in this article and by law not inconsistent therewith.

(3) All elections on initiative and referendum measures shall be held at the regular general elections, unless otherwise ordered by the legislative assembly.

(4) An initiative or referendum measure becomes effective 30 days after the day on which it is enacted or approved by a majority of the votes cast thereon. A referendum ordered by petition on a part of an act does not delay the remainder of the act from becoming effective.

Sec. 4. The initiative and referendum powers reserved to the people by sections 1 and 2 of this article are further reserved to the qualified voters of each municipality and district as to all local, special, and municipal legislation of every character in or for their municipality or district. The manner of exercising those powers shall be provided by general laws, but cities may provide the manner of exercising those powers as to their municipal legislation. In a city, not more than 15 percent of the qualified voters may

be required to propose legislation by the initiative, and not more than 10 percent of the qualified voters may be required to order a referendum on legislation.

ARTICLE IV—LEGISLATURE

SECTION 1. The legislative power of the State, except for the initiative and referendum powers reserved to the people, is vested in a legislative assembly.

Sec. 2. (1) The legislative assembly consists of a senate and a house of representatives.

(2) The number of senators and the number of representatives each shall be an odd number. The number of senators may not be less than one-third nor more than one-half the number of representatives. The number of senators and representatives shall be fixed by an apportionment, and they shall be apportioned by law among senatorial and representative districts as provided in this article and not otherwise.

Sec. 3. (1) An apportionment shall apportion the number of senators and representatives fixed thereby among senatorial and representative districts established thereby according to population based upon the final population figures for the State and subdivisions thereof resulting from the latest statewide Federal census. The population per senator in all senatorial districts and the population per representative in all representative districts, respectively, shall be as equal as practicable. The largest population per senator or representative, respectively, may not be more than twice the smallest population per senator or representative.

(2) An apportionment shall divide the State into senatorial and representative districts. Districts shall consist of contiguous territory. In establishing districts consideration shall be given to:

- (a) County boundaries;
- (b) Other political, natural, or other appropriate boundaries; and
- (c) Community of needs and interests by reason of geography, economy, transportation, and communication.

(3) An apportionment may not terminate the term of any senator or representative before his term would otherwise terminate. An apportionment shall include any provision necessary to comply with this subsection.

(4) An apportionment is applicable first for the purpose of nominating and electing senators and representatives to serve at the regular session next following that nomination and election. For all other purposes, the next preceding apportionment is applicable until the commencement of that regular session.

(5) An apportionment is not subject to veto by the Governor.

Sec. 4. (1) The legislative assembly shall enact an apportionment after the date on which the final population figures for the State and subdivisions thereof resulting from a statewide Federal census become available and before July 1 next following that date, and may not enact an apportionment at any other time.

(2) At the regular session next preceding the session at which the legislative assembly is required to enact an apportionment, the legislative assembly shall provide for an apportionment commission; but if the legislative assembly fails to do so, the Governor shall appoint an apportionment commission. A public officer or employee may not be a member of the commission. No more than a majority of the membership of the commission may be affiliated with the same political party. The commission shall prepare an apportionment based upon the final population figures referred to in subsection (1) of this section. Within 30 days after commencement of the session at which the legislative assembly is required to enact an apportionment, the commission shall submit its apportionment to the legislative as-

sembly and file a copy thereof with the State officer with whom acts are filed.

(3) If the legislative assembly fails to enact an apportionment as provided in subsection (1) of this section, the apportionment filed by the apportionment commission becomes law upon July 1 referred to in subsection (1) of this section.

Sec. 5. (1)(a) The supreme court has original jurisdiction to review an apportionment enacted by the legislative assembly or an apportionment law filed by an apportionment commission, upon the petition of any qualified voter of the State filed with the court before August 1 next following July 1 referred to in section 4 of this article.

(b) If the court determines upon review that the apportionment complies with this article, it shall dismiss the petition by written opinion before September 1 of the same year.

(c) If the court determines upon review that the apportionment does not comply with this article, it shall so declare by written opinion before September 1 of the same year. The apportionment is void upon the date of the opinion. The opinion shall specify with particularity wherein the apportionment fails to comply with this article. The opinion shall direct the Governor to prepare a new apportionment in compliance with this article, using the apportionment referred to in paragraph (a) of this subsection as a guide and departing therefrom only where necessary to comply with the particulars specified in the opinion.

(d) The Governor shall prepare the new apportionment and file it with the State officer with whom acts are filed before October 1 of the same year. The new apportionment becomes law upon the date of the filing.

(2)(a) The supreme court has original jurisdiction to review the new apportionment filed by the Governor, upon the petition of any qualified voter of the State filed with the court before November 1 of the same year.

(b) If the court determines upon review that the new apportionment complies with this article, it shall dismiss the petition by written opinion before December 1 of the same year.

(c) If the court determines upon review that the new apportionment does not comply with this article, it shall so declare by written opinion before December 1 of the same year. The new apportionment is void upon the date of the opinion. The opinion shall specify with particularity wherein the new apportionment fails to comply with this article. The opinion shall direct the Governor to prepare a second new apportionment correcting the first new apportionment in the particulars specified and in no others, and to file the second new apportionment with the State officer with whom acts are filed before December 15 of the same year.

(d) The Governor shall prepare and file the second new apportionment in accordance with the opinion. The second new apportionment becomes law upon the date of the filing.

Sec. 6. A senatorial or representative district consisting of one entire county only and entitled to two or more senators or representatives, respectively, under an existing apportionment may be divided into subdistricts from time to time by law. Subdistricts shall consist of contiguous territory within the district. The population per senator in all senatorial subdistricts and the population per representative in all representative subdistricts, respectively, within the district shall be as equal as practicable. The largest population per senator or representative, respectively, in subdistricts within the district may not be more than twice the smallest population per senator or representative.

Sec. 7. Members of the legislative assembly shall be elected by the voters of the respective senatorial or representative districts or

subdistricts into which the State may be divided by law. A vacancy in the legislative assembly shall be filled as may be provided by law.

Sec. 8. Senators shall be elected for terms of 4 years each. Representatives shall be elected for terms of 2 years each. The term of each senator and representative shall commence on the second Monday in January next following his election, unless otherwise provided by law. One-half of the senators, as nearly as possible, shall be elected every 2 years.

Sec. 9. Each member of the legislative assembly, at the time of his selection shall be:

(1) A citizen of the United States;

(2) A resident of the district from which he is selected for at least 1 year next preceding his selection; and

(3) Twenty-one years of age or older.

Sec. 10. (1) Except for treason, felony, or breach of the peace, members of the legislative assembly are privileged from arrest during, and in going to and returning from, a session of the legislative assembly.

(2) Members are not subject to any civil process during a session or during the 15 days next preceding commencement of a session.

(3) Members may not be questioned in any other place for words uttered on the floor of either house or at a meeting of a legislative committee.

Sec. 11. (1) A member of the legislative assembly may not hold any other office, position or employment for which compensation is paid directly by the State government.

(2) During the term for which he is selected, a member may not hold:

(a) Any nonlegislative office which may be filled by selection by the legislative assembly; or

(b) Any lucrative civil office created during the term, except an office which may be filled by election by the people.

Sec. 12. Members of the legislative assembly shall receive salaries in amounts fixed in the same manner as the salaries of other elected State officers.

Sec. 13. Regular sessions of the legislative assembly shall be held annually commencing on a day fixed by law. The Governor, by proclamation, may convene the legislative assembly in special session, and shall state to both houses, when assembled, the purpose for which he convened them. All sessions shall be held at the seat of government for the State.

Sec. 14. Each house of the legislative assembly, when assembled, shall:

(1) Select its own officers by open and recorded vote;

(2) Judge of the selection and qualifications of its own members by open and recorded vote;

(3) Determine its own rules of procedure by open and recorded vote;

(4) Determine its own adjournments; but neither house, without concurrence of the other house, may adjourn for more than 3 days nor to any other place than that in which it is sitting; and

(5) Have all the powers necessary for the performance of its functions.

Sec. 15. Two-thirds of the membership of each house of the legislative assembly is a quorum of the house to do business, but a smaller number may meet and adjourn from day to day and may compel attendance of absent members.

Sec. 16. All sessions of each house of the legislative assembly shall be open.

Sec. 17. Each house of the legislative assembly shall keep a journal of its proceedings.

Sec. 18. Any member of the legislative assembly has the right to protest and to have his protest, with his reasons therefor, entered in the journal of the house of which he is a member.

Sec. 19. Each house of the legislative assembly may punish its own members for disorderly behavior and may, with the concurrence of two-thirds of its membership, suspend a member.

Sec. 20. Revenue bills shall originate in the house of representatives. Other bills may originate in either house of the legislative assembly.

Sec. 21. Each bill shall be read by title only on three separate days in each house of the legislative assembly, but that requirement may be dispensed with in a house by two-thirds of its membership by a vote of yeas and nays.

Sec. 22. Each bill shall embrace one subject only and matters properly connected therewith.

Sec. 23. An affirmative vote of a majority of the membership of each house of the legislative assembly is necessary for passage of a bill or joint resolution. The vote on the final passage of each bill and joint resolution shall be by yeas and nays. Each bill and joint resolution so passed shall be signed by the presiding officer of each house within 10 days after he receives it.

Sec. 24. (1) Except bills ordering a referendum, bills on which a referendum is ordered and legislative apportionment bills, each bill passed by the legislative assembly shall be delivered to the Governor before it becomes law. If the Governor approves the bill, he shall sign it. The Governor may veto the bill, and if he does, he shall return it with his objections to the house in which it originated. If, upon reconsideration, two-thirds of the membership present of that house agree to pass the bill, it shall be delivered with the Governor's objections to the other house. If, upon reconsideration, two-thirds of the membership present of the other house agree to pass the bill, the bill becomes law.

(2) If the Governor does not sign or veto and return a bill within 7 days, Sundays excluded, after it is delivered to him, the bill becomes law without his signature. If the general adjournment of the session prevents return of a vetoed bill by the Governor within the 7-day period, the Governor, within 30 days, Sundays excluded, after the adjournment, shall file the bill with his objections with the State officer with whom acts are filed. That officer shall deliver the bill with the Governor's objections to the legislative assembly at its next session for reconsideration and action as a bill vetoed and returned by the Governor. If, within the 30-day period, the Governor does not sign or veto and file the bill, the bill becomes law without his signature.

(3) The Governor may veto any single item in an appropriation bill delivered to him or any provision in a bill delivered to him that would make a bill become effective earlier than 90 days after the end of the session at which the bill is passed, without thereby affecting any other provision of the bill.

Sec. 25. An act passed by the legislative assembly becomes effective 90 days after the end of the session at which the act is passed, unless otherwise provided by law. An act regulating taxation or exemption may not become effective earlier than 90 days after the end of the session at which the act is passed.

Sec. 26. (1) The legislative assembly may establish by law a joint committee, consisting of those members of both houses as the legislative assembly may provide by law, which may exercise, during the interim between sessions, any of the following powers that the legislative assembly confers upon it by law:

(a) Where an emergency exists, to allocate to any State agency, out of any emergency fund that may be appropriated to the committee for that purpose, additional funds beyond the amount appropriated to the

agency by the legislative assembly, or funds to carry on an activity required by law for which an appropriation was not made.

(b) Where an emergency exists, to authorize any State agency to expend, from funds dedicated or continuously appropriated for the uses and purposes of the agency, sums in excess of the amount of the budget of the agency as approved in accordance with law.

(c) In the case of a new activity coming into existence at a time that precludes the possibility of submitting a budget to the legislative assembly for approval, to approve, or revise and approve, a budget of money appropriated for the new activity.

(d) Where an emergency exists, to revise or amend the budget of any State agency to the extent of authorizing transfers between expenditure classifications within the budget of the agency.

(2) The legislative assembly may prescribe by law what constitutes an emergency for the purposes of this section.

(3) As used in this section, "State agency" means any elected or appointed officer, board, commission, department, institution, branch, or other agency of the State government.

(4) The term of a member of the committee commences at the time of adjournment of a regular session and expires at the time of organization of the next following regular session. A member of the committee does not cease to be a member of the committee solely by reason of the expiration of his term of office as a member of the legislative assembly.

ARTICLE V—EXECUTIVE

SECTION 1. The executive power of the State is vested in a Governor.

SEC. 2. The Governor shall be 30 years of age or older, a citizen of the United States and a resident of this State for at least 3 years next preceding his election.

SEC. 3. The Governor may not hold any other office, position, or employment for which compensation is paid directly by the State or any other government.

SEC. 4. The Governor is the only statewide elective State executive officer. Except as provided in section 6 of this article, the Governor shall be elected by the voters of the State at a regular general election. The candidate receiving the highest number of votes for Governor is elected. If two or more candidates receive an equal and the highest number of votes, the two houses of the legislative assembly at the next following regular session shall immediately by a joint vote elect one of those candidates Governor. The manner of transmitting and publishing returns of election for Governor and the manner of determining contested elections for Governor shall be provided by law.

SEC. 5. Except as provided in section 6 of this article, the Governor shall be elected for a term of 4 years, commencing at 12 noon on January 2 next following his election.

SEC. 6. (1) (a) If a Governor-elect, by reason of temporary inability, fails to qualify, the officer next in line of succession is Governor until the Governor-elect qualifies.

(b) If a Governor-elect, by reason of death or other permanent inability, fails to qualify, the retiring Governor continues to be Governor until a new Governor is elected by the voters of the State at a special election and qualifies. The special election shall be held not more than 60 days after the date on which the death or other permanent inability of the Governor-elect occurs. Provision shall be made by law for the special election and for the nomination of candidates to be voted upon for new Governor at that election. The new Governor elected at that election shall serve for the remainder of the term for which the Governor-elect was elected.

(2) (a) If a Governor becomes temporarily disabled, the officer next in line of succession is Governor until the disability is removed.

(b) If a Governor dies, resigns, becomes permanently disabled or is removed from office, the officer next in line of succession is Governor until commencement of the term of a new elected Governor. If the death, resignation, permanent disability or removal from office of a Governor occurs more than 30 days before the regular general election next following commencement of his term, a new elected Governor shall be elected at that election to serve for the remainder of the term, if any, for which the Governor last elected was elected.

(3) The line of succession to be Governor is: First, the president of the senate; second, the speaker of the house of representatives; and thereafter, other officers in order as may be provided by law.

SEC. 7. The manner of determining disability of a Governor and declaring a vacancy in the office of Governor by reason thereof may be provided by law.

SEC. 8. The Governor is responsible for the faithful execution of the laws.

SEC. 9. All executive offices, agencies, and instrumentalities of the State government, and their respective functions, powers, and duties, shall be allocated by law among not more than 20 principal departments, so as to group them as far as practicable according to major purposes. Quasi-judicial agencies and temporary agencies may, but need not, be allocated within a principal department.

SEC. 10. (1) The Governor shall appoint the heads of executive departments, subject to confirmation by a majority of the Senate.

(2) The manner of appointment and the qualifications of other executive officers shall be provided by law; but the term of an office may not be more than 4 years.

(3) The authority that appoints an executive officer may remove him.

(4) If a vacancy occurs in an executive office, appointment to which is subject to confirmation by the Senate, at any time other than during a session of the legislative assembly, the Governor may fill the vacancy by appointment. The term of that appointment shall be provided by law.

(5) A classified civil service system and other career service systems may be provided by law.

SEC. 11. A vacancy in the office of U.S. Senator shall be filled by appointment by the Governor until a U.S. Senator is next elected. If the vacancy occurs more than 30 days before the regular general election next following occurrence of the vacancy, a U.S. Senator shall be elected at that regular general election. If the vacancy occurs 30 days or less before the regular general election next following occurrence of the vacancy, a U.S. Senator shall be elected at the regular general election next following that regular general election.

SEC. 12. A State militia, its organization, maintenance and discipline may be provided for by law. The Governor is commander in chief of the State militia and any other military forces of this State. Except when they are called into the service of the United States, the Governor may call them out to execute the laws, suppress insurrection, repel invasion or protect the public health.

SEC. 13. The Governor shall, at the beginning of each session, and may, at other times, give to the legislative assembly information concerning the condition of the State and recommend measures he considers expedient.

SEC. 14. Subject to procedures that may be provided by law, the Governor may grant pardons, commutations and reprieves, and may suspend or remit fines and forfeitures.

ARTICLE VI—JUDICIARY

SECTION 1. The judicial power of the State is vested in a supreme court and other State courts as may be established by law, which constitute a unified judicial system. The supreme court has supervisory authority over all other courts in the judicial system.

SEC. 2. The supreme court consists of seven judges, who shall select one of their number to serve as chief justice for a term fixed by the court.

SEC. 3. The supreme court shall make rules of procedure for the judicial system. Before any rule becomes effective, it shall be submitted to the legislative assembly within 30 days after commencement of a session. Unless disapproved by the legislative assembly by joint resolution, a rule becomes effective 60 days after the end of the session at which it was submitted. A rule may be enacted, amended, or repealed at any time by law.

SEC. 4. (1) The supreme court has appellate jurisdiction in all cases arising under this constitution and the Constitution of the United States, and in other cases as provided by law.

(2) The supreme court may, in its discretion, issue original writs as provided by law.

(3) All other courts in the judicial system have original and appellate jurisdiction as provided by law.

SEC. 5. The supreme court may sit en banc or in departments consisting of not less than four judges. Other courts in the judicial system may be divided into geographical districts by law, and may be divided into functional departments and judicial functions distributed among those functional departments by law or rule not inconsistent with law.

SEC. 6. The judiciary shall be nonpartisan. A judge of any court in the judicial system who, with his consent, becomes a candidate for any elective Federal or State office thereby forfeits his judicial office.

SEC. 7. Judges of all courts in the judicial system, at the time of their appointment, shall be persons who are licensed to practice law.

SEC. 8. Judges shall be appointed by the Governor to fill all vacancies on courts in the judicial system as they occur. At the first regular general election that occurs more than 2 years after his appointment, and if he becomes a candidate for retention, a ballot shall submit to the voters of the State or appropriate geographical district the question: "Shall Judge _____ (name of judge) be retained on the _____ (name of court)? At the regular general election every 6 years thereafter, and so long as the judge is eligible and becomes a candidate for retention, the same question shall be submitted to the voters. The office of a judge who fails to become a candidate for retention or who is rejected by the voters at a regular general election, becomes vacant on the first judicial day in January next following that election.

SEC. 9. (1) A judge may not continue in office after the end of the calendar year in which he becomes 75 years of age. A lesser age for mandatory retirement may be fixed by law, but not earlier than the end of the calendar year in which a judge becomes 70 years of age.

(2) A judge may retire voluntarily. He may be retired, as provided by law, for physical or mental disability or any other cause that renders him incapable of performing his judicial functions.

(3) Provision may be made by law for assignment of retired judges by the supreme court to temporary active service on any court in the judicial system. A retired judge so assigned shall receive, during the period of his service, compensation in addition to his retirement pay so that his combined retirement pay and compensation is equal to the compensation received by a judge regularly serving on the court.

SEC. 10. (1) Provision may be made by law for:

(a) Assignment of judges by the supreme court to temporary service on any court, or department thereof, in the judicial system; but assignment to a court inferior to that on

which a judge regularly serves may be only with his consent.

(b) Appointment of lawyers by the supreme court to serve temporarily as judges of any court, or department thereof, in the judicial system inferior to the supreme court.

(2) A judge, while serving under temporary assignment or appointment, has all the judicial powers and duties of a judge regularly serving on the court, or department thereof, to which he is assigned or appointed.

(3) The temporary assignment of judges to the supreme court does not authorize more than seven judges of that court to participate in the decision of any case.

Sec. 11. The compensation of a judge shall be provided by law, but may not be diminished without his consent during his term of office except by general law applicable to all salaried State officers.

Sec. 12. A State law commission may be established in a manner provided by law to make studies, reports and recommendations to the legislative assembly on law and its administration, to the Governor on judicial selection and to the supreme court on rules of procedure, and to perform additional advisory services as may be provided by law.

Sec. 13. There shall be a right to trial by jury in all actions at law. Selection, number and qualifications of jurors, jurisdictional limits, and taxation of costs shall be provided by law. Three-fourths of a jury may render a verdict in action at law. No fact found by a jury shall be otherwise re-examined in any court unless the court affirmatively finds that there is no evidence to support the verdict.

Sec. 14. Grand juries shall be constituted and shall have powers and duties as provided by law.

ARTICLE VII—CONTROLLER

SECTION 1. There shall be a controller, who shall be selected, and who may be removed for cause, as provided by law.

Sec. 2. The term of office of the controller shall be fixed by law, but shall be not less than eight years. During the term for which he is selected, the controller is ineligible to be a candidate for election to any other office.

Sec. 3. The controller shall conduct post-audits of all executed transactions and accounts, as defined by law, of all branches, departments, offices and agencies of the State. He shall report to the Governor and to the legislative assembly at least annually, and at other times as the legislative assembly requires, on the performance of State functions involving receipt, disbursement and application of public funds in compliance with applicable standards of financial accuracy, administration and law. He shall make additional investigations and reports as required by the legislative assembly, and perform other functions as provided by law. He may not be given responsibility for performance of any executive function.

Sec. 4. Deputies and other personnel to assist the controller in performance of his functions may be provided by law. The controller shall designate a deputy to act as controller in case of his absence or incapacity or vacancy in the office. The controller shall administer his office and its functions, personnel and budget independently of the executive branch.

ARTICLE VIII—LOCAL GOVERNMENT

SECTION 1. The legislative assembly shall provide by law a method whereby a majority of the voters of any county voting at an election, may adopt, amend, revise or repeal a county charter. A county charter may provide for exercise by the county of authority over matters of county concern. Local improvements may be financed only by taxes, assessments or charges imposed on benefited property, unless otherwise provided by law or charter. A county charter shall prescribe

the organization of the county government and shall provide directly, or by its authority, for the number, selection, qualifications, tenure, compensation, powers and duties of those officers the county considers necessary. Those officers shall exercise all the powers and duties, as distributed by the county charter or by its authority, that are granted to or imposed upon any county officer by the constitution or laws of this State. The initiative and referendum powers reserved to the people by the constitution are further reserved to the qualified voters of each county as to the adoption, amendment, revision or repeal of a county charter and as to county legislation of each county that has adopted a charter.

Sec. 2. The voters of every city are granted power to enact and amend their city charter, subject to the constitution and criminal laws of this State; and the legislative assembly may not enact, amend or repeal any charter or act of incorporation for any city.

Sec. 3. Provision may be made by general law for a system of municipal courts for cities, including the manner of selection, qualifications, tenure, powers and duties of officers of municipal courts who exercise judicial functions.

Sec. 4. Provision may be made by general law for the creation of metropolitan districts by the voters of cities and areas adjacent thereto. Metropolitan districts shall exercise functions as may be provided by general law.

Sec. 5. People's utility districts may be created of territory, contiguous or otherwise, within one or more counties, and may consist of one or more incorporated municipalities with or without unincorporated territory, for the purpose of supplying water for domestic and municipal purposes; for the development of water power or electric energy or both; and for the sale, distribution or other disposition of water, water power and electric energy within or without the territory of the district. The legislative assembly shall, and the people by the initiative may, enact laws necessary to carry out the provisions of this section.

Sec. 6. Provision shall be made by general law for methods and procedures of altering the boundaries of, merging, consolidating and dissolving counties, cities and public corporations.

Sec. 7. A county, city or public corporation may not raise money for or loan its credit to any joint stock company, corporation or association, except as provided by general law.

Sec. 8. Officers of counties, cities and public corporations shall be selected in a manner provided by law; but the manner of selection of county or city officers may be provided otherwise in county or city charters.

ARTICLE IX—PUBLIC OFFICERS

SECTION 1. Except for members of the legislative assembly, the Governor and judges of courts in the judicial system:

(1) The term of a public officer elected at a regular general election shall commence on the first Monday in January next following his election.

(2) A public officer shall hold his office until his successor is selected and qualified.

Sec. 2. Each person selected to any office under this constitution, before assuming the office, shall take an oath or affirmation to support the Constitution and laws of the United States and of this State.

Sec. 3. A public officer may not be impeached. A public officer may be tried for corruption, malfeasance or delinquency in office in the same manner as criminal offenses and is punishable, upon conviction, by removal from office and additional punishment as may be provided by law.

Sec. 4. A public officer who is subject to election or retention by vote of the people also is subject to recall by the voters of the State or part thereof wherein he is subject to election or retention. A recall election may

be demanded only by a petition signed by a number of qualified voters of the State or part thereof as required by law, but not more than 25 percent of those qualified voters may be so required. If a majority of the votes cast in the recall election are in favor of recall, the officer is recalled and his office is vacant. Except as otherwise provided in this section, procedures for recall shall be provided by law.

ARTICLE X—TAXATION AND FINANCE

SECTION 1. A tax may not be levied except in pursuance of law.

Sec. 2. The legislative assembly shall, and the people by the initiative may, provide by law uniform rules of assessment and taxation. All taxes shall be levied and collected under general laws operating uniformly throughout the State. A tax shall be uniform on the same class of subjects within the area in which the tax is levied.

Sec. 3. Provision may be made by law that the ad valorem taxes levied by any taxing unit, in which is located all or part of an area included in a redevelopment or urban renewal project, may be divided so that the taxes levied against any increase in the true cash value, as defined by law, of property in the area after the effective date of approval of the redevelopment or urban renewal plan for the area, are used to pay any indebtedness incurred for the redevelopment or urban renewal project. Laws necessary to carry out the purposes of this section may be enacted.

Sec. 4. The legislative assembly shall provide for raising revenue sufficient to pay the expenses of the State for each fiscal year and to pay the interest on the State debt, if any. When the expenses of the State exceed the income, the legislative assembly shall provide for levying a tax, for the next following fiscal year, sufficient, with other sources of income, to pay the deficiency, as well as the estimated expenses for the next following fiscal year.

Sec. 5. Money may not be withdrawn from the State treasury except in pursuance of appropriations made by law.

Sec. 6. (1) A general obligation debt of the State may not be incurred unless authorized or required by law enacted or approved by a majority of the voters of the State voting at a statewide election. However, an obligation of the State, other than bonded indebtedness, may be incurred by specific law, but without the necessity of enactment or approval by the voters, to the United States or any agency thereof with respect to a project in which the State or any agency thereof and the United States or any agency thereof are cooperating parties.

(2) The authorization under the former Oregon constitution for the incurring of State indebtedness for building and maintaining permanent roads, farm and home loans to veterans, forest rehabilitation and reforestation and buildings and other projects and structures for higher education is continued in effect under this constitution. Laws now in existence or hereafter enacted that implement that authorization are effective without the necessity of enactment or approval by the voters.

Sec. 7. The State may not assume a debt of any county, city, or public corporation.

Sec. 8. A county may not incur any debt or liability that singly or in the aggregate with previous debts or liabilities exceeds \$5,000. However, a county may incur bonded indebtedness in excess of \$5,000 to carry out purposes authorized or required by law, but not in excess of limits fixed by law.

Sec. 9. (1) Except as provided in subsection (3) of this section, a taxing unit, whether it is the State, any county, municipality, district or other body having the power to levy a tax, may not exercise that power in any year to raise an amount of revenue greater than its tax base as defined

in subsection (2) of this section. The portion of any tax levied in excess of any limitation imposed by this section is void.

(2) The tax base of each taxing unit in a given year is either:

(a) An amount obtained by adding 6 percent to the total amount of tax lawfully levied by the taxing unit, except portions thereof described in subsection (3) of this section, in any one of the last 3 years in which a tax was so levied; or

(b) An amount approved as a new tax base by a majority of the voters of the taxing unit voting on the question submitted to them in a form specifying in dollars and cents the amount of the tax base in effect and the amount of the new tax base submitted for approval. If approved, the new tax base applies first to the levy for the fiscal year next following its approval.

(3) The limitation imposed by subsection (1) of this section does not apply to the portion of any tax levied which is:

(a) For the payment of bonded indebtedness or interest thereon.

(b) Specifically voted outside the limitation imposed by subsection (1) of this section by a majority of the voters of the taxing unit voting on the question.

(4) Notwithstanding subsection (1), (2), and (3) of this section, the following special limitations apply during the periods indicated:

(a) During the fiscal year next following the creation of a new taxing unit which includes property previously included in a similar taxing unit, the new taxing unit and the old taxing unit may not levy a tax on the property received or retained to raise an amount of revenue greater than an amount obtained by adding 6 percent to the total amount of tax lawfully levied by the old taxing unit on the property received and retained, except portions of that total amount described in subsection (3) of this section, in any one of the last 3 years in which a tax was so levied.

(b) During the fiscal year next following the annexation of territory to an existing taxing unit, the tax base of the annexing unit established under subsection (2) of this section is increased by an amount obtained by adding 6 percent to the amount obtained by multiplying the equalized assessed valuation of the taxable property in the annexed territory for the fiscal year of annexation by the millage rate within the tax base of the annexing unit for the fiscal year of annexation.

(5) The legislative assembly may provide by law for the time and manner of calling and holding elections referred to in this section. However, the question of establishing a new tax base by a taxing unit other than the State shall be submitted at a statewide regular general election or a general primary election.

ARTICLE XI—GOVERNMENTAL ACTIVITIES

SECTION 1. The capital of the State is Salem in Marion County.

Sec. 2. (1) The legislative assembly shall provide by law for the establishment of a uniform and general system of common schools.

(2) Provision shall be made by law for the administration of State school lands and a common school fund and for the distribution of income from that fund for school purposes.

Sec. 3. The rights, title and interest in and to the shore of the Pacific Ocean and offshore lands, now or hereafter owned by the State, shall be held by the State in perpetuity; but the State, by law, may grant leases, easements and licenses with respect thereto for purposes not inconsistent with the public use and enjoyment thereof.

Sec. 4. The rights, title and interest in and to all water for the development of waterpower and in and to the waterpower sites, now or hereafter owned by the State,

shall be held by the State in perpetuity; but the State, by law, may grant leases, easements and licenses with respect thereto for purposes not inconsistent with the public interest.

SEC. 5. The State may:

(1) Control and develop the waterpower within the State.

(2) Lease water and waterpower sites for the development of waterpower.

(3) Control, use, transmit, distribute, sell, and dispose of electric energy produced by any method.

(4) Separately or jointly or in cooperation with any political subdivision or public corporation in this State or with the United States or any agency thereof, develop any waterpower within the State, and acquire, construct, maintain, and operate facilities for the production of electric energy by any method and transmission and distribution lines.

(5) Separately or jointly or in cooperation with any political subdivision or public corporation in this State, with any other State, agency thereof or political subdivision or public corporation therein or with the United States or any agency thereof, develop any waterpower in any interstate stream, and acquire, construct, maintain, and operate facilities for the production of electric energy by that waterpower and transmission and distribution lines.

(6) Contract with any political subdivision or public corporation in this State, with any other State, agency thereof or political subdivision or public corporation therein or with the United States or any agency thereof for the purchase or acquisition of water, waterpower, or electric energy produced by any method for use, transmission, distribution, sale, or disposition thereof.

(7) Fix rates and charges for the use of water in the development of waterpower and for the sale or disposition of waterpower and electric energy produced by any method.

(8) Incur indebtedness to an amount not exceeding $1\frac{1}{2}$ percent of the true cash value of all the property in the State taxed on an ad valorem basis for the purpose of providing funds to carry out the provisions of this section, notwithstanding any other limitation on State indebtedness in this constitution.

(9) Do any and all things necessary or convenient to carry out the provisions of this section.

Sec. 6. Provision for bringing suit or action against the State may be made only by general law. Provision for making compensation to persons claiming damages against the State may not be made by special law.

Sec. 7. Corporations may be formed under general laws, but may not be created by the legislative assembly by special laws.

Sec. 8. Provision may be made by law for the State, any agency thereof or any political subdivision or public corporation therein to exercise any of its functions and participate in the financing thereof jointly or in cooperation with:

(1) Any other agency of the State or political subdivision or public corporation in the State;

(2) Any other State, agency thereof, or political subdivision or public corporation therein;

(3) The United States or any agency, territory, possession, or governmental unit thereof; or

(4) Insofar as consistent with the Constitution of the United States, any foreign power or agency or governmental unit thereof.

Sec. 9. Lotteries and the sale of lottery tickets, for any purpose whatever, are prohibited, and the legislative assembly shall prevent them by criminal laws.

Sec. 10. The proceeds from any tax levied on, with respect to or measured by the storage, withdrawal, use, sale, distribution, im-

portation or receipt of motor vehicle fuel or any other product used for the propulsion of motor vehicles, and the proceeds from any tax or excise levied on the ownership, operation or use of motor vehicles shall, after providing for the cost of administration and any refunds or credits authorized by law, be used exclusively for the construction, reconstruction, improvement, repair, maintenance, operation, use and policing of public highways, roads and streets within the State or otherwise directly in aid of highway traffic, including the retirement of bonds for the payment of which those revenues have been pledged, and also may be used for the acquisition, development, maintenance, care and use of parks, recreational, scenic or other historic places and for the publicizing of any of the foregoing uses and things.

ARTICLE XII—AMENDMENT AND REVISION

SECTION 1. Amendments to or revision of the constitution may be proposed and submitted to the people only as provided in this article or article III of this constitution.

Sec. 2. The legislative assembly, by two-thirds of the membership of each house by a vote of yeas and nays, may propose amendments to or revision of all or part of the constitution. An amendment or revision so proposed shall be submitted to the people for their approval or rejection at the next following general primary election, unless otherwise ordered by the legislative assembly.

Sec. 3. A convention may propose amendments to or revision of all or part of the constitution. A convention may be called only by a law proposed by an initiative petition and enacted by the people or an act of the legislative assembly on which a referendum is ordered by the legislative assembly and which is approved by the people. A convention shall be conducted and any amendment or revision proposed thereby shall be submitted to the people for their approval or rejection as may be provided by the law by which the convention is called, or if not inconsistent with that law, by other law.

Sec. 4. An amendment to the constitution proposed by the legislative assembly or a convention shall embrace one subject only and matters properly connected therewith. A proposed revision may embrace more than one subject, but shall be voted upon as a whole.

Sec. 5. An amendment to or revision of the constitution proposed by the legislative assembly or a convention and submitted to the people becomes effective 30 days after the day on which it is approved by a majority of the votes cast thereon.

Sec. 6. An amendment to the constitution proposed by an initiative petition, the legislative assembly or a convention may be submitted to the people in the form of alternative provisions so that one provision will become effective if a revision of the constitution proposed by the legislative assembly or a convention is approved by the people and the other provision will become effective if the proposed revision is rejected by the people. A proposed amendment submitted in the form of alternative provisions shall be voted upon as a whole.

Sec. 7. If two or more conflicting amendments to or revisions of the constitution are enacted or approved by the people at the same election, the amendment or revision receiving the highest number of affirmative votes shall prevail to the extent of the conflict.

ARTICLE XIII—TRANSITIONAL

SECTION 1. The purpose of this article is to insure an orderly transition from the former Oregon constitution to this constitution. When that purpose is accomplished and all provisions of this article cease to have any continuing effect, the legislative assembly, by law, shall so declare and thereafter this

article shall not be considered as a part of this constitution.

SEC. 2. Except as otherwise provided in this article, this constitution shall first become applicable on July 1, 1965, and the former Oregon constitution shall continue to be applicable until that date. However, amendments to or revisions of this constitution may be proposed pursuant to this constitution before that date, and laws to carry out the provisions of this constitution or to insure an orderly transition from the former Oregon constitution to this constitution may be enacted before that date to take effect before, on, or after that date.

SEC. 3. Except as otherwise provided in this constitution, a person holding any elective or appointive public office shall continue to hold that office and exercise the functions of that office until that office is abolished or altered or his successor is selected and qualified in accordance with this constitution or laws enacted pursuant thereto.

SEC. 4. Notwithstanding section 8, article VI of this constitution, a judge of any court in the judicial system serving on the date this constitution first becomes applicable is subject to retention or rejection by the voters under that section at the regular general election next preceding the expiration of the term he is serving on that date.

SEC. 5. Notwithstanding article IV of this constitution, the legislative apportionment in existence on the date this constitution first becomes applicable shall continue to be applicable until an apportionment based upon the final population figures for the State and subdivisions thereof resulting from the next statewide Federal census becomes effective and applicable.

ARTICLE XIV—STATUTORY PROVISIONS

SECTION 1. Sections 2 to 28, inclusive, of this article have the same effect as statutes enacted by the legislative assembly or by the people as of the date this constitution first becomes applicable, and thereafter are statutes. Those sections, without change in sense, meaning, effect or substance, shall be compiled in Oregon revised statutes. When those sections are so compiled, this article shall not be considered as a part of this constitution.

SEC. 2. All laws not inconsistent with the constitution of the State of Oregon of 1965 shall continue in force until they expire by their own limitation or are changed, amended, or repealed.

SEC. 3. All existing writs, actions, suits, proceedings, civil or criminal liabilities, prosecutions, judgments, sentences, orders, decrees, appeals, causes of action, contracts, claims, demands, titles and rights shall continue unaffected except as modified in accordance with the constitution of the State of Oregon of 1965.

SEC. 4. In all criminal prosecutions in the circuit court 10 members of the jury may render a verdict of guilty or not guilty, save and except a verdict of guilty of first degree murder, which shall be found only by a unanimous verdict, and not otherwise.

SEC. 5. For the purpose of taking private property for public use, the use of all roads, ways and waterways necessary to promote the transportation of the raw products of mine or farm or forest or water for beneficial use or drainage is necessary to the development and welfare of the State and is declared a public use.

SEC. 6. The penalty for murder in the first degree shall be death, except when the trial jury shall in its verdict recommend life imprisonment, in which case the penalty shall be life imprisonment.

SEC. 7. The State shall have power to license private clubs, fraternal organizations, veterans' organizations, railroad corporations operating interstate trains and commercial establishments where food is cooked and served, for the purpose of selling alco-

holic liquor by the individual glass at retail, for consumption on the premises, including mixed drinks and cocktails, compounded or mixed on the premises only. The legislative assembly shall provide in such detail as it shall deem advisable for carrying out and administering the provisions of this section and shall provide adequate safeguards to carry out the original intent and purpose of the Oregon Liquor Control Act, including the promotion of temperance in the use and consumption of lighter beverages and aid in the establishment of Oregon industry. This power is subject to the following:

(1) The right of a local option election exists in the counties and in any incorporated city or town containing a population of at least 500. The legislative assembly shall prescribe a means and a procedure by which the voters of any county or incorporated city or town as limited above in any county, may through a local option election determine whether to prohibit or permit such power, and such procedure shall specifically include that whenever 15 percent of the registered voters of any county in the State or of any incorporated city or town as limited above, in any county in the State, shall file a petition requesting an election in this matter, the question shall be voted upon at the next regular November biennial election, provided said petition is filed not less than 60 days before the day of election.

(2) Legislation relating to this matter shall operate uniformly throughout the State and all individuals shall be treated equally; and all provisions shall be liberally construed for the accomplishment of these purposes.

SEC. 8. No idiot or mentally diseased person shall be entitled to the privileges of an elector; and the privilege of an elector, upon conviction of any crime which is punishable by imprisonment in the penitentiary, shall be forfeited, unless otherwise provided by law.

SEC. 9. For the purpose of voting, no person shall be deemed to have gained or lost a residence by reason of his presence or absence while employed in the service of the United States or of this State; nor while engaged in the navigation of the waters of this State, or of the United States, or of the high seas; nor while a student of any seminary of learning; nor while kept at any almshouse or other asylum at public expense; nor while confined in any public prison.

SEC. 10. No soldier, seaman, or marine in the Army or Navy of the United States or of their allies shall be deemed to have acquired a residence in the State in consequence of having been stationed within the same; nor shall any such soldier, seaman, or marine have the right to vote.

SEC. 11. Every person shall be disqualified from holding office, during the term for which he may have been elected, who shall have given or offered a bribe, threat, or reward to procure his election.

SEC. 12. In all cases, except treason, felony, and breach of the peace, electors shall be free from arrest in going to elections, during their attendance there and in returning from the same; and no elector shall be obliged to do duty in the militia on any day of election, except in time of war or public danger.

SEC. 13. Incorporated cities and towns shall hold their nominating and regular elections for their several elective officers at the same time that the primary and general biennial elections for State and county officers are held, and the election precincts and officers shall be the same for all elections held at the same time.

SEC. 14. (1) A public officer who is subject to election or retention by vote of the people also is subject to recall by the voters of the State or part thereof wherein he is subject to election or retention.

(2) A recall election may be demanded only by a petition signed by a number of

qualified voters of the State or part thereof as otherwise required by law, but not more than 25 percent of those qualified voters may be so required. The petition shall set forth the reasons for the demand. The petition shall be filed with the officer with whom a petition for nomination for the office held by the officer whose recall is demanded is filed.

(3) A recall petition shall not be circulated against any officer until he has actually held his office 6 months, except that it may be filed against a member of the legislative assembly at any time after 5 days from the beginning of the first session after his election. After one recall petition and election, no further petition may be filed against the same officer during the term for which he is elected or retained unless the further petitioners first pay into the public treasury from which the first recall election expenses were paid, the whole amount of those expenses.

(4) If the officer whose recall is demanded offers his resignation, it shall be accepted and take effect on the day it is offered, and the vacancy shall be filled immediately as provided by law for filling a vacancy in that office arising from any other cause. If that officer does not resign within 5 days after the recall petition is filed, the officer with whom the petition is filed shall order a special election to be held within 20 days in the State or part thereof to determine whether the voters will recall the officer whose recall is demanded.

(5) On the sample ballot for the recall election there shall be printed, in not more than 200 words, the reasons for demanding the recall of the officer as set forth in the recall petition, and, in not more than 200 words, that officer's justification of his course in his office.

(6) The officer whose recall is demanded shall continue to perform the duties of his office until the result of the recall election is officially declared. If a majority of the votes cast in the election are in favor of recall, the officer is recalled, and the vacancy shall be filled immediately as provided by law for filling a vacancy in that office arising from any other cause.

SEC. 15. No act shall ever be revised or amended by a mere reference to its title, but the act revised or section amended shall be set forth and published at full length.

SEC. 16. All commissions shall issue in the name of the State; shall be signed by the Governor, sealed with the seal of the State and attested by the Secretary of State.

SEC. 17. The supreme court, circuit courts, and county courts shall be courts of record.

SEC. 18. All judicial power, authority, and jurisdiction not vested by the Oregon constitution, or by laws consistent therewith, exclusively in some other court shall belong to the circuit courts.

SEC. 19. The county clerk shall keep all the public records, books, and papers of the county, record conveyances and perform the duties of clerk of the circuit and county courts.

SEC. 20. The stockholders of all corporations and joint stock companies shall be liable for the indebtedness of said corporation to the amount of their stock subscribed and unpaid and no more, excepting that the stockholders of corporations or joint stock companies conducting the business of banking shall be individually liable equally and ratably and not one for another, for the benefit of the depositors of said bank, to the amount of their stock, at the par value thereof, in addition to the par value of such shares, unless such banking corporation shall have provided security through membership in the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation or other instrumentality of the United States or otherwise for the benefit of the depositors of said bank equivalent in amount to such double liability of said stockholders.

SEC. 21. The State shall not subscribe to or be interested in the stock of any company, association or corporation, but, as provided by law, may hold and dispose of stock, including stock already received, that is donated or bequeathed.

SEC. 22. The legislative assembly may lend the credit of the State and in any manner create any debts or liabilities to build and maintain permanent roads, but which shall not singly or in the aggregate with previous debts or liabilities incurred for that purpose exceed 1 percent of the true cash value of all the property of the State taxed on an ad valorem basis.

SEC. 23. No county, city, town or other municipal corporation, by vote of its citizens or otherwise, shall become a stockholder in any joint company, corporation or association whatever.

SEC. 24. People's utility districts shall be managed by boards of directors, consisting of five members, who shall be residents of such districts. Such districts shall have power:

(1) To call and hold elections within their respective districts.

(2) To levy taxes upon the taxable property of such districts.

(3) To issue, sell and assume evidences of indebtedness.

(4) To enter into contracts.

(5) To exercise the power of eminent domain.

(6) To acquire and hold real and other property necessary or incident to the business of such districts.

(7) To acquire, develop or otherwise provide for a supply of water, water power, and electric energy.

SEC. 25. (1) The credit of the State of Oregon may be loaned and indebtedness incurred in an amount not to exceed 3 percent of the true cash value of all the property in the State, for the purpose of creating a fund to be advanced for the acquisition of farms and homes for the benefit of male and female residents of the State of Oregon who served in the Armed Forces of the United States for a period of not less than 90 days after mobilization therefor, and before the end of actual hostilities with any of the Axis Powers or for a period of not less than 90 days between June 25, 1950, and January 31, 1955, and who are honorably discharged from such service, which fund shall be known as the Oregon War Veterans' Fund. Secured repayment thereof shall be and is a prerequisite to the advancement of money from such fund.

(2) Bonds of the State of Oregon containing a direct promise on behalf of the State to pay the face value thereof, with the interest therein provided for, may be issued to an amount authorized by subsection (1) of this section for the purpose of creating said Oregon War Veterans' Fund. Said bonds shall be a direct obligation of the State and shall be in such form and shall run for such periods of time and bear such rates of interest as provided by statute.

(3) No person shall be eligible to receive money from said fund except the following:

(a) Any person who resides in the State of Oregon at the time of applying for a loan from said fund, who served honorably in active duty in the Armed Forces of the United States for a period of not less than 90 days between September 15, 1940, and December 31, 1946, who was either at the time of his enlistment, induction, warrant or commission a resident of the State of Oregon or who has been a bona fide resident of the State of Oregon for at least 2 years between the date of his separation from aforementioned service and December 31, 1950, and who has been honorably separated or discharged from said service, or who has been furloughed to a reserve. No loans shall be made to persons justified under this paragraph after January 31, 1980.

(b) Any person who resides in the State of Oregon at the time of applying for a loan from said fund, who served honorably in active duty in the Armed Forces of the United States for a period of not less than 90 days between June 25, 1950, and January 31, 1955, who was either at the time of his enlistment, induction, warrant or commission a resident of the State of Oregon or who has been a bona fide resident of the State of Oregon for at least 2 years between the date of his separation from aforementioned service and December 31, 1960, and who has been honorably separated or discharged from said service, or who has been furloughed to a reserve. No loans shall be made to persons qualified under this paragraph after January 31, 1988.

(4) There shall be levied each year, at the same time and in the same manner that other taxes are levied, a tax upon all property in the State of Oregon not exempt from taxation, not to exceed 2 mills on each dollar valuation, to provide for the payment of principal and interest of the bonds authorized to be issued by this section. Said tax levy hereby authorized shall be in addition to all other taxes which may be levied according to law.

(5) Refunding bonds may be issued and sold to refund any bonds issued under authority of subsections (1) and (2) of this section. There may be issued and outstanding at any time bonds aggregating the amount authorized by subsection (1) of this section, but at no time shall the total of all bonds outstanding, including refunding bonds, exceed the amount so authorized.

SEC. 26. The credit of the State may be loaned and indebtedness incurred in an amount which shall not exceed at any one time three-fourths of 1 percent of the assessed valuation of all taxable property in the State, to provide funds for forest rehabilitation and reforestation and for the acquisition, management, and development of lands for such purposes. So long as any such indebtedness shall remain outstanding, the funds derived from the sale, exchange, or use of said lands, and from the disposal of products therefrom, shall be applied only in the liquidation of such indebtedness. Bonds or other obligations issued pursuant to this section may be renewed or refunded. An ad valorem tax shall be levied annually upon all the taxable property in the State of Oregon, in sufficient amount to provide for the payment of such indebtedness and the interest thereon. The legislative assembly may provide other revenues to supplement or replace the said tax levies.

SEC. 27. (1) The credit of the State may be loaned and indebtedness incurred in an amount which shall not exceed at any one time three-fourths of 1 percent of the true cash value of all the taxable property in the State, as determined by law to provide funds with which to redeem and refund outstanding revenue bonds issued to finance the cost of buildings and other projects for higher education, and to construct, improve, repair, equip, and furnish buildings and other structures for such purpose, and to purchase or improve sites therefor.

(2) The buildings and structures hereafter constructed for higher education pursuant to this section shall be such only as conservatively shall appear to the constructing authority to be wholly self-liquidating and self-supporting from revenues, gifts, grants, or building fees. All unpledged net revenues of buildings and other projects may be pooled with the net revenues of new buildings or projects in order to render the new buildings or projects self-liquidating and self-supporting.

(3) Ad valorem taxes shall be levied annually upon all the taxable property in the State of Oregon in sufficient amount, with the aforesaid revenues, gifts, grants, or building fees, to provide for the payment of such

indebtedness and the interest thereon. The legislative assembly may provide other revenues to supplement or replace such tax levies.

(4) Bonds issued pursuant to this section shall be the direct general obligations of the State, and be in such form, run for such periods of time, and bear such rates of interest as shall be provided by statute. Such bonds may be refunded with bonds of like obligation. Unless provided by statute, no bonds shall be issued pursuant to this section for the construction of buildings or other structures for higher education until after all of the aforesaid outstanding revenue bonds shall have been redeemed or refunded.

SEC. 28. The property and pecuniary rights of every married woman, at the time of marriage or afterward, acquired by gift, devise, or inheritance shall not be subject to the debts or contracts of the husband.

EXHIBIT 1

A METHOD FOR REVISION

During the 1957 session a constitutional amendment was proposed to provide an alternative method of changing the constitution. The idea would retain the section-by-section referendum apparatus but in addition, the legislature could refer a whole or partly revised constitution as a one-vote proposition, provided that two-thirds of each house approved the revision. The suggestion was not adopted in 1957 but it was approved as an amendment to the constitution by the 1959 session. The voters favored it in the 1960 general election, 358,367 to 289,895.

The 51st legislative assembly, meeting in 1961, faced the job of becoming a constitutional convention without benefit of preparation. It was obvious that with its other tasks the assembly did not have time to do groundwork on revision. The idea developed of an interim group—composed of representatives of all three branches and of the public—to propose a revision or revisions. Senate Joint Resolution 20 provided a Commission for Constitutional Revision, to report to the 52d legislative assembly in 1963.

The resulting 17-member commission was appointed by the speaker of the house, president of the senate, Governor, and chief justice. It included three State senators, four State representatives, two supreme court justices, a circuit court judge, two ex-governors, two newspaper publishers, a businessman with long political experience, a professor of constitutional law and a housewife who has long been active in revision study for the League of Women Voters. The membership represented a broad background of political, commercial, and educational experience about equally divided on party lines and from all sections of the State.

Members are:

George Layman, Newberg, chairman: An attorney in private practice; a graduate of the University of Oregon and its School of Law; four-term mayor of Newberg and five terms in the house; Federal Government experience in both Justice Department and Department of State, in the United States and overseas.

Kenneth J. O'Connell, Salem, vice chairman: Associate justice of State supreme court; a graduate of University of Wisconsin; on Law School faculty at the University of Oregon from 1936 until appointed to the court in 1958 except for 3 years of private practice of law in Eugene; chairman of the Oregon Statute Revision Council which managed complete codification of Oregon laws.

William B. Sweetland, Klamath Falls, secretary: Newspaperman; served 5 years in Army Air Corps during Second World War; has interests in newspapers in Montana and Iowa and is publisher of the Klamath Falls Herald and News.

Clarence Barton, Coquille: Title company officer and attorney; graduate of Willamette

University; 3 years' service in the Counter Intelligence Corps during World War II; Coquille city attorney and later city council member; president of West Coast Title Co.; in house for three terms.

Robert W. Chandler, Bend: Newspaper editor and publisher; graduate of Stanford University; served in the Counter Intelligence Corps during World War II; has had news and business experience with the Denver Post and United Press International; now publishes the Bend Bulletin and has an interest in the La Grande Observer and other publishing properties.

Alfred T. Goodwin, Salem: Associate justice of the Oregon supreme court; graduate of the University of Oregon; was in private law practice in Eugene from 1951 to 1955 when he was appointed to circuit court bench; his appointment to supreme court was in 1960; served in Army infantry, 1942-46.

Stafford Hansell, Hermiston: Farmer, stock grower; attended Montana State University for 3 years and graduated from Whitman College; is associated with a brother in a large scale swine growing operation; has served three terms in the House.

Robert D. Holmes, Portland: Public relations consultant and television moderator; attended University of Oregon; served two terms in the State senate and was Governor of Oregon 1957-59.

Donald R. Husband, Eugene: Attorney in private practice; graduate of the University

of North Dakota and the University of Oregon; served two terms in the House and has served two terms in the Senate.

Mrs. Esther D. Lewis, Portland: Housewife; graduate of Reed College; she was active in the Oregon League of Women Voters and was chairman of its State committee on constitutional revision from 1958 to 1961.

Hans A. Linde, Eugene: Professor of constitutional law at the University of Oregon Law School; graduate of Reed College and the University of California and member of the Oregon bar; in U.S. Army from 1943 to 1945; law clerk to U.S. Supreme Court Justice William O. Douglas 1950-51; attorney for the U.S. State Department 1951-53 and legislative assistant to U.S. Senator Richard L. Neuberger, 1955-58.

Thomas R. Mahoney, Portland: Attorney in private practice; graduate of Christian Brothers College and Northwestern College of Law; in the U.S. Army infantry, World War I; serving his fifth term in the State senate.

Walter J. Pearson, Portland: Insurance broker; graduate of the University of Oregon; has served two terms as a State representative, one term as State treasurer, and three terms in the State senate; former president of the State senate.

Herbert M. Schwab, Portland: Circuit judge; graduate of Northwestern College of Law; in the U.S. Army 1941 to 1946; in private practice of law in Portland 1946 to 1959 and on the Portland school board 1954-59; appointed circuit judge in 1959.

Charles A. Sprague, Salem: Editor and publisher of the Salem Oregon Statesman; graduate of Monmouth College, Illinois; assistant superintendent of public instruction in Washington State, 1913-15 and has been in the newspaper business since; Governor of Oregon 1939-43; alternate U.S. delegate to the United Nations General Assembly, 1952.

George Van Hoomissen, Portland: Attorney in private practice; graduate of the University of Portland and Georgetown University Law School; teaches a course at Northwestern College of Law; Marine veteran of the Korean war; served two terms as State representative.

Rudie Wilhelm, Jr., Portland: Warehouse firm manager; graduate of Reed College; Army Air Corps veteran of World War II; served four terms in the house and two terms in the State senate; was speaker of the house one session; was a member of the Governor's and legislative constitutional committee in 1953-54.

RECESS UNTIL MONDAY

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I move that the Senate now stand in recess until 12 o'clock noon on Monday next.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 1 o'clock and 4 minutes p.m.) under the order previously entered, the Senate took a recess until Monday, January 14, 1963, at 12 o'clock meridian.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Outlaw Political Extortion of Federal Employees

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. BYRNES

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 10, 1963

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I have today reintroduced legislation making it a criminal offense to threaten Federal employees with the loss of their jobs in the event they do not contribute to a political party.

This legislation is made necessary by the refusal of the Justice Department to use laws now on the books to prosecute party fund solicitors who coerce Federal employees into party contributions under threat of being fired.

In the last Congress I was unable to get any action by the Justice Department in such a case involving alleged threats of a Democratic fund solicitor against postal employees in my district. By a strange interpretation of the law, the Department maintains that it is legal for anyone, who is not a Federal employee, to threaten Federal employees with job loss as a means of coercing contributions to the party in power.

It is regrettable that Congress is forced to restate a law which clearly prohibits such pernicious activity. It is regrettable that Federal employees will be without the protection of the law until Congress is able to act. It is regrettable that the civil rights of those employees can still be violated with impunity.

I urge prompt passage of the bill. It reads as follows:

Whoever, directly or indirectly, deprives, attempts to deprive, or threatens to deprive any person of any employment, position, work, compensation or other benefit provided for or made possible by any Act of Congress, in an effort to force participation in any political activity, or support or opposition to any candidate or political party, or financial contributions to any candidate or political party, shall be fined not more than \$1,000 or imprisoned not more than one year, or both.

Independence Day of Sudan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ADAM C. POWELL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 10, 1963

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, on January 1, the Republic of Sudan celebrated the seventh anniversary of her independence, and we take this opportunity to send warm felicitations to His Excellency, the President of the Supreme Council for the Armed Forces, Ibrahim Abboud; and His Excellency, the Sudanese Ambassador to the United States, Dr. Osman al-Hadari, on the occasion of the anniversary of Sudan's independence.

Seven years have elapsed since the Sudan was declared independent, years of continued progress that have made the Sudan a nation to consider, to applaud. From the time of its independence ceremonies on January 1, 1956, the

Sudan has achieved a unique position of self-reliance, rapid economic transformation, and political stability. It is with great pleasure that we in America extend greetings to honor the Sudan's independence anniversary.

On Independence Day, 57 years of Anglo-Egyptian rule came to an end. Colonialism had been imposed upon a proud people. Several attempts to overthrow the oppressive yoke had ended in failure. But through perseverance and peaceful constitutional means, colonial rule was at last expelled.

Seven years of economic development have been the greatest achievement of the Sudan as an independent nation. During those short years, over 4,000 acres of irrigated cotton was added; 750 miles of rail track now binds the far-reaching corners of the nation to its capital and port city; electrification of hydraulic plants promoted industrial expansion; and healthy foreign trade was realized, with cotton being the prime motivator in most transactions. These are milestones in the economic development of a new nation.

As a new nation, it has and will continue to suffer setbacks. Because of political ineffectuality and dismemberment, a bloodless coup overthrew the old regime and established a ruling junta, generally supported and praised, though, by all save the Communists.

While dissimilarities of culture, religion, and race between the north and south have brought about eruptive disorder, the Sudanese Government is determined to obliterate the differences between these sections of the country so that the entire nation may progress in harmony and unity.

I salute these achievements and hopes of the Sudan. I am certain that the next 7 years will bring even greater advancement. We hope that in the forthcoming years the Sudan will set an example for the world community to emulate. We are proud to claim the Sudan as a friend and to share with the Sudanese people the celebration of their independence anniversary.

Truth-in-Lending Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. ROBERT N. C. NIX

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 10, 1963

Mr. NIX. Mr. Speaker, today I have introduced a bill designed to accelerate the stabilization of the Nation's economy by assuring equitable relationships that will result from the full disclosure of financing costs in connection with extensions of credit. In recent years an increasing number of complaints of widespread extortion, arising from presently accepted business practices, has been disclosed by witnesses before congressional committees, revealed in reports of the public press and related by individuals personally victimized by the flourishing credit racket. An abundance of relevant testimony, clearly establishing the viciousness of the system, has been recounted by witnesses before the House District Committee and the Subcommittee on Production and Stabilization of the Senate Committee on Banking and Currency.

I, therefore, have presented the bill both to stabilize the economy and to promote individual justice. I am deeply concerned over the fact that from both the quantity of substantial evidence presented to committees and secured through personal sources it is conclusively indicated that countless Negroes have been robbed and cheated by unscrupulous business people who willfully exact exorbitant interest through subtle means unrevealed to them. As a consequence of such practices the full cost of articles to the trusting purchaser is withheld while the seller is realizing profits as great as 100 percent or more. Moreover, through such criminal practices there are thousands of well-known instances pointing out that it is a common policy of dishonest sellers to resell the same articles several times over with the identical built-in interest charges to other unsuspecting Negroes further compounding, thereby, big profits for such businessmen. And, the sum total of the tragedy of this unconscionable condition has been that consumers who have suffered most are those in the lowest economic group and, thus, least able to pay.

Full disclosure of financing costs incident to consumer credit could prevent or at least restrain abuses of the helpless imposed as is now the case through the concealment of true rates, the manipulation of charges by the use of fees, and the failure to rebate amounts taken

in advance. These considerations, Mr. Speaker, are so compelling that I have presented this legislation and am now appealing to the leadership to join me in its passage.

Tax Rate Reforms for Growth and Jobs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. A. S. HERLONG, JR.

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 10, 1963

Mr. HERLONG. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I include the following statement by the gentleman from Tennessee, HOWARD H. BAKER, and myself, upon introduction of new bills for reform of personal and corporate income tax rates:

TAX RATE REFORM FOR GROWTH AND JOBS

(Statement of Hon. A. S. HERLONG, Jr., Democrat, of Florida and Hon. HOWARD H. BAKER, Republican, of Tennessee, January 10, 1963)

It is our hope that 1963 will witness the reversal of Federal tax policy which for so long has been stacked against capital formation, economic growth, and job creation. To this end, we have introduced new bills for reform of personal and corporate income tax rates over a 5-year period. The principle that lower tax rates mean more vigor and growth in the private economy is generally recognized by the average citizen. While this principle provides the basic guidance for reforming a rate structure, there are complex fiscal problems and sophisticated economic questions which tax specialists and policymakers, including Members of the Congress, must consider before agreement on specific legislation. To make it useful in policy deliberations, this statement in explanation and support of our bills is more of a technical than a popular exposition.

This legislative program is not designed to apportion tax relief among disputing claimants, but to serve the general public interest in greater growth and more jobs.

It is not designed to stimulate an inherently weak economy, but to release the world's strongest economy from the tax rates which bind it.

The critical test which we believe should be applied to any tax program at this time is not how much economic activity it might stir up in the next year or two, but is how much economic growth it will give us by the end of the decade. We believe our program meets this test; that it would produce maximum results in growth and jobs with a minimum of inflationary danger.

This is the third Congress in which we have proposed such legislation. Since the tax rate drags on the economy became a top public issue last summer, there has been a tremendous surge of interest in the key procedure of our bills; namely, spaced-out rate reform. Many new voices have been raised in support of our bills as a whole. Some others, however, seem to view the rate reform goals which we have set as unrealistic. Assuming that the purpose of tax action is to release the economy for optimum achievement in long-term growth and jobs, and without quibbling over negotiable details, we believe our bills encompass the only workable, realistic and adequate program now in being.

RATE REFORMS

This legislative program places the great emphasis on reduction of the range of grad-

uation of the personal tax. The graduated rates now top out at 91 percent and reach 53 percent at the \$18,000 to \$20,000 bracket of taxable income.

Over a 5-year period, our bills would reduce the top rate of personal tax to 42 percent, and the 53-percent rate to 24 percent, with other graduated rates lowered in a consistent pattern. The first bracket rate of 20 percent would be lowered to 15 percent, assuring a minimum reduction of 25 percent to every personal taxpayer. The graduated rates from 22 to 34 percent would be reduced to a new range of 16 to 19 percent. The 38-percent rate would come down to 20 percent (see tables I and II).

The rate of withholding on wages and salaries would come down from the present 18 percent to 13.5 percent at the end of 5 years.

The combined top rate of corporate tax would be reduced from 52 to 42 percent over the 5-year period (see table III). The new top rate of 42 percent would still be more than 10 percent higher than the 38-percent top rate of corporate tax between World War II and the Korean war.

Our earlier bills contemplated that all rates would be put into effect as of January 1, with enactment coming in advance of the date for the first scheduled rate cuts. The current bills contemplate enactment after January, but in time to make the first reduction in the withholding rate effective July 1, 1963.

Because taxpayer returns are on a calendar year basis, the actual 1963 tax rate cuts apply to the entire year, i.e., be effective as of January 1, but the percentage amount is only one-half of that which would have resulted from enactment in advance of January 1. The reduced withholding rate however, from July to December, is the same as it would have been if it had been effective from January 1 to reflect tax cuts for a full year. As regards the average taxpayer whose tax liability is satisfied by withholding, the practical effect is tax reduction beginning as of July 1.

This procedure enables a further reduction in the withholding rate effective January 1, 1964, as the second year's tax rate cuts go into effect on that date. There would be telescoped into these cuts the one-half year's cuts which were not made effective in 1963. Consistently, the corporate cut for 1963 is held to 1 percentage point, with the deferred percentage point added to the annual reduction of 2 percentage points effective January 1, 1964.

TAX SAVINGS, REVENUE EFFECT AND REVENUE GAIN FROM ECONOMIC GROWTH

The average annual tax savings under our bills would be approximately \$3.85 billion. These savings relate to the calendar year of tax liability. Of the average annual savings, \$2.85 billion would go to individuals and \$1 billion to corporations. Over the life of the legislation, the personal tax cuts would provide approximately \$14.25 billion in tax savings and the corporate cuts \$5 billion, or a total of \$19.25 billion. These data are based on 1962 income levels, because it would unnecessarily complicate this statement to assign different values to the tax cuts applying to the separate years.

Of the personal tax savings, about \$6.15 billion, or 43.1 percent of the total, would result from the cut to 15 percent of the 20-percent rate now applying to the first bracket of taxable income; \$2.1 billion, or 15.1 percent of the total, would result from the cut to 16 percent of the 22-percent graduated rate now applying to the second bracket of taxable income. The remaining tax savings, \$6 billion, or 41.8 percent of the total, would result from the cuts in the graduated rates which now range from 26 percent upward, but only 14.3 percent, or \$2.04 billion, from reducing the graduated rates now over

50 percent, ranging from 53 to 91 percent at the top. (See table IV.)

While tax savings are computed for calendar or taxpaying years, the Government calculates the effect on revenue of tax cuts to accord with its fiscal year (June 30) budget. The delay of cut in the 1963 withholding rate until July 1 means that the only revenue effect in fiscal year 1963 would come from revised declarations and payments of estimated tax and would involve only a nominal sum. The remaining revenue effect of the legislation would be spread over the 5 fiscal years ending with June 30, 1968. Because of the overlap of fiscal and calendar years, there is some bunching of revenue effect (as contrasted to calendar year tax savings) in fiscal years 1964 and 1965.

Because of this bunching, the revenue effect in fiscal 1964 would be \$4.81 billion, followed by an additional \$4.81 billion in fiscal 1965, or a total for the 2 years of \$9.6 billion. The additional revenue effect would be \$3.85 billion in each of the fiscal years 1966 and 1967, followed by \$1.93 billion in fiscal year 1968, when the total for the 5 years would correspond to the total tax savings of \$19.25 billion. None of these data take into account the return flow of revenue from a better performing and growing economy.

There is an alternate procedure for putting into effect tax cuts over a series of years which would eliminate the bunching of revenue effect in the early years. An explanation of how the procedure would work is given in the final section of this statement.

At this point, the critical question is: To what extent would the revenue gain from economic growth compensate for the revenue effects of the tax cuts? Administration reports and statements, and other material which will be presented in the hearings before the Ways and Means Committee, may throw light on this subject which is not available to us at this writing. However, in addition to laying the basis for an adequate long-term growth rate (in the range of 4 percent as compared with the average of about 2½ percent over recent years), it is generally agreed that a goal of tax rate reform or reduction is to make up for the gap created by the past inadequate performance of the economy (7 to 8 percent of gross national product, or about \$40 billion). If the loss were to be made up over a 5-year period, an average growth rate of about 5½ percent would be required.

For purposes of illustration, it is assumed—if our proposed legislation is enacted—that after a growth build-up in the first year, the average growth rate throughout the decade would be in the order of 5 percent annually; and that such a growth rate would produce annual additions to revenues in the order of \$4.5 billion—computed on the basis of 1962 income levels. These assumptions are incorporated in the following table, showing the calendar year of tax cuts under our bills, the estimated annual and cumulative revenue effect in the ensuing fiscal years, and the estimated gain in revenue from economic growth—annual and cumulative—for the same fiscal years:

(In billions)

Calendar year	Steps in cuts	Revenue effect, fiscal years ending June 30		Revenue gains from economic growth, years ending June 30	
		Annual	Cumulative	Annual	Cumulative
1963	1st..... 1½	(1)	(1)		
1964	2d..... 1½	\$4.81	\$4.81	\$3.5	\$3.5
1965	3d..... 1	4.81	9.62	4.5	8.0
1966	4th..... 1	3.85	13.47	4.5	12.5
1967	5th..... 1	3.85	17.32	4.5	17.0
1968	1.93	19.25	4.5	21.5
1969	19.25	4.5	26.0

1 Nominal.

In considering the implications of this table, the impact of the rate of growth on Government spending must be kept in mind. In the absence of an average growth rate in the order of 5 percent until the lost growth is recovered, economists generally agree that unemployment will not be brought down to reasonable levels. Contemporary attitudes do not admit of Government inactivity in face of excessive unemployment levels.

The options are clear. Either the Government provides the private economy through tax-rate reform with the opportunity to resolve the chronic unemployment problem, or the Government will compound the fiscal crisis caused by too much spending and too little revenue. The option of tax-rate reform offers promise of a stronger and freer America and in the long term, enough revenue to cover all necessary spending of the Government.

The option of more domestic programs and spending to solve the unemployment problem is a barren one. It inevitably would mean larger deficits carrying with them the possibility of a new, serious inflationary surge.

THE ECONOMICS OF TAX CUTTING

There are strong, respected dissenting voices mingled with what seems to be majority agreement on the economic need for tax cutting. By and large dissent is based on the proposal of tax cuts without expenditure reduction or control. Opposition is inflamed by loose statements attributing virtue to deficits. Question is raised as to the credibility of the general statement that lower taxes mean more revenue.

Unfortunately, among those who give full or qualified support to tax cutting, there is wide disagreement as to what tax rates should be cut, how much, and how tax cuts would bring about desirable economic results. Some place the great emphasis on removal or modification of the deterrent or drag effect of the present steeply graduated rates of personal tax, and the high combined rate of corporate tax, on capital formation, greater growth, and more jobs. Others place the emphasis on using tax-cut dollars for stimulation of private consumption, relying on secondary effects for greater capital formation and long-term growth. Some walk down the middle, giving credence to both approaches.

Our bills are oriented to the release of investment funds and incentives. Nevertheless, our estimate is that only about one-half of the tax savings under our bills would be employed as new capital, with the remaining one-half being used for current consumption spending. We believe it would be a serious economic mistake to enact legislation designed to channel the bulk of the tax savings into current consumption. This is a question which should be resolved on the basis of how tax cutting at different income levels affects the economy, and not on the basis of who gets the direct tax relief. The following explanations may be helpful in this respect.

The release of tax rate deterrents or drags. All taxation takes out of the private economy some income which otherwise would have been transformed into capital for growth. Large amounts of such income are taken by the steeply graduated rates of personal tax, and the excessive top rate of corporate tax. These rates also reduce the incentives of individuals to earn additional income, and to invest in risk-taking ventures, and the incentives of business to expand existing plant and the production of existing products and services, to add new products and services, and to employ more people.

In short, it is these uneconomic tax rates which restrict economic growth, limit the number of new jobs, and provide too little revenue for the support of government. Removal or modification of these tax rate deterrents or drags not only would be good business for the country; it also would be

good business for the government. A chronically, artificially repressed economy simply cannot be relied upon to provide the revenues to meet the needs of contemporary government.

Tax cutting to stimulate consumption. There is a significant contrast between tax rate reform for the purpose of removing tax rate drags and disincentives, and the conception of tax cutting as a form of government help or aid designed to stimulate the economy. Tax cutting which would increase private consumption without corresponding reduction in government spending would fall in the latter category.

When the Government takes and spends income which otherwise would have been used for private consumption, there is no direct effect on the rate of economic activity or of economic growth. The Government, including its employees and the beneficiaries of its programs, simply spends more, and unsubsidized private citizens spend less. Conversely, when the Government reduces its spending and its taxes bearing on consumption in equal amount, private citizens spend more while the Government, and its employees and beneficiaries, spend less. There is no direct effect on the rate of economic activity.

Thus, the stimulation of private consumption through tax cutting comes about only when the cutting is not matched by a comparable reduction in Government expenditures. In this situation, tax cutting creates \$2 of income where only \$1 existed before, because in effect, the Government borrows and spends an amount equivalent to the tax cuts.

An increase of private consumption through this means will add to the current rate of economic activity, and provide some return revenue flow. It is questionable, however, whether this process would have much significance for economic growth. The improvement in business volume would result in some increase in profits, and some increase in savings from personal incomes. As a general proposition, however, it would seem grossly inefficient to attempt to influence investment for growth and jobs in this roundabout manner. For any given number of tax reduction dollars, it is certain that a much greater result would be achieved by cutting the steeply graduated personal tax rates and the top corporate rate.

Moreover, whatever the immediate effect on private consumption of tax cuts financed by deficits, there would be no effect whatsoever as regards either total economic activity or economic growth when and if the budget is brought into balance. From that time on, the process would be substitution of private consumption, in itself highly desirable, for consumption brought about by government spending. It seems like an economic contradiction therefore to associate tax cutting to stimulate private consumption with long-term economic growth and job creation.

EASIER TAXES VERSUS TIGHTER MONEY AND CREDIT

In current discussions on tax cutting to increase private consumption, it is sometimes stated or implied that there may have to be a tightening up of the use of money and credit in the private economy to prevent the tax cuts from having inflationary effect.

Such a prospect seems wholly inconsistent with the goal of improved long-term growth and job creation. The inadequate growth of recent years has been accompanied by inadequate expansion in private use of money and credit. More growth inevitably will increase the private demand for money and credit. In fact, a fundamental purpose of tax rate reform is to improve the business climate, which in and of itself would create greater private demand for money and credit. It would be a most unfortunate thing if this

demand went unsatisfied because too much tax cutting to increase private consumption had built up potential inflationary pressures.

A program of rate reform oriented to releasing capital and incentives for growth and making healthy but not excessive tax cuts over a number of years, would provide the best set of conditions for a much-needed expansion of money and credit without inflationary consequences. By contrast, any tax cutting program involving substantial revenue effect, and heavily oriented to the increase of private consumption instead of releasing savings for investment and growth, would carry grave danger of a return to tight control on the use of money and credit in the private economy.

HOW MUCH TAX CUTTING?

We believe our bills incorporate a program which is balanced from the standpoint of the fiscal realities and of the economic goals of tax rate reform. Economists generally agree that the key factor in the lag in growth and employment over the past 5 years has been the failure of business investment spending to expand. As set forth in the statement appearing in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 108, part 17, pages 22687-22688, business expenditures for plant and equipment, in constant 1961 dollars, are some \$12 billion short of the level which would have been achieved under an average annual growth rate of 4 percent since 1951. We assume that about one-half of the tax savings under our bills, or \$9 to \$10 billion, would be saved and invested, instead of being used for current consumption. This would be on the short side of the indicated deficiency in business capital spending. Moreover, as new family formation moves up sharply after the mid-1960's, a considerable volume of new savings will be channeled into residential buildings, thus reducing the new savings available for use in business expansion. An offsetting factor, however, will be the business savings released by the depreciation reforms put into effect by the administration in 1962, and the investment tax credit enacted as part of the Revenue Act of 1962—the two together valued by the administration at approximately \$2.5 billion annually. To some extent these savings are nullified by provisions of the 1962 act which directly or indirectly reduce business or personal savings or adversely affect incentives. Relating all of these factors, it would be difficult to see how anyone could argue that our bills would release more income for capital formation, residential and business, than will be needed in the 1960's and beyond.

Nevertheless, our program involves a substantially larger total of tax cuts, over its proposed legislative life, than is contemplated by other programs under contemporary discussion. There is a tendency in many quarters to rely on the simple principle that tax cutting means more business and more revenues in the short future without facing up to the question of what is needed to turn our economy loose for optimum performance over the long term.

As a frame of reference in regard to size of tax cuts, it may be well to recall the aggregate tax reductions of 1954 which—at income levels then existing—involved tax savings estimated at about \$7.5 billion. Except for repeal of the Korean war excess profits tax, and the inauguration of the 4-percent dividend credit and \$50 exclusion, the 1954 cuts were not especially oriented toward capital formation and economic growth. The depreciation reforms provided in the 1954 act were of major importance, but in terms of depreciation speedup they did not provide for major key industries as much relief as had been available under the Korean war rapid amortization provision.

After the 1954 reductions, business activity expanded sharply in 1955 and 1956, with

revenues increasing to the point of transforming deficits of \$3.1 billion in fiscal 1954 and \$4.2 billion in fiscal 1955 into surpluses of \$1.6 billion in both fiscal years 1956 and 1957. Thereafter, however, the economy turned downward and into the period of too slow growth and too much chronic unemployment resulting in repetitive Federal deficits.

To us, the moral of this experience is that the tax rate reform necessary to pull down the blocks to adequate long-term growth and jobs must be more sweeping than other tax cuts in our history.

The economy is still laboring under a tax rate philosophy and structure which was conceived in the gloom of the 1930 depression and implemented by the revenue requirements of World War II and subsequent years. Only a sweeping reform of rates can reverse this philosophy and change the tax structure so that capital formation and business and human incentives can play their full role in creating a stronger and more bountiful economy.

If further evidence is needed in support of a program cutting and reforming taxes as deeply as our bills would, it is provided by the fact that the 1954 tax cuts, related to 1962 income levels, would have a current value in the order of \$12 billion. If we are to serve the objectives of growth and employment to which all groups and persons in our Nation are committed, it seems apparent that a much larger tax cutting package, much better distributed from the standpoint of capital formation, must be enacted in 1963.

After substantial tax cuts have been enacted in 1963, it is not likely that there will be further significant tax cutting in this decade or at least before the end of it. This means that if the purposes of growth and jobs in this decade are to be served by tax rate reform, the 1963 legislation must do the job.

Any question of doubt as to distribution of tax cuts, or as to total amount, should be resolved on the side of turning the economy loose from capital incentive destroying tax rates.

Looking ahead for a number of years, the prospect for further tax cutting will certainly depend on how fast the economy grows, unless there is a real easing of the cold war. From this benchmark, what is done now in cutting the growth-retarding rates will determine whether there can be future tax cuts to serve any purpose. By contrast, emphasis now on cutting taxes to stimulate consumption would leave little prospect of further tax cutting for any purpose in the foreseeable future.

THE MOST CRITICAL TAX RATES

While we are convinced of the economic necessity for enactment of legislation incorporating at least the full sweep of rate reform of our bills, we cannot ignore the fact of current proposals involving much smaller total tax cuts. In considering these less sweeping programs, we believe it important that the priorities in terms of long-range growth and jobs be recognized.

As against the potential for growth of a fully free economy, we believe that the steeply graduated rates of personal tax, as much through the middle brackets as beyond, constitute the most inhibiting and retarding force. Here are the rates which strike most directly at incentives, both business and personal. These steeply climbing rates discourage risk-taking, choke off venture capital at its source, curtail business starts and expansion, and thus prevent the creation of new jobs. They are the bane of small business and of the man on the ladder. In placing stiff penalties on hard work and long hours, such rates are a contradiction of the compensation principle of extra reward for extra effort and achievement.

It is these baneful effects of graduation which led us to the conclusion that, under a reformed tax rate structure, no unincorporated business or other individual should be required to pay a higher rate of tax than a corporation. Proposals for higher top rates of tax inevitably carry with them higher rates through the critical middle brackets. Similar top rates of personal tax would—

1. Give the unincorporated business roughly the same opportunity as a corporation to retain earnings for growth.

2. Relieve greatly the burden of double taxation on corporate income which is paid out in dividends.

3. Minimize the tax penalty on hard work, long hours, and achievement.

4. Maximize the release of incentives for venturesome investment, the creation of new products and services, the starting of new businesses, and the expansion of old.

Despite these objectives which would so well serve the general public interest, we recognize there is a reluctance to release from tax as much income of wealthy people as would result from our bills. We do not share this reluctance, because similar top rates of tax would mean the most in growth and jobs in the future. However, we recognize the difference in economic consequences to be expected from maximum moderation in rates which may be generally associated with the earned income potential of unincorporated business and other personal endeavor as compared with very large incomes derived from large aggregations of wealth. The greatest tragedy of our present tax rate structure is that those with high earned income potential, on whom we depend the most for economic building for the future, have so little opportunity to accumulate savings out of their current incomes. Our bills would release incentives to men and women with the greatest capacity for personal contribution to the Nation's economic future, and also the capital which would free them to make the maximum contribution. For a free, dynamic economy, these are inseparable attributes.

A top personal tax rate similar to the top corporate tax rate would be a small concession to make in order to turn our high-powered people loose to lead the way to high-level growth. However, too much damage would not be done as regards the "earned income" group if one or two higher rates of tax were set at very high income levels. Such higher rates of tax could not be justified at any income levels from the economic standpoint, but they would not be as growth-retarding as such rates applied within the existing taxable income brackets. Above all, however, the No. 1 priority in tax rate reform is to minimize the tax restraint on the energetic, creative, and far-sighted people who must accumulate their capital out of current income, and who inevitably would use the capital so accumulated—plus savings of others in much greater amount—to lead the way in building for the Nation's future.

Below the priority which should be given in any tax legislation to reforming the middle-through-high graduated rates of tax, we believe that the following priorities—in serving the objective of growth and jobs—should be recognized:

Second priority—lower graduated rates.

Third priority—top 5 percentage points of corporate tax.

Fourth priority—next 5 percentage points of corporate tax.

Fifth priority—base rate of personal tax.

We are hopeful that this statement of priorities will influence those who have espoused tax cutting programs less sweeping than the rate reforms of our bills to reconsider their stand. Actually, substantial reduction in the first rate of personal tax can be afforded at this time only if it is part of a rate reform program promising increase

in growth and income totals which could be expected to so expand the tax base as to lead to a balanced budget in the not too distant future. We believe that the first rate should be reduced as provided in our bills, but it is obvious that reduction in this area should not be traded against the rate reforms which would assure dynamic growth over the years ahead.

RATE REFORM VERSUS RATE REDUCTION

Although the general pattern of spaced-out rate reform provided in our bills is well known, the significance of our use of the words *rate reform* as contrasted to the words *rate reduction* may not be. The effects of the personal tax in restricting economic growth and employment result largely from steeply graduated rates and not from the basic rate. Our bills are designed to drastically reduce the range of graduation, thus internally changing or reforming the rates in relation to each other. In a lesser sense, the corporate tax cuts provided in our bills would constitute reform, in changing the relation of the normal and surtax rates to each other.

Personal tax rate reform is fiscally feasible because the entire graduated superstructure provides only about 15 percent of the revenue from the tax, or \$6.7 billion out of a total of \$45.3 billion. The remaining 85 percent, or \$38.6 billion, comes from the basic 20 percent rate on the first bracket of taxable income and the first 20 percentage points of all the graduated rates. The lack of revenue productivity of the present graduation is further indicated by the fact that a flat rate of 22.4 percent would produce as much revenue as the present rates.

In contrast with rate reform, rate reduction has no particular implication in regard to the pattern of reduction. However, for

comparative purposes it will be assumed here that rate reduction means a uniform percentage cut in rates, generally known as an across-the-board cut.

A valid question is: How much reduction in the most critical graduated rates, and how much potential high-velocity venture capital, would be lost if an across-the-board or uniform cut were substituted for reform of rates as provided in our bills?

The personal tax savings under our bills of \$14.25 billion equal 31.4 percent of revenue from the tax, based on 1962 income levels. If there should be a uniform cut of 31.4 percent in all rates, the rate cuts in the middle-through-higher brackets would be substantially less than under rate reform, without very significant increase in the first bracket cut. For example, there would be a loss of 20.4 percentage points in rate reduction as regards the present top rate of 91 percent, and a top loss of 23.7 percentage points as regards the present 87 percent rate. But there would be a gain of only 1.3 percentage points of reduction in the first bracket rate. In addition, the present 22 percent first graduated rate would be reduced more, by 9 percentage points, under a uniform cut as compared with rate reform. All higher graduated rates would be reduced more under rate reform.

In terms of tax savings, the substitution of a 31.4 percent uniform cut for the rate reforms provided in our bills would transfer about \$1.9 billion from the taxable income brackets now carrying graduated rates from 26 percent upwards to the first two brackets. The rate reductions and tax savings effects from a uniform cut, as compared with rate reform, are set forth below for the same tax rate groupings which appear at the bottom of table IV:

Present rates	New rates			Tax savings (millions)			
	Rate reform	Uniform cut	Point differences	Rate reform	Uniform cut	Differences	
Percent	Percent	Percent	Percent	Dollars	Dollars	Dollars	Percent
20	15	13.7	-1.3	6,145	7,729	1,584	+25.6
22	16	15.1	-.9	2,146	2,474	328	+15.1
26-34	17-19	17.8-23.3	+8.4-3.3	2,351	1,945	406	-17.4
38-50	20-23	26.1-34.3	+6.1-11.3	1,567	967	600	-38.4
53-91	24-42	36.4-62.4	+12.4-20.4	2,039	1,133	906	-44.5
Total				14,248	14,248		

¹ The percentage point differences regarding present rates from 78 to 90 percent would be greater than 20.4.

In relation to consumption totals, \$1.9 billion in tax savings has little significance for the present or the future.

But, \$1.9 billion of tax savings used as "lead" money—the dynamic, venture capital which pulls in other savings—would provide an ever increasing return in growth and jobs.

Some of the \$1.9 billion, if diverted to tax relief in the low taxable brackets, would be saved and invested. Some of it, if granted as tax relief in the middle-through-high brackets, would be used for current consumption.

On balance, however, distributing the \$1.9 billion through tax rate reform would reflect a decision to maximize economic growth and new job opportunities. To distribute it through a uniform cut would reflect a decision to maximize current economic activity at the expense of long-term growth and jobs.

POSTPONEMENT AND THE TAX CLIMATE

Unfortunately, widespread recognition of the need for tax rate reform did not come until lagging growth and revenue, and too much domestic spending, had put the budget in the red by some \$8 billion. Our military and space commitments require further increase in spending in these areas during the next fiscal year.

In our earlier bills, a provision required postponement of prescheduled rate reductions, after the first reduction, when the budget was out of balance. The provision included procedure by use of which Congress could limit postponements to 6 months without disturbing future reductions. However, if the postponement procedure were used fully, it would have meant that the reductions would have been spread out over 9 instead of 5 years.

This postponement provision was developed at a time when inflationary pressures were very great, when the budget was in balance, and when the twin problems of a lagging rate of economic growth and chronic unemployment, though foreseeable, had not yet emerged. The problem now is how to adapt this provision in light of current and prospective conditions.

In forward scheduling tax cuts, a major objective is to improve the business climate and the public psychology, creating optimism for the future; to induce forward business planning in anticipation of steady relief from growth-retarding income tax rates. Such an environment inevitably would be accompanied by greater private use of money and credit, multiplying the benefits of the tax cuts in the early years. Over the long

pull, of course, money and credit serve only as the lubricant of the economic system. The economy as a whole can prosper and grow without inflation only as current savings of business and individuals are adequate to the task. But, until the economy has recouped the ground lost during the inadequate growth of the past 5 years, expansion in private use of money and credit must be greater than would be appropriate thereafter. If such expansion does not take place in the private sector of the economy, we may be sure that it will take place through greater Federal spending and larger deficits.

To serve the purpose of expenditure control, without thwarting the objective of permitting forward planning on the basis of regularly scheduled lower tax rates, we have made two changes in the postponement provision:

The first change is to make postponement effective only as regards the rate cuts scheduled for the third and later years under our bills, as contrasted to the second and later years under earlier versions of our bills.

The second change is to add to the test of budget unbalance a new test, in regard to expenditure control. Postponement would be applied only if the budget is out of balance and if what we call "subordinate expenditures" are higher in the current fiscal year than in the preceding year. "Subordinate expenditures" are defined as all expenditures of the Government except those related to military preparedness, space research and technology, and interest on the public debt. As a general positive description "subordinate expenditures" cover those generally known as domestic spending programs and foreign economic assistance.

We believe that this addition to the postponement procedure makes our program entirely realistic, not just for enactment, but for expected effectuation over the 5 years. We are convinced that the executive branch and the Congress working in harmony can control the total of domestic spending without harm to any vital public program or segment of the public. Groups who are the beneficiaries of separate Federal spending programs also share the common general public interest in greater economic growth and economic strength. Actually, the unemployed and the underemployed, and the sections of the country which lag behind national economic achievements, will benefit the most from the release of capital and incentives under our bills. It makes much more human, as well as economic sense, to let the private economy provide new and greater opportunities to these people and sections of the country than to rely further on "dole-type" spending programs.

NEW WORKERS AND JOB OPPORTUNITIES

In addition to the problem of the currently underemployed and unemployed, during the remainder of the 1960's there will be an accelerating buildup in our working force—or of the number of young people who will need and want work, and who will expect good work opportunities. Over recent years, the "labor force" as it is technically known has increased by an average of only about 800,000 annually. Over the last 5 years of this decade, the average increase is expected to reach close to 1.5 million annually.

The excessive use of tax cutting at this time to increase consumption of people now fully employed is not going to solve the problem of good jobs for these new workers who are just around the corner in point of time. It will take a rebirth of business and individual incentives, and tremendous amounts of new capital, to provide those jobs.

EXPANSION OF THE TAX BASE

Our bills do not contemplate incorporation therein of structural tax reforms associated with base broadening. We believe

that the objectives of tax rate reform are too important to be submerged and obscured, and further delayed, by time-consuming discussion over what if any provisions of the tax law should be eliminated, modified, or revised. Moreover, whatever may be the merit of individual reforms or the overall case for structural reform of the tax law, we do not believe that this is a significantly productive route to broadening the base for taxation. On any extensive basis, such reform inevitably would reduce the potential of business and private savings, and thus tend to offset the release of incentives and capital formation provided by rate reform.

This is not to deny the need for base broadening. Aside from the system of exemptions, credits, exclusions, and deductions of general value to all taxpayers, the too small tax base of the current period is a product of inadequate growth over the past 5 years. Stated differently, if the economy had grown adequately over the past 5 years, the Federal tax base would be large enough to support all necessary spending out of current revenue. Looking ahead, the greatest opportunity for expansion of the tax base is found not in structural reform but in the enlargement of the economy which provides the tax base.

As a specific illustration, if the economy should not grow any more rapidly on the average over the remainder of this decade than it has over the past 5 years, the personal tax base under the law as it now stands would only be about \$259 billion in 1970, as compared to about \$193 billion in 1962. On the other hand, if the economy should grow at an average of 5 percent over the years ahead, the personal tax base in 1970 would be about \$337 billion. An \$80 billion addition to the personal tax base would be much greater than could be expected from

any impact on base broadening of structural tax reform.

THE BOUNTY FROM GREATER GROWTH

The return from greater growth (5 percent as compared with the recent average of 2½ percent) over the remainder of this decade is indicated for gross national product, personal income, and personal income per capita, in table V, attached hereto. Regardless of judgment as to whether such goals will be achieved, we believe the Government has the obligation to adjust its policies to provide the best promise of achievement. Experience provides ample documentation that more Government spending will hurt rather than help accomplish such goals. In our opinion, a "mixed" policy of somewhat more spending, and somewhat less taxing, would offer little promise of much improvement over recent history. We believe the time is here when the Government must turn the private economy loose from an oppressive tax rate structure; to let it develop its own head of steam and find out where it will take us. Halfway measures at the best can be expected to produce no more than halfway results. At the worst, they could keep the door open to return to the barren philosophy of greater growth in Government spending. The opportunity is present for a national decision for greater growth in the private economy over more growth in Federal spending (except as may be required for our military security and space effort). A positive declaration that our Nation is committed to restoring the full vitality and potential of our free economy, and the corroboration of that commitment through greater growth starting in 1963, could soon pave the way to forcing the Communist world to recognize that it had better collaborate in reducing the burden of military prepara-

tion so that it too can do more toward improving the everyday life of its citizens.

ALTERNATIVE PROCEDURE FOR SPACING OUT RATE REFORMS

If the one-half year's personal tax cut for 1963 provided in our bills were followed by only a one-half year cut as of January 1964, there would be no bunching of revenue effect in fiscal year 1964. Specifically, the revenue effect would be \$2.85 billion compared with \$4.31 billion under our bills as drafted.

If this process were repeated over 5 years—reduction in the withholding rate as of July 1 for a one-half year's tax cut, followed by another automatic one-half year's cut as of next January 1—there would be equal revenue effect, \$2.85 billion, in each of the 5 fiscal years. Combined with a 2 percentage point cut in the top corporate rate each calendar year, the annual revenue effect in each fiscal year would be \$3.85 billion.

This procedure might have further attraction as regards the working of a postponement provision. It would permit the provision to become an inherent part of the President's budget submitted to Congress each January covering the next fiscal year. The provision would, if the postponement test required, hold in abeyance the next sequence of tax cuts beginning with reduction in the withholding rate on July 1 for the first half year's cut and completed by another half year's cut on January 1 following. The Congress could put the sequence back into effect if it so decided in time to reduce the withholding rate on July 1. If Congress failed to act, the sequence would be postponed 1 year, thus moving ahead all following sequences provided in the legislation. The corporate tax cuts for the current calendar year would be held in abeyance, and then put back into effect or postponed for 1 year, by the same series of events.

TABLE I.—Reform of individual tax rates

Taxable income bracket ¹ (thousands)	Present rates	Original rates Jan. 1, 1963	Amended actual rates Jan. 1, 1963	Jan. 1, 1964	Jan. 1, 1965	Jan. 1, 1966	Jan. 1, 1967	Taxable income bracket ¹ (thousands)	Present rates	Original rates Jan. 1, 1963	Amended actual rates Jan. 1, 1963	Jan. 1, 1964	Jan. 1, 1965	Jan. 1, 1966	Jan. 1, 1967
\$0 to \$2	20	19.0	19.5	18.0	17.0	16.0	15	\$26 to \$32	62	55.0	58.5	48.0	41.0	34.0	27
\$2 to \$4	22	20.5	21.25	19.5	18.5	17.5	16	\$32 to \$38	65	58.0	61.5	51.0	43.0	36.0	28
\$4 to \$6	26	24.5	25.25	23.0	21.5	20.0	17	\$38 to \$44	69	61.0	65.0	53.0	45.0	37.0	29
\$6 to \$8	30	28.0	29	26.0	24.0	21.0	18	\$44 to \$50	72	64.0	68.0	56.0	47.0	38.0	30
\$8 to \$10	34	31.0	32.5	28.0	25.0	22.0	19	\$50 to \$60	75	66.0	70.5	57.0	48.0	39.0	31
\$10 to \$12	38	35.0	36.5	32.0	28.0	24.0	20	\$60 to \$70	78	69.0	73.5	60.0	51.0	40.0	32
\$12 to \$14	43	39.0	41	35.0	31.0	26.0	21	\$70 to \$80	81	71.0	76.0	62.0	52.0	41.0	33
\$14 to \$16	47	42.0	44.5	37.0	32.0	27.0	22	\$80 to \$90	84	74.0	79.0	64.0	54.0	44.0	34
\$16 to \$18	50	45.0	47.5	40.0	35.0	29.0	23	\$90 to \$100	87	76.0	82.0	66.0	56.0	46.0	36
\$18 to \$20	53	48.0	50.5	42.0	36.0	30.0	24	\$100 to \$150	89	78.0	83.5	68.0	58.0	48.0	38
\$20 to \$22	56	50.0	53	44.0	38.0	32.0	25	\$150 to \$200	90	80.0	85.0	70.0	60.0	50.0	40
\$22 to \$26	59	53.0	56	47.0	40.0	33.0	26	\$200 and over	91	82.0	86.5	72.0	62.0	52.0	42

¹ After deductions and exemptions. Applies to single persons, married persons filing separate returns, and "split income" of husbands and wives filing joint returns.

TABLE II.—Tax computation table—Individuals

If the taxable income ¹ is: Not over \$2,000				If the taxable income ¹ is: Not over \$2,000			
		The tax				The tax	
		Is: Present Law 20% of the taxable income	Would be: Year 1967 15% of the taxable income			Is: Present Law 20% of the taxable income	Would be: Year 1967 15% of the taxable income
Over	But not over	Of excess over	Of excess over	Over	But not over	Of excess over	Of excess over
\$2,000	\$4,000	\$400 plus 22%	\$300 plus 16%	\$32,000	\$38,000	\$14,460 plus 65%	\$7,060 plus 28%
\$4,000	\$6,000	\$840 plus 26%	\$620 plus 17%	\$38,000	\$44,000	\$18,360 plus 69%	\$8,740 plus 29%
\$6,000	\$8,000	\$1,360 plus 30%	\$960 plus 18%	\$44,000	\$50,000	\$22,500 plus 72%	\$10,480 plus 30%
\$8,000	\$10,000	\$1,960 plus 34%	\$1,320 plus 19%	\$50,000	\$60,000	\$26,820 plus 75%	\$12,280 plus 31%
\$10,000	\$12,000	\$2,640 plus 38%	\$1,700 plus 20%	\$60,000	\$70,000	\$34,320 plus 78%	\$15,380 plus 32%
\$12,000	\$14,000	\$3,400 plus 43%	\$2,100 plus 21%	\$70,000	\$80,000	\$42,120 plus 81%	\$18,580 plus 33%
\$14,000	\$16,000	\$4,260 plus 47%	\$2,520 plus 22%	\$80,000	\$90,000	\$50,220 plus 84%	\$21,880 plus 34%
\$16,000	\$18,000	\$5,200 plus 50%	\$2,960 plus 23%	\$90,000	\$100,000	\$58,620 plus 87%	\$25,280 plus 36%
\$18,000	\$20,000	\$6,200 plus 53%	\$3,420 plus 24%	\$100,000	\$150,000	\$67,320 plus 89%	\$28,880 plus 38%
\$20,000	\$22,000	\$7,260 plus 56%	\$3,900 plus 25%	\$150,000	\$200,000	\$111,820 plus 90%	\$47,880 plus 40%
\$22,000	\$26,000	\$8,380 plus 59%	\$4,400 plus 26%	\$200,000 and over		\$166,820 plus 91%	\$67,880 plus 42%
\$26,000	\$32,000	\$10,740 plus 62%	\$5,440 plus 27%				

¹ After deductions and exemptions. Applies to single persons, and married persons filing separate returns. Joint return taxpayers can find their tax savings by taking

the tax on half their taxable income and multiplying by 2.

TABLE III.—Corporate tax rate reductions

	Present rates	Jan. 1, 1963	Jan. 1, 1964	Jan. 1, 1965	Jan. 1, 1966	Jan. 1, 1967
Normal tax ¹	30	29	26	24	23	22
Surplus	22	22	22	22	21	20
Combined tax rate ²	52	51	48	46	44	42

¹ On all net income.² On net income exceeding \$25,000.

TABLE IV

TAX SAVINGS BY TAXABLE BRACKETS BASED ON 1962 INCOME LEVELS

Taxable income brackets	Taxable income	Present rates	Tax under present rates	Rates under Herlong-Baker end of 5 years	Tax under Herlong-Baker rates	Tax savings	Tax saving percent of total savings
	Mil- lions	Per- cent	Mil- lions	Per- cent	Mil- lions	Mil- lions	
0 to \$2,000.....	\$122,889	20	\$24,578	15	\$18,433	\$6,145	43.1
\$2,000 to \$4,000.....	35,759	22	7,867	16	5,721	2,146	15.1
\$4,000 to \$6,000.....	12,262	26	3,188	17	2,085	1,103	7.7
\$6,000 to \$8,000.....	5,976	30	1,793	18	1,076	717	5.0
\$8,000 to \$10,000.....	3,545	34	1,205	19	674	531	3.7
\$10,000 to \$12,000.....	2,549	38	969	20	510	459	3.2
\$12,000 to \$14,000.....	1,952	43	839	21	410	429	3.0
\$14,000 to \$16,000.....	1,470	47	691	22	323	368	2.6
\$16,000 to \$18,000.....	1,151	50	576	23	265	311	2.2
\$18,000 to \$20,000.....	784	53	416	24	188	228	1.6
\$20,000 to \$22,000.....	627	56	351	25	157	194	1.4
\$22,000 to \$24,000.....	935	59	552	26	243	309	2.2
\$24,000 to \$26,000.....	913	62	566	27	247	319	2.2
\$26,000 to \$28,000.....	560	65	364	28	157	207	1.5
\$28,000 to \$30,000.....	361	69	249	29	105	144	1.0
\$30,000 to \$32,000.....	255	72	184	30	76	108	.8
\$32,000 to \$34,000.....	282	75	212	31	87	125	.9
\$34,000 to \$36,000.....	164	78	128	32	52	76	.5
\$36,000 to \$38,000.....	116	81	94	33	38	56	.4
\$38,000 to \$40,000.....	79	84	66	34	27	39	.3
\$40,000 to \$42,000.....	55	87	48	36	20	28	.2
\$42,000 to \$44,000.....	152	89	135	38	58	77	.5
\$44,000 to \$46,000.....	67	90	60	40	27	33	.2
\$46,000 to \$48,000.....	196	91	178	42	82	96	.7
Total.....	193,100		45,309		31,061	14,248	100.0

TABLE IV—Continued

TAX SAVINGS BY TAX RATE GROUPS

Taxable income brackets	Present rates	Herlong-Baker rates	Tax savings	Percent of total
	Percent	Percent	Millions	
\$18,000 to \$200,000 and over.....	53-91	24-42	\$2,039	14.3
\$10,000 to \$18,000.....	38-50	20-23	1,567	11.0
\$4,000 to \$10,000.....	26-34	17-19	2,351	16.5
\$2,000 to \$4,000.....	22	16	2,146	15.1
0 to \$2,000.....	20	15	6,145	43.1

TABLE V

GROSS NATIONAL PRODUCT

[In billions of dollars]

	Calendar years							
	1963	1964	1965	1966	1967	1968	1969	1970
From 5-percent growth.....	575	604	634	665	699	734	770	809
From 2½-percent growth.....	568	582	597	612	627	643	659	675
Additional GNP.....	7	22	37	53	72	91	111	134
Cumulative additional GNP.....	7	29	66	119	191	282	393	527

PERSONAL INCOME

[In billions of dollars]

	1963	1964	1965	1966	1967	1968	1969	1970
From 5-percent growth.....	452	475	499	524	550	577	606	637
From 2½-percent growth.....	447	458	470	481	493	506	518	531
Additional personal income.....	5	17	29	43	57	71	88	106
Cumulative additional personal income.....	5	22	51	94	151	222	310	416

PERSONAL INCOME PER CAPITA

[Dollars]

	1963	1964	1965	1966	1967	1968	1969	1970
From 5-percent growth.....	2,385	2,468	2,552	2,638	2,725	2,815	2,909	3,012
From 2½-percent growth.....	2,359	2,379	2,404	2,422	2,443	2,468	2,487	2,511
Additional personal income per capita.....	26	89	148	216	282	347	422	501
Cumulative additional personal income per capita.....	26	115	263	479	761	1,108	1,530	2,031

Patriotic Public Affairs Broadcasting Service

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF HON. BOB WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 10, 1963

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, in support of the Federal Communications Commission's desire to encourage all radio and television networks to feature more public affairs programming of a positive, stimulating nature, I include the following remarks concerning the well qualified American Freedom Network:

Back in the days when television made its first appearance on the American scene, the major radio networks understandably focused attention on this new and important communications medium.

Unfortunately, with the concentration on TV, the radio networks suffered, but that, happily, is being corrected. America's AM and FM stations are rapidly regaining lost ground as many discerning broadcasters concentrate their efforts on strong, stimulating, public affairs programming. This is in keeping with FCC admonitions to feature more presentations of this nature.

While serving my former—30th—Congressional District, I was extremely pleased to accept an invitation to serve as a member of the advisory council of the recently formed American Freedom Network—America's independent, non-profit, nonpolitical, but informational public affairs broadcasting service.

This is an organization—staffed by dedicated, veteran broadcasters—who believe, in the words of Chief Justice Charles Evans Hughes, that our Nation's security is nothing at all unless we "have an uncorrupted public opinion to give life to our Constitution, to give vitality to our statutes, and to make efficient our Government machinery."

The American Freedom Network—not associated with any other group or organization—was founded more than 6 months ago in Bonita, Calif.

I have known Morris C. Allen, chairman of the American Freedom Network's board of directors, for many years. At 73, he remains active as a Bonita real estate broker, as well as in civic and patriotic affairs.

For more than three-quarters of a century, the Allens have been a prominent and highly respected family in San Diego County, tracing their history to the Bradfords of Mayflower fame. A Bonita elementary school is named after Mr. Allen's mother—Ella Bradford Allen.

In discussing his participation in the American Freedom Network, Mr. Allen has stated:

I have watched my sons grow into manhood; we have been blessed with eight grandchildren * * * and it is for them, and for all of America's young people, tomorrow's leaders, that I count it a privilege to have been instrumental in making this informational service a reality.

"A little bit of information can be a dangerous thing, and I trust you will concur that Americans must be informed and kept abreast of all sides of important public opinion. I am convinced that radio is the most effective instrument in achieving this end."

I would add there are few Americans like Morris Allen. A man without great financial means, he has mortgaged everything he owns to get this essential project underway. I believe the American Freedom Network is deserving of financial support from all interested citizens.

In addition to Mr. Allen, others associated with the American Freedom Network are—

Jonathon Kirby, vice president and executive director, who founded the organization. Mr. Kirby is an experienced radio-TV news commentator with more than 15 years of service in the broadcasting field. Only recently, Mr. Kirby

was the recipient of the American Legion's Americanism Award and Silver Medal "in recognition of his constant efforts to preserve America and our way of life for future Americans."

Richard Lewis Venturino, director of programing and production, whose long experience in the programing and production aspect of broadcasting, assures the network of a high professional standard for its taped presentations.

Serving on the American Freedom Network's board of directors, in addition to Messrs. Allen and Kirby, are William R. Richards, well-known San Diego attorney; H. L. Michael, Jr., Bonita real estate broker; and James S. Duberg, city attorney for Chula Vista, Calif.

The American Freedom Network, for a minimal charge, provides a complete, varied informational service to America's broadcasters offering, whenever possible, both sides of an issue, in keeping with the FCC's "doctrine of fairness."

In its dedication to the radio industry, the American Freedom Network supplies its member stations with the "tools" to assist them in earning their FCC public affairs credits.

Every week, subscribing stations receive dynamic taped programs and features designed to enhance listener interest. This taped service consists of provocative talks, discussions, interviews, debates, and commentaries by prominent personalities in the various fields of politics, science, business, and entertainment.

The policy of the American Freedom Network follows a positive approach, as opposed to irresponsible denunciations.

In addition to serving commercial radio stations, American Freedom Network programs are made available, upon request, without charge, to college and university radio stations, as well as to schools, both public and private, and to all service, civic clubs, and church groups throughout America.

In these days, when charges of mismanagement of news in high Government circles are being made, I am delighted to publicly commend the American Freedom Network to wish it God-speed in its determination to present both sides of all issues—free speech in a free country—and I urge all of our fellow citizens to get behind this effort to further enlighten our people concerning America's precious heritage, and to the problems facing our Nation and the free world.

Hon. Ernesto Ramos Antonini

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JACOB H. GILBERT

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 10, 1963

Mr. GILBERT. Mr. Speaker, I am deeply grieved by the death of the very able speaker of the Puerto Rico House of Representatives, the late Ernesto Ramos Antonini.

It was my privilege to meet the distinguished speaker when I visited Puerto Rico, and I was deeply impressed by his high degree of intelligence, his brilliant mind, his love for the people of Puerto Rico, and his high ideals and strong faith in democracy.

The record shows that he was an outstanding public servant, closely associated with the people, untiring in his efforts in their behalf and largely responsible for the great success of Operation Bootstrap and the economic development of Puerto Rico; he worked in close cooperation with Gov. Luis Muñoz-Marín and Ambassador Teodoro Moscoso to insure the splendid achievements realized in the remarkable development of the island in recent years.

Ernesto Ramos Antonini will be greatly missed and we deeply mourn his loss as a noble leader in the Western Hemisphere.

Independence Day of Libya

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. ADAM C. POWELL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 10, 1963

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, on December 24, 1962, Libya celebrated the anniversary of her independence, and we take this opportunity to send warm felicitations to His Majesty, King Idris I of Libya; and His Excellency, the Ambassador of Libya to the United States, Dr. Mohieddine Fekini, on the occasion of the 11th anniversary of Libya's independence.

Eleven years have passed since the nations of the world were witness to a modern Christmas story; for on December 24, 1951, a new nation was born for all the world to proclaim and honor. Libya, so long a pawn and conquered territory of militant powers, became a new member of the world community.

Successive waves of conquest comprise Libyan history, from Phoenician times through Greek, Roman, Vandal, Arab, Turk and Italian, to German and British forces during World War II. All have imparted an important lesson where Libya is concerned—its strategic importance as a crossroads between Europe and Asia.

Libya is primarily a desert. And unfortunately this desert, until the present, has been a deterrent for economic stability and independence. The Romans had built vast irrigation systems to support the large cities which they built in Libya. But through the years, these cisterns and water aqueducts fell into ruin. The newly independent country was in poor straits at its birth. The desert, though, became the succor for the nation when oil was discovered. The discovery of oil in other desert nations in the Mediterranean area led geologists to suspect the presence of oil in the south of Libya, but its production is above and beyond the expectation of any specialist. "Oil" is now the keyword to the country.

Its entire economic system is being geared toward an oil economy. As one writer so aptly proclaimed:

Only 5 years ago, Libya was regarded as little more than a vast empty tract of the Sahara's rock and sand. * * * Within that brief half decade, Libya underwent an economic metamorphosis that has already transformed it into a viable state possessing a dynamic and expanding economy.¹

By 1965 oil royalties will amount to \$500 million. Twenty-one oil companies have established headquarters in the country, with more expected. Development possibilities are unlimited.

Each year, as the world helps the Libyans to celebrate their independence, one and all can review with pleasure the progress that has occurred. Expansion of agriculture and water projects will enable the Libyans once more to call their country a granary as the Romans did during their reign. Confidence in the Government is establishing greater unity throughout the three semiautonomous provinces and will enable the Central Government to carry out without discord its development projects.

The United States has interested itself in Libyan affairs since the Barbary pirates pillaged American shipping. Today the United States has in Libya, Wheelus Field, a tremendous airbase. There are approximately 10,000 Americans stationed or living in Libya. The policies of Libya and the United States are, therefore, closely allied. Recently the crown prince visited the United States on a good-will tour, solidifying the amity of the two nations. It is with great pleasure that we in America recognize the anniversary of the establishment of Libyan independence.

Soviet Three Onsite Inspection Offer Rejected by United States in 1960

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. CRAIG HOSMER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 10, 1963

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, on December 19, 1962, Premier Khrushchev wrote President Kennedy that he would permit two or three onsite inspections annually of the Soviet Union in connection with a nuclear test ban treaty. The President replied on December 28, 1962, that he was encouraged and suggested further negotiations. Later, of the Khrushchev two or three statements, Secretary of State Dean Rusk said the United States is "encouraged to believe that the way is now open for some serious talks." On a Voice of America broadcast the President's science adviser, Jerome B. Wiesner, said it "does bring us within shooting distance of some agreements."

Somehow the impression has got around that the Khrushchev letter amounts to some magnificent concession

¹ Stephen Duncan-Peters, Foreign Commerce Weekly, Feb. 5, 1962, p. 208.

extracted from the Kremlin by some wizardry or other of the Kennedy administration.

The truth and fact is that the three onsite inspection proposition was put up by the Soviets in 1960 and rejected by the United States. Here is what was said of it in the Atomic Energy Commission's annual report to Congress dated January 1961 at page 128:

The Russian negotiators at Geneva have offered to permit only three onsite inspections per year in their country for all unidentified seismic events. The U.S. position is that, in view of the fact that more than 100 locatable seismic events of greater than 4.75 magnitude occur each year in the Soviet Union, 20 percent of these should be eligible for inspection (20 inspections per year.)

This quotation is recalled simply as a reminder to those who might wittingly or unwittingly attempt to rewrite history regarding this particular matter.

Congressman Philbin's Unique Tribute to Speaker John W. McCormack

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. HAROLD D. DONOHUE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 10, 1963

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Speaker, last Tuesday, January 8, 1963, in the House Democratic caucus held here, it was the privilege of the Members on this side to hear the distinguished gentleman from the Third Massachusetts Congressional District, Mr. PHILBIN, deliver one of the most eloquent addresses and tributes ever uttered on such occasion when he nominated, for the continuing speakership of this House, our beloved and revered colleague from Massachusetts, the Honorable JOHN W. MCCORMACK. Of course, the nomination was unanimously approved and that afternoon we wisely and formally reelected Speaker MCCORMACK.

All of us agree with and share in the sentiments so ably expressed by Congressman PHILBIN as he summarily traced the patriotic public service of our great Speaker and reviewed the remarkable talents of his brilliant mind and courageous heart, which have endeared him to all who have ever served with him and which assure that the name of Speaker MCCORMACK will be, forever, an inspiring byword in the legislative history of this Nation.

A great many Members, on both sides of the aisle here, asked me to intercede with my very dear and esteemed friend and colleague from the Third Massachusetts District for the purpose of having his eloquent address included in the permanent record. He graciously consented to permit me to introduce it into the RECORD and Congressman PHILBIN's nominating speech follows:

CONGRESSMAN PHILIP J. PHILBIN'S SPEECH
NOMINATING SPEAKER MCCORMACK

Mr. Chairman and members of the caucus, I have a very delightful duty to perform this

morning and it comes to me as a very great honor and privilege indeed.

Our dear and highly esteemed and illustrious friend, Hon. JOHN W. MCCORMACK, is one of the greatest Americans who has ever served in the Congress.

He enjoys the highest respect and warmest affection of each and every one of us.

He enjoys the confidence, esteem, and respect of the American people, indeed of the people of the world. To talk of his magnificent qualities and accomplishments seems almost like carrying coals to New Castle.

His service in the House, as we well know, can be measured only in superlative terms. During the time he has been here he has served his district, State, party, and country with a great ability, fidelity to duty, and humanitarian impulse that certainly has never been exceeded in the history of this great Government.

I hardly need, before this distinguished group, comprised of so many warm friends, admirers and supporters, to recount the prolific abundance of natural gifts, talents, characteristics and services that have distinguished the inspiring career of this great American from the colorful and patriotic community of South Boston in my home State of Massachusetts, as he forged his way from the humble precincts of his historic city to the third highest position of trust, honor, and responsibility in the great Government of the United States.

Speaker JOHN MCCORMACK is admittedly endowed with all the attributes of personality, character, leadership, and capacity that make for greatness.

Time and time again, in and out of this great body, the renowned House of Representatives, the greatest deliberative body of its kind in the world, he has demonstrated his true worth as an unsurpassed public servant.

A fearless, articulate, and inspiring leader, a gifted and effective debater, a respected and admired political strategist, a skilled diagnostician of the public will, a truly great heart and great mind, devoted to lofty concepts and objectives of statesmanship, JOHN MCCORMACK is commended and beloved by all of us.

A patriot of the top-most rank, a lawyer and counselor of recognized skill and experience, an eminent parliamentarian, known everywhere for his knowledge, fairness and impartiality, and, above all, a man whose vigorous, determined work in promoting the well-being and welfare of the great rank and file of the American people, the oppressed, the lowly, the exploited, the helpless and inarticulate, wherever they may be, has known no bounds.

Born with a great fighting heart and a buoyant spirit of uplift and regeneration, JOHN MCCORMACK has always been in the vanguard of forward-looking leadership, philosophically, politically, socially, economically, spiritually, and in every other way.

Resolutely committed to the doctrine that our political and parliamentary institutions are valid instruments for promoting the liberty, stability and progress of the Nation, no man has ever labored more ably, diligently, and effectively to further the general well-being of the Nation, protect the rights of those who struggle and toil under our free enterprise system and enlarge and elevate the advantages and opportunities of the American people.

To succeed our late, lamented, dear friend and memorable leader, that great statesman and ever to be esteemed and remembered former Speaker, the great Sam Rayburn, was indeed a task of monumental proportions.

Yet, in a comparatively short time of JOHN MCCORMACK's noteworthy service as Speaker, our membership, the Nation, and the world recognize the mettle and the high worthiness of the present great Speaker of the House.

In his characteristic way of deep humility, devout dedication to principle and conviction, Speaker MCCORMACK has been something more than the leader of this body. He has been our warm friend, our ready counsellor, our unselfish guide and adviser, our constant sustaining strength.

Confidant and adviser of our Presidents since the 1930's, he has labored with vigor, loyalty, and marked success to implement the legislative program of our cherished former colleague and great President and friend, John F. Kennedy.

As we know, he can be trusted and relied upon to carry out these great tasks of leadership in this session of Congress and in the time to come.

And as in the past, he will carry them out with dispatch, efficiency and a great driving force of sagacious statesmanship that will make for success and victory for the great cause we represent.

To touch a personal note, JOHN MCCORMACK has been my friend since before I came to this body. Just as many of you, I have seen and known him at close range. He is a great man, a great leader, a great American, a great Speaker, and he is a true and loyal friend.

We, as Members of the House, and the people of the Nation, are fortunate indeed, especially in this time of uncertainty and peril, when surging movements of conspiracy and unrest are assailing the pillars of free government throughout the world, as well as in our own Nation, and when we must unite as we will, in an invincible, resolute force against these evils and dangers, to have a truly outstanding, well-poised, experienced, humane leader like JOHN MCCORMACK to guide and counsel us and to join so wholeheartedly with our beloved and esteemed friend, our great President Kennedy, in preserving, protecting, and strengthening the rich heritage of our freedom and seeking peace, understanding, and amity for the world.

Man of deep faith and high destiny; man of profound spiritual beliefs and trust in his Divine Maker; who proudly bears the shield of justice and fair dealing and carries in his big heart an inspirational love of country and humanity; sprung from the people and devoted to their welfare; a true, dedicated, demonstrated believer in the American way of life; a great credit to our great party, the House of Representatives, the Congress, and our Nation, Hon. JOHN W. MCCORMACK is destined to go down in history as one of the greatest statesmen and leaders of the Nation.

The reelection of Speaker MCCORMACK is a foregone conclusion. But I want to say to my valued colleagues that Massachusetts is very proud of our great native son, the distinguished Speaker of the House.

It is with great pride and pleasure that I place in nomination in the Democratic caucus for Speaker of the House the name of our great, esteemed, and beloved friend, Hon. JOHN W. MCCORMACK.

H.R. 71: Restore Economic Freedom to Automobile Financing

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. EMANUEL CELLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 10, 1963

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, 2 years ago I introduced H.R. 71, a bill to supplement the antitrust laws of the United

States against restraint of trade or commerce by preventing automobile manufacturers from financing and insuring the sales of their products. I have introduced again the same measure, bearing the same number.

I presented this bill—and another like it 4 years ago—because I was convinced that such action was essential to stop monopolistic powers and trends in the automobile industry and related businesses. I was convinced that automobile manufacturing should be separated from auto financing and insurance in order to restore free competition to vast segments of our economy and to prevent captive market patterns from totally engulfing the sale of autos and related goods and services.

Events of the past 2 years have strengthened these convictions. Six days of public hearings in 1961 and voluminous statements, documents, and letters established such a strong case that the House Antitrust Subcommittee reported the bill favorably to the Committee on the Judiciary in 1962. With the press of an extremely heavy agenda in the 87th Congress, the full committee did not vote on it. This measure deserves to advance further toward passage in the 88th Congress, and I am confident that it shall.

All of us are gratified that automobile production and sales proved to be one of the highlights in our economy in 1962. But we should not let our satisfaction obscure underlying shackles on economic freedom which endanger us all.

In this past year, the world's largest manufacturer, General Motors Corp., has tightened its hold on the American automobile market, to claim well over 50 percent of sales, and at times nearly 60 percent. Some 80 percent of the U.S. auto market is controlled by only two manufacturers.

Such concentration is not healthy for our economy—neither for business nor consumers. In large part, this concentration has been a fruit of coercion of auto dealers and restraint of trade of sales financing. These abuses led long ago to antitrust indictments of the largest three auto manufacturers and their finance companies, conviction of General Motors and subsidiaries, and consent decrees enjoining certain coercive and discriminatory practices.

Injunctive consent decrees have failed as a substitute for the real remedy of divestiture which the Government originally sought, and to which Ford Motor Co. and Chrysler Corp. agreed if it would apply to all.

Captive markets in auto sales financing have surged, with the control which the dominant manufacturers wield over their dealers. Captive financing is both cause and effect in the manufacturer control over dealers and their sales.

General Motors dealers turned over 67 percent of their new-car sales financing to General Motors Acceptance Corp. in 1960—up sharply from a heavy 56 percent in 1956. These are GMAC's own estimates, prepared at the request of the House Antitrust Subcommittee.

The captive market pattern is equally clear in the dramatically abnormal

growth of Ford Motor Credit Co. in its second and third full years of operation. In 1961, this fledgling finance company more than doubled its business with Ford dealers. FMCC apparently more than doubled its business again in 1962, almost reaching that stage in 9 months. It now holds well over \$200 million in sales finance contracts.

To appreciate the abnormality of this quadrupling of business by one auto finance company, consider that auto sales financing for all financial institutions together declined somewhat in 1961 and will have increased something like 10 percent in 1962.

What sets two finance companies apart from the hundreds of independent finance companies and thousands of banks and other financial institutions? A parent that is the dealer's only supplier of new cars—the source of his livelihood.

Under the GM pattern, now being copied swiftly by Ford, the car manufacturer is the fount for all the dealer's needs—new cars, financing, insurance, parts, and accessories. Another way to express it is "putting all his eggs in one basket."

This is an expression which Ford Motor credit circulated to Ford dealers last March. It quoted a dealer as saying: "A dealer may be reluctant to put all his eggs in one basket. But if FMCC helps him become financially stronger—as I am sure it can—is this so bad? I, for one, think that it is fine."

From reports which have come to me, most Ford dealers have indeed remained reluctant to put all their eggs in one basket, but they cannot afford to offend the factory when their turn comes to start using the factory finance services. Most, I am sure, would gladly trade the real financial strength of real independence for any advantages, apparent or real, of dependence on one source for everything.

The trouble for auto dealers in putting all their eggs in one basket is that someone else gets a tighter grip on the handle.

There are other troubles too. The captive auto financing and insurance pattern poses unfair handicaps for those manufacturers, and wholesalers of autos without such means. Moreover, when dealers must put all their eggs in the manufacturer's basket, monopolistic conditions result in various related markets.

Independent businessmen—insurers, manufacturers, and wholesalers of auto parts and accessories, repair garages, as well as sales finance companies and banks—have told the House Antitrust Subcommittee of being denied the right to compete in GM-controlled markets on their merits—all because of captive financing and insurance controls. If Ford keeps racing in the same direction, thousands more of independent businesses will become casualties.

I should like to make clear that H.R. 71 applies only to the automobile industry. It deals with specific and demonstrated restraints of trade which have been subject of much antitrust criminal and civil court action. It would provide an antitrust remedy at least 25 years

overdue. I should like to point out also that divested companies can, and do, survive.

No other industry, to my knowledge, has a comparable economic and legal history to that of the auto industry and related markets. Our concern is not bigness as such, nor finance or other subsidiaries as such. Rather our concern is subversion of free competitive processes.

Businesses which have not misused finance or other subsidiaries to monopolistic ends have no need to fear either new laws nor the long-established antitrust laws under which the automotive giants were indicted and convicted.

In view of the clear need for relief, surely Congress will not stand by and let the free marketplace suffer further restraint by the two automotive giants. Consumers and all businessmen thrive best when goods and services are judged on merit in a free marketplace.

If competition is extinguished in any one sector of our economy, its survival is endangered in all commerce. Suppression of competition means suppression of economic freedom, and political and social freedoms as well.

Passage of H.R. 71 will be a great victory for the free enterprise system.

Pay Increase for the Military

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BOB WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 10, 1963

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, for many months I have been extremely concerned at the delay of the Kennedy administration in pushing for a pay increase for the military, despite the fact that other governmental employees have benefited from pay raises on two occasions since the last general military pay increase in 1958.

Last fall I pledged to introduce, if necessary, and support legislation calling for a substantial pay increase. Included was to be a section correcting the inequities in the pay scales for those retired personnel who left the service prior to July 1958. These retired persons were discriminated against and a great inequity has existed for over 4 years as a result.

A few weeks ago I was heartened to learn that the Defense Department was supporting a pay increase measure amounting to as much as 14 percent in some categories and also correcting the inequities I mentioned previously.

Rather than introduce my version of a pay bill I have decided to defer such action until the administration's measure comes before the Personnel Subcommittee of the Armed Services Committee. As a member of the subcommittee, I recognize that legislation as introduced by the administration is merely the raw material from which a truly effective and meaningful pay bill can be molded by our subcommittee and subsequently by the Congress.

It is the responsibility of the Congress to act with dispatch on a substantial and constructive pay bill for active duty and retired personnel of our military service and I am looking forward to helping to expedite this much-needed legislation.

Independence Day of Cameroon

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. ADAM C. POWELL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 10, 1963

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, on January 1, the Republic of Cameroon celebrated her third independence day anniversary, and we take this opportunity to send warm felicitations to His Excellency, the President of the Republic of Cameroon, Ahmadou Ahidjo; and His Excellency, the Cameroon Ambassador to the United States, Jacques Kuoh, on this memorable occasion.

CAMEROONS: A COUNTRY REUNITED

New Year's Day 1960 was a joyous occasion for the thousands of Africans whose home was the French Cameroons. On that day the U.N. trust territory under French administration became the sovereign Republic of Cameroon, the 11th nation on the African Continent to achieve independence. Thus ended a 75-year period of foreign occupation. Germany had declared Cameroon a protectorate in 1884. After World War I the territory was divided between the British and the French as League of Nations mandates. Then in 1946 the Cameroons became U.N. trust territories.

October 1, 1961, was another day for rejoicing in Cameroon, when the British Southern Cameroons joined the former French trust territory to form a federal republic. This event marked the fruition of the Kamerun idea which had emerged with political consciousness in the Southern Cameroons and had gained momentum as the British territory moved toward self-government. Kamerun became the political ideal of the reunification of the two Cameroons. The formation of the Federal Republic was an important event not only from the standpoint of the Cameroons themselves, but also from the larger perspective of continental African political development, for it was the first African experiment in the union of a British territory and a French territory. The educational, linguistic, and legal adjustments of the new union are gradually and most satisfactorily being worked out under the skillful leadership of Vice President Foncha and President Ahidjo.

The successful development of Cameroon is all the more spectacular because of the enormity of the difficulties, pointed out by observers of all kinds, facing the new nation. Ethnologists reminded us that Cameroon, lying at an ethnic crossroads of Africa, contained a "bewildering hodgepodge" of races from Islamic stock breeders in the north to Bantus

and Pygmies in the south. Political scientists noted that as of independence day there were some 382 legally registered political parties. Geographers pointed out that the northern and southern sections were divided by a central plateau which effectively discouraged communication. Economists said that the primary crop economy was extremely vulnerable to climatic change and price fluctuations. The pessimists predicted that President Ahidjo would have considerable difficulty in holding together his newly independent country.

But the pessimists were wrong. The Republic has been stabilized. The economy is advancing. Substantial improvements are being made in education. Communications development is under way, and industrialization is being speeded up. When President Ahidjo made a 5-day visit to the United States as the guest of President Kennedy in March 1962, the President of the United States congratulated President Ahidjo for his successful efforts in the progressive development of his country. The two Presidents agreed to encourage commerce and investment between their countries and expressed confidence that the visit had strengthened relations between the United States and the Federal Republic of Cameroon.

The American people add their voice to the congratulations of President Kennedy. To President Ahidjo, Vice President Foncha, and the people of the Federal Republic of Cameroon we express our faith in, and best wishes for, the continued successful development of their nation.

California Defense Dollars Go National

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. CRAIG HOSMER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 10, 1963

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, six of the larger California defense contractors recently reported to the California Defense Industries Committee of the Los Angeles Chamber of Commerce procurement data covering the national pattern of their relations with suppliers and vendors for articles, materials, and services.

This compilation of the data is on an annual basis for the various corporate fiscal patterns ending in the 1961-62 period, the most recently available data in each case. Each reporting corporation carries on an intensive procurement and contracting program aimed at the widest possible participation nationally, and in each case a main facet of the total program is the determination that small business receive an equitable opportunity to compete for subcontracts for articles, materials, and services of all kinds.

California defense contractors are doing business in 49 States with all kinds of enterprises from the local hardware store

to the giants of industry. Truly, California defense dollars go national.

The six reporting California defense contractors listed \$1,608,646,403 in dollars expended in 49 States and the District of Columbia to suppliers and vendors of articles, materials, and services.

Principal States receiving the impact of the California national procurement effort are:

	Percent of total	California dollars
New York.....	7.976	\$128,310,653
Connecticut.....	6.679	107,441,173
New Jersey.....	5.555	89,301,969
Ohio.....	5.252	84,492,287
Massachusetts.....	3.476	55,919,997
Illinois.....	2.775	44,645,064
Pennsylvania.....	2.627	42,263,470

In reporting for this study the companies that reported small business data revealed 37 percent of California procurement dollars to small business; 63 percent of California procurement dollars to large business. By comparison, only 17.7 percent was the national average to small business for fiscal 1962.

The accompanying table shows a percentage breakdown by State of the total procurements reported expended in each State. Truly, California defense dollars go national.

California defense dollars go national—50-State breakdown

	California dollars	Percent of total ¹
Alabama.....	\$1,344,433	0.0835
Alaska.....		
Arizona.....	23,716,937	1.4743
Arkansas.....	395,811	.0246
California.....	797,918,465	49.6018
Colorado.....	3,962,904	.2463
Connecticut.....	107,441,173	6.6789
Delaware.....	1,496,125	.0929
District of Columbia.....	1,305,904	.0811
Florida.....	4,967,319	.3087
Georgia.....	551,727	.0343
Hawaii.....	3,517	.0002
Idaho.....	604,963	.0376
Illinois.....	44,645,064	2.7753
Indiana.....	19,648,982	1.2214
Iowa.....	17,970,482	1.1170
Kansas.....	211,286	.0131
Kentucky.....	809,603	.0503
Louisiana.....	108,463	.0067
Maine.....	226,251	.0140
Maryland.....	14,535,750	.9036
Massachusetts.....	55,919,997	3.4762
Michigan.....	20,067,718	1.2493
Minnesota.....	26,262,741	1.6326
Mississippi.....	431,108	.0267
Missouri.....	6,978,319	.4337
Montana.....	8,715	.0005
Nebraska.....	1,336,837	.0831
Nevada.....	754,349	.0468
New Hampshire.....	1,848,212	.1148
New Jersey.....	89,301,969	5.5513
New Mexico.....	61,613	.0038
New York.....	128,310,653	7.9762
North Carolina.....	1,659,208	.1031
North Dakota.....	13	
Ohio.....	84,492,287	5.2523
Oklahoma.....	3,113,109	.1935
Oregon.....	6,161,125	.3829
Pennsylvania.....	42,263,470	2.6272
Rhode Island.....	1,318,214	.0819
South Carolina.....	1,004,239	.0624
South Dakota.....	7,820	.0004
Tennessee.....	3,158,943	.1960
Texas.....	41,356,271	2.5708
Utah.....	496,782	.0308
Vermont.....	2,208,153	.1372
Virginia.....	21,325,616	1.3257
Washington.....	8,919,560	.5545
West Virginia.....	1,654,813	.1028
Wisconsin.....	16,270,490	1.0114
Wyoming.....	58,900	.0036
Total.....	1,608,646,403	

¹ Will not total 100 percent because of rounding.

Women Strike for Peace and the HUAC

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. WILLIAM FITTS RYAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 10, 1963

Mr. RYAN of New York. Mr. Speaker, during December 1962, while Congress was not in session, the American public was treated to a sorry spectacle by a committee of Congress. The House Un-American Activities Committee decision to investigate the Women Strike for Peace and the subsequent hearings again demonstrated that this committee serves no useful legislative function and is antithetical to the principles upon which our Nation was founded. At the time of the hearings I issued a statement which I wish to call to the attention of my colleagues. I regret that on the first day of this session there was no opportunity to offer an amendment to the resolution on the rules of the 88th Congress which would repeal clause 1(r) of rule X and clause 18 of rule XI which provide for this committee. The House will have an opportunity to vote on this issue when the 1963 appropriation for the committee is before it.

The statement follows:

STATEMENT OF CONGRESSMAN WILLIAM F. RYAN CONCERNING THE ACTION OF THE HOUSE UN-AMERICAN ACTIVITIES COMMITTEE IN HOLDING HEARINGS ON THE WOMEN STRIKE FOR PEACE

The announcement by the House Un-American Activities Committee of public hearings with reference to the Women Strike for Peace is another example of the misuse and abuse of legislative power.

The hearings apparently are intended to discredit the Women Strike for Peace and to cast doubt upon the loyalty of those active in it. The action of the committee induces conformity of thought and action and intimidates citizens who are seeking to express their concern for peace.

The spontaneous peace movement in the United States is dramatic evidence of the strength of our democracy. Even at the height of an international crisis, citizens exercised their constitutional rights of petition, assembly, and free speech. However, the committee consistently opposes the spirit of independent inquiry and humane protest. By intimidation and innuendo the committee spreads fear and stifles dissent. The committee has a habit of using its power to expose and punish groups and individuals whose programs and ideas the committee disapproves of.

Disarmament under effective international control and a strong United Nations, imperatives of our time, are stated goals of Women Strike for Peace. A group of citizens working for these goals within our constitutional framework should be commended, not condemned.

The first amendment explicitly protects all ideas and expressions. The framers of the Bill of Rights asserted their belief in freedom of speech and the right to nonconformity at a time when our Nation was new and insecure. We should do no less today.

The committee has said one purpose of the hearings is to determine "whether existing Federal laws are being violated." As Dean Erwin Griswold, of Howard Law School, has pointed out, "a legislative investigation is improper when its sole or basic purpose is to expose people or to develop evidence for use

in criminal prosecution" ("The Fifth Amendment Today," Harvard University Press, 1955, p. 48). If the committee has any evidence of violations of Federal law, it should turn it over to the proper law enforcement agencies and not usurp the function of the Department of Justice.

We should be mindful of the words of Supreme Court Justice Black:

"History should teach us, then, that in times of high emotional excitement minority parties and groups which advocate extremely unpopular social or governmental innovations will always be typed as criminal gangs and attempts always made to drive them out. It was knowledge of this fact, and of great dangers, that caused the founders of our land to enact the first amendment as a guarantee that neither Congress nor the people would do anything to hinder or destroy the capacity of individuals and groups to seek converts and votes for any cause, however radical or unpopular their principles might seem under the accepted notions of the times" (*Bar-enblatt v. U.S.*, 360 U.S. 109, 150-1).

The House Un-American Activities Committee is antithetical to the principles upon which our Nation was founded. Its latest action demonstrates again the need for its abolition.

A Bill To Eliminate Labor Union Monopolies

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DAVE MARTIN

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 10, 1963

Mr. MARTIN of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced legislation designed to eliminate labor union monopolies. This legislation embodies amendments to the Sherman, Clayton, Norris-La Guardia, and National Labor-Management Relations Acts. This is the identical bill which I introduced in the 87th Congress.

Under existing court interpretations, antitrust statutes apply only to industry—prohibiting monopolies; prohibiting price fixing; and prohibiting collusion, but only on the part of management.

We do have monopolies in the field of labor. For instance, the United Automobile Workers Union represents all organized labor in the manufacture of cars, trucks, and farm implements, and so forth, a monopoly in this industry. One union bargains with all of the firms in this field—a monopoly. The same thing applies to steel—the United Steel Workers; coal—the United Mine Workers, and so forth.

Jimmy Hoffa has stated that he intends to have all teamster contracts end on a common date beginning in 1964. Do you realize the power which would be vested in the hands of this one man? He could tie up the economy of this country within a matter of hours. Metropolitan areas would be without perishable foodstuffs, in addition to necessities too numerous to mention. He could bring every city in the country to its knees at his command.

We now have a costly maritime strike in progress which covers the entire Atlantic and gulf coasts. This strike is preventing the shipment of goods to for-

eign countries, lowering the prestige of the United States in the eyes of other governments; causing American industry to lose business because it cannot make deliveries—leading perhaps to permanent loss of our customers to other countries. With an already serious imbalance of trade, this further complicates the entire situation.

My proposal, for instance, would put an end to this longshoremen's strike which is having such a catastrophic impact on the Nation's economy. Under my bill, bargaining between the parties would have to be conducted by a single employer and the representative of the employer's employees, or as provided in some cases, group bargaining where not more than 25 percent of an industry is involved in the labor negotiation. Also, the featherbedding demands by unions as indicated in the dockworker's strike could never become a labor issue since such restrictive practices are prohibited by my bill.

I wish to emphasize that my bill still allows strikes. It restores union power to the local labor unions and takes it out of the hands of the international unions. I repeat—this bill does not interfere with any legitimate labor objectives but only eliminates those activities not in the public interest. Industry-wide bargaining would be eliminated. It would be illegal for two unions to confer with one another in regard to the settlement of a wage dispute; and, likewise, it would be illegal for the management of two companies to confer with one another in regard to a settlement. You have to treat both sides fairly.

The evil of present industrywide bargaining is that identical labor costs throughout the industry further lessen competition and increase the chances for similar pricing. Bargaining increases costs of production which further place the American manufacturer at a disadvantage in competition with foreign firms.

Recent Department of Labor statistics on strikes and man-days idled in 1962 vividly demonstrate the need for legislation which would eliminate national labor disputes. Figures released for 1962 show that there were about 3,550 strikes, involving some 1,250,000 workers. About 19 million man-days were lost, compared with 16.3 million in 1961.

The Nation can ill afford a continuance of these labor disputes. The passage of my moderate approach to curbing union monopoly power and the abuses resulting from this power would, in most cases, eliminate the ever-growing chaos in the labor relations field. Yet, the remedy would not interfere with any legitimate union activity nor destroy unions or their welfare and pension programs. My bill will put an end to only those abuses we have been facing daily in our Nation; it will maintain collective bargaining without granting further authority to the executive branch of the Government to dictate the terms of a labor contract through such weapons as compulsory arbitration and seizure, which, in my opinion, lead this Nation down a dangerous path of socialism.

Is there a demand for this type of legislation over the country? Yes. The

Institute of Public Opinion of Princeton, N.J., in a recent survey found that 62 percent of the people throughout the Nation favored this type of legislation. In a recent questionnaire circulated in my district, 84 percent replied in favor of curbing union monopolies. The average American citizen, the man and woman on the street, wants this legislation passed—the voice of America without a lobby. Who would like to see this legislation defeated? The heads of the international labor unions whose monopolistic powers would be checked by the passage of this bill.

I can think of no better recommendation than that which appeared in the *International Teamsters* magazine for September 1962, in which it was stated that my bill was the worst of the lot on this subject; to me, that means it is the best.

Independence Day of Western Samoa

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ADAM C. POWELL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 10, 1963

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, on January 1, Western Samoa celebrated her first independence day, and we take this opportunity to send warm felicitations to Their Excellencies, Tupua Tamasese Mea'ole and Malietoa Tanumafili II, the heads of state of this Republic, on the occasion of the first anniversary of Western Samoan independence.

January the first is a symbol throughout the world for the birth of a new year; to the people of Western Samoa, this date has a special meaning. One year ago, on New Year's Day, Western Samoa was proclaimed sovereign and independent. It is this accomplishment that I wish to commemorate today.

Since its discovery by the Dutch in 1722, the Samoan Islands have played an important part in the history of the South Pacific. Strategically located as a naval station and a crossroads for trading ships, the islands were soon coveted by many nations. The United States sent its first expedition to the islands in 1839 and the first American consul was appointed in 1856. The climax of this particular struggle for possessions abroad occurred in 1889 when the United States, Germany, and Great Britain successfully checkmated each others forces. This led to a partitioning of the islands. The large islands of Opolu and Savaii, with several lesser islands, were awarded to Germany. These became Western Samoa.

As a result of World War I, Western Samoa was wrested from Germany by a New Zealand expeditionary force. Since then, New Zealand has held mandate over these islands, first through the League of Nations, then more recently through the United Nations.

New Zealand recognized the right of sovereignty for her trust territories and a constitution was promulgated in Oc-

tober 1960. Independence was proclaimed on January 1, 1962, thus ending 46 years of New Zealand administration and 70 years of foreign rule.

Samoa today has an approximate population of 113,500, mainly Polynesian, with a birth rate among the world's highest. Its complex constitutional system of government, headed by a dual chiefship and a prime minister, govern Western Samoa with wisdom and caution. Americans, visiting the country, will be able to pay their respects to Robert Louis Stevenson, who is buried near the capital, and who is revered and loved by the Samoans, his adopted people.

The Samoans, who are proud of the fact that they are the first independent Polynesian nation, look forward to a continuous and productive life under their own rule. The able Prime Minister Fiamē Mata'afa summarized the sentiments of the Samoans when he said:

Rooted and responding to the invigorating influences of the modern world, the independent state of Western Samoa will grow and flourish to become an ornament—if only a minor one—to the world community.

It is to this spirit and this nation that I salute the people of Western Samoa on their first independence anniversary.

The 100th Birthday of Billy Frost

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER ROGERS

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 10, 1963

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. One hundred years ago, on January 10, 1863, there was born at Tiney, Pa., on the banks of the Allegheny River, an American citizen who was named Billy Frost by his proud parents. At 14 years of age this new citizen started pumping oil wells at Oil Creek, Pa., when this business was in its infancy. Some of it must have gotten into his blood, because he has stayed with it through the years and as the great oil fields were discovered and developed, Billy Frost moved from one to the other—from Pennsylvania to Ohio, to Kansas, to Oklahoma, and to Texas.

In 1885 Billy Frost married Miss Effie Jane Thompson, the daughter of a minister. To this union were born two fine sons and two fine daughters. Billy Frost continued his work in the oil game and found his way with his fine family to Texas, in 1927. This was the beginning of the famous Panhandle oil field, which is located in the 18th Congressional District of Texas.

His kindness, good nature, and willingness to help others at all times had won for him the popular name "Uncle Billy," which has stayed with him through the years. As time began to take its toll, as it does with all of us, "Uncle Billy's" walk became a little slower and his eyesight began to dim, but his great personality remains unchanged

and the reasons for continued loving reference to him as "Uncle Billy" have become more pronounced with each year. His host of friends will pay honor to him at the Coronado Inn, in Pampa, Tex., on this, his 100th birthday. All America recognizes the great contribution that he has made to our country and to our way of life, in the exemplary leadership he has furnished in his chosen work.

Fairplay in Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALBERT H. QUIE

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 10, 1963

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Speaker, yesterday we considered a basic change in the permanent rules under which the House of Representatives will function in the future. Our decision is an indication of the attitude with which the House will approach the tasks it faces.

Some people, both inside and outside of this body, have made the claim that the Rules Committee has come to hold too powerful a position with the House of Representatives. These people conclude that the Rules Committee has the power to prevent the entire House from making decisions on various important issues. It is the so-called power to "block" legislation.

The solution which these same people advocated was to permanently expand the membership of the Rules Committee from 12 to 15. This solution was adopted and is simply a power play to control the committee. It is not an attempt to correct any present weakness in the committee.

If it is true that the committee has the ability to block legislation it does not like, having more members will not change that fact. Indeed, a new group will simply have the right to stop legislation which it finds undesirable.

The House has always had a formal written guarantee that the Rules Committee cannot permanently act contrary to the wishes of the majority of the House. That guarantee is the discharge petition. It was used successfully on a major bill as recently as 1960 when a discharge petition for the Federal employees pay raise bill was adopted by the majority of the House.

Whenever we discuss the desirability of any legislation, it is important to know who is determining the desirability. Does the majority of the House make that decision or do most of the members of the majority party of the House? When the Speaker was prohibited during the early part of this century from serving on the committee, it was assumed that such action was intended to make the committee a tool of the majority of the House Members rather than only of the leadership of the majority party.

Increasing the committee size from 12 to 15 members increases the Democratic majority from 4 to 5. Yet, proportionate representation would give the Democrats

a majority of only 3 members on a 15-man committee.

Fair representation of the minority party should always be maintained in any committee. Such should certainly be the case in a committee as powerful as the Rules Committee as was pictured yesterday.

I would have been favorable to considering reviving the 21-day rule. By prohibiting the Rules Committee from holding any bill for more than 21 days this change would correct the situation in which the Rules Committee could block legislation. At the same time, fair representation would be maintained on the committee.

If our concern is to insure that the majority of the House be given the opportunity to express its will on the important issues which come before this body, we should not simply give the power to determine desirable legislation to another group. That is what the present makeup of the Rules Committee does.

In the future, changes should be guided by three factors:

First, Congress should decide whether the Rules Committee should have the power to stop legislation.

Second, if the decision is affirmative, the minority party should be given representative strength on the committee.

Third, if the decision is negative, some means such as the 21-day rule will be necessary to weaken the power of the committee.

This is the only way fairplay in the House of Representatives will be secured.

Washington State Senate Opposes Japanese Halibut Fishing in Bering Sea

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. THOMAS M. PELL

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 10, 1963

Mr. PELL. Mr. Speaker, the Washington State Senate unanimously passed a memorial urging Federal action to cancel recent concessions of the International North Pacific Fisheries Treaty Commission to allow Japan to fish for halibut east of an existing treaty line.

This memorial was adopted 44 to 0 and charged that a halibut fishery conservation program was threatened by the concessions.

On February 5 a meeting of the International Commission is scheduled to be held in Tokyo to consider Japanese proposals for conservation. It seems to me the agreement to allow Japan to cross the line heretofore established by treaty is premature. Conservation arrangements should have been agreed to first.

Once this halibut resource was almost destroyed but through regulation and self-denial of our fishermen the catches have been increasing in the Bering Sea area. Now the question is, Will the Japanese make 30 years of such restraint and sacrifice in vain?

In this connection, Mr. Speaker, let me add that a joint House-Senate congressional committee has scheduled a hearing on February 14 and 15 in Seattle, Wash., to investigate as to whether the halibut Commission's action was justified.

Independence Day of the Republic of Tanganyika

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ADAM C. POWELL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 10, 1963

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, on December 9, 1962, Tanganyika celebrated her first independence day, and we take this opportunity to send warm felicitations to His Excellency Mwalimu, Julius K. Nyerere, President of the Republic of Tanganyika, on this memorable occasion.

TANGANYIKA: FROM COLONY TO REPUBLIC

On December 9, 1961, Tanganyika, a United Nations trust territory under the administration of the United Kingdom, became a sovereign member of the British Commonwealth and the 29th African state to achieve independence. The hoisting of the new green, black, and gold Tanganyikan flag marked the emergence of the first multiracial nation in Africa under African government. As such, it aroused considerable interest in a continent where racial problems have taken their place among the difficulties facing governments. The general optimism that the nation's 9 million Africans, 20,000 Europeans, 80,000 Asians, and 20,000 Arabs could live together in peace and order and in dedication to common goals was engendered to a large extent by the leadership qualities of Tanganyika's first Prime Minister, and now President, Julius Nyerere. Prior to independence British officials had called Nyerere "the key to everything in Tanganyika." The American press stated that "the personality, skill, and absolute dedication of Mr. Nyerere to nonviolence and antidiscrimination against Africans and non-Africans alike" was a key factor which would make a multiracial nation possible. In the not always smooth year since independence we have seen Mr. Nyerere's influence at work both in office and behind the scenes to mold Tanganyika into a democratic republic and a model of non-racialism for the rest of the African Continent to follow.

What is this country over which Mr. Nyerere has become President? Located just to the south of the equator on the Nile-Congo-Zambezi divide, Tanganyika stretches for more than 450 miles along the Indian Ocean. It borders on Kenya in the north and on Mozambique in the south. It is comparable in size to Nigeria and is larger than Texas and Oklahoma combined. Substantial portions of 2 of Africa's "great lakes"—Lake Tanganyika and Lake Victoria—lie within the country's boundaries. It is a land of plains and plateaus, with a humid coastal belt. It is the land where Stanley

met Livingstone and where, on the Kenya border, the summit of Mount Kilimanjaro, permanently covered with snow, rises over 19,000 feet from sea level to make it the highest mountain peak in Africa.

When Tanganyika became independent under the leadership of Julius Nyerere and his party, the Tanganyika African National Union—TANU—the government pledged, in Nyerere's words, to lead the people in an all-out fight against poverty, ignorance, and disease. "Uhuru na Kazi," TANU's slogan in the campaign for independence, has increasingly become used as a greeting throughout the country. "Uhuru na Kazi," meaning freedom and work, expresses Tanganyika's faith in the future and determination to fulfill the expectations of her people.

The world was momentarily stunned when Mr. Nyerere resigned from his post as Prime Minister only 6 weeks after independence to devote himself more fully to the chairmanship of the Tanganyika African National Union. Then, in late May the Government announced plans to turn the country into a republic, with a President elected by universal suffrage as the head of state. It became clear that Mr. Nyerere's resignation from office had not been an abdication of power but rather the prologue to his reemergence as President of the Republic of Tanganyika. On December 9, 1962, 1 year after its accession to independence, Tanganyika became a republic with Julius Nyerere its first President.

In commemorating the anniversary of Tanganyika's independence we commend President Nyerere and the people of Tanganyika for their untiring efforts in transforming Tanganyika from a colony to a republic. We wish them every success for the future.

A Deepwater Port for Indiana

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. J. EDWARD ROUSH

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 10, 1963

Mr. ROUSH. Mr. Speaker, yesterday I introduced a bill to authorize the construction of an Indiana port on Lake Michigan. Ever since I began my political life in Indiana, I have been talking to people all over our great State about the potential for development which such a port would present. The people of Indiana know the benefits which can be gained by the development of this deepwater port, and they share my enthusiasm for an Indiana port.

The road by which progress travels is always a hard one. There are always many obstacles, there are always delays, there are always disappointments and the path followed by this progressive proposal has provided no exception. Discussion of the Indiana public port predates concrete development of the St. Lawrence Seaway. A full 80 years

before the congressional Deepwater Seaways Commission report of 1896 suggested the development of the St. Lawrence Seaway, the statesmen of early Indiana recognized and protected Indiana's right to a harbor. By having the Indiana State boundary moved 10 miles north of the line established by the Northwest Ordinance, these early leaders laid the groundwork for our port development today.

By the establishment of the 36-mile coastline on Lake Michigan the political leaders of Indiana established our claim to a water access at the time of our introduction to statehood. Now, after years of bipartisan effort on the part of leaders of the State, our plans are formulated, our authority is developing, and we look forward to the early construction of our deepwater port.

The economic feasibility of the operation of a port at Burns Waterway is well substantiated. Scholarly economic presentations developed by Indiana University, various State agencies and private sources indicate that the Indiana deepwater port can become an important transportation center and an economic success. Preliminary work by the Indiana Port Commission indicates, without doubt, that previous estimates as to the economic potential of the port have been very conservative.

The navigational plan developed for this harbor is not only adequate but quite attractive. The approach and entry pattern, I am told, is one of simplicity and ease of management. For example, in tug service alone, a grain-carrying vessel would save \$1,055 per trip, for tugs will not be needed at the proposed Indiana Waterway Harbor.

I am proposing the development of an additional transportation facility for my State and for the Nation. History has shown that the access to water routes has, since the advent of recorded history, been a primary determinant in the economic progress of nations. Those nations and states and cities with access to this most economical form of transportation have prospered and have become the trade, population, and cultural centers of the world. Certainly, areas without such water commerce facility have also developed successfully but they have prospered in spite of transportation hardships.

Indiana is a State which has developed richly in both industrial and agricultural productivity. The richness of our soil and the skill of our farmers has combined to make Indiana an important part of America's food-producing Midwest. The industrial ingenuity and the quality of our workmen have contributed to our industrial progress.

Located as we are, at the crossroads of America, Indiana's industrial and agricultural capacity is important to the entire Nation. The food we produce is easily available to feed the people of the country. The goods we manufacture are easily available to fill the needs and wants of all Americans because we are located in the very population center of the continental United States. But to expand our industrial development, to provide further markets for our agricul-

tural abundance and our rich natural resources, Indiana needs access to inexpensive water transportation which can be provided by the Burns Waterway Harbor.

The development of the harbor is consistent with the national transportation policy. Indeed, the national transportation policy dictates its development because the needs of commerce cry out for the development of this additional transportation facility in our State.

Indiana is the only State bordering on the Great Lakes which has no public deepwater port; no door to the trade routes of the world. Since the St. Lawrence Seaway has provided Great Lakes ports with access to the world's great commercial centers, the importance of our harbor has taken on added significance. We now have the opportunity of making the industrial goods, the natural resources and the agricultural products, in which our State so abundantly abounds, available to the markets of the world. The key, of course, is the Indiana public deepwater port.

Let us look for a minute into the world of the future. We are discussing today the potential of the needs of commerce in Indiana and the benefits which an additional transportation facility can contribute to this commercial development.

I believe the greatest hindrance to our clear analysis of this problem lies in the inadequacy of our standards of judgment. I do not question the analyses made by so many learned and competent men, but I question the accuracy of any one of us to completely comprehend the potential for future growth and development of our area.

Who of us will predict, with any confidence in its accuracy, how much the population of our State and its environs will grow in the life of this project? Who will estimate the gross commercial product of our area for the next 50 years, and rest comfortably on that estimate? Who will suggest the maximum agricultural productivity of the great Midwest after the production explosion of the last decade and a half? We are incompetent judges of tomorrow's world because we are tied to the standards of today in making our analyses. We cannot fully comprehend the wonders of tomorrow's life because the frailty of our nature forces us to depend, for our premises, upon sensations which we have experienced.

Our Nation is built on growth and our society, our economy, and our future is geared to grow. Change is the only constant value in our society and the change pattern is one of growth.

Economic need for the Burns Waterway Harbor is clearly established in the world of today. Certainly the unlimited potential for the commercial development of the area adds further impetus to the favorable report on these navigation improvements.

There is clear and evident need for the development of the public harbor at Burns Waterway. The State of Indiana is determined to carry through its development of the facilities which are its responsibility. I trust that the Federal Government will move forward in good faith to initiate action on the naviga-

tional improvements which are its responsibility. There are 53 federally improved harbors in the 8 States on the Great Lakes waterways in the United States today. Construction of a second Indiana project to allow the State to develop its only deepwater public harbor seems fair and just.

Mr. Speaker, my State is a great State but its greatness cannot always be measured by its proud history. Its greatness must also be measured by its willingness to meet and accept the challenges offered by the hope of an even greater future. I personally look upon this dream and this endeavor as a step by the people of Indiana to justify our heritage of greatness. It is a real and challenging expression of a progressive spirit.

Mr. Speaker, I trust that, in the very near future, this proposal might receive the approval of this House. Indiana will be very grateful.

Copyright—New Frontiers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. EMANUEL CELLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 10, 1963

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I am pleased to include my remarks before the American Guild of Authors and Composers on November 14, 1962, at the Hotel New Yorker in New York City:

Now that the American people have chosen their Representatives and we are on the threshold of the 88th Congress, it seems peculiarly appropriate to review with the distinguished members of this guild the strengths and weaknesses of the Nation's copyright laws and the immediate prospects for their improvement as a protection for the authors and composers of music. What are the new frontiers in copyright?

Both as a private citizen and as chairman of the House Committee on the Judiciary, I have long been interested in the drama and musical arts—as a musician, a devotee of opera, a student, and a champion of the rights of all creators of American music, whether serious or popular. The jurisdiction of our committee includes measures affecting copyrights, but it is not merely concerned with the technical aspects of copyright legislation. The committee has the solemn duty of guarding the intellectual property of composers and authors, and of making sure that as our civilization grows more complex, American native talent will continue to be encouraged by receiving a just return from the commercial exploitation of its works.

For it must be recalled that the copyright law of the United States is founded on the constitutional provision (art. I, sec. 8) which empowers Congress “* * * to promote the progress of science and useful arts, by securing for limited times to authors and inventors the exclusive right to their respective writings and discoveries.”

The Constitution thus envisages two purposes in providing for copyright. It wishes to foster the useful arts and it proposes to do so by rewarding authors for their contribution to society. Obviously these two purposes are closely related.

The last general revision of the copyright laws occurred in 1909. We have gone from a horse-and-buggy day to a nuclear age. Tremendous changes in technology have taken place in the intervening half century. These have fostered entire new industries and new methods for the reproduction and dissemination of literary and artistic works. In consequence the 1909 statute is no longer adequate in its application to present-day conditions. It is like measuring the tail of a pig with the tail of a comet. Among the respects in which the copyright laws fail to achieve the constitutional objectives are a number of shortcomings which peculiarly affect songwriters and composers—notably the present inadequate term of copyright protection, the outmoded jukebox exemption, insufficient sanctions against the counterfeiting and piracy of phonograph records, the compulsory license for the recording of music, and the awkward and unsatisfactory provisions governing renewal and reversion of copyrights.

Past efforts to bring the copyright laws up to date have failed, largely, according to the Register of Copyrights, because of controversy among various private interest groups having a stake in the matter. In 1955, however, Congress provided funds for a comprehensive study by the Copyright Office as the groundwork for a general revision and in 1961, after much study, the Register issued a tentative report containing detailed recommendations.

These recommendations in large measure meet the proposals of your own group as to major matters, though varying in some areas and in particular details. Widespread discussions of the Register's report were undertaken and are still in progress, with your organization taking a leading part. What is more, the Copyright Office has now turned its efforts to the drafting of a comprehensive bill which, in turn, will be the subject of extensive study by interested parties before it is submitted to Congress. It is hoped that, with the genuine cooperation of organizations interested in the project, such submission will take place during the forthcoming 88th Congress.

While waiting for the legislative proposals of the Register, the 87th Congress has not been idle in this field. With respect to the term of copyright, for example, Congress was called upon, as an emergency measure, to take steps to prevent the expiration of renewal terms of copyright during the period which still must elapse before the enactment of overall legislation. The present term of copyrights, as you know, is 28 years from first publication or registration, renewable during the 28th year by certain persons for a second period of 28 years. One criticism of existing law is that today the United States is the only important Western power in which it is possible for a copyright to expire during the life of the author. The Register's 1961 report recommends that the maximum term be increased from 56 to 76 years. Under this recommendation the basic term would continue to run for 28 years, and would be renewable for a second term of 48 years. Although some groups, including your own, prefer a term of protection that would endure for the life of the author and for 50 years thereafter, as is the rule in many European countries, all interested parties appear to agree that the present term of copyright is unduly short. Meanwhile, existing renewal terms were continuing to expire and would be lost forever.

In this context, I introduced House Joint Resolution 627, which extends the duration of copyright protection temporarily. As enacted, this measure continues until the end of 1965 the renewal terms of all copyrights subsisting on September 19, 1962, the date on which President Kennedy approved my measure. It thus provides an interim suspension of copyright expirations pending the enactment of detailed overall copyright

legislation. Originally this bill proposed to extend copyright terms until the end of 1967, but the subcommittee accepted the argument of the Register of Copyright that a temporary extension of that length might unduly impair the incentive of interested parties for achieving agreement on an overall revision.

Another significant congressional achievement of the 87th Congress in this area was the enactment of my bill outlawing the vicious traffic in counterfeiting phonograph records. Hearings before the Copyright Subcommittee of the Committee on the Judiciary elicited testimony from representatives of phonograph record manufacturers, music publishers, and composers and performers of music to the effect that there exists a widespread practice of counterfeiting phonograph records, including labels, produced by reputable phonograph record manufacturers and selling them in interstate commerce in competition with the genuine articles. In 1960, alone, it was estimated, this practice drained more than \$20 million from the legitimate music industry. Typically, the counterfeiter takes hold of a legitimate phonograph record manufactured by a reputable concern and containing a popular song or arrangement. He makes copies of the recording and of the label as well. Then he palms off his counterfeit copies as the genuine products of the manufacturer whose label and recording he has appropriated.

Because the counterfeiter operates outside the law, paying no compensation to artists, no arrangers' fees, no copyright royalties, and no excise taxes, he is able to sell his illegitimate and often mechanically inferior records to jobbers and dealers at prices far below those charged by the legitimate manufacturers whose work has been forged.

The victims of this unconscionable practice are many. They include songwriters and publishers; record manufacturers, distributors, and dealers; recording artists and musicians; manufacturers of phonographs; and the U.S. Government. The songwriters, publishers, artists, and musicians are deprived of their royalties. The record industry is denied its legitimate profits. The Federal Government is robbed of its excise and other taxes. And the music-loving public, often as not, receives a mechanically imperfect product. This in turn injures the reputation of the artists and of the manufacturers of records and sound equipment, because the public naturally attributes the mechanical defects of the counterfeit record to the producers of the real thing.

The few State laws which attempt to deal with the problem impose relatively ineffective fines. Counterfeiters are happy to pay such fines, regarding them as in the nature of licenses.

Inasmuch as counterfeit records are being shipped in interstate commerce across State lines, I believe it essential to the proper administration of justice that Congress should enact a Federal criminal statute that would add the power and weight of the Federal Government to State and county law enforcement agencies. Accordingly, I introduced and Congress enacted H.R. 11793, a bill that amends the Federal Criminal Code by declaring the traffic in counterfeit records to be a criminal act, subject to fine and imprisonment.

I believe that it is significant that both of these measures—the copyright extension bill and the counterfeit record bill—underwent amendment before they were enacted. I cannot emphasize too strongly the necessity for flexibility and compromise in the area of copyright legislation. In the copyright extension bill, as I have said, Congress accommodated the need of copyright owners to be saved from unnecessary extinction of their right to the equally urgent need of the Register to avoid a flagging of interest in a final

agreement in overall revision. I believe the accommodation was a wise one.

Similarly, the counterfeit record bill underwent revision by the Senate, which sharply reduced the penalties provided by the House bill. This took place near the end of the session. Our House committee was faced with the alternatives of accepting the Senate amendments and the greatly reduced penalties, or asking the Senate for a conference. In the second alternative, it is possible that we might have come out with a stronger deterrent; on the other hand, we might have come out with nothing at all. In this context committee staff consulted the principal proponents of the measure, representatives of phonograph record manufacturers. These persons wisely expressed their preference for a bird in the hand. I think this was much to their credit. One must stretch one's feet according to one's blanket. The measure, as amended by the Senate, was enacted; trafficking in counterfeit records is now a Federal offense; and the investigative agencies of the Federal Government can be enlisted to stamp it out. A new deterrent has been placed on the books and, should the penalties prove inadequate, they can easily be revised upward.

There is one area, however, in which the spirit of compromise and accommodation has not yet borne fruit. I refer to my unceasing efforts to bring about the repeal of the anachronistic and outmoded jukebox exemption.

Through the years, Congress has amended the provisions of the copyright law to protect authors and composers in the commercial exploitation of their creative works by requiring users to pay reasonable fees to copyright owners for the sale or use of their property. Radio and television broadcasters, concert halls, movies, hotels, cabarets, wired music—all these industries pay composers of copyrighted music for the right of commercial performance. The sole exception is the coin machine operator—the corporation that owns and leases coin machine phonographs to taverns and restaurants. To quote the Register of Copyrights, "Jukebox operators are the only users of music for profit who are not obliged to pay royalties, and there is no special reason for their exemption. The jukebox exemption should be repealed or at least replaced by a provision requiring jukebox operators to pay reasonable license fees for public performance for music or profit." With this statement I agree. The use of copyrighted music on jukeboxes for profit without so much as a by-your-leave to the composers of such works is nothing less than legalized piracy.

In the 85th and 86th Congresses, I introduced bills to repeal the jukebox exemption. In June 1959 the Copyright Subcommittee of the House Committee on the Judiciary held extensive hearings on my bill, H.R. 5931. Witness after witness testified to the injustice and inequity of the out-of-date copyright law which was enacted in 1909, 21 years before the modern machine phonograph made its appearance. Helen Sousa Abert, daughter of the late John Philip Sousa, told the subcommittee: "A songwriter is entitled to compensation during the short term of his copyright from all sources which perform his work publicly for profit. The jukebox is certainly performing copyrighted music for profit."

The subcommittee also heard from qualified witnesses that the jukebox industry is today a \$500 million industry—purchasing popular works at wholesale prices and selling renditions of the music at 10 cents a play. Coin machine performances of recordings are clearly performances for profit; but under existing law the composer receives no royalties for them.

On the other hand, the coin machine operators make the plea that they cannot afford

to pay such royalties, that they fear that outright repeal of the present exemption would leave them at the mercy of the copyright owners who might charge them unconscionable fees.

Thus, embraced in controversy, the antiquated 1909 jukebox exemption remains unchanged. But it should be changed, and Congress must act responsibly to find a path of justice in this matter.

In August 1958 a subcommittee of the Senate Committee on the Judiciary reported favorably a bill to repeal the jukebox exemption. In the report on this measure there were several references to a possible compromise solution of the problem, offered by the National Beverage Association. This proposal envisaged the payment of between \$15 and \$25 per annum per coin-operated machine, depending upon size. Even Mr. George Miller, president of the Music Operators of America, Inc., originally expressed interest in this proposal and the House Judiciary Committee staff attempted to schedule a conference for the purpose of discussing it. This conference, however, could not be arranged, the operators having apparently lost all interest in discussing a possible area of agreement.

In the 87th Congress I again introduced a bill to repeal the jukebox exemption, H.R. 70. Along with the Register of Copyrights, many public-spirited citizens—authors, newspaper columnists, actors—have endorsed H.R. 70. The Department of State supports it. The American Bar Association, the American Patent Association support it. But because of the controversy that surrounds this matter, some Members of Congress may feel that a blanket repeal of the exemption is not the best answer, because the coin machine operators and the music copyright owners might not be able to agree on fair and equitable royalty in negotiations. Accordingly I introduced, as an alternative to H.R. 70, a new bill, H.R. 12450, which would not only provide for the payment of royalties by jukebox operators but would also establish trustees with an obligation to provide for the fair and orderly determination of the amount and the proper distribution of such royalties. Hearings were scheduled on these bills but had to be canceled because of the unavailability of necessary witnesses.

In the new Congress I shall again introduce legislation for the purpose of eliminating this grossly unfair provision of existing law and I shall do everything in my power to see to it that this legislation is given a very high priority.

In appraising the reasons for the failure of Congress thus far to remedy this unconscionable situation, I believe that the members of your guild—as well as all members and friends of the songwriting profession—have an indispensable role to play. Because of the inability to foresee the development and popularity of the coin-operated phonograph, the jukebox industry has been able to reap large profits from the exploitation of music and at the same time to deprive the songwriters of their just share. The songwriters must bring the justice of their position to the attention of the Members of Congress, not only in the large urban centers but also the less populated areas. I am confident that when the issue is thoroughly understood remedial action will inevitably follow.

I believe that all auguries are peculiarly favorable for substantial progress in copyright law reform. The Federal administration has uniquely manifested its interest in cultural affairs, having for the first time appointed a Special Presidential Consultant on the Arts, the Honorable August Heckscher. The President and the First Lady have manifested great zeal in fostering the arts in this country. They have in many ways shown that we do not live by bread alone.

The Congress will be increasingly alert and sympathetic to these problems, having worked with them, and it is your job to make us wholly conversant with your needs and problems. The Copyright Office is diligently tackling the challenging task of drafting legislation. Last, but not least, distinguished organizations like your own with specific stakes in copyright legislation are lending their expert assistance to the Register in attempting to accommodate competing interests and minimize conflicts among groups. It is hoped the new Congress will see the introduction of a general revision bill supported by the greatest possible consensus. In this work, no less than in the work of legislators, patience, statesmanship, recognition of the other fellow's needs, and an eye to the public interest are indispensable. Above all you must learn patience. Patience is bitter but it bears sweet fruit. From what I have seen of their work, I am happy to say that your own president, Burton Lane, your counsel, Mr. Kellman, as well as the members of your copyright committee, admirably combine these qualities and seem uniquely fitted to represent the interests of your guild in this vital area. I am confident, also, that the public interest will be furthered by their continued efforts.

Congress Must Control REA

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN M. SLACK, JR.

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 10, 1963

Mr. SLACK. Mr. Speaker, most of us will recall the debate in this Chamber late in the last session when the House had under consideration the appropriation bills for the Department of Agriculture, and several pertinent questions were raised concerning operations of the Rural Electrification Administration. At that time due credit was given to REA for its gratifying accomplishments in the pursuit of its assigned objective—the transmission of electric current into rural areas where the standard of living had been held to minimum levels because of the lack of an electric power supply.

At the same time many Members indicated that they were disturbed by the growing tendencies exhibited by REA to branch out into other fields, without any directive to do so by the Congress, and to thereby enter into direct competition with private industry while holding an insuperable advantage through REA use of low-interest Federal funds. In this connection Congressman ROBERT MICHEL, of Illinois, has recently published in the Public Utilities Fortnightly an outspoken and discerning article which underscores a fundamental issue yet to be resolved satisfactorily. I commend this statement to your attention because I am firmly convinced that, sooner or later, we must grapple with this problem realistically, and determine by congressional action the ground rules within which REA must operate.

The article follows:

A student of government once made this wise observation: "Irresponsible bureaucracy can be made responsible most quickly through financial control. The legislature is

the logical agency to exercise it and thereby restore democracy in administration."

The Rural Electrification Administration today is an outstanding example of "irresponsible bureaucracy." Although some of this irresponsibility may be attributed indirectly to the failure of Congress to exercise sufficient supervisory control over this agency, it is Congress and Congress only, as the legislature, that is "the logical agency" to "restore democracy" in the Rural Electrification Administration.

What has gone wrong? Essentially, Congress has not adequately exercised its constitutionally granted "financial control." But there is much more to it. As long as REA was doing what it was supposed to do, according to the law as it was drafted in 1936 and according to the intent and purpose of the founders of REA, Congress could rightly delegate its "financial control" to the Administrator. But this is 1962, not 1936. Conditions and circumstances have changed. Above all, by a steady process of pyramiding one twisted interpretation of its basic statute upon another, REA is now headed in a direction never intended by its creators, the Congress.

Today REA is basically a Federal power agency. The words "rural" and "farm" have little meaning in terms of its program. It is even using Federal funds—the public's money—to help Federal power agencies bypass Congress in their efforts to build a nationwide public power system. In the absence of the "financial control" that Congress should exercise and does not, REA has taken upon itself the task of attempting to direct national power policy, and, even more disturbing, to actually establish national economic philosophy. This is not, and can never be, the function of bureaucracy. REA today is violating virtually every precept of its founders. The need, therefore, has become pressing for Congress to step in and take control.

Look back for a moment. In 1936, American agriculture had been in a depressed condition for nearly two decades. Farm income was low, farms were widely scattered and, in some cases, relatively inaccessible. Despite the fact that land-grant colleges, national farm organizations, electrical manufacturers, and many of the Nation's power companies had been engaged in serious research programs, and positive efforts toward extending central station electric service to farms for over a decade only, about 11 percent of the farms were actually electrified. Under these conditions, and in an effort to stimulate the overall national economy, there was ample justification for the Congress to approve a program to promote farm and rural electrification.

Under the REA program, rural electric systems are 100 percent debt financed by the Federal Government. In the early years, borrowers had little or no equity in their systems. (These same cooperatives now have total assets of over \$3.5 billion and an equity of nearly \$700 million—or 20 percent—in their systems.)

Over the intervening years the REA grew largely with little or no congressional direction or supervision. At the same time, a radical change was taking place in the farm economy. Income improved steadily. Today, the whole farm economy is generally up as the capacity of American agriculture to produce has expanded. And, according to the latest available statistics from the REA, almost 98 percent of the Nation's farms are electrified. The task of bringing electricity to rural America is virtually complete.

INITIALLY FOR DISTRIBUTION

A cardinal fact to remember is that Congress originally intended rural electric cooperatives to secure their electric power,

¹ Prof. Harvey Walker in "The Legislative Process."

wherever possible, from existing power sources. They were to be primarily distributors of power. They were not to build generating plants unnecessarily. This was clearly understood by REA. Early in 1936, Morris Cooke, the first Administrator of the REA program, stated before a committee of the House of Representatives that "in 99 instances out of 100, they (REA cooperatives), are going to buy current from existing plants." The late Honorable Sam Rayburn, who introduced the bill in the House, had this to say: "By this bill we hope to bring electrification to people who do not now have it. This bill was not written on the theory that we were going to punish somebody or parallel their lines and go into competition with them."

These comments indicate that there was some concern even then that the REA program might become a means of using Federal financing to compete unfairly with existing free enterprise and to do a job that others are ready, willing, and able to do. It is clear from the record that Congress was assured that this type of activity would not be carried on. So, with the belief that REA would be a noncompetitive type of program designed to supplement the activities of others in their efforts to electrify the rural areas of our country, support for the program was widespread.

Apparently in keeping with the promise of obtaining power from existing sources wherever possible, loans for generation and transmission, as against loans for distribution, constituted only about 3 percent of total REA loans over the period 1936-41. By 1950, however, this had risen to 18 percent. By 1961, the percentage of generation and transmission loans made up to that year had risen to 25 percent. In fiscal year 1962, a new record for G. & T. loans was set with more than 59 percent of all REA electric loans for the year being approved for this purpose; and, for fiscal 1963, it is estimated that between 65 and 70 percent of the electric loans will be for generation and transmission purposes.

The obviously changing character of the REA has not gone unnoticed. Because the very thing that the original founders tried to guard against was happening, attention has been focused on the problem.

Widespread controversy has been evoked by (1) new administrative policies of REA concerning the granting of generation and transmission loans, (2) the cloak of secrecy surrounding loan applications, and (3) the subsidizing of industry through rural electric cooperatives.

Increasingly, REA loans are financing generating facilities of giant "super cooperatives" so that they can create an autonomous, nontaxpaying, and generally unregulated electric supply system to compete with private power sources, contrary to the co-author of the original act, the late Mr. Rayburn, who said they did not intend to go into competition with anybody.

Prior to last year, it was REA policy to award generation and transmission loans only (1) where no adequate dependable source of power was available in the area to meet the borrower's needs, or (2) where the rates offered by existing power sources would result in a higher cost of power to the borrowers than the cost from facilities financed by REA. This was based on the announced policy of the first REA Administrator to Congress when the question of generating loans was discussed during debate on the 1936 act.

The present Administrator of REA, Norman M. Clapp, has stated, however, that it is not enough to judge the desirability of generation and transmission loans on the basis of adequacy, dependability, and low cost of power. On April 21, 1961, Mr. Clapp, in a speech before a Louisiana electric co-

operative, said, "We must be certain that cooperatives enjoy a supply of power which will guarantee the cooperative device a permanent place in the American power industry."

On May 31, 1961, the Administrator announced a third criterion for G. & T. loans apparently aimed at enabling him to accomplish his previously stated goal. This new third criterion provides that, in addition to the two original criteria, loans for generation and transmission can be made "where generation and transmission facilities are necessary to protect the security and effectiveness of REA-financed systems." This completely nullifies the two above criteria which, if administered fairly, carry out congressional understanding and approval of REA G. & T. policy.

EXISTING SUPPLIERS PROTEST

Under this new philosophy abuses of the REA program have been mounting. At least 10 large loans totaling over \$215 million have been approved in recent months for cooperative generating plants which will not fill any power shortage. All these loans were made over the protests of existing power suppliers that all present and anticipated future cooperative power needs would be provided and at a price cheaper than it would cost the cooperatives to generate it themselves.

A \$60 million loan to an Indiana generating cooperative, heralded by REA as the largest loan in its history, was approved on June 15, 1961. When it became evident that the Indiana Public Service Commission might disapprove this loan as unnecessary, the cooperative switched the loan to another cooperative in an obvious and blatant circumvention of the rights and powers of the State commission.

Last November a loan of over \$20 million was made to the Alabama Electric Cooperative to build a 66,000-kilowatt steamplant. This loan was made although REA's own published figures show that the local electric company is supplying power of the G. & T.'s member co-ops at a cost to them less than that G. & T. is now selling power to its members.

Not only is the total amount being loaned for generation and transmission facilities increasing each year, but the size of the individual loans is, on the average, becoming larger. With individual loans now running into the multimillion-dollar figures, Congress needs to take a closer look at the G. & T. program to make certain that loans of this size are necessary and in the public interest. A loan application has been filed by REA borrowers in Louisiana totaling \$53 million for the construction of two 100-megawatt generating plants and nearly 1,800 miles of transmission line. This is enough transmission mileage to crisscross the State from north to south and from east to west five times. If this loan is approved out of funds made available by the 1963 appropriations bill, it will require one-eighth of all the money Congress approved for REA loans for 1963. Certainly, under such circumstances the Appropriations Committees of Congress should review a loan of this magnitude.

It has also become evident that REA loans under section 5 of the act, intended primarily to assist farmers to utilize the electricity the REA program was bringing to them, are now being made to subsidize industry.

Section 5 of the 1936 act authorized the REA to make loans to finance electrical and plumbing equipment for persons in rural areas. During recent years, REA limited loans under this section to facilities for rural households and farmsteads. But the present administration has made section 5 loans for such diverse purposes as the purchase and installation of gravel-crushing and washing machinery, for the purchase of a snow-

making machine for a ski resort, and for the purchase of textile machinery for a private textile mill. Incidents such as these force one to view the House Agriculture Committee's statement that it "feels that REA's present interpretation of section 5 of the 1936 act is inconsistent with the original intent of Congress" as a gross understatement.

LOW INTEREST RATE

The public money that REA is using to finance such industrial electrical machinery through section 5 loans is, of course, loaned to borrowers at the below-cost, taxpayer-subsidized interest rate of 2 percent.

With the aid of this public money REA is therefore subsidizing industry, not to help the farmer, but merely to expand its own bureaucratic activities.

The Administrator also states that section 5 funds will not be used for financing industrial machinery until an industry has exhausted all other sources of credit. This may be the Administrator's policy, but the REA staff apparently is more interested in making loans than checking out the efforts of prospective borrowers to first obtain alternative borrowing sources. A case in point is the loan to finance snowmaking machinery for a ski jump. An official of the REA borrower making the loan testified before the House Agriculture Committee on the Food and Agriculture Act of 1962:

"Chestnut Hills [the ski resort] is our biggest load, and it promises to grow bigger every year. That is one important reason why our co-op agreed to make a loan [under sec. 5] to the company when the company could not get financing for snow-making equipment from any other source, including the Small Business Administration." (Pt. 2, p. 968.)

In reply to my query to the Small Business Administration as to whether the ski resort had applied to SBA for a loan, the Small Business Administrator wrote on March 22, 1962:

"This will confirm advice given to * * * your staff concerning the status of the loan inquiry made by Chestnut Hills Resort, Hanover, Ill. No loan application has been filed with this agency."

In short, if I could obtain such information by merely addressing a letter to SBA, why wasn't REA able to ascertain this fact? Obviously, REA made no real effort to verify the extent of other efforts to obtain financing when processing this section 5 loan. REA was apparently too interested in loaning its subsidized money and building up its own bureaucracy to check out all the facts it needed. If this is an example of REA efficiency in processing a relatively small loan amounting to only \$30,000, how can REA be trusted to handle the many millions of dollars made available to it by Congress each year and process the more complex G. & T. loans amounting in some cases to \$50 and \$60 million? As a banker entrusted with the taxpayers' money, REA standards appear to be slipshod. This provides a good reason why Congress through the Appropriations Committee should start taking more control over the activities of this agency.

The secrecy surrounding REA generation and transmission loan applications has also evoked criticism of the House Committee on Agriculture. In its report accompanying the Food and Agriculture Act of 1962, the committee admonished the REA, as follows:

"Testimony revealed a growing concern over the failure of REA to disclose information on various phases of its operation. The public is entitled to know how public funds are being used, and the REA should approach the consideration of loans for generating facilities in a manner designed to provide as full public information as possible. * * * Certainly, interested parties should be notified and their views obtained before such

loans are approved. Secrecy tends to kindle doubt, whereas public knowledge of the reasons for and justification of loans would go far toward dispelling criticism which could bring the program into disrepute."

Last April, under pressure of increasing criticism from Members of Congress, congressional committees, as well as from the press and the public, REA issued an administrative bulletin on the release of information and availability of records relating to loan applications. REA supporters hailed this bulletin as a major departure from its previous policy of secrecy. A careful study of the bulletin failed to reveal any basic major policy change. In fact, rather than lowering the iron curtain of secrecy, the bulletin, with minor exceptions, merely implemented existing REA practices in writing.

Perhaps the most determining argument in support of tighter congressional control over REA through the Appropriations Committee is the secrecy which surrounds the program. Today, secrecy stands between REA and what should be effective congressional financial control. Once having received its annual appropriation from Congress, REA conducts its lending activities in complete secrecy—not only from the Congress, but from the public and other interested parties who may be directly affected by its activities.

QUESTION OF CRITERIA

Two of the criteria which REA uses in approving G. & T. loans are the cost of power and adequacy of service. To ascertain the necessary facts upon which to base a decision, REA needs the best possible alternative offer from existing suppliers, public or private, in the area of a proposed G. & T. system. Unless existing power suppliers know what they are bidding on—i.e., the future plans and needs of the borrower—they cannot adequately present their own case for providing additional facilities to serve borrowers' needs. If the best alternatives cannot be presented by existing suppliers because of their inability to obtain enough facts to prepare their offer, then REA may be guilty of making an unnecessary loan as it is not comparing the proposed generating loan with the best alternative.

This raises the entire question of how the Administrator can honestly and accurately comply with his own criteria to measure the need for a G. & T. loan unless adequate information is made available to existing suppliers so they can make their best offer based on up-to-date, accurate information on their customers' needs. How can the Administrator in all candor approve a G. & T. loan application and spend the taxpayers' money when he is comparing a G. & T. application with alternatives drafted without knowledge of all the facts?

This raises further questions as to why REA conducts its program in secrecy from Congress and the public, the answers to which are not too difficult. Once secrecy is removed from REA's operations, it would become obvious both to Congress and the public that REA's generation and transmission program is, for the most part, wholly unnecessary and, in many cases, uneconomic and unsound.

Our Nation today is served by a power system unmatched and unparalleled anywhere in the world. There is an abundance of power available to meet the country's present and future needs. The average cost of electricity to the electric consumer has been steadily decreasing over the years.

In view of these accomplished facts, there is little or no excuse for REA to spend tax money for financing separate power systems for its borrowers. This is an uneconomic approach from the standpoint of both the REA borrowers and the public and, therefore, contrary to the best interests of the people.

REA is now in its 27th year. As local distribution borrowers repay their 35-year loans to the Federal Government, REA loses the tied in its mortgage and loan contract with its borrowers. As long as a local borrower is in debt to the Federal Government, the REA control over their activities which is embodied in Administrator maintains such rights as the veto power over a borrower's choice of manager and attorney, and the right to maintain an exclusive banker's position by refusing to permit the borrower to obtain expansion funds elsewhere. Once the Federal debt has been retired, however, the borrower is free to conduct his business independently as a cooperative should.

Thus, when REA approves a G. & T. loan for a group of distribution borrowers, these cooperatives become indebted to the Federal Government and come under the Federal Government's control for another 35 years. Once a group of cooperatives construct their own G. & T. system and take on a utility responsibility for their own power supply, normal load growth (a co-op doubles its load every 7 years) requires periodic expansion of facilities, thereby increasing the borrower's debt to REA. Thus, borrowers soon find themselves indebted to the Federal Government for an indefinite future. REA's strict contractual control over its borrowers makes this agency as much of a Federal power agency as TVA or the Interior Department.

CONGRESS CONTROLS ONLY FUNDS

This is another important reason why Congress should take greater control over the REA program. As an elected body, Congress represents the best interest of the people themselves, while REA, as a Federal bureaucracy, is primarily motivated by its own selfish interests—those of agency growth, prestige, and self-perpetuation of its existence.

Congress today has virtually no control over the REA program with the exception that it makes a lump sum appropriation available to this agency for loans each year. Under the Constitution, Congress is given responsibility to maintain control over the Government purse strings. When Congress authorizes expenditures for an executive agency without knowledge of how the money is to be used, Congress, in effect, is automatically transferring its responsibility to the executive branch of the Government.

There is no question that the REA Administrator, under the law, should and does have the authority to study, recommend, and approve REA loans, but this does not supersede Congress' authority to decide how Federal funds—including REA's—should be spent. The Bureau of Reclamation, for example, has blanket authority to construct projects which it finds financially feasible. Congress, however, will not permit the Bureau to spend money except on projects that it specifically approves each year in appropriation acts. Reclamation also gets lump sum appropriations, but how the money is to be used is specifically set forth by Congress in the reports of the Appropriations Committees.

A further reason that Congress, through the Appropriations Committees, should have the authority of approving the use of REA funds—at least for major G. & T. projects costing over a certain amount—is that the purpose of the REA program is no longer one of constructing distribution systems to provide electricity to farms and other rural customers in unserved areas. The major share of REA's money is now being loaned to put REA permanently and completely in the power business—by constructing generating plants and transmission systems to serve customers and areas that are already receiving central station electric service in adequate amounts at reasonable prices.

Because of this changed policy the REA power program is becoming the largest spender of all the Federal power programs financed by the taxpayers. In fiscal year 1963, REA estimates it will be spending more money for generation and transmission system (\$260 to \$275 million) than either the Corps of Engineers (\$238.8 million) or the Bureau of Reclamation (\$185.2 million) have requested for their multiple-purpose power programs.

For many years REA has been a sort of "sacred cow" in Congress. Each time legislation has been introduced which would, in any way, limit the powers of REA, those brave enough to introduce or support such legislation have been denounced by cooperative lobbyists as "antifarmers" and even "anti-American." But this is changing rapidly. Events during the latest session of Congress have indicated an increasing awareness and concern of Members over REA actions in recent months. An amendment which I introduced to the agriculture appropriations bill this year to limit the amount of funds to be loaned for generation and transmission facilities received bipartisan support even though it lost by a vote of 133-94. The fact that Members would actively oppose REA's present administration of this program and stand up and be counted is, to me, a real step toward finding a solution to this problem.

Prior to this vote, during consideration of the REA appropriations request before the House Appropriations Committee, I proposed an amendment that would require the Budget Bureau in presenting REA's program for fiscal year 1964 to itemize and justify in detail all G. & T. projects costing more than \$5 million. This would have given the Appropriations Committee an opportunity to consider the REA construction program in the same way that it considers the power programs of the Bureau of Reclamation and the Corps of Engineers. The voting on this suggestion of mine, although defeated by a narrow margin of three votes in the House Appropriations Committee, indicated an increased willingness on the part of members to recognize the seriousness of the present trend in REA's policy.

A requirement of this nature would not deprive one single cooperative, or one single rural consumer, of electric power, nor would it create in any way a power shortage among cooperatives. It would not increase the cost of power to any cooperative. It would not in any manner reduce the amount of loan funds available to rural electric cooperatives. It would not impair the security of a single cooperative.

What such a requirement would do is to bring the REA program more closely into line with the intent and purpose of the Rural Electrification Act and to give Congress some semblance of control over this agency. In addition, the REA Administrator might be a little more careful of the manner in which he conducts some of his activities. Without any checks and balances, he has a clear field.

Presentation of this information to the Appropriations Committees of Congress would in no way infringe upon the authority of the Administrator to make loans. It would, however, give Congress the needed information to specifically approve appropriations for this agency. Congress has a right to this information and it has a responsibility to the taxpayers of assuring them that their elected Representatives still have control over Government spending. At present, insofar as REA is concerned, Congress has the responsibility, but not the control.

"Irresponsible bureaucracy can be made responsible most quickly through financial control. The legislature is the logical agency to exercise it."

A View From Capitol Hill—An Article on the Role of Junior Colleges by Representative Edith Green, of Oregon

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN BRADEMAS

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 10, 1963

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to include in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an excellent commentary on the implications of Federal legislation affecting junior colleges by our distinguished colleague and chairman of the Special Subcommittee on Education of the House Committee on Education and Labor, the Honorable EDITH GREEN, of Oregon.

The article entitled "A View From Capitol Hill," appears in the January 1963 issue of Junior College Journal, a publication of the American Association of Junior Colleges.

The article follows:

A VIEW FROM CAPITOL HILL

(By Representative EDITH GREEN, of Oregon)

It seems evident that junior colleges stand on the threshold of their greatest period of service to higher education in our country.

We know that last fall 4.1 million students enrolled in degree-credit courses in colleges and universities across the Nation, and that by 1970 this number will rise to 7 million. It is obvious that junior colleges must provide for an increasing share of the college population if these 3 million additional students are to obtain a higher education.

At the same time, our modern society demands an increasing number of semiprofessional technicians trained at a level below the baccalaureate degree. Here, too, it is obvious that junior colleges have the opportunity to supply the semiprofessional training so greatly in demand.

How can, or how will, the junior colleges meet these twin challenges? I know that there is considerable discussion of the major function of the junior college. Should it concentrate on the 2-year terminal student, or on the transfer student working toward a baccalaureate degree? I believe that there is room for—and certainly need for—both types of junior colleges, or both types of courses in the same institution, if it possesses the resources, in funds and in faculty, to provide them.

With the growing pressures upon junior colleges for a rapid expansion in two directions, I should like to inject a note of caution. It seems to me that the junior colleges can render the most valuable service to education by emphasizing quality in whichever courses they decide to provide.

The Members of Congress, I am sure, will want to be certain that Federal funds will in no way help to perpetuate mediocrity in either a 2-year or a 4-year institution.

The junior college would have little reason for existence if it could not offer education beyond the level of a good high school, since it then would be merely stretching out a secondary education. While growing in size, it cannot grow in stature without careful attention to the quality of its faculty and its curriculum.

In recent years, we have witnessed a greater public interest in junior colleges, and indeed in all higher education. This has been reflected in the number of bills introduced, and also in the increased amount of Federal support for higher education, especially in the sciences and particularly at the graduate level.

I think it inevitable that Federal assistance to higher education will increase in the future. I would hope that the new Congress can be convinced of the urgent need for financial assistance in constructing academic facilities and will enact legislation in 1963. It was encouraging to us in the last Congress that all major higher education organizations, including the American Association of Junior Colleges, united in support of the college academic facilities bill. As the new year begins, the need for additional college classrooms, laboratories, and libraries has not diminished.

I believe it is accurate to say that there is a particular interest among Members of Congress in junior colleges as the avenue for providing higher education at the least cost for our rapidly growing student population. If any higher education legislation is enacted—and I am optimistic that it will be—it most certainly will include junior colleges.

Junior colleges may look for further support through the National Defense Education Act. The National Defense Education Act has demonstrated its worth in improving both secondary and higher education in some areas. But the National Defense Education Act has gaps which should be closed, and I would hope that the Congress would be receptive to changes in this act in 1963.

As mentioned earlier, the demands of the space age require an increasing level of education. This means not only more education for large numbers of our young people—and older, too—but a higher degree of education in our complex professions.

The Federal Government has provided support—often quite generous—for advanced graduate work, mainly in the scientific fields. It seems to me that the national interest requires that more support be given to higher education at the undergraduate level in all fields—if we are to maintain our educational advance. The process may be gradual, but I think it is inevitable.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MONDAY, JANUARY 14, 1963

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D.D., offered the following prayer:

I Corinthians 4: 2: It is required of stewards that they be found faithful.

O Thou God of all grace and goodness, at this noon hour, we are again entering the sacred retreat of prayer, earnestly beseeching Thee that our minds and hearts may be the sanctuaries of Thy light and truth.

Grant that in these early days of the New Year we may be delivered from all feelings of fear and foreboding and be strengthened to go forth faithfully on the path of duty, trusting in the Lord.

Show us how we may implement with wisdom and understanding those lofty principles of democracy which the founders of our Republic cherished and clung to with ever-increasing tenacity of confidence and courage.

We pray that Thou wilt manifest Thy special favor unto our President, our Speaker, and the Members of Congress, inspiring them to make great adventures of faith and fidelity as they encounter the heavy responsibilities of their high vocation.

In Christ's name we offer our prayer. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, January 10, 1963, was read and approved.

RECESS

The SPEAKER. The Chair declares the House in recess at this time subject to the call of the Chair.

Accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 2 minutes p.m.) the House stood in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker at 12 o'clock and 19 minutes p.m.

JOINT SESSION OF THE HOUSE AND SENATE HELD PURSUANT TO THE PROVISIONS OF HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 1 TO HEAR AN ADDRESS BY THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

The SPEAKER of the House presided. The Doorkeeper announced the Vice President and Members of the U.S. Senate who entered the Hall of the House of Representatives, the Vice President taking the chair at the right of the Speaker, and the Members of the Senate the seats reserved for them.

The SPEAKER. On the part of the House the Chair appoints as members of the committee to escort the President of the United States into Chamber: the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. ALBERT], the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. BOGGS], the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALTER], the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK], and the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. BYRNES].

The VICE PRESIDENT. On the part of the Senate the Chair appoints as members of the committee of escort the Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], the Senator from California [Mr. KUCHEL], and the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER].

The Doorkeeper announced the ambassadors, ministers, and *chargés d'affaires* of foreign governments.

The ambassadors, ministers, and *chargés d'affaires* of foreign governments entered the Hall of the House of Representatives and took the seats reserved for them.

The Doorkeeper announced the Chief Justice of the United States and the Associate Justices of the Supreme Court.

The Chief Justice of the United States and the Associate Justices of the Supreme Court entered the Hall of the House of Representatives and took the