

sation as Envoy Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Kingdom of Yemen.

John S. Badeau, of New York, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the United Arab Republic.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate May 16, 1961:

PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE

The following candidates for personnel action in the Regular Corps of the Public Health Service, subject to qualifications therefor as provided by law and regulations:

For appointment as indicated:

To be senior surgeons

Marvin S. Cashion Louis J. Oropallo
Louis S. Gerber Bernard F. Rosenblum
Dominick J. Lacovara

To be surgeons

Baruch S. Blumberg James P. Shortal
Carleton R. Dean Chen Tung Sun
Walter H. Freygang, Hugh F. Williamson
Jr. Harold C. Woodworth

To be senior assistant surgeons

Ray A. Brinker
Vincent A. DiScala

To be senior dental surgeons

Charles J. Donnelly Harry J. Kunstadter
Isadore J. Jarin Louis L. Murzin

To be dental surgeon

Stanley Raynor

To be senior sanitary engineers

Clarence J. Feldhake
Jens A. Jensen
Daniel J. Weiner

To be sanitary engineer

Paul F. Woolrich

To be pharmacists

Cornelius B. Kelly, Jr.
Dwight D. Wendel

To be senior scientists

Elwin E. Bennington Robert H. McCauley,
William F. Buren Jr.
Leon O. Emik Herbert F. Schoof

To be scientist

Albert S. Perry

To be sanitarians

George J. Burton Wilbert R. McLean
James A. King Stephen Megregian

To be senior veterinary officer

Earl J. Catcott

To be nurse officers

Hilda H. Falls
Elsie K. Y. Ho
Ovelia Winstead

To be dietitians

Rebecca T. Crockett
Margaret L. Smith

To be therapists

Martha D. Collins
Edith W. Palmer

To be health services officers

Louisa E. Haas Elsa J. Nelson
Stanley I. Hirsch Albert E. Rhudy
Max T. McKee

For permanent promotions as indicated:

To be senior assistant surgeons

William J. Atkinson Robert J. Warren
John R. Baugh Frederick V. C. Feath-
George T. Harding, Jr. erstone
Otto L. Loehden

To be senior assistant dental surgeon

James W. Knowles

To be senior sanitary engineer

Joseph L. Minkin
For appointment as indicated:

To be senior assistant surgeons

Paul H. Black Fred Gorstein
Sherman M. Weissman Jack Zusman

To be senior assistant dental surgeons

James E. Hamner III Milton E. Schaefer
Sherman L. Cox Loren F. Mills

To be assistant dental surgeons

Robert J. McCune Lloyd K. Croft
Phillip M. Lightbody Kenton E. Nesbit
Irwin Blumenthal Merwyn C. Crump
David R. Madsen Maurice A. Correy
Steve D. Hunsaker Wayne E. Stroud
Richard E. Adams David Stevenson
Bryant G. Speed Gerald C. Stanley
James D. Ashman Kenneth J. Richter
Darrel D. Lee Robert A. Clalone
James N. Franklin Norman L. Clark

To be senior assistant sanitary engineer

William C. Galegar

To be assistant sanitary engineers

James R. Coleman
John N. English
John A. Frierson

To be junior assistant sanitary engineers

G. Lee Christensen Russel H. Wyer
Fred M. Reiff William A. Felsing, Jr.
Max E. Burchett John D. Clem
John K. Carswell Louis J. Breimhurst
Samuel B. McKee Robert L. Bolin, Jr.
James H. Eagen Robert H. Reeves
Howard J. Edde James V. Waskiewicz
John E. Hagan III Stuart F. Somers
John M. Leach Carl H. Johnson

To be senior assistant veterinary officers

Robert P. Botts William A. Priester, Jr.
Allan C. Pier Philip H. Coleman
Kirby I. Campbell

To be assistant veterinary officers

John O. Iversen William B. Henry, Jr.
Billy E. Hooper Wendell E. Johnson
Robert G. Scholtens

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

TUESDAY, MAY 16, 1961

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

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

The words of the Master, Matthew 28: 20: *Lo, I am with you always, even unto the end of the world.*

Most merciful and gracious God, Thou art here with us in the fellowship of prayer and in the faith which calls upon Thee for guidance in pursuing the ways of reason and righteousness.

May our minds and hearts be animated and aglow with the comradeship and counsel of our blessed Lord for we humbly acknowledge that our finite wisdom is so fallible and our insight so limited.

Grant that we may feel the urgency of Thy divine appeal to give ourselves as partners and fellow workers in the great struggle against aggression, injustice, and inhumanity.

Show us how we may create an atmosphere of good will among the members of the human family and may the visions and hopes which we cherish of a world of peace and brotherhood soon be attained and fulfilled.

Hear us in the name of the Prince of Peace. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

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

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

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

H.J. Res. 143. Joint resolution authorizing the President to proclaim the week in May 1961 in which falls the third Friday of that month as National Transportation Week.

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

S. 1619. An act to authorize adjustments in accounts of outstanding old-series currency, and for other purposes.

S. 1852. An act to authorize appropriations for aircraft, missiles, and naval vessels for the Armed Forces, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT OF AGRICULTURAL ADJUSTMENT ACT OF 1938, AS AMENDED

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (H.R. 7030) to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

Mr. HOEVEN. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman explain the provisions of this bill?

Mr. GATHINGS. Yes. This legislation is exactly the same legislation as the House and Senate approved in 1958, when we had a similar flood condition. This permits farmers in flooded-out areas to move their allotment of acreage to higher ground. It will not increase the acreage by 1 acre, but it will permit them to have an income in 1961, continue their operations and liquidate their indebtedness. A large area is flooded with water. This winter and spring has been exceptionally cold and wet. Our farmers have experienced difficulty and disaster in 3 of the last 4 crop years.

Mr. HOEVEN. This applies just to 1961, and there is no cost whatever involved?

Mr. GATHINGS. It applies to 1961 only and there is no cost involved. This is emergency legislation that is needed immediately. If cotton is not planted before May 20 the chances are little yield will result.

Mr. HOEVEN. I withdraw my reservation of objection, Mr. Speaker.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, is amended by striking out of section 344(n) the figures "1958" and inserting the figures "1961".

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert: "That section 344(n) of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, is amended (1) by striking out the figures '1958' where they first appear therein and inserting the figures '1961' and (2) by striking out the last two sentences thereof and inserting: 'Any farm allotment transferred under this paragraph shall be deemed to be released acreage for purposes of acreage history credits under sections 344(f) (8), 344(m) (2), and 377 of this Act.'"

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CORE "FREEDOM RIDERS"—MERCHANTS OF RACIAL HATRED

Mr. HUDDLESTON. 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 Alabama?

There was no objection.

Mr. HUDDLESTON. Mr. Speaker, the so-called "freedom riders" have obtained their goal. Their sole purpose in trespassing upon the South and its well established and understood customs was to create a deplorable and disturbing situation. This they have done. It is difficult for any southerner who understands the problems confronting our people to sympathize with this radical extremist group which has invaded our State. They got just what they asked for.

Every decent southerner deplors violence in this case; all of us understand the tremendous aggravation brought about by these self-annointed merchants of racial hatred.

When the group left Washington last week, the fanfare and publicity marking their departure made it clear that their motives were not those of good will and racial understanding. They deliberately set about to violate the laws of Alabama.

ELECTIONS SUBCOMMITTEE OF THE COMMITTEE ON HOUSE ADMINISTRATION

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Elections Subcommittee of the Committee on House Administration may be permitted to sit today during general debate.

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

There was no objection.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON IRRIGATION AND RECLAMATION OF COMMITTEE ON INTERIOR AND INSULAR AFFAIRS

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on Irrigation and Reclamation of

the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs may be permitted to sit today during general debate.

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

There was no objection.

PRIVATE CALENDAR

The SPEAKER. This is Private Calendar Day. The Clerk will call the first individual bill on the Private Calendar.

WORTHINGTON OIL REFINERS

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 1414) for the relief of the Worthington Oil Refiners, Inc.

Mr. HEMPHILL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

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

There was no objection.

EMMETT P. DYER

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 1623) for the relief of Emmett P. Dyer.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the application for old-age insurance benefits filed with the Bureau of Old-Age and Survivors Insurance in February 1956 by Emmett P. Dyer (social security account numbered ~~xxx-xx-xxxx~~) shall be deemed to have been filed on December 31, 1956; and the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare is hereby authorized and directed, without requiring a further application, to recompute his primary insurance amount (effective with respect to monthly insurance benefits under title II of the Social Security Act for months beginning after the date of the enactment of this Act) on the basis of such filing date and in accordance with section 102(e) (6) of the Social Security Amendments of 1954. Such recomputation shall not be deemed to be a recomputation for the purposes of section 215(f) of the Social Security Act.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

LOUIS J. ROSENSTEIN

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 2686) for the relief of Louis J. Rosenstein.

Mr. LIBONATI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

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

There was no objection.

MRS. MAURICIA REYES

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 3843) for the relief of Mrs. Mauricia Reyes.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

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

There was no objection.

MR. AND MRS. JAMES H. McMURRAY

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 4872) for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. James H. McMurray.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

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

There was no objection.

HELEN TILFORD LOWERY

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 1887) for the relief of Helen Tilford Lowery.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That sections 15 to 20, inclusive, of the Federal Employees' Compensation Act are hereby waived in favor of Helen Tilford Lowery, Cincinnati, Ohio, and her claim for compensation benefits arising out of radio necrosis of both feet allegedly contracted as a result of the course of X-ray treatments while a student nurse at Freedmen's Hospital, Washington, District of Columbia, from 1934 through 1938, shall be acted upon under the remaining provisions of such Act if she files such claim with the Bureau of Employees' Compensation, Department of Labor, within the six-month period which commences on the date of enactment of this Act: *Provided,* That no benefits shall accrue by reason of the enactment of this Act for any period prior to the date of its enactment except in the case of such medical or hospital expenditures which may be deemed reimbursable.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

BIG SANDY RANCHERIA, CALIFORNIA

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 1593) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to convey certain land in the Big Sandy Rancheria, California, and to accept other land in exchange therefor.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Secretary of the Interior is authorized, in his discretion, and subject to such terms and conditions as he may prescribe, to convey by quitclaim deed to the American Baptist Home Mission Society, all right, title, and interest of the United States in and to a tract of land described as the north half of the northwest quarter of the northeast quarter of the northeast quarter and the north half of the south half of the northwest quarter of the northeast quarter of the northeast quarter of section 9, township 10 south, range 23 east, Mount Diablo meridian, California, comprising 7.50 acres, more or less, of the Big Sandy Rancheria, California, and to accept in exchange therefor a conveyance in fee simple to the United States by the American Baptist Home Mission Society of a tract of land described as the northwest quarter of the southeast quarter of the southeast quarter and the north half of the north half of the southwest quarter of the southeast quarter of the southeast quarter of section 4, township 10

south, range 23 east, Mount Diablo meridian, California, comprising 12.50 acres, more or less.

SEC. 2. The land conveyed to the United States under section 1 of this Act shall become a part of the Big Sandy Rancheria.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

HELEN IRMA IMHOOF

The Clerk called the bill (S. 118) for the relief of Helen Irma Imhoof.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That in the administration of the Immigration and Nationality Act the periods of time Helen Irma Imhoof resided abroad in the employ of the United States Ambassador to Italy shall be held and considered to be residence and physical presence in the United States within the meaning of section 316 of the said Act.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EDWARD W. SCOTT III

The Clerk called the bill (S. 126) for the relief of Edward W. Scott III.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, in the administration of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Edward W. Scott III, who was born in the Republic of Panama on May 25, 1938, of an American citizen mother, shall be deemed to have been born in the Canal Zone.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MICO DELIC

The Clerk called the bill (S. 138) for the relief of Mico Delic.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, for the purposes of sections 101(a)(27)(A) and 205 of the Immigration and Nationality Act, the minor child Mico Delic shall be held and considered to be the natural-born alien child of Mr. and Mrs. Eli Delic, citizens of the United States.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

HADJI BENLEVI

The Clerk called the bill (S. 177) for the relief of Hadji Benlevi.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of

*America in Congress assembled, That for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Hadji Benlevi shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this Act, upon payment of the required visa fee. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this Act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available: *Provided*, That the said Hadji Benlevi executes and files with the Attorney General, in such form as he shall require, a written waiver of all rights, privileges, exemptions, and immunities under any law or any Executive order which would otherwise accrue to him if he retains this occupational status as a treaty trader.*

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ALESSANDRO GELLHORN

The Clerk called the bill (S. 217) for the relief of Alessandro Gellhorn.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Alessandro Gellhorn shall be deemed to be within the purview of section 323 of the said Act.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ERICA BARTH

The Clerk called the bill (S. 277) for the relief of Erica Barth.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. HEMPHILL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

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

There was no objection.

ALPO FRANSSILA CRANE

The Clerk called the bill (S. 285) for the relief of Alpo Franssila Crane.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill as follows:

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, for the purposes of sections 101(a)(27)(A) and 205 of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Alpo Franssila Crane shall be held and considered to be the natural-born minor alien child of Mr. and Mrs. Radford Raymond Crane, citizens of the United States: *Provided*, That no natural parent of the beneficiary, by virtue of such parentage, shall be accorded any right, privilege, or status under the Immigration and Nationality Act.*

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MAH JEW NGREE

The Clerk called the bill (S. 292) for the relief of Mah Jew Ngee (also known as Peter Jew Mah).

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Mah Jew Ngee (also known as Peter Jew Mah) shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this Act, upon payment of the required visa fee. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this Act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

HARRY N. KOUNIAKIS

The Clerk called the bill (S. 330) for the relief of Harry N. Kouniakis.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Harry N. Kouniakis shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this Act, upon payment of the required visa fees. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such aliens as provided for in this Act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct the required numbers from the appropriate quota or quotas for the first year that such quota or quotas are available.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

HARUO T. HENDRICKS

The Clerk called the bill (S. 417) for the relief of Haruo T. Hendricks.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, for the purposes of sections 101(a)(27)(A) and 205 of the Immigration and Nationality Act, the minor child, Haruo T. Hendricks, shall be held and considered to be the natural-born alien child of Sergeant and Mrs. Joel C. Hendricks, citizens of the United States.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

STANLEY BULSKI

The Clerk called the bill (S. 532) for the relief of Stanley Bulski (Zdzislaw Rekosz).

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of

America in Congress assembled, That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Stanley Bulski (Zdzislaw Rekosz) shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this Act, upon payment of the required visa fee. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this Act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available: *Provided*, That the natural parents of the said Stanley Bulski (Zdzislaw Rekosz) shall not, by virtue of such parentage, be accorded any right, privilege, or status under the Immigration and Nationality Act.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MRS. ELIZABETH CLIFFORD

The Clerk called the bill (S. 545) for the relief of Mrs. Elizabeth Clifford. There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Mrs. Elizabeth Clifford shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence on September 30, 1956: *Provided*, That a suitable and proper bond or undertaking, approved by the Attorney General, be deposited as prescribed by section 213 of the Immigration and Nationality Act.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

NICOLAOS A. PAPADIMITRIOU

The Clerk called the bill (S. 555) for the relief of Nicolaos A. Papadimitriou. There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, for the purposes of sections 101(a)(27)(A) and 205 of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Nicolaos A. Papadimitriou shall be held and considered to be the natural-born minor alien child of Mr. and Mrs. James N. Demette, citizens of the United States: *Provided*, That the natural parents of the said Nicolaos A. Papadimitriou shall not, by virtue of such parentage, be accorded any right, privilege, or status under the Immigration and Nationality Act.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ANDREAS RAKINTOZIS

The Clerk called the bill (S. 663) for the relief of Andreas Rakintozis (also known as Andreas Rakintzis or Rakajes).

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, for the purposes of section 4 of the Act entitled "An

Act to provide for the entry of certain relatives of United States citizens and lawfully resident aliens", approved September 22, 1959 (73 Stat. 644), Andreas Rakintozis (also known as Andreas Rakintzis or Rakajes) shall be held and considered to be eligible for a quota immigrant status under the provisions of section 203(a)(4) of the Immigration and Nationality Act on the basis of a petition approved by the Attorney General prior to January 1, 1959.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CAPT. ERNEST MOUNTAIN

The Clerk called the bill (S. 894) for the relief of Capt. Ernest Mountain.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Captain Ernest Mountain shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of June 30, 1929, upon payment of the required visa fee.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

LEE DOCK ON

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 1458) for the relief of Lee Dock On.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, for the purposes of section 101(a)(27)(B) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Lee Dock On shall be deemed to be a returning resident alien.

SEC. 2. Notwithstanding the provision of section 212(a)(19) of the Immigration and Nationality Act Lee Dock On may be issued a visa and admitted to the United States for permanent residence if he is found to be otherwise admissible under the provisions of that Act: *Provided*, That this exemption shall apply only to a ground for exclusion of which the Department of State or the Department of Justice had knowledge prior to the enactment of this Act.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

LASZLO HAMORI

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 1394) for the relief of Laszlo Hamori.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, upon his admission for permanent residence in the United States, Laszlo Hamori shall be held and considered to have complied with the residential and physical presence requirements of section 316 of the Immigration and Nationality Act.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MRS. ANNELEISE FRANZISKA GUAY

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 1575) for the relief of Mrs. Anneliese Franziska Guay.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, notwithstanding the provisions of section 212(a)(3) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Mrs. Anneliese Franziska Guay may be issued a visa and admitted to the United States for permanent residence if she is found to be otherwise admissible under the provisions of that Act: *Provided*, That, unless the beneficiary is entitled to care under the Dependents' Medical Care Act (70 Stat. 250), a suitable and proper bond or undertaking, approved by the Attorney General, be deposited as prescribed by section 213 of the Immigration and Nationality Act: *Provided further*, That this exemption shall apply only to a ground for exclusion of which the Department of State or the Department of Justice had knowledge prior to the enactment of this Act.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

A. E. WATERSTRADT

The Clerk called the bill (S. 1097) for the relief of A. E. Waterstradt.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, notwithstanding any period of limitations or lapse of time, claim for credit or refund of overpayment of income taxes for the taxable years 1942 to 1945, inclusive, made by A. E. Waterstradt, of Takoma Park, Maryland, may be filed at any time within one year after the date of the enactment of this Act. The provisions of sections 322(b), 3774, and 3775 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1939 shall not apply to the refund or credit of any overpayment of tax for which credit or refund is filed under the authority of this Act within such one-year period.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

WALLACE R. PRICE AND NORA J. PRICE

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 1531) for the relief of Wallace R. Price and Nora J. Price.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Wallace R. Price and Nora J. Price, his wife, of Grand Ledge, Michigan, the sum of \$1,000. The payment of such sum shall be in full settlement of all the claims of Mr. and Mrs. Price against the United States arising out of a collision which occurred on September 11, 1953, between a United States Post Office truck and a vehicle which Mrs. Price was driving. This claim is not cognizable under the tort claims procedure as provided in title 28, United States Code: *Provided*, That no

part of the amount appropriated in this Act in excess of 10 per centum thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this Act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 8, strike "against the United States" and insert: "and their subrogee, the State Farm Mutual Auto Insurance Company, Marshall, Michigan, against the United States and Mr. George F. Brooks."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

WORLD GAMES, INC.

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 1687) for relief of World Games, Inc.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. HEMPHILL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

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

There was no objection.

RALPH B. CLEVELAND

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 4636) for the relief of Ralph B. Cleveland.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill as follows:

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Ralph B. Cleveland, Florence, Oregon, the sum of \$670.07, plus any interest on such amount required to be paid by him under the terms of the judgment rendered against him in the district court of Lane County, Oregon, as a result of a motor vehicle collision on May 4, 1959, near Deadwood, Oregon, between a privately owned vehicle and a Government vehicle being operated by him within the scope of his employment with the Soil Conservation Service, United States Department of Agriculture. The payment of such sum shall be in full settlement of all claims of Ralph B. Cleveland against the United States for reimbursement of amounts required to be paid by him under the terms of such judgment. Such sum shall be paid only on receipt by the Secretary of the Treasury of assurances satisfactory to him that Ralph B. Cleveland will use such sum, or so much thereof as may be necessary, to pay such judgment in full: *Provided, That no part of the amount appropriated in this Act in excess of 10 per centum thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this Act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.**

With the following committee amendment:

Page 2, line 11, strike "in excess of 10 per centum thereof".

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

RICHARD A. HARTMAN

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 4796) for the relief of Richard A. Hartman.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That Richard A. Hartman, Hanover, Pennsylvania, an employee in the postal field service, is hereby relieved of all liability to refund to the United States the sum of \$381.79. Such sum represents the amount of certain overpayments of compensation made to the said Richard A. Hartman through administrative error in the determination of his longevity benefits as a postal field service employee. In the audit and settlement of the accounts of any certifying or disbursing officer of the United States full credit shall be given for the amount for which liability is relieved by this Act.

*Sec. 2. The Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Richard A. Hartman, Hanover, Pennsylvania, the sum certified to the Secretary of the Treasury by the Postmaster General as the sum of amounts paid to the United States by the said Richard A. Hartman, or withheld from amounts otherwise due him from the United States, by reason of the liability referred to in the first section of this Act: *Provided, That no part of the amount appropriated in this section in excess of 10 per centum thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this section shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.**

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

HOUSTON BELT & TERMINAL RAILWAY CO.

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 6013) for the relief of the Houston Belt & Terminal Railway Co.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Houston Belt and Terminal Railway Company the sum of \$28,614.16. The payment of such sum shall be in full settlement of all claims of the said Houston Belt and Terminal Railway Company against the United States for reimbursement for actual expenses borne by such company for alteration of its bridge 3.62 over Brays Bayou in Houston, Harris County, Texas, which al-

teration was made in connection with the improvement of Brays Bayou for flood-control purposes and for which amount such company has not otherwise been reimbursed, and if Houston Belt and Terminal Railway Company had not made such bridge alteration, such alteration would have been made subsequently at the expense of the United States as a part of its flood-control project which included the improvement of Brays Bayou; and such bridge alteration inured to the benefit of the United States in subsequently carrying out such flood-control project which it approved and authorized: *Provided, That no part of the amount appropriated in this Act shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this Act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.*

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. AVERY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks on the bill just passed.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. AVERY. Mr. Speaker, I did not object to the consideration or passage of H.R. 6013 by the distinguished gentleman from Texas [Mr. CASEY]. I would like to point out, however, that I consider the committee report to be somewhat evasive in supporting the justification for the passage of this bill.

It is noted in the committee report that the Harris County Flood Control District was the local sponsor for a channel improvement project that was authorized by Congress on September 3, 1954, under the River and Harbor Act as amended. It is further stated that the local flood control district "was not aware that the cost of such alterations was authorized as a Federal expense." Despite their apparent lack of knowledge, they were aware that the plans for such bridge alteration had to be approved by the district engineer for the Corps of Engineers at Galveston. The plans for the alteration were approved by the above-mentioned engineer, but obviously he could not obligate the Federal Government to the expense of the bridge alteration, since this particular project had not as yet received construction money.

It is inconceivable to me that the local flood control district would have been aware that the plans had to be approved by the district engineer, and yet could have proceeded "not aware that the cost of such alteration was an authorized Federal expense."

I recognize this as a legitimate Federal cost of the project, but I do object to the manner in which it was presented to the Judiciary Committee and to the House.

MISS ELSIE ROBEY

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 6224) for the relief of Miss Elsie Robey.

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

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

There was no objection.

MAX BLEIER

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 1353) for the relief of Max Bleier.

Mr. HEMPHILL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

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

There was no objection.

MRS. JOSEFA PIDLAOAN AND DAUGHTER, ANNABELLE PIDLAOAN

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 1399) for the relief of Mrs. Josefa Pidlaogan and daughter, Annabelle Pidlaogan.

Mr. HEMPHILL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

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

There was no objection.

MANSUREH RINEHART

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 1477) for the relief of Mansureh Rinehart.

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

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

There was no objection.

IDO ENRICO CASSANDRO

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 1602) for the relief of Ido Enrico Cassandro.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, for the purposes of sections 101(a) (27) (A) and 205 of the Immigration and Nationality Act, the minor child, Ido Enrico Cassandro, shall be held and considered to be the natural-born alien child of Mr. and Mrs. Joseph H. Livaudais, citizens of the United States: Provided, That the natural parents of Ido Enrico Cassandro shall not, by virtue of such parentage, be accorded any right, privilege, or status under the Immigration and Nationality Act.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MRS. LILYAN ROBINSON

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 1642) for the relief of Mrs. Lilyan Robinson.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of

America in Congress assembled, That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Mrs. Lilyan Robinson shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this Act upon payment of the required visa fee. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this Act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert in lieu thereof the following: "That, the Attorney General is authorized and directed to cancel any outstanding orders and warrants of deportation, warrants of arrest, and bond, which may have issued in the case of Mrs. Lilyan Robinson. From and after the date of the enactment of this act, the said Mrs. Lilyan Robinson shall not again be subject to deportation by reason of the same facts upon which such deportation proceedings were commenced or any such warrants and orders have issued."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ELIE HARA

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 1677) for the relief of Elie Hara.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Elie Hara shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this Act, upon payment of the required visa fee. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this Act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

TOMISLAV LAZAREVICH

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 1888) for the relief of Tomislav Lazarevich.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, for the purpose of sections 101(a) (27) (A) and 205 of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Tomislav Lazarevich shall be held and considered to be the natural born minor alien child of Steve Lazarevich, a citizen of the United States.

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert in lieu thereof the following: "That, for the purposes of section 4 of the Act of September 22, 1959, Tomislav Lazare-

vich shall be deemed to have been registered on a consular waiting list pursuant to section 203(c) of the Immigration and Nationality Act under a priority date earlier than December 31, 1953."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MRS. FRANCISCA HARTMAN

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 2152) for the relief of Mrs. Francisca Hartman.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Mrs. Francisca Hartman shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this Act, upon payment of the required visa fee. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this Act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

With the following committee amendment:

On page 1, strike out all of lines 8, 9, 10, 11, and 12.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

REOKO KAWAGUCHI MOORE

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 2155) for the relief of Reoko Kawaguchi Moore.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, in the administration of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Reoko Kawaguchi Moore, if otherwise admissible to the United States except for the one conviction in Japan on June 3, 1953, of violation of the Narcotics Control Act and the Criminal Code of Japan, shall be considered to be admissible under the Act and not subject to the ineligibility and exclusion provisions of section 212(a) of the Act.

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert in lieu thereof the following: "That, notwithstanding the provision of section 212(a) (23) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Reoko Kawaguchi Moore may be issued a visa and admitted to the United States for permanent residence if she is found to be otherwise admissible under the provisions of that Act: *Provided, That this exemption shall apply only to a ground for exclusion of which the Department of State or the Department of Justice had knowledge prior to the enactment of this Act.*"

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MRS. TUI HING TOW WOO

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 2156) for the relief of Mrs. Tui Hing Tow Woo.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That in the administration of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Tui Hing Woo, also known as Tow Shee, if otherwise qualified, shall be exempt from the provisions of section 312(1) of the Immigration and Nationality Act as provided in the first proviso of paragraph (1) of section 312 of said Act, even though she has only resided in the United States continuously since 1937.

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert in lieu thereof the following: "That, Mrs. Tui Hing Tow Woo shall be held and considered to have complied with the provisions of section 312(1) of the Immigration and Nationality Act."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

JOSE LAUCHENGO, JR.

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 2835) for the relief of Jose Lauchengco, Jr.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, for the purposes of section 101(a) (27) (A) and 205 of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Jose Lauchengco, Junior, shall be held and considered to be the natural-born minor alien child of Mrs. Angeles Y. Sapota, a citizen of the United States: Provided, That the natural father of Jose Lauchengco, Junior, shall not, by virtue of such parentage, be accorded any right, privilege, or status under the Immigration and Nationality Act.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 7, after the words "United States" change the colon to a period and strike out the remainder of the bill.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The SPEAKER. That completes the call of the bills on the Private Calendar.

OFFICE OF INTERNATIONAL TRAVEL AND TOURISM

Mr. SISK. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 284, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution as follows:

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 4614) to direct the Secretary of Commerce to take steps to encourage travel to the United States by residents of foreign countries, to establish an Office of International Travel and Tourism, and for other purposes. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill, and shall continue not to exceed two hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, the bill shall be read for amendment under the five-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 57]

Abbutt	Fulton	Phillbin
Addabbo	Gavin	Powell
Anfuso	Gilbert	Rabaut
Ashley	Goodling	Rains
Auchincloss	Granhahn	Randall
Barrett	Grant	Rhodes, Pa.
Battin	Gray	Riley
Belcher	Green, Pa.	Rivers, S.C.
Blicht	Griffin	Roberts
Breeding	Gubser	Rodino
Brewster	Hagen, Calif.	Rooney
Buckley	Healey	Rousselot
Byrne, Pa.	Hébert	Santangelo
Cahill	Hollfield	Saylor
Cannon	Holland	Schweiker
Carey	Holtzman	Scranton
Celler	Horan	Selden
Clancy	Ichord, Mo.	Shelley
Clark	Kearns	Slack
Coad	Kee	Staggers
Cook	Keogh	Steed
Corbett	Kilburn	Stephens
Curtis, Mass.	Macdonald	Teague, Tex.
Dague	Martin, Mass.	Thompson, La.
Delaney	Merow	Thompson, Tex.
Dent	Miller, N.Y.	Toll
Devine	Milliken	Tuck
Dole	Minshall	Van Pelt
Donohue	Moorhead, Pa.	Wallhauser
Dooley	Morgan	Walter
Evins	Morrison	Wilson, Calif.
Farbstein	Moulder	Wilson, Ind.
Fenton	Nix	Winstead
Fino	O'Neill	
Flood	Osmer	

The SPEAKER. On this rollcall 331 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

OFFICE OF INTERNATIONAL TRAVEL AND TOURISM

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from California is recognized.

Mr. SISK. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROWN], and yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 284 provides for the consideration of H.R. 4614, a bill to direct the Secretary of Commerce to take steps to encourage travel to the United States by residents of foreign countries, to establish an Office of International Travel and Tourism, and for other purposes. The resolution provides for an open rule with 2 hours of general debate.

The purpose of H.R. 4614 is to promote friendly understanding and appreciation of the United States by encouraging foreign residents to visit the United States. To accomplish this, the bill imposes upon the Secretary of Commerce certain duties and functions described in the report of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, and provides for the establishment of an Office of International Travel and Tourism in the Department of Commerce to assist the Secretary in the performance of these duties and functions.

The encouragement of travel within the United States for the purpose of promoting friendly understanding and good will among peoples of foreign countries and of the United States long has been recognized as desirable.

Shortly before World War II the Congress passed an act to encourage travel in the United States, which created a Travel Bureau in the Department of the Interior with the authority to cooperate with and coordinate existing travel encouragement agencies of the United States, and cooperate with similar agencies of other countries, in the development of good will, understanding, and commerce by increasing travel to the United States.

In 1948 a bill which would strengthen the functions of the Travel Bureau passed the House but did not become law. At that time the Congress and the Nation were interested in taking steps to assist European nations in their economic recovery. It appeared that the making of positive efforts to promote travel to the United States at that particular time by the nationals of countries already short of dollars would be undesirable. Indeed, only a few countries then were in an economic position to afford expenditures for travel and most countries were so short of dollar exchange that they had been forced to restrict exchange for travel and other purposes. In keeping with the realities of the time the Congress not only cut off appropriations to the Travel Bureau, but included a provision in the Economic Cooperation Act of 1948 for the purpose of adding to dollar receipts of foreign nationals.

More recently it has appeared that as the foreign nations have achieved economic recovery and have been enabled to relax restrictions on exchange they have made available for their nationals to travel, it is only proper again to emphasize the benefits which might be received in a better understanding of the peoples of the United States if greater encouragement were given to the

promotion of travel to the United States by residents of foreign countries.

It is believed that H.R. 4614 is a desirable and feasible legislative proposal.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the adoption of House Resolution 284.

Mr. BROWN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, as the gentleman from California, my colleague on the Rules Committee, has explained, this resolution makes in order the consideration of the bill H.R. 4614 under an open rule with 2 hours of general debate.

When this matter came before the Rules Committee I was one of those who opposed the granting of a rule on this bill. A rule was granted for the resolution providing the rule was adopted by a single vote.

I am opposed to the adoption of this rule, and the consideration of the bill, for some very simple reasons.

H.R. 4614 would establish in the Department of Commerce a new agency of Government, a so-called Tourist Agency, with some 60 employees to start with, at cost of some \$3 million a year—that is for the first year—\$4,700,000 the second year, and only the good Lord knows how much each year thereafter, for the purpose of getting citizens of foreign countries to visit the United States.

Mr. Speaker, every penny of the money involved in the creation and financing of this new agency of Government would have to be borrowed by our Federal Treasury to be paid off by our children, our grandchildren, and future generations yet unborn, because we are already operating in the red—we already have a deficit. Our present tax revenues will not now meet the cost of Government. Every time we create a new activity or new agency of Government we do so on borrowed money.

I wonder how far we want to go in having the Federal Government, this great Central Government of ours, enter into competition with every free enterprise activity in the world we can possibly think of. We are being told by the sponsors of this legislation that we have to have a Federal agency to encourage the citizens of foreign countries to visit the United States and to tour this country. Yet we have a great many American as well as foreign airlines, and ship lines, also of other countries, busily engaged now in promoting such travel, not only to the United States by tourists from other countries, but also travel by tourists from this country to other countries. They are very busy, and have their representatives working all over the world. It is being proposed now that Uncle Sam do the same thing, all on borrowed money.

I just wonder how far we can continue to go with proposals such as this, when we stop and realize—I think it is very interesting to take the hearings on this legislation and read them—that in foreign country after foreign country, foreign nation after foreign nation, the governments have restrictions on the amount of money their citizens can take out of their own country for use in foreign travel.

I think perhaps the largest amount allowed under the restrictions placed on

such travel is \$700 for a person from England who wants to visit the United States or tour this country. Other countries have as low as \$200 as their restriction. I see some of you in front of me who just returned not long ago from visiting our Nation's greatest city, New York. I am sure you will agree with me if you have had the experience most Americans have when they visit that great metropolis, that probably the amount of money that each foreign citizen is permitted to take out of their own country for the purpose of visiting the United States would not take care of the cost of spending one weekend in New York, especially if they visit a nightclub or so. So, I am wondering if the next step will not be that we will be asked to furnish the funds for these foreign citizens to come and see what a brave and glorious and wonderful land we have, and how well we handle things in this country. We are told by some agencies of our Government that should know, that from some foreign countries practically all of the tourists and all of the diplomats and special groups who visit here, mostly at their own government expense, are actually engaged in various types of intelligence, and are usually working for the benefit of those countries behind the Iron Curtain. So, I suppose in this way we can encourage that sort of tourism as well as other kinds. But, in my own mind, here is an opportunity for some of those great champions of economy—and I have seen a number of them running around here rather lively lately and orating on the floor of the House—to say the time has come when we stop creating new agencies and new departments of Government, operating on borrowed money; that we begin to live within our own Federal income, our tax income; and that we try to balance the budget instead of unbalancing it by adding new Federal activities continuously as we have been doing. Now, you and I have watched—at least some of us who have been here throughout the years—how bureaucracy grows and thrives and spreads. You have seen these little so-called activities, little agencies of Government, begin, of course, with a high-sounding purpose, or for a good purpose, something nice to do if we could afford it. But, they grow and expand and spread, and instead of costing just a few million dollars a year, in a short time the costs are running into tens of millions, and even higher. By the defeat of this rule we not only have the opportunity to save a great deal of tax money, by casting an honest vote for economy, but also to save a great deal of the time of the House in considering this type of spending legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I hope that this rule will be defeated.

Mr. MEADER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROWN. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. MEADER. I would like to ask the gentleman whether or not consideration has been given to the employment of the U.S. Information Agency, which has offices scattered all over the

world as propaganda specialists and in a promotional type of work, to also attract tourism to the United States. What is wrong with using an existing agency already staffed rather than to create a duplicating and parallel agency.

Mr. BROWN. As far as I am concerned, I found no evidence before the Committee on Rules that there is any plan to use an existing agency. Of course, if we used an existing agency, then there would be no excuse for creating a new bureau or bureaucracy in the Federal Government.

Mr. MEADER. Does the gentleman know any reason why the U.S. Information Agency and its oversea staff could not perform this function along with its normal functions?

Mr. BROWN. Of course, I know no reason why they could not, or why other agencies of the Federal Government could not do just that. Of course, I am very well aware of the fact that the private enterprise transportation services of this country do have representatives abroad attempting to sell their services, their travel, to citizens of foreign countries who may wish to visit the United States and who are able to get the necessary funds with which to do it.

Mr. SCHENCK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROWN. I yield.

Mr. SCHENCK. I am very much interested in my colleague's explanation of the bill. I note that the bill provides for a \$3 million appropriation for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1962, for the purposes outlined in the bill; and thereafter not to exceed \$4,700,000. I am wondering if the gentleman will pursue his comments still further. It would seem to me that the spending of money in this Nation by travelers from abroad would create additional business and additional income in this country on which taxes would be paid. I wonder if the gentleman would comment further on that.

Mr. BROWN. I would be glad to comment on that. First of all I am sure the gentleman from Ohio, my colleague, who is a very learned individual, knows full well that we have never started any activity of the Government and then held the cost down to the original estimate. It has always gone up. Secondly, there is not going to be much taxable income generated by travelers from foreign countries who cannot get sufficient money to spend in the United States under the laws of their own country, unless we furnish that money to them. And, of course, that would be the next step, that we should furnish money to them so that they might see our great and illustrious land, these people who are unable to come with their own funds, or bring out of their country sufficient money to meet their expenses while they are in the United States.

How far does the gentleman think that a visitor from Denmark, let us say, with a \$200 limit, could travel in the United States, and how much wealth could he create in this country by spending his \$200 here? He would be lucky if he was able to get out of New York City.

Mr. SCHENCK. Mr. Speaker, I am happy to have the gentleman's viewpoint and I appreciate the answers he has given to my questions.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROWN. I yield briefly.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. As I understood the gentleman, he was needling some of us who talk economy but sometimes skid a little bit when it comes to a vote.

Mr. BROWN. I have noticed that.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. About this \$2 million that we gave to the Economic Council the other day. Was that not a little excessive?

Mr. BROWN. That \$2 million, as the gentleman has evidently not learned yet, was for the purpose of saving money, because more than that amount is being spent, through the employment of consultants, out of other funds. And this \$2 million was to be a limit. I regret to inform the gentleman, now that he has raised the question, that yesterday the other body took the limit off entirely, so now he can have his way, and still let them spend as much money as they wish.

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROWN. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, I congratulate the gentleman and commend him for his statement and desire to associate myself with him in his disapproval of this proposal. I wanted to ask the gentleman whether there were not any minority views expressed by members of the committee or anyone who appeared before the Committee on Rules.

Mr. BROWN. There were no minority views expressed at the time although, I understand, there were members of the committee who were not in support of the adoption of this legislation.

Mr. ALGER. I wanted to take this opportunity to say that I disapprove the failure of the committee to give us minority opinions within the committee because we on the House floor thereby are denied that information.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROWN. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HARRIS. There were no minority views. The minority did not ask to present any views. I do not think the gentleman should, by implication, try to leave the impression with the House that the minority was deprived of the opportunity to present any views that they might have. There was the opportunity to appear before the Committee on Rules.

Mr. BROWN. I am sure the gentleman did not mean to imply that.

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield further, so that I may reply to the gentleman from Arkansas?

Mr. BROWN. I yield.

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, let me assure the chairman of the committee and the members of the committee that in no sense am I inferring that anyone was denied his rights. I think the gentleman knows me well enough to know that I would not infer that. I have been on that committee and I regard it too

highly. I know how fair the gentleman was to this member of the committee when he was a member of it.

I wanted also to express my disappointment that those who for whatever reason disagreed with the purpose of the bill, if they did disagree, did not express themselves so that we on the floor of the House would have their views.

Mr. SISK. I have no further requests for time, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. BROWN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mrs. ST. GEORGE].

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, I think it must be thoroughly explained that this legislation got through the Committee on Rules only by an eyelash. There were certain circumstances that helped it along to get that eyelash.

It seems to me this legislation is typical of something that is going on not only here but all over the world and that is in direct contravention of what we used to believe was the way this Government functioned. It was well said that Government should do for the people what they could not better do for themselves. Certainly this question of tourism is a thing that private enterprise can do infinitely better than Government.

When Government gets into tourism, as it does to the *n*th degree in Russia, where everyone is furnished with an in-tourist guide not only to guide them but also to watch them and go through their luggage and briefcases in the meantime, it has certain merit, but we, I presume, do not expect to do that in this country.

Another thing, I think we are putting the cart before the horse. We are asking a lot of these people to come over here on very modest amounts. It has been pointed out, I believe, that the maximum amount that can be taken out of a foreign country for travel is \$700. We are inviting them to come over here. We are telling them they are going to find everything: a land of milk and honey. As a matter of fact, they are going to find transportation in this country very poor indeed compared to their own country. That I can guarantee you.

I sat at the feet of Dean Landis the other day. I do not think anybody is going to accuse the gentleman of being a violent reactionary of any kind. He informed us categorically that all our modes of transportation were, as he expressed it, very sick indeed. So it seems rather a poor time to force more work on them.

Reference has been made to the great city of New York. I will guarantee it is going to be very difficult for the great city of New York to accommodate more people than it is accommodating already.

Maybe it would be better, if the Government is going to do for the people what they cannot better do for themselves, that the Government assist the transportation agencies of this country, that we help the airlines, that we help the railroads, that we help all means and modes of travel, and that we give a slight lift to private enterprise so that they can take care of all of this rush that we wish to encourage into this country.

I am quite sure that the amount of money derived therefrom will not compensate us for the expense Government will eventually have to go to. Certainly it is true that in this bill the amount is very modest, but as the ranking member has well said, and we are thoroughly accustomed to that, this amount will have to grow, and it will grow and grow, and the bureaucrats who will have to administer it will also proliferate all over the country.

Mr. BROWN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER].

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I suppose that it is the style today to present to the Congress, as they have brought out in the past on the floor of the Congress, all sorts of legislation which lead us into the New Frontier but have no solid basis behind the approach that they make. If we set up another agency in the Department of Commerce we will never get rid of the agency. We will never get rid of the agency. It starts off with \$3 million and it only runs to \$4,700,000 in future years. How long do you suppose it could stay at that point? Frankly, I cannot see and I do not believe that it would be at all possible for anybody in the budget office or in the White House to destroy and break down the silly setup we have presented to us here to vote for today. Is there no sense of responsibility left in the minds and hearts of the membership of the House of Representatives? Is it not time that we woke up? Is it not time that we began to feel a sense of responsibility and to realize that we should keep out of such performances as the creation of new agencies in the Department of Commerce?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GROSS].

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, if there is any rock or stone unturned by which Congress can spend money on international deals, I do not know where it would be found. I would like to know who dreams up all of these international boondoggles. I would like to ask the chairman of the committee, Mr. HARRIS, who brought this bill to the floor of the House, a question. I call his attention to page 308 of the hearings and ask him what this item of \$50,000 is to be spent for? It is under the title of "Visitor Satisfaction Materials." What in the world could visitor satisfaction materials be?

Mr. MACK. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield?

Mr. GROSS. Yes, I would be glad to have the gentleman, whose name appears on the bill, explain that.

Mr. MACK. This is the budget which has been submitted by the Department of Commerce who is going to be responsible for carrying out the provisions of the bill. As I understand this portion of it, it would have to do with certain publications concerning this country to give information to the tourists when they are travelling within this country.

Mr. GROSS. Just publications? This would not have anything to do with anything in the nature of scotch or bourbon or gin?

Mr. MACK. Unfortunately, that is not envisioned by the Secretary of Commerce. On page 423 of the hearings, we have the budget as proposed by the Department of Commerce. I presume the gentleman has seen that—"Visitor Satisfaction—a modest budget should be available to provide training material which would be valuable to hotels, resorts, restaurants, etc., in developing in their employees an understanding and appreciation of the problems of foreign visitors."

Mr. GROSS. Let me point out to the gentleman there is already earmarked \$2,500,000 for advertising and \$205,000 for editorial promotion.

There is also \$814,750 for sales promotion; so this "visitor satisfaction materials" must go to something more than reading material. I hope that before the debate is over, if this rule is adopted, and I certainly hope the rule is defeated—if the rule is not defeated I hope somebody will explain to the satisfaction of the Members of the House what is meant by "visitor satisfaction materials."

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Did the gentleman notice in the press the other day that the State Department was becoming worried over the fact that some of these new members of the United Nations have three or four or five wives? Now, if they are worrying about that, undoubtedly we would have to supply quarters for those extra wives if they came over here.

Mr. GROSS. The gentleman has suggested another interpretation of what it means; on the one hand, it is reading material, and on the other it is the satisfaction of extra-marital relations or something that corresponds to that.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. It is quite clear they will be entertained here, but the gentleman would not advocate that a man should leave one of his wives at home, would he?

Mr. GROSS. Oh, of course not; no.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Well, I guess not.

Mr. GROSS. I do not know whether the Members of the House realize it or not, but I think it was in the third deficiency appropriation bill that the House appropriated a substantial increase in the appropriation for the bankruptcy referees and courts of this country to take care of not only the bankruptcies that are already pending, but the predicted increase in bankruptcies that will take place in this country. Why not vote down this rule and save the taxpayers of this country some money that can be used to prevent the increase in bankruptcies in this country instead of spending it for a lousy boondoggle of this kind?

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. BROWN. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time.

Mr. SISK. Mr. Speaker, I think it is evident by the questions that have been raised that the fair thing to do would be to adopt this rule and let the committee explain the bill.

Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the resolution.

The question was taken, and on a division (demanded by Mr. BROWN) there were—ayes 60, noes 37.

Mr. BROWN. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken and there were—yeas 241, nays 70, not voting 121, as follows:

[Roll No. 58]

YEAS—241

Albert	Frazier	Mills
Alexander	Friedel	Monagan
Andersen,	Gallagher	Montoya
Minn.	Garland	Morris
Andrews	Gary	Morse
Ashley	Gathings	Mosher
Ashmore	Glenn	Moss
Aspinall	Goodell	Multer
Ayres	Griffin	Murphy
Baker	Griffiths	Murray
Baldwin	Hagan, Ga.	Natcher
Barry	Halpern	Nelsen
Bass, N.H.	Harding	Norblad
Bass, Tenn.	Hardy	Norrell
Bates	Harris	O'Brien, Ill.
Becker	Harvey, Mich.	O'Brien, N.Y.
Beckworth	Hays	O'Hara, Ill.
Bell	Hechler	O'Hara, Mich.
Bennett, Fla.	Hemphill	Olsen
Bennett, Mich.	Henderson	Ostertag
Blatnik	Hosmer	Passman
Boland	Huddleston	Patman
Bolling	Hull	Perkins
Boiton	Inouye	Peterson
Bonner	Jarman	Pfost
Boykin	Jennings	Pike
Brademas	Joelson	Pirnie
Bray	Johnson, Calif.	Poage
Breeding	Johnson, Md.	Poff
Bromwell	Johnson, Wis.	Price
Brooks, La.	Jonas	Pucinski
Brooks, Tex.	Jones, Ala.	Quie
Broomfield	Jones, Mo.	Reuss
Broyhill	Judd	Rhodes, Ariz.
Burke, Mass.	Karsten	Riehlman
Burleson	Karth	Rivers, Alaska
Casey	Kastenmeier	Robison
Cederberg	Kearns	Rogers, Colo.
Celler	Keith	Rogers, Fla.
Chamberlain	Kelly	Rogers, Tex.
Chelf	Kilday	Roosevelt
Chenoweth	Kilgore	Rostenkowski
Chiperfield	King, N.Y.	Rutherford
Cohelan	King, Utah	Ryan
Collier	Kirwan	Saund
Conte	Kitchin	Schneebell
Cooley	Kluczynski	Scott
Corman	Knox	Seely-Brown
Cramer	Kornegay	Selden
Curtin	Kowalski	Sheppard
Curtis, Mass.	Landrum	Shipley
Curtis, Mo.	Lane	Shriver
Daniels	Lankford	Sibal
Davis, Tenn.	Lennon	Sikes
Denton	Lesinski	Sisk
Derounian	Libonati	Smith, Iowa
Derwinski	Lindsay	Smith, Miss
Diggs	Loser	Spence
Dingell	McCormack	Springer
Dominick	McDonough	Stafford
Dowdy	McDowell	Steed
Doyle	McFall	Stratton
Dulski	McIntire	Stubblefield
Edmondson	McSween	Sullivan
Elliott	McVey	Taylor
Ellsworth	MacGregor	Teague, Calif.
Everett	Machrowicz	Thomas
Fallon	Mack	Thompson, N.J.
Fascell	Magnuson	Thornberry
Findley	Mahon	Tollefson
Finnegan	Mailliard	Trimble
Fisher	Mathias	Tupper
Flynt	Mathews	Ullman
Fogarty	May	Vanik
Ford	Miller, Clem	Van Zandt
Forrester	Miller,	Vinson
Fountain	George P.	Watts

Wels
Westland
Whitener
Whitten

Widnall
Willis
Wright
Yates

Young
Younger
Zablocki
Zelenko

NAYS—70

Abernethy
Adair
Alford
Alger
Anderson, Ill.
Arends
Ashbrook
Avery
Bailey
Baring
Beermann
Belcher
Berry
Betts
Bow
Brown
Bruce
Byrnes, Wis.
Church
Cunningham
Davis,
 James C.
 Davis, John W.
Dorn

Durno
Goodling
Gross
Haley
Hall
Halleck
Harrison, Wyo.
Hiestand
Hoeven
Hoffman, Ill.
Hoffman, Mich.
Jensen
Johansen
Kyl
Laird
Langen
Latta
Lipscomb
McCulloch
Marshall
Martin, Nebr.
Mason
Meador
Moeller

Moore
Nygaard
O'Konski
Pelly
Pilcher
Pillion
Ray
Roudebush
St. George
Schadeberg
Schenck
Scherer
Schwengel
Short
Siler
Smith, Calif.
Smith, Va.
Taber
Thomson, Wis.
Utt
Weaver
Wharton
Williams

NOT VOTING—121

Abbutt	Garmatz	Morrison
Addabbo	Gavin	Moulder
Addonizio	Giaino	Nix
Anfuso	Gilbert	O'Neill
Auchincloss	Granahan	Osmers
Barrett	Grant	Philbin
Battin	Gray	Powell
Blitch	Green, Oreg	Rabaut
Boggs	Green, Pa.	Rains
Brewster	Gubser	Randall
Buckley	Hagen, Calif.	Reifel
Burke, Ky.	Hansen	Rhodes, Pa.
Byrne, Pa.	Harrison, Va.	Riley
Cahill	Hasha	Rivers, S.C.
Cannon	Harvey, Ind.	Roberts
Carey	Healey	Rodino
Clancy	Hébert	Rooney
Clark	Herlong	Rousselot
Coad	Hollifield	St. Germain
Colmer	Holland	Santangelo
Cook	Holtzman	Saylor
Corbett	Horan	Schweiker
Daddario	Ichord, Mo.	Scranton
Dague	Ikard, Tex.	Shelley
Dawson	Kee	Slack
Delaney	Keogh	Staggers
Dent	Kilburn	Stephens
Devine	King, Calif.	Teague, Tex.
Dole	McMillan	Thompson, La.
Donohue	Macdonald	Thompson, Tex.
Dooley	Madden	Toll
Downing	Martin, Mass.	Tuck
Dwyer	Marrow	Van Pelt
Evins	Michel	Wallhauser
Farbstein	Miller, N.Y.	Walter
Feighan	Millikin	Whalley
Fenton	Minshall	Wickersham
Fino	Moorehead,	Wilson, Calif.
Flood	Ohio	Wilson, Ind.
Frelinghuysen	Moorhead, Pa.	Winstead
Fulton	Morgan	

So the resolution was agreed to. The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Hébert for, with Mr. Kilburn against.
Mr. Auchincloss for, with Mr. Rousselot against.

Mr. Wilson of California for, with Mr. Clancy against.

Mr. Giaino for, with Mr. Van Pelt against.
Mr. Feighan for, with Mr. Dague against.

Mr. Garmatz for, with Mr. Devine against.
Mr. Evins for, with Mr. Miller of New York against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Barrett with Mr. Battin.
Mr. Green of Pennsylvania with Mr. Wilson of Indiana.

Mr. Nix with Mr. Cahill.
Mrs. Granahan with Mr. Fino.

Mr. Toll with Mr. Whalley.
Mr. Walter with Mr. Wallhauser.

My Byrne of Pennsylvania with Mr. Scranton.

Mr. Flood with Mr. Osmers.
Mr. Clark with Mr. Moorehead of Ohio.

Mr. Addonizio with Mr. Martin of Massachusetts.

Mr. Rodino with Mr. Gubser.

Mr. Randall with Mr. Dole.

Mr. Rhodes of Pennsylvania with Mr. Hruska.

Mr. Riley with Mr. Harvey.

Mr. Dent of Pennsylvania with Mr. Merrow.

Mr. Daddario with Mr. Reifel.

Mr. Brewster with Mr. Saylor.

Mr. Ikard of Texas with Mr. Tollefson.

Mr. Shelley with Mr. Dooley.

Mr. St. Germain with Mr. Gavin.

Mr. Morrison with Mr. Fulton.

Mr. Thompson of Louisiana with Mrs. Dwyer.

Mr. Moulder with Mr. Schweiker.

Mr. Morgan with Mr. Michel.

Mr. Moorhead of Pennsylvania with Mr. Minshall.

Mr. Donohue with Mr. Fenton.

Mr. Philbin with Mr. Horan.

Mr. O'Neill with Mr. Milliken.

Mr. McDONOUGH changed his vote from "nay" to "yea."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The doors were opened.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 4614) to direct the Secretary of Commerce to take steps to encourage travel to the United States by residents of foreign countries, to establish an Office of International Travel and Tourism, and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill, H.R. 4614, with Mr. YATES in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. HARRIS].

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 10 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, if I may have the attention of the Members of the House for just a few minutes, I think I can dispel some of the fears and illusions that have been expressed on the floor of the House regarding the proposed legislation. The Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce reported this bill, H.R. 4614, and urges its passage.

Mr. Chairman, this is a good bill; it is needed legislation. The committee has worked it out very carefully and have incorporated safeguards which, in my judgment, are desirable and, in my opinion, strengthen our recommendations to the House for your acceptance today.

Mr. Chairman, this is not a partisan bill. It is true that it is an administration bill, not only of this administration but also of the previous administration.

This bill is recommended by many people and organizations interested in the future welfare of our country. Many such organizations testified before the committee, travel organizations, hotel associations, airline associations, and so forth, as well as many Members of Congress. As a matter of fact, there were no witnesses who appeared during the course of the hearings and opposed the

legislation. The Secretary of Commerce appeared twice and testified on behalf of the administration, giving the background of the consideration of this proposal, the need for it, and the good it would accomplish for this country.

The purpose of the bill is to promote friendly understanding and appreciation of the United States by encouraging foreign residents to visit the United States. To accomplish this the bill imposes upon the Secretary of Commerce certain duties and functions, and provides for the establishment in the Department of Commerce of an Office of International Travel and Tourism to assist the Secretary in the performance of these duties and functions.

This is no Johnny-come-lately bill; this legislation was proposed years ago. During the last Congress the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, through its subcommittee under the chairmanship of the distinguished gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MACK], conducted extensive hearings. The other body had passed a bill and sent it over here. It was incontrovertibly established that insofar as international travel and tourism is concerned, the United States has an imbalance of \$1 billion; in other words, the people of this country who traveled abroad spent a billion dollars more in travel than did people from other countries of the world spend coming to this country; and the purpose of this legislation is to try to do something about reducing the imbalance.

During the last Congress, hearings were conducted before the committee, the committee was not satisfied with it as it was presented at that time and decided that if we had more time to go into it we could make a better record and perhaps bring to you a better bill. At least, there could be a better understanding and a greater accomplishment with it. This had resulted exactly as the committee thought it would when after hearings and executive sessions of the subcommittee in the last Congress the committee decided to postpone action until this Congress to give it further consideration and thus have an opportunity for us to go into it further.

During the interim several members of the committee have made an extensive study of the facts, what the situation is; they have made reports to the committee, they have testified before the committee, thus resulting in the bill we have before us today. I want to commend the members of our committee who have given so much of their time and study to it. I want to commend the subcommittee and the chairman, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MACK] and all members of the committee, for the extensive study they have given to this legislation and in preparing it for your consideration.

Mr. Chairman, a lot has been said here today about the cost. I think my record shows I am a fairly conservative individual. As a Member of this Congress I do not advocate spending all the money that we can authorize and appropriate. That is well known. I think you will find the members of our committee give very close scrutiny and attention to any proposal that authorizes an appro-

priation of funds by this Congress. This is no exception.

The hearings disclose it is contemplated to bring many people to this country who will spend their money here. The Government in turn will get in return manyfold the amount that will be spent in carrying on this important travel agency under the leadership and direction of the Secretary of Commerce, Mr. Hodges, who is well known.

Today I remind you the private travel agencies and private industries spend some \$15 million a year in carrying on this kind of work abroad. This does not in any way interfere with that operation, and it does not take anything away from their efforts. It complements what they are doing on behalf of our country in operating abroad.

Foreign governments spend in this country \$20 million a year in promoting foreign travel by our own people. In other words, there is more money spent in this country by foreign governments advertising and promoting travel abroad by people of this country. It would seem to me that it is time that we should try to undertake to get some of this back into our country instead of seeing everything go the other way all of the time. Consequently, I feel that the committee has done a good job in bringing this bill to you.

We are justified, Mr. Chairman, in asking the support of this House for this legislation.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARRIS. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Reading from page 7 of your report, it states:

In his report on the pending legislation the Secretary of Commerce suggested that it be amended to include an authorization for the use of counterpart funds.

It goes on to state that this was opposed by the Bureau of the Budget and the Department of the Treasury on the ground that a specific provision was not necessary, because that authority existed. Later the Secretary of Commerce suggested that that authority be not included. It seems to me that we should not only authorize the use of counterpart funds, but I would like to see it written into this bill, at least, a portion of it, and I would suggest even as much as 50 percent of any money that was spent for this purpose be in counterpart funds. Now, we have counterpart funds in many of these countries from which we are trying to attract visitors. I know one of the arguments will be that where we are giving away money, that they do not have money to spend to come over here. But, I am not sold on that. However, I think that where we have these counterpart funds, they should be utilized. I know there is a tendency on the part of many of our agencies of Government that they would rather spend U.S. tax dollars than to use counterpart funds that are available. I would like to have your comment on that, if you please.

Mr. HARRIS. The committee gave a great deal of consideration to the question. Not only was it discussed during

the course of the hearings and in the report that the gentleman referred to, but in executive session it was discussed. And, there is a lot of merit in it. However, we found in the principal countries where most of the travel would be expected they do not have counterpart funds available, and for that reason we thought it would be most inadvisable to try to require the use of counterpart funds.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Let me ask this question: In those countries where there are counterpart funds available, what would be the objection to requiring this agency to utilize those funds?

Mr. HARRIS. I might say to the gentleman, if he will permit, that we are going to have some further discussion of this matter when the chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MACK] takes the floor. It will be thoroughly discussed at that time.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. I understand that, but I wondered what your attitude would be toward it. You have a lot of influence concerning the passage of this bill.

Mr. HARRIS. In any country where it would be permitted, where it could be used, it would be perfectly all right, but the proposal we had before us was to use counterpart funds, and that being true, we might as well have no bill. That is the reason the committee reported it as it is.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, the bill, H.R. 4614, directs the Secretary of Commerce to first, develop, plan, and carry out a comprehensive program to stimulate and encourage travel to the United States by residents of foreign countries; second, encourage the development of tourist facilities, low-cost unit tours, and other plans within the United States for meeting the requirements for foreign visitors; third, foster and encourage the widest possible distribution of the benefits of travel at the cheapest rates between foreign countries and the United States consistent with sound economic principles; fourth, encourage the facilitation of international travel; and fifth, collect and exchange certain statistics and information concerning travel and tourism.

In performing these duties the Secretary, among other things, is to utilize to the fullest extent possible existing Government agencies; may consult and cooperate with those in or concerned with the field of international travel; and may establish branches in foreign countries as he deems necessary and desirable. He is specifically prohibited, in exercising the authority granted by this act, from engaging in competition with businesses engaged in providing or arranging for transportation or accommodations.

In order to assist him in carrying out this program and duties, an Office of International Travel and Tourism is established within the Department under a Director to be appointed by the President by and with the advice and consent of the Senate.

The encouragement of travel within the United States for the purpose of pro-

moting friendly understanding and good will among peoples of foreign countries and of the United States long has been recognized as desirable.

Shortly before World War II the Congress passed an act to encourage travel in the United States (54 Stat. 773) which created a Travel Bureau in the Department of the Interior with the authority to cooperate with and coordinate existing travel encouragement agencies of the United States, and cooperate with similar agencies of other countries, in the development of good will, understanding, and commerce by increasing travel to the United States.

Again in 1948 this committee considered a bill which would strengthen the functions of the Travel Bureau with respect to encouragement of travel to and within the United States. This bill, H.R. 6136, passed the House but did not become law.

At that time the Congress and the Nation were interested in taking steps to assist European nations in their economic recovery. It appeared that the making of positive efforts to promote travel to the United States at that particular time by the nationals of countries already short of dollars would be undesirable. Indeed, only a few countries then were in an economic position to afford expenditures for travel and most countries were so short of dollar exchange that they had been forced to restrict exchange for travel and other purposes. In keeping with the realities of the time the Congress not only cut off appropriations to the Travel Bureau but included a provision in the Economic Cooperation Act of 1948 for the purpose of adding to dollar receipts of foreign nationals under which—

The Administrator, in cooperation with the Secretary of Commerce, shall facilitate and encourage, through private and public travel, transport, and other agencies, the promotion and development of travel by citizens of the United States to and within participating countries.

Under this authorization the Secretary of Commerce created a Travel Division within his Bureau of Foreign Commerce. Whether or not as a result of the efforts of this Division, it is clear that the growth in the number of U.S. citizens traveling abroad has been tremendous.

For the past several years there have been various measures before the Congress culminating in bills which were the subject of hearings by this committee during the last Congress. During the course of our committee's consideration of the bills last year, a number of questions arose as to the proper format in which legislation should be drafted to carry out the purposes of the legislation. These could not adequately be resolved before the close of the session. Following adjournment our committee has given intensive study to the subject and indeed members of the committee were authorized and directed to make an extended examination of the travel situation in a number of foreign countries and have provided us with an informative and comprehensive report and recommendations.

On the basis of the committee's examination of the subject, of the hearings on the bills which are before the committee, and of the committee's familiarity over these past many years with the problem, the committee believes that this is an appropriate time for practical efforts to be undertaken by our Government, jointly with industry, to promote more travel to the United States.

It appears to the committee that there does exist a potential market of foreign nationals which can be attracted to visit the United States. It appears that for sundry reasons, whether from misunderstanding about the cost of travel and tourism within the United States, inconvenience and annoyance over visa requirements, competition from foreign tourist areas, lack of incentive to come here, different rates of commissions received by travel agents on foreign and domestic business, or otherwise, this market has not developed as it might.

It appears to the committee that there is a role which an official Government agency may undertake in supplementing the activities of others toward encouraging foreign nationals to come to this country. Our own travel industry is estimated to have spent in 1960 in 75 foreign countries about \$15 million, \$10 million by our international airlines alone. At the same time foreign travel interests are estimated to have spent in this country to attract our citizens abroad some \$20 million, over \$4 million being by foreign government tourist offices in this country.

The committee believes that the "selling" of this country as a place to visit for study, culture, recreation, business, and other activities, is but a portion of the job which needs to be done. The proper treatment of these visitors once they have reached this country is most important. At this time there is an acknowledged lack of low-cost unit tours, such as are widely available in other countries, under which foreign visitors can tour this country at reasonable cost. The committee believes that in the encouragement of such tours, an official agency properly has a role, though here the domestic travel industry, of course, has major responsibilities.

The committee is of belief that H.R. 4614 is a desirable and feasible legislative proposal.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. GLENN].

Mr. GLENN. Mr. Chairman, our subcommittee held hearings last year on similar bills to this, one of which had been passed in the Senate having to do with the creation of an Office of International Travel in the Department of Commerce, the same purport as this bill, H.R. 4614.

The Senate bill came to us late in the session, and our hearings were consequently both limited and late. The subcommittee was in accord with the overall purpose of the legislation; to increase the flow of foreign tourist traffic to the United States, and to thus stimulate the domestic economy; to reverse or retard the flow of travel dollars involved in our foreign payment deficit; and to expose as many citizens of the world as possible

to America as a travel destination. The Eisenhower administration approved the legislation. However, the then Secretary of Commerce did not give us the benefit of any detailed study or plan of organization and program, which was sufficiently convincing to the subcommittee to enable us to report a bill, particularly as to the estimate of a cost of \$5 million.

We, therefore, took no action last year on reporting any bill. Our capable chairman, PETER MACK, after consultation with the subcommittee members instructed the staff to work on the problem following adjournment, and several members of this committee, at the request of the chairman, undertook the making of a survey of the international travel picture in various foreign countries. Their endeavor has been of great help in the present hearings this year. The report which they filed is specific, detailed, and factual, and their observations and conclusions manifest what can be accomplished with this legislation. Mr. O'BRIEN, Mr. HEMPHILL, and Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI are to be complimented on the very fine performance of their assignment.

On the convening of the Congress this year, bills were again introduced to establish the Office of International Travel and Tourism, and a bill in the Senate was passed in short order. I introduced a counterpart to the Senate bill for which I am sorry. A cursory reading of the Senate bill made it appear satisfactory, but after the benefit of our hearings and our executive sessions, I am convinced that this bill, H.R. 4614, is the one that should be enacted, and I endorse it without reservation.

It is important to keep in mind that the worldwide development of tourism has become one of the most competitive business enterprises in world commerce. In many foreign countries it is sponsored and controlled by the national government. It is an instrument of their national policy.

The budgets of foreign countries for their official travel offices bears out their importance. Great Britain spends over \$3½ million annually, France \$2½ million, Canada \$2½ million, Ireland \$1½ million, while our budget for 1961 is only \$165,000, a little more than Finland, East Africa, and San Marino.

The practical results of these spending programs has poured billions of American dollars into the economy of other nations around the world. The emergence of many nations from the difficult postwar period into prosperity has raised the standard of living and enabled the citizens of foreign countries to travel.

This will be a new field for our Government to develop—its benefits can be only measured by the objectives, but they are sufficiently attractive and basically sound to warrant a reasonable investment.

Let me mention three objectives:

First. The program will seek to increase the flow of foreign tourist traffic to the United States at a rate sufficient to check the flow of dollar balances from this country arising out of our failure to

bring travelers to our shores in sufficient numbers. It is estimated that a billion dollars of our national payment deficit lies in the field of tourism.

Second. It will stimulate the domestic economy in direct proportion to the number of additional travelers, which can be sold on visiting our country. It is estimated that a European traveler spends a little over \$500 in the United States. An increase of only 100 percent in 4 years over the current level of visitors would pour \$250 million annually into the domestic economy in the fourth year of the program.

Third. In the competitive effort by the nations of the world to lure travelers within their borders, we can make an effective contribution to world peace and understanding. Unless the tourist, who is being sought by scores of foreign countries is attracted to our shores, he will be drawn to other destinations. During our hearings, it was reported by an American travel representative in England that Russia is putting on a massive tourist drive throughout the world, and can be one of our main competitors.

It must be continuously remembered that the function of the U.S. Office of International Travel will be to sell the United States as a travel destination. It is not charged with promoting transportation, hotels, facilities, or other specific features. It will, however, furnish necessary information to the potential traveler concerning those services or facilities essential to his plans. And keep in mind, that almost every State in the Union and scores of our cities have travel attractions, which will be featured in the program. There will be European and other offices for dissemination of this tourist information.

Some may ask—how can an average citizen of a foreign country meet some of the comparative high travel and lodging rates in this country? Our travel industry has considered this—in fact they have been working on plans to meet all obstacles, and one solution is the so-called package deal for tourists, either individually or in small or large groups—an all-cost trip meeting the requirements of all pocketbooks. I have found that Europeans like to travel in groups, and the one-piece bus tour method is one of the most popular in Europe. It permits the tourist with limited funds to budget his trip. We can duplicate it here.

All segments of the travel industry throughout the United States gave enthusiastic support to this program during our hearings. The steamship industry and the airlines gave assurance of cooperation in making fares attractive, and the most convincing factor to me was the complete study, analysis, and plans made by the Secretary of Commerce. Mr. Hodges appeared before our subcommittee on two occasions, and I was greatly impressed and pleased with his presentation of the problem and his program.

The record will disclose how minutely he went into the subject, and how well he has planned. He suggests a first year budget of \$3 million, and an annual expenditure of slightly under \$4.7 million

thereafter. Now, these are not just round figures; he submitted a breakdown of costs and allocations in detail. I am convinced that these requests are reasonable, and to do the job envisioned, they are necessary. Also considering all aspects, I am of the opinion that this can be one of the best and most far-reaching endeavors in the foreign field that we will have legislated on this year.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MACK].

Mr. MACK. Mr. Chairman, in the closing days of the last Congress, the Senate passed a bill similar to the one that we are considering today. My subcommittee held hearings on this bill but it was not reported because we were not completely satisfied with the provisions of this bill. While we favored the general objectives, we felt that several changes were needed to be made if this program were to be a success. Following this, three members of our committee made an extensive study and submitted a very valuable report. While the Congress was in recess last fall, I asked the staff of the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee to do further research and when I returned to Washington, I drew up H.R. 4614 which we are considering today. This bill directs the Secretary of Commerce to take steps to encourage travel to the United States by residents of foreign countries. It also establishes an Office of International Travel and Tourism within the Department of Commerce.

International travel has today become a big business and I am thoroughly convinced that a program of travel promotion is in our national interest both as a matter of economics and as an opportunity to promote international understanding. We are all aware of the fact that we have a substantial deficit in our balance of payments which has caused an alarmingly large drain on our gold supplies. Few of us, however, realize that one-third of this deficit is because of the great number of American citizens traveling in foreign countries. The travel deficit is approximately \$1 billion on an annual basis. This bill is designed to attract foreign tourists to the United States in order to reduce this deficit. The President in his message to Congress on February 6 made reference to the imbalance of payments and gold outflow. He strongly endorsed a travel bill to expand efforts to encourage foreign travel to the United States.

Other countries are spending millions of dollars annually in the United States and elsewhere to attract foreign tourists. Now that the people of other countries are able to afford a trip to the United States, it is logical that we should enter this field. Increased travel from abroad will have many economic benefits and approximately 10 percent of the money that is spent here will end up in the Public Treasury. However, the most important consideration of this bill is that it will promote friendly understanding and appreciation of the United States. It will give more people in foreign lands

firsthand impressions of this great country and an impression which is generally inaccurately reflected through our tourists traveling in foreign lands. It would improve our international relations by giving these people the true story about America—our Government, and our desire for peace. For these reasons, I think we are justified in using Government funds to sell this country as an attractive travel destination. Today, in excess of \$20 million is being spent annually within the United States by foreign advertisers to lure our American citizens to foreign lands. We are today the only nation which does not have a substantial government program to stimulate the growth of tourism.

Therefore, Mr. Chairman, I feel very strongly that we should pass H.R. 4614 to compete with other countries in this important area. Mr. Chairman, my committee conducted hearings on this and 15 similar bills in March and April of this year. We have carefully considered all the testimony received and we have accepted certain amendments which we feel strengthen the bill.

Mr. Chairman, I was somewhat surprised at some of the opposition that developed over this bill, which is designed to encourage foreign tourists coming to this country. During the last 3 years we have had a deficit in our balance of payments of approximately \$10 billion. We have lost \$5 billion of our gold supply. It would seem to me that the people who call themselves conservatives ought to be interested in doing something about it. This bill, as I see it, will do something about the deficit in our balance of payments and something about the loss of gold in this country.

I was amazed at some of the people who today are evidently concerned. Some of them, I notice, having opposed foreign aid in the past. I might say that I for the first time last year opposed foreign aid because of my concern over this very important problem. Therefore I am convinced that this Government does have a reason to get into this area, that the Government should conduct itself as these other governments are doing today in appropriating substantial sums of money to encourage people to come into our country to see what we have to offer here.

I might mention that in the proceedings of the subcommittee, and I believe we had hearings for some 2 weeks and have 500 pages of testimony, there was not a single Member of Congress who came before the subcommittee to oppose this bill. For that matter, there was not a single person who came before our subcommittee to oppose this legislation.

This bill was approved unanimously by my subcommittee. Every person on my subcommittee was in favor of this bill at the time it was reported, Republicans as well as Democrats. The first objection that was raised, I think, was raised in the full committee during the executive session. I could understand their concern because when this problem first came to me over a year ago I was not at all enthusiastic about it, and I raised several questions that were raised

in our executive session at the time it first came before our committee.

But in the course of the hearings all of these questions have been resolved. I hope that the people who have raised an objection to the bill today will take the time to read part of the testimony and, needless to say, we will be very happy to answer any questions you may have concerning the bill.

Mr. Chairman, in the closing days of the last Congress, the other body passed a bill designed to establish an international office of tourism. That bill came to the House. In the House, our colleague, the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. JARMAN], had introduced a bill and my subcommittee gave it consideration at that time. It is interesting that one of the questions I raised at the time this bill was before the committee had to do with the problem of foreign currency.

This year the other body did include the provision concerning foreign currencies in their bill. But, in the course of our hearings this year, it became quite obvious to us this provision was not necessary. The Department of Commerce already has the authority to use foreign currencies and it is not necessary to put any additional amendment in to provide for these foreign currencies.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MACK. I yield to the gentleman because I was trying to explain it for the benefit of the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. It seems I have been unable to make myself clear. There is plenty of authority for using all these funds, but in the past we have been unable to impress a lot of these agencies as to the desirability of using them, and I think you are going to have to write it into law and say that wherever these funds are available, they shall be used. That is what I am insisting on. I want to support this bill. I am in favor of this. I would like to see more people come to the United States. I would even vote to appropriate money to bring more people to America where they could learn about our way of life, and carry this message back home, and I think it would do far more good than much of the money that we are spending in foreign countries. At the same time I cannot vote for a bill where you are not requiring these agencies to use the counterpart funds which, in my opinion, will never be used unless we write it into law demanding that they be used.

Mr. MACK. I first would like to say that they do have this authority, that the Secretary of Commerce has told the committee he is going to utilize all the counterpart funds available.

Mr. BARRY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MACK. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. BARRY. I understood the previous speaker, the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. HARRIS], to say that if a mandatory provision to use counterpart funds had been included in the bill, we would not have a bill. Can the gentleman shed some light on that, if that is

a correct interpretation of the gentleman's statement?

Mr. MACK. I think the problem there, as it has been explained to me, is the fact that if you have a mandatory requirement in the bill, then they will not be able to get the funds necessary to operate the agency of Government if counterpart funds are not available at the time they are needed. I might say this matter is up to the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives, and if they decide to authorize the counterpart funds, the counterpart funds would have to be used by the agency or they would not have funds available.

Mr. BARRY. It would be possible for us to vote for this bill, if we believed the counterpart funds had to be used, first if the Committee on Appropriations so authorized in an appropriation bill covering the expenses for this agency of Government; is that not true?

Mr. MACK. Yes, this is a matter which must be determined by the Committee on Appropriations of the House.

Mr. BARRY. I think you referred earlier, or perhaps one of the previous speakers, referred earlier to hasty hearings on this. Was not that caused by our imbalance of exchange and imbalance of payments?

Mr. MACK. We had hearings last year.

Mr. BARRY. Does the gentleman think those who were opposed to the bill were heard as well as those who were particularly interested in it?

Mr. MACK. I think the gentleman will agree that 500 pages of testimony indicates substantial coverage.

Mr. BARRY. Inasmuch as the gentleman was chairman of the subcommittee I just wanted to make certain in my mind that he felt the opposition had been heard, too.

Mr. MACK. I only know that the hearings were well publicized, and that considerable time was devoted to this subject matter. We held hearings on March 28, 29, and 30, and April 11 and 12 of this year.

Mr. BARRY. And no one appeared against it?

Mr. MACK. As I say, we issued notices at the time the hearings were announced. The Secretary of Commerce appeared personally on two occasions before my committee, and I have news articles I received from California to New York. The hearings were extensively reported. I think most people who read the newspapers were aware of the fact that hearings were being conducted.

Mr. BARRY. As far as the gentleman was concerned, then, there was really no objection to the bill from the public.

Mr. MACK. No person testified in opposition to the bill when the subcommittee was holding hearings. No person to the best of my knowledge appeared before the Rules Committee in opposition to the bill.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MACK. I yield.

Mr. HARRIS. On that particular point I may say to the gentleman from

New York that the budget that was submitted by his administration in January of this year included about 12 pages on the question of counterpart funds that was referred to by the gentleman.

Mr. MACK. I might also say that the last administration approved the proposal. That was during the last session of Congress. I may also say that President Eisenhower designated 1960 as the official Visit America Year, but they recognized too late that they had failed to follow through with any type of program to make it a success.

Mr. KING of Utah. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MACK. I yield to the gentleman from Utah.

Mr. KING of Utah. During debate on the rule on this bill two rather provocative questions were raised, and I would like to have the gentleman address himself to those questions if he will. The first was: Why cannot the U.S. Information Agency which now has a rather elaborate network spread over most of the world, why can they not be used for this service since they have the machinery already set up?

And the second question, as I understand it, was: What can the Government expect to do which private industry has not already done? It has been testified that private agencies are already spending \$15 million a year in selling America. What would another \$2 million or \$3 million do that the \$15 million are not doing? If the gentleman would discuss those two questions I would appreciate it.

Mr. MACK. I would be very happy to, and I had intended to cover those subjects at a little later point, but will be glad to do so now.

First of all the airlines, the steamship lines, the travel agencies, and others are interested selfishly in promoting their own interests. The purpose of this bill would not be to duplicate or subsidize any corporation or any private business, but to do what is being done by other countries, such as Great Britain, to encourage people to come to this country as a destination, to give them information, and develop low-cost tours.

It is a separate function. You need a Government agency and you need a private agency to carry that out.

Mr. KING of Utah. Is it not the purpose of the private tourist agencies also to bring people to America, or conversely?

Mr. MACK. Yes. We made reference to this in the report. You have Pan American Airways that would like to bring people to America on Pan American airplanes. You have several steamship lines that are operating overseas. You have some travel agencies, a limited number, that are operating overseas trying to encourage people to come here. This is an official function that is necessary as far as the overall program is concerned, if you want to do it successfully. The State of Florida has an agency similar to this. I have requested certain information from one of the Congressmen from Florida, and I understand the State of Florida spends some \$4,600,000 a year to encourage the tourism and business into the State of

Florida. Incidentally, they have done it with a great deal of success.

If you are going to really be serious about the visit U.S.A. program, you have to do that. There is promotional work and advertising, and it will take money to perform that service. I hope that answers the first question satisfactorily.

The second question concerns the U.S. Information Service. As I stated last year when this bill was before the committee, several of us were concerned that this job could be done in another fashion. If the gentleman will look at the hearings of last year, I suggested that the U.S. Information Service could perform this function. But, after doing considerable research on the matter, it was quite obvious that is not a function of the U.S. Information Service. On the other hand, the U.S. Information Service will perform a function that will assist our representatives, and we will utilize their facilities, as well as the facilities of the Department of State, wherever practicable. So they do have a part in it, but they cannot perform the service and they are not designed to perform the same functions that would be performed under the provisions of this bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 5 additional minutes.

Mr. BRAY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MACK. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. BRAY. First, the gentleman mentioned, in response to a previous question, that Pan American is advertising to bring people to America by Pan American Airlines. He said that this legislation had a much broader purpose than that. It is a fact, however, that one of the great losses to the United States is the travel on foreign lines that have been subsidized by foreign governments.

Is there going to be any attempt in this advertising to get them to use American lines, both air and surface?

Mr. MACK. I know that the Department of Commerce would be very happy to have them use American lines, and I am certain they would not discriminate against the American companies.

Mr. BRAY. I would hope they would not.

Mr. MACK. I do not think the purpose is to begin a program to discriminate against the transportation of other governments.

Mr. BRAY. The purpose is to get them to come to America instead of going from America. A very substantial part of the loss has been due to Americans using foreign lines. If we are going to make no attempt to sell American lines, it certainly would not save us so much gold as if we would do that. I wanted to mention that because that has been one of the great causes for the loss of gold to America. The subsidized foreign lines are taking the business of Americans traveling abroad. If we do not make some attempt to protect our lines, like the foreign countries do, we are not going to accomplish very much, at least as far as our gold reserves are concerned.

Mr. MACK. I share the gentleman's concern about the amount of money spent on foreign lines.

However, I do not believe that it would be the objective to exclude the foreign lines from the benefit of this legislation. I understand that the Americans are spending approximately \$450 million—and these figures are not too accurate; they are estimates—on foreign carriers, and the foreigners are only spending about \$104 million on the American lines. So, the gentleman is correct. You would have a deficit of approximately \$346 million, which is part of the overall deficit. I think that something can be done to improve that situation, but in fairness I must say that I do not believe that is the objective to be accomplished by this legislation.

I might say to the gentleman, since he raised this question—and I notice that the gentlewoman from New York also mentioned the problem of our transportation system—that that is one of the things that can be accomplished here. This bill can strengthen our transportation system. There is a good possibility that the rates can be reduced if we can improve our flow of traffic and put it more in balance.

Today we have great peakloads going to Europe on the airlines especially in the spring of the year, about this time of the year, on in through the middle of July, and we have the peakloads coming back in the fall of the year. Since the Europeans take their vacations about the same time as the Americans, and if the program is successful, then you will even the flow of traffic, getting a heavier load, and therefore it would have the effect of reducing the cost of the transportation system.

Mr. Chairman, this is a very simple bill. It is designed to strengthen the foreign commerce of the United States and promote friendly understanding and appreciation of the United States by encouraging foreign residents to visit the United States and by facilitating international travel generally. Under this bill the Secretary is required to develop, plan, and carry out a comprehensive program designed to stimulate and encourage travel to the United States by residents of foreign countries for the purpose of study, culture, recreation, business, and other activities as a means of promoting friendly understanding and good will among peoples of foreign countries and of the United States.

The people on the Continent traditionally have traveled in groups. They have had group tours, and many expect the same kind of tour when they come into this country. The other problem is that some of the expenses are staggering when you get off the plane or ship in New York City and walk into the hotel. By group rates that can be reduced substantially.

I notice some of the congressional people went to New York on a special excursion that cost \$30 per person. I heard this morning of another trip that leaves on Friday and comes back on Sunday that costs \$50 a person for the week end. A travel agency does have a program for touring the entire eastern

seashore from Florida to New York for \$150 for a 14-day period. That is the type of thing that we hope to encourage so that we can attract more tourists into this country. The bill will foster and encourage the widest possible distribution of the benefits of travel at the cheapest rates between foreign countries and the United States consistent with sound economic principles.

That is carrying out the idea of the Bermuda Agreement of 1946 between the United States and Great Britain.

The bill provides that the Secretary shall "encourage the simplification, reduction, or elimination of barriers to travel, and the facilitation of international travel generally."

Also he is required to "collect, publish, and provide for the exchange of statistics, information, and schedules of meetings, fairs, and other attractions, relating to international travel and tourism.

Also we have required that the Secretary of Commerce—"shall utilize the facilities and services of existing agencies of the Federal Government to the fullest extent possible; and, to the fullest extent consistent with the performance of their own duties and functions, such agencies shall permit such utilization of facilities and services."

We are permitting him to "consult and cooperate with individuals, businesses, and organizations engaged in or concerned with international travel, including local, State, Federal, and foreign governments, and international agencies."

And also he "may obtain by contract and otherwise the advice and services of qualified professional organizations and personnel."

And he "may establish such branches in foreign countries, with the concurrence of the Secretary of State, as he deems to be necessary and desirable."

We establish in this bill the Office of International Travel and Tourism. In the bill which I introduced we provided for a Director rather than an Assistant Secretary of State. And we establish that the salary shall be \$18,000 per year.

The only other change made in the bill was that we authorize \$3 million for the first year and \$4.7 million in succeeding years. I might say, if some Members have any concern about the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, that my chairman has been most diligent in this area and required that we authorize a specific amount for future years rather than leave it as an open-end proposition. I concur in that. I believe if it is necessary, as some of the gentlemen here have indicated, to expand this facility, that they shall come back to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce for authorization before they can go to the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. Chairman, that concludes my statement, and I should be glad to answer any questions anyone might have, if I can.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MACK. I yield to my friend from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. How many consultants presently in the Department of Commerce have been promoting this idea?

Mr. MACK. As a matter of fact, the Department of Commerce was at first opposed to this proposal and only late last year agreed to go along with it.

Mr. GROSS. How many consultants in the Department of Commerce have been promoting this? The gentleman has not answered my question.

Mr. MACK. To be perfectly fair about it, I do not know of any professional in the Department of Commerce who has been promoting it.

Mr. GROSS. I did not say professional, I said consultant.

Mr. MACK. I do not know of any consultant today who is promoting this bill who is associated with the Department of Commerce.

Mr. GROSS. The chairman of the subcommittee held hearings on this bill and I am sure he knows that the hearings show that at least one consultant has been hired at the rate of \$50 a day plus expenses to promote this thing. He must know that; and I do not know how many more. But at least one shows up in these hearings.

Mr. MACK. I did not know; I was not aware of the fact that anyone had been hired to lobby the Congress on this bill.

Mr. GROSS. I did not say to lobby the Congress, I said to promote it. I would rather the gentleman would not put words in my mouth.

Mr. MACK. I must say I was not aware of the fact that anyone had been hired for that purpose.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. YOUNGER].

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Chairman, I take this time merely to say that I objected to the bill as it first came to the full committee on the ground that paragraph (b) in section 3 could be construed to develop a governmental agency that would be in competition with our own travel agencies.

I proposed an amendment to make sure that the Secretary, under the authority of this act, shall not provide or arrange for transportation for, or accommodations to, persons traveling between foreign countries and the United States in competition with business engaged in providing or arranging for such transportation or accommodations.

I do hope that in the conference our conferees will insist that that amendment stay in, because it was not in the Senate bill, it was not clear, and I think we should make it very definite that we are not trying to set up a governmental organization in competition with our own taxpaying organizations.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. CURTIN].

Mr. CURTIN. Mr. Chairman, I am on the subcommittee that handled this bill. I must say that when the hearings on similar bills started last year, I was extremely dubious as to the necessity for this legislation. However, as the hearings developed last year and as they were continued this year—and incidentally, I attended all the hearings

because of my feeling originally about the bill—I became convinced of the need for this legislation.

These hearings, which were conducted under the able leadership of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MACK], developed certain things which convinced this member of the subcommittee that this is legislation which is going to be extremely beneficial to this country.

The United States is one of the very few countries which does not appropriate money for this specific program. Tourism is a big business. It just so happens that we are not benefiting from this business the way the other countries of the world are doing.

Questions were asked of the various witnesses that appeared before the subcommittee as to whether or not this bill was being pushed for the purpose of having the Government take over the expenditure of money private industry of this country is now spending. It was proved, to my satisfaction, at least, that this was not the idea, that these funds were to supplement the funds presently being spent by private enterprise.

As a matter of fact, the National Association of Travel Organizations, which is probably one of the biggest organizations in this field, indicated that the members of that organization were spending approximately \$101 million a year now for this type of work, and, of that sum, approximately \$10 million was for promotional work in foreign countries. The witness for this group testified that the members intend to continue to spend that sum and, in fact, increase the amount they spend annually.

We may ask: Why is it necessary to have Government funds spent when so much is being spent by private enterprise? That question has already been answered, I think, but I should like to add that I feel sure that when a private industry spends money for such promotional work, it is spending it for its own particular interest. The airlines, for instance, are undoubtedly slanting such promotional funds to appeal to the sections of the United States which they serve. That is the reason why it is necessary to have these Federal funds to supplement that type of expenditure to promote travel to this country in general.

We were asked, Can you use counterpart funds for these purposes? Frankly, I think we can and should use counterpart funds wherever possible. Secretary Hodges was asked his personal feeling about the matter, and I believe that he said he was in favor of the use of counterpart funds, and if this bill became law he would explore that possibility to the fullest. He pointed out one thing we should consider here, however; I believe he said that counterpart funds are available usually only in the underdeveloped countries, that there are normally not counterpart funds available in the developed countries of Europe from which most of this traffic is expected to develop. Therefore, that would seem to restrict the use of counterpart funds.

It seems to me this is a relatively small expenditure that is being asked

for here and I think there are strong possibilities of a large return. Therefore, I urge the passage of this bill.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CURTIN. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. Does the gentleman have any estimate of the return that he so fluently talks about?

Mr. CURTIN. Secretary Hodges was asked that particular question. He was not able to put it down in dollars and cents. The question was also asked of the Secretary as to the currency restrictions of foreign governments and whether that would not restrict the amount of money that people could spend when they came to this country.

Mr. GROSS. The gentleman from Pennsylvania cannot tell us and neither can the Secretary of Commerce tell us whether this is going to increase tourism to this country or not; is that correct?

Mr. CURTIN. That is quite correct.

Mr. GROSS. So this is another one of these blank check operations—where we hope for the best and fear the worst—but the money is going to be spent anyway.

Mr. CURTIN. It is a promotional program and practically all the other countries in the world find it is a profitable expenditure, and I certainly think we ought to try it.

Mr. GROSS. Why did this go from \$910,000 to \$3 million.

Mr. CURTIN. I believe that the original expenditure asked for in one of the bills last year was this lesser sum. However, this year as the hearings developed, the witnesses itemized the amount of money that would be necessary until the next fiscal year. It is my recollection that the \$900,000 in that bill last year was for the fiscal year ending July 1961, and the \$3 million in this bill is for the fiscal year ending July 1962.

Mr. GROSS. I understand this bill has the support of the Kennedy administration; is that correct?

Mr. CURTIN. That is correct.

Mr. GROSS. And this is the Kennedy bill—or is it?

Mr. CURTIN. This bill also had the support of the Eisenhower administration last year. This present bill, I believe, had some reductions in the amount and some of the personnel originally asked for in President Kennedy's recommendations.

Mr. GROSS. President Kennedy wanted a Secretary, did he not, in the Department of Commerce to direct this operation?

Mr. CURTIN. That is correct.

Mr. GROSS. And he also wanted a \$20,000-a-year salary for this Pooh-Bah; is that correct?

Mr. CURTIN. That is correct.

Mr. GROSS. And I think originally he wanted to start this thing at \$5 million; did he not?

Mr. CURTIN. I am not sure as to the figure, but it was more than is set forth in this bill.

Mr. GROSS. So this is not exactly the Kennedy bill?

Mr. CURTIN. The idea in back of this legislation is favored by the Ken-

nedy administration and was favored by the Eisenhower administration; that is right.

Mr. GROSS. And it was thrown out by the Committee on Appropriations, and every time it has been tried in the past several years it has been thrown out. They tried to run it through the Committee on Appropriations and the appropriations for the purpose has been thrown out; has it not?

Mr. CURTIN. My colleague is more familiar with whether that is correct than I am.

Mr. GROSS. So we had to wait until this year to get a bill out of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce for this kind of boondoggle.

Mr. KYL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CURTIN. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. KYL. I did not find anywhere in these hearings a statement as to the number of tourists, the actual number of tourists coming into the United States from foreign countries and those leaving the United States to go to foreign countries as tourists. Is such a figure available?

Mr. CURTIN. I believe it is in the hearings. I believe it was submitted in a letter—which later became a statement—addressed to the chairman of our subcommittee, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MACK], from Secretary Hodges. I believe it is part of the exhibits attached to that statement.

Mr. KYL. I did find some figures of the nonimmigrant visa status people and, of course, a lot of those would be students rather than tourists; would they not?

Mr. CURTIN. That is correct.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield to me on this question in order to make it clear, the record of the hearings show that there were 455,000 people who came into this country from overseas and 1,500,000 approximately who went from this country to foreign lands.

Mr. KYL. Could the gentleman give me the number of the page that that information is to be found?

Mr. HARRIS. I would be glad to look it up and advise the gentleman.

Mr. KYL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CURTIN. I yield.

Mr. KYL. Is it not true that one-third of this so-called travel gap cost is involved in travel itself rather than in the stay within the United States or the foreign country?

Mr. CURTIN. I am not quite sure I understand the gentleman's question. Does the gentleman mean is it in transportation or is it in money left in this country after they arrive where we have this travel gap?

Mr. KYL. The gentleman interprets it correctly.

Mr. CURTIN. That is a question I would like to refer to the distinguished chairman of the committee who undoubtedly would be able to answer it.

Mr. HARRIS. I refer the gentleman to page 3 of the report in which there is a disclosure of the payments and receipts arising from foreign travel in the

decade from 1950 to 1960, from which he can obtain the information.

Mr. KYL. The purpose of asking the question was to ascertain if there was anything in this bill which would promote the use of U.S. travel facilities rather than foreign carriers.

Mr. HARRIS. No; the bill is not designed for that purpose at all. As the gentleman will remember, the gentleman from California [Mr. YOUNGER] a moment ago explained his interest in subsection (b) on page 3 of the bill in which he wanted it made abundantly clear that this was not to interfere whatsoever with what private carriers or transportation people are doing in this regard; in other words, this will not in any way arrange for transportation or for accommodations, or try to describe what type of travel should be used. The intent of the bill is to supplement the work of private industry and in this way encourage through advertising and so forth abroad this program which would inure to the benefit of the private agencies who are trying to develop travel for the transportation facilities of this country. We hope by this method we will recoup some of the losses we have sustained in our international balance of payments.

Mr. KYL. The point I wanted to make is that if we continue to use foreign carriers in the same proportion in the future as we have in the past the relative disparity between income and outgo so far as tourism is concerned would still exist, would it not?

Mr. HARRIS. I do not think you can view it that way. I think our own people should utilize our own travel facilities extensively. What we need to do is to change the situation where foreign travelers use other lines instead of ours. We hope to do so by this method. We hope it will encourage the use of our own carriers. And then there is the matter of the kind of accommodations they will have when they get here. The mechanics of this program have been worked out more or less consistently we think.

Mr. KYL. It would seem reasonable to assume that with a larger number of Americans going abroad than vice versa, our people must be using these foreign carriers to create this disparity which shows up, and I was hoping we might be able to do something realistic about it.

Mr. HARRIS. Of course, that should be the concern of all of us, but I do not think that is where the great bulk of the imbalance comes; that comes from money that is spent in foreign countries. That is what brings about the imbalance of payments.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. O'BRIEN].

Mr. O'BRIEN of New York. Mr. Chairman, I believe the RECORD up to this point is abundantly clear in one respect; that is, the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce did not bring this bill to the floor as a starry-eyed, ill-conceived, hastily constructed bill.

The gentleman from Pennsylvania mentioned a moment ago that he was

dubious at the start. Many other members of the committee felt the same way. That is one reason why we did not bring a travel bill to the floor of the House last year. I will admit I was one of those who wanted a long, close look at this legislation.

I had the opportunity of traveling abroad last fall to study this problem, as it were, in the field. One of the things in this debate which has puzzled me a little bit has been the reference, particularly during the discussion on the rule, to this bill being in competition with free enterprise. I suggest it is entirely the opposite. I suggest that it is a partnership with free enterprise; and I suggest, further, that the travel industry is big business indeed, and that every segment of it which was represented at the hearings and by the representatives to whom we talked abroad, favored this legislation. When I mentioned the travel industry, I am not thinking only of the airlines, the steamship lines, and the railroads, but I am thinking all the way down to the distribution of that dollar, to the little storekeeper who sells a pen-nant to a visitor for a dime. I conceive this agency as being the hub of a wheel.

The suggestion has been made here that the U.S. Information Service could handle this matter, that the embassies could handle the matter, that the airline travel agencies could handle the matter. What we need is a hub represented by this travel agency which can coordinate all of those activities.

We found during our investigations abroad that none of them separately can do that job. I admit very frankly at this point unless that hub, that core, is manned by capable, experienced travel people, the program will not succeed. I believe it will be so manned. I believe that the first \$50 million of additional revenue we get through these additional visitors to our shores will pay, more than pay off in direct taxation the amount appropriated in this bill, leaving everything additional to the general economy of our country.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'BRIEN of New York. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. I wonder if the gentleman will agree with me, this being an off year so far as elections are concerned, with the junketing number of Members that is going to take place all over the world, if the Members of Congress could not save the taxpayers some money by drumming up this business while they are junketing around the world. Could it be done somewhat in that way?

Mr. O'BRIEN of New York. I think the gentleman has his own ideas on that. Let me say that I have before me a 40-page document. I am not ashamed of the document and the words which went into it. I think we are better prepared to deal with this problem on the floor of the House today because three Members of this House did junket abroad and did study this problem abroad.

I would like to say finally, Mr. Chairman, that an experience I had in London one day erased the final doubt from my mind. I took a long walk in the fog

there one morning and I counted the number of countries which have official Government travel agencies. Some of them were very elaborate, indeed. There were 40. There was Great Britain, of course, but we went all the way down the line to little Malta, and I have an idea that those 40 countries are not just throwing money away. I think they feel that they are producing for their respective countries, and I think that the United States will benefit from the passage of this legislation.

Mr. MACK. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MACDONALD] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. MACDONALD. Mr. Chairman, I want to say a few words in support of the pending bill, H.R. 4614, to establish an Office of International Travel and Tourism, which I feel is of extreme importance. The most dramatic part of this bill, and I might add, my bill H.R. 4145 which is similar to the bill before us, deals with the outflow of gold from the United States. Of equal importance is the part that deals with the fact that if we can attract people here to the United States who have been neglected for quite some time, that the long-range point of view of this bill will be almost as effective, and that is giving proper perspective to the United States, and our much vaunted way of life to the people who ordinarily feel that it would be beyond their means to be able to come to the United States.

I think that the imbalance of the difference between American tourists spending abroad and foreign tourists spending here in the United States has become four times as large as it was less than 15 years ago.

During the past year it reached a staggering sum and made up almost one-third of our total payments imbalance.

I think that even more significant is the fact that the increase in this travel deficit in 1960 alone amounts to \$145 million. Unquestionably, the greatest single factor contributing to this deficit increase has been the explosive expansion of the numbers of U.S. citizens traveling and spending abroad.

This expansion, in turn, is largely due to concentrated effort on the part of foreign governments and international transportation interests to corner American tourist dollars through intensive advertising campaigns and promotional programs conducted in this country. Since World War II the United States heart of its foreign aid program has taken steps at home to facilitate travel of U.S. citizens abroad, and has provided both financial and technical assistance to foreign countries to aid in the rehabilitation and expansion of tourist facilities overseas. But little or nothing has been done to promote travel to this country from abroad or to prepare the tourists and transportation industries of this country to accommodate a substantial number of foreign travelers. For vari-

ous reasons, the so-called Visit U.S.A. in 1960 campaign announced by President Eisenhower never got off the ground, and the small amounts presently budgeted by the Department of Commerce for the initial work of an Office of International Travel, in my opinion, are completely inadequate to support an effective promotional program. The new Office of International Travel and Tourism would be created within the Department of Commerce with a budget of \$3 million for the first year and attempts to set up a realistic travel promotion program on the Federal level.

The bill I introduced contains an additional provision for the establishment of a Travel Advisory Board, to aid in the task of formulating overall policy with special emphasis on the development of the American tourists and travel facilities to fit the special requirements of foreign visitors. This Advisory Board would be composed of 20 members, appointed by the Secretary and would include representatives of all segments of the tourist industry. They would be individuals who, by reason of interest, training, or experience are qualified to advise and consult with the Director and make recommendations for programs and policies to be adopted. While I believe such an Advisory Board would be of real importance in stimulating interest and making the program more effective, I heartily support the provisions of H.R. 4614 which was authored by my good friend and colleague, PETER F. MACK. I know that this legislation will give impetus to a program which was endorsed by both the previous administration and by the present administration.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Delaware [Mr. McDOWELL].

Mr. McDOWELL. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 4614, which is similar to a measure I introduced as H.R. 5536, to strengthen the domestic and foreign commerce of the United States by providing for the establishment of an Office of International Travel within the Department of Commerce.

In my testimony before the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce I stated that I would support and vote for the committee bill if it adequately carried out the purposes I had in mind in introducing my own H.R. 5536.

Among the steps advanced by President Kennedy to ease the balance-of-payments problem was one to attract foreign investment and travelers to this country.

The bill we are considering today will make it possible to launch a major drive to attract foreign visitors to the United States.

It is significant that this legislation had the support of the Eisenhower administration last year, and that it has the broadest kind of support in the travel industry, and among leaders in banking, business, farming, and labor.

The Secretary of Commerce, Mr. Hodges, has endorsed it heartily, and many people have appeared to testify in favor of it.

The United States is the only major nation in the world today which does

not have a travel bureau to encourage people from other nations to visit our 50 States.

Because of the lack of such a Federal tourist agency, other nations are getting the tourist trade, and our travel deficit is growing at the rate of \$150 million a year.

In 1960 the travel deficit reached the alarming sum of \$1,200 million or the equivalent of about one-third of our entire balance-of-payments deficit.

If we brought home to our shores all of the dependents of our Armed Forces, as former President Eisenhower proposed, the saving would still be less than what is being drained off by means of foreign travel by Americans.

Americans last year spent \$2.2 billion abroad, while foreign tourists spent only about \$1,100 million in our own country.

It was shown in the committee hearings that American travel abroad has doubled since 1953, and this increase is largely due to the fact that under the active leadership and direction of national governmental agencies abroad foreign tourist and transportation companies have been engaged in a massive program of travel promotion.

The travel bill under consideration here today—like the bill I sponsored—will make it possible for the United States to expand travel in this country by people of other nations, and to encourage these foreign tourists to visit us for purposes of study, and activities in such diverse fields as culture, recreation, and business.

The Soviet Union has moved aggressively to lure tourists behind the Iron Curtain.

We must not lose sight of the fact that we are in a cold war, and it behooves us to get as many tourists to come to this country as possible where they can observe us at work, at play, in our homes, in our business, and governing ourselves.

In this way we will be able to build enduring friendships, and our visitors will leave our shores knowing us as we really are. They will go back home to become the best kind of ambassadors of good will.

Many of these tourists will come in the future, as they have come in the past, to the great State of Delaware.

Let me say that Delawareans will continue to display their matchless hospitality.

Our restaurants, our seashore, our famous museums and historic buildings and towns will continue to rest, relax, delight, and educate all of our visitors.

Rehoboth Beach has few equals anywhere in the world, and the French and Italians with their own superb beaches will find new delights at Rehoboth Beach.

Culturally minded European families will enjoy especially the new and stimulating way in which they can enjoy the arts in our State.

Europeans who have lived all their lives with some of the world's greatest art museums and galleries will especially enjoy such museums as Winterthur, with its matchless collections of American furniture, the Hagley Museum, the Delaware State Museum at Dover, and the Zwaanendael Museum at Lewes.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. ROGERS.]

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Chairman, as a cosponsor of this bill, I would like to join my colleagues in support of this legislation. I feel strongly that this bill is in the national interest, and of course we in the resort State of Florida have an interest in it as well.

As you know, this bill would seek to increase foreign tourism in this country by establishing American travel offices overseas, conducting promotional campaigns for travel within the United States, greater facilitating the processing of visitors as they enter and leave the United States, and easing travel restrictions. In short, we would greatly improve our image overseas by extending a warmer hand of welcome.

Previously, travel within the United States was considered a very expensive proposition, available only to a small segment of the world. But now, as more countries are showing the effects of prosperity, travel within the United States could become a reality for millions of the world's citizens if the desire to do so were created. A campaign to create such desire is inherent in this bill. I further believe that this bill meets with the action requested by the President. In a recent message to Congress, the President outlined the balance of payments problem and the gold outflow. In this message, the President stated that Americans spend some \$2 billion abroad on foreign tourism, but that only \$1 billion is spent by foreign travelers in the United States. Thus, Mr. Chairman, if a bill of this nature were passed, the United States could realize an additional income of \$1 billion.

It is my belief that such an energetic program outlined in this legislation would not only be a boon to the national economy, but the economy of every community and tourist facility in the Nation.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. LINDSAY].

Mr. LINDSAY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this bill. I have long been interested in this subject and have had legislation in for some time. Although I would have made changes in the bill that the committee reported out, I think it is an excellent composite of a collection of ideas and brings us to the hard, basic fact that we have to face, which is that it is high time that our National Government provided some national leadership in this all-important area. The fact is that the current balance of payments problem can be attributed in large part to the tourist gap. Almost one-third of the dollar gap for the year 1960 is traceable to the tourist gap. So, here we have got a hard, practical reason for the enactment of this bill.

It is extremely important also to stress the nonmonetary benefits that might accrue—the political, cultural, and educational significance of foreign tourism and the promotion of it. But, we have a tough-minded Congress here, and they are entitled to know what the facts are insofar as the benefit materially to be

gained by the United States in this area, so I will concentrate on that.

The tourist gap is well over a billion dollars. It is accelerating at the rate of \$100 million a year. It has been proven that there is a direct relationship between the amount of hard currencies that a country gains and the amount of effort that that government puts into the operation of the tourist business. Figures have been stated by the distinguished ranking minority member of the subcommittee, Mr. GLENN, indicating the amount of effort that other countries put in. The gentleman from New York [Mr. O'BRIEN], has done the same: Great Britain, \$2.8 million; France, \$2.6 million; and India, \$1.5 million per year.

The several States of the United States collectively spend over \$17 million a year in order to attract tourists into their areas. It is estimated that \$1 out of every \$10 spent in this country by foreigners finds its way into the National Treasury.

It seems to me that what has to be done in this country if we are to take a leadership position is to shift the whole point of view about travel to the United States. For decades we have as a country been obsessed with a kind of xenophobia. We have done just the opposite of trying to attract people to come to the United States. Our whole system of immigration laws is designed, in fact, to keep people out of the United States. Every tourist who comes to the United States must qualify under the immigration laws insofar as they apply to non-permanent residents of the United States and go through all the necessary redtape. We are so afraid that one of them might wish to settle down in the United States and become a permanent resident that we handcuff the business of encouraging people to come to this country. I suggest that what we have to do is to change the direction of the railroad train that we are on. For years we have been going in the direction of exclusion. Now it is high time that we reverse the direction of the train and start competing with other countries; that we ask people to come to the United States and encourage them to visit us.

This bill will bring together and provide leadership to the entire industry. This is a private industry, run by conservative people. But it is an industry which recognizes the need for national leadership. The industry is willing to spend money—to make substantial investments. They have faith that this program will work. They are willing to develop programs in order to attract the nationals of other countries to this country; but they do look for leadership. No one segment of the industry, be it hotels or airplanes, or railroads, or travel agents, is going to go out on a single limb by itself in the absence of a nationwide effort with a national leadership behind it.

I quite agree with the statement made a moment ago by my colleague from New York, Mr. O'BRIEN, that other countries which are making a national effort to attract tourists to their countries, are not doing it with any sense of altruism toward the rest of the world.

They are trying to attract capital to their own countries.

I agree also with the statement that this is going to require the assistance of professionals if we are going to do a proper job. The U.S. Government has got to take experts aboard if it is going to promote tourism to the United States.

Now, can the job be done? I do not think the travel industry would be as enthusiastic about this measure if it did not think it could be done. It can be done. Why do we stand in this Chamber and even for a moment make the suggestion that we cannot compete with other countries in this kind of thing? We are experts in package programs. We know how to do this, so let us begin.

Mr. Chairman, let me make one other reference. When I testified before the subcommittee which has written this bill, I emphasized the importance of the Congress taking steps to reexamine our immigration laws insofar as they apply to tourists. I mentioned that we give the impression of being obsessed with a sense of xenophobia, and we do. And one reason we do is because of the ridiculous complexities of our immigration system for tourist visitors, the so-called nonpermanent immigrants to the United States. When you think that a foreigner coming to this country has got to deal with the State Department to get a visa, with Health, Education, and Welfare for his health check, with the Treasury Department for his customs check, with the Justice Department for his immigration check, and now with the Commerce Department which is going to be involved in the travel business, you can see how utterly absurd it is that there is no reformation of this entire subject.

In addition to this, remember that there are in our immigration laws built-in restrictions against travel. For example, why are we bogged down with visas where tourists are involved? The Secretary of State should be given the power to waive the visa requirement for nonpermanent residents—tourists to the United States—on the basis of reciprocity with other countries.

Some say, How are you going to have a check if you get rid of visas? The Justice Department, which is responsible for immigration and our internal security, has made it eminently clear that this is desirable, and it ought to be done. What you would establish in lieu thereof is a less expensive and less cumbersome system of preinspection. A bill I have introduced would make these changes.

Another example: the burden of proof is on a tourist to prove that he is not coming to the United States in order to settle down permanently. He has to prove this before he can get a visa to visit the United States. Why should not this be changed? I believe it should, and a bill I have introduced would do so.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will count.

Fifty Members are present, not a quorum. The Clerk will call the roll.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 59]

Abbitt	Evins	Norrell
Addabbo	Fallon	O'Neill
Addonizio	Fenton	Osmers
Albert	Fino	Ostertag
Anfuso	Flood	Philbin
Ashley	Fogarty	Powell
Auchincloss	Fulton	Rabaut
Barrett	Garmatz	Rains
Bass, N.H.	Gavin	Rhodes, Pa.
Becker	Gilbert	Rhodes, Pa.
Blicht	Granahan	Riehlman
Brewster	Grant	Riley
Broomfield	Gray	Rivers, S.C.
Buckley	Green, Pa.	Roberts
Burke, Ky.	Harsba	Rodino
Byrne, Pa.	Harvey, Ind.	Rousselot
Cahill	Hebert	Saylor
Cannon	Hollifield	Schweiker
Carey	Holland	Scranton
Casey	Holtzman	Shelley
Celler	Horan	Smith, Va.
Chiperfield	Ichord, Mo.	Spence
Clark	Kearns	Staggers
Coad	Kee	Steed
Collier	Keogh	Stevens
Colmer	Kilburn	Stubblefield
Conte	Kitchin	Teague, Tex.
Cook	Kluczynski	Thompson, La.
Corbett	Macdonald	Thompson, Tex.
Daddario	Madden	Toll
Dague	Martin, Mass.	Tuck
Davis,	Meador	Wallhauser
John W.	Merrow	Walter
Davis, Tenn.	Miller, N.Y.	Watts
Dawson	Milliken	Whalley
Delaney	Minshall	Williams
Dent	Moorhead, Pa.	Wilson, Calif.
Devine	Morgan	Wilson, Ind.
Diggs	Morrison	Winstead
Dole	Mosher	
Donohue	Moulder	
Dooley	Nix	

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. YATES, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill H.R. 4614, and finding itself without a quorum, he had directed the roll to be called, when 311 Members responded to their names, a quorum, and he submitted herewith the names of the absentees to be spread upon the Journal.

The Committee resumed its sitting.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York [Mr. LINDSAY], is recognized.

Mr. LINDSAY. Mr. Chairman, when the point of order was made I had about completed my statement.

In conclusion, let me say that for the reasons that I have mentioned—economic, political, cultural, and educational—a new effort is required in this area. The promotion and facilitation of foreign tourist travel in this country is on all possible counts both good policy and good sense. The most immediate pressing reason is the necessity for positive action to help mitigate the alarming deficit in our balance of payments. More important in the long run is the need to open new and vitally needed channels of communication between the American people and our friends all over the world.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Bow].

Mr. BOW. Mr. Chairman, I have asked the distinguished gentleman from Illinois to yield me this time so that I might advise the Committee that I am going to offer an amendment to this

bill on page 4, line 24. This amendment will provide as follows:

Of which not less than \$2 million annually shall be used for the purchase of foreign currency credits owned by the United States Treasury.

This will require the use of foreign currencies in the administration of this program up to not less than \$2 million a year.

In some of the debate here today it was indicated that there were no foreign currencies except in backward Nations. I will say to the membership that I hold in my hand a record of the foreign currencies owned by the Treasury. If anyone is interested, when I have used my time I shall be glad to refer to any country you want to and show their foreign currencies owned by the United States Treasury. I am talking about France, the United Kingdom, Germany, and almost all of the South American countries; in fact, practically any place you can think of where this program might be put into effect there are foreign currency holdings. So I think we should utilize these foreign currencies inasmuch as we are setting up this agency abroad and going to use these moneys abroad. We might just as well be using the currencies we have in our possession.

I take this time, if anyone is interested in finding out about any particular country, to say that I have the record here. I will at the proper time offer this amendment to permit the use of foreign currencies for this purpose.

Mr. JARMAN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. JARMAN. Mr. Chairman, in March and April the Subcommittee on Commerce and Finance of the House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee conducted hearings on H.R. 4614, and 15 other similar proposals. We are today considering the reported measure, and I should like to take this opportunity to go on record as a proponent of the bill.

The legislation before us, if favorably considered, would establish an Office of International Trade and Tourism and would also impose upon the Secretary of Commerce certain functions and duties in carrying out the provisions of the measure. The primary purpose of the bill is, of course, to encourage foreign tourists to visit the United States thereby promoting friendly understanding and appreciation among this and other Nations. However, Mr. Chairman, it is to another equally important, and perhaps even more imminent, purpose that I should like to address myself for the next few moments.

At the present, most Americans are deeply, and I think properly, concerned about the outflow of gold from this country and the deficit in our international balance of payments. Intensive studies have revealed that an important aspect of the trade deficit accounts for nearly one-third of our total balance of payments deficiency. This has been referred

to as the tourist gap or the travel dollar gap. Defined simply, this gap is the difference between the amount spent abroad by American tourists as compared with the amount spent in the United States by foreign travelers.

Mr. Chairman, it goes without saying that this tourist gap is highly detrimental to the Nation's economy. It represents over a billion dollars lost each year to foreign businessmen and it means that in order to travel abroad over 1,500,000 Americans disregard the natural and scenic vacation wonders of places like Oklahoma and the Southwest in general. I would suggest this afternoon that the adoption of H.R. 4614 and the implementation of its provisions would develop an aggressive and effectual program which might result in a reversal of this trend. Foreign tourists would be encouraged to visit the United States and the dollars they spend would, I think, go a long way toward arresting the evergrowing tourist gap and correcting the balance of payments deficit.

Mr. Chairman, some Members of Congress may understandably hesitate to authorize a new program costing several millions of dollars, especially in these years of unbalanced budgets and a national debt approaching \$300 billion. However, I would point out that funds for a Federal travel bureau, in a very real sense, would be an investment realizing dollar returns as more and more foreign tourists visit America. Foreign trade and tourist dollars are an intricate part of our gross national product. With an increase of foreign visitors, which would surely come as a result of the enactment of this bill, we can expect an expansion of the foreign trade component of the GNP, resulting in an increase of the entire national income. Economically then, Mr. Chairman, there is justification for enactment of the measure before us.

In conclusion, I am convinced that fruits of action in this vast field of international travel are exceeding abundant. I have touched on only one major phase. There are, of course, many others that could be brought to your attention. However, that aspect already mentioned in my remarks is sufficient enough, I think, for me to urge the committee to report H.R. 4614 back favorably to the House, and to then join with me in voting final approval.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. HEMPHILL].

Mr. HEMPHILL. Mr. Chairman, I have been a member of the subcommittee which has been considering this legislation now for 2 years. When we first received the legislation last summer it was known as S. 3102, a Senate bill, which had an authorization of \$5 million. At that time, for the benefit of those on my left, not only had the Republican Budget Bureau approved the \$5 million authorization and the Secretary of the Treasury of the last administration under budget authority had sent a letter to the chairman of our committee approving the authorization.

When we examined the witness concerning the legislation we were not sat-

isfied that the legislation had been prepared with the proper background, even though it was proposed by the administration, so we did not report out the bill last year, because we felt they were not prepared. We made an exhaustive examination to determine whether or not this would be profitable to the United States.

In that connection, we found that for the Department of Commerce in previous years the budget had carried an item of \$75,000 for encouraging travel. When we were overseas on a trip of investigation we found that the United States of America was the only country of any consequence we could find that had not realized that traffic was a profitable business. Even though travel today is the fourth largest industry in the United States, even though the United Kingdom today is spending over £2 million, or approximately \$6 million, and even though such little countries as Denmark have a budget for this purpose of over \$2 million, today we question the economy of spending over 3 years approximately \$12 million in an effort to offset \$1,200 million of imbalance in our balance of payments. So this measure says we will offset 1 percent against the deficit to see what we get back. We will get back our investment tenfold if this program works.

If you are interested in what other countries have spent, look at page 386 of the hearings.

If you are interested in the facts of the record, look at it and the facts will tell you that other countries realize that this is profitable. When we were on this particular trip that some call a junket, we went to the State of Hawaii and examined carefully what the State of Hawaii was able to do. The State of Hawaii had a budget of \$2 million and they estimated that the tourist business had brought them as much money or even more money than any other industry they have in that great State of Hawaii. When we went to London and were trying to examine the reason for the vacuum which existed in our U.S. effort, we found that other countries questioned the fact that this great country of America had never seen the profit that other countries had realized. When I speak of profit, I not only speak of, perhaps, the \$50 million or up to the \$500 million which it has been estimated we will get from the tourist trade, but I am talking about the tax dollar that will be realized from the money that is spent in this country. If you are interested in the tax dollar, and if you want to read the record and see what the truth of the matter is, look at page 379 of the record and you will find the tax potential that will bring revenue to this country far in excess of this meager item that we are spending amounting to \$3 million the first year and \$4.7 million in the years after that.

It just does not make any sense to say that this is not an economy measure for the country. It does not make any sense to do what some of my friends call nit picking on this proposition where we can make some money for a change, and then turn around and try

to excuse their vote on some other proposition where we are giving away money with no possibility of a return.

Mr. MONAGAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HEMPHILL. I yield to the gentleman from Connecticut.

Mr. MONAGAN. I wonder if the committee made any investigation of the capacity of these foreign countries to spend money for this purpose. That is, I can see how some of the foreign countries might spend money to get Americans to go to their countries, but do they have the capacity to spend money to come here and spend money in the United States?

Mr. HEMPHILL. They not only have the capacity, but on pages 67, 68 and 69 of the record we have listed not only how much they can spend or take out of their country, but they allow them to buy dollars to come to this country to spend in this country. Not only have we done this—but just to give one illustration of what can be done, about 2 or 3 years ago under the auspices of one of the travel agents, 80 Swedish industrialists came to this country for the purpose of visiting in a group. When they went back to Sweden, after a period of 3 or 4 months had elapsed, they were asked what impact it had on their purchases of goods from the United States. This is what they said: They said, We went as a group, but if we had come as individuals and then come back to try to tell the group what the advantages are of trading with America, no one would have listened. But as a group, everybody has been able to see just what the situation is. That particular industrial organization is sending this year, and has sent every year since their first trip, 80 Swedish industrialists to this country to see if they can buy our goods to take back to Sweden to sell. That is the sort of thing that has not been examined, apparently, by the people who are opposed to this bill. They have not only not read the record, but they have not examined into the question of the impact of this legislation. This is the first legislation I have seen, providing for so small an expenditure, which has so great a potential of bringing you back the dollars that America is spending overseas in the currencies of other countries and bringing back good relations and bringing about an opportunity even down to the smallest villages for foreign visitors to come and visit with us and see how we live and learn to love us. The opportunity is unlimited at a price of 1 percent of what you are investing against—even if you want to call it gambling and I say it is investing, not gambling.

This is good legislation. It is sound legislation. Every other country in the world knows it is good legislation. They spend money on this sort of thing and they wonder why we have not spent money on it. Someone has questioned the budget on advertising. I questioned the advertising at first, but I realize in order to sell America you have to give them a picture of America overseas. We found out that you cannot even get a map of the United States so that people in other countries can make out a travel

itinerary for themselves. We found out that you could not get information about the United States.

In one place we ran into a situation triggered because Pan American had published a book. It was illegal for the government authorities to put out that book because Pan American had its name on it. We found that a private individual was buying copies at 75 cents apiece and distributing them so that people would know something about America. The people of this country wanted to go to America but did not have the information, did not know how to go about it.

We do not have offices similar to even the small countries of Europe, Cyprus, Malta; even the little country of Ghana has offices to lure travel organizations and travel generally to their country. I think we should be willing to spend a little money on the development of this the fourth biggest industry in the United States. I think it deserves at least the consideration this bill allows and the potential which this bill will promote.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DINGELL].

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this bill and urge upon my colleagues favorable consideration and an affirmative vote on its passage.

Mr. Chairman, I rise today to stress one particular point of this bill which has not been discussed with the attention I feel it deserves. We have talked about the potential that is present in this bill to make money for the United States. We have talked about the potential for tax revenue that is inherent in the bill. I do not want to belittle these things, but there is an even greater potential to the United States and to the people than the money that might be attracted by the very modest expenditure provided in this bill; that is, the possibility of bringing to our shores a large number of visitors; and this bill offers to us a vehicle which extends an opportunity for Europeans, Asiatics, Africans, nationals of countries everywhere around this world to visit the United States.

It offers a potential vehicle for them to visit us in unit tours, low-cost tours, which would probably be the way most of them can travel. As has been pointed out to us previously, most of these people do not travel as Americans travel, individually, but cooperatively. They travel as parts of business groups, parts of labor unions, parts of religious groups, parts of professional societies, groups from the same or a similar college, or groups with kindred interest. I would ask the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee which handled this particular bill, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MACK] a question which I would ask him to discuss. Page 3 of the bill, subsection (2), reads as follows:

(2) May consult and cooperate with individuals, businesses, and organizations engaged in or concerned with international travel, including local, State, Federal, and foreign governments, and international agencies;

I am sure my colleague recalls that we discussed the proposition of whether

this could not be utilized by the Secretary to stimulate and encourage low-cost tours and to encourage American organizations and American travel associations, various trade unions, which are engaged in cooperative programs of travel abroad. I would ask the chairman of the subcommittee whether or not my understanding is correct that this section will encourage the Secretary to cooperate and assist these organizations that are engaged already in these programs, to assist them in bringing their alter egos in other lands to this country under cooperative programs?

Mr. MACK. I may say to the gentleman in two of the bills we have instructed the Secretary to refer to the development of tourist facilities, low-cost unit tours, and other arrangements with the United States in meeting the requirements. I would think he would be interested in developing various groups within this country, the ones the gentleman has mentioned, in order to have some assistance in developing tours in this country. One of the big problems in connection with the program and to make the business attractive is as the gentleman has outlined, and I am sure the Director or the Secretary would want to consult those groups.

Mr. DINGELL. I would like to point out that we are spending in this country right now billions of dollars to encourage friendship abroad through the various exchange programs and through programs which we have in the State Department and other Government agencies to bring foreign nationals within our boundaries to see our country.

In subsection (1) of section 2, it is stated:

The "Secretary" shall—(1) develop, plan, and carry out a comprehensive program designed to stimulate and encourage travel to the United States by residents of foreign countries for the purpose of study, culture, recreation, business, and other activities as a means of promoting friendly understanding and good will among peoples of foreign countries and of the United States.

Under these two sections a program of great benefit could be conferred upon our people in the encouragement of international travel. Dollars can be earned. More important we can earn friends in a battle for men's minds with atheistic godless communism—visitors to our shores will have an opportunity to learn of our way—its virtues and of our concern for the dignity of man.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN].

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I promised to yield back part of my time.

Mr. GROSS. Do not be in a hurry. We have the rest of the afternoon. This is the shank of the afternoon.

I wonder if the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DINGELL] would like to see these tourists equipped with Mercedes, Volkswagens, or Fords made in England, or whether they will bring their own cars when they come to this country, and perhaps sell them here to compete

with the auto industry in Michigan. I do not know of any exclusions in this bill.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I do not like to ask any embarrassing questions.

Mr. GROSS. I would not want the gentleman to ask such questions.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I have the highest admiration for the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DINGELL]. Since cars have been coming in from abroad, I do not know how he regards some activities.

Mr. GROSS. The tourists will have to have a car; will they not? The tourists will have to have an automobile to travel in when they come to this country.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I have no idea of what they will want. Has the gentleman?

Mr. GROSS. No; but I assume we will be providing them in one way or another with automobiles before we get through with this, if we follow the usual procedure in dealing with foreigners in this country.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Is it a good idea we have here in this bill to encourage these people to come here from abroad on the theory they may spend some of their money here? They might be induced to do that, provided we continue this foreign aid program and give them the money so that they can come over. Some folks do not think that will be very helpful overall.

Someday, sometime, someone will have to say something about our own national security, but realizing how the House talks, acts, and votes until adversity comes—until we have no more dollars to spend—can borrow no more—the spending seems certain to continue. But just a word about our present situation.

SELF-PRESERVATION

Mr. Chairman, now or later, if we are to survive as a nation, the administration will be forced to adopt a positive, aggressive policy—determine what we must do for our own protection and then aggressively follow through.

Yesterday, for 40 minutes, the House debated House Concurrent Resolution 226, which states:

It is the sense of the Congress that such steps as may be necessary should be initiated in the Organization of American States to reevaluate the role of the Government of Cuba in inter-American affairs for the purpose of imposing sanctions under the Inter-American Treaty of Reciprocal Assistance; and also to exclude representatives of the Government of Cuba from attendance at meetings of the Inter-American Defense Board.

Tomorrow, there may be a yea-and-nay vote on the adoption of this resolution.

We are asking the 20 nations of the Organization of American States to take action to protect our future existence. This because, by joining this and other international organizations, we have surrendered our right to act independently, even though our national existence may be at stake.

We are now confronted by the fact that we must either make good our promises to others or, violating those

agreements, do whatever we think is necessary to retain our independence, make secure our future existence as a nation.

My vote will again, as always in the past, be cast against a surrender of the power to determine our own course in world affairs, instead of placing our future in the hands of a one world or some international organization.

That we must before too long make a vital decision is evident from the editorial in the May 20 issue of the Saturday Evening Post, which I read:

THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA CAN'T AFFORD ANOTHER FIASCO IN CUBA

It ought to be plain to everybody by this time that no insurrection against Castro's Soviet satellite in Cuba is going to succeed without U.S. assistance, and a lot more of it than was available for the abortive and scandalously overadvertised putsch of last month. With Soviet military equipment on the ground, as detailed in the Kennedy-Schlesinger memorandum, a successful revolt on a far larger scale than this fiasco is not in the wood.

The mystery of why it was encouraged remains. Statements by President Kennedy and State Department officials that this country was not involved certainly did little to boost morale among the Cuban rebels. A failure by the Central Intelligence Agency to evaluate the strength of the movement is obvious. Apparently underrated was the ability of Castro's police state apparatus to deal with such outbreaks unless seriously supported by us. In any event, this country has again invited the gibe "Too little and too late" from friend and foe alike.

Certainly all Americans will respond with gratitude to President Kennedy's courageous assurance that we do not intend to permit Cuba to be abandoned to the Communists and that this Government will not hesitate in meeting its primary obligations, which are to the security of our Nation. It is unfortunate, of course, that this plain truth could not have been laid on the line earlier, most appropriately during the previous administration when Castro's Communist connection had been established beyond doubt—and before the Soviet Union had committed so much materiel and prestige to the adventure.

Now, instead of dispelling a threatening situation, we must deal with an accomplished fact. However, we shall have to make do with what we have, trusting that from now on officialdom will be guided, if not by wisdom from on high, at least by better intelligence work than appears to have been provided by CIA.

For whatever action is decided on, Khrushchev has provided more than ample justification. By stating that Soviet forces will "render the Cuban people all necessary assistance in beating back any armed attack on Cuba," the Soviet dictator underscores the Soviet involvement in this grassroots revolution. Surely world opinion, if anybody is worried about that, cannot fairly condemn the United States for any course deemed necessary to deal with this invasion of the West.

If intervention is the only way out, such a course should be as acceptable to Americans as a possible involvement in Laos, which the public seems to contemplate calmly. For a country which has been involved in two world wars and one costly police action in areas far from our shores, prevention of a Soviet satellite a few miles off Florida ought to be routine. Unless survival has become a dirty word, we have nothing to apologize for in Cuba except failure.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. FASCELL].

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the bill under consideration to create within the Commerce Department an Office of International Travel and Tourism. I was pleased to cosponsor this legislation and am gratified that the committee has given us this early opportunity to vote on it.

As a member of the Foreign Affairs Committee of the House, I enjoy the privilege of examining closely and discussing at length all of the elements of our international policies and programs. The basic underlying purpose of these is to assist other people in promoting their material welfare and in preserving their God-given right to govern themselves in a free and democratic society. Frequently the implementation of these policies and the administration of these programs comes in for some fortified criticism and de-evaluation. Much of this criticism is engendered by a basic lack of understanding of and appreciation for the different backgrounds, training, culture, customs, and ambitions of people of the Old World and the New. Our continuing challenge, therefore, is to find effective ways and means of developing the kind of understanding and appreciation so badly needed.

I consider the objectives of this legislation are a step in the right direction toward meeting that challenge. The success of our educational, cultural, and scientific exchange program has shown there is no more effective way for people to get to know and understand one another than by giving them the opportunity to travel and live abroad, to observe one another in their individual home surroundings and to see for one's self the day-to-day activities, modes and mores that go to make up the whole personality of a man and his reflection of and impression on his national government.

The effects of previous legislative measures to encourage our people to travel abroad and tour foreign cities of the world have meant a great deal to our citizens and have accounted for a large measure of continuing interest in and accelerated concern for the problems and aspirations of people in foreign lands. Evidence of this interest is the growing number of citizens, business leaders, labor organizations, civic clubs, who have joined and actively participate in the people-to-people groups which have sprung up all over our country.

I consider this measure a type of people-to-people activity, in that it is designed to encourage foreign visitors to our country. The Office of International Travel through branch offices to be established throughout the world, will help in encouraging low-cost travel programs, will assist in facilitating necessary travel documents, and will make itself available to answer questions and generally assist in promoting travel to our shores, and throughout our country.

I would suggest that in setting up these offices abroad particular attention

be paid to including the words "U.S. Government" Office of International Travel and Tourism. This will make it clear that it is an official office of our Government and will avoid any doubt or confusion which might arise as to its identity. There are numerous varieties of travel offices and agencies all over the world with similar names and the words "U.S. Government" should be used to distinguish this Office from any commercial enterprise.

I join the other Members of the House who commend Committee Chairman HARRIS and Subcommittee Chairman MACK for getting this bill to the House. I hope for its speedy enactment and implementation.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Utah [Mr. KING].

Mr. KING of Utah. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 4614, which is designed to create an Office of International Travel and Tourism. The function of this Office will be, as I understand, to promote more travel in America on the part of our foreign neighbors and friends.

As a representative from Utah, a typically Western State, I see unlimited possibilities in this Office. The West is a land of fantastic scenery, of vast plains, of rugged mountains, of incomprehensible geological formations, of colorful and stirring history. It is typically American. I hope that this new Office, once it becomes operational, will give adequate publicity to the West, to the end that the latter might receive its fair share of the tourist dollar.

During the debate, one of the gentlemen in opposition to the bill suggested that New York might have difficulty in accommodating all of the tourists who will come to our shores. May I remind you, Mr. Chairman, that the West has no such problem. I am told that one could drop every man, woman, and child on the face of the earth into the recesses of the Grand Canyon, and thereafter would have difficulty in finding them. Space is no problem in the West. We will take every tourist that the world can send us, and will see that he has the finest tourist experience of his life.

I am not suggesting for a moment that the other sections of our great land be slighted. Each one has its unique contribution, and each one should receive full consideration. We must recognize, however, that the West is geographically removed from the place where the vast majority of these tourists will first set foot on American soil. I am suggesting, therefore, that the Director of the new Office of International Travel and Tourism make a particular effort to encourage tourists to extend their proposed itinerary to all parts of the Nation, and particularly to the West. Bryce Canyon, Zion Canyon, Rainbow Natural Bridge, Salt Lake City, Yellowstone, Grand Canyon—these are but a few of the fantastic experiences that await the newcomer to America. It is my hope that these experiences may become realities, and that through them, many millions of Europeans, Africans, Asians, Australians, and South and Central

Americans may come to know us better, and that through this greater enlightenment, the cause of peace and international understanding may be served.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. BENNETT].

Mr. BENNETT of Florida. Mr. Chairman, this bill offers a splendid and positive approach to two problems, the need to have more tourist travel from abroad in our country and the need to improve the balance of money exchange between our country and other nations. There are safeguards in the legislation to protect the security of our country. The bill is in a modest amount when the possibilities of return are considered.

I sincerely hope that the House will pass the measure promptly.

The CHAIRMAN. All time having expired, the Clerk will read the bill for amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That it is the purpose of this Act to strengthen the domestic and foreign commerce of the United States, and promote friendly understanding and appreciation of the United States by encouraging foreign residents to visit the United States and by facilitating international travel generally.

Sec. 2. In order to carry out the purpose of this Act the Secretary of Commerce (hereafter in this Act referred to as the "Secretary") shall—

(1) develop, plan, and carry out a comprehensive program designed to stimulate and encourage travel to the United States by residents of foreign countries for the purpose of study, culture, recreation, business, and other activities as a means of promoting friendly understanding and good will among peoples of foreign countries and of the United States;

(2) encourage the development of tourist facilities, low cost unit tours, and other arrangements within the United States for meeting the requirements of foreign visitors;

(3) foster and encourage the widest possible distribution of the benefits of travel at the cheapest rates between foreign countries and the United States consistent with sound economic principles;

(4) encourage the facilitation of international travel through simplification, reduction, or elimination of barriers to travel;

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the further reading of the bill be dispensed with and that it be open for amendment at any point.

Mr. GROSS. Reserving the right to object, I do not think the Members of the House ought to be deprived of this sugar-coated language that we have in this bill.

Mr. HARRIS. I withdraw my request. The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will continue reading.

The Clerk read as follows:

(5) collect, publish, and provide for the exchange of statistics, information, and schedules of meetings, fairs, and other attractions, relating to international travel and tourism.

Sec. 3. (a) In performing the duties set forth in section 2, the Secretary—

(1) shall utilize the facilities and services of existing agencies of the Federal Government to the fullest extent possible; and, to the fullest extent consistent with the per-

formance of their own duties and functions, such agencies shall permit such utilization of facilities and services;

(2) may consult and cooperate with individuals, businesses, and organizations engaged in or concerned with international travel, including local, State, Federal, and foreign governments, and international agencies;

(3) may obtain by contract and otherwise the advice and services of qualified professional organizations and personnel;

(4) may establish such branches in foreign countries, with the concurrence of the Secretary of State, as he deems to be necessary and desirable.

(b) Nothing in this Act shall authorize the Secretary to provide or arrange for transportation for, or accommodations to, persons traveling between foreign countries and the United States in competition with business engaged in providing or arranging for such transportation or accommodations.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 2, strike out lines 18 through 20 and insert the following:

(4) encourage the simplification, reduction or elimination of barriers to travel, and the facilitation of international travel generally;

Page 3, lines 20 and 21, strike out "Nothing in this Act shall authorize the Secretary to" and insert in lieu thereof the following: "The Secretary, under the authority of this Act, shall not".

The committee amendments were agreed to.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. JONES of Missouri: On page 3, line 7, after the word "possible" insert "including the maximum utilization of counterpart funds."

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I am going to be very brief. I think most people recognize that where we do have counterpart funds which can be used they should be used. The report points out that there is authority. We have authority in many fields that is never exercised. This amendment says that in performing the duties set forth the Secretary shall utilize the facilities and services of existing agencies of the Federal Government to the fullest extent possible; and then I would add that he shall do this, including the maximum utilization of counterpart funds. For the benefit of those who will say that there are no counterpart funds available in some countries, I can only say that if there are none, they cannot be used. But where those funds are available they should be used. So I am asking that this amendment be adopted on that premise.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, as I stated to the committee earlier in the afternoon, the committee gave considerable attention to the utilization of counterpart funds. The question was discussed during the course of the hearings. We considered it in executive session of the committee. As proposed at that time, it would have authorized the use of counterpart funds for this program in lieu of appropriations, as I understood it. I also stated to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr.

JONES] that I believe where counterpart funds were available and could be utilized, we should utilize them. So, as far as I am concerned—and I have talked with some of the Members—I am willing to accept the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. JONES].

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 4, line 4:

"Sec. 4. (a) There is hereby established in the Department of Commerce an Office of International Travel and Tourism.

"(b) The Office of International Travel and Tourism shall be headed by a Director who shall be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, and who shall be compensated at the rate of \$17,500 per annum. All duties and responsibilities of the Secretary set forth in sections 2 and 3 of this Act shall be exercised through the Director."

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the first committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 4, line 10, strike out "\$17,500" and insert in lieu thereof "\$18,000".

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the chairman of the committee how he arrived at this good, round figure of \$18,000 for this new director. Who is he? What are his qualifications?

Mr. HARRIS. In the first place, the bill as it came to us from the other body provided for an Assistant Secretary in the Department of Commerce. It is well known that a position of that kind carries with it an authorization of \$20,000 a year. We did not feel, neither did the Secretary of Commerce feel, that we should have an Assistant Secretary to perform this function even though it was rather important. He suggested that we have a director under the Secretary of Commerce to carry out this function. Then the question of salary arose and the figure of \$17,500 was included in the bill. In the discussion of the matter it appeared to the committee that \$18,000 for comparable work would be more appropriate and that is the way we arrived at this figure.

Mr. GROSS. Would this individual be a classified employee or a schedule C employee, or what would he or she be?

Mr. HARRIS. He would be designated as the Director for this program at the designated salary. I cannot commit the Secretary of Commerce as to who the person would be. That would be his responsibility.

Mr. GROSS. The gentleman does not know whether this individual is going to be a civil service employee or a schedule C or what?

Mr. HARRIS. My attention has just been called to the fact that this would be a Presidential appointment.

Mr. GROSS. How many more employees will they have in this office; can the gentleman tell me?

Mr. HARRIS. I believe the budget that was submitted to us carried an estimate of what would be required, which the gentleman will find in the

hearings. I am surprised he has not already seen it, in view of the thorough work the gentleman always does. The Washington office, it is estimated, would have 23.

Overseas branch field managers, as recommended, six. Travel promotion advisers, six. An average of 4 foreign employees in each office would be a total of 24. So there would be an estimated total of 59.

Mr. GROSS. An estimated total of 59 of all categories and descriptions?

Mr. HARRIS. Yes.

Mr. GROSS. Are the salaries for these employees listed?

Mr. HARRIS. No; they are not.

Mr. GROSS. How many would be of supergrade status? Is this one at \$18,000 a year the only one?

Mr. HARRIS. That would be the only one.

Mr. GROSS. I thank the gentleman.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the committee amendment.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the next committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment: Page 4, line 11, strike out "all duties and responsibilities of the Secretary set forth in sections 2 and 3 of this Act shall be exercised through the Director," and insert "The Director shall perform such duties in the execution of this Act as the Secretary may assign."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment to offer to page 3.

The CHAIRMAN. We have already passed that page.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that we return to page 3 so the gentleman from Massachusetts may offer his amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Chairman, would that unduly delay us tonight?

Mr. HARRIS. No.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw my reservation. There was no objection.

The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. McCORMACK, of Massachusetts: On page 3, line 19, before the word "may" and after the numeral "(4)" add "After consultation with the Secretary of State", and strike out in line 20 after the comma the words "with the concurrence of the Secretary of State,".

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, the purpose of this amendment is to provide in the establishment of branch offices abroad that the Secretary of Commerce shall consult with the Secretary of State. Under the language in the bill it is provided "with the concurrence of the Secretary of State." That would give the Secretary of State a veto. I do not believe that in delegating a duty to an agency or department we should give another department a veto power.

I have conferred with the chairman of the committee, with the chairman of

the subcommittee, and with the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SPRINGER], and they are all in agreement on the amendment.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. I want to compliment the gentleman. This is the first amendment I have heard of for a long time that would take some power away from the Secretaries of State, who past and present seek to run all the affairs of this Government. I am for the amendment.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, permit me to say to my colleagues on this side, you notice the difference in the procedure. Yesterday when I demanded a second the Speaker said I was too late, and enforced what was said to be the rule. I had to be right up and on time or I could not get recognition, even though I had gone along on the assumption that no one would demand a second unless he was opposed to the bill as rule 27 states. But when the gentleman, the majority leader from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK] comes in today, with an amendment to a section which we have passed, too late, notice how we treat him. Certainly, distinguished leader that he is, we yield and let him offer an amendment.

Mr. McCORMACK. You are not opposed to me?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Oh, personally I love you.

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, may I ask the chairman of the committee perhaps a kindergarten question, but I have traveled quite a good deal and I am just wondering what is the imperative necessity for a government organization of this kind?

Mr. HARRIS. The debate, I believe, rather clearly explained the reasons for this.

Mrs. BOLTON. It has not explained it to me at all, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. HARRIS. I doubt very seriously that I will be able to explain it to the gentlewoman satisfactorily, but I will do the best I can.

Mrs. BOLTON. I know it will be very difficult—I am merely a woman who has traveled a very great deal.

Mr. HARRIS. Of course, the committee could benefit, I am sure, from the information which the gentlewoman could give us on it. The need for this, as was explained during the course of the hearings and during the course of the debate this afternoon, is to try to do something about catching up on the lag or the imbalance that now exists of about \$1 billion, as a result of travel by our people overseas as compared with the amount of expenditures from people abroad coming into this country. The reasons for developing this program are that it will contribute greatly to the future welfare of our country and to good relationship of this country with other countries.

Mrs. BOLTON. May I say very simply then, I think it will contribute a great

deal toward putting more and more power into Washington—if that is what you are trying to do, you are taking a very real course in that direction.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK].

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 5. The Secretary shall submit to the President to the Congress an annual report on his activities under this Act.

SEC. 6. For the purpose carrying out the provisions of this Act, there is authorized to be appropriated not to exceed \$910,000 for the fiscal year beginning July 1, 1961, and such sums as may be necessary for each fiscal year thereafter.

Committee amendment:

On page 4, line 21, strike out lines 21 and 22 and insert in lieu thereof the following: "\$3,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1962, and not to exceed \$4,700,000 for each fiscal year thereafter."

Mr. BOW. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment to the committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. Bow to the committee amendment: On page 4, line 24, before the period insert "of which not less than \$2,000,000 annually shall be used for the purchase of foreign currency credits owned by the United States Treasury".

Mr. BOW. Mr. Chairman, this amendment in no way affects the previous amendment which was adopted which provided for the maximum utilization of counterpart funds. In some instances, there is a difference between counterpart funds and foreign currency owned by the Treasury. But the amendment I have offered, although it does not in any manner affect the other amendment which provides that the Secretary would be required wherever available to use to the maximum amount of the funds that are available. But, under this amendment, he must use at least \$2 million each year in foreign currencies. As I said before in debate today, there are foreign currencies in every country where they may be able to use this program. I might point out that some question was raised about backward countries. In France we have \$29,722,000 in these funds. In Germany we have \$14,800,000. In Israel, where we may do some of this work, we have \$47,613,000. I could go on down the list. We have millions of dollars in practically every country where this could be done. I see no reason at all when we are going to use a program of this kind, to generate tourism in these foreign countries, why we should not use the currencies which we have in the Treasury of the United States to carry on these programs. So, I submit, Mr. Chairman, there is no conflict between the amendments that have been adopted and my amendment. This amendment requires that there must be at least \$2 million of foreign currencies used each year.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOW. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. Does this eliminate the \$4,700,000 or is it a provision that \$2 million of that must be in counterpart funds?

At least \$2 million of any amount appropriated must be in counterpart funds.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOW. I yield.

Mr. HARRIS. Do I understand that what he refers to as counterpart funds is credit owned by the Treasury of the United States?

Mr. BOW. I am referring to foreign currencies. The gentleman's previous amendment was "counterpart funds" and I said in my opening statement there is some difference between counterpart funds and foreign currencies.

Mr. HARRIS. I understood the gentleman was referring to counterpart funds.

Mr. BOW. I am referring to foreign currencies in this amendment; it specifically says "foreign currencies."

Mr. HARRIS. That is quite different from counterpart funds.

Mr. BOW. This amendment specifically refers to foreign currencies owned by the Treasury of the United States. They are now in the Treasury owned by the United States.

Mr. MACK. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, this is a very simple proposition. The gentleman from Ohio voted against the rule, and now his objective is to reduce the appropriation by \$2 million. Members who are opposed to the bill ought to vote for the amendment and those who are in favor of the bill ought to vote against the amendment. As a matter of fact, the committee amendment increases the appropriation from \$1 million to \$3 million for the first year, and the effect of the Bow amendment would be to keep it at \$1 million for the first year. The reason for that is because there are no funds available in the countries where we would like to promote travel to the United States.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MACK. I will yield but first I want to be sure I get my point across, because the gentleman from Ohio is an authority on appropriation bills and I do not have that background. However, I do understand this problem and I want to explain it before I yield.

This problem is very simple. I have in my hand a copy of the budget for 1962. On page 1011 is a table showing funds available in all countries: They are Burma, India, Israel, Pakistan, Poland, U.A.R., and Yugoslavia; and that is all. The chart from which the gentleman from Ohio was reading shows countries that have no funds available. Therefore, if you vote for the Bow amendment you would be voting to reduce the appropriation by \$2 million.

I am opposed to the amendment.

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MACK. I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. PASSMAN. The gentleman means funds available in excess of pres-

ent requirements. You have funds but they are not in excess of present requirements to meet commitments. Is that correct?

Mr. MACK. That is exactly my point. There are some funds in the other countries, but they are not in excess of our present requirements. It is that simple; and as I said, if you are opposed to the bill then vote for the Bow amendment which has the effect of reducing the appropriation by \$2 million. However, if you believe we ought to reduce our deficit in the international balance of payments then vote against the Bow amendment.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the pending amendment.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield to my friend from Ohio.

Mr. BOW. I regret that the gentleman from Illinois did not yield for a question on this matter of foreign currencies. To say there are foreign currencies in these few countries is not the fact. Here is a Treasury report for the period July 1, 1960, through December 31, 1960. There are foreign currencies in France, in Germany, in the United Kingdom, in Japan, in Greece. I can go down through the list of any country you will go to to get people to travel with you. I am surprised that the gentleman from Louisiana has added to this debate by saying these are necessary for our present commitments. I did not think he had committed us that much around the world. There were some additional commitments of \$600 million. Maybe that has something to do with it. But these funds are available. We do this, and the gentleman knows it, in the State, Justice appropriation bill, and so far as the U.S. Information Agency is concerned we do it, we do it in the foreign building projects, in the FBO. In one appropriation bill after another there is language providing that a certain amount of the currencies of the countries in the Treasury will be used. This does not reduce and will not reduce the amount one iota. You will only be using foreign currencies instead of foreign dollars in these countries where you purchase currency from the Treasury Department.

It seems to me when we have these currencies in the Treasury, this is one of the areas where it is proper to use them, as we do in the foreign building operation, as we do with the U.S. Information Agency, as we do in many other ways. We are going to come in here shortly with another bill that is going to create more foreign currencies. We had better find some way to use them and use them properly. This is one place this can be done.

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. PASSMAN. It is not my purpose to get into this debate. However, if the gentleman will refer to page 1011 of the budget for fiscal 1962, he will find listed there the countries in which we have local currencies in excess of our requirements, followed by countries

where currencies held are not in excess. Some of the countries that the gentleman named have currencies stronger than our own. It could conceivably be that we would wind up with local currencies concentrated in five or six countries of the world. Maybe we would not have any need for the excess currencies, where we might have possibly 80 or 90 percent of the total in five or six or seven countries. In what position then would the legislation be?

Mr. BOW. I have confidence in the gentleman. The gentleman is chairman of the great subcommittee on the foreign giveaway program, but I am sure he is not going to let 90 percent get into any one nation.

The gentleman will have to admit a \$2-million-a-year purchase on this program will never take 90 percent of the currency of any country, when we have \$370 million in India alone. You would not have it all over the world and you are not by this \$2 million amendment going to get 90 percent of the currency in any one country.

Mr. PASSMAN. That is not what the gentleman from Louisiana said. The gentleman from Louisiana said that maybe we would reach a point where 80 or 90 percent of all the currencies that we owned would be in six or seven foreign countries, and not equally distributed throughout the world. There would be a plus in certain cases, and there would be a minus in countries where we might need the currencies. If the gentleman should read the language on page 1011 of the budget he might find the facts. I am trying to be helpful toward fixing the legislation so that it will work, not so that it will not work.

Mr. ALFORD. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word for the purpose of asking the gentleman from Illinois a question. I would like to have a definition of the duties and authority of the Director that will be created if this is enacted into law. How much power does he have? What is he to do?

Mr. MACK. Well, the Director, I will say to the gentleman, would serve under the Secretary of Commerce and would be responsible to the Secretary, and would set up the entire program both here and overseas.

Mr. ALFORD. In particular are we to understand that the Director then is empowered to operate a travel agency for the United States?

Mr. MACK. The committee amended the bill on page 4.

Mr. ALFORD. Yes; I have that.

Mr. MACK. Which makes it very clear that the Director shall perform such duties in the execution of this act as the Secretary may assign.

Mr. ALFORD. That is the purpose of my question. What are his duties that the Secretary may assign to him under this bill?

Mr. MACK. Previous to that the Director would have more authority. Now, under the bill the Director would be in charge of the program, of organizing the program, of promoting and carrying out the provisions of this act in promoting travel generally to the United States. He would participate in the selection and

establishment of foreign offices and direct the activities as suggested.

Mr. ALFORD. On page 2, line 21, we have this language:

Encourage the simplification, reduction, or elimination of barriers to travel, and the facilitation of international travel generally.

Is this Director to be empowered to liberalize the issuance of visas for travel into the United States?

Mr. MACK. No. The hearings made that very clear, that the Director or the Secretary would not have that power. The legislation does give the Secretary the authority or the responsibility for encouraging simplification, reduction, or elimination of barriers to travel, and the facilitation of international travel generally. There was an objection raised concerning the language in the Senate bill, and I believe that this bill relieves any question that might be raised concerning this provision. It does not amend any immigration laws. It only empowers the Secretary or places the responsibility on the Secretary to coordinate, to encourage simplification, to do whatever he can to encourage people to come to this country.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ALFORD. I yield to the gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. HARRIS. I do not think we had extensive discussion during the course of the debate, and I wanted to emphasize what the chairman of the subcommittee has just said. It is true that the bill passed by the other body used the words "coordinate all travel facilities," and so forth. The Subcommittee on Immigration under the chairmanship of the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALTER], raised some question about the language. We analyzed it and went into it and found out that the words "coordinate all travel facilities" might very well cause the Secretary of Commerce, in his administration of the bill, to supersede some of the administration of our immigration laws. Consequently, the record is very clear in the hearings and also in the consideration of the bill that the language was changed to make it very certain that the immigration laws will not in any way be affected by it.

Mr. ALFORD. I thank the gentleman. I might say to the distinguished chairman that that was a particular matter of doubt in my mind with reference to the immigration laws.

I should like to ask one more question. Do we have any statistics available to show this? May I say that we are of the opinion that anyone with an income of less than \$10,000 a year certainly could not ordinarily travel abroad. Have we any statistics available to show, in comparison with what we are calling the small amount that we are going to expend, the number of people who will be able to travel from these countries to the United States? We have heard it discussed today that they will be able to travel in units or groups and stay at hostels at moderate expense.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. ALFORD] has expired.

Mr. MACK. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I do this to reply to the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. ALFORD]. In the course of the debate today several people raised questions about the amount of money available and the amount allowed to be taken out of other countries. I think almost all of the countries where we plan to establish an International Travel Office for all practical purposes have no restrictions. Where there are restrictions they can secure additional funds on request.

Now, to answer the gentleman's question, I think he will find these figures on potential tourists interesting. In England they consider a person a potential tourist when he earns 1,200 to 1,500 pounds a year. To give you some idea of the number of potential tourists, there were 2,150,000 British residents who traveled to the Continent last year. There were 3,500,000 Germans who traveled to foreign countries from Germany last year.

In Britain there are 1,340,000 who are earning more than 1,500 pounds per year. In Germany there are 1,110,000 who are earning over \$4,500 per year. So there are quite a few within these countries who are financially able to come to this country.

Mr. ALFORD. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. FORD. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, let me say at the outset, if you ask the State Department whether there are any foreign currencies available that might be used for any purpose the answer will always be categorically no. They will always tell you that the funds are committed. Let me give you an illustration. For the last several years the Air Force has been trying to make and has made contracts with foreign scientists for research and development, tests and evaluation. They have been paying these foreign scientists for this work out of the U.S. Treasury with U.S. dollars.

In our Subcommittee on Defense Appropriations we asked the question, "Why can you not pay these foreign scientists with foreign currencies, which have been generated through various programs of the United States over the last 10 or 15 years?" The State Department always says that these foreign currencies are committed. I just do not believe it. The facts have been proved that these foreign currencies were not committed.

All you have to do is to put the pressure on the State Department. They do not want to give them up to the Army, the Navy, the Air Force, or to this organization. It is about time we compelled the State Department to make these currencies available. I think this amendment is good, and the more we do of it the better off we will be.

This is a good point to get started on the program in a bigger way. They will always give you a million alibis why this cannot be done. I think we ought to take the bull by the horns and tell them how we want it done.

Let me give you an illustration of how these foreign currencies have been used.

Over the years we have built up these foreign currency accounts in various countries. I noticed the other day that by a stroke of his pen the President decided we will use foreign currencies to help save these pyramids and other historical monuments in Egypt. We are going to help pay for the removal of these pyramids from the Valley of the Nile so they will be preserved for posterity. Maybe it is a good idea, but Congress was never asked whether that could be done, whether these foreign currencies could be made available for that purpose. I ask the chairman of my Subcommittee on Mutual Security, was he ever consulted about the giving away of some \$11 million in foreign currencies for that purpose? I do not think he was.

I just noticed the other day that the President signed an agreement to give to the Government of Austria all of the foreign currencies that have been generated over the past 10 or 15 years in that country. Congress was never consulted, yet I will venture to say that 6 months ago if the State Department had been asked they would have said, "There is no foreign currency available in Austria, there is no foreign currency available in Egypt." They want to decide for themselves how these moneys shall be used. I just do not think we should tolerate it. Where we have a bona fide and legitimate opportunity to utilize these foreign currencies in such a program as this one we should decide, not the State Department.

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I am trying to be helpful. As a usual thing, members of the Committee on Appropriations are pretty much in accord when we endeavor to save actual dollars. This information is not from the State Department, but from the Budget Bureau.

I made a statement earlier that we may find ourselves in a condition where 80 or 90 percent of all the local currencies that we own may possibly be concentrated in seven or eight countries. Reference to page 1011 of the budget will indicate that we now have excess currencies in only eight countries. We have no excess currencies in the other countries. So, I am wondering what position we would be in if we adopted the amendment, and then found later that about 75 percent of the need for local currencies would be in countries where we would not have such currencies available in excess of needs.

This is a statement from page 1011 of the budget presentation for fiscal 1962:

In 68 of the 92 countries listed in table 3 the approximate supply of currencies available in 1962 is less than our anticipated needs for regular operations with the result that the United States will have to purchase the currencies of these 68 countries.

I am afraid that if we adopt an amendment which requires this agency to use local currencies, it is not going to accomplish the job intended.

Therefore, I repeat, I think the budget that came down in January would do a better job explaining why this amendment should be defeated than I can do.

I hope, too, that you will read pages 10 and 11 of the hearings on this subject matter.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment, and all amendments thereto, close in 5 minutes.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I object.

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I do not claim to be an authority on foreign affairs. I must admit very frankly that I do not know the full import of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio. I respect his views and, of course, understand that he has the best of intentions. But I do have some grave concern about the proposed amendment. It is anticipated that the greatest good from this proposal will come from those countries where we do not have foreign credit. The gentleman from Louisiana has just read the account of the budget for fiscal 1962 which was submitted to this Congress under the administration of President Eisenhower. That budget did not show any foreign credits of the United States Treasury for any of the Western European countries, where it is expected that, perhaps, the greatest good will come. Let me read a paragraph from a letter from the Treasury Department, addressed to me as chairman of the Subcommittee on Foreign Operations Appropriations on March 27, 1961, with reference to this particular item:

There is, however, one provision of the bill which this Department believes to be unnecessary. Section 6 of the bill would amend section 104 of Public Law 480, 83d Congress (7 U.S.C. 1704), to make foreign currencies generated by title I sales available for financing the establishment and operation of travel offices and other activities authorized by the bill, in amounts to be specified from time to time in appropriation acts. This provision is unnecessary since authority now exists under which the proposed U.S. Travel Service could purchase from the Treasury foreign currencies to pay expenses incurred abroad in connection with its operations. Under this authority, currencies in Treasury accounts from all sources, including those accruing under Public Law 480, as amended, could be made available to the U.S. Travel Service to the extent such currencies can be utilized freely for payment of U.S. expenses in the country of origin.

Mr. Chairman, I prefer to take the advice and suggestion on this matter of those who are handling it, and who had it before them and who know what the situation is.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Bow] to the committee amendment.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. Bow) there were—ayes 46, noes 52.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Chairman, I ask for tellers.

Tellers were ordered and the Chair appointed as tellers Mr. Bow and Mr. HARRIS.

The Committee again divided and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 51, noes 61.

So the amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The question recurs on the committee amendment.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. GROSS: On page 4, strike all of lines 23 and 24, and insert the following: "\$910,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1962."

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. HARRIS. The amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa strikes out an amendment which has just been adopted.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. YATES). The Chair sustains the point of order. The amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa would strike out an amendment which has just been adopted.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I offer another amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. GROSS: On page 4, line 23, strike the matter following "1962", insert a period, and strike the remainder of line 23 and all of line 24.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, a point of order, for the same reason as was stated in connection with the previous amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Iowa desire to be heard?

Mr. GROSS. No, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair sustains the point of order.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, this afternoon we heard the chairman of the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee and other members of the committee say no one appeared before the committee in opposition to this bill. I did not appear because I could not believe a bill of this kind, in view of the huge debt and deficit situation of the Federal Treasury of this country, could be or would be offered to the House of Representatives. That is one of the reasons I did not appear before the committee.

The gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. HARRIS] says that we must enact this legislation in order that there will be a better appreciation by foreigners of the United States. My friend from South Carolina [Mr. HEMPHILL] said the legislation must be enacted so that foreigners will learn to love us.

Now, after 13 years and \$100 billion given away to the foreigners, if they have not learned to love us, if they have not learned to appreciate us, I do not think \$5 million a year is going to help the situation very much.

One of the quarrels I have with this legislation is the fact that we have cultural attachés and cultural officers all over the world. I was looking recently at a list of the cultural officers now on the Government payrolls. Go dig one out and take a look. We have a \$19,000-a-year cultural officer in London. Why should not that fellow be handling this tourist business in London instead of sending some more high-priced people

over there? Why should not the cultural officers in the USIA be handling this business instead of setting up a new bureaucracy in the Department of Commerce? Why do you not get rid of some of those people? Then you could come in here with some slight justification.

I still do not know who the new \$18,000-a-year Director is going to be. I do not believe there is a Kennedy or a Kennedy brother-in-law available. Apparently they all have Government jobs now.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Just who can the President trust? Maybe he has to take one of the family.

Mr. GROSS. I do not know. I would not want to pass on that.

Speaking of cultural officers, I learned a couple of years ago we had an eight or nine thousand dollar a year cultural officer in Iceland. What did they do? They put a woman cultural officer in Iceland at \$13,000. So we apparently had two cultural officers in Iceland.

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. HAYS. If they cannot find a Kennedy, maybe they can find a broken-down politician from Iowa like Gilliland that Eisenhower put on the CAB.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. The gentleman from Iowa never got an advance from any committee in the House for traveling expenses anyway.

Mr. GROSS. I am not so sure that the State of Ohio has not had a few broken-down politicians.

Mr. HAYS. Two or three of them were elected to the Presidency.

Mr. GROSS. It is my understanding most, if not all, of the Presidents elected from Ohio were Republicans.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Some of them stayed here and attended to business and did not travel all over the world all the time, riding planes and so forth.

Mr. HAYS. And they never sent their secretary for a trip around the world to get her out of town.

Mr. GROSS. I suggest to Members of the House, before we approve a new bureaucracy such as this, a new addition to a bureaucracy, that we get rid of some of the superfluous personnel we have all over the world. Let us save the taxpayers a little money and vote this bill down.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Permit me to do as did the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HAYS] and assume that a statement made by a Member referred to him, even though his name was not mentioned. He seemed to think some-

thing said fitted him, so he puts on the coat; as is sometimes said, takes the floor, squawks about it, and makes as he did once before the false charge that I sent a secretary on a trip around the world to get her out of Washington, and, because, on the other occasion, he did refer to me, I now assume he is again doing so. It may be he will leave his remarks out of the RECORD.

He is just absolutely wrong if he was referring to me when he talked about sending a secretary around the world at Government expense. I never sent a secretary around the world on any mission, I never sent any employee out of this country or anywhere in this country at public expense. The gentleman from Ohio may put that in his pipe and smoke it. On a prior occasion he was told of his error. The gentleman will not tell the truth, that is what causes trouble. I nailed that lie in the RECORD once before.

Mr. HAYS. You can nail it all you want to, but the fact remains that I know about it, and so do you.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. And I say to you and to the Committee, the Members on the floor, you are not telling the truth, and I say again that I never sent any secretary or employee of my office out of town nor anywhere else at public or, for that matter, at my or private expense. What the gentleman probably is talking about is something he does not understand about somebody on the Committee on Government Operations. Though he was once advised of the trip. There were three women on that trip by a subcommittee around the world. A woman member of the committee and of Congress; Mrs. Davis, a most talented and faithful clerk of the committee; and another committee employee, were on the trip. I did ask the chairman of the committee to permit a woman member to accompany the committee, even though I knew some members did strenuously object to women members going on investigations. There seemed to be a thought that the pleasures or activities of the male members were in some way circumscribed if the women were along. I did not go on that trip or any other outside of the U.S.A., except once to Alaska.

Mr. HAYS. Oh, I understand it all too well.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Just a moment, Mr. Chairman. I did not yield to the gentleman. I repeat that he did not tell the truth if referring to me he made that charge.

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Chairman, during the debate in the Committee of the Whole, a reference was made to a distinguished Iowan as a broken down politician. This is indeed unfortunate because it is evident that the gentleman who made the statement obviously did not have the facts or he would not have made such an unfounded charge or ac-

cusation. In order to set the record straight I ask unanimous consent to set the record straight and to have my remarks inserted in the RECORD following the statement on this matter by the gentleman from Ohio, Mr. WAYNE HAYS.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. YATES, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 4614) to direct the Secretary of Commerce to take steps to encourage travel to the United States by residents of foreign countries, to establish an Office of International Travel and Tourism, and for other purposes, pursuant to House Resolution 281, he reported the bill back to the House with sundry amendments adopted by the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

The question is on the amendments. The amendments were agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The question was taken, and the Speaker announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Under the agreement of last Thursday, further proceedings will go over until tomorrow.

PROGRESS IN MIGRATORY FARMWORKER PROBLEMS

Mr. DANIELS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD, and to include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. DANIELS. Mr. Speaker, one of our Nation's most socially and economically deprived groups is our migratory agricultural workers. For the past three decades, the migratory farmworker problem has increased in scope and severity until it can no longer be tolerated by this Nation. Within the last 20 months, the American public has become increasingly aware of the plight of our migratory workers. The attention now being given our migratory farmworkers is largely attributable to the efforts of the Senate Subcommittee on Migratory Labor, the chairman of which, I am proud to say, is the distinguished junior Senator from New Jersey, HARRISON A. WILLIAMS, JR. It was, therefore, with no little interest that I noted an excellent editorial in the Jersey Journal, Jersey City, N.J., on April 22 entitled, "Hope for Migrants."

The editorial gives well deserved recognition to the leadership provided by my colleague from New Jersey in the field of migratory farmworker problems by noting that "one of the Nation's principal voices in their behalf is that of Senator HARRISON WILLIAMS of New Jersey. He has done much to make their plight known."

The editorial also points out that Secretary of Labor Goldberg has promised "united Federal effort to aid the most economically underprivileged group in the Nation, the migrant farmworker."

Senator WILLIAMS has formulated an 11-point legislative program designed to improve the living and working conditions of our migratory farmworkers which is now pending before the Congress. With the passage of this program, we will be proving to ourselves and to the world that we are no longer ignoring the needs of our fellow Americans no matter how small or politically insignificant they may be.

Because the editorial is indicative of the growing national interest and concern for our migratory farmworkers and because it recognizes the positive leadership of Senator WILLIAMS in this field, under unanimous consent I include the editorial in the RECORD at this point:

HOPE FOR MIGRANTS

Secretary of Labor Goldberg has promised a "united Federal effort" to aid the most economically underprivileged group in the Nation, the migrant farmworkers. Americans who place human values above economic advantage applaud this announcement, and will be anxious to see the pledge carried out as quickly as possible.

The 400,000 migrant farmworkers and their families are a weight on the conscience of America. They have been conspicuously deprived of a just share in the Nation's prosperity. In an era when such things as automobiles, numerous appliances including television, and varied and abundant food are commonplace for the average American family, the migrant's average yearly income is less than \$1,000.

These workers and their families suffer more than economic deprivation. Another aspect of their problem was summed up thus by Secretary Goldberg: "Because they are constantly on the move, their children are denied the opportunity to receive a decent education, and restrictive residence requirements deny them public health and welfare services."

The plight of the migrants has not gone unnoticed. One of the Nation's principal voices in their behalf is that of Senator HARRISON WILLIAMS of New Jersey. He has done much to make their plight known. During the Eisenhower administration, the then Labor Secretary, James Mitchell, also a New Jerseyite, urged vigorous Federal action to improve working conditions for migrant labor.

It is right that our State, important as it is in agriculture and advanced as it is in outlook, should provide leadership in this cause. The chance for prompt action now rests on the fact that this administration, including Agriculture Secretary Freeman, is fully behind Goldberg's pledge of united effort and Senator WILLIAMS' legislation. Whatever is done, it cannot be done too soon.

AMENDING HOME LOAN BANK ACT

Mr. SPENCE. 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 Kentucky?

There was no objection.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a bill to amend the Federal Home Loan Bank Act and title IV of the National Housing Act, and for other purposes, which was transmitted by the Federal Home Loan Bank Board.

In my judgment this bill represents a very important and very desirable item of legislation. It is intended to strengthen the position of the Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation, which insures, up to a statutory limitation of \$10,000, the investments of the public in withdrawable accounts of savings and loan associations. It will do this by a method which, in the main, will not add any significant financial burden to the insured institutions.

The opportunity to strengthen the Insurance Corporation without adding to the burden of insured institutions arises from legislation passed by the Congress in 1950 as part of the program for the retirement of the Government stock in the Federal home loan banks and the Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation.

During that year we approximately doubled the amount of the stock in these banks that member institutions were required to hold, with a provision that each bank should retire Government stock equal to the excess stockholdings of members immediately prior to the enactment of the legislation and that annually thereafter each bank should retire Government stock equal to 50 percent of the net increase in its stock held by its members.

Through the operation of this legislation, and through voluntary additional retirements by the banks, the retirement of the Government stock was promptly completed, and as of July 1, 1951, the capital stock of the Federal home loan banks was owned entirely by their members, as it has been ever since. The doubled requirement for members' stockholdings is still in effect, although its primary purpose has long since been accomplished.

Under the same 1950 legislation, we also required the Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation to retire its Government stock of \$100 million, by application each year of one-half of its net income. It was estimated that this would require a period of 10 to 15 years, but the retirement was actually completed in approximately 8 years. The final payment was made in July 1958.

Of course, the application of one-half of its net income to the Government stock retirement meant that the resources of the Corporation did not increase as rapidly as they otherwise would have done. It is the object of the bill to accelerate the building up of those resources.

The bill would require each institution insured by the Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation to make with respect to its future regular premiums an annual prepayment equal to 2 percent of

the net increase in the accounts of its insured members, less any requirement for the purchase of Federal home loan bank stock. At the same time, the bill would reduce the stock-purchase requirement from the existing figure of 2 percent of the aggregate unpaid principal of the members home mortgage loans, home-purchase contracts, and similar obligations to 1 percent of that base.

The general result would be that an institution having both Federal home loan bank membership and insurance of its accounts by the Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation would make approximately the same total payments as if the bill had not been enacted, but that a part of the total would go to the Insurance Corporation to strengthen its resources, instead of going to the purchase of Federal home loan bank stock. The correspondence between the total payments under existing law and those under the bill would not be exact, but in the typical case it would be approximate.

Under the terms of the bill, the Corporation would establish a primary reserve, which would be its general reserve, and a secondary reserve. The premium prepayments would be credited to the secondary reserve.

As of the close of each year the Corporation would also credit to the secondary reserve a return on the outstanding balances of that reserve, at a rate equal to the average annual rate of return on the Corporation's investments in Government and Government-guaranteed obligations. When the aggregate of the two reserves reached 2 percent of a base consisting of the total of the accounts of insured members and creditor obligations of all insured institutions the premium prepayments would cease, and each insured institution's pro rata share of the secondary reserve would be used, so far as available, to discharge the institution's obligations for its annual premiums, which are one-twelfth of 1 percent of the accounts of its insured members and its creditor obligations. If the aggregate of the two reserves later fell below 1¾ percent of the base, the prepayments would resume and such use of the secondary reserve would cease.

However, if the primary reserve, by itself, should at the close of any year equal or exceed 2 percent of the base, the Corporation would pay in cash to each insured institution its pro rata share of the secondary reserve and would not thereafter accept or receive any further prepayments.

There are a number of other provisions in the bill. Some of them are perhaps too complicated to mention in detail at this point, but I would like to call attention to one of the most important protective features. This is the provision that no Federal home loan bank member which is such a member on the date of enactment of the measure shall be permitted to reduce its stock to an amount which is less than the amount held by it as of the close of that date, with two exceptions.

The first exception is that, subject to the minimum of \$500 to which all mem-

bers are subject, any such member may at any time reduce its stock to an amount which is not less than 2 percent of its unpaid loan principal as of the close of the date of enactment and not less than 2 percent of such principal as of the beginning of the year in which the reduction is made. This exception is intended to take care of members which, on the date of enactment of the bill, hold bank stock in excess of the 2 percent requirement.

The second exception allows the Federal Home Loan Bank Board, in its discretion, to permit such a member to reduce its stock to an amount below that held on the date of enactment, but not less than 2 percent of the member's unpaid loan principal at the beginning of the year of the reduction and not less than the \$500 minimum. This exception is designed to allow the Board to permit a reasonable degree of flexibility in proper cases.

In my opinion it is desirable that this measure be given prompt consideration.

A FARM CREDIT EMERGENCY

Mr. SISK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks and to include correspondence with the Secretary of Agriculture.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. SISK. Mr. Speaker, I rise to call the attention of the Members and the administration to a grave emergency in farm financing and farmer's credit which is likely to ruin thousands of farmers unless decisive steps are taken immediately.

I refer to a complete lack of either public or private financing for essential soil and water conservation on farms. This is a life and death matter for thousands of farmers in drought areas, for in many instances, without the means of developing new water sources, they face not only the loss of a year's crop, but actual loss of the trees, vines, and plantings which may have taken many years to bring to production. In other instances, floods, winds, and natural disasters make soil conservation and rebuilding projects essential before land can be restored to production.

I became urgently concerned with this problem last fall when farmers in the district I represent were unable to get loans to deepen wells and install pumps to restore water supplies cut off by 2 successive years of drought. To my astonishment, I found that all funds appropriated to the Farmers Home Administration for soil and water loans were exhausted within a month after the start of the fiscal year last July. The money had been used to cover loan applications already pending at the start of the year. No more loan funds would be available until next July. Now, the Members certainly know that our farms needing this financing will literally dry

up and blow away without water for a year while an application is pending.

It is true that the Farmers Home Administration has programs for both insured private loans and for bank participation loans, but these programs currently provide no relief because banks generally will not loan at the interest rates specified and because of the comparative long term of the loans.

We had been looking forward to financing relief for the coming fiscal year starting July 1, but I now find that under budget recommendations of the administration now before the Committee on Appropriations, no relief is in sight. Here are the cold facts: Appropriation of \$3 million has been recommended. The Farmers Home Administration already has on hand 526 applications for soil and water conservation loans, together with 107 applications for similar loans from associations. To fund these approved applications will require \$13 million. Thus, we would be \$10 million short of enough money to make the loans already requested 2 months before the fiscal year starts, without regard to the credit requirements sure to develop hereafter and before July 1, 1962.

Furthermore, to my knowledge, the applications on hand represent only a small fraction of the actual demand and need for these loans. Farmers naturally have been discouraged from filing applications with no possibility of getting the money.

Obviously, to carry on this urgent program, immediate steps must be taken to make loan financing available. It appears to me this requires either or both the appropriation of substantial additional funds, or revision of the insured and participation loan programs to make such loans attractive to private financing.

To get at the facts and make them available to the Members, I have directed a letter to the Department of Agriculture people and I now have a response from the Secretary of Agriculture. I think these letters point up the urgency of the problem and the hopelessness of a solution unless we enlarge and fund this program. I am including my inquiry and Secretary Freeman's response, with accompanying data. I most urgently commend them to the attention of the Committee on Appropriations, the Members generally, and those in the administration responsible for our budget recommendations. I ask for immediate help.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., April 18, 1961.

Mr. JOHN A. BAKER,
Director, Agricultural Credit Services, Department of Agriculture, Washington, D.C.

DEAR Mr. BAKER: It is my understanding that funds available to the Farmers Home Administration this fiscal year for soil and water conservation loans are exhausted and that it will be impossible to serve many applicants seeking assistance.

In view of the increasing national emphasis on the conservation and development

of our water resources, it is most important that farmers be afforded every opportunity to install safe dependable water supplies for domestic use, irrigation, and related purposes. In many instances a lack of adequate water, even for a temporary period, results in substantial financial losses and frequently prevents a farmer from continuing his operations.

In other instances the establishment of urgently needed soil conservation practices may make the difference between success and failure. It will be unfortunate if the planning or construction of essential soil and water conservation facilities is delayed because loan funds are not adequate to meet the needs of eligible applicants.

Will you, therefore, give me as soon as possible the number of applications now on hand for soil and water conservation loans, the estimated amount required to process such applications and the amount included in the 1962 budget request for these loans. Please indicate in your reply the number of families represented by these applications and the outlook for additional applications in the future.

Since authority also exists for insuring loans made with funds advanced by private lenders for these purposes, I shall appreciate information on the extent to which funds from that source have supplemented funds appropriated for these loans and the outlook for insured loan funds in the future.

Sincerely yours,

B. F. SISK,
Member of Congress.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
Washington, D.C., May 11, 1961.

Hon. B. F. SISK,
House of Representatives.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN SISK: It is true as indicated in your letter of April 18, 1961, that there are no appropriated funds available with which to make additional soil and water conservation loans the rest of the fiscal year.

As of March 31, there were on hand 526 applications for soil and water conservation loans to individuals and 107 applications for similar loans to associations. These applications represent about 6,000 families. Based on recent loan averages of about \$4,000 each for individual loans and \$100,000 each for associations, it would require approximately \$13 million to process the applications on hand. A table showing by States the number of applications received this year and the number on hand is enclosed.

The budget for fiscal year 1962 submitted by the previous administration recommended a total of only \$183 million for farm ownership, farm operating, and soil and water conservation loan programs. When the present administration took office, a thorough review was made of the need for funds for Farmers Home Administration programs, as well as for other high priority programs of the Government. As evidence of his strong support for Farmers Home Administration loan programs, the President on March 20, 1961, submitted a budget amendment to the Congress recommending an additional \$11,900,000 for farm ownership loans and an additional \$72,100,000 for operating loans. In view of the urgent needs of other high priority programs, and the competition for scarce budgetary resources, the President did not find it possible to request other additional funds proposed by the Farmers Home Administration. However, budgetary needs and resources are under frequent review by this administration and if the President finds it possible to request additional funds in the future, I am confident that he will submit such a request to the Congress.

More specifically, the President's budget as submitted for fiscal year 1962 contains \$3 million for soil and water conservation loans. Adequate insured loan authority exists to supplement such appropriated funds but the amounts available from private lenders to make insured loans have been very limited in recent years. We hope that more insured loans can be made next year, but unless there is a significant change in the money market, it appears that the amount available from private lenders will probably be somewhere in the neighborhood of \$1 million, which has been the average for the last 2 years. For your further information, we are enclosing a second table showing amounts which have been available for loans since the Water Facilities Act was amended in 1954.

We have found that potential applicants hesitate to apply for loans when it is known that adequate funds have not been available in previous years for all those who did apply. However, in view of the increased interest in the development of water resources and the installation of soil conservation practices, we expect a substantial increase in the number of applications to be received next year as compared with this year. An even greater increase will probably result if existing authorities are broadened as proposed in S. 1643 and H.R. 6400 which were introduced recently.

A copy of our reply to your letter is being sent to each of the Senators and Congressmen to whom a copy of your letter was sent. If you wish any further information, please let us know.

Sincerely yours,

ORVILLE FREEMAN,
Secretary.

Applications for soil and water conservation loans, 1961 fiscal year through Mar. 31, 1961

State	Applications from individuals	Applications on hand Mar. 31, 1961	Applications from associations	Applications on hand Mar. 31, 1961
Alabama	6	0	0	0
Arizona	18	13	1	1
Arkansas	49	17	0	0
California	57	11	1	2
Colorado	27	19	23	22
Florida	7	5	0	0
Georgia	6	3	0	0
Hawaii	1	1	0	0
Idaho	75	53	2	3
Illinois	2	1	0	0
Indiana	10	6	0	0
Iowa	16	4	0	0
Kansas	20	8	7	21
Kentucky	15	1	13	15
Louisiana	10	3	0	0
Maryland	2	2	0	0
Michigan	21	10	0	0
Minnesota	8	4	0	0
Mississippi	38	23	0	0
Missouri	23	10	0	0
Montana	68	39	4	3
Nebraska	37	25	0	0
Nevada	10	2	0	0
New Jersey	1	0	1	0
New Mexico	38	20	0	1
New York	3	1	0	0
North Carolina	20	6	0	0
North Dakota	12	9	1	1
Ohio	11	6	0	2
Oklahoma	23	15	0	0
Oregon	31	17	7	7
Pennsylvania	1	2	0	0
South Carolina	25	4	0	0
South Dakota	18	9	0	0
Tennessee	15	4	2	3
Texas	69	36	8	8
Utah	43	32	2	3
Virginia	11	4	0	0
Washington	85	36	6	5
West Virginia	0	1	6	6
Wisconsin	43	23	0	0
Wyoming	17	8	2	4
Puerto Rico	88	33	0	0
Total	1,078	526	86	107

Amounts authorized and used for SW loans since act was amended to extend program to humid areas

Fiscal year	Appropriated	Committed	Insured authority	Committed	Total	
					Appropriated and insured	Committed
1955	\$11,500,000	\$4,022,000	\$25,000,000	\$15,500,000	\$36,500,000	\$19,522,000
1956	11,500,000	1,300,000	25,000,000	10,600,000	36,500,000	11,900,000
1957	5,500,000	5,500,000	25,000,000	4,000,000	30,500,000	9,500,000
1958	5,500,000	4,600,000	25,000,000	1,200,000	30,500,000	5,800,000
1959	5,500,000	5,000,000	25,000,000	2,500,000	30,500,000	7,500,000
1960	2,000,000	2,000,000	25,000,000	924,000	27,000,000	2,924,000
1961 ¹	3,000,000	3,000,000	25,000,000	1,021,390	28,000,000	4,021,390

¹ As of Mar. 31, 1961.

THE TEXTILE INDUSTRY IS NOT WELL YET

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. HEMPHILL] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. HEMPHILL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and to include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. HEMPHILL. Mr. Speaker, I take this time to comment again on the situation which exists and the situation which may exist in a very precious industry of this Nation. I am speaking of the textile industry. If I were to choose any topic for this particular address or these remarks that I am about to make, I believe it would be, "The Textile Industry is Not Yet Well."

As we all know, on May 2 of this year all of us were most happy in the fact that the President of the United States had seen fit, after examination by a special council which he had set up to propose a program aimed at the aid of the textile firms in their effort to meet foreign competition to detail his efforts in behalf of the textile industry.

In the well of this House before it has been my privilege and also my duty to express my opinion and my concern, along with some of my colleagues, at the threats which the textile industry found at its doorstep and has continued to find during the 5 years I have been a Member of this Congress.

From time to time we have outlined here the statistics on foreign imports which have given us concern and which today give increasing impetus to the realization that something must be done.

I say we were happy with the President's program. We were happy because it was the first time in many years that the administration, or at least the executive branch of the Government, or any of the departments of the executive branch of the Government, had given the concern which we thought was necessary and proper to the problems of the textile people.

I have here, and I quote from it, the President's special message, because it was significant to us in the textile area. It gives us hope.

I believe this program will assist our textile industry to meet its basic problems, while at the same time recognizing the na-

tional interest in expansion of world trade and the successful development of less developed nations. It takes into account the dispersion of the industry, the range of products, and its highly competitive character. It is my hope that these measures will strengthen the industry and expand consumption of its products without disrupting international trade and without disruption of the markets of any country.

I was glad that the President expressed that hope, and when questioned by some of the reporters on the message of the President I said it gave me great hope and along with other people in the textile industry I hastened to express that hope.

Mr. Speaker, I have here an article from the Wall Street Journal of May 3, 1961, which says something about the program, which I insert at this point of my remarks.

(The matter referred to is as follows:)

KENNEDY PROPOSES PROGRAM AIMED TO AID TEXTILE FIRMS MEET FOREIGN COMPETITION

WASHINGTON.—President Kennedy ordered a series of administration actions and studies aimed at helping domestic textile manufacturers meet stepped-up foreign competition.

The administration steps range from a proposed international conference to seek limitations on textile shipments to this country to a study of additional depreciation deductions on textile machinery. Some of the Administration proposals were vague and indefinite.

Coming on the eve of today's vote in the House on raising the minimum wage and broadening coverage, the President's message prompted hope among some House Democratic leaders that the administration's expressed willingness to help domestic textile manufacturers might encourage some Southerners to vote with them on the minimum wage bill. Particularly in the House, every vote on the bill will be important.

The seven-point program, developed by a special Cabinet committee headed by Commerce Secretary Hodges, was presented personally by the President at a meeting of leading textile industry officials at the White House. These are the seven points:

The State Department was directed to call an early conference of the principal textile exporting and importing countries, "to seek an international understanding which will provide a basis for trade that will avoid undue disruption of established industries." This obviously is aimed at persuading foreign textile-producing countries voluntarily to agree to reduce shipments to the United States.

An application by the textile industry for higher tariffs or quota protection under the present reciprocal trade law "will be carefully considered on its merits."

The Agriculture Department was directed to make recommendations for subsidies

either to cotton producers or to U.S. mills to eliminate or offset the higher raw cotton prices U.S. textile mills must pay compared with those paid by foreign producers.

The administration will send Congress shortly a proposal to provide Federal aid, unspecified but presumably some sort of loans and grants for retraining and readjustment, for industries seriously injured or threatened with serious injury from increased imports. Presumably this would apply to all industries and not just the textile industry.

The Treasury Department was directed to review existing depreciation deductions on textile machinery. Revision of these allowances, along with the tax investment credit proposed in his recent tax program, should assist in the modernization of the textile industry facilities, the President declared.

The Small Business Administration was directed to help the textile industry obtain the necessary financing to modernize its equipment. No details were given.

Finally, the Commerce Department was directed to cooperate with management and union groups in a broad research program covering new products, practices, and markets.

Mr. Kennedy said he hoped the program would "assist our textile industry to meet its basic problems, while at the same time recognizing the national interest in expansion of world trade and the successful development of less developed nations."

The administration has been under increasing pressure from the domestic textile industry and Congress Members from textile-manufacturing areas. This agitation was considered a threat to continuation of the reciprocal trade program next year when it comes up for renewal by Congress, and the administration program just announced was obviously designed to help keep in line the votes of lawmakers from textile-manufacturing districts on other issues.

White House officials conceded the program is a middle course between the desires of textile manufacturing groups for drastic import curbs and of free-trade forces for minimum curbs on imports. "It will probably please neither group completely," one high-ranking official declared.

However, spokesmen for textile and apparel trade associations said they are "highly encouraged" by the administration program. They conceded some of the steps are not particularly new, but said they feel the "atmosphere" at the White House indicates a new awareness of textile industry problems.

They indicate there probably would be an early industry petition for quota or other relief by the Government under the Reciprocal Trade Program. Asked if he feels the administration program would produce mandatory Government import quotas, J. M. Cheatham, president of the American Cotton Manufacturers Institute, replied, "We certainly will be dissatisfied if this doesn't produce the necessary measures to give us relief."

The free-trade versus protectionist battle focused most recently on textile imports from Japan, and the Government worked out an agreement whereby Japan voluntarily reduced its exports to the United States. Since then, however, exports to the United States have been stepped up from Hong Kong and elsewhere.

Most of the administration proposals were deemed to hold out real promise of eventual help—even though they were in general terms. For example, while Mr. Kennedy said only that the Treasury Department is going to review tax depreciation allowances, it would be politically difficult for the administration to decide that no changes should be made. Similarly, it would be politically dangerous for the Agriculture Department to fail to come up with recommendations for some sort of cotton price aid for the U.S. mills.

Mr. HEMPHILL. Mr. Speaker, I also have an article from one of my local papers located in Rock Hill, S.C., known as the Rock Hill Evening Herald, dated May 7, 1961, in which they share the concern and they say, "So Far, So Good; Let's Wait and See."

I enclose that article at this point:

SO FAR, SO GOOD; LET'S WAIT AND SEE

President Kennedy's program to relieve the ailing textile industry is as good as anything proposed in recent years. It remains to be seen whether it gets beyond the study stage into corrective action.

There are two key points—the volume of textile imports and the price at which U.S. cotton is sold abroad.

On imports, the President proposed a conference of all countries that import and export textiles. The idea would be for these countries to work out a fair and practical system of quotas on textile imports. The idea is good, but practical results may be a long time in coming. Perhaps speedier action will come from the President, himself, after he receives a report from the Official of Civilian Defense Mobilization on the harmful effects of imports upon U.S. textiles.

On cotton prices, the President told the Department of Agriculture to study the matter of equalizing the price of U.S. cotton at home and abroad. American mills now must pay 6 cents a pound more for U.S. cotton than this country charges for U.S. cotton sold abroad. The issue has been studied so many times it is threadbare. Another study is not apt to shed new light. The idea of selling U.S. cotton at a lower price to foreign competitors of U.S. mills does not make sense.

The President's suggestion that the United States give thought to a better depreciation allowance on textile equipment holds some promise. A faster writeoff of machinery would encourage mills to replace machinery faster—which would make them more efficient and more competitive.

Another suggestion—that the Department of Commerce step up its research for new products, processes and markets in textiles—offers no hope of immediate results. It is sound and may bring long-range benefit, although it must be noted that alert industries should do their own hunting for new products, processes and markets.

The President's program looks good on paper and may turn out to be helpful. Only time will tell whether the plan produces real help for American textiles.

Mr. HEMPHILL. That particular paper serves an area which is entirely or almost entirely dependent upon the textile industry, the textile industry which provides not only production but provides jobs; and, of course, when you provide jobs you provide consumers; and when you provide consumers you provide trade in the local area.

Then, as matters progressed, on May 10, 1961, I was distressed—and I say distressed—to read in a paper in which I do not have any great confidence, but at least it has expressed the ideas of those who think may be radical or left wing, or whatever you may call them, so far as the textile industry is concerned; and I am speaking of the Washington Post, commonly termed among those of us who read it with suspicion, the Washington Daily Worker. In any event, they had an article on the editorial page, which I read frequently and read on that morning of Wednesday, May 10, 1961, called "A Terminal Case."

We all know in the treatment of diseases when you speak of a terminal case what you are talking about is somebody that is going to die. This particular editorial was about the textile industry. I ask unanimous consent, Mr. Speaker, that this editorial be included at this point in my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ALBERT). Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

The editorial referred to is as follows:

A TERMINAL CASE

With its oversea outlets vanishing and the competition at home increasingly savage, the textile industry was lobbying with desperate energy this spring for Federal quotas to hold back the rising flood of foreign imports. Last week President Kennedy told the textile manufacturers he would extend every legitimate kind of aid they were requesting, but he declined to impose quotas. The President put himself on the side of commonsense and international fairplay.

Although only 7 percent of the cloth sold here is now imported, the manufacturers can see the future clearly. From 1958 to 1960, imports of cotton, wool, and synthetic fibers more than doubled.

The State Department will renew its labors to persuade the exporting nations into voluntarily limiting their shipments to us. Apparently these self-imposed limits are to be expanded with time. Meanwhile the textile makers here will have a grace period to get out of the lines of production in which they find they cannot compete. This temporary protection is altogether proper.

President Kennedy evidently has convinced the textile industry of his genuine concern for its troubles. He will propose loans like those offered in distressed areas. The Commerce Department will undertake the research that the industry no longer can afford. The Agriculture Department will seek a solution to the really outrageous inequity of cotton pricing; the mills here must buy raw cotton on the supported domestic market, while their competitors abroad can buy American cotton 20 percent cheaper on the unsupported world market.

All of these remedies will be money well spent if they relieve the political pressure for the imposition of fixed quotas, with the discrimination that would mean. But the point to remember is that no amount of protectionism can restore the industry even to the fragile health it enjoyed 15 years ago.

Our cotton exports have sunk to one-third of the 1947 level, and quotas will not raise them. At home, consumers have spent a diminishing share of their income on clothing; plastics and paper have replaced many industrial uses of cloth. Although textile production has diminished only slightly since World War II, productivity in the mills has risen more than 70 percent; it has meant the loss of 400,000 textile jobs, and quotas will not bring them back.

Fixed textile import quotas would invite retaliation against our own products, and betray our whole foreign economic policy. Textile manufacturing is largely a low-wage, low-investment industry suitable for the early stages of a nation's development. With its high-wage, mature economy, the United States has outgrown much of textile manufacturing as an appropriate livelihood. Sustained protection of uneconomic mills would close our markets to struggling nations in whose advancement we have invested millions of dollars of foreign aid.

The decline of uncompetitive industries is always a cruel affair, both for the people who work in it and those who invested in it. The President has rightly perceived that the Government's proper role is to

soften temporarily a blow that cannot be shielded except at prohibitive cost in both dollars and international good faith.

Mr. HEMPHILL. Mr. Speaker, I do not know whose idea it is that this is a terminal case. I am here to say that anybody who says the textile industry's illness is a terminal case is doing a great disservice to the people working in that industry, the people investing in that industry, and the merchants depending on the industry as a source of merchandise and trade. I resent that article. I felt it was designed to please those who have sought to undermine the textile industry, and some, I fear, are still on the scene, not having changed with the administration.

Mr. WHITENER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HEMPHILL. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. WHITENER. I appreciate the gentleman's yielding to me. I assume one of the organizations to which he refers is the so-called Committee on National Trade Policy, when he says there are those who would like to do away with the textile industry.

Mr. HEMPHILL. I want to say to the gentleman from North Carolina that my district is next to his district. He and I have been friends for many years. I have been one of his admirers for many years. I want to say this for public consumption down in his part of the world, that I do not know anyone who has been more zealous in championing the cause of the textile people, sharing the concern others have had over the illness of the textile industry, and trying to do something about it, lifting his voice.

I am mindful of a recent and very productive trip which my distinguished friend went on in which he went into some of the textile plants over in the East and made a very wonderful and significant report. I congratulate him on it publicly. I want to say to him that his statesmanship in this field is a matter of great admiration throughout my entire State, and I am happy to have his comment during these remarks.

Mr. WHITENER. I certainly appreciate the generous remarks of my old friend and schoolmate, who has been one of our outstanding fighters for the jobs of the people in our area. As he has well stated, our districts are very similar, and depend so much on the good health of the textile industry that I feel we must of necessity speak out whenever the opportunity presents itself. I commend my friend for what he is doing, what he has done, and what I know he will do in the interest not only of the people of his district but my district and throughout this Nation who are so concerned about the state of the textile industry.

If the gentleman will permit me to do so, I should like to call to the attention of our colleagues some figures which I received yesterday from the Department of Commerce. One of my outstanding constituents is A. G. Myers, Sr., of Gastonia, who is chairman of the board of a rather large textile concern operating some 14 or 15 plants in my home county. I am happy that I happened to have this

information in my pocket today when the gentleman from South Carolina commenced his remarks.

I think very few people realize that in this country a great proportion of the textile industry is of the type we have in our part of the country, not the so-called integrated system of textile manufacturing, but where we have yarn mills. We sell to the knitting trade and to the finished goods trade. These yarn mills must be in a position to compete not only with the large textile organizations that we have in our own country which have an integrated system from the cotton or the manmade fiber to the finished product, but they must compete in prices with the products coming in from abroad.

In recent years for the first time we have seen the importation of cotton yarns and manmade fiber yarns. I think it is significant that we find in January of 1959 there were only 57,000 pounds of imports of cotton yarns for domestic consumption. In January of 1960, this figure had risen to 746,000

pounds of yarn which were brought into this country. In 1961 in January, 1,133,000 pounds of cotton yarn were shipped into this country from foreign manufacturing plants. At the same time we see from these statistics that great quantities of manmade fiber yarns are coming into our country from foreign nations. In 1950 the total amount of cotton yarn shipped into our country from abroad was 1,381,000 pounds whereas in 1960 there were 15,140,000 pounds of cotton yarn shipped into the United States from foreign countries. During that time we saw the advent of Spain, Portugal and other countries in the field of yarn manufacturing and exporting to the United States.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to include this table from the Department of Commerce, Bureau of the Census, at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ALBERT). Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

The table referred to is as follows:

Cotton and manmade fiber yarns, U.S. imports for consumption, 1959-61

[Thousands of pounds]

	Cotton yarn			Manmade fiber yarn		
	1959	1960	1961	1959	1960	1961
January.....	57	746	1,133	429	232	185
February.....	102	1,363	681	258	203	354
March.....	124	1,709	1,123	64	571	399
April.....	100	1,663	403	567
May.....	52	955	415	314
June.....	71	1,472	604	372
July.....	36	1,354	336	255
August.....	62	1,328	468	359
September.....	94	1,024	410	176
October.....	162	1,649	269	233
November.....	141	955	126	184
December.....	378	922	53	122
Total.....	1,381	15,140	3,855	3,678

Source: Bureau of the Census, "Report FT-110."

Prepared by Textiles and Clothing Division, Business and Defense Services Administration, Department of Commerce, May 12, 1961.

Mr. WHITENER. The gentleman has mentioned newspaper comment on this critical subject. Twenty miles from my hometown and just 6 or 8 miles from the line of my congressional district, there is published a newspaper known as the Charlotte News which is owned by the Knight newspaper people. For some time, they apparently were very unsympathetic with the problem of our people who earn their living in the textile plants with reference to this problem of textile imports. Just a few minutes ago, I read the Charlotte News of Monday, May 15, 1961, which is yesterday's issue and I was pleased to find an editorial entitled "Textiles: Time for Relief Is Short." They conclude with this statement:

But, clearly, the time has come for concrete action and negotiations that produce substantial results.

Otherwise, SAM ERVIN's talk (that is in reference, of course, to our distinguished senior Senator from North Carolina) of a liquidated industry may assume an appearance of prophecy.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to include this very splendid editorial in the RECORD at this point.

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

There was no objection.

The editorial referred to is as follows:

TEXTILES: TIME FOR RELIEF IS SHORT

Despite Senator SAM ERVIN's gloomy forecasts of an ongoing liquidation of the textile industry, two major factors give concreteness to President Kennedy's recent promises of relief.

One is a new high of tough protectionist sentiment in the Congress. Unless accommodated by determined efforts to guard U.S. industries against unregulated foreign goods imports, this sentiment could result in grievous damage to the international trade structure.

The administration, according to a New York Times report, sees a necessity of avoiding that risk by concrete concessions. While hope remains of avoiding mandatory tariffs or quotas on imports, these have not been ruled out. In any event, the pressure on the administration is strong and growing.

The other major factor is statistics that remove all doubts of merit in industry cries for help. There must, to be sure, be new initiatives by industry in research, merchandising, and plant modernization—and the Government can assist here without question. But in view of the following figures, industry initiative clearly cannot do the job alone:

Textile imports in 1960 were running at the rate of 140 percent of exports which hit their lowest point since World War II.

Textile employment was at an alltime low—at 807,300 in January, it was about half the total employment in 1947.

Five years ago, when industry complaints led to a voluntary quota system in Japan, imports in cotton broadwoven goods, the largest category, were running 3 percent of total U.S. production.

The figure in 1960 was 8 percent and rising.

The domestic textile industry labored through this period and still labors under the discriminatory two-price cotton system which gives increasing advantage to foreign factories.

The administration ought to take every possible step to avoid tariff and quota walls by making voluntary import-limit arrangements with a dozen countries comparatively new in the textile field, or by arranging with other countries to take greater shares of the imports.

Once the mandatory tariff-quota door is opened, there can be no visible end to appeals by other industries for protection. Moreover, the encouragement of economic development in friendly countries is basic to the U.S. role in the world.

But, clearly, the time has come for concrete action and negotiations that produce substantial results.

Otherwise, SAM ERVIN's talk of a liquidated industry may assume an appearance of prophecy.

Mr. WHITENER. Mr. Speaker, the Charlotte Observer, also published by the Knight newspapers, a year or two ago were implying in their editorials and articles, written by their representative here in Washington, that the people in the textile industry and people like the gentlemen from South Carolina who have been concerned about the future of the industry were crying wolf when no wolf was at the door.

I was very pleased to note on Friday, May 12, 1961, a United Press International article appearing in the Charlotte Observer entitled "U.S. Textile Industry Is Sick." The publication of this article in the Observer would indicate, I hope, that they have now seen the light and realized that we are confronted with a disastrous problem. I do not, of course, agree with everything else in the article, but I think the burden of the article is that the textile industry is in such shape that immediate assistance must be had if we are to preserve the jobs of the people in it.

Significantly, this article points out that one out of every three workers who worked in textile plants in 1947 either has another job today or is jobless. We are told in this article that more than one-half of these 229,000 people were turned out when 838 mills stopped their looms and closed their doors. The man who wrote this apparently is not too familiar with textiles, because it was not stopping looms that put that many out of work, it was stopping frames, looms, openers, pickers, winders, spoolers, and cards, and all types of other machinery. But in this article there is further pointed out something which I think very few people in the nontextile areas realize. They say that American manufacturers cannot compete with goods from places like Hong Kong, Japan, India, and Pakistan where the cost of labor is so much lower than it is here; but

at another point in this article we are told that today the big problem is Hong Kong, since they are now exceeding the Japanese in the amount of textiles that are being sent into this country.

I ask unanimous consent, Mr. Speaker, that this article I have mentioned may be made a part of the RECORD at this point.

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

There was no objection.

(The matter referred to follows:)

U.S. TEXTILE INDUSTRY IS SICK—MILLS INSIST FOREIGN IMPORT CURBS ARE ONLY SURE CURE
(By Steven Gerstel)

WASHINGTON.—The textile industry in the United States is sick.

A lingering malady, first diagnosed shortly after World War II, has steadily eaten away at its size and strength.

One out of every three workers who toiled in a mill in 1947 has another job today; or he is jobless.

More than one-half of these workers—229,000—were turned out when 838 mills stopped their looms and closed their doors.

Many of these mills were small. But many of them were either the only or the biggest industry in a New England village or a town in Dixie.

To the textile industry there is only one cure for the illness: stop the flood of imports. We can't compete with the cheap labor overseas, they cry. Save us, because in time of war the United States will need us.

To President Kennedy, to Senate committees, to the Commerce Department, to the State Department, to the press, and to anyone else who will listen, the textile industry says it is faced with extinction unless the Government imposes country-by-country, category-by-category quotas on foreign imports.

The chant has been adopted and repeated by Senators and Representatives from the textile States. They have repeated it in speeches on the floors of Congress and they have repeated it to President Kennedy.

The President has reacted. He has announced a seven-point program to help the industry. But he has not specifically recommended quotas.

The President, like virtually everyone else including the importers and the committee for a national trade policy, knows the textile industry is unhealthy.

But he has said that "protectionism is not a solution" to American trade problems.

Commerce Secretary Luther Hodges, speaking to the 12th annual convention of the American Cotton Manufacturers Institute, said "I need not tell you that until and unless you have more unselfishness and more long-range planning and thinking, nobody can help you stay in business and make a profit.

"Many of us," he added, "are asking the country to take care of us before we have done all we can."

Buried beneath the statistics showing the decline of the textile industry and the well-publicized drive for quotas are at least several weaknesses within the industry itself.

One, pointed out by the Senate subcommittee which recommended quotas, is the industry's unwillingness to spend enough on research to find new uses for textiles.

Another, revealed by Senator OLIN D. JOHNSTON, Democrat, of South Carolina, last week is that domestic textile manufacturers have heavy investments in foreign mills which compete with the American companies.

Foreign textiles have undoubtedly hurt the domestic industry and hurt it badly.

Imports are one facet of this pain.

American manufacturers cannot compete with goods from places like Hong Kong, Japan, India, and Pakistan where the cost of labor is much lower.

A vivid example of the difference is that a man can buy identical white shirts in this country at two prices. The \$2.95 model has a "made in Hong Kong" label. The more expensive shirt was made in the United States.

In addition, the imports, which account for only about 8 percent of the domestic consumption, tend to drive American prices down and cut profits.

But exports from the United States have also been hurt by the increase abroad. The export market has remained relatively stable while foreign manufacturers have muscled in, both in this country and elsewhere.

Kennedy's seven-point program has given the industry a good deal of encouragement. The feeling stems mainly from the fact that the Office of Civil Defense and Mobilization will consider any request for quotas if the industry can prove it is vital to the national defense.

The industry feels it can prove this, if not on a blanket basis then certainly in some categories. It plans to file for quotas.

But it may run into trouble. Southern manufacturers are refusing to bid on Army Quartermaster Corps contracts. They are shying away because the President's Committee on Equal Job Opportunities won't approve defense outlays to plants that are segregated.

South Carolina, for example, has a specific law which prohibits Negroes and whites working together in mills.

The textile industry has a friend in Kennedy. His home State of Massachusetts has suffered the full effects of the industry's decline. He also received the backing of the Southern textile people because of his campaign promises of relief. And he needs the votes of many textile Congressmen to push his program through Congress.

But Kennedy is no longer a Massachusetts Senator and he has to weigh the plight of the textile industry against the effect of quotas on such allies as Japan and such neutrals as India.

IMPORT RATE DOUBLES 1958

BOSTON.—Textile imports poured into the United States markets in 1960 at twice the rate of 1958 and 10 times the rate of 1948, the Northern Textile Association (NTA) reported Thursday.

A study of Federal import statistics, just completed, shows imports of textile manufacturers last year reached a record 1.3 billion square yards in contrast to only 131 million square yards 12 years ago, the NTA said.

Surprisingly, in 1960, Hong Kong moved out ahead of Japan as the principal source of cotton textile imports, although Japan remained in second place. The combined totals from Spain, Egypt, France, and Portugal multiplied 33 times in 2 years.

Mr. WHITENER. Mr. Speaker, and may I say again to the gentleman from South Carolina that the 806,000 remaining textile workers that we are told we now have—and I do not include the apparel industry in that number—today feel a sense of appreciation for the splendid work that the gentleman from South Carolina is doing in trying to preserve the jobs of those people in the industry. I feel that unless others join with us in this battle the textile worker will become a vanishing breed in this country, and that throughout the great textile area in which we live and the great cotton-producing area in which we live we will see appearing on the horizon

ghost towns as these textile plants are passing from the American economic scene by reason of the dereliction of many in protecting a basic textile industry, a basic value of our economy, and an industry which provided a livelihood for many thousands and millions of people in the past, an industry which has given to me and thousands of others summer jobs in vacation periods. We were able to get work in those plants, an industry which is home-owned, for the most part, where the largest chain in the textile industry, unlike many other great industries, produces only approximately 5 percent of the total of American textiles. It is an industry of small business.

We hear so much about small business here in the Halls of Congress. I certainly hope my friends over on the left and on the right will join with us as we carry on this battle for survival of an industry which is so important to all of us.

Mr. HEMPHILL. I thank the gentleman from North Carolina for the inclusion of those fine statistics and for his comments.

I have here the May 11, 1961, edition of the American Textile Reporter, and I should like to refer to an article beginning on page 19 and continuing on page 44 of that publication, with which I do not altogether agree. It goes on to say this proposal is a gift package but there is precious little in it, I share the gentleman's concern, but I must say I do not see it that way. I feel that we have an opportunity. Since the textile industry was lulled to sleep once before—and before we passed the Reciprocal Act of 1958 it was lulled to sleep—it should wake up to the fact that it was lulled into this false security position and the textile industry should not be lulled into any sense of false security. Words alone are not sufficient in this day and time. We must give voice to our feelings here, but we also want those who are charged with responsibilities uptown to know that we expect some action from the Department of State, the Department of Agriculture, and the Department of Commerce in accord with the President's proclamation.

I believe the President was sincere. We were sincere in appealing to him in the campaign last fall, and also during the spring when various Members of Congress went to him representing the textile industry. I was not privileged to be selected for the smaller group, but I was in the larger group. He gave us hope.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to include this article from the American Textile Reporter at this point.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

The article referred to follows:

The textile industry has received a beautiful gift package tied with fancy ribbon from President Kennedy but there's precious little in it.

In effect, the President has said he may favor more import restrictions on textiles if foreign exporting nations do not agree to an international control program which would guarantee them an ever-increasing share of

the U.S. market. In other words, the administration isn't opposed to foreign manufacturers taking a larger and larger share of domestic business; it only opposes abrupt increases in textile imports which disrupt market conditions here. What the Government is seeking is a system which would—and this a direct quote—"stabilize the increase." This is what industry leaders are applauding.

The fact of the matter is that the industry got absolutely nothing from the President's seven-point program which it did not already have—except, perhaps, a little more reason to hope for faster tax write-offs on textile machinery and the "privilege" of paying the same price as foreign competitors for U.S. cotton. Most industry spokesmen disagree with this interpretation; some go so far as to say that the seventh item in the President's program—his pledge that an application by the industry for import relief under the escape clause or national security provisions of the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act will be "carefully considered on its merits"—means that any request for restrictions by way of these routes will be automatically approved. However, the President's promise represents no more than what is required by law.

Actually, the industry's plea for mandatory quotas was rejected by President Kennedy—for the present—at a crucial April 18 meeting at the White House with his Cabinet Committee on the Textile Industry. In all the debate over what President Kennedy's seven-point program means to the industry, the question of just what the Committee recommended has been forgotten. However, this is an extremely important point.

The recommendations of the Cabinet group, headed by Commerce Secretary Luther H. Hodges, were neatly fuzzed up in the various briefings, off-the-record explanations of the new program, and the President's announcement itself. When the excitement died down, there was no one to explain the Committee's role in the final decision. Chairman Hodges took off for Europe 24 hours before the White House announced the program and other Cabinet members long since had gone back to the affairs of their various departments. The White House merely said the seven-point program was "developed" by the Hodges group.

There was a reason for shunting the Cabinet Committee to one side in the excitement of getting the program out. The reason was that the Hodges Committee had in fact recommended import quotas along the lines urged by textile industry leaders for years. The President, however, was unwilling to accept the quota system for international political reasons and he ordered an alternative solution developed. This is when the seven-point program, featuring the international conference idea, was cooked up as a substitute.

It cannot be established whether the Cabinet Committee's recommendations were ever put on paper. The White House denies there was any record of the April 18 meeting, the decisive session on the textile problem. They say the group's presentation was oral and did not contain any recommendations, a version of the meeting that is hard to credit. It is difficult to believe that the group, after studying the situation with the object in mind of making recommendations, merely took the President on a "tour of the horizon" to acquaint him with problems with which he is well acquainted from his days in Congress. It is also difficult to believe that the Committee failed to make recommendations, as the President requested when he organized the study group, explicitly or implicitly, on paper or otherwise.

On the basis of information supplied by a first-rate authority within the Government, here's what transpired at the April 18 meet-

ing. After detailing various possible solutions to the import question, Secretary Hodges said the Committee was recommending import quotas on a country-by-country, category-by-category basis. This was the only workable solution to the import issue, he told the President. Secretary of the Treasury Douglas Dillon, who also attended the meeting, seconded the recommendations. This was obviously a difficult task for a man of his liberal trade views, but he backed Secretary Hodges completely. George W. Ball, Under Secretary of State for Economic Affairs, opposed the plan. President Kennedy also found the plan unpalatable and directed that a substitute be prepared. The result was the seven-point program.

To a striking degree, the President's proposals parallel recommendations made to the President by the National Committee for a National Trade Policy, a liberal trade group. This placed some members of the industry in the position of praising recommendations which only a short time before they had criticized. Representatives of foreign countries, exporter and importer groups were generally gleeful over developments. They felt it meant the President plans to help the industry become more competitive by modernization while doing little about imports.

Another authoritative source said the White House had ordered industry representatives to show enthusiasm over the program if they expected any help at all. This source said that some of the statements issued after the White House meeting with industry leaders were written by members of the President's staff. Although spokesmen for the industry deny these reports, it is hard to understand what the industry could find in the program on imports to generate so much enthusiasm. Privately, a number of textile people did express dismay and puzzlement.

By weekend, a group of fiber, textile, and apparel trade associations had announced plans to petition the Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization for import restrictions under the national security provision of the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act. The speed with which they acted reflects their desire to get something done before the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act comes up for extension next year. This is the sole remaining lever available to the industry to help get favorable consideration of its bid for protection.

The national security procedure has been viewed by the textile industry as the most promising vehicle to control imports since it was changed in 1958 by an amendment sponsored by Senator HARRY F. BYRD, Democrat, of Virginia, chairman of the Senate Finance Committee. At the time, Secretary of the Treasury Douglas Dillon was Under Secretary of State and in charge of guiding the bill through Congress. In order to get it through the conservative Finance Committee, he had to agree to accept the Byrd amendment. In effect, this extended the meaning of the national security provision—which specified that import controls could be imposed if imports threatened national security—to include economic welfare. Thus, if imports threaten to undermine the economic welfare, the Byrd amendment says they also threaten the national security.

Commenting on the petition which would be filed, ACMI President J. M. Cheatham said: "Our group is confident it can substantiate the position that imports are increasing at such a rate as to threaten not only the American fiber-textile-apparel industry's ability to contribute to the growth of the Nation's economy (that is, its economic welfare), but also its capacity to supply the Nation's primary military textile item requirements in the event of either a limited or general emergency."

However, at a high level background briefing, one U.S. official said that the ad-

ministration is against trade restrictions. While he reluctantly acknowledged that textile imports are a growing problem, he stated flatly that the United States has no present intentions of rolling back imports. Instead, he said, the problem is to increase imports over the years on a systematic basis. He said a primary objective in forthcoming trade talks would be to convince Canada and Western Europe that they also must accept a larger share of textile imports from developing nations.

It is difficult to see how such comments can be construed to show a change of atmosphere in Washington.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HEMPHILL. I am happy to yield to the distinguished majority leader.

Mr. McCORMACK. While it is not in any way going to solve the problem of the textiles, I was very much interested in a matter called to my attention back several years ago where the Government sold cotton abroad at several cents a pound less than it was being sold to American industry. I introduced a bill that provided that at least for a period of time the American industry would be enabled to purchase cotton at the same price that it was sold abroad. I think there was an 8-cent differential, or something like that. Is that correct?

Mr. HEMPHILL. Six cents to eight and one-half cents.

Mr. McCORMACK. I introduced a bill again a few days ago. On one occasion we had a bill up here relating to agriculture. The chairman of the committee and the ranking Republican member of that committee were agreeable to accepting my bill as an amendment, but it was not germane to the bill before the House. A Member made a point of order. I never could understand why legislation along such lines, whether introduced by me or by someone else, should not be reported out of the committee. From information I have received, I know that the bill would be helpful, not a solution, but it is one of the steps. As I remember, it was one of those matters mentioned by the President in his statement of a few weeks ago, and I understand that the President's Committee on Textiles is considering the matter.

Would the gentleman care to express his views as to the value of legislation along such lines to the textile industry?

Mr. HEMPHILL. I certainly would, and I thank the gentleman for his remarks and his interest, and for his introduction of that legislation.

In the fourth item of the several items mentioned by the President in his message, he mentioned specifically that he had directed the Department of Agriculture to explore and make recommendations to eliminate or offset the cost to U.S. mills of the adverse differential in raw cotton costs between domestic and foreign textile producers.

I found when I was overseas looking into the textile problem that this was one of the situations of a problematical nature. The differential in cotton is very significant, and this year when it was first announced that there would continue to be a differential there was great concern in the industry which was

expressed to me about the fact there was still this differential in cotton. I think and I hope this will go a way toward solving the problem.

Mr. McCORMACK. This is a matter that has been considered for several years. I introduced my first bill back 5 or 6 years ago, and a distinguished Member of the other body, who was a Member of this House, the present Senator from Maine [Mrs. SMITH] introduced a bill. I was so impressed with the justice and the fairness of it that my conscience prompted me to introduce the bill for whatever value it might be worth. Now, when I read the President's statement and the several points called to the attention of one of the President's Cabinet Committee, I again introduced a bill about 10 days ago. Now, this matter is nothing new. It has been considered previously. The thought in my mind is, Why cannot the Secretary of Agriculture—and I say this in no critical sense—get an immediate report relative to this situation? At least, the prompt passage of that bill would be an affirmative act of deep interest to the textile industry; action showing interest; taking it out of the academic stage into the active stage. That is something that should be done very quickly. It seems to me that the Department of Agriculture—and I say it in no critical sense—should make a prompt report, and certainly the Committee on Agriculture should see that prompt action is taken on such legislation.

I do not care whether my bill is reported out. I am not seeking authorship. I am seeking results, because that particular aspect—and I am not confining my remarks to the textile industry alone—appeals to my sense of fairness, something that the American industry is entitled to.

Mr. HEMPHILL. I thank the gentleman for his timely and very pertinent remarks, and I am heartily in agreement with him. It is a very fair thing, and I shall do all in my power to help him further the consideration and passage of this legislation.

Mr. WHITENER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HEMPHILL. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. WHITENER. I want to say to the gentleman and my colleagues that I appreciate the statement just made by the majority leader, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK], and for the effort he has put forth in this one problem concerning the textile industry. I have talked to many people who know and understand the problem, and they feel that if we can get one-price cotton, as suggested by the distinguished majority leader, that our ability to compete with foreign textiles would be greatly improved. I know of no American in the textile industry, whether as employee or as owner, who feels that we can bring the type of operation of our plants, the wage scale, and the other operations, down to the low standard which the gentleman from South Carolina and I have observed in foreign textile plants. But, if we can

get for our industry a bit of help, such as the gentleman from Massachusetts is suggesting, we can give them a good run for their money, because even though we talk about the excellence of these mills abroad, my observation has been that they are not yet the type of people who have the ingenuity of the American people. So, if we can break through with this one-price cotton and two or three other things, I am sure that we can compete and rebuild our textile industry which is staggering now. I think it is characteristic of our friend, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK] that he is not seeking personal recognition and does not say that he has any great pride of authorship.

Rather, he is trying to eliminate an inequity which any fairminded person upon study and reflection would recognize. I certainly join with the gentleman from South Carolina in pledging to the gentleman from Massachusetts my fullest efforts in trying to accomplish the very worthwhile purpose which he is promoting through his legislation.

Mr. HEMPHILL. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. HEMPHILL. I am happy to yield again to the distinguished majority leader.

Mr. McCORMACK. The fairness of the proposition has so effectively appealed to me since I first had called to my attention this differential against American industry that after introducing the bill I sent a letter to the chairman of the House Committee on Agriculture a few days ago enclosing a copy of the bill, urging early action by his committee. It seems to me to be so self-evident that we ought to give our American industry the same opportunity to buy at the same price at which we are selling abroad.

Mr. HEMPHILL. Mr. Speaker, I certainly agree with the gentleman's sentiments and I might say it is my feeling that the actions of the gentleman show the good faith of the Kennedy administration in promoting some relief along this line and other lines.

Mr. WHITENER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield to me in order that I might ask the distinguished majority leader a question?

Mr. HEMPHILL. I am happy to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. WHITENER. I hear it said by many that we must protect our foreign cotton market for the farmers of our country. It seems to me that the basic market of the American cotton farmer is still the American textile industry and when we overlook the fact that the basic requirement for cotton in this country will probably always be the American industry, I am wondering if the gentleman would agree with me that in trying to protect a so-called foreign market we are probably overlooking the more important market which our farmers have for their cotton.

Mr. McCORMACK. The answer is that the American textile industry is one of the great industries of our country and that certainly every consideration should be given to enable this great in-

dustry—and I am not confining my remarks to this—to meet foreign competition; and certainly in the field that I have addressed myself to in connection with the bill that I have introduced, to give to the American textile industry the same price level that is given to textile companies abroad.

Now, that is not the whole solution, but certainly it would constitute an important step forward in meeting the problems that confront the American textile industry.

Mr. HEMPHILL. I want to thank the gentleman. Unless he objects, under permission previously granted, to keep the continuity of these remarks, I shall insert at this point in the RECORD the bill known as H.R. 6783 introduced by the distinguished majority leader and for which we of the textile area are most grateful:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That it is the purpose of this Act to assist the United States cotton textile industry to reestablish and maintain its fair historical share of the world market in cotton textiles so as to

- (1) insure the continued existence of such industry,
- (2) prevent unemployment in such industry, and
- (3) allow employees in such industry to participate in the high national level of earnings.

Sec. 2. (a) In order to carry out the purpose of this Act the Secretary of Agriculture is authorized and directed to make available to textile mills in the United States during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1960, and each of the four succeeding fiscal years not less than seven hundred and fifty thousand bales of surplus cotton owned by the Commodity Credit Corporation at such prices as the Secretary determines will allow the United States cotton textile industry to regain the level of exports of cotton products maintained by it during the period 1947 and through 1952. Cotton shall be made available to a textile mill under this Act only upon agreement by such mill that such cotton will be used only for the manufacture of cotton products for exports.

(b) The Secretary shall announce, not later than September 1 of each year for which surplus cotton is made available under this Act, the price at which such cotton is to be made available and thereafter for a period of thirty days shall accept applications from textile mills for the purchase of such surplus cotton. In the event the quantity of cotton for which application is made exceeds the quantity of such cotton made available for distribution under this Act, the cotton made available for distribution shall be distributed pro rata among the mills making application therefor on the basis of the quantities of cotton processed by such mills during the three calendar years preceding the year for which such distribution is made.

Sec. 3. The Secretary shall promulgate such rules and regulations as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this Act.

Sec. 4. Any person who knowingly sells or offers for sale in the United States any product processed or manufactured in whole or substantial part from any cotton made available under this Act shall be punished by a fine of not more than \$5,000, or by imprisonment for not more than five years, or by both such fine and imprisonment.

Mr. HEMPHILL. Mr. Speaker, I also have here an article which was sent to me through the mails, put out apparently by Prentice-Hall, Inc., whom I know as lawbook publishers, dated May

15, 1961, in which there is a treatment of trade under the title "Trade Restraint—For Awhile." I do not believe this article expresses the truth of the situation but I think it important in any discussion of this kind that we document for the RECORD what others are saying, because we want the whole picture.

We in the textile industry want, and I know the President wants, and so do others, the comments on the situation. So I include that in the RECORD at this point:

TRADE RESTRAINT—FOR AWHILE

Against his long-range wishes, President Kennedy is following a trade policy with decidedly protectionist overtones. If current calculations are right, however, it will be discarded after about a year. In the meantime, administration officials realize, it will be difficult to curtail imports while simultaneously trying to promote American trade abroad.

So far, willingness to restrain imports has shown up best in the White House's response to the textile industry's plea for protection. This gave Mr. Kennedy a chance to begin erecting a shelter over textiles, while also heralding a broader aim of Government: aid to any industry hurt by imports.

The object of both efforts is to show domestic protectionists and foreign industrialists alike that the administration is sympathetic toward U.S. economic woes traceable to foreign competition. This is intended to quiet the protectionists and keep them from seeking drastic solutions while also persuading foreigners to use self-restraint in shipping to the United States to avoid officially-imposed barriers.

Administration aids are all but certain that they can begin working toward an unqualified free trade policy after about a year. They feel confident that industry problems here can be smoothed over if not solved.

And, privately, they concede that free trade will become politically realistic next year, after Congress renews Presidential authority to bargain with other countries to reach agreements on mutual reduction of tariffs.

Mr. HEMPHILL. Mr. Speaker, recently I received from an old friend who had just visited in Kioto, Japan, a letter in which he wrote to me about my interest in textiles and he said:

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: My son, Walter Jr., sent me copies of your report to Congress on your investigation of the Chinese and Japanese textile situation and I want to express my appreciation of your efforts in behalf of our industry. I visited four mills in Manila, four in Hong Kong, and four in Taiwan before coming to Japan.

I have been through some of the mills you visited and I know you share my grave concern over the future of our industry in the States. The mills of Manila and Hong Kong are running 7 days a week and with their wages and ability to buy cotton 6 cents and 8½ cents cheaper in August it is no wonder. I was especially impressed with the high caliber of our State Department representatives in Hong Kong.

When you consider there was scarcely any textile industry in Manila, Hong Kong, and Taiwan prior to 1948 and there are now 400,000, 500,000, and 382,000 spindles, respectively, in those countries, and Japan has come up from 3,500,000 spindles at the end of the war to more than 12 million—all while the industry in the United States is being liquidated.

Do hope the President's seven-point program will furnish some relief. It is urgently needed.

I call that to your attention because that ties in with the remarks of the gentleman from North Carolina who was over there and was on the scene.

I have here some clippings which I should like to include at this time from Japanese papers. One of them is the Mainichi Daily News. These clippings are dated May 5, 1961, and they are from Japan. I ask unanimous consent to include them at this point in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

The articles referred to are as follows:

JAPAN TO PARTICIPATE IN INTERNATIONAL COTTON CLOTH MEET CALLED BY JFK

Kelichi Matsumura, director of the Textile Bureau of the Ministry of International Trade and Industry, told the press Thursday that Japan will take part in an international conference proposed by President Kennedy on textile trade problems.

At the same time present cotton fabric export quota negotiations between the United States and Japan will be continued, he said. The cotton export quota is outside the scope of the international textile conference, he said.

The United States has proposed that Japanese delegates suspend negotiations temporarily until the Kennedy administration has worked out a reconstruction plan for the U.S. textile industry.

Now that President Kennedy has announced America's 7-point textile program, negotiations for cotton fabrics export quotas should be resumed, the Japanese Government considers. The Foreign Ministry is instructing the Japanese Embassy in Washington to make the proposal to the American Government.

Matsumura said that at the proposed international conference the United States will request European countries to purchase more textiles in order to lessen pressure on the American textile industry. At the same time, the United States may urge textile exporting countries to adopt a voluntary export quota system, he said.

The Government and Japanese businessmen will sound out the opinions of cotton exporting countries on the proposed international textile conference at the International Cotton Conference to be held in Osaka starting May 8.

Regarding the international conference proposed by President Kennedy, Kichihai Hara, chairman of the All-Japan Cotton Spinners Association, commented that the Japanese industry was willing to make concessions to the extent that other countries concerned are willing to respect a rightful share for each other.

[From the Mainichi (Japan) Daily News
May 5, 1961]

UNITED STATES PLANS INTERNATIONAL MEETING TO FIX TEXTILE QUOTAS

WASHINGTON, May 4.—The State Department said Wednesday it is getting in touch with the main textile exporting and importing nations to arrange a conference on President Kennedy's plan for controls of the textile trade.

Later, however, a State Department official said this did not mean that formal invitations had been sent out or that the full list of countries to be invited had been determined.

At the conference, one official said, the United States probably will propose a formula for assuring slow and orderly expansion of textile exports. The result would be a system of semivoluntary export quotas somewhat like Japan's quota controls.

About 20 countries and colonies, including Hong Kong, were to be asked to attend. The State Department was expected to announce the list later Wednesday.

At the same time, the United States and Japan will resume direct talks on Japan's 1961 quota controls on textile shipments to the U.S. market. Japan wants to increase the quotas by an average of 30 percent, contending that Hong Kong and other countries are taking advantage of Japan's rigid self-limitation to seize big shares of the U.S. market.

A State Department official said it would be impossible to complete the complex multilateral negotiations on the proposed worldwide textile trade restrictions in time to deal with Japan's proposal for the current calendar year.

However, it was expected that the international arrangement would replace the United States-Japan arrangement in future years.

A State Department official denied a published (New York Times) report that the Kennedy administration's plan for meeting the complaints of the U.S. textile industry points strongly toward imposing U.S. import quota barriers.

He said this could not be completely ruled out if the proposed conference and other measures fail to solve the problem on a multilateral, cooperative basis. But the administration hopes to avoid a sweeping protectionist move which would undermine the basic U.S. liberal trade policy and invite retaliation against U.S. exports.

[From the Yoniuri, May 5, 1961]

J.F.K.'S SEVEN-POINT PLAN SPIRITS JAPAN TEXTILE INTERESTS

WASHINGTON, May 2.—Japanese textile interests were greatly encouraged Tuesday that President Kennedy had avoided all reference to mandatory quotas in laying down a seven-point program of assistance to the U.S. textile industry.

The main attention of foreign producers, who have been sending an increasing flow of cotton textiles into the U.S. market, was centered on Kennedy's proposal for an early conference of the principal textile exporting and importing countries.

The State Department is now arranging to call the meeting which presumably will be held in Washington.

Kennedy defined the purpose of the conference as an effort to seek an international understanding which will provide a basis for trade that will avoid undue disruption of established industries.

To many textile experts here, this sounded like a U.S. effort to obtain voluntary instead of mandatory quotas on imports to this country.

How far such a conference can go in reaching a broad understanding remained to be seen.

The U.S. domestic industry was gratified by the seven-point Kennedy program particularly on point 7 which invited the industry to make use of the existing escape clause provisions under the tariff commission or the national security provision of the Trade Agreements Extension Act.

The United States-Japan Trade Council headed by Nelson Stitt said in a letter to President Kennedy "We are confident that you will approve no measure on textiles which would be inconsistent with our paramount foreign policy objectives." He said the textile industry together with other segments of the American economy "has a vital stake in maintaining its export markets. This goal can scarcely be achieved by adopting restrictive quota barriers against imports or similar devices which would invite retaliation."

REACTION

The Japan textile industry Wednesday expressed deep concern over Kennedy's proposal and decided to watch closely its future developments.

As to the proposed international conference, the industry is expected to decide on its firm attitude after sounding opinions of delegates from textile producing countries who are to attend a general meeting of the International Cotton Federation to be opened in Osaka Monday.

Mr. HEMPHILL. Mr. Speaker, the thing that is bothering us so much is the fact that textile imports not only from Japan, where we have the voluntary quota, but now from Hong Kong, where we have no quota, are rising. I ask unanimous consent to include in my remarks at this time a newspaper clipping on this subject, from the Columbia, (S.C.) State, of May 13, 1961.

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

There was no objection.

The newspaper clipping is as follows:

JUMP IN TEXTILE IMPORTS REFLECTED IN
NEW REPORT

BOSTON.—Textile imports poured into the U.S. markets in 1960 at twice the rate of 1958 and 10 times the rate of 1948, the Northern Textile Association reported Thursday.

A study of Federal import statistics, just completed, shows imports of textile manufactures last year reached a record 1.3 billion square yards in contrast to only 131 million square yards 12 years ago, the NTA said.

Surprisingly, in 1960, Hong Kong moved out ahead of Japan as the principal source of cotton textile imports, although Japan remained in second place. The combined totals from Spain, Egypt, France, and Portugal multiplied 33 times in 2 years.

Cotton manufactures imported from Formosa, Korea, Pakistan and India jumped 1,200 percent in the same 2-year period, the NTA said, while in wool textiles Italy and Japan supplied nearly two-thirds of U.S. imports.

Seabury Stanton, president of Berkshire Hathaway Inc., New Bedford, Mass., and chairman of the association, said the report is being distributed to more than 100 Members of Congress who took part in recent import discussions. It also will go to Government and trade officials studying the problem.

Mr. HEMPHILL. Mr. Speaker, just today in the Wall Street Journal, on page 10, appears an article of importance in this connection. I ask unanimous consent to include that article in my remarks at this point.

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

There was no objection.

TEXTILE INDUSTRY ASKS AGENCY TO RULE IMPORTS THREATEN U.S. SECURITY—SUCH A FINDING WOULD EMPOWER PRESIDENT TO ORDER REMEDIES SUCH AS QUOTAS, TARIFFS, FEES

WASHINGTON.—The textile industry began the series of steps it hopes will result in the imposition by President Kennedy of Government quotas on textile imports.

Industry organizations petitioned the Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization for a finding that textile imports are threatening the national security. If such a finding is made, the President is empowered under the reciprocal trade law to order remedies such as import quotas, higher tariffs, or import fees.

Though the filing with the agency made no mention of specific remedies, there's no

doubt the textile industry seeks import quotas. In past testimony before congressional committees, industry representatives have contended that the only way to solve the industry's ills is for the Government to slap country-by-country and category-by-category quotas on textile imports.

The industry action comes less than 2 weeks after President Kennedy, in outlining a seven-point program of Government assistance for the domestic industry, gave assurance that an application under the reciprocal trade law would be carefully considered on its merits.

ADMINISTRATION'S PROGRAM

The seven-point administration program ranged from a proposed international conference, not yet called, to seek voluntary agreement among foreign textile-producing countries to reduce shipments to the United States to a study of additional depreciation deductions that might be allowed for tax purposes on textile machinery.

The industry petition requested the OCDM "to institute an investigation, to require expedited submission of views, and at the earliest practical time to determine and advise the President that textiles and textile manufacturers are being imported under such circumstances as to threaten to impair the national security."

Under the reciprocal trade law, the OCDM, in order to render a finding that imports threaten the national security, must conclude that the affected domestic industry is essential either to the Nation's military establishment, to the national economy, or to both.

The textile industry argued that it qualified for Federal help on both counts. Because of excessive imports, the industry said it "is threatened with absolute incapacity to meet projected national defense requirements." The petition noted that during times of emergency, the military demands for textiles climb sharply. For example, it said, military consumption of textiles at World War II's peak exceeded normal consumption by 50 times; during the first full year of the Korean emergency, military consumption jumped tenfold.

AN IMMEDIATE INCREASE

"It may be concluded that there will be an immediate increase in the military requirements for textile manufactures in the event of an emergency, ranging from 10 times to as much as 50 times the rate at present," the petition asserted. In addition, it added, during emergency times "the requirements for textile materials to fill civil defense and essential civilian needs would be very high."

Mr. HEMPHILL. Mr. Speaker, the reason I have included all these various articles is that I think they reflect the concern of the people of this Nation over what is going to happen to the textile industry. For my part, it is very vital that this industry survive. For my part, it is very vital that this particular industry not only survive but that conditions improve, because if conditions do not improve then people will be out of work. Not only will people be out of work, but a great industry will lose its impact on the American economy. I do not believe it is the will of the people of this country, I am certain now it is not the will of this administration, and I do not believe it is the will of this Congress that this industry shall disappear or be so decimated that it no longer has its impact as one of the great industries on the American scene.

I think we should not be lulled into any sense of security. We not only have our problems incidental to the industry and peculiar to the industry, we have the problem of meeting the competition. That is a problem that we cannot afford to overlook. In spite of all the assurances we have, we of the textile area must be ever on guard that not only is our industry efficient but that we overlook no opportunity to improve and compete in every way.

I ask unanimous consent to include in my remarks at this point some tables showing the trend in the textile industry and in the imports of certain textile manufactures. These tables appear on page 1 through page 7 of the booklet I have here. They show these most unfortunate effects on the textile industry.

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

There was no objection.

The matter referred to follows:

Trends in U.S. imports of certain
textile manufactures

[U.S. imports of textile manufactures increased 10 times since 1948 and more than doubled since 1958]

	Millions of square yards			Percent increase	
	1948	1958	1960	1958-60	1948-60
Cotton manufactures.....	64	456	1,008	121	1,475
Wool manufactures.....	26	55	111	102	327
Wilton and velvet carpets.....	1	5	8	60	700
Manmade fiber manufactures.....	8	49	100	104	1,150
Silk manufactures.....	32	65	83	28	159
Total.....	131	630	1,310	108	900

Nineteen hundred and sixty imports were sizable both absolutely and as a percentage of domestic production of cloth and yarn.

	Square yards		Imports as percent of domestic production
	Imports	Domestic production	
Cotton broadwoven manufactures.....	Millions 841	Millions 10,914	7.7
Wool broadwoven manufactures.....	74	483	15.3
Wilton and velvet carpets.....	8	33	24.2
Man-made and silk broadwoven manufactures.....	163	3,278	5.0
Yarn and yarn products, except broadwoven.....	224	3,714	6.0
Total.....	1,310	18,422	7.1

In 1948, imports were less than 1 percent of domestic production; in 1958 the ratio was 3.5 percent, and in 1960, 7.1 percent.

For certain types of textiles this ratio is much higher. In 1960, wool broadwoven textile imports were 15 percent of domestic production, carpet imports 24 percent, and silk textile imports over 200 percent.

Imports enter in many forms such as yarn, fabric, and a great variety of textile products, including apparel.

Imports in each of these forms have risen sharply; 1960 fabric imports were 2½ times greater than in 1958. In the same period, imports of textile products rose by two-thirds. Yarn imports jumped 800 percent.

There has also been a marked increase in the sources of imports.

TABLE VIII.—U.S. imports for consumption of silk manufactures by major category, 1958-60

	[Millions of square yards]		
	1958	1959	1960
Woven fabric.....	55	81	72
Other ¹	10	11	11
Total.....	65	92	83

¹ Includes wearing apparel, laces, scarves, and handkerchiefs.

Source: U.S. Department of Commerce, Bureau of the Census Rept. FT-110; and Bureau of Foreign Commerce World Trade Information Service Statistical Repts., pt. 3, Nos. 60-26 and 61-2.

TABLE IX.—U.S. imports for consumption of silk manufactures, by major category and principal country of origin, 1960

	[Millions of square yards]		
	Total	Fabric	Other ¹
Japan.....	73	67	6
Total.....	83	72	11

¹ Includes wearing apparel, laces, scarves, and handkerchiefs.

Source: U.S. Department of Commerce, Bureau of the Census Rept. FT-110; and Bureau of Foreign Commerce World Trade Information Service Statistical Repts., pt. 3, Nos. 60-26 and 61-2.

Textile industry average hourly earnings in selected foreign countries and the United States, 1958-60

[In U.S. dollars]				
Country	Date of earnings	Average hourly earnings	Comparative U.S. average hourly earnings	Ratio of foreign to United States
				Percent
Belgium.....	Oct. 1959	\$0.51	\$1.56	33
France.....	Apr. 1959	.39	1.57	25
Formosa.....	1959	.05	1.57	3
Hong Kong.....	Apr. 1959	.10	1.52	7
India.....	Apr. 1959	.12	1.52	8
Italy.....	Sept. 1959	.28	1.59	18
Japan.....	1959	.17	1.57	11
Korea.....	1959	.06	1.57	4
Pakistan.....	Dec. 1958	.18	1.52	12
Portugal.....	1958	.10	1.45	7
Spain.....	1958	.18	1.51	12
United Kingdom.....	Apr. 1959	.55	1.57	35
West Germany.....	May 1960	.54	1.61	34

Source: U.S. Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics, "Labor Developments Abroad," and French National Institute of Statistics and Economic Studies, Paris, France.

Mr. HEMPHILL. Finally, Mr. Speaker, let me say, we of the textile area are glad that the President took the action he did, happy in the hope he has given and determined that we on our part shall leave no stone unturned, not only to make friends and influence people to our way of thinking, but to do things to preserve our industry; to do what we should do in keeping faith with the people in those industries; the people who have sent us here to represent the textile-industry areas; the people who have made sacrifices through the years by sending their sons to war as well as making other sacrifices; the people who have paid the taxes through the years, in the faith that a country as great as this is would always consider the textile industry and its people valuable and necessary assets of this great country. I could not leave the well of this House, Mr. Speaker, without saluting these people—many of whom are my close per-

sonal friends whom I admire and love as honest, hardworking, self-sacrificing Americans who hope for their just share in the great future that faces America.

THE IOWA PLAN FOR GROWTH AND PROGRESS IN EDUCATION

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

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, there is a great deal of discussion these days about Federal aid to education. As one who has been the personal beneficiary of an excellent public school system, as one who has been a part of that system in the capacity of a teacher, and as one who led forces for improved educational opportunities in my State as a member of the Iowa Legislature, I am fully aware of the fact that proper and adequate education is important to the preservation of our freedom opportunities. I know education best fulfills its high purpose when responsibility for education is kept close to the people it serves, when it is rooted in the home, nurtured in the community and sustained by a rich variety of public, private and individual resources and encouraged by government. The bond linking home and school and community—the responsiveness of each to the needs of the others—is a precious asset of American education.

This bond must be strengthened, not weakened, as American education faces new responsibilities in the cause of freedom. For the increased support our educational system now requires, we must look primarily to citizens and parents acting in their own communities, school boards and city councils, teachers, principals, school superintendents, State boards of education and State legislatures, trustees and facilities of private institutions.

Someone has reminded us that:

Education is the parent of progress, the creator of culture, molder of destiny. Art is the work of her hands as is philosophy and science. It banishes ignorance, discourages vice and disarms anarchy. It has become and is freedom's citadel, the great arm of the Republic, the pride of adolescence while promoting humility. It is the joy of old age. Fortunate the nation and happy the homes that welcome it. Those interested in education, and all reasonable men should be, need forever to remember that the school is its workshop. The school, in its workshop, if it has an adequate course of study and good teachers, stirs ambition, stimulates ideals and forges the keys that open the door of opportunity. True education promotes and expands freedom. The school, through its teachers and libraries, is a source of inspiration and the aid of aspiration. It is irresistible power.

Mr. Speaker, bills for pouring massive sums of Federal funds into the country's educational coffers will soon be before us. All of us realize, I am sure, that regardless of the way, we must give an added stimulus to higher education and bring forth more and better trained college graduates.

To that end, I am today introducing three bills which will have a salutary effect upon solving the problems of higher

education. They are the result, Mr. Speaker, of long and thorough research and study on this great problem. Most of the research and study which I will reveal today was done by my research team of college students in the law school at the University of Iowa. The work of this team has been ably supervised and directed by Dr. Deil Wright, of the department of political science at the university. The present members of this fine research team, of which I am very proud, are Robert Downer, of Newton, Iowa; Tom Scheuerman, formerly of Rock Island, Ill., now residing in Iowa City, Iowa; and Ivan Ackerman, of Allison, Iowa.

This research team has always had in mind developing a system that would expand opportunities and promote freedom by developing a greater sense of responsibility for it at the grassroots level. These bills, we believe, are consistent with this objective. They would offer a tax deduction or a tax credit for college expenses. One bill would increase the personal exemption for college students and/or parents who meet the bills. The other two would offer tax credits for these expenses. Because at least some of the ideas in these bills and others to be introduced originated in Iowa I have chosen to call this "The Iowa Plan For Growth and Progress for Higher Education."

These bills will, I feel, go a long way toward helping meet the crisis in higher education, should it be the will of Congress to enact any one of them into law.

These are modest approaches, and are the first phase of a total program to meet this challenge more adequately than has been suggested by any plan presented so far. They are sound ones because they recognize that the costs of a college education are legitimate tax deductions or credits. Instead of adding to the burden of the taxpayer, they offer him some real encouragement in a way which would serve as an inducement to send more of our young people to college. Figures show that a college education is not only a good investment for the individual, it is equally good for the growth and productive capacity of the country.

It is my sincere hope that these bills can be considered by the Ways and Means Committee during its hearings on general tax revision and that recommendations will be forthcoming to see this principle of tax credit or deduction for college educational expenses enacted into law.

It is my intention to take the floor on other occasions in the future in support of this legislation. I seek to emphasize the need for such legislation and explain how my bills meet this need. Today, I will dwell on the bill which will increase the personal income tax exemption for those who pay college expenses.

In the past decade we have seen a greater emphasis placed upon the values of higher education than ever before. As a result, college enrollment figures have shown a greater increase than the growth in our population. During this period, the population of the United States grew only 18.5 percent, or only

about one-third of 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 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 826,969 or 5.6 percent above the total—freshman enrollment—of 781,075 only 1 year before. The freshman enrollment, in turn, was 6.6 percent above the 1957 figure in 1958.

Recent studies point out that, in all probability, this trend will continue or even accelerate during this decade. 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 portion had reached 30 percent, or double the percentage in only 10 years. However, this phenomenal increase can, in some measure, be attributed to the large numbers of ex-servicemen receiving financial aid through the GI bill. By 1960 this figure had 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 that they planned to go on to college. The survey also shows that only 22 percent, or only about one-third of those interested in attending college, have the funds necessary to finance a college education. Elmo Roper, in a recent survey for the Ford Foundation, found that 69 percent of the parents interviewed say that 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.

The latest averages of college costs show that tuitions generally range from \$300 to \$1,200 per year; board and room averages from \$400 to \$600 for State-supported institutions, and \$300 to \$900

for private colleges and universities; books and supplies range from \$25 to \$200, and fees from \$15 to \$75 per year.

Today, I am going to speak to you about the first of a series of three bills that I have introduced as an attempt to partially alleviate the financial burden on families with members in college. At a later time, I will speak to you concerning the two other bills I have introduced on this subject.

The bill I am going to discuss with you now is one which, I believe, would materially aid this situation but, in my opinion, is not the best solution to this problem. This bill would increase Federal income tax exemption for dependents by \$400 for each person in the family attending college. Thus, a family of five with one person in college would receive a total of \$3,400 in exemptions rather than the present \$3,000, and if this family had two college students this amount would be increased to \$3,800.

If this proposal were adopted it would be very easy to administer. Only a slight change in present tax forms would be necessary, requiring the addition of one space where a person or family would be allowed to add \$400 in exemptions for each of the members of the family enrolled in college. Auditing of returns would be no more complicated if the plan were adopted, because only a statement from the college or university would be necessary to show that the person was in college for a given year, and thus was entitled to the exemption.

This plan would provide some relief to the students or the parents of students who were hard-pressed financially. However, I feel that this proposal has several disadvantages which are not present in the other two bills that I have introduced. The other two bills use a tax credit rather than a tax deduction. Under a tax credit the amount of tax relief granted is equal for everyone, that is, each person qualifying for the credit has his tax bill reduced by the same amount. Since it is my primary aim in these proposals to aid lower income families who need help most, I feel that a tax credit is better suited to this situation. With a tax deduction, the amount by which the tax bill is reduced increases as the income, and the percentage at which it is taxed, rises. Thus a \$400 tax deduction might mean a tax saving of \$80 for one man, and \$200 for another.

Because of this feature, the loss of revenue to the Treasury would be proportionately greater for the same amount of tax relief granted to taxpayers in lower income groups. I am sure that we all agree that the persons who should be benefited primarily by this tax relief are those in lower income brackets; consequently the tax credit proposals which I will be discussing with you soon are more advantageous.

However, I do feel strongly that if this tax deduction proposal were adopted it would be a big stride forward in the solution to this vital problem. In times such as these, when America badly needs college-educated men and women, it is our duty to see that as many of them as possible have the opportunity to attend college, and thus become more useful citizens of our Nation.

MEDICAL CARE FOR THE AGED

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. ALGER] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, in the Appendix of the daily CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for May 1, 1961, on page A2947, there appears a letter from a Mr. A. L. Thomas, of Gonzales, Tex.

The purport of the letter is to set forth alleged facts concerning a resident of Gonzales who was severely burned and who did not receive adequate medical care because of her inability to pay for medical care. The letter goes on to state that the woman "will die quickly and be out of her misery."

The letter was inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD with a short introductory comment to the effect that the letter was "self-explanatory". It was also contended in that introduction that the letter demonstrated "the need of our elderly for medical aid with eloquent force." The suggested implication of the introductory comment is that here is the conclusive evidence on which to decide the great and urgent need for the Federal Government to provide medical care for our aged. Apparently we needed no other facts on which to proceed to the enactment of a vast Government medical program than the facts in the letter.

Mr. Speaker, two questions arise from the inclusion of this letter in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. The first question is—was the letter really self-explanatory as claimed? The second question is—did the letter really demonstrate "the need of our elderly for medical care with eloquent force" as claimed? The answer to both of these questions is a very emphatic "No." A third possible question could be answered with equal emphasis, "No; the woman not only did not die but she is recovering very satisfactorily."

The letter from Mr. Thomas was not self-explanatory. Its contents were at complete variance with the facts. I have in my possession affidavits by relatives of the injured woman and another person having firsthand knowledge of the incident. These affidavits prove conclusively that not only was there no medical neglect of the woman, but that she did more to prevent medical care than did any person or any other thing. There is also evidence that the physician care was provided without cost.

Also, the letter failed to demonstrate need for a Federal program to provide medical care for social security recipients. The truth of the matter is that even if the facts had been as they were alleged to be in Mr. Thomas' letter, the woman concerned would not have benefited from a program of social security health care coverage for our elderly. The lady involved would not have been able to qualify for benefits under the President's program because she is not presently eligible for social security. Thus, a case selected to demonstrate a need for health care under social security concerned an individual who could not have qualified for help even if we had had such a program. It would have been necessary for such a program to

cover persons not qualified for social security benefits to help this individual—a program of compulsory national health insurance from the cradle to the grave.

Mr. Speaker, as can be noted in the accompanying RECORD insert with a Washington dateline, it has been contended that my Republicanism would preclude my having an interest in obtaining and disclosing the true facts in this case. In response to such a fallacious and specious contention, I categorically assert that neither Republicanism nor Democratism that may be tinged with a leftwing bias should preclude a common interest in obtaining the true facts in this case and its applicability to the question of whether or not America should embark on a program of compulsory Government health care for the aged under social security.

When it is proposed to spend literally billions of dollars in added taxes on our people for a new and untried Federal program, I think it is imperative that we insist on the facts. When an individual undertakes to reflect on the integrity of members of an honorable professional group, the only responsible course demands that the attacker know his facts. Unfortunately, ignorance of the facts in this case has led to rash and intemperate allegations that investigation have proved false. Those persons responsible for disseminating this misinformation owe apologies to the American people and to the persons who were the subject of this unwarranted criticism.

It is to be regretted that so much time has been devoted to an attempt to mislead the people on this subject. Mr. Speaker, I am privileged to serve on the Committee on Ways and Means which has legislative jurisdiction over proposals to amend the Social Security Act to provide a program of health care. As a member of that committee I have endeavored to learn of a single case in which an individual who has sought medical care has been refused such care because of financial inability to pay. Thus far no valid case of such a denial of care has come to my attention. It is the fact of committee responsibility and my search for information that prompted my inquiry into the alleged case in Gonzales, Tex.

Mr. Speaker, I will include as part of my remarks the following documents: First, chronology of events; second, statement by Dr. Harvey Renger, president, Texas Medical Association; third, letter, May 9, 1961, from BRUCE ALGER; fourth, letter, May 9, 1961, received by BRUCE ALGER; fifth, letter, May 11, 1961, from BRUCE ALGER; sixth, affidavit of husband of patient; seventh, affidavit of employer of husband; eighth, affidavit of son-in-law; ninth, reprint of letter from Dallas Morning News of May 14, 1961; tenth, article with Washington dateline, Dallas Morning News, May 14, 1961; eleventh, reprint of notarized statements from Dallas Morning News, May 14, 1961; and twelfth, news article from Dallas Morning News, May 14, 1961:

CHRONOLOGY OF EVENTS

March 20, 1961: Mrs. Muenich burned herself but she refused to let her husband seek medical care for her.

March 28: Son-in-law of Mrs. Muenich for the first time called a doctor and within 30 minutes the physician was at the house. The patient declined to submit to hospitalization, but did receive treatment.

March 30: Patient admitted to hospital.

April 4: Patient left hospital at her own insistence contrary to advice of physician.

April 5 to May 1: Patient received treatment by physician at home and through office calls.

May 2: Patient readmitted to hospital.

STATEMENT OF HARVEY RENGER, M.D., PRESIDENT, TEXAS MEDICAL ASSOCIATION, IN REGARD TO THE LETTER INSERTED INTO THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD PERTAINING TO THE BURN CASE IN GONZALES

A letter by Mr. A. L. Thomas citing the case of a Gonzales woman who suffered burns a month ago was recently placed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. In a news article which appeared in several Texas newspapers, it was reported that the woman still has not been hospitalized, and that this incident reflects the need for a Government medical care program for the aged. As president of the Texas Medical Association, I investigated this case personally, and here are the true facts:

The patient, Mrs. L.M., 62, who resides in a small community outside of Gonzales, relates a history of warming herself over a heater on the night of March 20, 1961. Her clothes caught on fire and she sustained burns of both buttocks and right hip. She was brought to her son-in-law, Mr. A.W., on March 28, who lives in Gonzales, Tex. He contacted Dr. D.M.S. by telephone and the doctor suggested that she be brought to the office. The son-in-law maintained that she did not want to come to the office. Therefore, Dr. D.M.S. went to Mr. A.W.'s home to see the burned woman within 30 minutes time of the first phone call. The delay of 8 days was caused by the patient's declination to heed the advice of her husband, who wanted to call a doctor earlier. These were second degree burns with some small areas of third degree burns. The patient then was treated with an antiseptic spray, a pressure bandage was applied over the bleeding burned area, and she was advised to be hospitalized.

She received injections of tetanus and antibiotics in the home. On the next day, March 29, no action was taken and on March 30, she was brought to the office of Dr. D.M.S. The doctor requested again that the patient be admitted for hospitalization. The family then went to see the husband's employer, Mr. D.W. Mr. D.W. agreed to take care of the hospital bill and let the patient's husband remit monthly installments out of his salary back to him. The patient was admitted at 5 p.m. on March 30 and stayed in the hospital until April 4 at 3:45 p.m. She left the hospital at her own insistence, and contrary to the advice of the doctor. She went back to her son-in-law's home, who cared for her approximately 2 weeks. She was seen at the doctor's office on April 10 and 19, at which time she received treatment and further advice. She left the home of her son-in-law and went back to the community in which she lived.

Dr. D.M.S. was out of town attending a medical meeting between April 23 and 26 and had asked Dr. W.A.S. to cover for his calls. On Sunday evening, April 23, Dr. W.A.S. was called by phone to attend this patient in her home. The doctor was told over the phone that the neighbors had collected some money to pay for his call. The doctor informed the individual calling that he would not accept the money collected, it should be used for other purposes, and that he would gladly donate his services as requested by phone that Sunday afternoon. Dr. W.A.S. was directed to the place by some

neighbors and went into the house and found the patient lying on her abdomen under an improvised treatment tent. The patient declined to talk.

Her temperature was taken by the doctor and found to be 99.2°. The wounds looked well, considering the burn, and were dry. An eschar on both buttocks no larger than a man's hand was found. Dr. W.A.S. remarked that the lesions were healing well and that they were not as severe as had been related to him over the phone. It was suggested to the patient that she get up and move around and that the wound should be soaked in a warm solution each day. The husband made the remark that he did not have time to look after her because of his chicken business. Dr. W.A.S. finished the examination and then suggested that they bring in a urine specimen for an examination the next morning. He also left a supply of antibiotics and rest medicine, because the patient was restless at night. He suggested that she be given a bath. Inasmuch as the family and the neighbors indicated that they could not bathe her, Dr. W.A.S. secured a nurse (Mrs. E.H.) the next morning. The nurse was instructed to give the patient a bath and to remake her bed. For the call, Dr. W.A.S. accepted no fee, providing his professional services as his donation to the cause. Dr. W.A.S. then reported back to Dr. D.M.S., who returned on Wednesday, April 26. On April 28, Dr. D.M.S. was contacted and was asked to come back and see her—which he did. She looked well, and the woman was doing fine. She had a slight cold with a cough, and he advised her to continue the same medicine as prescribed by Dr. W.A.S. On Sunday, April 30, Dr. D.M.S. went back to the home to see her. The friends of the patient had reported that she had fever, and on that Sunday her temperature was 100.6°.

Dr. D.M.S. gave her another injection of antibiotic. The patient was readmitted on May 2 at 7 p.m. to a hospital in Gonzales. She is still under medical supervision at this time. In regard to the question of admission to John Sealy Hospital in Galveston, an application was made for a future admission in case the patient would require skin grafting. The woman at this time is not acceptable for grafting, and it is possible that the wound may well heal without grafting. These are the facts in the case, and I have been assured that this lady was not, in any way, neglected because of the lack of medical or hospital care.

I sincerely hope that all these facts will be included in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. As it now stands, the citation in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD contains errors and represents a definite reflection on the integrity and self-respect of the people in the fine community of Gonzales, Tex. It also is a reflection on the medical profession and the hospital in Gonzales which have served the health needs of this area for so many years.

Sincerely,

HARVEY RENGER, M.D.

MAY 3, 1961.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., May 9, 1961.

Washington, D.C.

DEAR —: Please refer to your insertion in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of Monday, May 1, page A2947, "Aged People in Desperate Need of Medical Aid."

I am now in possession of an entirely different version of this case, and I regret exceedingly that the original fallacious and apparently completely unfounded statement was inserted in the RECORD without complete investigation of the facts.

I assume that you now have the statement of Dr. Harvey Renger based upon the

That is why I think that what the gentleman is doing is particularly significant in tracing through this case and I hope he will trace through any other case that is called to our attention, without prejudging it. If it is an actual case and something needs to be done, it reveals the fact that our systems are not as we think they are. But I would appeal to the press who do not apparently report what is being said right here, if the press of this country thinks that there are people around this country in any number who are not receiving adequate medical care, they could help us and bring these matters to our attention. But here is this case the gentleman has cited—and I hope people will read the RECORD for the details of it, because I have read the record of this case that the gentleman has cited today, and far from its being what it was billed as being, quite the reverse is true.

Here is a person who had suffered an accident. The doctor's care was given freely, adequate, and rather extensive medical care was given freely; not necessarily altogether free, but much of it was free. But certainly it was available to this person and was utilized and the people themselves—and I will ask the gentleman if this is not true—the people themselves have said that they thought that they were doing pretty well; is that about right?

Mr. ALGER. I have not gone into the details. I think my colleagues will find it sufficiently interesting to read all the details, but I must corroborate what the gentleman has just said, what he has intimated in his question. The doctors visited this lady several times, against her wishes. She did not want to be attended. She said she was not badly off, although she was burned; not seriously as burns go we know now, but at the instance of the occurrence it was serious. Her husband insisted and her husband finally forced her to go to the doctor; or rather, I should say, the doctor came to her. She would not go. The doctor came within 30 minutes of being called. Two doctors paid innumerable visits. Then she was taken to the hospital and given all of the medicine and all of the care that one could expect. The doctors refused to take a penny. Even when the neighbors tried to raise money and give it to the doctors they said no, that they were donating their services.

There are some who in their zeal to get a program passed who are not only going too far but are downgrading a profession that is not only willing but is bound by its code of conduct to donate its services.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. As I recall it, there was also a son-in-law who felt a little bit badly about this.

Mr. ALGER. He asked people to stop helping them. People brought food. As the additional services were offered, this gentleman finally said, "We don't want more attention."

Does not the gentleman share my concern on the other end of the spectrum of the cases that may be given us; would it not be a shame if we found some of these cases are politically motivated and that in our investigation we found they are being trumped up? Just

to get a program passed they are downgrading and hurting the finest medical care that has been given in the world.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. I trust we will not find too much of that. I want to say one thing, though. Frequently when I have made speeches pointing out what I believe is true, that this is the greatest health care program that any society has ever had, some people have said, "You are satisfied with it." I have said, "No. I want to continue to improve it, because there are many areas in which we can improve it, and should." But I do feel that the ingredients are within the system for this future improvement. It has been the very success of the health care program in our society that has created the major problem. Our people live 10 years longer because of the success of the health care program, not because of its failure. I believe that in this system lies the greatest opportunity for continued improvement to keep it always the highest and give care to as many of our people as possible, if not most of them.

Mr. ALGER. I want to join the gentleman by saying he has stated what I was about to comment. Those who are critics of the health care system in our country should notice that our people live longer and have better health, and we have the freest medical attention in the world.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Thirty years ago many of our medical students, those who could afford it and who wanted a top medical education, used to go to the universities of Western Europe, because that was where the top medical care was. Today the only society that has free medicine is the United States. What is the situation as far as medical students are concerned? They come from Western Europe and all around the world to the United States, which is now the mecca for those who want to learn the highest skills in the field of medicine. I think it behooves us to think very carefully over this subject of whether we want to continue the high quality care that we have in our society and continue to improve it as we go on into the future.

Mr. ALGER. I thank the gentleman for his remarks, and in closing want to commend him for the work he has done in this field. I think he is the most able man in the Congress in this field. I hope that through his efforts and those of our colleagues we will preserve the finest medical care in the world rather than be led astray by this philosophy that has infiltrated the thinking of many people in this matter. We can present to our colleagues the things we have heard in our hearings, not slanted, but that we have heard before the Committee on Ways and Means. This case I have cited was not only in my State of Texas but it was also within the jurisdiction of the Committee on Ways and Means.

ASSISTANCE TO INSTITUTIONS OF HIGHER EDUCATION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentle-

man from Minnesota [Mr. QUIE] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Speaker, today the House Committee on Education and Labor reported a bill to authorize assistance to higher education institutions for the construction and improvement of needed facilities and to authorize scholarships for undergraduate study. The reason I take the floor, as will my colleague on the subcommittee, the gentleman from New York [Mr. GOODELL], is that the subcommittee and now the full committee has accepted amendments and substitutes offered by the gentleman and myself.

Going to the two titles of the bill—one to provide aid for academic facilities and the other to provide scholarships, let us consider first title I, the academic facilities title.

As the President recommended and as Congresswoman GREEN introduced the bill, it provided only loans for academic facilities. In the past we have been providing loans for income producing buildings, mostly college dormitories. But, it has been felt the colleges are lagging behind in providing the needed academic facilities and due to the great increase in enrollment in the next decade, additional academic facilities must be provided. In fact, in the next 5 years, it is estimated college enrollments will increase by about one-third, and in 10 years they will just about double. From our hearings, we determined that strictly loans for academic facilities just as we provided loans for income-producing buildings would not be adequate and would not build the classrooms that are needed. It is estimated in our hearings that about 30 percent of the needed increase in academic facilities would be constructed by the loan provision.

Dr. Flemming, former Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare under President Eisenhower, appeared before us and in his testimony, I believe, in a most conclusive manner showed us why strictly loans would not be adequate. One of the reasons quoted from the American Association of Land Grant Colleges and State Universities and State universities associations recommendations was that since both legal restrictions and major considerations of educational philosophy bar many institutions from using loans as a means of constructing academic facilities, we believe it is essential that the grant and loan program be linked together in legislation.

Another reason why this would not be as beneficial as some people might have expected it to be is that tax supported institutions can secure loans at just about as favorable a rate of interest as they can receive from the Federal Government. So the subsidized rate of interest would be mostly to private institutions of higher learning. If the institutions accepted the loans, intending to pay them off in later years, and began to look for the money, it was pointed out by Dr. Flemming and others, they would have difficulty in encouraging contributions because there is a great willingness on peoples' part to contribute money for a building that is to be constructed, but

after it is constructed, they are not quite as willing to contribute money.

Also, if they were to secure the moneys, undoubtedly, it would have to come from increased tuitions. This would be harmful to private institutions and it would not be desirable judging from the past experience of tax supported institutions. Also, there might be an effort for the administration and the colleges and universities not to increase professors' salaries as they should, wanting to use the available money rather than pay off the loans. This would be undesirable because we need the greatest brains in this country as professors to teach our young people who are enrolled in higher education. Therefore, the recommendation which was quote by Dr. Flemming, which was made by the American Council on Education, was that the moneys be divided—70 percent for grants and 30 percent for loans and that the grant money be made available on a 50-50 matching basis.

In our subcommittee we accepted a compromise, however, of 60 percent grants and 40 percent loans, the grants to be allocated on a matching basis one-third Federal, two-thirds by the State or local institution. This was accepted by the full committee, and we hope that the House agrees with this Republican proposal which I assure you will do the greatest amount of work in providing the academic facilities that are so greatly needed if we are going to be able to educate the increased number who will enroll in our colleges and universities.

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield at that point?

Mr. QUIE. I yield.

Mr. GOODELL. Having the pleasure of serving on this subcommittee with the gentleman from Minnesota I can particularly appreciate his taking time today to discuss this very important issue. He has done a very incisive job of analyzing the provisions of title 1, the academic facilities construction section of the bill.

I think it should be emphasized that the Republicans on the subcommittee first moved to have a 70-percent-grant, 30-percent-loan provision adopted in this academic facilities section in accordance with the almost unanimous testimony from the academic leaders of this country as to their needs. That was rejected by the subcommittee on a strictly party-line vote. Subsequently, however, this compromise was adopted providing 60 percent for grants and 40 percent of the funds for loans, the matching part to be one-third by the Federal Government and two-thirds by the institution rather than 50-50 as the Republicans originally proposed. Is that not correct?

Mr. QUIE. The gentleman is correct, and I thank the gentleman. To substantiate that, I would like to quote from page 127 of the committee hearings on aid to higher education, at the bottom of the page where Dr. Fleming quoted from the American Council on Education.

I ask unanimous consent that this be included in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

A new program of federally administered assistance to institutions of higher learning, for construction of academic facilities of the kinds they require to meet their needs in improvement of quality as well as expansion of enrollment should be established, offering each institution the following options on each separate project: (a) A grant to defray up to 50 percent of the cost of construction, or (b) a low interest 40-year loan to finance such construction, the interest rate to be determined under the same formula approved for the college housing loan program.

A long-range program is recommended, with initial authorization for 4 years and with funds supplied at the average rate of \$1 billion a year. A survey of member institutions by the American Council on Education indicates that of this annual amount approximately 70 percent should be appropriated for matching grants and 30 percent authorized for loans.

Mr. QUIE. Another point that was raised many times was the need of financial assistance to students. But I might point out in the offset that unless academic facilities are provided for the students there will not be any place to educate the many students who have the academic ability to continue their education in our colleges and universities.

When Dr. Henry L. Ashmore, the president of Pensacola Junior College at Pensacola, Fla., representing the American Association of Junior Colleges, appeared before our committee I asked him about comparative costs of higher education in Florida and also about assisting those who were financially unable to go to a State university or to a private college. I asked Dr. Ashmore the cost of education in a junior college, in a State university, and in a private college. He stated the difference in Florida was as follows: In a junior college it would be \$450; in the State university \$1,200; and in a private college in the State of Florida about \$2,000 or \$2,200. All of these figures are quite comparable to national averages.

I asked him if that amount was the actual cost of the education or the total amount and he said it was the total cost, that board and room would be the greatest cost, and this is included in the above amounts. Tuition would run to about \$225 in the State university of Florida. In the university a student pays very little of the total cost of higher education; he pays less than 20 percent and the State pays the other 80 percent, but after a student is discreet he could go to the University of Florida for \$1,200, but if he went to Pensacola Junior College the cost would be \$450.

We feel under title 1 of this bill we have provided ample assistance for the construction of the junior and community colleges which will enable the children of ability to go in their first 2 years right in their own community thereby saving them a great deal of money and in those 2 years choosing whether they want to follow a technical course which would give them the skills to be employed in an occupation in high skill or to go on 2 more years or longer in other institutions of higher learning to follow some profession.

I believe the direction we have chosen in this legislation is sound.

In title II some of us were quite alarmed and dismayed at the direction we were taking by setting up State commissions to administer a Federal scholarship program, the amounts of money to be given regardless of the institution the child chose to enroll in. After we worked on this for long hours in the subcommittee, we found we could reach no agreement. So the subcommittee reported the bill without making any final recommendations to the full committee. We spent long hours in the full committee deliberating how best we could provide assistance to students who wanted to go to college, who had the ability to go to college but were unable to find the financial means to go.

Many changes were made in the administration's proposal. When the bill came up to us from the administration it was an amendment to the National Defense Education Act which, I believe, recognizes that any assistance to needy students ought to be coordinated under one title, under one program. This was changed to where we would have a separate scholarship program and a separate loan program. Also, there were other changes to divide the scholarships according to the number of people in each congressional district, one scholarship for each 50,000 population of a congressional district.

Another part of it was to grant 1,000 Presidential awards to the most able students in the country with a \$1,000 stipend to each one.

As we progressed there was a feeling by Members that we were providing scholarships or grants in an undesirable way. So an amendment was offered by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. SMITH], that the student who received a scholarship would pay it back after he had finished his college education at the rate of 5 percent of his annual salary per year or 20 percent of the scholarship he received per year, whichever he chose.

When the committee went back into session it reversed its position and struck this from the bill. Many of us felt that the wisest thing the committee could do was to remove title 2 or the scholarship section from the bill and consider it at the same time that title 2 of the National Defense Education Act was considered in order that we might have a coordinated aid—financial assistance to students program rather than to have a patchwork of legislation which we have seen in other areas of Federal legislation and which I surely hope we will not do under any assistance by the Federal Government for students who want a higher education.

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. QUIE. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. GOODELL. Is it not true that while the full committee was considering the scholarship title of this aid to higher education bill, the President sent to the Congress his recommendation for changes and extension of the National Defense Education Act so that we had before the full committee at that time the recommendations of the administra-

tion which could have been considered and coordinated, both the NDEA program and the scholarship program in this bill, making them cohesive, so that there would be a better balance?

Mr. QUIE. That is correct. The message was sent to us and it could have been and it should have been considered at the same time, judging from the experience that was related to us in our hearings and the way the colleges presently administer their scholarship program and blend them with National Defense Education Act loans.

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. QUIE. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. GOODELL. We are now proceeding with a scholarship program without the benefit of hearings as to the manner in which the NDEA program has been working and just exactly the best way of coordinating loans and scholarships, under that program or under a separate program; is that correct?

Mr. QUIE. That is correct. When we found that the full committee would not accept our proposal to strike title II, the scholarship section of the bill, and consider it with the loan section of the National Defense Education Act, the only alternative was to propose a substitute which would grant financial assistance in such a way that we could blend this sort of assistance with the National Defense Education Act loan. Such an amendment was offered, and we are happy to say that it was accepted today by a vote of 22 to 6.

There are many reasons why this substitute is preferable, and I am going to call on my colleague, the gentleman from New York [Mr. GOODELL] who offered this amendment, to explain it further.

But, I would like to make two points first. When Dr. Flemming was before us, he stated that from all the information he could derive and from the recommendations of the American Council on Education—and he quoted from their recommendations—he said the scholarships should be awarded by the institutions themselves using funds allocated in approximately the same manner as the Federal student loan fund.

Then he went further and quoted from Dr. J. Douglass Brown, dean of Princeton University, a statement filed with the Office of Education, in which he strongly supported placing the responsibility of the scholarship program in the hands of the colleges and universities. A quote from his statement is this:

Because of the urgent need to encourage all accredited institutions in American higher education to participate vigorously in the search for outstanding young people in their area of coverage by having scholarships of distinction to attract such talent and to take an active rather than a passive role in motivating young people of talent to go on to college. Also, it is believed that this method of administration would increasingly assure a stimulating stream of private students in all accredited institutions which would encourage excellence in instruction and in student response throughout higher education.

Now, a comparable program which we looked at at great length was our national merit scholarship program and

tried to determine whether there was any congregating of scholarships in some institutions. Dr. Flemming made a study of this and he said that it is interesting to note that of the Federal scholarships 50 percent of them go to only 36 of the colleges. That means that 50 percent of the students who receive national merit scholarships go to 3 percent of the total number of accredited colleges and universities in our country or, looking at it in another way, of the colleges and universities who have enrolled in their student body one or more scholarship holders—and that number is 391—50 percent of the scholarship holders have chosen to go to colleges which are 9 percent of the total who have national merit scholarship holders enrolled, indicating quite conclusively that under a national scholarship program administered by State commissions they would undoubtedly congregate in a few institutions. But, the administration bill had a proposal which would make it even worse than that. Every student who received a stipend would choose his own college or university. Then the college or the university would receive \$350 in addition for each student who received a stipend, supposedly to compensate the college for accepting that student. This would mean that the colleges and universities would be out seeking these students over and against the students who receive their financing from other sources, which would be the same thing as if a parent said, "I will give you \$350 under the table if you will accept my child."

Here the Federal Government is saying, "We will give you \$350 if you will accept one of our scholars."

The prestige institutions, the institutions which have chosen not to increase their enrollment would not in any way be compensated for the increased cost of educating these scholars. They would get the \$350 and be placing a Federal scholar in their enrollment in place of a person who would have paid his own expenses. This is completely unreasonable.

An amendment was adopted in the committee under which the stipend to the institution would be one-half of the stipend to the student, with a top of \$350. This is even more unreasonable, since if a student who chose to go to college received only a \$100 stipend, the institution would only get \$50 for educating him. But if another student received a \$700 stipend the institution would receive \$350 for educating him. Also, a stipend to the student would be granted regardless of the cost of education at the institution. So one student might choose to go to a junior college and receive a \$1,000 stipend from his State commission, and it would only cost him \$450 to go to that junior college, so you could say that he would be making money. The junior college would receive \$350 for educating that student. Then if another person were to go to a State university or a private college and received only \$100, it would cost him a great amount above that, and the institution would receive only \$50 for educating him.

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. QUIE. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. GOODELL. It would seem that would be an absurd result of the bill as it was written, but as a practical matter I think the gentleman from Minnesota is absolutely right. It would work out that way, because it is not true that the whole basis of this scholarship system proposed by the administration is that the State commission would grant a scholarship without reference to the school that the recipient was going to attend? It would grant a scholarship and a stipend to him before anybody knew what college that student was going to be enrolled in, so they would have no idea what the cost of his education would be. Let us say in the senior year in high school a student was awarded a Federal scholarship under the administration bill of \$700 based on need—the amount that his family could provide, the amount that they felt he could earn part time. Then the student enrolled in his local community college and paid \$250 or \$300 for his education that year. The \$700 scholarship stipend would already have been allocated to him; is that not correct?

Mr. QUIE. That is correct; whether the cost of education in one of the institutions quoted in the East was \$2,600 or in the case of California, where there is no tuition cost to the student of going to the college or the junior college, would only be his living expenses, regardless which institution he chose, he would receive the same stipend under the administration bill.

Mr. GOODELL. Pursuing that point further, if a very brilliant student applied to one of the top universities in this country, after receiving a scholarship and a stipend, the stipend and the scholarship would already have been granted to him and might easily have been \$300 or \$400, based upon his family need and the fact that they felt that he might go to a community college if he were assisted with \$300 or \$400 from the Federal Government. That brilliant student might be barred from actually going to a school where the cost was \$2,200 or \$2,400 a year. That expensive school might very well be the exact school that fitted his needs and his talents. Thus a brilliant student that this country needs to develop would be lost.

Mr. QUIE. The gentleman is absolutely correct.

While he is speaking, I would suggest that he explain the difference between the administration's bill and his substitute, because the gentleman has worked long hours on studying these proposals and has come up with an amendment which makes it a sound bill. I think it would be interesting to this body to see the difference between these two proposals.

Mr. GOODELL. May I say at the outset that I was extremely pleased at the vote this morning, 22 to 6 in the full committee, to adopt the substitute which I proposed, because I think it does establish a bipartisan position in favor of some sort of Federal assistance to students on a grant basis in connection with higher education. I think it greatly

improves the chances of our having a good higher education bill of this kind.

Running down the differences quickly, the substitute which I proposed would have provided for college administration of the program. This is in contrast with the administration bill, which provided for administration by a State commission. In connection with the State commissions there were a great many criticisms made during our committee deliberations. No. 1, the cost of setting up these State commissions throughout the country was originally to be assumed by the Federal Government. The State Commissions were going to give examinations all over the country. Then they were going to try to evaluate the need of everybody who took that examination and graded high on it. Thus the responsibility on these State commissions was to evaluate the merit of these students within the State and the need of each student relative to the others.

The administrative costs of doing this were about 15 percent of the total amount of student money in this scholarship title of the bill. That in our opinion is an excessive cost.

In addition, we felt the State commissions were a very clumsy vehicle to accomplish the purposes of this bill. So college administration of the program would strike out entirely the State commissions and would save all the administrative expense that was to be funneled into those State commissions. The colleges themselves for the most part have the framework set up today to administer this type of program for scholarship aid and loan aid in their own schools under the National Defense Education Act of 1958. There has been a great improvement in college administration of such programs since NDEA was enacted in 1958. The colleges would take over the administration and carry the cost of it, which would be minimal under the circumstances because it would feed right into their presently established programs.

Mr. QUIE. This would be the same as the present program under the National Defense Education Act, in which the college bears the cost of administration.

Mr. GOODELL. That is right, by having the college administer the grants to students as well as the loans under the National Defense Education Act, we have the same agency administering both of these funds. Thus the student who applies will have the same individual deciding how much he needs in a grant to him and how much he needs in a loan in order for him to attend that particular institution. The colleges, of course, will take into consideration the cost of the education at the institution to which he applies.

Mr. QUIE. Many people are going to make the point that some institutions have no experience in determining student needs. This might have been true prior to the National Defense Education Act, but did not our hearings show that about 600 institutions prior to that time had had no experience, but now the Office of Education has helped them develop a program so that they are already equipped to determine student needs and

are equipped to administer this new title II?

Mr. GOODELL. I think the gentleman from Minnesota is correct. One of the great advantages of having the colleges administer the program would be a further stimulation to the colleges to set up new scholarship grant and loan programs financed from private sources, so that such funds would be made available to needy students from their areas.

I might point out also that the program that was sent up here by the administration, title II on scholarships, would have cost a total of \$925 million over a period of 5 years. The program that was substituted this morning on my motion will cost \$280 million instead of \$925 million. There are a number of reasons why the program substituted this morning would be more economical. We will actually grant more scholarships and more aid the first year than the administration program. The substitute program is going to provide 40,000 estimated grants of assistance to students in the first year as compared to the administration bill's 25,000. Another reason our program will be cheaper is that we, originally at least, are granting aid for 2 years rather than for 4 years.

It was my concept that the great need was to get the students out of high school and over the hump into college, and that, perhaps, grants as well as loans were necessary to do this. Testimony indicated that as a rule, once a student gets out of high school into the college atmosphere, he finds ways of staying in college through various assistance programs that are now operating. This was the consistent testimony, I believe, of the college administrators themselves. The great problem is getting them to start—and not to keep them there after they are once stimulated by college courses.

In addition, the 2-year proposal was amended in the committee as a compromise to provide if a given student was granted aid in high school to go to college for 2 years, and in his sophomore year in college it developed that he could not continue in the opinion of college officials without further grant assistance from the Federal Government that the college would have the option of reviewing that student's grant and renewing it for another 2 years at whatever level they felt was necessary to keep him in college. This was to avoid the situation that some of the members of the committee feared would develop in which we would send virtually all these students to attend junior college and community colleges or abandon them when they actually could find no way of staying on in college without some sort of grant assistance.

I might point out the substitute conforms to the administration request that the maximum amount of grant aid would be \$1,000 per student. There can be no further aid per student beyond \$1,000. Presumably, the national defense education loan program can thereafter come into play to assist a student who needs more money than the college is able to grant to him.

I think, perhaps, one of the most important aspects of having the colleges administer the grants to students is that we would avoid what the gentleman from Minnesota talked about in the national merit scholarship program where 36 colleges now have enrolled on their campuses 50 percent of the national merit scholars in this country. This would be avoided by granting aid directly through the colleges to the students instead of through State commissions. We are granting funds to the college to make assistance available to the students who come to that institution needing aid. The money would be allocated on the basis of 5 percent of the entering class of that college multiplied by \$700. For example, if an entering class in a given college was 100 students, 5 percent of that would be 5. Multiplying 5 by \$700, that school would receive \$3,500 to disperse as it felt was most economical and most effective among as many scholarship recipients as they chose.

I think that this would avoid completely the collecting of students in the prestige institutions which without question would have developed in the program as it was sent up here by the administration.

Another aspect that is important to me is that the colleges themselves under my substitute can grant these assistance grants based upon factors other than simple objective tests.

The danger of having State commissions administer this program was that they would inevitably have so many applicants that they would have to give an objective test such as the Princeton tests, put the results through an IBM machine or other automated process, and automatically award scholarships accordingly. When the colleges administer it, they may take into consideration not only the score the student makes in college board examinations, but also the marks he made in high school, the amount of extracurricular activity in high school, and all the other factors normally considered by a college admissions board.

I think that all of these factors make it extremely important that we have adopted a bipartisan proposal in the full committee which eliminates the bad features of the administration's proposal and which gives us a bipartisan framework under which we can proceed to help our higher institutions of learning.

Mr. QUIE. Now, going further in the comparison of these two bills, I think it should be pointed out that the number of scholarships in the administration's bill for the first year was 25,000, while under the new proposal 40,000 students would receive financial assistance. By the time 5 years were over under the administration proposal, 212,500 would have received financial assistance, while under our proposal 200,000 would have received financial assistance, but at less than half the cost.

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield at that point?

Mr. QUIE. I yield.

Mr. GOODELL. In connection with this problem of who will administer the scholarship or grant-in-aid program I think it would be well to place in the

RECORD at this time the opinion of the college administrators themselves. When they were polled on this question they were asked whether they felt that scholarships should be awarded by a national competition without reference to geographical areas; 11 percent said they thought they should be allocated on that basis; 11 percent said they thought they ought to be allocated on the basis of State commissions giving State examinations as proposed in the administration bill; 11 percent of the State educators favored that kind of approach.

Seventy-seven percent of the college educators favored a program which was administered by the colleges themselves within the framework of the NDEA loan structure; 77 percent favored the type of approach that was proposed this morning by me in the committee, and that was adopted in full committee, and which will come to the floor.

Mr. QUIE. I will quote an eminent authority whom many people quote on the scholarship program, President Everett Case, of Colgate University, chairman of the American Council on Education's Committee on Relationships of Higher Education to the Federal Government, page 147 of the hearings:

The scholarships should be awarded by the institutions themselves and those funds allocated in approximately the same manner as Federal student loan funds.

Mr. GOODELL. I think we had as close to a unanimous opinion in the testimony of the educators before our subcommittee as you could get on this question. If we are going to have a grant-in-aid or scholarship program it should be administered by the colleges themselves.

Mr. QUIE. That is correct.

Mr. Speaker, Dr. Morse, vice president of Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute appeared before us reporting on the advisory committee of national student financial programs. He stated that the needy student who is extremely able is now receiving financial assistance.

A Federal scholarship program which merely duplicates current programs is certainly not needed. At present, the extremely able but needy student is receiving ample financial assistance and attending college. The moderately able, moderately needy student is also obtaining a higher education. The moderately able and very needy student has been overlooked. In this last group are hidden thousands of talented young people for whom a program is vitally needed which will stimulate and encourage them to seek a higher education.

Dr. Morse comes to a different conclusion than we did. A large number of people in higher education believe that the proposal we have adopted will actually assist those moderately able but very needy students to get an education.

Mr. GOODELL. I am very proud, and we in New York State are very proud of the Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute. Dr. Morse is a distinguished representative of that institution. I would like to point out that Dr. Morse was very helpful to us on the entire subcommittee in presenting material and information and giving us the benefit of his experience.

He did not agree with all of our final conclusions on this side of the aisle and particularly that the program should be administered by the colleges. Dr. Morse thought the State commission plan had a great deal of merit. But in his testimony and in his observations to the gentleman from Minnesota and myself he did indicate that in his opinion the very topnotch students in this country are going to college and are able to enroll and find financial assistance if needed. He refined the definition later on by saying he would concede that the top 1½ to 3 or 4 percent of students are going to college with no problem as to financing because they are getting some kind of assistance. But assuming this is true, the administration proposal for scholarships would, in my opinion, have taken care of the same group that presently finds ways to go to college. It would have given them Federal scholarships, thereby supplanting the private sources that are providing the topnotch students with education today. Is that correct?

Mr. QUIE. That is right. Dr. Morse also made a statement on that as follows:

3. A Federal scholarship program should be designed to complement various student support programs already in existence—The Nation's colleges, many organizations, the Federal and State Governments, all support excellent and much needed student aid programs. Any new Federal program should take into consideration the purposes and achievements of these programs, and it should seek, in the words of President Kennedy, "to supplement but not supplant those programs of financial assistance to students which are now in operation."

I believe that the presidential awards which the administration did not recommend, but which were in the bill when the full committee considered it, would supplant many of the national merit scholarships. This might lessen the interest in the national merit scholarship program by its sponsors.

Mr. GOODELL. I think that is true.

I want to say, in all fairness, I do not think Dr. Morse came to the conclusion that it would supplant these particular scholarships. However, in the testimony before the subcommittee we did find that the great problem is not the topnotch students. It is the moderately able students, just below the top level, who are to a degree going to waste in the country. These students are not receiving much assistance to go on to college. This to me is the great merit of the program we proposed this morning. Col-

leges all over the country will have funds available to go out and seek these students. The institution is required to go out and find ways to induce the students to come to college that would not otherwise consider doing so.

Mr. QUIE. He also stated further on in his testimony that money, even in small amounts, should not be given to students who do not have serious need for it. Undoubtedly, if 1,000 presidential awards were given of \$1,000 each, regardless of the need of the students, some of that would be going to students that had no need.

Mr. GOODELL. Yes. As you are well aware, that proposal for 1,000 presidential scholarships was eliminated by the adoption of the substitute this morning.

Mr. QUIE. Then, in regard to paying a stipend, regardless of the need, I think this is a significant statement by Dr. Morse "that the payment of excessive moneys to students contributes to increase in college fees and unduly promotes the attendance of students in high cost institutions." This does not permit your substitute.

Mr. GOODELL. May I say in conclusion that the bill which was reported this morning is not what we would have written, I am sure, had we been in the majority. It does not conform in every way to the specifications that we feel are so important in this momentous age as far as higher education is concerned. But, it is a greatly improved bill over what was sent down here to us by the President, in my opinion. In that light it is my intention, provided that this is not watered down and diluted too much on the floor, to support this bill as it is reported out of the full committee wholeheartedly and enthusiastically on the floor. I will fight in every way I can to see that it is not destroyed by amendments or by conference recessions when we get to working this over with the Senate later on.

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Speaker, I am happy that the gentleman from New York joins me today in going over the various aspects of the bill as it now is reported from the committee.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that a comparison of the two bills be incorporated with our remarks at this point in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

The comparison is as follows:

TITLE II COMPARISON	
ADMINISTRATION BILL	REPUBLICAN SUBSTITUTE BILL
<i>Administration of program</i>	
Separate State scholarship commissions.	Each institution of higher education.
<i>Federal cost of program</i>	
Nine hundred and twenty-five million nine hundred and fifty thousand dollars.	Two hundred and eighty million dollars.
<i>Number of students assisted</i>	
Twenty-five thousand the first year, two hundred and twelve thousand five hundred at end of 5 years.	Forty thousand the first year, two hundred thousand at end of 5 years.
<i>Duration of scholarships</i>	
Four years.	Two years.
<i>Maximum annual stipend</i>	
One thousand dollars.	One thousand dollars.

Eligibility requirements

Must attain sufficiently high rank on State examination to qualify, be in need of financial assistance to continue education and be admitted to institution.

Must be an individual capable of doing superior academic work, who is in need of financial assistance to pursue a full-time course of study and is without reasonable expectation of obtaining aid from any other source, and who is of good character with earnest desire to obtain an education at an institution of higher education.

Identification of recipients

State commission examination of applicants.

Each participating institution is required to develop its existing procedures or initiate new programs for identifying and motivating prospective recipients who would be eligible but who otherwise would not go on to higher education.

Payments to institutions

Three-hundred-and-fifty-dollar grants to colleges for each Federal scholar in attendance, with a total Federal cost over 5 years of \$300 million.

This provision completely eliminated.

Administrative costs

Cost amounting to 12 to 15 percent of the total scholarship funds for the first 2 years, and thereafter the costs borne by the States.

Administered by the colleges with no cost to the Federal Government.

Allocation of funds

Each State would be allocated funds based upon the number of students graduating from high school and the number of students already in college.

Funds allocated directly to the colleges based upon 5 percent of the entering freshmen class multiplied by \$700.

Coordination of loans and grants

Awarded by State commissions and unrelated to NDEA loans awarded by colleges. These would supplant many private scholarships.

Grants administered by the colleges, over and above private scholarship funds, and blended with NDEA loans.

Colleges benefiting

Students would be awarded scholarships based upon statewide examinations and need. Students would then enroll in the college of their choice and tend to congregate in a few institutions.

All of the estimated 2,000 colleges, junior colleges, and community colleges would have Federal funds available to allocate assistance grants to students.

Stipend relation to the cost of education

Stipends granted regardless of cost of education (could be greater than cost of education at the institution).

Institutions administer, so stipend would not be greater than the cost of the education.

Mr. QUIE. In conclusion, I, too, would say that I am happy with the outcome of the deliberations of our full committee. It is not exactly the bill as I would have liked to have seen it written; in fact, I still have some question whether it was wise for us to consider scholarships separate from loans and I still wish we could have taken the time to study thoroughly the National Defense Education Act loan program, how it has functioned in its 4 years of operation and then make certain that we blended and developed under one title a program of assistance to needy students. But, being unable to do this, I feel that we have brought together here legislation which, when we work on the National Defense Education Act, we will be able to blend the two programs together to make certain that they will not go in separate directions and make difficult of administration by the institutions of higher learning themselves and actually be of greatest assistance to needy students with ability to go to college and to give them the financial assistance which they need.

Mr. GOODELL. As a final note, and a more harmonious note than some of the other things we talked about today, may I take the time to commend the Democratic members of the Committee on Education and Labor who supported my move this morning to substitute an entirely different program for higher ed-

ucation than the President sent to the Congress. I believe that in discussing this for the past 2½ or 3 weeks in the full committee many of these Democrats saw the great failings and disabilities in the proposal that was sent up to us, and they voted conscientiously with most of the Republicans to report out a bill on a bipartisan basis which can command a great deal of bipartisan support in the House.

Mr. QUIE. I thank the gentleman.

A NEW INVITATION TO OKLAHOMA'S VACATIONLAND

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. EDMONDSON] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, less than 2 years ago I called the attention of the Congress and of the American public to the rapid development of Oklahoma as the recreational heartland of the United States. At that time, I pointed to the phenomenal and almost unbelievable growth of Oklahoma in the field of outdoor recreation. In concluding those remarks, I expressed my firm faith in the tremendous and continuing economic growth that lies ahead for our State and extended to all Americans an invitation to come to Oklahoma and discover for themselves the new vacation mecca of America.

In recent weeks one of Oklahoma's great newspapers has published an inventory of our State's recreational resources which eloquently and factually confirms everything that I said 2 years ago on this subject. On April 16, 1961, the Daily Oklahoman of Oklahoma City included in its Sunday edition an "Outdoor Guide to Oklahoma." This publication is not only an outstanding contribution to the wide ranging literature on recreation in Oklahoma, but is also a highly useful guide to sportsmen and vacation-minded citizens all over our land.

The fund of information in the Oklahoman's "Outdoor Guide" is dramatic proof that Oklahoma is in a position today to serve all the people of the United States, whatever their recreational interests. Whether one be inclined toward fishing, camping, scuba diving, skiing, hunting, exploring, water sports or sightseeing, Oklahoma has become a wonderland of easily accessible and beautiful lakes, modern facilities, and varied entertainment for millions.

As is borne out by the "Outdoor Guide," Oklahoma's claim to being the Nation's recreational heartland is not idle boasting. It is based on the solid facts of an unparalleled record of planned achievement in the development of water resources and of constant growth in the number of our citizens from all parts of the country who visit the State each year. These facts in turn rest on the foresight of those public servants who many years ago saw in Oklahoma's rich natural endowment, principally its lakes and rivers, a grand opportunity for progress in water conservation and development for the benefit of the entire Nation.

Thanks to decades of dedicated effort by the State government, by the Corps of Army Engineers, and by the Bureau of Reclamation, Oklahoma now has more than 1,000 square miles of surface water and more than 10,000 miles of lake shoreline. About half of this comes from huge manmade multipurpose reservoirs that last year attracted some 20 million visitors. According to the Daily Oklahoman, in the next 10 years alone we can expect this surface area to double and the shoreline to triple.

What is more, all this says nothing of Oklahoma's 15 State parks which in 1958 attracted 8 million visitors and which today are visited by up to 12 million vacationers annually.

My main purpose today is to invite the attention of the House and of America's sportsmen to the Outdoor Guide's specific inventory of this great recreational development and growth. In particular, I would like to point to those lakes and reservoirs in northeastern Oklahoma lying within the confines of the Second Congressional District.

It is not by accident that these recreational areas are emphasized, for by far the major part of Oklahoma's water resources are found in this portion of the State. Of equal importance is the fact that the two of the largest new reservoirs now under construction in Oklahoma—Eufaula Reservoir and Oologah Reservoir—also are located in the Second District. If all of Oklahoma may be said

to be developing into the recreational heartland of America, then the center of this development is taking place in northeastern Oklahoma.

In my remaining remarks I will refer briefly to some of the most outstanding recreational areas in the Second District and will call freely upon the eloquence of the Daily Oklahoman's presentation to summarize our State's achievements in this field.

The Grand Lake o' the Cherokees, located in the extreme northeast corner of the Second District, provides an example in miniature of the tremendous growth which Oklahoma's recreational areas have enjoyed. After 3 years of drought prior to 1955, a "new era" has come to this 66-mile long lake that covers almost 60,000 acres and is surrounded by 1,300 miles of scenic shoreline. Today, the "Outdoor Guide" reports that this "beautiful \$40 million hydroelectric reservoir has more recreational facilities, more visitors, and more prosperity than at any time since it was opened to the public in 1941." The following passages from the "Outdoor Guide" describe vividly the many recreational opportunities which it now provides:

Giant black bass and barn-door crappie abound again in their old haunts while believe-it-or-not runs of white bass and a boom of trotline fishing for catfish have restored the lake to high favor among fishermen.

With the water level pretty well pegged inside the 15-foot confines of the power pool, boating has hit a new peak with the great influx of the powerful ski rigs adding greatly to the activity and excitement.

The lake's many deepwater bays protected from wind by the steep, tree-covered hills offer ski opportunity unlimited and afford safe and pleasant anchorages for cruising boatmen in even the largest cabin cruisers.

At least 10 parks with modern facilities are available free to visitors. There are four convenient airstrips and even a year-round hunting area where you can shoot quail and pheasants to your heart's content.

More than 200 resorts now dot the lake's deep-etched shoreline and there are more than 70 heated fishing docks in operation on the lake at which 150,000 anglers while away the winter months. It is estimated that 2 million crappie were taken from the lakes last year and that a majority of them were creel in fishing docks.

Just below Grand Lake in the vicinity of Spavinaw lie the somewhat smaller but no less important Spavinaw Lakes, the Lower Spavinaw having been opened for recreational purposes since 1922. The Lower Spavinaw was created initially to solve Tulsa's chronic water shortage problem. Since the 1920's it has also become a haven for an ever-growing number of bass fishermen from the tristate area of Arkansas, Missouri, and Kansas. A brief but illuminating sketch of the history of this area, leading to the development of the Upper Spavinaw in 1953, has been included in the Daily Oklahoman's report:

Many believed that the sparkling lake soon would be fished out, but year after year there were more fish. Now experts think that the great number of fishermen was responsible for the fact that the lake has continued to be a top fishing spot for almost 40 years.

With the approach of World War II, there was another industrial boom in the Oil City and before the war had ended Tulsans knew that even more water was needed. When the shooting was over engineers marched 9 miles upstream on Spavinaw Creek from the initial dam and built another one.

Thus, Upper Spavinaw was created. It stretches 9 miles up the creek almost to the city limits of Jay and covers 3,192 acres.

If the opening of the original lake had been exciting 31 years earlier, the opening of the new one was doubly so. Every effort had been made to remove rough fish from Spavinaw Creek before the dam was closed and precautions were taken to see that no white bass got into the water. * * * There isn't better bass fishing any place than on Upper Spavinaw.

Another of Oklahoma's notable recreational achievements is the Hulah Reservoir whose development was begun by the Corps of Army Engineers as a flood control project to control the Caney River. Situated to the west of Grand Lake and the Spavinaws and nudged up against the Oklahoma-Kansas border, this lake has now turned into a two-State recreational area for fishermen, skiers, and duck hunters alike. The "Outdoor Guide" gives us this thumbnail description of the area and its attractions for the sportsman:

Hulah Reservoir is not a large lake. It has long, twisting arms with the 97-foot earthen dam that stretches a mile across the Caney located 96 miles upstream from the confluence of the river it holds in check and the Verdigris upon which a big lake is now in the finishing process. * * * The reservoir was completed in 1951 at a total cost of little more than \$11 million.

Fishing is excellent at all seasons but of late the water ski addicts have taken over during spring and summer months.

"The skiers burn more gallons of gasoline in their motors here every summer than we have gallons of water in the lake," an official (with tongue in cheek) reported recently.

At that he might not have been too far off base. One holiday weekend last summer the engineers counted more than 15,000 persons at the lake.

With good fishing and excellent skiing facilities, Hulah has good hunting to make it a recreational spot with 12 months appeal to the sportsmen.

It is perhaps the only lake in the United States that passes out duck blinds on a first-come, first-served basis.

In addition to their attractions for the energetic sportsmen, Oklahoma's lakes also provide matchless beauty and every modern convenience for the sightseer, camper, and picnicker. One of the best examples of these features of Oklahoma's resource development is at Greenleaf Lake, near Muskogee, which is also a fisherman's paradise:

Sheer straight-up-and-down bluffs and the steep, heavily timbered Cookson Hills give the crystal-clear spidery little lake a charm that can be found no place else in Oklahoma.

Now operated by the Oklahoma Planning and Resources Board * * * there are several rustic cabins for rent, a large youth camp, lodge that can be opened for large groups, boat ramps, campsites and picnic areas on the west side of the lake just north of the dam.

There are camp supplies, tackle, and groceries at the small restaurant that serves as headquarters. Boats, motors, fuel and some storage space is also available.

Whopper black bass, barn-door crappie, and arm-long channel catfish are the top prizes for anglers, but for sheer fun and enjoyment fishermen can take a creelful of pan fish, a sport that is especially relished by youngsters just taking on the art of mastering rod and reel.

Tenkiller Ferry Reservoir, north of Gore, provides still another of Oklahoma's great flood control projects which has become known throughout the Southwest for its spectacular beauty, fine fishing, and boating. Deep, crystal-clear water is a special feature of the Tenkiller Lake area. The Daily Oklahoman's report includes these facts:

A hydroelectric, flood control project of the Corps of Army Engineers that cost more than \$25 million, Tenkiller Ferry stretches its crystal-clear water from its damsite more than 30 miles to a point well past Standing Rock where Cherokee braves once stood and shot fish with bow and arrow.

The power pool level is 630 feet but the engineers point out there are 37 feet above this level reserved for flood control. They also report that 35 feet may be taken below the top of the power pool in a gradual drawdown for the production of electricity.

About 2 years ago, during a great flood, Tenkiller Ferry was filled to capacity and water avalanched over its native stone spillway in an awesome display that rivaled Niagara Falls. Actually, the tumbling water fell 1 foot farther than at Niagara.

The force of the water cut deeply into the native stone and now underway is a vast project for refacing the spillway with concrete and steel to prevent additional damage should capacity be reached again.

North of beautiful Tenkiller is spacious Fort Gibson Reservoir, located in the heart of the Second District. This reservoir is one of Oklahoma's most fully developed recreational centers with good roads available to reach even secluded areas and a stable water level to enhance both fishing and boating. A nostalgic historical background and a setting of famed natural beauty increase its appeal to the many thousands who visit this area each year. Space will permit only a few of the more tantalizing excerpts from the Daily Oklahoman's account of this richly endowed playground:

The reservoir is not unlike the figure of a wry Chinese dragon in appearance on a map as its more than 225 miles of shoreline takes frequent excursions into the hills to form the many legs.

Dotting this picturesque shoreline are more than 20 unrivaled resorts that offer comfort, pleasure, and relaxation to their many patrons.

Perhaps the heart of the lake region is Sequoyah State Park, a superb installation situated on a well-groomed 2,800-acre tract that will have available a fine new nine-hole golf course this spring.

The park is located on a rugged parcel of land that juts out into the lake between Grand River and scenic Fourteenmile Creek. It boasts a swank lodge, deluxe cottages and cabins, campgrounds, a trailer park complete with electricity and water, vast picnic area, huge swimming beaches, fishing docks, boats, a big marina with docks berthing some of the largest cruisers in the State, a grocery store, a riding academy, and about everything else you can bring to mind that makes leisure time worth every cent it costs.

For all their importance, not all of Oklahoma's best fishing is found in its

great lakes and reservoirs, as is indicated by these comments of the "Outdoor Guide" on Big Sallisaw Creek, also located in the Second District:

Once for ounce the fiercest fish fight an angler can match is with a brownie, and the finest brownie fishing in Oklahoma is to be found on beautiful Big Sallisaw Creek, a clear, cold stream flowing across Sequoyah County in the scenic Cookson Hills.

The water is rarely dingy since the springs flow across clean sandbars, gravel beds and white flint rocks.

The stream can be fished from the banks or it can be waded. Best fishing spots are usually the downstream edges of shoals where the water swirls into good holes of cold water.

Similarly, the Illinois River, which flows into Tenkiller Reservoir, offers the sportsman unique opportunities not always available on the State's reservoirs lakes:

Oklahoma sportsmen are rediscovering the intriguing adventure and excitement of float fishing and most of them are doing it on scenic Illinois River, a sparkling spring-fed masterpiece of nature that heads in the rocky crags southeast of Siloam Springs, Ark., and enters Oklahoma near Watts through Lake Frances.

More than 1,500 boatloads of fishermen made successful excursions down the swift moving stream last year and the growing interest in outdoor living and pleasure indicates that even more boats will hurry over the sparkling, fish-infested water this year.

In addition to the innumerable fishing areas which one may find around any of Oklahoma's great lakes and in its major rivers, our State has taken significant strides in the field of wildlife conservation. This review of recreational opportunities in the State would not be complete without some mention of the big game, especially deer refuges which have been established in nearly all of Oklahoma's 77 counties. Some of the best deer refuges are to be found in Ouachita National Forest, the Cookson Hills, and the Spavinaw Hills.

Finally, mention should be made of Oklahoma's State park system which is one of the best of its kind in the Nation. The major problem of the parks has been to keep pace with a constantly increasing number of visitors. Something of the scope of this system is suggested by the Daily Oklahoman, in the following quote:

During the past year more than \$654,000 in capital improvements—additions, renovations and furnishings—in the parks was spent by the Oklahoma Planning and Resources Board which supervises the parks.

Besides the biggest lake and the biggest lodge, 93,000-acre Lake Texoma and 106-room Texoma Lodge in Texoma State Park, large lakes with parks include Fort Gibson Reservoir, 19,000 acres; Tenkiller, 12,500; Great Salt Plains, 10,700; Murry, 6,000; and Wister, 4,000. State recreation areas are on 46,300-acre Grand Lake o' the Cherokees; Canton Reservoir, a 6,700-acre lake, has Corps of Engineers recreation areas.

In closing, let me reiterate that these brief and selective remarks are intended to give only a sampling of the great sweep and variety of the outdoor recreational development which has taken place in Oklahoma in recent years.

To appreciate fully Oklahoma's tremendous contribution in this field, especially those of the northeastern part of

the State, you must turn to the record as it is set out in the Daily Oklahoman's "Outdoor Guide to Oklahoma." Once again, I want to commend this outstanding presentation to all of America's sportsmen.

At the same time, I wish to repeat the invitation I extended 2 years ago on behalf of all Oklahomans to all of America's citizens to come to our State. No written report or speech, no matter how eloquent, can fully convey the beauty and wealth of the resources and facilities which Oklahoma now offers to the Nation.

Only when you come to see for yourself will you discover why each year additional thousands of Americans are visiting Oklahoma to take advantage of its recreational possibilities.

Only then will you find why Oklahomans take an ever-increasing pride in their State and believe with all their hearts that it has a key role to play in the continued development of our natural resources.

PROPOSED SUMMIT MEETING

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. DOMINICK. Mr. Speaker, recent reports indicate that the President is making plans to meet with Mr. Khrushchev in June. Like everyone else in the country I too would like to see tensions between Russia and the free world lessened, but I do not believe this is the way to do it. At the very least, this is another reversal of his attitude expressed during the campaign when he blasted so-called summit meetings. What possible good can such a meeting produce at this time?

We are presently engaged in finding methods to outlaw Communist takeover of governments in this hemisphere and recently failed in this attempt in Cuba. Are we now running to Khrushchev, asking for mercy from further spreads of Communist influence in the Americas?

We are presently trying to work out some method of saving face over our retreat in Laos. Are we running to Khrushchev to ask him to help us in this affair when we all know that Russia and Red China masterminded the Laotian invasion?

We are still talking about orbiting a human in 1963, and Russia has already done this. Are we asking Khrushchev to let us know how he did it?

Khrushchev has stated that he will in the near future sign a separate peace treaty with East Germany while we have been committed to the preservation of our position in Berlin and a unified Germany by peaceful election. Are we backing down on this commitment?

For years Russia has refused to permit any inspections of its atomic blasts, and has broken up all conferences on nuclear test bans. This has been re-

peated in the last month. Can it be truthfully said that there is any sign that Russia, or its bloc of suckling pigs nursing on the same snake milk, have given even the remotest idea that there is a better climate for working our disagreements? Is there any hope that signs of American weakness in foreign affairs constitutes any basis on which to work out an agreement at the summit which will tone down the cold war?

This proposed meeting is in violation of the President's public statements before and after the campaign; creates a further impression of free world weakness in the neutral and satellite countries; offers opportunity to Khrushchev to heap further indignities on the President of the United States, and will stimulate further demands for retreat from present free world positions in support of freedom.

I would strongly suggest that this meeting, if carried through at this time, will do nothing but give further opportunities to Khrushchev to seek retreats by this Government from its pledges to the free world, to mouth further insults and to give impetus to his propaganda that communism is stronger and must inevitably win world domination. As has been said on many occasions, a summit meeting of this kind will be completely unproductive and may do real harm unless the basic goals are first carefully outlined and the means for discussing those goals have first been worked out in depth by normal diplomatic channels.

CULTURAL RESPONSIBILITY OF RADIO AND TELEVISION INDUSTRY

Mr. KING of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. ASHLEY] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Utah?

There was no objection.

Mr. ASHLEY. Mr. Speaker, the fantastic growth of the commercial radio and television industry in the United States is a tribute to the business energy and technical skill of our Nation. But equally noteworthy is the failure of that industry to match its physical growth with a sense of cultural responsibility.

When one considers that there are almost as many radio sets in this country as there are families and that almost 90 percent of all the homes in this country are equipped with television sets, the awesome power of this industry to influence the taste of our people—indeed, to mold the national culture—is brutally apparent.

I say "brutally" because in all too large a part of the programming that is poured out of our 60 million radio sets and our 56 million television sets is scarcely a compliment to the national intelligence. It does not reflect much credit on our culture that carbon-copy cowboys mouth carbon-copy words in carbon-copy saloons through endless hours of carbon-copy westerns. It is not a major national achievement that iden-

tical private eyes chase identical crooks through endless hours of identical crime and violence shows. Even in the third vast area of dramatic programing, the so-called situation comedy, we are not subjected to an overdose of wit, insight, and originality.

This is not a critical essay, and I by no means wish to demean the fascinating achievements of radio and television's best talents, most particularly in news and nonfiction presentations. But we cannot avoid the fact that in recent years there has been a steady deterioration in the majority of the prime time network offerings; there has been a slavish timidity and a degrading lack-luster in their format and content; and there has been a shameless and disturbing death rate among programs designed for the even slightly more discriminating tastes of millions of our citizens.

This great industry has reached a critical period in its development. Because the airwaves belong to the people, there is no question of the propriety of governmental inquiry into the causes and the possible cures of the industry's problems. Because of the incredible impact of its product on the mind and taste and spirit of the whole Nation, and therefore upon its very soul, it assumes an importance and sensitivity quite outside the normal profit and loss standards of most businesses. Indeed, it seems to me that the television executive who measures his success purely in profit figures is plainly irresponsible.

Yet, the admission that it is the right and the duty of the general public, and therefore the Government, to make such an examination raises yet another complicated and unpretty question—namely, censorship. I do not propose that any direct system of censorship be imposed on the selection of broadcast material. In fact, I am opposed to it both as a matter of principle and as a matter of practical workability.

The bill that I am proposing is motivated by a desire to avoid direct governmental censorship and yet provide the responsible leaders of the broadcasting industries, and the allied advertising agencies, sponsors, and production units, with intelligent and sympathetic guides to action.

I am proposing the creation of a National Citizens Advisory Board on Radio and Television to be composed of 11 outstanding private citizens prominent in the fields of education and communications, or in the civic, cultural, or religious life of the country. These citizens, appointed by the President with Senate approval, will make a continuing study of programing trends and make annual recommendations, including suggested legislation, to both the Congress and the Federal Communications Commission. The Board also is authorized to investigate the extent to which broadcasting stations carry programs designed to broaden the civic, education, and cultural interests of the American people and to study the nature and composition of groups which exercise effective control over programing.

Mr. Speaker, I hope that these proposals will receive the consideration and support of this body.

AMERICAN EXPORT CREDITS GUARANTY CORPORATION

Mr. KING of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. MULTER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Utah?

There was no objection.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, the distinguished gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. WIDNALL] joined me today in introducing a bill to establish an adequate export credit guarantee system for U.S. exporters.

The following is a statement, which we jointly issued in connection therewith:

The United States faces a serious problem in regard to the imbalance of international payments and the outflow of gold to other countries. Our national income from the goods or services we provide to the rest of the world is presently far exceeded by what we spend outside of the United States. One way to correct the imbalance in payments is for the United States to sell more goods and services to other nations—to export more.

During World War II, and for some years immediately thereafter, the United States was virtually the only market in which foreign buyers could shop for needed goods and services, and there was such a ready market for our exports that credit terms were not so vital as they now are. Today other industrial nations are stronger economically than they ever were, and they now compete aggressively with the United States in all world markets. This competition will intensify, and we must prepare to meet its challenge.

More and more, American exporters now find that foreign buyers are as interested in the terms of payments as they are in price and quality. American exporters now face the need to offer payment terms to prospective buyers equal to those granted by foreign suppliers. More and more, American exporters find they are often not as well equipped to meet the credit terms offered by competing nations.

A great part of our export sales, like our domestic sales, is not paid for immediately in cash. Purchasers abroad, like those at home, customarily ask for credit terms. If the U.S. exporter cannot finance the deal himself, or obtain financing elsewhere, very often he loses the sale to a competitor who is able to meet the buyer's need for credit terms.

Recognizing the vital role of adequate credit facilities in the expansion of national income from exports, other countries for many years have offered their exporters and their financing institutions incentives designed to make available adequate funds to permit credit extensions to overseas customers. One major incentive takes the form of a guarantee against export credit loss—a form of insurance which provides that the exporter, or his banker, will be protected against nonpayment of trade bills.

As in other forms of insurance, the exporter pays a small premium for such protection. The insuring organization depends upon the income from many premiums to offset the losses sustained by the relative few.

We are still the wealthiest nation in the world and have adequate resources to finance overseas business. However, our commercial banks and other lending institutions must avoid risks and there is presently no adequate export credit guarantee system in the United States to make it possible for our financing institutions to make as much of their funds available to exporters as they

would if they were effectively protected against unforeseeable losses. The United States does have a system of partial guarantees to cover some of the risks involved in exporting certain categories of goods, but, as President Kennedy pointed out, in his balance-of-payments message to Congress of February 6, 1961, American export credit facilities "are not yet adequate, nor are they comparable to those offered by other countries."

The question is what kind of an export credit guarantee system will be of most value and utility to our country, in the intensifying struggle for world markets? What has been our experience to date with credit guarantees? What can we learn from other countries? How can we best equip ourselves to increase our trade and improve our economic health as a Nation?

As long as 6 or 7 years ago, a number of manufacturers, bankers and others involved in international trade sensed that adequate export credit could well become a critical problem for their individual businesses and for our Nation. They began to examine the export credit systems of other countries and the advantages which their exporters gained from their use.

They established the National Coordinating Committee for Export Credit Guarantees (NCC) sponsored by the International Section of the New York Board of Trade, Inc. The NCC promptly gained the support of more than 100 companies in many States. Both in size and diversity of its membership, the NCC has since grown to represent a cross section of all American interests concerned with foreign trade. Today its roster of members includes well over 200 companies with headquarters in 26 States, with combined invested capital of more than \$25 billion and annual sales of nearly \$50 billion, covering the spectrum of American industrial output that goes to the export market—from drugs, chemicals and hospital supplies, to mining, transportation, agricultural and construction equipment, to farm products, steel, containers, glass, metals, textiles, office equipment, electronic equipment, and a variety of other products and services which can be sold overseas.

The NCC has maintained contact with the existing export credit insuring systems of all nations and has over a period of years kept informed of their operations. It finds that what these other countries are doing for their exporters goes well beyond anything presently available to the U.S. trade. Through correspondence and meetings in the principal centers of American export industry, the NCC has held discussions, interchanged ideas and experiences with business leaders, and has gradually evolved a specific proposal designed to meet the practical and reasonable needs of the trade.

Studies of export credit guarantee operations in other countries show that other nations offer guarantees which go beyond those now available to U.S. exporters especially as to:

1. The breadth of loss protection afforded;
2. The extent of goods and services covered;
3. The speed and flexibility with which guarantees are made available in keeping with exporters' needs;
4. The terms on which the guarantees are made available, e.g., minimum documentation requirements, flexibility, and ready adaptation to specific trade and market practice, etc.

Generally speaking it was observed that all other nations recognize the clear distinction between banking and insurance. Bankers and other lenders of money must emphasize avoidance of risk; insurers, on the other hand, are in the business of assessing and spreading risks. Hence, other nations keep their export credit insurance systems separate from their lending agencies. Because of their accumulated long and wide experience in export credit underwriting, all

the world's principal trading nations, except the United States, now insure their exporters against credit loss to an extent that enables them to effectively compete in offering attractive credit terms to purchasers. These credit guarantors generally show a profit from their operations. Since they impose no burdens on their taxpayers, they are not subsidies.

On the basis of its findings, the NCC began to implement its proposal and to formulate a program to put the U.S. trade on an equal footing. In devising its plan for the United States of America, the NCC sought to find a solution that would best meet U.S. needs and that would accord with the American tradition of allowing private enterprise to function to the fullest extent possible. Under the NCC plan, a privately owned and administered guarantee corporation would assume responsibility for the insurance of commercial credit risks, with Government participation limited to whatever part of the noncommercial risk underwriting was found to be beyond the capacity of the political-risk reserves.

We have carefully studied the findings of the NCC. It is our opinion that most useful to the American exporter would be a system which would have the advantage of both the broad coverage offered to our competitors and the flexibility and skill inherent in the American tradition of free enterprise. Private capital and management can provide commercial export credit guarantees as comprehensive as those available in other countries. It can also administer the provision of guarantees against non-commercial credit risks, if given a degree of Government support in that area. Thus, it would be possible to have the advantage of the flexibility and skills inherent in a commercial insurance type organization. The Government's role can then be centered on the overall control of those aspects of the operation which cannot be undertaken wholly by private enterprise, i.e., the guaranteeing of political or catastrophe risks which might prove to be beyond the financial capacity and scope of any one or any combination of private organizations.

We have carefully considered whether this entire operation could best be accomplished by the establishment or entry into a field of a number of insurance organizations whose combined resources and facilities might be equal to the task, or whether it would be best to create a single, specialized organization which would serve as a central agency or instrument in whose ownership and business all interested companies and individuals could participate.

After much deliberation, it is our considered opinion that the single instrument or agency approach is preferable for these reasons:

Amassing information on the credit worthiness of individual buyers and countries all over the world and creating an organization with the facilities needed to insure a nation's export credit sales is an enormous task—one that can be efficiently performed only by a strong, centralized insurance carrier specializing in and confining itself to this type of underwriting.

Even if a number of commercial underwriters in the casualty, marine, and other branches of insurance were to enter the field, as competitors they would not pool the information separately accumulated from their credit underwriting experience. If each had only a part of the business, the premium income from their respective shares would not be enough for any of them to build an organization of adequate strength and capacity to provide the kind of service needed to satisfy the exporters of their nation.

As the experience of other countries shows, this task can be efficiently performed only by one specialized organization concentrating its entire resources in the foreign

credit guarantee field. Consequently, in the case of the United States of America, a comparable centralized underwriter is needed for our exports to reach their maximum potential.

We have decided to introduce a bill which calls for the establishment of a federally chartered, privately owned and managed American Export Credits Guaranty Corporation.

In this bill authorizing the creation of a single Guaranty Corporation any possible monopoly stigma is avoided by requiring that the equity ownership of the Corporation be available to any and all interested American insurance companies. In addition, the Corporation would be required to spread its underwriting portfolio and premium income by offering to commercial insurance companies direct participating shares or reinsurance up to 90 percent of its volume of business. There would be no prohibition against setting up other enterprises which would underwrite guarantees.

The Corporation would serve as a central clearinghouse, or vehicle, for all interested commercial insurers. The Corporation would offer the U.S. exporter and/or his financing institutions a contract of guarantee to protect his receivables up to an agreed percentage, against all types of unpreventable commercial and/or political credit risks. Its premium rates and contract conditions would be competitive with those charged in other nations, yet sufficient to provide income to cover losses and expenses, plus a fair return on invested capital.

Losses from both commercial and political risks would be met from premium income. Since no private insurer, or group of insurers, can assume the political and other noncommercial risks involved in export credits, the bill provides for a measure of U.S. Treasury support for these particular risks. In the event that loss reserves accumulated from political risk premiums were not equal to meeting political risk loss claims (for example, due to a general freeze of receivables in a given country because of exchange transfer restrictions), the Corporation would be authorized to borrow within prescribed limits from the U.S. Treasury. Against such emergency borrowing, the Corporation would pledge its "frozen" receivables as collateral. Loans from the Treasury would be used only to cover political risk losses, and the corporation would keep all political risk funds separate and apart from its commercial risk and private capital funds.

To protect the public interest and to provide direction of the Corporation's exposure limits and other factors relating to political risks for which Government funds might be needed to meet emergency excess claims situations, and to police the use of such Treasury funds, a Government Director would serve on the Board of the Corporation. This Government Director would have veto power over the Corporation's political risk operations, globally, by country and by length of credit terms, and over political risk premium rates and political risk claim reserves. Since there would be no intermingling of public with private funds, the Government Director need not, and would not, be involved in the Corporation's detailed underwriting activities, though he would have a vote in these matters equal to other members of the Board.

Goods and services of all types exported from the United States, Puerto Rico, or its possessions, when more than 50 percent of their export value is produced or manufactured in the United States of America, Puerto Rico, or its possessions, would be eligible for coverage provided the payment terms were consistent with the type of product or service, the custom of the industry and market, and other pertinent factors, including the general credit worthiness of the customer and country at time of acceptance of the risk.

Short-term consumer-goods credits (normally to 6 months, exceptionally to 1 year) would generally be covered under global policies, based mainly upon the exporter's (or banker's) own credit determination. Such global policies would require that the Corporation be offered all short-term credit business, or a cross section of it sufficient to give the Corporation a reasonable spread of risk and to minimize average premium cost.

Credit for durable consumer goods (normally to 3 years) would be subject to these same general principles.

Medium-term, capital goods credits (to 5 years from delivery but jet aircraft and other special cases to 7 years) would be covered under specific policies.

Credit guarantees for services would be made available to cover nonpayment of export earnings arising from engineering, architectural, contracting, and other technical services; leasing rentals or fees from the use of property rights such as patents, trademarks, copyrights, licensing of technical know-how, etc.

In all respects, the Corporation's underwriting policies would be flexible, and based primarily on individual risk criteria, with a view to providing the U.S. exporter with maximum protection at the lowest cost consistent with a self-sustaining operation.

We believe the advantages of the export credit guarantee system embodied in the bill can be summarized as follows:

It is generally held unwise for the Federal Government to undertake any activity that can be performed satisfactorily by private enterprise.

The underwriting of export credit demands a high degree of specialized knowledge and competence. Qualified personnel can be more readily attracted and held by a private corporation than by a governmental agency. And a private corporation is not subject to political pressures in its personnel, its underwriting, or other policies.

A private corporation can render prompt and efficient service, because it is not subject to the encumbrances of Federal administrative, management, and personnel procedures. Also, any dissatisfaction with service can be quickly brought into the open without the reservations that are sometimes evident in dealing with a Government agency.

Exporters and their bankers should be able to obtain a single comprehensive policy covering both political and commercial risks.

Private management can adjust its policies and procedures to changing commercial conditions more rapidly than can governments.

Private corporations can make decisions on commercial credit risks based on business judgments without the political pressures and considerations that can bear on the decisions of a Government agency.

Considerable reservoirs of financial and credit information can readily become available to a private corporation from business sources in this country and abroad. But commercial organizations, in the United States and other countries, are generally reluctant to disclose such information to any Government agency.

The U.S. Government should be relieved of any possibility of political repercussions which might arise from one of its agencies having to: (1) Determine the insurability or credit worthiness of individual buyers; and (2) serve as a debt collector when guaranteed accounts develop into actual or pending loss claims requiring the guarantor to take steps against citizens of other countries to protect these receivables.

The Government should be spared the necessity of adding to its budgetary burden to set up a fully adequate Government export credit guarantee system, necessitating the adding of some thousand persons to the Federal payroll, and the establishment of offices throughout the Nation.

The question may be asked: What about the export credit guarantee operations of the Export-Import Bank?

Examination of the expanded guaranty facilities which Eximbank announced on March 24 shows that these will not in all respects put our export business on an equality with its foreign competition. Even were this proposed new Export-Import Bank program to be fully implemented, there would still remain certain deficiencies.

The Guaranty Corporation as proposed by this bill would overcome the most basic objection of the Eximbank operation, namely, the fusion of banking and insurance functions in one and the same institution. Banking must inherently avoid taking risks. Insurance, on the other hand, is the business of recognizing and accepting those risks which reasonable and prudent safeguards cannot prevent. The insurer's function is to spread, or average, those risks over the widest possible area so that the impact of sustained loss is kept within bearable limits.

The experience of other countries shows that an export credit guaranty operation is successful when it is administered through a centralized organization specializing in that particular field.

This principle is not followed in Eximbank's currently revised credit guaranty program. Instead, that program divides itself into two parts: one relating to short-term credits (applicable to consumer goods sold on terms usually not extending beyond 6 months); and the other to medium-term credits (applicable principally to machinery and other capital goods usually sold on payment terms for 6 months to 5 years). Export-Import Bank now proposes to make short-term credit guarantees available through companies engaged in casualty, marine and other branches of insurance, or through syndicates or pools of such companies. As to medium-term credits, Eximbank proposes to continue intermingling guarantees with direct financing, and to administer this part of the program directly from Washington as in the past.

It is easy to see that, if several insurance companies, or insurance pools or syndicates, operating separately, are to provide the short-term credit guarantees to the trade, then the available volume of guarantee business is likely to be so fragmented that none of these individual companies, or groups can afford the qualified underwriting staff or organization essential to an efficient operation in this new and highly specialized branch. Each individual participant will naturally endeavor to attract as clients those exporters having the largest dollar volume of business to offer, consequently the tendency will be to give prime attention to serving the large exporting firms, with consequent lesser attention to those with a smaller business volume.

Our proposed Guaranty Corporation, on the other hand, will have every incentive to service all exporters desiring guarantees. As the central vehicle for this type of underwriting it will provide the personnel and facilities requisite to efficient operation and will spread the business among all other companies wishing to participate, without the necessity for those companies to set up their own credit underwriting mechanisms.

Since Eximbank proposes to continue issuing its medium-term credit guarantees directly from Washington, this could mean continued procedural difficulties and delays which would endanger the ability of American suppliers to obtain business for which they were competing with the exporters of other nations.

There is, and will continue to be, a need for the Export-Import Bank, especially to provide medium and long-term financing for foreign development projects and other types of export financing which our private lending institutions cannot undertake. The bill we are introducing provides that Export-Import Bank be given an overall con-

trol of the political risk underwriting of the proposed Guaranty Corporation. It would, however, relieve the Bank of the detail workload and the responsibilities involved in granting its direct credit risk guarantees to the export trade and permit these to be assumed by private business operating with private funds under Government supervision and a degree of control adequate to protect the national interest.

We believe that this legislation provides for a system of export credit guarantees which will become as important to the expansion of American export trade as the Federal Reserve System is to the soundness, stability and orderly progress of our banking structure.

The availability of comprehensive guarantees against losses would encourage insurance companies, banks and other sources of financing for exports to make available a very considerable increase in funds for this purpose.

In turn, this would permit the exporter whose capital does not permit him to finance all of his sales with his own funds to enlarge his exports to a degree which would result in added income to the United States of possibly hundreds of millions of dollars a year.

The American Export Credits Guaranty Corporation is the instrument which is needed by both the Federal Government and private business to undertake their respective roles and act together in expanding our exports to their utmost.

NEW POSTAGE BILL IN CONGRESS

Mr. KING of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Utah [Mr. PETERSON] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Utah?

There was no objection.

Mr. PETERSON. Mr. Speaker, the House Post Office and Civil Service Committee has not concluded hearings or reported a bill on the proposed postal rate increases, so it is premature at this time to take issue.

However, the May 11 editorial of the *Uintah Basin Standard*, of Roosevelt, Utah, so aptly portrays the apprehensions of many nonmetropolitan editors and publishers that I believe it deserves your most serious consideration and submit it herewith for insertion in the RECORD:

NEW POSTAGE BILL IN CONGRESS: A HARDSHIP

A drastic postage rate increase bill which, passed in its proposed form, will cost publishers of small nonmetropolitan newspapers through the country about \$6 million per year has been introduced in the Congress. Hearings are now in progress before the House Post Office Committee, having started April 25.

The bill, which was drafted by the Office of the Postmaster General, known as H.R. 6418, was introduced by Representative THOMAS MURRAY, Democrat, of Tennessee, and would raise \$78 million annually from second-class mail, for a 79-percent increase overall. However, hundreds of small weekly newspapers will find their increase will run several times more than the overall 79 percent.

Needless to say, the National Editorial Association, national organization of the small newspaper publishers, is very actively fighting this bill. There are many reasons why this is so and why NEA is so vigorous in their opposition.

Major changes asked in second-class rates are abandonment of free-in-county mailing

rights, the addition of 1½ cents per piece rate and 1½ cents per pound within county, plus a surtax of 1½ cents per piece on some rated publications sent beyond the county. Some rates will not be changed. The biggest chunk of added revenue, nearly \$69 million out of the \$79 million sought from second class, would come from the surtax.

All these figures perhaps won't mean much to the average person who might read his hometown newspaper each week, until his editor makes the same kind of an observation the editor of the *Standard* is about to make. He'll use some plain, cold, hard dollar-and-cents facts to illustrate what it would do to his operation. Like any other inflationary proposition, it would be the consumer who'll have to pay the bill.

For an example, if the *Standard* publisher is forced to abide by the proposed bill, his average cost of mailing the *Standard* for 1 month will jump from approximately \$12.58 to \$65.20. (These figures are actual for the month of February 1961, based on the number of pounds of newspapers mailed through the local post office). When we do some more calculating with these dollar-and-cents figures, we find the cost of mailing the *Standard* for a full year would jump from \$52.92 to \$2,751.84. Carrying on the formula a bit further this means a 530-percent increase in cost of mailing the *Standard* for 1 year's time. If we print more pages, the cost will increase in proportion.

Since the paid circulation of the *Standard* averages about 1,700 to 1,800, this would mean the price of the *Uintah Basin Standard* would have to be raised to \$5.50 per year to break even.

If the average small town publisher had to absorb this 530-percent increase on his own, he'd soon have one of the following signs on his front door: "New Postal Law Put Us Out of Business"; or "Plant for Sale—Make a Reasonable Offer"; or "Bankrupt", etc.

This is very serious with people like your local editor. It's like was stated earlier, someone will have to pay the higher cost of living—the little retailer or businessman can't do it, so the increase is passed on to the little fellow—the consumer.

Also in this proposed bill are 5-cent letters, 4-cent postcards, plus many other postage costs, that are conceived by the Postmaster General to balance the postal budget that has not been balanced since you first started receiving letters, way back when.

The idea of a hike in postal rates was advocated by the former administration, and has been taken up by the new administration. So it's not a partisan deal, but rather a bad deal for publishers and readers of smalltown newspapers.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. SCHADEBERG, for May 22 through May 24, on account of official business of House Committee on Un-American Activities.

Mr. SCHERER, for May 22 through May 26, on account of official business of House Committee on Un-American Activities.

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. ALGER, for 30 minutes, today.

Mr. VANIK, for 15 minutes, tomorrow, and to revise and extend his remarks.

Mr. QUIE (at the request of Mrs. WEIS), for 1 hour, today.

Mr. CURTIN (at the request of Mrs. WEIS), for 15 minutes, on May 17.

Mr. EDMONDSON, for 30 minutes, today, and to revise and extend his remarks.

Mr. KING of Utah, for 30 minutes, tomorrow.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

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

Mr. LANE.

Mr. GATHINGS, to revise and extend the remarks he made in the House today and include extraneous matter.

Mr. DULSKI.

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

Mr. VAN ZANDT in two instances.

Mr. ANFUSO.

SENATE BILLS REFERRED

A bill of the Senate of the following title was taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 1619. An act to authorize adjustments in accounts of outstanding old-series currency, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

ENROLLED JOINT RESOLUTION

Mr. BURLESON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled a joint resolution of the House of the following title, which was thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.J. Res. 143. A joint resolution authorizing the President to proclaim the week in May 1961 in which falls the third Friday of that month as National Transportation Week.

SENATE ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The SPEAKER announced his signature to enrolled bills of the Senate of the following titles:

S. 104. An act to waive certain restrictions of the New Mexico Enabling Act with respect to certain sales of lands granted to the State by the United States; and to consent to an amendment at the constitution of the State of New Mexico; and

S. 712. An act authorizing the Secretary of the Treasury to coin and sell duplicates in bronze of a gold medal presented to Robert Frost by the President of the United States.

BILL PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. BURLESON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee did on May 15, 1961, present to the President, for his approval, a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 2195. An act to convey certain land of the Pala Band of Indians to the Diocese of San Diego Education and Welfare Corp.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. KING of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 6 o'clock and 57 minutes p.m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, May 17, 1961, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

912. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to regulate the election in the District of Columbia of electors of President and Vice President, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

913. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, relative to a proposed bill now pending before the House Interior and Insular Affairs Committee entitled "A bill to amend section 6(a) of the Virgin Islands Corporation Act"; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

914. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a proposed contract extension agreement to extend through December 31, 1961, or until such prior time as a new long-term contract may be executed, concession contract No. 14-10-333-103 under which Fred Harvey is authorized to operate the Painted Desert Inn and provide related facilities for the public in Petrified Forest National Monument, pursuant to the act of July 14, 1956 (70 Stat. 543); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

915. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting determinations relating to partial deferment of the February 1, 1962, and 1963, construction payments due the United States from the Fort Sumner Irrigation District, Fort Sumner project, New Mexico; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. RIVERS of Alaska: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H.R. 2924. A bill to repeal an act entitled "An act extending the time in which to file adverse claims and institute adverse suits against mineral entries in the district of Alaska," approved June 7, 1910 (36 Stat. 459); with amendment (Rept. No. 394). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. MILLS: Committee on Ways and Means. H.R. 6352. A bill to amend section 170 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to the unlimited deduction for charitable contributions for certain individuals); without amendment (Rept. No. 395). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ADAIR:

H.R. 7079. A bill to provide for the denial of passports to persons knowingly engaged in activities intended to further the international Communist movement; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

H.R. 7080. A bill to authorize gratuitous benefits for a remarried widow of a veteran upon termination of her remarriage; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois:

H.R. 7081. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act to eliminate the reduction in annuity elected for a spouse when such spouse predeceases the person making the election; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. ASHLEY:

H.R. 7082. A bill to establish a National Citizens Advisory Board on Radio and Television; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. COHELAN:

H.R. 7083. A bill to provide grants for adult education for migrant agricultural employees; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 7084. A bill to provide for the establishment of a Council to be known as the "National Citizens Council on Migratory Labor"; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 7085. A bill to provide for the registration of contractors of migrant agricultural workers and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 7086. A bill to provide certain payments to assist in providing improved educational opportunities for children of migrant agricultural employees; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 7087. A bill to amend section 13(c) of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 with respect to the exemption of agricultural employees from the child labor provisions of such act; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 7088. A bill to amend title III of the Public Health Service Act to authorize grants for improving domestic agricultural migratory workers' health services and conditions; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 7089. A bill to provide for the desegregation of public schools, with all deliberate speed, including nationwide first-step compliance by 1963, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 7090. A bill to prohibit discrimination in employment because of race, color, religion, or national origin; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 7091. A bill to amend part III of the Civil Rights Act of 1957; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 7092. A bill to make the Commission on Civil Rights a permanent agency in the executive branch of the Government, to broaden the scope of the duties of the Commission, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DENTON:

H.R. 7093. A bill to amend section 503 of title 38, United States Code, to provide that social security benefits and other annuities shall not be considered as income for purposes of determining eligibility of individuals for pension; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 7094. A bill to amend section 503 of title 38, United States Code, to provide that up to \$10,000 in payments under policies of life insurance shall not be considered as income for purposes of determining eligibility of individuals for pension; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. DULSKI:

H.R. 7095. A bill to amend paragraph 1798(c) (2) of the Tariff Act of 1930 to reduce temporarily the exemption from duty enjoyed by returning residents, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HALEY (by request):

H.R. 7096. A bill to provide for the restoration to Indian tribes of unclaimed per capita

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mr. ADAIR:

H.R. 7123. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Takako Coughlin; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. AUCHINCLOSS:

H.R. 7124. A bill for the relief of Martin Kamnan; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MOORE:

H.R. 7125. A bill for the relief of Dr. Gerardo L. Yubero, his wife, Luz Fortuny de Lopez, and their two minor children, Gerard Lopez Fortuny, and Fernando Lopez Fortuny; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 7126. A bill for the relief of Ying-Kwei Pan (Bingham Y. K. Pan), Ti-Wei Liu

Pan, Kai-Tien Pan and Kai-Yu Pan; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PELLY:

H.R. 7127. A bill for the relief of Hajime Sumitani; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI:

H.R. 7128. A bill for the relief of Constantine D. Diles and his wife, Vasiliki Diles; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SHELLEY:

H.R. 7129. A bill for the relief of Piero Della Bordella; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SIBAL:

H.R. 7130. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Elizabeth Cornish Fel; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 7131. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Katarina Pezelj; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 7132. A bill for the relief of Cary (Chow-Yuen) Chen; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

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

153. By Mr. GIAIMO: Petition of 41 constituents of the Third Congressional District of Connecticut in support of H.R. 3745, the so-called World War I pension bill; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

154. By the SPEAKER: Petition of Maj. Gen. Stuart D. Menist, The Senior Reserve Commanders Association, Army of the United States, San Francisco, Calif., relating to urging certain strengths for the Active Army, Army Reserve paid drill, and Army National Guard paid drill; to the Committee on Armed Services.

155. Also, petition of Nathan Wolfman, city council, Philadelphia, Pa., relative to requesting support and approval of the proposed Delaware River Basin project; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

The Addition of Electric Generating Facilities to the New Plutonium Production Reactor at Hanford, Wash., at a Cost of \$95 Million Not in Best Interest of All the American People

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 16, 1961

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, about 2 weeks ago Congress gave its final approval to the depressed areas bill authorizing almost \$400 million for loans and grants to revitalize depressed areas. I supported that legislation because it was for the national good as well as for the good of my constituents. But, now I want to call attention to a proposal that will come before the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy May 17 which, if approved, would result in spending \$95 million of Federal funds—taxpayers' funds—that would further aggravate the conditions we are trying to correct. I refer to the proposed addition of electric generating facilities to the new plutonium production reactor being constructed at Hanford, Wash.

The needless expenditure of this \$95 million would, in my opinion, be contrary to the best interests of the citizens. It would result only in producing heavily subsidized electricity by nuclear fuel which would be used to lure industries away from other areas where there is a serious need for additional employment opportunities.

Present challenges facing this Nation from international tensions have already placed considerable stress on available Federal finances. As the trend seems to continue toward the Government doing more and more for everybody and because greater use of the back-door spending mechanism makes it easier to spend tremendous amounts of money, it has become a matter of the utmost ur-

gency for every thoughtful Member of Congress to evaluate each new spending proposal very carefully. There seems to be a serious relaxation of what used to be considered as fiscal guidelines so we should determine whether such spending is absolutely necessary and is the best possible utilization of available funds.

With this in mind, let us look at the \$95 million proposal to add electric generating facilities to the new Hanford plutonium production reactor.

Many of us remember the House debate in July 1958 on authorizing construction of the plutonium production reactor at Hanford. It was to cost \$145 million, including \$25 million to allow for subsequent addition of electric generating facilities if and when Congress should authorize it.

There were clear assurances in 1958, however, that incorporating convertibility features in the project to the tune of \$25 million would not commit Congress to the actual addition of electric generating equipment at some later date. In fact, during debate on the project, the Vice Chairman of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy said:

I want to say and reiterate that by passage of the authorization legislation today we shall not in any way commit ourselves ever to convert the plant.

Let us not forget this important point—there is absolutely no commitment for Congress to proceed with adding generating facilities to Hanford now or even in the future simply because it has equipment which would permit such an addition. The proposed Hanford steamplant can and should be considered solely on its merits or demerits.

I will not attempt at this time to elaborate on all the demerits of adding electric generating facilities to Hanford, because I, along with several of my colleagues, will have much to say about this project in the next few days. But, today, I will limit my remarks to its effect on other areas and resources of the country.

Mr. Speaker, I supported construction of the new production reactor in

1958 to produce weapons grade plutonium and asked other Members to support it also. During debate on that bill, I pointed out that nothing in the bill at that time—and I repeat at that time—should cause the coal industry concern because we were making no commitments to add electric generating facilities to the reactor. Now, however, this administration has requested authorization to proceed with the addition of these facilities, and this should cause serious concern to the coal industry. I do not say this merely because I am privileged to represent a coal mining area; but, rather, because this major industry represents a vital natural resource of America which is presently in a seriously depressed condition.

The proposal is to add about 700,000 kilowatts of generating capacity to Hanford. This is roughly equivalent to 2,319,000 tons of coal per year, based on an 85-percent load factor. The load factor may seem somewhat high to many, but let me quote from page 16 of the "Supplemental Report on New Production Reactor Power Plant Economic Feasibility Study" prepared by the Federal Power Commission and dated February 1961. The report states:

An NPR maximum annual power plant factor of 85 percent has been adopted for comparison of NPR plant dependable capacity to that of conventional fuel-electric plants.

Since it takes less than one pound of coal to generate a kilowatt-hour of electricity in most modern steamplants, the total kilowatt-hours from the Hanford steamplant can be translated into 2,319,000 tons of coal.

This figure can also be expressed in terms of man-days of employment for miners in this depressed industry. An average of 12.12 tons of coal can be mined per man per day. This would mean that approximately 191,360 man-days of gainful employment could result from generating 700,000 kilowatts of electric power using a modern fossil fuel steamplant.