

Regular Air Force, in the grade of second lieutenant, under the provisions of section 8284, title 10, United States Code, with dates of rank to be determined by the Secretary of the Air Force:

Edward W. Allis	Douglas W. Jamieson
Lawrence B. Anderson	Joseph R. Johnson
David W. Anderson	Walter S. Kirimitsu
Keith W. Balcom	William S. Koopman
John F. Baldwin	Leon A. Kranz
Bruce G. Barrett	Loel J. Labberton
Neil R. Bearce, Jr.	John M. Lind
James A. Bell	Darrell L. Lucas
Horace E. Benedict	Erving W. Mantey
Roy F. Birkhead	Thomas L. Marek
David C. Blevins	Samuel P. Mitchell, Jr.
Donald M. Bohler	William J. Morgan
Douglas R. Blount	Fred L. Morton
Donald A. Brooks	James E. Muehleisen
Paul H. Burbage III	Leon J. Murphey
Robert C. Christensen	Robert L. Newton
Ray G. Collins III	Ronald B. Owens
William T. Cooper	Charles M. Ozment
Jan G. Cummings	Arthur P. Petty III
Larry A. Darda	Milton B. Porter
Leslie A. Dean	Donald A. Richardson
Joseph P. Dellinger	William J. Ritchie
David L. Dibell	Harold L. Rogler
Roger W. Dixon	David Sanchez
Matthew W. Donavin	Thomas F. Schammel
III	William H. Sibley
Anton J. Dorr	Jon J. Silvernall
Noel H. Duncan	Albert R. Sinclair
Lester B. Durham	Ronald V. Smith
Hunter D. Echols	David E. Sundstrom
Richard J. Flaherty	Warren N. Suzuki
Theodore P. Foster, Jr.	Benard W. Gann
Benard W. Gann	Jerry M. Terry
Frank O. Garrity, Jr.	James G. Thomas
Arthur E. Greiner	Preston J. Thornbrough
Kenneth J. Gurry	Joel M. Upton
Lawrence J. Hagen	Paul L. Vanston
Edwin L. Hamilton	Donald D. Warrick
Jay W. Hamilton	Arthur J. Wilson III
George W. Hanks	Richard L. Wilson
Robert C. Hansen	Alan E. Yabul
Larry E. Harvey	Frederick A. Zehrer
Robert E. Hawkins	III
Richard S. Heaton	Robert K. Zimmerman
Lee C. Hitchcock	
William B. Huey	
Robert S. Ingram	

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate August 1 (legislative day of July 26), 1962:

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

John A. Baker, of Virginia, to be an Assistant Secretary of Agriculture.

COMMODITY CREDIT CORPORATION

John A. Baker, of Virginia, to be a member of the Board of Directors of the Commodity Credit Corporation.

U.S. DISTRICT JUDGES

Harold R. Tyler, Jr., of New York, to be U.S. district judge for the southern district of New York.

Mitchell H. Cohen, of New Jersey, to be U.S. district judge for the district of New Jersey.

Allen E. Barrow, of Oklahoma, to be U.S. district judge for the northern district of Oklahoma.

WITHDRAWAL

Executive nomination withdrawn from the Senate August 1 (legislative day of July 26), 1962:

POSTMASTER

The nomination sent to the Senate on January 22, 1962, of Glenn M. Mattison to be postmaster at Amberg in the State of Wisconsin.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

WEDNESDAY, AUGUST 1, 1962

The House met at 12 o'clock noon. Dr. Waights G. Henry, Jr., D.D., president, La Grange College, La Grange, Ga., offered the following prayer:

Proverbs 14: 34: *Righteousness exalteth a nation, but sin is a reproach to any people.*

We bow our heads in reverence before Thee, our Heavenly Father, to acknowledge that Thou alone of all in our universe art worthy of our souls' adoration. We confess that our deviation is more apparent than our devotion. We beg Thy forgiveness and ask for enlightenment and direction.

Thy hand of blessing through the centuries has rested upon those nations that love Thee. All nations stand under the judgment of Thy righteousness. Make us worthy to petition Thy benedictions upon our beloved country.

Grant that on this day these men assembled may perform their sacred tasks with vital courage, holy wisdom, and under the sense of divine surveillance. Give unto us all those rich rewards that come to those who love and obey Thee. In Christ's holy name we pray. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

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

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries, who also informed the House that on July 31, 1962, the President approved and signed a bill and a joint resolution of the House of the following titles:

H.R. 10618. An act granting the consent of Congress to the southern interstate nuclear compact, and for related purposes; and H.J. Res. 839. Joint resolution making continuing appropriations for the fiscal year 1963, and for other purposes.

WATERSHED PROTECTION AND FLOOD PREVENTION

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication, which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Appropriations:

JULY 27, 1962.

HON. JOHN McCORMACK,
The Speaker,
U.S. House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Pursuant to the provisions of section 2 of the Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention Act, as amended, the Committee on Agriculture has today considered the work plans transmitted to you by executive communication and referred to this committee and unanimously approved each of such plans. The work plans involved are:

Executive communication No. 2060: Kentucky; Little Kentucky.

Executive communication No. 2060: Hawaii; Puukapu.

Executive communication No. 2060: Illinois; Scattering Fork.

Executive communication No. 1899: Georgia; Rocky Comfort Creek.

Executive communication No. 1899: Missouri; South Fork Blackwater River.

Executive communication No. 2288: Florida; South Sumter.

Executive communication No. 2288: Michigan; North Branch Mill Creek.

Executive communication No. 2288: Texas; Kent Creek.

Executive communication No. 2288: Ohio; Dick's Creek-Little Muddy Creek.

Sincerely yours,

HAROLD D. COOLEY,
Chairman.

INDEPENDENT OFFICES APPROPRIATION BILL, 1963

The SPEAKER. The unfinished business is the question on the passage of the bill, H.R. 12711.

The Clerk read the title of the bill. The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The question was taken.

Mr. HALL. 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 368, nays 12, not voting 55, as follows:

[Roll No. 184]

YEAS—368

Abbitt	Cannon	Fascell
Abernethy	Carey	Feighan
Adair	Casey	Fenton
Addabbo	Cederberg	Finnegan
Albert	Celler	Fino
Alexander	Chamberlain	Fisher
Andersen,	Chelf	Flood
Minn.	Chenoweth	Flynt
Anderson, III.	Chiperfield	Fogarty
Andrews	Church	Ford
Anfuso	Clancy	Forrester
Arends	Clark	Fountain
Ashbrook	Cohelan	Frelinghuysen
Ashley	Collier	Friedel
Ashmore	Colmer	Fulton
Aspinall	Conte	Gallagher
Auchincloss	Cook	Garmatz
Avery	Cooley	Gary
Bailey	Corbett	Gathings
Baker	Corman	Gavin
Baldwin	Cramer	Gialmo
Barrett	Cunningham	Glenn
Barry	Curtin	Goodling
Bass, Tenn.	Daddario	Grant
Bates	Dague	Gray
Becker	Daniels	Green, Oreg.
Beckworth	Davis,	Green, Pa.
Belcher	James C.	Griffin
Bell	Davis, John W.	Griffiths
Bennett, Fla.	Dawson	Gross
Bennett, Mich.	Delaney	Gubser
Berry	Dent	Hagan, Ga.
Betts	Denton	Hagen, Calif.
Blatnik	Derounian	Haley
Boland	Derwinski	Halleck
Bolling	Devine	Halpern
Bonner	Diggs	Hansen
Bow	Dole	Harding
Boykin	Dominick	Hardy
Brademas	Donohue	Harrison, Va.
Bray	Dorn	Harrison, Wyo.
Breeding	Dowdy	Harsha
Bromwell	Downing	Harvey, Ind.
Brooks, Tex.	Doyle	Harvey, Mich.
Broomfield	Dulski	Hays
Brown	Durno	Healey
Broyhill	Dwyer	Hechler
Burke, Ky.	Edmondson	Hemphill
Burke, Mass.	Elliott	Henderson
Burleson	Ellsworth	Herlong
Byrne, Pa.	Everett	Hoeven
Byrnes, Wis.	Fallon	Hoffman, Ill.
Cahill	Farbstein	Hollifield

Horan	Montoya	St. George
Holland	Moore	Santangelo
Hosmer	Moorehead,	Saylor
Huddleston	Ohio	Schadeberg
Hull	Moorhead, Pa.	Schenck
Inouye	Morgan	Schneebeil
Jarman	Morris	Schweiker
Jennings	Morrison	Schwengel
Jensen	Morse	Scott
Joelson	Mosher	Scranton
Johnson, Calif.	Moss	Selden
Johnson, Md.	Multer	Shelley
Johnson, Wis.	Murphy	Sheppard
Jonas	Murray	Shipley
Jones, Ala.	Natcher	Shriver
Jones, Mo.	Neisen	Sibal
Judd	Nix	Sikes
Karsten	Norblad	Siler
Kastenmeier	Norrell	Sisk
Kearns	Nygaard	Slack
Kee	O'Brien, Ill.	Smith, Calif.
Keith	O'Brien, N.Y.	Smith, Iowa
Kelly	O'Hara, Ill.	Smith, Va.
Keogh	O'Hara, Mich.	Spence
Kilgore	O'Konski	Springer
King, Calif.	Olsen	Stafford
King, N.Y.	O'Neill	Staggers
Kirwan	Osmer	Steed
Kitchin	Ostertag	Stephens
Kluczynski	Passman	Stratton
Knox	Patman	Stubblefield
Kornegay	Pelly	Sullivan
Kowalski	Perkins	Taylor
Kunkel	Pfost	Teague, Calif.
Kyl	Philbin	Teague, Tex.
Laird	Pike	Thomas
Landrum	Pillion	Thompson, N.J.
Lane	Pirnie	Thomson, Wis.
Langen	Poage	Toll
Lankford	Poff	Tollefson
Latta	Powell	Trimble
Lennon	Price	Tuck
Libonati	Purcell	Tupper
Lindsay	Quie	Udall, Morris K.
Lipscomb	Randall	Ullman
McCulloch	Reece	Vanik
McDonough	Reifel	Van Pelt
McDowell	Reuss	Van Zandt
McFall	Rhodes, Ariz.	Vinson
McIntire	Rhodes, Pa.	Waggoner
McMillan	Riehlman	Walhauser
Macdonald	Riley	Walter
MacGregor	Rivers, Alaska	Watts
Mack	Rivers, S.C.	Weaver
Madden	Roberts, Ala.	Weis
Magnuson	Roberts, Tex.	Westland
Mahon	Robison	Whalley
Mailliard	Rodino	Wharton
Marshall	Rogers, Colo.	Whitener
Martin, Mass.	Rogers, Fla.	Whitten
Martin, Nebr.	Rogers, Tex.	Wickersham
Mathias	Rooney	Widnall
Mathews	Roosevelt	Williams
May	Rosenthal	Willis
Meador	Rostenkowski	Wilson, Calif.
Miller, Clem	Roudebush	Wilson, Ind.
Miller, N.Y.	Roush	Wright
Milliken	Rousselot	Young
Mills	Rutherford	Younger
Minshall	Ryan, Mich.	Zablocki
Monagan	Ryan, N.Y.	Zelenko

NAYS—12

Alger	Gonzalez	Johansen
Beermann	Goodell	Michel
Bruce	Hall	Ray
Curtis, Mo.	Hiestand	Utt

NOT VOTING—55

Alford	Gilbert	Nedzi
Ayres	Granahan	Peterson
Baring	Harris	Plicher
Bass, N.H.	Hébert	Pucinski
Battin	Hoffman, Mich.	Rains
Bltch	Ichord, Mo.	St. Germain
Boggs	Karth	Saund
Bolton	Kilburn	Scherer
Brewster	King, Utah	Seely-Brown
Buckley	Lesinski	Short
Coad	Loser	Smith, Miss.
Curtis, Mass.	McSween	Taber
Davis, Tenn.	McVey	Thompson, La.
Dingell	Mason	Thompson, Tex.
Dooley	Merrow	Thornberry
Evins	Miller	Winstead
Findley	George P.	Yates
Frazier	Moeller	
Garland	Moulder	

So the bill was passed.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Mr. Hébert with Mr. Ayres.
Mr. Boggs with Mr. Merrow.

Mr. Peterson with Mr. Kilburn.
Mr. Buckley with Mrs. Bolton.
Mr. Thompson of Texas with Mr. Findley.
Mr. Loser with Mr. Seely-Brown.
Mr. Davis of Tennessee with Mr. Battin.
Mr. Gilbert with Mr. McVey.
Mr. Frazier with Mr. Short.
Mr. Pucinski with Mr. Dooley.
Mr. Rains with Mr. Curtis of Missouri.
Mr. Brewster with Mr. Mason.
Mr. Evins with Mr. Bass of New Hampshire.
Mr. Nedzi with Mr. Scherer.
Mr. George P. Miller with Mr. Taber.
Mr. St. Germain with Mr. Hoffman of Michigan.
Mrs. Granahan with Mr. Garland.

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

Messrs. COLLIER and LAIRD changed their vote from "nay" to "yea."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The doors were opened.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

UPPER DIVISION OF THE BAKER FEDERAL RECLAMATION PROJECT, OREGON

The SPEAKER. The further unfinished business is the question of the passage of the bill, H.R. 575.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 200, nays 182, not voting 53, as follows:

[Roll No. 185]

YEAS—200

Addabbo	Farbstein	Kluczynski
Albert	Fascell	Kowalski
Andrews	Finnegan	Landrum
Ashley	Fisher	Lane
Aspinall	Flood	Lankford
Bailey	Flynt	Libonati
Baker	Fogarty	McDowell
Baldwin	Forrester	McFall
Barrett	Friedel	McMillan
Bass, Tenn.	Gallagher	Macdonald
Bennett, Fla.	Garmatz	Mack
Bennett, Mich.	Gialmo	Madden
Blatnik	Gonzalez	Magnuson
Boland	Grant	Mahon
Bolling	Gray	Marshall
Bonner	Green, Oreg.	Mathias
Boykin	Green, Pa.	Mathews
Brademas	Griffiths	May
Breeding	Gubser	Miller, Clem
Brewster	Hagan, Ga.	Mills
Brooks, Tex.	Hagen, Calif.	Montoya
Burke, Ky.	Halpern	Moorhead, Pa.
Burke, Mass.	Hansen	Morgan
Byrne, Pa.	Harding	Morris
Carey	Hardy	Morrison
Celler	Harrison, Va.	Moss
Chelf	Hays	Multer
Chenoweth	Healey	Murphy
Clark	Hechler	Murray
Cohelan	Hollifield	Natcher
Cook	Holland	Nix
Cooley	Horan	Norblad
Corman	Huddleston	Norrell
Daddario	Hull	Nygaard
Daniels	Inouye	O'Brien, Ill.
Davis, John W.	Jarman	O'Brien, N.Y.
Dawson	Jennings	O'Hara, Ill.
Delaney	Johnson, Calif.	O'Hara, Mich.
Dent	Johnson, Md.	Olsen
Denton	Johnson, Wis.	O'Neill
Diggs	Jones, Ala.	Patman
Donohue	Karsten	Perkins
Downing	Kastenmeier	Pfost
Doyle	Kearns	Philbin
Dulski	Kee	Poage
Edmondson	Kelly	Powell
Elliott	Keogh	Price
Everett	Kilgore	Randall
Fallon	King, Calif.	Reifel

Reuss
Rhodes, Ariz.
Rhodes, Pa.
Rivers, Alaska
Roberts, Ala.
Roberts, Tex.
Rodino
Rogers, Colo.
Rogers, Fla.
Rogers, Tex.
Rooney
Roosevelt
Rosenthal
Rostenkowski
Roush
Rutherford
Ryan, Mich.
Ryan, N.Y.

Santangelo
Seiden
Shelley
Sheppard
Shipley
Sikes
Sisk
Slack
Smith, Miss.
Smith, Va.
Spence
Staggers
Steed
Stephens
Stratton
Stubblefield
Sullivan
Teague, Tex.

Thomas
Thompson, N.J.
Toll
Tollefson
Trimble
Udall, Morris K.
Ullman
Vinson
Walter
Watts
Weaver
Wickersham
Willis
Wright
Young
Zablocki
Zelenko

NAYS—182

Abbott
Abernethy
Adair
Alexander
Alger
Andersen, Minn.
Anderson, Ill.
Arends
Ashbrook
Ashmore
Auchincloss
Avery
Barry
Bates
Becker
Beckworth
Beermann
Belcher
Bell
Berry
Betts
Bow
Bray
Bromwell
Broomfield
Brown
Broyhill
Bruce
Burluson
Byrnes, Wis.
Cahill
Cannon
Casey
Cederberg
Chamberlain
Chipperfield
Church
Clancy
Collier
Colmer
Conte
Corbett
Cramer
Cunningham
Curtin
Curtis, Mo.
Dague
Davis,
James C.
Derounian
Derwinski
Devine
Dole
Dominick
Dorn
Dowdy
Durno
Dwyer
Ellsworth
Feighan
Fenton
Fino

Ford
Fountain
Frelinghuysen
Fulton
Gary
Gathings
Gavin
Glenn
Goodell
Goodling
Griffin
Gross
Haley
Hall
Halleck
Harrison, Wyo.
Harsha
Harvey, Ind.
Harvey, Mich.
Hemphill
Henderson
Herlong
Hiestand
Hoeven
Hoffman, Ill.
Hosmer
Jensen
Joelson
Johansen
Jonas
Jones, Mo.
Judd
Keith
King, N.Y.
Kitchin
Knox
Kornegay
Kunkel
Kyl
Laird
Langen
Latta
Lennon
Lindsay
Lipscomb
McCulloch
McDonough
McIntire
MacGregor
Mailliard
Martin, Mass.
Martin, Nebr.
Meador
Michel
Miller, N.Y.
Milliken
Minshall
Moeller
Monagan
Moore
Moorehead,
Ohio
Morse

Mosher
Neisen
O'Konski
Osmer
Ostertag
Passman
Pelly
Pike
Pillion
Pirnie
Poff
Purcell
Quie
Ray
Reece
Riehlman
Riley
Rivers, S.C.
Robison
Roudebush
Rousselot
St. George
Saylor
Schadeberg
Schenck
Schneebeil
Schweiker
Schwengel
Scott
Scranton
Shriver
Sibal
Siler
Smith, Calif.
Smith, Iowa
Springer
Stafford
Taylor
Teague, Calif.
Thomson, Wis.
Tuck
Tupper
Utt
Vanik
Van Pelt
Van Zandt
Waggoner
Walhauser
Walter
Weis
Westland
Whalley
Wharton
Whitener
Whitten
Widnall
Williams
Wilson, Calif.
Wilson, Ind.
Younger

NOT VOTING—53

Alford
Anfuso
Ayres
Baring
Bass, N.H.
Battin
Bltch
Boggs
Bolton
Buckley
Coad
Curtis, Mass.
Davis, Tenn.
Dingell
Dooley
Evins
Findley
Frazier
Garland

Gilbert
Granahan
Harris
Hébert
Hoffman, Mich.
Ichord, Mo.
Karth
Kilburn
King, Utah
Kirwan
Lesinski
Loser
McSween
McVey
Mason
Merrow
Miller,
George P.
Moulder

Nedzi
Peterson
Plicher
Pucinski
Rains
St. Germain
Saund
Scherer
Seely-Brown
Short
Taber
Thompson, La.
Thompson, Tex.
Thornberry
Winstead
Yates

So the bill was passed.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Hébert for, with Mr. Taber against.
Mr. Boggs for, with Mr. Hoffman of Michigan against.
Mr. Thompson of Texas for, with Mr. Findley against.
Mr. Gilbert for, with Mrs. Bolton against.
Mr. Buckley for, with Mr. Curtis of Massachusetts against.
Mr. Loser for, with Mr. Ayres against.
Mr. Davis of Tennessee for, with Mr. Dooley against.
Mr. Frazier for, with Mr. Garland against.
Mr. Peterson for, with Mr. Scherer against.
Mr. St. Germain for, with Mr. Mason against.
Mr. George P. Miller for, with Mr. Kilburn against.
Mr. Dingell for, with Mr. Bass of New Hampshire against.
Mr. Kirwan for, with Mr. Merrow against.
Mr. Nedzi for, with Mr. Seely-Brown against.
Mr. Lesinski for, with Mr. McVey against.
Mr. Anfuso for, with Mr. Winstead against.
Mr. Pucinski for, with Mr. Alford against.

Until further notice:

Mrs. Granahan with Mr. Battin.
Mr. Coad with Mr. Short.

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

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SPOKANE VALLEY PROJECT

The SPEAKER. The next unfinished business is the vote on the passage of the bill (S. 2008) to amend the act of September 16, 1959 (73 Stat. 561; 43 U.S.C. 615a), relating to the construction, operation, and maintenance of the Spokane Valley project.

The question is on the passage of the bill.

The bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The title of the bill was amended to read: "An Act to amend the Act of September 16, 1959 (73 Stat. 561; 43 U.S.C. 615s), relating to the construction, operation, and maintenance of the Spokane Valley project."

FIFTEENTH ANNUAL REPORT OF HOUSING AND HOME FINANCE AGENCY—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read, and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency:

To the Congress of the United States:

Pursuant to the provisions of section 802(a) of the Housing Act of 1954, I transmit herewith for the information of the Congress the 15th Annual Report of the Housing and Home Finance

Agency covering housing activities for the calendar year 1961.

JOHN F. KENNEDY.

THE WHITE HOUSE, August 1, 1962.

DEPARTMENTS OF LABOR AND HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE APPROPRIATION BILL, 1963

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (H.R. 10904) making appropriations for the Departments of Labor and Health, Education, and Welfare, and related agencies, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1963, and for other purposes, and ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers on the part of the House be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

The conference report and statement are as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT (H. REPT. NO. 2100)

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 10904) making appropriations for the Departments of Labor and Health, Education, and Welfare, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1963, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 4, 9, 16, 25, 49, 51, 54, and 55.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 10, 14, 15, 18, 20, 21, 22, 24, 29, 30, 31, 32, 33, 34, 35, 36, 39, 40, 50, 53, 57, 58, 59, 61, 64, and 66; and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 1: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 1, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$70,000,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 7: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 7, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$1,344,500"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 8: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 8, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$2,048,500"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 11: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 11, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$893,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 12: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 12, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$4,261,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 23: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 23, and agree

to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter stricken and inserted by said amendment, insert the following: "expenses of primary and secondary schooling of dependents, in foreign countries, of Public Health Service commissioned officers stationed in foreign countries, in amounts not to exceed an average of \$285 per student, when it is determined by the Secretary that the schools available in the locality are unable to provide adequately for the education of such dependents, and for the transportation of such dependents between such schools and their places of residence when the schools are not accessible to such dependents by regular means of transportation"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 26: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 26, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$6,993,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 27: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 27, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$1,250,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 28: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 28, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$3,250,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 37: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 37, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$4,122,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 38: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 38, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$24,707,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 41: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 41, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$159,826,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 42: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 42, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$155,742,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 43: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 43, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$143,599,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 44: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 44, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$147,398,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 45: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 45, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$21,199,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 46: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 46, and agree

to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$103,388,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 47: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 47, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$66,142,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 48: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 48, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$83,506,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 60: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 60, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: Restore the matter stricken by said amendment, amended to read as follows: "Sec. 203. None of the funds provided herein shall be used to pay any recipient of a grant for the conduct of a research project an amount for indirect expenses in connection with such project in excess of 20 per centum of the direct costs."

An the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 62: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 62, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by said amendment insert "204"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 65: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 65, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$4,973,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 67: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 67, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: Restore the matter stricken out by said amendment, amended to read as follows: "Sec. 904. None of the funds contained in this Act for 'Juvenile delinquency and youth offenses' shall be paid, for the purpose of conducting or assisting in conducting a research or demonstration project, to any person or organization registered with the Clerk of the House and the Secretary of the Senate under the Regulation of Lobbying Act."

And the Senate agree to the same.

The committee of conference report in disagreement amendments numbered 2, 3, 5, 6, 13, 17, 19, 52, 56, 63, and 68.

JOHN E. FOGARTY,
WINFIELD K. DENTON,
CLARENCE CANNON,
MELVIN R. LAIRD (except
as to action on amend-
ments 41 through 48)

Managers on the Part of the House.

LISTER HILL,
RICHARD B. RUSSELL,
WARREN G. MAGNUSON,
JOHN C. STENNIS,
JOHN O. PASTORE,
MILTON R. YOUNG,
NORRIS COTTON,
MARGARET CHASE SMITH,
GORDON ALLOTT,

Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 10904) making appropriations for the Departments of Labor, and Health, Education, and Welfare, and related agencies, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1963, and for other purposes, submit the following statement in explanation of the

effect of the action agreed upon and recommended in the accompanying conference report as to each of such amendments, namely:

TITLE I—DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

Manpower development and training activities

Amendment No. 1—Appropriates \$70,000,000 instead of \$75,000,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Welfare and pension plan reports activities

Amendment No. 2—Reported in disagreement. A motion will be offered in the House to agree to the Senate amendment with an amendment to appropriate \$1,300,000 instead of \$1,532,000 as proposed by the Senate and to add the language "to be transferred to Salaries and expenses, Bureau of Labor Standards."

Bureau of Employment Security

Amendment No. 3—Reported in disagreement. A motion will be offered in the House to appropriate \$400,000,000 for grants to States instead of \$350,000,000 as proposed by the House and \$405,000,000 as proposed by the Senate. The Department reports that \$20,590,000 of the Senate allowance is required to meet increased State salaries, while only \$7,200,000 of the 1962 appropriation was budgeted for the same purpose. The committee of conference questions the need for this large an increase.

Amendment No. 4—Strikes language proposed by the Senate.

Amendments Nos. 5 and 6—Reported in disagreement.

Amendment No. 7—Appropriates \$1,344,500 for "Compliance Activities, Mexican Farm Labor Program" instead of \$1,640,000 as proposed by the House and \$1,049,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 8—Appropriates \$2,048,500 for "Salaries and Expenses, Mexican Farm Labor Program" instead of \$2,178,000 as proposed by the House and \$1,919,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Bureau of Labor Standards

Amendment No. 9—Restores language proposed by the House and stricken by the Senate.

Amendment No. 10—Appropriates \$3,244,000 as proposed by the Senate instead of \$3,800,000 as proposed by the House.

Women's Bureau

Amendment No. 11—Appropriates \$893,000 for salaries and expenses instead of \$718,000 as proposed by the House and \$968,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Office of the Solicitor

Amendment No. 12—Appropriates \$4,261,000 for salaries and expenses instead of \$4,181,000 as proposed by the House and \$4,281,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Office of the Secretary

Amendment No. 13—Reported in disagreement. A motion will be made in the House to recede from disagreement to the Senate amendment and agree to the same with an amendment which will appropriate \$2,026,000 instead of \$1,905,000 as proposed by the House and \$2,066,000 as proposed by the Senate and will authorize the use of funds for commissions or boards to resolve labor-management disputes. If this motion is agreed to, it will have the following effect: Appropriate no funds for a departmental archives and a historian as proposed by the House instead of \$20,000 as proposed by the Senate; appropriate \$80,000 for celebration of the Department's 50th anniversary instead of \$109,000 as proposed by the House and \$50,000 as proposed by the Senate; and appropriate \$150,000 for activities involved in resolving labor-management disputes including expenses of commissions or boards instead of nothing as proposed by the House and \$200,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 14—Strikes language proposed by the House.

TITLE II—DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE

Office of Education

Amendment No. 15—Appropriates \$34,716,000 for "Promotion and further development of vocational education" as proposed by the Senate instead of \$34,672,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 16—Strikes appropriation of \$15,707,000 for "Payments to School Districts, fiscal year 1962" proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 17—Reported in disagreement.

Amendment No. 18—Provides authority to make advance loans and payments under Title II of the National Defense Education Act for the first quarter of the next succeeding fiscal year at any time after March 31 of the current year as proposed by the Senate instead of any time after May 31 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 19—Reported in disagreement.

Amendment No. 20—Appropriates \$12,300,000 for salaries and expenses as proposed by the Senate instead of \$12,250,000 as proposed by the House.

Office of Vocational Rehabilitation

Amendment No. 21—Appropriates \$25,500,000 for "Research and training" as proposed by the Senate instead of \$24,500,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 22—Appropriates \$2,000,000 for "Research and training (special foreign currency program)" as proposed by the Senate instead of \$1,500,000 as proposed by the House.

Public Health Service

Amendment No. 23—Strikes language proposed by the Senate and restores language proposed by the House and stricken by the Senate amended to change the term "Public Health Service personnel" to "Public Health Service commissioned officers."

Amendment No. 24—Appropriates \$33,200,000 for "Buildings and facilities" as proposed by the Senate instead of \$31,000,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 25—Appropriates \$10,062,000 for "Communicable Disease Activities" as proposed by the House instead of \$10,662,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendments Nos. 26, 27, and 28—Appropriate \$6,993,000 for "Control of Tuberculosis" instead of \$6,493,000 as proposed by the House and \$7,493,000 as proposed by the Senate; and provide that \$1,250,000 of the appropriation shall be available for project grants to States instead of \$1,000,000 provided by the House and \$1,500,000 as provided by the Senate; and provide that \$3,250,000 of the appropriation shall be available for formula grants to States instead of \$3,000,000 provided by the House and \$3,500,000 as provided by the Senate.

Amendment No. 29—Appropriates \$8,000,000 for "Control of Venereal Diseases" as proposed by the Senate instead of \$7,000,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 30—Appropriates \$3,006,000 for "Dental Services and Resources" as proposed by the Senate instead of \$2,506,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendments Nos. 31-35—Appropriate \$226,220,000 for "Hospital Construction Activities" as proposed by the Senate instead of \$188,572,000 as proposed by the House and provide the following earmarking of funds under the appropriation: \$150,000,000 for grants or loans for hospitals and related facilities pursuant to Part C as proposed by the Senate instead of \$125,000,000 as proposed by the House; \$4,200,000 for the purposes authorized in section 636 as proposed by the Senate instead of \$1,800,000 as proposed by the House; \$70,000,000 for grants or loans for facilities pursuant to Part G as

proposed by the Senate instead of \$60,000,000 as proposed by the House; and \$20,000,000 for nursing homes as proposed by the Senate instead of \$10,000,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 36—Appropriates \$8,536,000 for "Milk, Food, Interstate, and Community Sanitation" as proposed by the Senate instead of \$7,502,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 37—Appropriates \$4,122,000 for "Occupational Health" instead of \$4,022,000 as proposed by the House and \$4,542,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 38—Appropriates \$24,707,000 for "Water Supply and Water Pollution Control" instead of \$24,607,000 as proposed by the House and \$25,407,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 39—Deletes language proposed by the House making \$2,657,000 of the appropriation "Hospitals and Medical Care" available for carrying out the Dependents' Medical Care Act.

Amendment No. 40—Appropriates \$47,602,000 for "Hospitals and Medical Care" as proposed by the Senate instead of \$50,259,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 41—Appropriates \$159,826,000 for "General Research and Services, National Institutes of Health" instead of \$155,826,000 as proposed by the House and \$161,826,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 42—Appropriates \$155,742,000 for "National Cancer Institute" instead of \$150,409,000 as proposed by the House and \$158,409,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 43—Appropriates \$143,599,000 for "Mental Health Activities" instead of \$133,599,000 as proposed by the House and \$148,599,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 44—Appropriates \$147,398,000 for "National Heart Institute" instead of \$143,398,000 as proposed by the House and \$149,398,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 45—Appropriates \$21,199,000 for "National Institute of Dental Research" instead of \$19,199,000 as proposed by the House and \$22,199,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 46—Appropriates \$103,388,000 for "Arthritis and Metabolic Disease Activities" instead of \$98,721,000 as proposed by the House and \$105,721,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 47—Appropriates \$66,142,000 for "Allergy and Infectious Disease Activities" instead of \$62,142,000 as proposed by the House and \$68,142,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 48—Appropriates \$83,506,000 for "Neurology and Blindness Activities" instead of \$77,506,000 as proposed by the House and \$86,506,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 49—Restores language proposed by the House and stricken by the Senate with regard to the National Library of Medicine.

Amendment No. 50—Inserts language proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 51—Strikes language proposed by the Senate to extend the availability of certain construction funds.

Social Security Administration

Amendment No. 52—Reported in disagreement.

Amendment No. 53—Inserts language proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 54—Deletes appropriation of \$1,500,000 for "Grants for Training of Public Welfare Personnel" proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 55—Deletes appropriation of \$1,800,000 for "Research and Training (Special Foreign Currency Program)" proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 56—Reported in disagreement.

Special institutions

Amendment No. 57—Appropriates \$739,000 for "American Printing House for the Blind" as proposed by the Senate instead of \$718,000 as proposed by the House. The committee of conference is agreed that the increase over the amount proposed by the House shall be used only for educational materials.

Amendment No. 58—Appropriates \$1,458,000 for "Salaries and Expenses, Gallaudet College" as proposed by the Senate instead of \$1,410,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 59—Appropriates \$1,065,000 for "Construction, Gallaudet College" as proposed by the Senate instead of \$355,000 as proposed by the House. The committee of conference was agreed that the amount appropriated is to complete construction and equipment of the Arts Building.

General provisions

Amendment No. 60—Restores language proposed by the House and stricken by the Senate, amended to provide a 20 percent limitation on funds which may be expended for indirect costs of research projects instead of 15 percent. The committee of conference desires that the Department carefully review the expenses incurred under research grants with a view to allowing no more than the actual expenses for indirect costs in cases where such indirect costs amount to less than 20 percent of the direct costs.

Amendment No. 61—Strikes language proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 62—Changes section number.

Amendment No. 63—Reported in disagreement.

TITLE VI—FEDERAL MEDIATION AND CONCILIATION SERVICE

Amendment No. 64—Provides per diem rate of \$100 for temporary employment of arbitrators, conciliators and mediators as proposed by the Senate instead of \$75 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 65—Appropriates \$4,973,000 instead of \$4,923,000 as proposed by the House and \$5,023,000 as proposed by the Senate.

TITLE IX—GENERAL PROVISIONS

Amendment No. 66—Inserts language proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 67—Restores language proposed by the House and stricken by the Senate with an amendment to provide that it shall apply only to funds made available for "Juvenile Delinquency and Youth Offenses."

Amendment No. 68—Reported in disagreement.

JOHN E. FOGARTY,
WINFIELD K. DENTON,
CLARENCE CANNON,
MELVIN R. LAIRD (except as
to action on amendments
41 through 48),
Managers on the Part of the House.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, the conference agreement results in a bill carrying appropriations which total \$5,334,609,500. This is, in round figures, \$46 million less than the bill passed by the Senate and it is almost \$52 million less than the President's budget request. The conference agreement results in appropriations totaling \$163 million more than was originally approved by the House. However, after the House acted, the President submitted budget amendments to the Senate which totaled over \$100 million. The main item contained in these budget amendments was \$100 million for the new manpower, development, and training program. In view of the indicated feeling of the House when this legislation was before it, I feel sure that the House would have allowed at least a major portion of this request had it come before us. Also, in accordance with a general agreement reached in the conference on the defense appropriation bill, the conferees agreed on a 20-percent allowance for overhead on research projects instead of the 15-percent originally allowed by the House. This will result in several million dollars additional expenditures in 1963 which was taken into consideration when we settled the National Institutes of Health items.

Thus Mr. Speaker, when you take into consideration the two factors of budget requests submitted to the Senate after the House acted and the adjustment in the indirect cost allowances, the actual agreement represents roughly an even split between what we passed in this House and what was approved by the other body.

The following table sets forth the pertinent summary statistics concerning action on this bill from the budget submission to the current stage:

Item	Budget estimates	Passed House	Passed Senate	Conference action	Conference action compared with—		
					Budget estimate	House	Senate
Department of Labor.....	\$374,081,100	\$264,326,000	\$340,222,000	\$335,150,500	-\$38,930,600	+\$70,824,500	-\$6,071,500
Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.....	4,985,100,000	4,879,380,000	5,013,554,000	4,972,327,000	-12,773,000	+92,947,000	-41,227,000
Related agencies.....	27,182,000	27,082,000	27,182,000	27,132,000	-50,000	+50,000	-50,000
Total.....	5,386,363,100	5,170,788,000	5,380,958,000	5,334,609,500	-51,753,600	+163,821,500	-46,348,500

Mr. Speaker, I would like to comment on the report of the Senate Committee on Appropriations dealing with separation of unemployment insurance and em-

ployment service activities in the larger cities. This report states:

The committee is concerned with the mounting cost of the employment security

program, and in the interest of economy and efficiency it is essential that administration of the unemployment compensation and employment services be directed and coordinated, geared to local conditions, at all levels.

Separation of the services would greatly increase administrative costs and should under no conditions be thrust upon State officials. Separation would result in less exposure of claimants to job openings, and through less effective application of the work test, cause the payment of benefits to claimants neither seeking work nor willing to work.

Let me deal first with the matter of the rising costs of the employment security program. It is true that the cost of this program has increased, and I believe logically so. There are several contributing factors: First, the increase in population and the size of the work force; second, the growing complexity of labor market problems; third, the recent addition of badly needed new services to workers and employers; fourth, the statutory extension of unemployment insurance; and fifth, the increase in State salaries and in the price of goods and services generally.

Now, I am sure my colleagues are well aware that any discussion of cost means nothing unless it is related to value received. So let us take a look at what we are receiving in value for the increasing cost of administering the employment security program.

Soon after his inauguration, President Kennedy requested, and the Congress provided, additional funds for the purpose of expanding and improving the Employment Service. As a result of these directives and actions from the President and the Congress, State agencies have expanded their services and reorganized their staff in the larger cities so that today we have the most efficient network of public employment offices in history.

Public employment offices in the Federal-State system found six and a half million nonfarm jobs for American workers during the fiscal year ending June 30, an increase of 16 percent over the corresponding 1961 fiscal period and the highest 12-month total since the ending of the Korean war in 1953.

The cost of employment security has also been increased by the addition of new programs such as the Temporary Extended Unemployment Compensation Act approved by Congress. In fiscal year 1962 grants-to-States appropriations for the administration of that program totaled some \$13.3 million. I should also point to the programs for unemployment compensation for ex-servicemen and Federal employees. In 1963, it is estimated that \$6.8 million will be required for State administration of these two programs. The number of workers covered by unemployment insurance will have increased 34 percent between 1951 and 1963. It now protects almost 42½ million American workers. Can we continue to expand these programs and make benefits available to millions of additional workers and not expect costs to rise proportionately?

Certainly the cost of employment security programs is increasing. In an expanding economy with steadily expanding responsibilities, can we logically expect it to do otherwise?

But the point is that for these increased costs, we are getting full measure in terms of value to the national

economy and the accomplishments of these expanding programs.

Now I should like to discuss the issue of separation itself. It should be explained here that in the larger cities, the Bureau of Employment Security is recommending that separate local office facilities be established for the handling of unemployment compensation claims and for employment service and job placement activities. I can attest from personal knowledge that in the case of my own State of Rhode Island, in the city of Providence, where the two services have been separated, that the change has improved both programs.

There is a tendency on the part of the public and of employers who see the flood of claimants for unemployment compensation descending on public employment offices to categorize those offices as "unemployment offices," as places where one goes to receive compensation, not as places to go to seek a new job or employment assistance. In the case of the larger metropolitan areas, the volume of claimants and job applicants makes the physical separation of the two activities desirable.

In the smaller cities—those of less than 200,000—where the volume of claimants and jobseekers is not so great, physical separation is not desirable from the point of view of efficient operations.

Mr. Speaker, a serious question has been raised in connection with this bill regarding regulations the Secretary of Labor has established for the Mexican farm labor program. I think the record should be set straight on this matter.

The Mexican farm labor importation program, a wartime emergency measure which has been extended and expanded during peacetime, has raised, and is raising, serious moral, economic, and social questions, as well as principles of public policy.

This is a program which depends for its existence on poverty and unemployment in the Republic of Mexico, and has a tendency to increase poverty and unemployment at home. As it is presently operating, it has been denounced by religious leaders of all faiths, and has been criticized by responsible citizens from all walks of life. For 10 years, distinguished citizens of the United States, both Republican and Democrat, have pushed for reform of Public Law 78. During the first session of this Congress, for the first time in history, the Congress adopted a few significant reforms, despite the opposition of bracero users and their organizations.

Today, these growers and their organizations are attempting to nullify the effect of one of the amendments which was enacted. This amendment which prohibits the employment of Mexican nationals in year-round jobs would have the effect of opening up new job opportunities for underemployed domestic farmworkers. The workers who have become accustomed to have the U.S. Government do their recruiting for them, both in the United States and in Mexico, are succeeding in convincing the U.S. Congress that the amendment which was enacted into law does not really mean what it says.

These growers want to have their cake and eat it too, and they do not seem to care if some of the most depressed workers in the U.S. labor force are hurt because of their actions.

What does the amendment provide? It provides that Mexican workers may be employed only in "temporary or seasonal occupations, except in specific cases when found by the Secretary of Labor necessary to avoid undue hardship." This amendment uses the exact language that was proposed by the administration. Congress in its conference report on H.R. 2010—Public Law 78 as amended—stated as follows:

The purpose of the program is to supplement the domestic labor force in peak periods, such as at harvest time, when crops may be lost through a lack of sufficient workers. It is not intended to provide Mexican workers for year-round jobs that which might well be filled by domestic workers.

The importance of this provision was underlined by President Kennedy when he signed the bill with this comment:

The adverse effect of the Mexican farm labor program as it has operated in recent years on the wage and employment conditions of domestic workers is clear, and is cumulative in impact. We cannot afford to disregard it. We do not condone it. Therefore I sign this bill with the assurance that the Secretary of Labor will, by every means at his disposal, use the authority vested in him under the law to prescribe the standards and to make determinations essential for the protection of the wages and working conditions of domestic agricultural workers.

Under these mandates from the President and the Congress, the Secretary of Labor began a series of consultations with all interested parties by holding a public hearing in Washington, D.C., on December 8, 1961. At that hearing, all interested parties, including Members of Congress were given an opportunity to present their views on the Labor Department's proposals for implementing the new legislation. The hearing was followed by numerous other meetings and consultations with representatives of farm employers and workers and with Members of Congress. It was not until March 21 of this year, and then only after very serious and intensive consideration of the interests of all parties concerned, that the Secretary of Labor issued procedures to implement the seasonal and temporary provision. I remind you that these procedures or regulations were not only in order, they were demanded by the law itself, and were in direct response to the express wishes of the Congress.

The procedures at issue here simply provide that jobs which last longer than 210 days in more than 35 weeks in a calendar year cannot be said to be temporary or seasonal jobs, and thus cannot be filled with Mexican workers except in specific cases when necessary to avoid undue hardship. This procedure appears to me to be correctly in line with the language of the law and with the intent of Congress as expressed in the conference report.

Now certainly, 210 days in 35 weeks—more than 8 months a year—could scarcely qualify as temporary employ-

ment under long-established practices and precedents. Take for example, the international agreement between the Mexican Government and ours which limits the period during which Mexican nationals can be employed in the United States to 6 months, although 15 percent of the total workers recruited can be extended for an additional 3 months. In other words, from the point of view of both Governments, temporary and seasonal work is set at 6 months. And this is the basic standard which should be applied. In addition, the Bureau of the Census has defined seasonal agricultural employment as lasting less than 150 days. The Department of Agriculture uses a similar formula in reporting on hired farmworkers. Those working fewer than 150 days in the year are classified as seasonal, and workers employed 150 to 249 days are classified as regular workers.

So by all existing and established standards, the 210-day limitation imposed by the Secretary of Labor certainly is a most liberal interpretation of seasonal employment. It is clear to me that any grower or group of growers who are in a position to offer employment throughout the year should offer it to domestic workers. Most of these year-round jobs could be filled with domestic workers if reasonable wages and working conditions were offered. But to permit the employment of Mexican workers for longer than the 210 days set forth by the Secretary of Labor would be to circumvent the express wishes and intent of the Congress and the requirements of the law itself.

In its report the Senate Appropriations Committee states:

It is concerned with the effect of the 210-day limitation on employment of Mexican nationals in some areas of the United States where there is a year-long growing season and lack of domestic labor.

The committee says it is informed that—and I read:

The application of this limitation to an individual farmer may have the effect of denying him necessary labor to grow and harvest a portion of his crops.

It is impossible for the Secretary of Labor to certify a real shortage of labor unless growers are forced to institute intensive recruitment programs to obtain domestic labor. But if growers are assured of a year-round supply of Mexican labor, there is no reason for them to institute such programs—and the Labor Department's ability to make shortage certifications is nullified.

Furthermore, the seasonal and temporary amendment contains a clause which provides the Secretary of Labor with the authority and responsibility to make exceptions to these restrictions in specific cases when necessary to avoid undue hardship. Thus, if a grower makes positive and tangible attempts to recruit domestic labor without success, the Secretary of Labor can and will make an exception to the rule and see to it that the grower is provided with sufficient labor to harvest his crop.

What are the growers afraid of? Perhaps they are afraid that if this amendment were administered strictly, the

growers would suddenly discover that there is adequate labor available right here in the United States if and when the workers are offered reasonable wages and working conditions.

It is the position of the Department of Labor that Mexican and other foreign workers should be employed only during those periods of peak activity where, after intensive recruitment efforts have been made, it is apparent that there is a real shortage of domestic labor.

The protection of our American farmworkers has been and must continue to be of major concern to the Congress. We have provided a measure of protection in H.R. 2010. At the same time, we have given assurances to farm employers that in peak periods, such as at harvest time, they will not be denied the use of Mexican farmworkers if there are not sufficient American workers available.

I believe the Secretary of Labor should be commended for the regulations he has established. I further believe strongly that if he were to go beyond the 210 days in 35 weeks limitation, such action would undermine the intent of the law.

Mr. Speaker, I now yield 10 minutes to my distinguished friend and minority leader, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. LAIRD], to discuss the conference report.

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate very much the chairman of our subcommittee, the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY], yielding to me for the purpose of discussing certain sections of this conference report which I could not agree with in conference.

Mr. Speaker, when this bill left the House of Representatives there was included in it \$60.4 million more than the President had asked for, for the National Institutes of Health. The President had asked in his budget estimates for \$780 million to carry on the activities of the National Institutes of Health for fiscal year 1963. When the House acted on this bill we gave to the National Institutes of Health authority to expend an amount equal to their unexpended balances of 1962, which were estimated at that time to be \$60.4 million, in addition to the amount that was recommended in the President's budget. When this bill went to the other body there was added \$120.4 million above the President's budget.

Mr. Speaker, it is important, I think, for every Member of the House to realize today that the amount of money which Congress made available to the National Institutes of Health in fiscal year 1962 was \$738,355,000. Of this appropriation there was lapsed on June 30 of this year, \$73 million. The National Institutes of Health could not spend this \$73 million, although every effort was made to expend this money in fiscal year 1962.

Mr. Speaker, what are the problems? I have been and am now a promoter and a supporter of the work of the National Institutes of Health. It is because of my support for a sound and progressive NIH program that I take the floor of this House today to plead with my colleagues not to appropriate more than the House Appropriations Committee's recommen-

dation. My position is supported by Dr. Shannon, Director of NIH; by Dr. Luther Terry, Surgeon General of the U.S. Public Health Service; by the Secretary of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare; and by the President of the United States.

The major problem facing the National Institutes of Health is not a question of money. The main problems which the National Institutes of Health must cope with today are: No. 1, a problem of facilities, and No. 2, a problem of personnel. The most crying need, according to the testimony taken in the House, was a question of facilities with which to carry on this research work throughout the United States at the present budget level. The second most pressing problem was the problem of personnel. What is happening at the National Institutes of Health in their intramural program and their extramural program at the present time? NIH is losing some of the best investigators in its intramural at the National Institutes of Health to other research organizations throughout the United States because of the problems of paying capable investigators the amount that they should be paid to carry on this most important work. Every day we are losing investigators at the National Institutes of Health. It is not a question of the funding level established in this bill. It is a question of the pay limitations for Federal scientific personnel. As a result the level of research being carried on by the National Institutes of Health is being downgraded. Merely adding the amount of money that the Senate has approved in this bill does not solve this problem.

Mr. Speaker, I have here in my hand a report which was made by a committee of the House of Representatives—the Committee on Government Operations—which I hope each Member of this House has had an opportunity to study. This is a very far-reaching report covering an investigation made by this House committee of the activities at the National Institutes of Health.

Recommendations were made by the Government Operations Committee last year, some of last year's recommendations which are reiterated in this report this year. This report clearly shows to every Member of the House of Representatives that the growth in this activity has not been the kind of growth that brings about the best type of progress in medical research. Just look at this growth figure. In 1955 this Congress appropriated \$81,298,000 to the National Institutes of Health. As I stated earlier, last year we appropriated \$738,355,000. The President in his budget estimate this year recommends \$780,400,000. The increased program level from 1955 to 1963, 8 years, is \$799 million, or an increase of nearly 11 times in the funding for NIH. And what has resulted is covered most adequately in this report.

These are fine, outstanding programs that are being carried on by the National Institutes of Health, but simply adding more millions than the people in charge of the program want will not help this program—it will in the long run hurt the program. Facilities and retention of key personnel are the needs of this

program. My motion to recommit does not in any way affect facilities or the personnel problem.

The position of the President of the United States as of this week is the same as it was when he submitted the budget to us earlier in the year. I quote from a statement of the President's Director of the Budget, Mr. Bell, incorporated in a letter:

Taking all factors into account the estimates contained in the President's budget for 1963 continue to represent his judgment of the funds needed to provide for a sound and an effective rate of increase in the programs of the National Institutes of Health.

Mr. Speaker, I intend to offer a motion to recommit this conference report. This motion to recommit will deal with amendments 41 through 48. These are the amendments of the Senate adding funds to the National Institutes of Health over and above the amount made available in the House-passed bill, and that amount provides an increase of \$102 million over last year.

The conference report as it comes back to you provides for a funding level of the NIH program of \$880 million in the fiscal year 1963 rather than the \$780 million recommended in the President's budget or the \$840 million approved in

the House-passed bill. The conference report provides \$40 million more than was placed in this bill as it passed the House of Representatives. I hope I will have the support of the House on this motion to recommit, particularly when an important committee of this House, Republicans and Democrats alike, on the Government Operations Committee, unanimously agreed in this report, House Report No. 1958, 87th Congress, 2d session, that this program needs to be tightened.

Mr. Speaker, I include at this point a table putting forth the appropriation history of NIH:

Appropriation history—National Institutes of Health

[Thousands of dollars]

Amendment No.	Appropriation title	1955	1956	1957	1958	1959	1960	1961	1962	Estimate, 1963	House	Senate	Conference
41	General research and services, National Institutes of Health: Obligational cash.	\$4,675.0	\$5,929	\$12,122	\$14,026	\$28,974	\$45,904	\$83,900	\$127,637	\$147,826	\$155,826	\$161,826	\$159,826
42	National Cancer Institute: Obligational cash.	21,737.0	24,978	48,432	56,402	75,268	91,257	111,000	142,836	139,109	150,409	158,409	155,742
43	Mental health activities: Obligational cash.	14,147.5	18,001	35,197	39,217	52,419	68,090	100,900	108,876	126,899	133,599	148,599	143,599
44	National Heart Institute: Obligational cash.	16,668.0	18,898	33,396	35,936	45,613	62,237	86,900	132,912	126,898	143,398	149,398	147,398
45	National Institute of Dental Research: Obligational cash.	1,990.0	2,176	6,026	6,430	7,420	10,019	15,500	17,340	17,199	19,199	22,199	21,199
46	Arthritis and metabolic disease activities: Obligational cash.	8,270.0	10,840	15,885	20,385	31,215	46,862	61,200	81,831	91,921	98,721	105,721	103,388
47	Allergy and infectious disease activities: Obligational cash.	6,180.0	7,775	13,299	17,400	24,071	34,054	44,000	56,091	59,342	62,142	68,142	66,142
48	Neurology and blindness activities: Obligational cash.	7,600.5	9,861	18,650	21,387	29,403	41,487	56,600	70,812	71,206	77,506	86,506	83,506
	Total, obligational cash.	81,268.0	98,458	183,007	211,183	294,383	400,000	560,000	738,335	780,400	840,800	900,800	880,800

¹ Includes funds for construction of mental health-neurology research facility.

² Includes funds for plans and specifications for a gerontological research facility; and

renovations and alterations, modernization, and planning and construction at the Rocky Mountain Laboratory, Hamilton, Mont.

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

Mr. LAIRD. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. BECKWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I am very interested in what the gentleman said about the fact that the National Institutes of Health is losing the type of investigators it needs to retain.

Mr. LAIRD. I have a whole list here of investigators they have lost in the last few years. This is not a question of the funding level, because the National Institutes of Health this last year returned to the Federal Treasury funds which they could not expend in the amount of over \$73 million.

Mr. BECKWORTH. My inquiry is this. What does the gentleman suggest be done in order to retain these investigators?

Mr. LAIRD. This is something we cannot do in this conference report nor by the Committee on Appropriations. But I believe that this is a matter which needs correction by the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service so that these scientific investigators are not lost to the Government, so that our program is not downgraded as it is being downgraded today.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. FOUNTAIN].

Mr. FOUNTAIN. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the distinguished gentleman from Rhode Island for giving me 5 minutes, although I hope he will extend me additional time. It is very difficult to deal adequately with this complex subject in such a brief period.

First of all, let me say that I have always supported the full amount of appropriations recommended to this House for public health activities and for the National Institutes of Health. I do not recall ever having voted to cut these funds. So it is with reluctance that I stand here today urging the Members of this House, for reasons which I shall explain, to oppose the motion of the gentleman from Rhode Island that we accept the report of the managers on the part of the House and Senate, and to support instead the motion which the gentleman from Wisconsin will make for recommitment.

I have no personal satisfaction in taking this position because I am as interested in health research as any Member of this House. I know what research has accomplished. And I want to commend the gentleman from Rhode Island and those who have worked with him over the years in providing sufficient appropriations to permit the adequate support of health research.

I could not in good conscience, however, sit here in silence and carry out my responsibilities as a Member of this House and as chairman of a subcommittee of the Committee on Government Operations which unanimously adopted a report on this subject, particularly in view of the findings of our committee that the National Institutes of Health does not have adequate management controls to enable it to spend grant funds efficiently and economically.

Our committee has prepared and submitted to the House two reports, one

last year and the other this year. The conclusions in these reports are supported not only by the committee's independent investigations but, in substance, by the testimony of the officials of NIH themselves.

I want to emphasize, as the Committee on Government Operations did in its recent report on NIH's administrative deficiencies—House Report No. 1958—that I fully subscribe to the principle of allowing scientific investigators the greatest possible freedom in carrying out their research. My remarks today should not be construed as intending any restrictions on the conditions essential for productive scientific research. What we must achieve is a harmonizing of freedom for the investigator with responsibility to the public in the expenditure of Government funds. It is NIH's obligation to develop adequate policies and procedures for assuring that grant funds are prudently spent for their intended purposes.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the House to support the motion of the gentleman from Wisconsin when it is offered, to recommit to the committee on conference amendments Nos. 41-48 in the conference report accompanying H.R. 10904 with instructions that the House-approved amounts be maintained. These amendments would provide appropriations for the National Institutes of Health far in excess of the extremely generous amounts which the House has approved.

Mr. Speaker, for 5 years now we have engaged in the unusual proceedings in

which the House increases the President's appropriation request for NIH, only to have the Senate add greatly to this increase, after which the recommendations of the conference committee are customarily set close to the higher Senate figures.

This year is no exception. The President recommended \$780.4 million, the House voted \$840.8 million, the Senate voted \$900.8 million, and the conference now recommends \$880.8 million, or two-thirds of the total amount added by the Senate. In addition, \$50 million was requested and allowed by both the House and Senate for health research facilities grants.

Mr. Speaker, congressional stimulation of these programs may have been necessary and justified in the past, but today the situation is completely different. The President, who is surely liberal in these matters and has demonstrated a deep personal interest in health research, made provision in the 1963 NIH budget for an increase of more than \$62 million over last year's appropriation, and approximately \$136 million over the amount NIH actually spent in 1962. The President's budget recommendations represent an increase of almost 20 percent above NIH's 1962 expenditures.

This would constitute a challenging rate of growth for even the best-managed organization. NIH grant management, however, has been found to be unsatisfactory.

Few public programs have expanded as rapidly and with as little critical examination as NIH's. I would remind my colleagues that between 1950 and 1962, appropriations for NIH have increased by approximately 15 times, from a level of around \$50 million in 1950 to well over \$700 million last year. Appropriations for research and training grants to nongovernmental scientists alone have increased by more than 26 times during this period.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MICHEL].

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the motion to recommit.

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

Mr. MICHEL. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from North Carolina to make a few additional observations and take this time to commend his committee for the work they did. I have read those reports as a member of this subcommittee and I think the gentleman's comments are very apropos.

Mr. FOUNTAIN. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague very much.

Mr. Speaker, the Committee on Government Operations in a unanimous report issued on June 30—House Report No. 1958—found serious deficiencies in the management of the National Institutes of Health. The committee has made an intensive study during the past 3 years of the administration of the NIH grant programs. Although serious management weaknesses were brought to the

agency's attention in April 1961—House Report No. 321—very little effective action has yet been taken by NIH to correct these shortcomings which it has acknowledged do exist.

The investigations made by the Committee on Government Operations have demonstrated that the NIH grant programs are not being administered in an efficient and economical manner. To increase the appropriation for these programs in the absence of effective management can only result in greater waste and inefficiency. I believe it would be a serious mistake, and a disservice to the cause of medical research and to the taxpaying public, if these appropriations were increased beyond the amount approved by the House before the agency has strengthened its capability for the efficient and economical administration of these programs.

Our committee has found that NIH has no effective machinery for a normal, businesslike review of the budget requests of grant applicants. As a consequence, NIH allows its grantees, on the average, 95 percent of the dollars they request and in a great many cases 100 percent. Moreover, NIH's policies and procedures provide no safeguard against waste, extravagance, and duplication in the expenditure of grant funds for such purposes as the purchase of equipment and foreign travel.

NIH agreed more than a year ago that its scientific advisers do not have the qualifications and the time to perform the budget review function, and that it would set up the proper machinery and procedures for meaningful budget review and control—but practically nothing has been done to date to accomplish this.

Mr. Speaker, there would be no real question of NIH's ability to support all present commitments, plus new meritorious projects, with the budget increase recommended by the President if the agency were to make proper use of the funds that are now spent unnecessarily as a result of inadequate review procedures. NIH could support many, many additional projects from its present funds through prudent management. Despite this, the House has already added \$60.4 million to the President's liberal request. Shall we now add still another \$40 million as proposed by the conference committee?

I say to my colleagues that we must put an end to this contest in which each House tries to outdo the other in increasing the NIH appropriations. Today is a most opportune time to act. The President is against these appropriation excesses; the Committee on Government Operations has found serious management deficiencies which the agency acknowledges exist but does not hasten to correct; and it is doubtful that sentiment in the other body supports the extra amounts recommended by the conference committee. You will recall that an amendment to reduce the NIH appropriation to the House level did not carry in the Senate by the close margin of 36 to 41.

Last Wednesday I placed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a letter which I re-

ceived from the Director of the Bureau of the Budget in which Mr. Bell stated:

The estimates contained in the President's budget for 1963 continue to represent his judgment of the funds needed to sustain the forward movement in the very important programs of the National Institutes of Health.

We are confronted here with a situation where the President sticks by his earlier figures, where \$26.9 million could not be spent out of the 1962 appropriations even after \$46.6 million was held in reserve by the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, where a committee of the House has found serious deficiencies in the management of the agency's grant programs, and where the House has already added \$60.4 million more than the President believes wise. Shall we now be so foolhardy as to vote an additional \$40 million under these circumstances?

Today we are concerned about a huge budget—unbalanced as well—increasing appropriations in a variety of important areas, and the need to reduce taxes. Here we have a chance to effect savings without in any way impairing the ability of NIH to continue to carry on its otherwise good work. If we do not do so, in my opinion, we will be taking a dangerously unwise position.

I hope the Members of this body will support the recommendational motion of the gentleman from Wisconsin.

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

Mr. MICHEL. I will yield to the gentleman, but before doing so may I take just a second to again commend the gentleman for his efforts, and to say that before my time expires, and I have but a minute left, we would like to hear what the proposal is on this motion to recommit. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. LAIRD. We only have a minute left to present the motion to recommit.

This motion to recommit only affects amendments 41 through 48. If this motion to recommit is carried the amount of funds available to NIH will be the same as the House allowed, \$60,400,000 above the amount recommended by President Kennedy. It will, however, be \$40 million below the amount recommended by the conference committee.

This particular motion to recommit will still allow for an increase in the NIH program for fiscal year 1963, in the amount of \$173 million as compared with last year's, being increased to expenditures. This is the greatest increase in the history of our medical research program, although \$780 million was appropriated, it was only possible for NIH to spend \$707 million in fiscal year 1962. My motion will permit a program level of \$840 million for fiscal year 1963. Although I may not have a majority of the House in support of this motion today, I assure the House that time will prove that my action is in the best interest of the National Institutes of Health and its programs.

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

Mr. MOORE. 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 West Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Speaker, in talking with the chairman of the Subcommittee on the Appropriation Bill of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, I have learned that the conferees have stricken from the bill all reference to the Ohio River Basin study which the Senate had included in the bill together with an amount of \$500,000 for the setting up of this water quality control study.

I am advised that the conferees did increase the House sums by \$100,000. The House having heretofore included \$193,000 for the Columbia River Basin and no funds for the Ohio River Basin project.

Even with the addition of the \$100,000, the conferees used no language to refer to the Ohio River Basin project even though the overall House appropriation was increased by \$100,000. I am terribly disturbed that the conferees would strike out this worthwhile project and even while agreeing to add \$100,000 to that section of the bill, it still made no reference to this much-needed Ohio River Basin project.

I have today directed a letter to Gordon McCallum of the Public Health Service asking for that agency of the Government to advise me whether or not they consider this \$100,000 increase over the House figure to be sufficient to undertake a beginning on the Ohio River Basin project. Failure of the conferees to mention the Ohio River Basin puts no obligation upon the Public Health Service to spend these additional funds for that project. While I am greatly disturbed by the action of the conferees, I am only hopeful that the Public Health Service will consider this increase as being made available to them to start the Ohio River Basin project.

Mr. AVERY. Mr. Speaker, I regret the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY], did not agree that the full hour for approving the conference report should be used to discuss all of the items in the bill and the accompanying conference report. There is an appropriation item in this bill about which I would like to have questioned the chairman of the subcommittee or some other member.

It has come to my attention from several universities and colleges over the Nation that the Department of Labor may be attempting to preempt the function and responsibility of placing college graduates in a position of gainful employment. Mr. Speaker, the college placement bureaus on the campuses of this Nation have been concerned about suitable positions for the graduates of their particular institutions for many years. They have a trained professional staff and in addition to the technical knowledge this staff possesses, they have the further opportunity of personal observations and faculty reports on the aptitude and the predominant characteristics of many of their graduates. This personal interest in the graduate is a relationship that is entirely unknown to a State employment service or any other

agency directly or indirectly under the Department of Labor of the Federal Government.

It appears that the interest of the Department of Labor to intervene in this field has been considerably accelerated since the passing of the Manpower Training Act of 1962. It certainly was not my understanding, nor does the legislative history of this act suggest, that it was anticipated by the Congress that Government personnel under this agency would be concerned with college graduates. The legislative history is abundantly clear that the primary function of this newly created agency is to retrain displaced workers for skills that hold promise for future employment. With the daily reminder that the unemployed still number over 4 million, it appears that there is among the unemployed a sufficient amount of work to entirely occupy the personnel in the retraining agency of the Department of Labor. I would hope that this agency would contain their effort to retraining the displaced and unemployed men and women of the Nation and would cease to intervene, except upon invitation, into the functions that have been historically so well handled by the individual college or university administration. Functions and services might be made available to the college bureaus by the employment service, but they should not seek to project its service into this jurisdiction.

I would hope the Department of Labor would reconsider its policy position in regard to this matter. Mr. Speaker, I am including a paragraph that is taken from a directive from the Department of Labor in regard to this effort which I interpret as an extension of influence:

Students' interest may be attracted by publicity in college papers or on bulletin boards. News of successful placements is usually the greatest single means for insuring continuing student cooperation. Graduates confronted with a multiplicity of job opportunities frequently appreciate an opportunity to talk the situation over with an employment service representative who has a broad view of the labor market.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I would like to state that I think the final test on the success of college placement bureaus would be an inquiry to the large employers that have used this service for many years. I understand such a survey has been conducted and the response was overwhelming to the point that these employers would much prefer to deal directly with the college or university and not be restricted by the encumbrances that are always inherent under Federal Government jurisdiction.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, as agreed to in conference, the bill provides \$880,800,000 for the National Institutes of Health. This is \$40 million more than the amount in the House bill but it is \$20 million less than the appropriation as passed by the Senate.

It is always difficult to arrive at the most effective and most prudent level for the appropriations for these vitally important programs. The transcripts of the thorough and exhaustive hearings held by the appropriation committees of both houses constitute a well-documented and authoritative assessment by

highly competent and well-informed witnesses of the immediate needs of medical research. The cost of the research and training programs which, in the opinion of those outstanding experts, are necessary if this country is to take full advantage of current research opportunities and train an adequate number of men and women to meet our future research and highly specialized patient-care needs, totalled more than \$1.1 billion. This is not a blue-sky figure but the sum of rational estimates by conservative physicians and scientists of the level of support required to do only those things that urgently need doing and on which work could begin immediately if the necessary funds were available.

The original budget requests of the several Institutes to the Director of NIH—representing the professional judgment of the staff both on program needs and on the program levels that could be successfully implemented—also totalled more than \$1 billion.

I hope that all of the Members of the House have taken time to study the transcripts of the hearings so that they will have seen for themselves not only the detailed testimony describing specific needs for which the administration's budget made no, or only insufficient, allowance but also the impressive accounts of the tremendous achievements of American medical research in recent years as the result of the progressive increases in support which the Congress has made available.

The amount on which the conference has agreed not only falls quite far short of these professional assessments but is also nearly \$5 million less than the trimmed-down estimate of \$885.3 million which NIH formally submitted to the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. This request represents the most conservative professional judgment of those responsible for the highly successful NIH programs about the funding level needed to maintain the momentum and high quality of their achievements.

Moreover, the NIH estimate was based on program plans that made no provision for the urgent and vital need for substantial increases in the support of professional training programs.

As Members of the House will recall, the Appropriations Committee, in its report on the 1962 appropriation bill, instructed NIH to submit a comprehensive report on the estimated national requirements for medical research manpower in 1970 and the projected output necessary to meet this requirement. The report was not completed until this spring. The urgent training needs outlined in it were, therefore, not reflected in the \$885 million request which the Department submitted to the Bureau of the Budget and no provision for meeting these increased needs was made in the budget estimates submitted to the Congress.

This comprehensive manpower report should be carefully studied by everyone interested in maintaining this country's vigorous and highly successful medical research effort. It shows that the Nation will need 80,000 highly qualified investigators in the medical and related sciences by 1970. In 1960 we had about 40,000 trained professionals doing re-

search in these sciences. We must therefore double our research manpower in the 10 years from 1960 to 1970.

To reach this goal—and allowing for deaths, retirements, and loss of personnel to other activities—we must add about 5,000 trained professional investigators a year. During the years 1954–60 we increased our medical research manpower from 19,000 to 40,000—or by an average of only 3,500 investigators a year. In other words, the average annual output of our training programs must now be increased by 40 percent.

This increase must be achieved in the face of two new factors which make it more difficult to attract suitable men and women to medical research. Many scientists trained during the war in other, but related fields, have during recent years been attracted to the rapidly expanding field of medical and biological research. This reservoir of highly skilled manpower has now been exhausted and medical research must henceforth depend on training its own investigators. The second factor is that the competition for trained young people with a deep research interest is becoming increasingly severe. New areas of science such as space exploration, nuclear and solid-state physics—the branch of physics which gave us transistors and made it possible to construct highly complex electronic equipment in miniature and durable form—oceanography, the atmospheric sciences, the environmental sciences, and other fields all offer exciting research opportunities that appeal to young people anxious to make a contribution to the advancement of man's mastery over his environment.

If the advancement of man's defenses against the dread diseases is to hold its own and make further advances, we must provide the incentives and the opportunities for young people to choose and prepare themselves for a research career in the medical and other biological sciences.

The dramatic advance of medical research during the past decade has presented scientists with increasingly complex problems which demand broad knowledge of many fields of science. Our future need is not merely for more biomedical scientists but for investigators with a wider competence. In much clinical research, physics is now as important as physiology. Modern problems in biochemistry, microbiology, genetics and the behavioral sciences require training of extraordinary breadth and depth. To meet these needs new training programs, that cut across the traditional compartments of science, must be developed. We must make it possible, by means of fellowships and other training support, for young investigators to spend a number of years in advanced training and in gaining experience in the complex modern techniques of medical research.

It takes years to train a competent research scientist. Expansion of the training programs must be started at once if a substantial increase in the number available in 1970 is to be achieved. If increases in the appropriations are delayed until next year, a major expansion of fellowships and training pro-

grams cannot take place until the 1964–65 academic year—when the decade during which we must double our research manpower is already nearly half over.

The bill, as now reported, will enable NIH to take significant steps, within its existing training and fellowship programs, toward meeting our long-term manpower needs in health research and for providing training in especially critical fields where shortages of qualified personnel now have a direct and tragic impact on the health and welfare of our people.

Competent outside witnesses testified that if better anesthetic procedures were generally available, a substantial number of the 30,000 to 40,000 anesthetic and surgical deaths that occur each year might be prevented. They are not available because we now have less than half the number of well-trained anesthesiologists that are needed. If there were enough to go around, it might also be possible to shorten the length of recovery from operations and thus restore an estimated 20 million man-days and \$480 million in earnings to the economy.

This country has only about 1,000 neurological specialists but urgently needs at least 3,000. The program for training general practitioners in the diagnosis and treatment of mental illnesses must be greatly expanded if we are to bring the benefits of research that has already been done to those who desperately need it.

Many Members of Congress have from time to time expressed concern over the frequent lag between the achievement of research results and the general use of this new information by practicing physicians in the diagnosis, treatment, or prevention of disease.

The increase in the NIH appropriation will provide additional funds for the special programs designed to help bridge this gap. There are, for example, many new techniques for the prevention and treatment of a number of diseases which are now not available to many people who could benefit from them. It is estimated that half of the 1,300,000 people in the United States who probably have the increased eye tension that can lead to glaucoma do not know that they have a condition that can result in blindness. Thousands of lives are lost each year because cancer victims did not have the early diagnosis tests that are now available for some types of cancer. Many victims of coronary attacks can be saved if all physicians and emergency health personnel were trained to give the closed-chest massage which, if promptly applied, can often restore the normal heartbeat.

It is false economy and a grave disservice to the American people to spend Federal funds for the support of research without, at the same time, doing everything possible to make the practical results of this research quickly and easily available to all the people who can benefit from them.

The increase agreed to in conference will also make available funds for planning grants, on a matching basis, to assist the States to develop comprehensive mental health plans. Such planning

grants were recommended by the Joint Commission on Mental Illness and Health. They have the strong endorsement of the National Governors' Conference on Mental Health. The President, in his special health message to the Congress on February 27, endorsed the Joint Commission report and referred specifically to the need for "still further Federal, State, and local cooperation and assistance."

It is particularly important that these grants be made available during the current fiscal year because many State legislative sessions occur in 1963. If the planning grants are delayed, substantive legislative action to implement the plans will, in many States, have to wait until 1965.

Some Members of the House may question whether NIH can effectively use the substantial increases provided by the bill in view of the fact that the Institutes had a total of about \$27 million of their available funds in unobligated balances at the end of fiscal 1962.

NIH's inability to use all its funds was due to factors beyond its control. The Congress did not pass the appropriation bill until the first week in September. The President did not sign the bill until the end of September. NIH did not get its first quarter's apportionment until November. In December, the Bureau of the Budget imposed a \$60 million administrative reserve on NIH.

This delay and this arbitrary cut made it impossible for NIH to plan and implement programs at the levels the Congress intended. The situation was further confused when the Bureau of the Budget released \$14 million of the reserves at the end of March when it was too late to program this sum effectively for obligation before the end of the fiscal year.

Even with this belated addition of \$14 million, the \$27 million in unobligated funds represents only 3.9 percent of the funds available to NIH which is only a slightly higher percentage than in the 3 previous years. In 1959, unobligated balances were 3.1 percent; in each of the years 1960 and 1961 they were 2.4 percent. In 1958, when the unexpended balances for the previous year were 7.3 percent, the Congress saw in this fact no reason for withholding a substantial increase in the appropriation.

Unobligated balances of the order of 3 or 4 percent are not evidence of excessive funds but of prudent management. The eight separate Institutes appropriations are each allocated to a large number of separate programs. The amount of many grant decisions made near the end of the fiscal year are unpredictable. Even relatively small balances remaining in so many different accounts must add up to a considerable total.

Another factor, during this past year, was that one of the new Research Career Award programs got off to a slow start. NIH encountered a number of problems in developing the policies, conditions of award, and administrative guidelines for this program which required extensive and time-consuming consultations with the medical schools. All of the problems were successfully

resolved but not until the year was so well advanced that it was not possible to obligate funds prudently to the extent that had been thought desirable early in the year.

A more important factor, however, was the restriction on programing imposed by earmarking and budget allocations. The extra funds in some programs were offset by insufficient funds for others.

Approved but unfunded fellowship applications totaled \$3.6 million. Nearly \$15 million more could have been effectively used for training grants—\$10 million by the National Institute for Mental Health alone.

Funds available to the Arthritis and Allergy Institutes for the clinical centers programs were seriously inadequate.

Almost all of the Institutes had approved project applications of great merit which they could not fund.

The coexistence of surpluses and shortages of funds illustrates the undesirability of earmarking funds for specific programs before it can be clearly seen where the greatest needs will lie.

It is, of course, necessary and proper that the Congress should indicate to which programs or activities it wants the NIH to give special emphasis or attention. Dollar earmarking by program can, however, interfere with the full and most effective utilization of the funds appropriated. The wishes of the Congress for special program effort can be satisfactorily met by giving the Institutes specific directions, but without tying their hands by earmarking funds, and then reviewing their actual expenditures in detail during the next appropriation hearing to determine whether these wishes were met to the extent feasible and prudent.

While the increase in the NIH appropriation will provide urgently needed additional funds for the training and fellowship programs and for hastening the application of research results to the care of patients, the House conferees have not agreed to any earmarking of funds.

The question has been raised on the floor of the House whether it is desirable to increase the appropriation for NIH in view of the defects in administration of the research grant programs to which the report of the Committee on Government Operations has drawn attention.

Let me say, quite frankly, that I have been much disturbed by this report. The Congress—and, indeed, the taxpayers of this country—owe a debt of gratitude to the gentleman from North Carolina who is the chairman of the subcommittee which conducted the investigation of the NIH extramural programs and to his distinguished colleagues, from both sides of the aisle, on this subcommittee.

The Appropriations Subcommittee is, of course, also deeply concerned to insure that these large and important programs are well managed and closely supervised and that the public funds provided by the Congress are scrupulously devoted to the purposes for which they are intended. The committee has always kept an eye on the management of all the NIH programs and I have discussed the administrative problems and

deficiencies in some detail with the Director of NIH and with members of his staff. They, too, are sincerely concerned by the evidences of abuses which the Committee on Government Operations has uncovered.

There is no doubt that a thorough re-examination of the grants management policies and the institution of more effective administrative procedures is necessary. The Surgeon General of the Public Health Service and the Director of the National Institutes of Health have readily acknowledged this. They are seeing to it that suitable steps are taken to remedy existing deficiencies and to carry out, in the best manner possible, the recommendations of the Committee on Government Operations.

An interbureau committee of the Public Health Service, appointed by the Surgeon General, has completed a review of the grants administration process and has proposed a large number of changes. Some of these have already been put into effect. I should like to mention a few of the steps that are being taken.

The actual needs of investigators with research grants awarded for more than 1 year will be reviewed annually by the staff and the amount to be paid under the grant for the next year will be renegotiated within the ceiling figure set by the Council when the award was first made. The previous practice was to pay the amount requested by the grantee, within the limit set by the Council, less any unexpended balance from the previous year in excess of \$5,000.

Applications for large long-term grants will, in addition to the normal scientific review, be examined by special committees including experts in accounting and management to review the administrative arrangements for the proposed research program.

All approved research grant applications falling in the lowest 10 percent of the priority ratings are now receiving individual review by the Advisory Councils. These are research proposals that have already been judged scientifically sound and worthy of support by the scientific review panels but which were considered less urgent—though not necessarily less good or less desirable—than the other applications than being considered. The special review procedure insures that the Advisory Councils will specifically consider, in the light of the relationship of the proposed project to the research goals of the Institute, whether the award can safely be withheld or whether steps should be taken to make certain that the award is made. Under the previous practice low priority grants, like other grants, were individually considered by the whole Council at its regular meeting only if separate action was requested by a Council member or by the staff. This was often done but was not routine. It is now mandatory for all low-priority grants.

Site visits will be made in connection with every grant application for \$50,000 or more a year from a new grantee to examine, on the spot, facilities, equipment, institutional arrangements and administrative procedures. Under the previous practice site visits were made only in connection with ap-

plications, regardless of amount, for which the study section felt it did not have adequate information.

Purchases of equipment costing \$2,500 or more, not previously itemized on grant applications, will require specific staff approval.

Expenditures for foreign travel, not previously itemized on grant application and approved, now also requires prior NIH staff approval.

Other administrative changes designed to forestall abuses and insure the most effective use of public funds are being worked out in cooperation with representatives of the educational and research institutions.

In this connection, I should like to remind the House that the organization whose grants the Committee on Government Operations has audited and whose expenditures of grant funds it has very properly criticized was a commercial firm engaged in research for profit.

Less than 3 percent of the NIH grants have, in the past, been made to profit-making corporations. The Director of NIH has frankly admitted that it was a mistake to use the grant mechanism—instead of a more rigid contract—to finance research done by profitmaking organizations. The Surgeon General has now ordered that no grants will in the future be made to commercial firms.

Among the abuses found by the committee were the use of NIH grant funds for finance capital for a new corporation; to purchase office equipment and furnishings; to pay corporation rent, moving expenses, and remodeling costs; and to pay salaries for time spent by corporate officers at directors and stockholders meetings and for an employee at the company's Washington office. These are not the type of expenditures likely to be incurred by an investigator in a medical school, a university, a research hospital, or a nonprofit research institution—which comprise 98 percent of the NIH grantees. Restrictions to prevent such unwarranted expenditures must be imposed on those who might be tempted to make them but NIH is being properly careful that they are not so broadly designed or applied as to impair the freedom of bona fide scientists in our educational institutions.

NIH now supports nearly 15,000 active research projects involving 11,000 investigators in 1,500 institutions. Inevitably, there will be some unjustified expenditures. Most of these will result from different judgments as to what is proper and prudent. But in any large body of people there will be some who misuse the trust placed in them. It is important that NIH guard against both misjudgments and misfeasance. But it is no less important that NIH avoid any actions which will in any way impede the work of the vast majority of our scientists whose dedication and probity no one can question.

Medical research is not a commodity that can be purchased but an activity that must be supported. Despite the great progress that has been made in medicine in recent years, the biological sciences are in a much more primitive stage of development than the physical sciences. The basic causes of many

common diseases—from cancer to dental cavities—are not clearly understood. Many treatments must still be discovered by trial and error, or, like penicillin, by accident.

Biomedical research is by its nature exploratory. More progress is made by following unexpected leads than by following predetermined paths. If medical research is to be productive, the investigator must be free to change the direction and manner of his work as opportunity offers. For this reason NIH has firmly adhered to the policy of leaving the investigator free to proceed as he thinks best and has, therefore, permitted the greatest possible flexibility in the expenditure of grant funds.

In doing so, NIH has, however, not taken sufficient care to insure that the grantee institution adequately exercised its responsibility for the proper administration of grant funds. NIH is now making a major effort to provide an organized, codified body of policy and procedure to guide institutions in their administration of funds made available through research and training grants. NIH has held a series of regional meetings with the deans and administrative personnel of all medical and dental schools in the Nation to clarify the responsibility of these institutions for administration of Federal grants and to assist them in the development of adequate mechanisms for this purpose.

The Association of American Medical Colleges and the American Council on Education are cooperating with NIH in furthering the development of sound institutional administration of Federal grant funds.

The national medical research program is a magnificent cooperative effort on the part of the Federal Government and the educational and research institutions of the United States. It can continue to succeed only if the institutions themselves play a major role in its management. The Federal Government must depend on the integrity, the sense of responsibility, the dedication to the public interest that mark our universities and research institutions.

I am confident that the administrative deficiencies which the Committee on Government Operations has criticized are being fully corrected. I know that the responsible officials of NIH, despite their embarrassment and chagrin, are sincerely grateful to the committee for having drawn attention to faults that need correcting and for its helpful recommendations. I also know that the Director of NIH appreciates the confidence which the gentleman from North Carolina has expressed in the substantive merit of the NIH programs.

No one familiar with the dramatic change in the pace and scope of medical research in this country during the past few years can doubt that the great progress that has been made in dealing with the major causes of death and disability is attributable to the programs of the National Institutes of Health.

The record is, indeed, impressive. There have been major advances on almost every front. Some diseases have

been practically eliminated by highly effective preventive techniques, diagnoses have been sharpened, and treatment of almost all major diseases has been vastly improved.

One of the most dramatic instances of the virtual elimination of a disease was the result of the discovery, in the course of a cooperative research project supported by NIH, that a form of blindness—known as retrolental fibroplasia—common among premature infants was due to the administration of too much oxygen. As the result of this discovery, the number of these tragic cases dropped from nearly 2,000 a year to less than two dozen. At least 13,000 children born during the past 7 years have good eyesight today, thanks to this one research finding.

The success of the Salk vaccine and the still newer oral polio vaccines, which were licensed during the past year, is well known. This success is about to be matched by the development of effective measles vaccines which are now in the final stage of testing. Measles has actually caused more deaths in the United States than polio. In many underdeveloped countries it is a major cause of death among young children. These new vaccines will not only save the lives of many children but will prevent such dreadful aftereffects of measles as mental retardation and deafness.

The so-called broad-spectrum antibiotics have provided dramatically effective treatments for a host of infectious diseases ranging from scarlet fever to boils. One of the newest members of this group is staphicillin which, for the first time, provides an effective means for combating the dreaded staphylococcus infections.

The pace of research has been so great that most of the drugs in use today for the treatment of major diseases were completely unknown 10 or 15 years ago. Tuberculosis sanatoriums are being closed all over the country because this disease can now be so effectively treated by specific drugs and antibiotics. Hypertension, a number of neurological diseases—including epilepsy—and many forms of mental illness can be controlled as the result of recent drug research. A welcome discovery of the past year was a drug which will prevent the migraine headaches that now disable thousands of people for short periods of time.

Drug therapy for cancer, which could only be hoped for 15 years ago, is beginning to make a dent in the mortality figures for certain types of cancer. For one form of cancer in women a particular drug actually provides a positive cure in a high percentage of cases. New drugs substantially prolong the comfortable and useful life of many cancer victims.

Newly developed techniques for massaging the heart without the necessity of opening the chest and electrical devices for restarting or artificially maintaining the heartbeat are saving many victims of coronary attacks.

The tremors and rigidity of Parkinson's disease, which used to be known as shaking palsy, can be eliminated by a delicate but relatively simple brain op-

eration using a new localized freezing technique.

Important progress is being made in the development of artificial organs. During the past year it became possible for artificial kidneys to take over the function of the irremediably damaged kidneys of several patients otherwise doomed to die. The device, developed with NIH grant support, is still experimental and the treatment—involving periodic purification of body fluids by the artificial kidney—costs about \$10,000 a year for each patient. Facilities are now so limited that a committee has the heart-rending task of selecting the few, from the hundreds of applicants, who can be given this lifesaving treatment. Can any argument be advanced for withholding funds for the additional research needed to perfect the treatment and reduce its cost so that it can be made available to the tens of thousands of persons who now die each year from diseases of the kidney? Must these funds be diverted from other research which may ultimately save other lives?

There has been remarkable progress, during the past few years, in the understanding of a number of metabolic and blood diseases—including several conditions usually fatal to children—which for decades have baffled physicians. These diseases—such as sickle cell anemia, galactosemia, and phenylketonuria, or PKU—have now been traced to inherited defects in the composition of the blood, in the body's supply of enzymes or in other aspects of its ability to handle certain foods. These discoveries have made it possible not only to save the lives of many infants but to prevent such permanent damage as mental retardation by taking prompt countermeasures some of which simply consist of a diet that completely avoids the chemical substances that the body cannot handle.

Ingenious techniques have also been developed for the use of radioactive isotopes for the diagnosis and treatment of various thyroid diseases.

Hormones are being used, with greater knowledge and better success, to make it possible for women with a history of spontaneous abortions to bear and give birth to healthy children.

Steroid hormones, an important group of natural chemical compounds found in the body, such as ACTH and cortisone, have been found to be effective in the treatment of a long list of diseases including rheumatoid arthritis and related diseases, adrenal insufficiency and some leukemias.

The new oral antidiabetic drugs have made it possible for more than a third of the diabetics in this country to control this disease by taking pills instead of using a hypodermic needle to inject insulin.

New drugs have been found both to treat gout and to prevent the acute attacks.

What may well prove to be one of the most important achievements in medical research is the discovery by two NIH scientists, during the past year, of the chemical means by which hereditary characteristics are transmitted from parents to children. This is a very great

step toward making it possible for medical scientists to prevent or control hereditary physical and mental defects. The possible consequences of this development strain the imagination.

The Nation can be proud of the two NIH scientists—Dr. Nirenberg and Dr. Matthaei—who did this work. And the Congress can also be proud of the fact that practically all of the other scientists in this country whose research in genetic chemistry during the past several years is recognized as having led up to this major breakthrough have been recipients of NIH support and have had full freedom to use this support to pursue scientific opportunities as they arose in their work.

Mr. Speaker, I hope the House will adopt this conference report and turn down the motion to recommit. If this motion to recommit should be carried we will go back to conference and the bill will be opened to reconsideration of everything we have agreed on, including hospital construction, aid for school construction in federally impacted areas; it opens up the entire bill. From a parliamentary angle it is impossible to confine the conference to the few items the gentleman from Wisconsin mentioned.

I am not finding fault with the gentleman from Wisconsin but I think that the Institutes of Health can effectively spend more money than we are allowing them here. I agree with the gentleman from Wisconsin that they have shortages of personnel and facilities. As he knows, part of the increase over the budget will be used for their training program to increase the number of trained people in these fields, and now for the first time we are spending \$50 million in grants for the construction of research facilities during 1963. I think we should be spending \$100 million. But that is not within the authority of the Appropriations Committee, because we gave every dime the basic legislation allows in this regard.

I think the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. FOUNTAIN] is one of the hardest working Members we have in the House. I read his report of a year ago and I read fully the one he made this year. I am convinced that many of the problems he discussed need the attention of Congress, and when we hold hearings on next year's budget we will go into all of these charges that have been made by the Fountain committee, not just with the National Institutes of Health and its able director, Dr. James Shannon, but with the new Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare and with Dr. Luther Terry who is doing such an excellent job as Surgeon General.

With all the good that has been accomplished in the past 16 years by the National Institutes of Health, I would hate now to see that progress halted, as I think it would halt if we should adopt the motion to recommit to be offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. LAIRD] for whom I have a deep respect. It was another Wisconsin Congressman, Mr. Frank Keefe, chairman of the committee in 1947 and 1948 who led the fight for increased appropriations for every institute that was enacted into law at that time. I served my apprenticeship

under Frank Keefe. I think he was one of the greatest men in this House as far as trying to get the Federal Government to do something in the field of medical research is concerned. If he were here today, he would be standing up here saying that we are not spending enough in this field.

In view of all of the advantages that have been gotten out of this program, the lives that have been saved in the past 15 or 16 years, and the disabilities that have been prevented by this research under the continuous leadership of the Congress in providing for them more adequately than proposed by the executive branch of the Government—when those things are taken into consideration, I do not see how anyone could vote against this sort of an approach.

We had a full and free discussion of the bill when it was before the House. Everybody had an opportunity to speak then and to offer amendments and points of order. We have never gone to the Committee on Rules for a rule waiving points of order. I said at that time I did not think we were going to spend enough money in 1963. There are so many needs in the field of training and in the field of research today that affect every household in this country. If you vote against this bill to continue advancing the research program of the Institutes of Health as we are proposing today, it will affect every household in the country.

A million people are going to die this year because of some form of heart disease, 260,000 or 270,000 people are going to die because of some form of cancer, about 20 million people in the country are now suffering from neurological diseases of one form or another, about 10 or 12 million people in the country are suffering from arthritis and rheumatism, and 2 or 3 million of them have been bedridden for years.

To slow down the progress we have made over the past 15 years would be tragic and the small amount of money involved in this bill will save the taxpayers of the country a great deal more money in the long run. Just to take one example—4 or 5 years ago we voted for a \$50,000 item over the Bureau of the Budget request at that time to try to find out what causes blindness in many prematurely born babies. In a year they came back with the answer, as a result of which it is estimated that blindness has been prevented for 13,000 babies born during the past 5 years because of this discovery.

The best statistics we have reflect that that expenditure of \$50,000 in that field alone has saved the taxpayers in the past 5 or 6 years about \$800 million.

Mr. Speaker, we can go down Institute after Institute and talk about the extension of life expectancy of human beings in the past 7 or 8 years, the lives that have been saved through new drugs, new techniques, new methods, and the disabilities that have been prevented because of the leadership of the Federal Government in the field of medical research.

Mr. Speaker, I believe it would be a terrible mistake to vote for the motion to

recommit, not just because of these things I have mentioned, but also because if we do it opens up the entire bill.

Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the conference report.

The previous question was ordered. The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER. Is the gentleman opposed to the conference report?

Mr. LAIRD. I am opposed to the conference report as it is presently drawn, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. LAIRD moves to recommit the conference report on H.R. 10904 to the committee on conference with instructions to the managers on the part of the House to insist on disagreement to Senate amendments Nos. 41 to 48, inclusive.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the motion to recommit.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion to recommit.

The question was taken; and the Speaker announced that the noes appeared to have it.

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

The SPEAKER. 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 173, nays 214, not voting 48, as follows:

[Roll No. 186]

YEAS—173

Adair	Curtis, Mo.	Johansen
Alexander	Dague	Jonas
Alger	Derounian	Jones, Mo.
Andersen, Minn.	Derwinski	Keith
Anderson, Ill.	Devine	Kilgore
Arends	Dole	King, N.Y.
Ashbrook	Dominick	Kitchin
Auchincloss	Dorn	Knox
Avery	Dowdy	Kornegay
Bailey	Downing	Kunkel
Baker	Durno	Kyl
Barry	Dwyer	Laird
Bates	Ellsworth	Langen
Becker	Everett	Latta
Beermann	Fenton	Lennon
Belcher	Findley	Lipscomb
Bell	Fisher	McCulloch
Bennett, Mich.	Ford	McDonough
Berry	Fountain	McIntire
Betts	Frellinghuysen	MacGregor
Bow	Gary	Martin, Nebr.
Bray	Gathings	Matthews
Bromwell	Glenn	May
Brown	Goodell	Meador
Bruce	Goodling	Michel
Burleson	Griffin	Miller, N.Y.
Byrnes, Wis.	Gross	Milliken
Cahill	Haley	Minshall
Casey	Hall	Moeller
Cederberg	Halleck	Moore
Chamberlain	Hardy	Moorehead,
Chenoweth	Harrison, Va.	Ohio
Chiperfield	Harrison, Wyo.	Mosher
Church	Harsha	Murray
Clancy	Harvey, Ind.	Nelsen
Collier	Harvey, Mich.	Norblad
Colmer	Henderson	Nygaard
Conte	Hiestand	O'Konski
Cooley	Hoever	Osmers
Cramer	Hoffman, Ill.	Ostertag
Cunningham	Horan	Pelly
Curtin	Hosmer	Pillion
	Jennings	Pirnie

Poff
Purcell
Quile
Ray
Reece
Reifel
Rhodes, Ariz.
Riehlman
Robison
Rogers, Tex.
Roudebush
Rousselot
St. George
Schadeberg
Schenck
Schweiker

Schwengel
Scott
Short
Shriver
Siler
Smith, Calif.
Smith, Iowa
Smith, Va.
Springer
Stephens
Taylor
Teague, Calif.
Thomson, Wis.
Tollefson
Tuck
Udall, Morris K.

Utt
Van Pelt
Waggonner
Wallhauser
Weaver
Wels
Westland
Wharton
Whitener
Williams
Wilson, Calif.
Wilson, Ind.
Wright
Younger

St. Germain
Saund
Scherer
Seely-Brown

Taber
Thompson, La.
Thompson, Tex.
Thornberry

Winstead
Yates

Gray
Green, Oreg.
Green, Pa.
Griffin
Griffiths
Gubser
Hagan, Ga.
Hagen, Calif.
Haley
Hall
Halleck
Halpern
Hansen
Harding
Hardy
Harrison, Va.
Harrison, Wyo.
Harsha
Harvey, Ind.
Harvey, Mich.
Hays
Healey
Hechler
Hemphill
Henderson
Herlong
Hoeven
Holland
Horan
Hosmer
Huddleston
Hull
Inouye
Jarman
Jennings
Jensen
Joelson
Johnson, Calif.
Johnson, Md.
Johnson, Wis.
Jones, Ala.
Jones, Mo.
Judd
Karsten
Kastenmeier
Kearns
Kee
Keith
Kelly
Keogh
Kilgore
King, Calif.
King, N.Y.
Kirwan
Kitchen
Kluczynski
Knox
Kornegay
Kowalski
Kunkel
Landrum
Lane
Langen
Lankford
Latta
Lennon
Libonati
Lindsay
McCulloch
McDonough
McDowell
McFall
McIntire
McMillan
Macdonald
MacGregor
Mack

Madden
Magnuson
Mahon
Malliard
Marshall
Martin, Mass.
Mathias
Matthews
May
Meader
Miller, Clem
Miller, N.Y.
Milliken
Mills
Moeller
Monagan
Montoya
Moore
Moorehead, Ohio
Moorhead, Pa.
Morgan
Morris
Morrison
Morse
Mosher
Moss
Multer
Murphy
Murray
Natcher
Nelsen
Nix
Norblad
Norrell
Nygaard
O'Brien, Ill.
O'Brien, N.Y.
O'Hara, Ill.
O'Hara, Mich.
O'Konski
Olsen
O'Neill
Osmer
Ostertag
Passman
Patman
Pelly
Perkins
Pfost
Philbin
Pike
Pillion
Pirnie
Poff
Powell
Price
Pucinski
Purcell
Quile
Randall
Reece
Reifel
Rhodes, Ariz.
Rhodes, Pa.
Riehlman
Riley
Rivers, Alaska
Rivers, S.C.
Roberts, Ala.
Roberts, Tex.
Robison
Rodino
Rogers, Colo.
Rogers, Fla.
Rooney
Roosevelt
Rosenthal
Rostenkowski
Roush
Rutherford
Ryan, Mich.
Ryan, N.Y.
Santangelo
Saylor
Schneebell
Scranton
Selden
Shelley
Sheppard
Shipley
Sibal
Sikes
Sisk
Slack
Smith, Miss.
Spence
Stafford
Staggers
Steed
Stephens
Stratton
Stubblefield
Sullivan
Taylor
Teague, Calif.
Teague, Tex.
Thomas
Thompson, N.J.
Thomson, Wis.
Toll
Tollefson
Trimble
Tupper
Udall, Morris K.
Ullman
Vanik
Van Zandt
Vinson
Wallhauser
Walter
Watts
Weaver
Wels
Westland
Whalley
Wharton
Whitener
Whitman
Wickersham
Wick
Williams
Willis
Wilson, Calif.
Wilson, Ind.
Wright
Young
Younger
Zablocki
Zelenko

Rosenthal
Rostenkowski
Roudebush
Roush
Rutherford
Ryan, Mich.
Ryan, N.Y.
St. George
St. Germain
Santangelo
Saylor
Schadeberg
Schenck
Schneebell
Schweiker
Schwengel
Scott
Scranton
Selden
Shelley
Sheppard
Shipley
Short
Shriver
Sibal
Sikes
Siler
Sisk
Slack
Smith, Iowa
Smith, Miss.
Spence
Springer
Stafford
Staggers
Steed
Stephens
Stratton
Stubblefield
Sullivan
Taylor
Teague, Calif.
Teague, Tex.
Thomas
Thompson, N.J.
Thomson, Wis.
Toll
Tollefson
Trimble
Tupper
Udall, Morris K.
Ullman
Vanik
Van Zandt
Vinson
Wallhauser
Walter
Watts
Weaver
Wels
Westland
Whalley
Wharton
Whitener
Whitman
Wickersham
Wick
Williams
Willis
Wilson, Calif.
Wilson, Ind.
Wright
Young
Younger
Zablocki
Zelenko

NAYS—214

Abbutt
Abernethy
Addabbo
Albert
Andrews
Anfuso
Ashley
Ashmore
Aspinall
Baldwin
Barrett
Bass, Tenn.
Beckworth
Bennett, Fla.
Blatnik
Boland
Bolling
Bonner
Boykin
Brademas
Breeding
Brewster
Brooks, Tex.
Broomfield
Broyhill
Buckley
Burke, Ky.
Burke, Mass.
Byrne, Pa.
Cannon
Carey
Celler
Chelf
Clark
Cohelan
Cook
Corbett
Corman
Daddario
Daniels
Davis
James C.
Davis, John W.
Dawson
Delaney
Dent
Denton
Diggs
Donohue
Dulski
Edmondson
Elliott
Fallon
Farbstein
Fascell
Feighan
Finnegan
Fino
Flood
Flynt
Fogarty
Forrester
Friedel
Fulton
Gallagher
Garmatz
Gavin
Gialmo
Gilbert
Gonzalez
Grant
Gray

Green, Oreg.
Green, Pa.
Griffiths
Gubser
Hagan, Ga.
Hagen, Calif.
Halpern
Hansen
Harding
Hays
Healey
Hechler
Hemphill
Herlong
Holifield
Holland
Huddleston
Hull
Inouye
Jarman
Jensen
Joelson
Johnson, Calif.
Johnson, Md.
Johnson, Wis.
Jones, Ala.
Judd
Karsten
Kastenmeier
Kearns
Kee
Kelly
Keogh
King, Calif.
Kirwan
Kluczynski
Kowalski
Landrum
Lane
Lankford
Libonati
Lindsay
McDowell
McFall
Macdonald
Mack
Madden
Magnuson
Mahon
Malliard
Marshall
Martin, Mass.
Mathias
Miller, Clem
Mills
Monagan
Montoya
Moorhead, Pa.
Morgan
Morris
Morrison
Morse
Moss
Multer
Murphy
Natcher
Nix
Norrell
O'Brien, Ill.
O'Brien, N.Y.
O'Hara, Ill.
O'Hara, Mich.

Olsen
O'Neill
Passman
Patman
Perkins
Pfost
Philbin
Pike
Poage
Powell
Price
Pucinski
Randall
Reuss
Rhodes, Pa.
Riley
Rivers, Alaska
Rivers, S.C.
Roberts, Ala.
Roberts, Tex.
Rodino
Rogers, Colo.
Rogers, Fla.
Rooney
Roosevelt
Rosenthal
Rostenkowski
Roush
Rutherford
Ryan, Mich.
Ryan, N.Y.
Santangelo
Saylor
Schneebell
Scranton
Selden
Shelley
Sheppard
Shipley
Sibal
Sikes
Sisk
Slack
Smith, Miss.
Spence
Stafford
Staggers
Steed
Stratton
Stubblefield
Sullivan
Teague, Tex.
Thomas
Thompson, N.J.
Toll
Trimble
Tupper
Ullman
Vanik
Van Zandt
Vinson
Walter
Watts
Whalley
Whitten
Wickersham
Widnall
Willis
Young
Zablocki
Zelenko

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Taber for, with Mr. Hébert against.
Mr. Hoffman of Michigan for, with Mr. Boggs against.

Mr. Dooley for, with Mrs. Granahan against.

Mr. Garland for, with Mr. Thompson of Texas against.

Mrs. Bolton for, with Mr. Davis of Tennessee against.

Mr. Kilburn for, with Mr. Frazier against.

Mr. Ayres for, with Mr. Loser against.

Mr. McVey for, with Mr. Dingell against.

Mr. Scherer for, with Mr. George P. Miller against.

Mr. Mason for, with Mr. Peterson against.

Mr. Bass of New Hampshire for, with Mr. Yates against.

Mr. Merrow for, with Mr. Lesinski against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Doyle with Mr. Battin.

Mr. Nedzi with Mr. Seely-Brown.

Mr. Rains with Mr. Curtis of Massachusetts.

Messrs. DOWNING, BAILEY, and ALGER changed their vote from "nay" to "yea."

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

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the conference report.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 350, nays 35, not voting 50, as follows:

[Roll No. 187]

YEAS—350

Abernethy
Adair
Addabbo
Albert
Alexander
Andersen, Minn.
Andrews
Anfuso
Arendt
Ashley
Ashmore
Aspinall
Auchincloss
Avery
Bailey
Baker
Baldwin
Barrett
Barry
Bass, Tenn.
Bates
Becker
Beckworth
Belcher
Bell
Bennett, Fla.
Bennett, Mich.
Berry
Betts
Blatnik
Boland
Bolling
Bonner
Bow
Boykin
Brademas
Bray
Brewster
Brooks, Tex.
Broomfield

Brown
Broyhill
Bruce
Buckley
Burke, Ky.
Burke, Mass.
Burlison
Byrne, Pa.
Cahill
Cannon
Carey
Casey
Cederberg
Celler
Chamberlain
Chelf
Chenoweth
Chiperfield
Clancy
Clark
Cohelan
Conte
Cook
Cooley
Corbett
Corman
Cramer
Cunningham
Curtin
Daddario
Dague
Daniels
Davis, James C.
Davis, John W.
Dawson
Delaney
Dent
Denton
Derounian
Derwinski

Diggs
Dole
Dominick
Donohue
Dowdy
Downing
Doyle
Dulski
Durno
Dwyer
Edmondson
Elliott
Ellsworth
Everett
Fallon
Farbstein
Fascell
Feighan
Fenton
Findley
Finnegan
Fino
Fisher
Flood
Flynt
Fogarty
Ford
Forrester
Fountain
Frelinghuysen
Friedel
Fulton
Gallagher
Garmatz
Gary
Gavin
Gialmo
Gilbert
Gonzalez
Goodling
Grant

Gray
Green, Oreg.
Green, Pa.
Griffin
Griffiths
Gubser
Hagan, Ga.
Hagen, Calif.
Haley
Hall
Halleck
Halpern
Hansen
Harding
Hardy
Harrison, Va.
Harrison, Wyo.
Harsha
Harvey, Ind.
Harvey, Mich.
Hays
Healey
Hechler
Hemphill
Henderson
Herlong
Hoeven
Holland
Horan
Hosmer
Huddleston
Hull
Inouye
Jarman
Jennings
Jensen
Joelson
Johnson, Calif.
Johnson, Md.
Johnson, Wis.
Jones, Ala.
Jones, Mo.
Judd
Karsten
Kastenmeier
Kearns
Kee
Keith
Kelly
Keogh
Kilgore
King, Calif.
King, N.Y.
Kirwan
Kitchen
Kluczynski
Knox
Kornegay
Kowalski
Kunkel
Landrum
Lane
Langen
Lankford
Latta
Lennon
Libonati
Lindsay
McCulloch
McDonough
McDowell
McFall
McIntire
McMillan
Macdonald
MacGregor
Mack

Madden
Magnuson
Mahon
Malliard
Marshall
Martin, Mass.
Mathias
Matthews
May
Meader
Miller, Clem
Miller, N.Y.
Milliken
Mills
Moeller
Monagan
Montoya
Moore
Moorehead, Ohio
Moorhead, Pa.
Morgan
Morris
Morrison
Morse
Mosher
Moss
Multer
Murphy
Murray
Natcher
Nelsen
Nix
Norblad
Norrell
Nygaard
O'Brien, Ill.
O'Brien, N.Y.
O'Hara, Ill.
O'Hara, Mich.
O'Konski
Olsen
O'Neill
Osmer
Ostertag
Passman
Patman
Pelly
Perkins
Pfost
Philbin
Pike
Pillion
Pirnie
Poff
Powell
Price
Pucinski
Purcell
Quile
Randall
Reece
Reifel
Rhodes, Ariz.
Rhodes, Pa.
Riehlman
Riley
Rivers, Alaska
Rivers, S.C.
Roberts, Ala.
Roberts, Tex.
Robison
Rodino
Rogers, Colo.
Rogers, Fla.
Rooney
Roosevelt

NAYS—35

Dorn
Gathings
Goodell
Gross
Hiestand
Hoffman, Ill.
Johansen
Jonas
Kyl
Laird
Lipscomb
Martin, Nebr.

Michel
Minshall
Ray
Rogers, Tex.
Rousselot
Smith, Calif.
Smith, Va.
Tuck
Utt
Van Pelt
Waggonner

NOT VOTING—50

Davis, Tenn.
Dingell
Dooley
Evins
Frazier
Garland
Glenn
Granahan
Harris
Hébert
Hoffman, Mich.

Holifield
Ichord, Mo.
Karth
Kilburn
King, Utah
Lesinski
Loser
McSween
McVey
Mason
Merrow

Alford
Ayres
Baring
Bass, N.H.
Battin
Blitch
Boggs
Bolton
Coad
Curtis, Mass.
Davis, Tenn.
Dingell
Dooley

Doyle
Evins
Frazier
Garland
Granahan
Harris
Hébert
Hoffman, Mich.
Ichord, Mo.
Karth
Kilburn
King, Utah
Lesinski

Loser
McMillan
McSween
McVey
Mason
Merrow
Miller, George P.
Moulder
Nedzi
Peterson
Pilcher
Rains

Miller, George P.	Poage Rains	Taber Thompson, La.
Moulder	Reuss	Thompson, Tex.
Nedzi	Saund	Thornberry
Peterson	Scherer	Winstead
Pilcher	Seely-Brown	Yates

So the conference report was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Mr. Hébert with Mr. Ayres.
Mr. Boggs with Mr. Scherer.
Mr. Davis of Tennessee with Mr. McVey.
Mr. Loser with Mr. Glenn.
Mr. Frazier with Mr. Battin.
Mr. George P. Miller with Mr. Dooley.
Mr. Nedzi with Mr. Seely-Brown.
Mr. Rains with Mrs. Bolton.
Mr. Hollifield with Mr. Bass of New Hampshire.

Mr. Baring with Mr. Kilburn.
Mr. Peterson with Mr. Taber.
Mr. Ewins with Mr. Merrow.
Mrs. Granahan with Mr. Curtis of Massachusetts.

Mr. Dingell with Mr. Garland.
Mr. Coad with Mr. Mason.
Mr. Thompson of Texas with Mr. Hoffman of Michigan.

Mr. O'KONSKI changed his vote from "yea" to "nay."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ALBERT). The Clerk will report the first amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 2: Page 3, line 12, insert:

"WELFARE AND PENSION PLAN REPORTS
ACTIVITIES

"For expenses necessary for performing the functions vested in the Secretary by the Welfare and Pension Plans Disclosure Act, as amended (72 Stat. 997; 76 Stat. 35), \$1,532,000."

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. FOGARTY moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 2 and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: Strike out "\$1,532,000" and insert in lieu thereof, the following: "\$1,300,000, to be transferred to 'Salaries and expenses, Bureau of Labor Standards'."

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will read the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 3: Page 5, line 14, strike out "not more than \$350,000,000" and insert "\$405,000,000".

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. FOGARTY moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 3 and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter stricken out and inserted, insert the following: "\$400,000,000".

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. GROSS. Is the gentleman from Rhode Island going to explain any of these amendments?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. That is within the discretion of the gentleman.

Mr. GROSS. A further parliamentary inquiry. Does not the gentleman have an hour on each of these amendments?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman has if he desires to use it.

Mr. GROSS. I think the House ought to know something about these amendments.

Mr. FOGARTY. The gentleman from Rhode Island is not going to use any time, I will say to the gentleman from Iowa.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 5; Page 5, line 20, insert: ", and of which \$15,000,000 shall be available only to the extent necessary to meet increased costs of administration resulting from changes in a State law or increases in the number of claims filed and claims paid or increased salary costs resulting from changes in State salary compensation plans embracing employees of the State generally over those upon which the State's basic grant (or the allocation for the District of Columbia) was based:".

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. FOGARTY moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 5 and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: At the end thereof, add the following: ", which increased costs of administration cannot be provided for by normal budgetary adjustments:".

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 6: On page 6, line 19, insert: "Provided further, That notwithstanding section 901(c)(1)(A) of the Social Security Act, the limitation on the amount authorized to be made available for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1963, for the purposes specified in such section 901(c)(1)(A) is hereby increased to \$405,000,000."

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. FOGARTY moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 6 and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: Strike out "\$405,000,000", and insert in lieu thereof: "\$400,000,000".

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman explain this amendment?

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, this is a reduction of \$5 million in the amount granted to the States for administering the unemployment compensation and employment services programs. The House passed the bill at \$350 million, which was the authorized amount. The Senate made it \$405 million and amended the authorization accordingly.

Mr. GROSS. That increased it how much?

Mr. FOGARTY. Fifty-five million dollars.

Mr. GROSS. That is about par for the course.

Mr. FOGARTY. This is paid from the Unemployment Trust Fund and goes back to the States to be used by the States—not a dime out of the Federal Treasury.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Rhode Island.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 13: Page 13, line 16, strike out "\$1,905,000" and insert "including expenses of commissions or boards to resolve labor-management disputes, \$2,066,000,".

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. FOGARTY moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 13 and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: Strike out "\$2,066,000", and insert in lieu thereof: "\$2,026,000".

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 17: Page 16, line 24, insert "For an additional amount for 'Assistance for School Construction', fiscal year 1962, \$7,092,000."

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. FOGARTY moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 17 and concur therein.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 19: Page 19, line 9, insert:

"SALARIES AND EXPENSES (SPECIAL FOREIGN
CURRENCY PROGRAM)

"For purchase of foreign currencies which the Treasury Department determines to be excess to the normal requirements of the United States, for necessary expenses of the Office of Education, as authorized by law, \$400,000, to remain available until expended: Provided, That this appropriation shall be available, in addition to other appropriations to such agency, for the purchase of the foregoing currencies."

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. FOGARTY moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 19 and concur therein.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Rhode Island.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 52: On page 37, strike out "only to the extent necessary to process claims workloads not anticipated in the budget estimates and after maximum absorption of the costs of such claims work-

load within the existing limitation has been achieved", and insert the following: "only to the extent necessary to process workloads not anticipated in the budget estimates."

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. FOGARTY moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 52 and concur therein with an amendment as follows: Strike out the matter inserted, and restore the matter stricken out, amended to read as follows: "only to the extent necessary to process workloads not anticipated in the budget estimates and after maximum absorption of the costs of such workload within the existing limitation has been achieved".

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 56: On page 41, line 8, insert the following: "Provided, That not to exceed \$11,000 shall be available to pay preparation costs for a meeting of the International Social Security Association."

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. FOGARTY moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 56 and concur therein.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 63: Page 47, line 21, after the comma, insert the following: "the Bureau of Prisons, Department of Justice,".

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. FOGARTY moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 63 and concur therein.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 68: Page 51, line 23, insert the following:

"Sec. 904. The Secretary of Labor and the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare are each authorized to make available not to exceed \$5,000 from funds available for salaries and expenses under titles I and II, respectively, for entertainment, not otherwise provided for, of officials, visiting scientists, and other experts of other countries."

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. FOGARTY moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 68 and concur therein.

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

Mr. FOGARTY. Yes, I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. Will the gentleman explain this amendment?

Mr. FOGARTY. Well, in the House bill we have these items in two places in

the bill. The Senate took them out and put them in one place. The dollar amount is the same.

Mr. GROSS. Is this an increase from \$1,000 to \$5,000 for entertainment?

Mr. FOGARTY. That is right. That is for the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. The one for the Secretary of Labor was not changed from the House amount.

Mr. GROSS. And that is in conformance with the fact that you have jumped this bill \$164 million more than the President asked for?

Mr. FOGARTY. And less than, I think, ought to be appropriated in some instances.

Mr. GROSS. And, so, an increase of \$4,000 is needed for entertainment to take care of the spending of \$164 million above the President's budget? That is about right, is it not?

Mr. FOGARTY. To a certain extent. Mr. GROSS. Well, that is par for the spending course, too.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Rhode Island that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment.

The motion was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider the votes by which action was taken on the several motions was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members be permitted to revise and extend their remarks on the conference report.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Rhode Island?

There was no objection.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. McGown, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 11737) entitled "An act to authorize appropriations to the National Aeronautics and Space Administration for research, development, and operation; construction of facilities; and for other purposes."

The message also announced that the Vice President, pursuant to Public Law 703, 83d Congress, had appointed the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] a member of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, vice the Senator from Idaho [Mr. Dworshak], deceased.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will count. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. TRIMBLE. 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. 188]

Alford	Granahan	Moulder
Ashley	Harris	Nedzi
Ashmore	Harrison, Va.	Norrell
Auchincloss	Hébert	Peterson
Ayres	Hoffman, Mich.	Powell
Baring	Hollifield	Rains
Bass, N.H.	Ichord, Mo.	Roberts, Tex.
Battin	Johnson, Wis.	St. Germain
Blatnik	Jones, Ala.	Saund
Blitch	Karh	Scherer
Boggs	Kearns	Seely-Brown
Bolton	Kilburn	Shelley
Bonner	King, Utah	Smith, Calif.
Brewster	Lankford	Smith, Miss.
Coad	Lesinski	Taber
Curtis, Mass.	Loser	Thompson, La.
Davis, Tenn.	McMillan	Thompson, Tex.
Diggs	McSween	Thornberry
Dingell	McVey	Winstead
Dooley	Mason	Yates
Evins	Morrow	Zelenko
Frazier	Miller,	
Garland	George P.	

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Three hundred and fifty-six Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

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

AMENDING FOREIGN SERVICE BUILDINGS ACT

Mr. TRIMBLE, from the Committee on Rules, filed the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 741, Rept. No. 2114), which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed:

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. 11880) to amend the Foreign Service Buildings Act, 1926, to authorize additional appropriations, 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 Foreign Affairs, 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.

AWARDS UNDER PHILIPPINE REHABILITATION ACT

Mr. TRIMBLE. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules I call up House Resolution 738 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. 11721) to authorize the payment of the balance of awards for war damage compensation made by the Philippine War Damage Commission under the terms of the Philippine Rehabilitation Act of April 30, 1946, and to authorize the appropriation of \$73,000,000 for that purpose. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill, and shall continue not to exceed three hours,

to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, 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.

ANNOUNCEMENT

Mr. BREEDING. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 187 I was detained on official business and was not present at the rollcall. Had I been here, I would have voted "yea."

AWARDS UNDER THE PHILIPPINE REHABILITATION ACT

Mr. TRIMBLE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume, after which I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mrs. St. GEORGE].

Mr. Speaker, this resolution makes in order, as you heard the Clerk read, consideration of H.R. 11721. The resolution provides for an open rule with 3 hours general debate on what is known as the Philippine War Damages Act, which we have had up here for consideration on the floor once before. I believe all are familiar with the details except perhaps as to an amendment or two.

I know of no objection to the rule itself, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, this resolution, House Resolution 738, makes in order consideration of the bill H.R. 11721 authorizing payment of the balance of awards for war damage compensation made by the Philippine War Damages Commission under the terms of the Philippine Rehabilitation Act of April 30, 1946, and authorizes an appropriation of \$73 million.

Mr. Speaker, this bill or practically an identical bill came before the House for consideration on May 8. It was defeated at that time by a vote of 201 to 171. What we are doing here today, it seems to me, is we have gone up the hill and now we are going down again. I do not believe there is any serious opposition to the rule itself.

I would like, however, to call attention to two things. First of all, it seems to me that the only question before us is, Do we actually owe this money? That is the first consideration. The second is, Is it a commitment of the U.S. Government? If those two questions can be answered in the affirmative, then, of course, we should pass this bill. Those of us who voted the other way, the 201 Members, did not feel that that was the case.

After that vote was taken I received a letter containing a copy of a resolution introduced by a Congressman in the Philippine House of Representatives. I am not the only Member who received this. I imagine it was sent to almost

every Member of the House. The letter was written by Mr. Antonio V. Raquiza. In the beginning of this letter he says:

While our people were in the grip of bitter disappointment and the Philippine Congress bristled in heated denunciation, I remained sober and calm in the belief that what happened is a blessing in disguise.

In the resolution which he introduced in the Congress of the Philippines he also had this to say:

This would confirm the belief, which has been little appreciated here up to now, that many of those who rejected the first bill did so because of lack of sympathy toward the Philippine people. On the contrary, it now appears they wished to assure that it was the country as a whole and not just a few large claimants who would benefit from the payments.

I think these things which were considered before at some length are still worthy of our consideration, Mr. Speaker. As I said before, I think that the rule is not going to suffer and no one is going to vote against that. We are going to make in order the consideration of this bill. But I think the 201 Members who voted against it should again look back on the arguments for and against and should take into some consideration the remarks of this gentleman who is a Member of the Philippine Congress.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. BARRY].

Mr. BARRY. Mr. Speaker, the main objective of the opponents of the original bill was to come back into the session today with something that would be for the benefit of all the people of the Philippine Islands rather than a certain few people in the Philippine Islands. After considerable research in the intervening time when the last bill was before the House, I have satisfied myself that there may be a certain moral obligation insofar as the administration is concerned, but not because of any reason stated thus far on the floor of the House of Representatives. I have come to this conclusion because of some research which I have done and which I shall bring out during the course of the debate on the bill today.

Mr. Speaker, I found that there were discussions between the executive in the last administration and the Philippine Government. A document was handed by this Government to the Philippine Government, and I will make known the contents of that document during the course of the general debate.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to say that in order to carry out generally the premise on which my original statement was made—a moment ago—I will propose three amendments to this bill, all of which I hope will be for one primary purpose; namely, that we benefit all the people of the Philippine Islands to the maximum extent we possibly can. I shall not offer—and I want everyone to know this—a motion to recommit. I believe we should not leave the House of Representatives this evening and do anything that would impair or hurt our foreign policy any more than it has already been hurt by the action we neces-

sarily had to take, using our conscience as our guide, when we last voted on this measure.

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

Mr. BARRY. Yes; I would be happy to yield to the distinguished minority leader.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I just want to say that when the bill was before us previously, I voted for it and I thought it ought to be passed then. Some changes have been made. Just how effective or how far reaching they are, I do not know. But I want it on the record at this early stage in the proceedings that as far as I am concerned I expect to vote for this bill as reported by the committee, and I trust it will be passed today without further delay.

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. Gross].

CONFERENCE REPORT ON THE BILL MAKING APPROPRIATIONS FOR THE DEPARTMENTS OF LABOR AND HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE, AND RELATED AGENCIES, FISCAL YEAR 1963

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to speak out of order and to revise and extend my remarks.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, it is a strange commentary on the procedure in the House of Representatives when a bill involving \$164 million more than the free-spending President of the United States requested for the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare comes to the House floor and the chairman of the subcommittee handling that appropriation limits the time before the adoption of the report—when the debate is vital and when the explanations are vital, to 30 minutes when, as a matter of fact, he had a full hour to devote to debate and explanation of why a staggering \$164 million was added.

The gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. LAIRD] was limited to 10 minutes. The chairman of a subcommittee of the Government Operations Committee, Mr. FOUNTAIN, of North Carolina, whose committee investigated the operations of the National Institutes of Health, was yielded only 5 minutes in which to present an excellent statement of his painstaking investigation, and had to get a few minutes of additional time through a second party. The chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY] refused to yield for questions concerning this bill which I say—

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

Mr. GROSS. I am happy to yield to the gentleman if he can explain why he took only 30 minutes on this vital conference report.

Mr. FOGARTY. I yielded to any person who asked me to yield.

Mr. GROSS. I stood on this floor for nearly 5 minutes and asked the gentleman to yield to me and he moved the previous question. The gentleman from Wisconsin was also asking the gentleman from Rhode Island to yield and he moved the previous question.

Mr. FOGARTY. The gentleman from Iowa knows the rules better than I do. I do not know what he is crying about now.

Mr. GROSS. The gentleman knows what I am crying about, if he wants to call it that.

Mr. FOGARTY. I have never refused to yield to anyone. If the gentleman asked me to yield, I did not hear him.

Mr. GROSS. I was standing and asked the gentleman to yield several times, as did the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. LAIRD].

Mr. FOGARTY. I believe I yielded to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. GROSS. No, the gentleman from Rhode Island did not yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin, as he concluded his final remarks. The gentleman from Rhode Island immediately moved the previous question.

Mr. FOGARTY. If I did not yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin, it was because I did not hear him asking me to yield.

Mr. GROSS. The gentleman will admit that there was half an hour, 29 minutes, to be exact, of unconsumed time on a bill that exceeded even the President's liberal budget request by nearly \$164 million—and the gentleman well knows that \$164 million above the Kennedy budget is not peanuts. It carried \$100 million above the budget figure for NIH, or approximately that figure.

Mr. FOGARTY. That is right.

Mr. GROSS. So we were not dealing with peanuts. The gentleman could have taken an hour on this bill, and I hope he was not afraid there would be some arguments made that might have changed some minds on adoption of the conference report.

Mr. FOGARTY. No; I think you got as many votes as you could get. I was surprised that you got as many as you did. When the issue is brought up in the coming campaign, the vote is going to be on the motion to recommit, whether you are for health research or not.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I do not yield further. I do not think that the \$100 million increase for NIH is going to prevent all of the casualties from heart attacks or any other one affliction.

During the subcommittee hearings this year, the gentleman from Rhode Island asked Dr. Shannon in effect—mind you, I cannot quote his exact words now—if he could not use \$60 million more. Dr. Shannon, the Director of NIH, tried two or three times, as I recall the hearings, to tell the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY] that with the increase in the President's budget he could live within it; that there would be no slowing of the forward movement of the health programs because of the increase in the budget; that he did not really need the additional \$60 million that was being offered.

Mr. FOGARTY. That is not quite right, but it comes almost in that area.

Mr. GROSS. I am glad to hear the gentleman say it is approximately correct.

Mr. FOGARTY. I went further than that. You are treating me kindly. I went much further than that.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GROSS] has expired.

Mr. TRIMBLE. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. ALBERT].

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed out of order and to revise and extend my remarks.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I think I speak the sentiments of every Member of the House when I say that there is no Member of this body whose reputation for fairness and thoroughness is greater or more deserved than that of our distinguished colleague who presides over the subcommittee in question.

And, Mr. Speaker, I think no person in the history of this House, with the possible exception of the late distinguished gentleman from Wisconsin, Mr. Keefe, has done as much in the field of public health as the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY].

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

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

Mr. GROSS. Just exactly what does that have to do with the circumscription of debate on the bill?

Mr. ALBERT. The gentleman had control of the time.

Mr. GROSS. Of course he did, and he used that control to shut off debate.

Mr. ALBERT. I think personally the gentleman used the time in a manner that brought out all of the issues. The gentleman has indicated here that the gentleman from Rhode Island may have been trying to push the conference report through without sufficient debate. That is the inference I caught. I am merely saying that the distinguished gentleman from Rhode Island is fair, he is thorough, and he has made a contribution to public health and to the welfare of this country second to no other Member.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, in view of the 30 minutes that the gentleman from Rhode Island saved, I now 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:

Alford	[Roll No. 189]	Bailey
Andersen,	Anfuso	Baring
Minn.	Ashmore	Bass, N.H.
	Ayres	

Battin	Harris	Norrell
Blatnik	Hébert	O'Neill
Bltch	Hoffman, Mich.	Peterson
Boggs	Ichord, Mo.	Pilcher
Bolton	Karth	Powell
Boykin	Kilburn	Rains
Broomfield	King, Utah	Riley
Buckley	Kirwan	Saund
Celler	Kluczynski	Scherer
Coad	Lesinski	Seely-Brown
Curtis, Mass.	Loser	Smith, Miss.
Davis, Tenn.	McSween	Springer
Diggs	McVey	Taber
Dingell	Mason	Thompson, La.
Dooley	Morrow	Thompson, Tex.
Evins	Miller,	Thornberry
Frazier	George P.	Winstead
Garland	Morrison	Yates
Gavin	Moulder	
Granahan	Nedzi	

The SPEAKER. On this rollcall 370 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

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

AWARDS UNDER PHILIPPINE REHABILITATION ACT

Mr. TRIMBLE. 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. FULTON) there were—ayes 192, noes 3.

So the resolution was agreed to.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. 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. 11721) to authorize the payment of the balance of awards for war damage compensation made by the Philippine War Damage Commission under the terms of the Philippine Rehabilitation Act of April 30, 1946, and to authorize the appropriation of \$73 million for that purpose.

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. 11721, with Mr. HULL in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 25 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, H.R. 11721, the bill being considered at the present time, authorizes the Foreign Claims Settlement Commission to complete payment on claims of individual Philippine citizens, certain former citizens, and corporations for damages to their property in the Philippines during World War II.

Immediately after the war the Congress determined that it was vitally necessary to assist the Philippine economy.

An amount was appropriated which proved to be insufficient to satisfy the claims.

Earlier in this session of Congress a bill corresponding to H.R. 11721, H.R. 8617, was adversely acted upon by the House of Representatives on May 9.

Immediately after the vote on H.R. 8617, a number of Members approached me suggesting that I reintroduce the bill. They felt, as I did, that there was considerable misunderstanding about the

provisions of this legislation. Some Members were under the impression that the legislation was designed to authorize the filing of new Philippine war damage claims. Others, apparently, were under the impression the bill was intended to provide a windfall to a select group of large corporations.

The fact is that H.R. 8617, just like the bill now before us, H.R. 11712, dealt exclusively with the final settlement of claims approved under the Philippine Rehabilitation Act of 1946. The legislation before us simply authorizes the payment of the outstanding balance on some 86,000 claims which were adjudicated and approved after World War II by an authorized agency of the U.S. Government.

There are important differences, however, between the bill which was adversely acted upon and the one we have before us today. First, the bill before us requires proof from all claimants before any payment can be made under the authority provided in this bill, that such claimants have invested or will invest a sum equal to the value of their war damage award in the rehabilitation and economic development of the Philippines.

The bill assures that funds paid to satisfy claims approved under the Philippine Rehabilitation Act of 1946, including the final payment authorized in this bill, have been or will be spent in such a way as to benefit the Philippine economy.

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

Mr. ZABLOCKI. I yield to my colleague.

Mr. BECKER. How are you going to force anyone who claims that he has money coming to him to spend the money for building or rehabilitation under this legislation?

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Under the legislation, the Foreign Claims Settlement Commission will have to have proof that either the money was already invested in the rehabilitation of the Philippines or that it will be so invested. If there should be any doubt, then the Foreign Claims Settlement Commission, even before making any payment—and this matter has to be wound up within 2 years and 6 months after the enactment of this bill—can demand proof that the money will be properly invested.

Mr. BECKER. Will the gentleman yield for one other question which came up the last time the bill was up? I think one of the greatest confusions that existed in our minds on May 8 when we debated this bill was, Who made the commitment? Who is responsible if a commitment was made by the U.S. Government that we would pay any additional moneys beyond—what was it, \$473 million that had already been paid to the Philippines? Where was this additional commitment made and how was it made?

Mr. ZABLOCKI. The commitment was made over a period of years beginning with the time when President Roosevelt requested that Congress authorize payment of war damages to the Philippines, and when the legislation was enacted by Congress. At that time, the 25-percent reduction of the amount

of the awards was agreed upon, and it was then understood that we would pay 75 percent of the awards approved by the U.S. Philippine War Damage Commission.

Furthermore, when the amount to be appropriated was being determined, there were Members who felt \$400 million would be necessary to cover the situation. The history of the legislation clearly indicates the intent that if the amount originally provided turned out to be insufficient, the Congress in the future would make available such additional amount as may be necessary to meet the obligations. However, the Korean war intervened and, of course, the payment of the balance of the awards was deferred.

Mr. BECKER. The gentleman is saying then that the legislation committing the \$500 million indicated in the legislation that this would not be the sum total but that there would be possible additional claims?

Mr. ZABLOCKI. It was made very clear that if the amount of funds authorized and appropriated were insufficient, then future appropriations would be made.

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

Mr. ZABLOCKI. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota, who was a member of the committee which reported the original legislation on this subject.

Mr. JUDD. Perhaps this is a good place to get the story on the record on this point to answer the question of the gentleman from New York [Mr. BECKER]. It was the Congress that made the commitment, because it passed the law. The whole plan of the act was to authorize payment up to 75 percent of the awards determined by the War Damage Commission. At the outset, claims in an amount of almost \$1,250 million were submitted. How could anybody know then what the adjudicated awards would be? It was estimated the claims would be cut down to between \$500 million and \$600 million, and that turned out to be extraordinarily accurate because the amount finally awarded was approximately \$540 million. In the old Committee on Insular Affairs, of which I was at that time a member along with the gentleman from California [Mr. GEORGE P. MILLER], I proposed that we authorize \$500 million. Another Member offered an amendment to make it \$600 million, arguing that if the entire amount should not be needed, the balance would go back to the Treasury. The committee finally decided to authorize \$400 million initially.

This is made clear in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of the debate on the bill in April of 1946. During the debate I said:

I doubt that \$400 million will ultimately be enough and I want the record to show that fact. We in the committee recognize that we may have to increase the amount somewhat. We were conservative in our estimate. We said, "Let us authorize this amount now until we see how things go. If another \$100 million or even \$200 million is eventually needed to put the Philippines back on a sound basis, I am sure we will do it."

The \$400 million appropriated initially ran out when we had paid 52½ percent of the awards instead of the full 75 percent planned. This bill is to authorize payment of the remaining 22½ percent due the claimants. At the time everybody, I think, both here and in the Philippines, understood we were committing ourselves to pay up to 75 percent of the amounts to be awarded by the War Damage Commission.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. I want to thank the gentleman from Minnesota for making that very clear explanation of the legislative history of this measure. As the gentleman from Minnesota has pointed out, the claims filed amounted to over \$1.25 billion.

I would like to point out further that the Commission handling the claims disallowed 91,000 claims. The Commission approved only those claims that were valid and proper.

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

Mr. ZABLOCKI. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. HAYS. The gentleman knows I opposed this legislation before, and I will say that this bill has been improved mainly through the addition of the amendment which requires some proof that these people are not getting a windfall. We heard the gentleman talk about a windfall, and my contention before was that it was windfall if they did not have to show or did not have to use it in the rehabilitation of the Philippines, or show that they had used it; in other words, if someone received payment who had not used it in that way, in my opinion, it was a windfall. That is what the argument about windfall was.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. That is true.

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. ZABLOCKI. I yield.

Mr. HAYS. I do not think there is any doubt of the fact that these people, as I said in debate before, must have records which they can show to prove what their damages were, and I do not think we are asking too much to have record proof of their loss.

I would like to point out another thing about these commitments. I worked on this bill here and I think it is an improvement over the other bill. I want to see that the record is clear and not muddy about the facts. I do not agree that any previous Congress can commit a succeeding Congress to pay anything. So when you are talking about the commitments I think it is only fair to say to the gentleman from Minnesota that there may have been an implied commitment which the Philippines could have understood, but legally no Congress can commit a future Congress to do anything.

If you are willing to put it on that basis, then I am willing to admit that there was an implied commitment, but I am not willing to say that there was a commitment made because I do not believe that could be legally possible.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield so that I may comment on the statement of the gentleman from Ohio?

Mr. ZABLOCKI. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. JUDD. I want it made completely clear that there never existed a legal commitment and I am sure I have never suggested there was a legal or binding commitment. As the gentleman from Ohio has said, one Congress has no power to commit another. That is obvious.

The thing I want to emphasize is that while there was no legal commitment, I think we accepted a moral obligation—probably that is a more accurate word than commitment. We ourselves in the Congress understood that it was a moral obligation, the newspapers so understood it, and the Filipinos so understood it. I think we still have a moral obligation; but we do not have any legal obligation. That is perfectly clear.

Mr. HAYS. I think in the interest of accuracy, in previous debate I said that the requirement which would make us feel an obligation was for them to show that they had invested this money or were going to.

Now that is in the bill, but I would not want the debate on this matter to go by without at least saying, in view of the antics and actions of the President of the Philippines, that he did not make it any easier for some of us who wanted to vote for it if certain safeguards were in to vote for this bill. I hope there is no commitment, implied, moral, or otherwise by which through the passage of this bill the House of Representatives is saying to the Philippines or to any other country, "All you have to do is to put a gun at our head and you can get whatever you want from the Treasury." I think the action of the President of the Philippines was reprehensible and if I do vote for this bill, I would vote for it not because of what he did but in spite of what he did.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. I assure the gentleman I brought this bill up for exactly the same reason, not because of what the President of the Philippines said or failed to say, but because of the moral obligation we had to pay the balances that are due.

Mrs. KELLY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

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

Mrs. KELLY. I feel this would be straightened out if we would say in this bill as in the previous bill that the authority rests in the Secretary of the Treasury to pay the claims involved in this bill. Therefore, we would be more sure that the qualifications under this bill would be carried out, if it were in the hands of the Secretary of the Treasury.

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

Mr. ZABLOCKI. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. COLLIER. I want to clarify an impression or misimpression I got from the colloquy between the gentleman from Wisconsin and the gentleman from New York that I have not been able to clear up in my own mind. As I understand it, there must be assurance that the funds they receive will be reinvested in the Philippines; is that correct?

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Or have been reinvested.

Mr. COLLIER. Have been or will be. Mr. ZABLOCKI. Or will be.

Mr. COLLIER. Assuming that there is a promise or whatever medium is used to get the assurance there will be a reinvestment and if there is, in fact, a default on the part of the firm or individual who fails to reinvest again, what recourse do we have to get reimbursement of those funds which are not reinvested but wherein there has been a promise to reinvest?

Mr. ZABLOCKI. I think I can clarify that by pointing out that such firms would come under the "will be reinvested" provision in the bill. It will be up to the Foreign Claims Settlement Commission to prepare regulations and take the necessary steps to see that congressional intent is carried out. The Commission will have to be assured that the money will be invested to the full amount of the award.

Mr. COLLIER. The gentleman has still not answered my question. My question is this: What recourse can be taken in spite of the explanation I have had?

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Final payment will not be made, I am certain, until investment has been proven. There are two and a half years in which a claimant will have time to offer proof and final payment will not be made until he offers such proof or shows such proof.

Mr. COLLIER. As I understand it, the moneys then will be withheld if there is not established proof of reinvestment and such reinvestment as is not made within two and a half years then is foreclosed; is that correct?

Mr. ZABLOCKI. That would be my impression.

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

Mr. ZABLOCKI. I would be delighted to yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. HALEY. Inasmuch as the gentleman on the other side of the aisle, the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. JUDD], just a little while ago said this was a moral commitment—and let us say it is—could the gentleman speaking now tell me how much foreign aid and economic aid this Nation has given to the Philippines since this so-called moral commitment was made?

Mr. ZABLOCKI. The Philippine Islands have received economic aid in the amount of approximately \$1,285 million since World War II.

Mr. HALEY. If the gentleman will yield further, my figures, I might say to the gentleman, show approximately \$1,735 million. If the Philippine Government felt that these people should be reimbursed, instead of waiting 20 years later for us to pick up the tab, why did it not do something to reimburse these people out of the \$1 billion and so many odd hundreds of millions of dollars which we have paid to them over there?

Mr. ZABLOCKI. I think the gentleman has brought up a very pertinent question. This bill is not foreign aid or economic aid to the Philippines as such. This is a bill to settle the balance that is due to individual claimants under the Philippine Rehabilitation Act of 1946.

Mr. HALEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. ZABLOCKI. I yield further, but briefly.

Mr. HALEY. If we are going to do this for the Philippines, why do we not go to all the other battlefields of the world and do the same thing? I think the Philippine people should realize this fact: Had we not gone into the Philippine Islands, they would all be speaking Japanese today.

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

Mr. ZABLOCKI. I shall be glad to yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. Will the gentleman indulge me the reading of three short paragraphs from the Manila Bulletin? I do not want to take the gentleman's time if he does not have the time in which to yield.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. I yield for that purpose.

Mr. GROSS. The Manila Bulletin of May 21, 1962, says this:

There is reason to think that Democrat Representative CLEMENT J. ZABLOCKI, annual sponsor of the annually falling war damage bill, was just trying to get some free publicity by attacking President Macapagal's statement that he might go to the United States if the bill would be passed.

He has accused the President of putting a dollar tag on his state visit. Idealistic politico. What national leader does not carry a dollar tag when he visits the world's richest nation?

ZABLOCKI, being sponsor of the bill, should be the last man to suddenly become idealistic and say such things. Maybe he is scrounging around for another excuse just in case the bill is killed again. Or maybe he wants free lunches from Filipino lobbyists to be perpetuated.

If the gentleman will permit me, I think that is both a slander and an injustice upon the gentleman from Wisconsin. I do not think the gentleman deserves any such treatment as that from the Manila Bulletin—

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Or any other paper.

Mr. GROSS. Or any other paper. But I think it does very well represent the "gun to the head" climate in which this \$73 million is demanded from the taxpayers of the United States.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. I want to thank the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GROSS] for bringing that article to the attention of the House. Regardless of what the Manila Bulletin or any other newspaper from that country, or what some newspapers in this country may say is the reason for my support of this bill, I support it for reasons of principle. I believe that this unpaid balance is an irritant that cannot be ignored or pushed aside. We cannot put it in a drawer and hide it. We have to meet this problem and enact this legislation. I am supporting it because it is in our national interest. If I were thin skinned, I suppose that after that article appeared, and after some other criticisms I received from the Philippines—I would have dropped my hands and said, "To Hades with everything." But I want to assure the gentleman that I am just as concerned about the need to pass this legislation now as I was prior to the attack upon me.

Mr. Chairman, if I may return to my statement.

There are two major differences between H.R. 11721 and prior legislation on this subject.

First. H.R. 11721 requires proof from the claimants, before any payment can be made under the authority provided in this bill, that such claimants have invested, or will invest, a sum equal to the value of their war damage awards, in the rehabilitation and economic development of the Philippines.

This condition was embodied in section 104(c) of the original Philippine Rehabilitation Act of 1946. H.R. 11721 makes it applicable to the payment of the outstanding balance of awards made under that law.

This particular requirement was incorporated in H.R. 11721 in order to meet the objections voiced on the floor of the House to prior legislation on this subject. Some Members argued that the prior bill did not insist on a direct relationship between the payment of war damage compensation and the rehabilitation of the Philippine economy.

This objection has been met in H.R. 11721. The bill assures that funds paid to satisfy claims approved under the Philippine Rehabilitation Act of 1946—including the final payment authorized in H.R. 11721—have been or will be spent in such a way as to benefit the Philippine economy.

Only the very small claimants—those who will receive payments of less than \$25,000—or approximately \$6,400—are exempt from the above requirement on the theory that they have already reinvested the full value of their awards in the rehabilitation of their business property.

Second. A change which appears in section 2 of H.R. 11721 reduces the period of time available to the Foreign Claims Settlement Commission to wind up its affairs under this legislation. That period is reduced from 3 years and 60 days to 2 years and 60 days.

This provision was also incorporated in H.R. 11721 to meet specific objections voiced by Members of Congress to the earlier legislation.

REASONS FOR THIS LEGISLATION

Mr. Chairman, I am certain that I need not take up too much of the committee's time in repeating all of the reasons which argue for the enactment of H.R. 11721.

I want to briefly review the history and the facts:

First. The Philippines—which were our ward at the time—suffered extensive damage during World War II. A good part of this damage was inflicted by our own Armed Forces in the process of our offensive in the Pacific theater.

Second. Our Government pledged to help the Filipinos repair that damage. This promise was made by our President during the war, and ratified by Congress through the enactment of the Philippine Rehabilitation Act of 1946.

Third. Under the authority of the Philippine Rehabilitation Act of 1946, 1¼ million war damage claims were filed by the Filipinos with the U.S. Philippine War Damage Commission. These claims had a claimed value of \$1.25 billion.

Fourth. The Commission screened these claims. It disallowed 91,000 of them entirely. It approved a portion of the claimed amount on others. All together, the awards approved by the Commission—and based on a prewar evaluation of the war damaged properties—amounted to less than \$600 million, somewhat less than one-half of the amount claimed.

Fifth. Under the terms of the Philippine Rehabilitation Act of 1946, all claim awards were reduced by 25 percent of the amount over \$500. The original legislation indicated that we were going to pay the remaining 75 percent of the approved awards.

Sixth. To meet this obligation, Congress appropriated \$400 million. This amount was distributed to the claimants. The Filipinos whose claim awards amounted to \$500 or less, were paid in full. The remainder received 52½ percent—of the 75 percent authorized by law—of their awards over the first \$500. Then the money ran out. And the Korean conflict prevented further appropriations.

Seventh. There are approximately 86,000 claimants in the Philippines who feel that they are entitled to receive the remaining 22½ percent of their war damage awards. The discharge of this obligation will involve—at the maximum—\$73 million.

Eighth. H.R. 11721 provides for the payment of these outstanding balances of awards approved by the U.S. Philippine War Damage Commission under the authority of the 1946 law. No new claims can be filed under this legislation. It simply provides for the discharge of an obligation—a moral obligation, if you wish—which has been outstanding for more than a decade. This is the sole, and the entire, purpose of this legislation.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to make one more point:

Proposals have been advanced that we pay the \$73 million involved in this legislation directly to the Philippine Government. In that way, some people argue, we will save ourselves a lot of work, avoid any so-called windfalls to Philippine claimants, and make certain that the money is used to further the rehabilitation and economic development of the Philippine Republic.

This is a spurious argument. We are not dealing here with the issue of economic aid to the Philippines. We are dealing with war damage claims of private individuals who have or will have to reinvest in the rehabilitation and economic development of the Philippines. These claims we have promised to honor some 15 years ago.

I feel that it is incumbent upon us to discharge that debt. We will not discharge it by handing over \$73 million to the Philippine Government. We can only discharge it by paying the claimants directly. We have the records—and the claimants are expecting payment. The good faith of the United States is at stake.

I earnestly hope, therefore, that the committee will vote to approve H.R. 11721.

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

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

Mr. ANFUSO. Mr. Chairman, I wish to congratulate the gentleman from Wisconsin for his great interest in this problem and for his ever trying to promote better relations between the United States and other countries. I think this Congress made a serious mistake by not passing the bill the last time we had it before us. I sincerely hope we will pass it today.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 11721, the bill to amend the Philippine Rehabilitation Act of 1946.

I would like to state that I have studied the merits of this legislative proposal and its effect upon the international relations of the Government of the United States. While it is perhaps technically true that the United States is under no legal obligation to provide further war damage payments in the Philippines, I am convinced that a payment in settlement of this claim would be of great assistance to the United States in maintaining its foreign policy objectives.

You will recall that during the span of years since the Philippines attained independence in 1946 there have been a long series of discussions and negotiations with respect to the final settlement of various types and categories of claims between that Government and the Government of the United States. These discussions culminated in 1960 at which time the Philippine Government agreed to settle its obligation under the Romulo-Snyder agreement with the payment of \$20 million. That payment to the United States was made on April 10, 1961.

The proposal before the House for consideration today represents the other side of the coin. I think that the Government of the United States would be remiss and derelict in its duties and obligations if it were to fail to enact this bill.

Accordingly, I consider it most desirable, both in the interest of our relations with the Philippine Government and the good will of the individual claimants who suffered war damage in the devastation of their country at the hands as much of our own Armed Forces as those of the Japanese in retaking it from them.

But, Mr. Chairman, I have an additional reason for rising in support of H.R. 11721, and that is this. I have followed the operations of the Foreign Claims Settlement Commission since its inception in 1954. I know personally, and have great confidence in the present membership of the Commission whose Chairman is the Honorable Edward D. Re.

This Commission has no relationship to the Philippine War Damage Commission which originally administered the Philippine Rehabilitation Act of 1946, except as we may affix such a relationship by the amendment before us today. Over the course of the past 12 years the Foreign Claims Settlement Commission and its predecessors, the War Claims Commission and the International Claims Commission, have processed well in ex-

cess of 600,000 claims of U.S. nationals against foreign governments and in that process has disbursed approximately \$300 million derived from foreign governments with the exception of an item of \$8 million which was provided by the United States to compensate members of our Armed Forces who were held as prisoners of war by the North Koreans and Communist Chinese during the Korean conflict. Moreover, practically all of the operating expenses of the Commission have also been derived from sums provided in one manner or another by foreign governments. I think it is highly commendable that we are able to look at the vast structure of our Government and to find one agency which has operated at little or no cost to the U.S. taxpayer.

Mr. Chairman, the Foreign Claims Settlement Commission, under the able chairmanship of Dr. Edward D. Re, who has earned an enviable reputation among international lawyers and diplomats, is an efficient and effective arm of the Government. I am confident that this program will be administered in a manner that will reflect the greatest credit and good will to the United States.

I think it is incumbent upon us today to demonstrate our good will to our allies in the Philippines by the enactment of H.R. 11721.

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

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

Mr. JOHANSEN. Mr. Chairman, at the time this legislation was before the House I offered an amendment to strike out on line 11, page 2 of the original bill the word "not" so that it read:

Amounts paid under this Act shall be subject to the provisions of section 104(c) of the Philippine Rehabilitation Act.

Do I understand that that is corrected in this bill to the extent that section 104(c) will be applicable with respect to all payments in amounts over ₱25,000?

Mr. ZABLOCKI. That is correct.

Mr. JOHANSEN. Can the gentleman answer this one question: Procedurewise what will that addition involve?

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Procedurewise it will exempt those claimants who have payment of ₱25,000 or less coming, which is equivalent to \$6,250 in American money, from showing any proof of investment. The reason for that is that it is presumed that the small claimants have already reinvested the full amount of their awards in the economy of the Philippines.

Mr. JOHANSEN. And conversely those claims over ₱25,000 would have to show proof of such investment?

Mr. ZABLOCKI. In each and every instance; and no payment would be made until such proof was furnished.

Mr. JOHANSEN. I will say that I think that is a major improvement in the bill.

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

Mr. ZABLOCKI. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. MACDONALD. Mr. Chairman, the Manila Times, in an editorial dated

May 23, 1962, stated that it may yet turn out that the rejection of H.R. 8617 was a "blessing in disguise."

It is my belief that H.R. 11721, the revised Philippine war damage legislation, will prove to be much more beneficial to the people of the Philippines than H.R. 8617. I voted against H.R. 8617 not because of lack of sympathy and respect toward the Philippine people but rather because this legislation had nothing to do with Philippine rehabilitation. The original Philippine Rehabilitation Act of 1946 required that claimants show proof that they had invested a sum equal to the amount they were to be paid in the repair or rebuilding of their damaged property. Where the rebuilding, replacement, or repair could not be done, the act requires that sums equal to or greater than the amount awarded have been reinvested, or that the amount of the payment to be made will be reinvested in the rehabilitation and economic development of the Philippines. H.R. 8617 waived this requirement, except for claimants who were not residents of the Philippines. H.R. 11721 amends H.R. 8617 to read that—

All payments under this act in amounts over 25,000 pesos or equivalent value in dollars shall be subject to the provisions of section 104(c) of the Philippine Rehabilitation Act of 1946.

Thus, while under H.R. 8617, substantial parts of the \$73 million could have gone to large claimants who had not contributed to the economic rehabilitation or development of the country beyond the amounts they were given out of the \$400 million of the 1946 act. For example, suppose that a Philippine businessman had a claim of \$100,500 approved by the Philippine War Damage Commission. Under the terms of the 1946 act the amount to be paid on claims over \$500 was reduced by 25 percent. He received the \$500 immediately, and was owed \$75,000. The \$400 million was distributed on a pro rata basis, and about 52.5 percent of claims above \$500 were paid. Therefore the claimant got approximately \$52,500—plus his original \$500 if he could prove that he had put at least \$52,500 into the repair, rebuilding, or replacement of his property. Assuming that he was able to prove this. Under H.R. 8617 he would have been eligible to receive the \$22,500—in order to get his full \$75,000—without being required to show proof of having previously invested an equal sum in the rehabilitation or development of the Philippine economy. H.R. 11721 requires him to show such proof.

The second significant change in the provisions of this legislation prevents the Foreign Claims Settlement Commission from being tied up indefinitely in taking action on the private claims. H.R. 11721 puts a definite termination date on the handling of these claims. H.R. 8617 has said—in section 2—that—

The Commission shall complete its determination with respect to applications filed under this act not later than 2 years after the last date on which applications may be filed.

H.R. 11721 says that—

The Commission shall complete its determination and take final action with respect to applications filed under this act not later than 1 year after the last date on which applications may be filed.

I therefore am pleased to support this much improved bill and offer my congratulations to its authors on the Foreign Affairs Committee.

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

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

Mr. SANTANGELO. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 11721.

Mr. Chairman, it has been said many times over in this very Chamber that our allies and friends in the Philippines constitute one of the great and last bastions against communism on the far side of the Pacific. When we view what is taking place in southeast Asia at the present moment it seems strange for the U.S. Government to take an untoward step in defeating the amendment under consideration and thereby alienating the friendship of a people who over the years have been so close to our hearts. The Philippines constitutes a nation which we have nurtured and brought into being. Her sons stood with us shoulder to shoulder throughout the rigors and deprivations of World War II. They constituted the one spark of hope in the Pacific theater during the dark days of that war.

As I view the history of the Philippine Rehabilitation Act of 1946 and the processes that have led to the consideration of the amendment before us today, I am convinced that the U.S. Government does indeed have a moral obligation, at the very least, to make this final payment.

Now I am familiar with the original transaction of this proposal in the 86th Congress which was designed to provide a lump-sum payment directly to the Government of the Philippines. I think that the Committee on Foreign Affairs is eminently correct in requiring the administration of this bill by an agency of the U.S. Government. And I think it also fair to point out to my colleagues that the Foreign Claims Settlement Commission, the designated agency, operating under statutory time limitations imposed on it by the Congress, has always met its deadlines and has never sought extensions.

Moreover, Mr. Chairman, I am well acquainted with Dr. Edward D. Re, Chairman of the Foreign Claims Settlement Commission and one of the country's leading experts in international law and relations. Since his appointment last year by President Kennedy he has done much to increase the effective operation of the Foreign Claims Settlement Commission. I know that this agency, which has established a most noteworthy record of administering such legislation in the past, will perform this task under his direction with the utmost efficiency, speed, and credit to this country. In so doing, Mr. Chairman, I know it will carry out to the letter the spirit of this

much-needed legislation. Mr. Chairman, we owe it to ourselves to live up to this obligation.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 10 minutes, and I shall take more time if there are Members who wish to ask questions.

Mr. Chairman, the background of this legislation has been covered previously. There are several questions we need to consider. First, should we make any payment whatsoever? The answer to that, it seems to me, is, yes. I believe we have a moral obligation to pay the unpaid remainder of these adjudicated claims. As has been said, there is no legal commitment, but the Congress at the time it passed the Philippine Rehabilitation Act in 1946 understood that it was an obligation, as the record makes clear. The Truman administration understood it that way. The Eisenhower administration understood it that way. Perhaps the best statement of it is this short letter from former President Eisenhower himself, written after the House had acted adversely on the original bill, before the revisions in the bill before us today. He wrote from Gettysburg on May 22 after he had read that there had been some question in the debate as to what he thought ought to be our country's position. He wrote:

HON. WALTER JUDD,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR WALTER: I understand that some question has been raised as to my views on the so-called Philippine war claims bill. I send you this note so that you can make my position known if this should become necessary.

Pursuant to legislation passed by the Congress in 1946, it appears quite clear that this Nation has an unpaid obligation of approximately \$73 million to the Filipinos. During my administration it was my conviction that the Philippine Government should settle its own obligations to our country under the Romulo-Snyder agreement. I likewise believed that the United States should meet its own obligations under the 1946 law.

The Philippines have paid their debt. I think we should promptly meet our own longstanding obligation, under such terms as the Congress in its wisdom may determine. I do not recall any additional details respecting these particular war damage claims.

With warm regard,
Sincerely,

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

That states clearly and forcefully the sum and substance of the reason why from a moral standpoint we ought to fulfill this longstanding obligation. Maybe we should not have given the Filipinos and the Americans who had suffered war damage in the Philippines reason to believe that we intended to give them up to 75 percent of the sums awarded them by our own War Damage Commission; but the fact is we did give them reason to believe that. However late it is, we ought to carry through on what was almost universally understood at that time as the purpose and the intention of the Congress of the United States.

Another reason why we should make these payments is the practical consideration. It will bring substantial benefits to our closest friend and ally in Asia, and

equally substantial benefits to ourselves and our position in that part of the world. The Philippine Government has had some hard sledding for several reasons that we do not need to enumerate today. It now has a new administration which is trying to do a lot of things that we previously urged without much success. It has devalued the peso to a realistic figure, which has done a great deal to dry up the black market and some of the existing irregular practices. This has permitted abolition of exchange controls without runaway inflation. It is endeavoring to free the Philippine economy on a sound basis lifting various governmental restrictions on economic activity, along lines our Government has recommended for some time. It badly needs the shot in the arm which this bill would give to the people and to the economy. The Government and people have been shaken somewhat by the failure of our country to carry through what is regarded as an obligation on our part. I believe it is in America's interest, very strongly in our interest, to pass this bill today.

When you think of the aid we have given to neutrals, one neutral up to \$800 million a year, and when you think of the aid we debated here last week or the week before, aid which has gone to countries under Communist control and which conceivably can be used against ourselves some day, surely it would be shortsighted and unwise for us to fail to provide for a tested ally what is a very small amount proportionately. It will be of great benefit to the Philippines, and it will wipe out the misunderstanding or irritation or feeling that the United States has not quite come through that may or does still linger in the Philippine mind. Because of both the rightness and the wisdom of this legislation, we ought to pass it today.

The bill with the new safeguards against diversion of the payments to any other purpose than economic developments is an improvement over the former bill. I had prepared an amendment at that time to do essentially the same thing, as my colloquy then with the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HAYS] indicated. Unfortunately there was no opportunity then to offer the amendment.

Under the revised bill, there is a minimum of opportunity for any claimant who receives a final payment under this bill to use it for any other purpose than helping the economic development of the Philippines.

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

Mr. JUDD. I am happy to yield to my friend, the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. BOW. The gentleman has said that the moral obligation, which has been referred to here by everyone who speaks, is contained in the Philippine Rehabilitation Act of 1946. I call attention to page 26 of the committee report, section 105 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1946. My question to the gentleman is this. Is there not there some moral obligation to the people of the United States? I read section (b):

(b) Any money or bullion received by the United States from the Japanese Government or the Japanese people by way of repara-

tions or indemnity on account of war losses in the Philippines—

(1) shall be covered into the Treasury of the United States until the value of said money or bullion so covered into the Treasury is equal to the sum of the amounts appropriated for the payment of compensation under this title and the amounts appropriated for carrying out the purposes of title III of this Act.

I will say to the gentleman, that is an indication that these funds appropriated, \$400 million, would be in the form of reparations from the Japanese Government and that is where the funds actually should have come from for this payment.

May I call the gentleman's attention to the second paragraph which reads:

(2) when the amounts covered into the Treasury under clause (1) are equal to the amounts so appropriated, the excess over the amounts so appropriated shall be used, first, to satisfy in full the balance unpaid of any approved claims.

It seems to me, there is a moral obligation that this was to be reparations, and we recognized it and hoped that this \$400 million would be covered by reparations from the Japanese Government, and then we provided a moral obligation that if those reparations were over \$400 million, that was to be paid into the Treasury and to repay us for the American contribution and at that time we would pay the unpaid balance of claims, out of the excess of reparations payments over the \$400 million.

It seems to me, on reading this act that this is the only moral obligation, that it was to be paid out of reparations paid in by the Japanese.

My question to the gentleman is—how much money was paid into the fund in the Treasury by way of reparations and indemnities on account of war losses in the Philippines by the Japanese Government?

Mr. JUDD. I do not think any money has been received by the United States from the Japanese Government or the Japanese people by way of reparations or indemnity for war losses in the Philippines. At the time the Rehabilitation Act was passed in 1946, nobody knew when there would be a treaty of peace with Japan or what its terms would be. The committee was merely seeking in advance to assign for war damage in the Philippines, any reparations that it might some day receive from Japan on that account. The treaty of peace with Japan was signed in 1951. As I recall, it had no provision for payment by Japan of indemnity or reparations to the United States for damages Japan had inflicted on the Philippines. It did agree to negotiate directly with the Philippines and other governments in southeast Asia which had suffered damages in the war with Japan. In its negotiations with the Philippine Government, Japan agreed to pay \$500 million in capital goods to the Philippines. It has also paid \$20 million in the form of processed goods shipped from Japan, and \$30 million in the form of services and installations, the repair of harbors, ocean transportation, and things of that sort. Japan has thus furnished the Philippines directly a total of \$550 million in what might be

called reparations or indemnity. But, to the best of my knowledge, no money or bullion has been received by the United States from the Japanese Government in reparations for damages to the Philippines.

Mr. BOW. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. JUDD. Certainly.

Mr. BOW. Will the gentleman agree with me that there is a moral obligation to the American people when the Congress enacted the law which provides that when the amounts covered into the Treasury under clause 1 are equal to the amounts so appropriated the excess shall be used to pay the unpaid balance? There is nothing in this act which says that we are to pay the unpaid balance out of further appropriations, but rather to repay the unpaid balance from reparations that we get from Japan. This has not happened. So we have no moral obligation to the people of the Philippines in that regard. But I think then that there is a moral obligation to the people of the United States to comply with this and since it did not come into the Treasury in the form of reparations, we have no obligation to make any further payment.

Mr. JUDD. I cannot agree that because we did not recover any reparations for that purpose from the Japanese, we therefore, should default on what I regard as the obligation we assumed to the Philippines.

If the treaty had required the Japanese to pay us reparations because of their damage to the Philippines, the law provided that such money would be used for rehabilitation payments to the Filipinos. We did not get any such reparations from the Japanese. I feel that we ought to do what I believe it is right for us to do even though we did not get reparations from the Japanese.

Incidentally, subsection (a) of the section 106 from which the gentleman read states:

All money heretofore or hereinafter appropriated under authority of this title shall remain available until April 30, 1951.

This indicates that the Congress expected to appropriate more if the initial appropriation proved inadequate to—satisfy in full the balance unpaid of any approved claims.

This bill today is for the purpose of belatedly satisfying in full the approved claims.

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

Mr. JUDD. I yield.

Mr. CRAMER. In reading the report this question comes to my mind, and that is, apparently the Commission had completed its work in 1951 and filed a list of claims not acknowledged and paid. That was in existence at that time. Further, that this matter remained inactive until 1959 when it was given consideration.

I read from the minority views, page 36, from Secretary Dillon's letter of March 3, 1960:

Moreover in view of the time which has elapsed since the original claims were approved, and since the U.S. Philippine War Damage Commission went out of existence

on March 31, 1951, it is not considered practicable for the U.S. Government to assume any responsibility for the payment of the balance of approved individual private property claims.

Here we have the bill before us in 1962. Can the gentleman indicate why this period of time ensued and comment on Secretary Dillon's letter?

Mr. JUDD. May I first quote another portion of Secretary Dillon's letter:

Additional war damage payments are therefore looked on by the Filipinos as the fulfillment of a moral obligation, already recognized by our Congress, to provide assistance because of war damage sustained in the defense of the interests of the United States and the Philippines. The Philippine Government and people sincerely feel that the failure of the United States to appropriate additional war damage compensation has defeated a legitimate expectation of assistance from the United States to a firm ally which was severely damaged in the mutual war effort. The Department of State considers that settlement of this claim would remove any basis for the Philippine belief that the United States has not fulfilled its promises to the Philippines.

Thus, he said it seemed too late to make payments now for rebuilding, replacement, or repair of war-damaged private property, as the original legislation contemplated as its first objective. It would be impracticable to insist on such a use, but additional payments should be made to fulfill an obligation and should be used in a manner which would further the economic development of the Philippines, the second objective stipulated in the act. It is too late now for rehabilitation; it is not too late for economic development.

Mr. CRAMER. Would the gentleman comment on the expiration of time? And if this is a moral obligation, why was it not acted on sooner? The War Claims Commission made its awards in 1951, and we are not acting on it until 1962.

Mr. JUDD. The first reason was that at the time the money ran out in 1951, we had been plunged into a war in Korea and our attention was properly diverted elsewhere. Then there was the question of a debt owed to us by the Philippines, under the so-called Romulo-Snyder agreement referred to in the letter from former President Eisenhower. This was a loan of \$24 million made to the Philippines in 1950 when Mr. Snyder was Secretary of the Treasury. The status of this loan was unsettled. For a time it was in the Philippine courts. During those years our Government felt, as the President wrote, that our payment of our obligation should be related to their payment of their obligation. The issue was decided by the Philippine courts and the debt settled in April 1961. The new administration then approved this bill, on which the chairman of the Subcommittee on the Far East, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. ZABLOCKI], and I had been trying to get action for several years.

Another reason for delay, I may say to the gentleman, is that, as he will recall, last year there was a question about the legality of importation of several million dollars worth of tobacco shipped from the United States to the Philippines. There was opposition, or at least

hesitancy about taking up this bill until that matter was cleared up.

The Government of the Philippines referred it to their supreme court and the new President, Mr. Macapagal, said that if the supreme court of the Philippines decided the American tobacco was there legally, he would accept it. That is what the supreme court decided. So that irritant has been removed. It was one regrettable delay after another. The Filipinos have discharged their obligations. I hope today we will discharge ours and eliminate what in the minds of many people is a reflection upon the United States.

Mr. CRAMER. The gentleman is saying that assuming a moral obligation existed during this length of time, the fact it was not settled is also partly the responsibility of the Philippines and the \$24 million obligation does justify the period of time involved. How is answered the question, then, is it practicable now to make reparation after this lapse of time?

Mr. JUDD. I think it is practicable. Both the Eisenhower and the Kennedy administrations—or the State Department under them—believe it is practicable and desirable. Those of us who have worked in this field a long time believe it is practicable. In fact, while we know there will be difficulties, we think this is the most practicable way to discharge this obligation in order to bring the best results within the Philippines and the best results for ourselves.

Mr. CRAMER. Is it going to have the effect of actually providing reparation to the businesses and individuals involved who suffered the damage?

Mr. JUDD. Yes, all payments go directly to them. Under this bill not a single claim will be reopened, not one will be readjudicated, no new ones will be received. Whoever comes in and can show the Commission that he is the legitimate holder of a claim with 22½ percent still due or is the legitimate heir or has acquired that claim in the ordinary course of business with acquisition of all the assets of a business firm, will get a check for the unpaid balance. There is no re-examination of claims, just the payment of the unpaid 22½ percent to make it up to the 75 percent originally authorized. If the amount due him is more than 25,000 pesos, he must show to the satisfaction of the Commission that the "payment shall be reinvested in such manner as will further the rehabilitation or economic development of the Philippines."

Mr. CRAMER. I thank the gentleman.

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

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

Mr. JOHANSEN. I wonder if the gentleman from Minnesota would reject the suggestion that perhaps there is a moral to be gained from this experience with respect to the definiteness with which we do make commitments, particularly with respect to the matter of the Executive or his agents making commitments, such as the commitment that was made by Secretary Dillon involving \$20 billion

of foreign aid to Latin America, particularly with respect to such precedents as apparently have been set with the use of the President's contingency fund to aid the U.N., with an offsetting writeoff of the obligations of some Communist countries? In other words, do we not have some lessons to learn?

Mr. JUDD. Yes. But I do not think the point the gentleman has made regarding those commitments applies to this situation. I am in hearty agreement with what he says about the executive branch making unauthorized commitments which the Congress is then expected to fulfill. But this was an act passed by the U.S. Congress itself, not a commitment by the Executive. It was passed in April 1946. The war was over only 6 months. Many of our boys still were not home. The emotions of the war period still prevailed. There was warm gratitude, and properly and understandably so, in the hearts of the American people that no matter how badly they had suffered, the Filipinos had been steadfast and had fought valiantly side by side with our men. They had saved the lives of hundreds of American soldiers and civilians by hiding and protecting them for 4 years so they were never captured by the Japanese. There was a close understanding between the two peoples. We in the United States wanted to do this to help a sorely stricken friend and to carry on the partnership of the United States and the Philippines forged in peace and in war. There are some lessons to be drawn, indeed.

Mr. JOHANSEN. Unfortunately, a part of them was on an iffy basis, and that is where we got into trouble.

Mr. JUDD. The only if in this case was whether there would be money enough. We did not appropriate quite enough money at the start for reasons which are plain.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. First, I would like to comment that I do believe the Filipinos were fighting for their own independence.

Mr. JUDD. Certainly.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. And not just for America.

Mr. JUDD. No; and I did not suggest that. We too were fighting for ourselves, and not just for them.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Second, I want to say this: I have a deep sympathy for these people. I was in the Philippines at the end of the war and I have the honor of wearing the Philippine liberation ribbon. But this is a very sticky thing. I certainly do not like some of the comments that were placed in this report from the President of the Philippines and some of the comments from some of our other good friends in the Philippines. I think this whole thing needs a little more thorough consideration.

Here is what I am specifically concerned about: The point was made in the minority views that this was to rehabilitate the Philippine economy and only incidentally using this method of compensating individuals. If that is so, then relate that to the facts. I wonder if this is true. I am reading from page 39 of the report:

Total U.S. economic assistance to the Philippines since 1946 has been \$773 million, of which \$273 million was from ICA since 1951.

A great deal of these were grants. If this is so, the figure would go away beyond any \$73 million which we are talking about here. That certainly looks away beyond any amount of compensation, even if there were a legal or moral obligation.

I wonder if the gentleman would comment on that?

Mr. JUDD. The difference is this: The Philippine rehabilitation bill, when it was passed, was based on a belief that the quickest and best way to get broad economic recovery and development underway in the Philippines was to provide payments to something over 1 million people who could demonstrate they had suffered the loss of a work animal or a little home or store or a plow or on up to a factory.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. That sounds like a good idea.

Mr. JUDD. This was the philosophy of it. The payments were made to individuals and firms, and there is a \$73 million still due on those payments.

The ICA operates government-to-government, as the gentleman knows.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. I think there were many small people involved, and I understand all those small claims were taken care of. However, the \$73 million represents those claims above a certain amount?

Mr. JUDD. That is right, above \$500.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. The other thing which concerns me is this: On page 35 of the report containing the minority views there is the following statement:

They were not payments of legal war damage claims such as arise when our Army found it necessary to seize property and was obligated later to give compensation. Those types of claims have been handled separately from this legislation.

How much did we pay in the way of these legal war damage claims? How much was paid under that procedure to the Philippine Islands?

Mr. JUDD. You mean when we took over property by eminent domain or other legal measures as contrasted with war damage?

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Yes; we took over quite a bit of property over there. Does anyone have any idea how much that would amount to? Perhaps that can be supplied for the RECORD.

Mr. JUDD. I am sorry, but I do not have that figure available at the moment. I will endeavor to secure it for the RECORD.

Mrs. KELLY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

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

Mrs. KELLY. Since the war, the following amounts have been paid as compensation to persons who suffered injury, privation, or property loss in the Philippines during World War II: \$400 million under title I of the Philippine Rehabilitation Act of 1946; \$120 million under other provisions of that Act for the rehabilitation of public facilities; and approximately \$39 million under the

War Claims Act of 1948, as amended, which last amount came from the War Claims Fund.

In addition, of course, \$73 million remains to be paid as the final installment to claimants who received awards under the Philippine Rehabilitation Act of 1946.

This is the \$73 million involved in H.R. 11721 before us today.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Chairman, I yield as much time as he may consume to the gentleman from California [Mr. SHELLEY].

Mr. SHELLEY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this bill. I think it is a correction of a situation which has existed for just a little too long. Because of the defeat of the bill when it was before us previously, I think a sort of strained relationship between this Nation and the new nation resulted; a strained relationship created with a country that is now our anchor in one of the most critical spots in the world today, southeast Asia.

Mr. Chairman, I do not know how many Members of the House have had the privilege of visiting the Philippines. My first visit there was away back in 1923. I suppose I have been there about 16 or 18 times in my life.

Mr. Chairman, I have a great regard for the Philippine people. I know of their keen appreciation of the viable principles of a democratic nation. I have a high regard for the friendship and respect which they have for the United States and our concepts of democracy. I think that we do have a moral obligation to enact this legislation. I think the gentleman from Minnesota, Dr. Judd, put his finger on it when he said it was delayed inadvertently by the outbreak of the Korean war, because there were quite a few bills in just about at that time, and there was a conviction to work it out and pay this unpaid balance at the most opportune time.

Since then things have dragged out. I sincerely hope the House will pass this bill overwhelmingly and show these fine believers in democracy that we believe in them, that we are with them and want to keep them on our side in these precarious times.

Mr. Chairman, I strongly urge that the Members of the House of Representatives give decisive passage to H.R. 11721, the Philippine war damage claims bill. This is a bill to repay a debt which we owe to the people of the Philippines, and it has been to our discredit that we have not discharged this obligation sooner.

When the enemy began their attack in December 1941, the Philippines was only a few years away from reaching independence. For this reason, and because the Filipinos had a deep emotional commitment to their bonds with the United States, the country was a constant headache to the enemy high command. Not only did Filipinos lend major support to the delaying action on Bataan, but they also constantly harassed the enemy troops in the islands, thus neutralizing the effectiveness of thousands of the best enemy forces. During the devastating

liberation campaign, Filipino resistance fighters worked very closely with the advancing Americans and thereby helped considerably to shorten the war in that area. Although it is very hard to measure such factors precisely, there can be no doubt that without the gallant Filipino assistance to the war, thousands more Americans would have lost their lives.

During World War II President Roosevelt and other prominent Americans committed the United States to lend aid to the postwar rebuilding of the islands. With a view toward fulfilling this pledge the U.S. Congress passed on April 30, 1946, the Philippine Rehabilitation Act. The purpose of this bill was to encourage rehabilitation through promising compensation, up to 75 percent of the property value, to individuals and organizations who reestablished their damaged property. We appropriated \$400 million for this purpose. The \$400 million paid off all of the claims under \$500 and the first \$500 of bigger claims, but it was not able to reach the promised 75 percent of claims above \$500. Instead, the level was only 52.5 percent, leaving the remaining 22.5 percent to be handled by a later appropriation. H.R. 11721 is designed solely to provide the \$73 million which is required to pay that 22.5 percent. It should also be pointed out that \$73 million is the maximum that will be needed; funds which are left over will revert to the U.S. Treasury.

The bill before us today is an amended version of H.R. 8617, the Philippine war claims bill which was defeated by a narrow majority in this body in May 1962. H.R. 11721 differs from its predecessor in one important respect, a strengthening amendment requiring further proof of previous investment. It was assumed under H.R. 8617 that the claimants had previously reinvested in the economy of the Philippines the remaining 22.5 percent. This seemed sensible, since the claimants had had to show proof of reinvestment of 52.5 percent in order to win their award in the first instance. In the new bill, however, proof of having reinvested the entire 75 percent is required.

Mr. Chairman, the partnership which existed between our two peoples during the war has remained sturdy to this day, and the Philippines is now our most powerful ally in southeast Asia, where we are united in our determination to resist the encroachments of Sino-Soviet aggression.

Because it is so clearly in our interest to retain the close spirit of cooperation which binds our two nations, we must be particularly careful not to endanger that friendship through some legislative oversight. I believe that the May vote against the Philippine war claims bill was a blunder on our part, and I am thankful that we are being given this opportunity today to reverse this action. This matter is of very deep concern to the people of the Philippines, for they feel that we are backing out on a debt which is due to them. We must be foolish in the extreme if we quibbled our way out of this money we owe to the Philippines, for the consequences of such an action would be to sour the close friend-

ship between our nations and to jeopardize the security of American interests in Asia.

Mr. Chairman, there can be no doubt that this is a just debt, and if our national honor means anything to us, I believe that we ought to live up to our responsibilities and see that this obligation is discharged as soon as possible.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. ADAIR], a member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Mr. ADAIR. Mr. Chairman, I shall address my remarks at this time particularly to those of us who on the occasion of the last vote had doubt about the propriety and the wisdom of this legislation. In the time that has elapsed since that vote we have had additional opportunity to study this legislation and the reasons why it ought to be passed, and also to look at the negative aspects of the bill. For several reasons I would urge the Members of the House today to adopt, by an overwhelming vote, this bill.

In the first place, there are certain changes in the bill before us today from the bill which was before us previously. Now it is true that those changes are not of the greatest magnitude, but I do think they accomplish some worthwhile objectives. First of all, they do move in the direction of seeing that these claims, if paid, will go toward the continued revitalization of the Philippine economy, that the money will be used in that country and not dissipated elsewhere.

Also, the time during which this settlement can and must be made, and accordingly during which its maximum effects will be felt, has been shortened. This assures that this matter, which has dragged on for so long a time, will soon be concluded.

A second reason why we should want to reconsider our position is the one which has been previously referred to as our moral obligation. Because previous speakers have devoted themselves to this point I shall not labor it. But we have had time to ask ourselves the question, do we really have a moral obligation to make this repayment? And I think most of us have found that the answer would be yes.

We are fond of saying that we would like to see in the Philippines a showplace of democracy in Asia. The enactment of this legislation would contribute to that effort. It would contribute toward the ability of the Republic of the Philippines to make of itself such a showplace of democracy.

Thirdly, we have had an opportunity to observe the attitudes generally of the new administration in the Philippines. We have seen what the ideas and the ideals are of President Macapagal. We have seen what he is trying to do for his country and his people. We have observed, as has been pointed out, that the Romulo-Snyder agreement, although prior to the present administration of the Philippines, has been implemented and carried out. So I think it can be said that in enacting this legislation we will be contributing toward a stable, pro-American, pro-freedom government in the Philippines. For these reasons, Mr.

Chairman, I urge that the legislation before us today be adopted.

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

Mr. ADAIR. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. BAKER. Mr. Chairman, I, too, voted against this bill previously. I feel that the bill should be enacted. I shall vote for it today and I associate myself with the gentleman from Indiana in the reasons he so ably presented.

Mr. ADAIR. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from California [Mr. BALDWIN].

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 11721. I feel this bill is fully justified. We made a commitment years ago to pay these claims to those persons and firms in the Philippines who suffered war damage in World War II. These persons risked their lives and their property in our defense. I hope this bill passes by an overwhelming margin.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from New York [Mr. LINDSAY].

Mr. LINDSAY. Mr. Chairman, I take the floor today in order to speak in behalf of the Philippine war damage bill. It is important that this bill pass. In my view the House committed a grave error when it defeated the war damage bill on May 9 of this year, and I said so at the time.

That defeat, Mr. Chairman, was an unnecessary defeat. It demonstrated, once again, the inadequacy of the liaison and the relations between the State Department and the Congress. The State Department has an obligation to see to it that Members are apprised in advance of the facts surrounding bills that affect international relations. The Department did not meet that obligation. I do not lay the blame solely on the State Department. The Congress is at fault too. We do not appropriate sufficient funds to enable the Department to have an adequately staffed congressional liaison office and public information office.

This bill authorizes the Foreign Claims Settlement Commission to complete payment on approved claims of individual Philippine and American citizens for damage done to their property during World War II. There are adequate safeguards in the bill to prevent submission of new claims, to prevent duplicate payments, and to limit legal fees. It also requires that all claimants receiving amounts over 25,000 pesos—approximately \$6,200—prove that such amounts have been invested in the rehabilitation of the Philippine economy.

The Philippines, in April 1961, settled its obligation to the United States, under the Romulo-Snyder agreement of 1950, with the payment of \$20 million to the United States. The Philippines fully anticipated that having settled its obligation, Congress would act favorably on war claims legislation in 1961. I do not have to remind my colleagues that there was considerable disappointment in the Philippines when Congress adjourned last year with no action taken on the war damage claims bill.

With the passage by the Congress of the Philippine Rehabilitation Act of 1946 the United States accepted a self-assumed but unescapable moral commitment to provide compensation for war damage to the property of Philippine and American individuals and corporations.

Mr. Chairman, it is too late and too serious to defeat this bill. The work of three administrations should not be undone by any such overhasty action on our part. I hope, Mr. Chairman, that the House will support the bill.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as she may desire to the gentlewoman from New York [Mrs. KELLY].

Mrs. KELLY. Mr. Chairman, I take this opportunity to compliment our colleague from Wisconsin [Mr. ZABLOCKI] for giving to us the opportunity to reconsider H.R. 11721, a bill to authorize the payment of the balance of awards for war damage compensation made by the Philippine War Damage Commission. I must emphasize that he was encouraged in this renewed effort by many—particularly the leadership of the House of Representatives and our colleague, the gentleman from California, GEORGE P. MILLER. We are all familiar with the background of this legislation. Therefore, we know the purpose of the legislation.

PURPOSE OF LEGISLATION

This bill provides for the payment of the unpaid balance of claims approved under the Philippine Rehabilitation Act of 1946, which was reported from the former Committee on Insular Affairs. Approximately \$389 million has already been paid on these claims; this bill provides for the payment of the approximately \$73 million remaining unpaid balance. This would be considered as full and final satisfaction of the payments under the Philippine Rehabilitation Act. No new claims are allowed. Only those claimants who were granted awards under the original legislation and meet the criteria of sections 1 and 5(a) of this bill will receive payment of the balances due them under the original awards.

LEGISLATION WILL BE ADMINISTERED BY FOREIGN CLAIMS SETTLEMENT COMMISSION

The legislation will be administered by the Foreign Claims Settlement Commission, which will receive applications, and determine that the applicant is the original claimant or his successor in interest, and determine the amount remaining unpaid on the original award. The amount so determined will be certified to the Secretary of the Treasury.

Payments authorized under this act shall be made in U.S. dollars or in Philippine pesos at the option of the Secretary of the Treasury. If paid in pesos, the payments shall be made at the free market rate of exchange. The use of this rate is required by equity if the United States is to pay near the true value of the outstanding claims. The use of the 2-to-1 rate which was in effect at the time when the claims were adjudicated is inappropriate because the peso has depreciated faster than the dollar. If the old rate were used in paying pesos,

the United States would be taking advantage of the recent currency devaluation in the Philippines at the expense of the claimants. The claimants would then receive only one-half of the purchasing power to which they are entitled.

The original Rehabilitation Act of 1946 did not specifically provide for payment in pesos. As a result of the conditions in the Philippines it was more desirable to pay all claims in pesos at that time. The committee decided to place discretion in the Secretary of the Treasury for payment in dollars or pesos.

The discretionary authority which the bill proposes to give the Secretary of the Treasury, to pay the claims in U.S. dollars or in Philippine pesos, will not increase or decrease the amount of dollars authorized to be appropriated. It will not result in inequitable treatment of different claimants.

It would enable the Secretary of the Treasury to avoid complications involved both in a multiple exchange rate system and in exchange rate changes which cannot be accurately forecast at the moment. It would also strengthen his hand in negotiations with the Philippine Government.

The administration of this law will be in the hands of a most capable gentleman who is Dr. Edward D. Re, Chairman of Foreign Claims Settlement Commission. Fortunately for all of us he comes from New York—in fact, from Brooklyn.

Mr. Chairman, the following is the biography of Dr. Edward D. Re, Chairman, Foreign Claims Settlement Commission. To our colleague, the gentleman from New York, Hon. ALFRED E. SANTANGELO, we owe much for his sponsorship of Mr. Re as Chairman of the Commission:

Dr. Re was born in Italy on October 14, 1920. A graduate of P.S. 176 and New Utrecht High School of Brooklyn, N.Y., he received his bachelor of science degree cum laude from St. John's University School of Commerce in 1941. He received his bachelor of laws degree summa cum laude from St. John's University School of Law in 1943, and in that year was admitted to the New York Bar. He is also admitted to practice before the U.S. Supreme Court, the U.S. Court of Appeals (Second Circuit), the U.S. District Court (Southern and Eastern Districts of New York), the U.S. Tax Court, the U.S. Court of Military Appeals, and various administrative agencies. In 1950 he received the degree of doctor of juridical science from New York University and in 1960 was awarded the honorary degree of doctor of pedagogy by the University of Aquila, Italy. He was appointed to the faculty of St. John's University School of Law in 1947, and was made a full professor in 1951.

In 1956, Dr. Re was appointed a special hearing officer for the Department of Justice by the Attorney General of the United States. In that year, he was the recipient of the distinguished service award of the Brooklyn Junior Chamber of Commerce. He was appointed to the Board of Higher Education of the City of New York by Mayor Robert F. Wagner on March 25, 1958. In 1960 he was tendered the Order of Merit by the Republic of Italy. In the 1960 national elections he served the New York State electoral college as an elector of the President and Vice President of the United States.

Dr. Re has served on various committees of the American Bar Association, New York State Bar Association, Association of the Bar of the City of New York, New York County

Lawyers Association, and Brooklyn Bar Association. From 1949 to 1956 he served as chairman of the Comparative Procedure and Practice Committee of the American Bar Association Section of International and Comparative Law, and is presently divisional vice chairman of the Comparative Law Division of the Section of International and Comparative Law. He has also served as chairman of the Administrative Law Committee of the New York County Lawyers Association and chairman of the Comparative Law Committee of the Association of American Law Schools. On July 21 of this year, he was elected a member of the American Law Institute.

Pursuant to the provisions of section 464 of the Civil Practice Act of New York, he has been appointed referee by consent in cases involving the nationalization of property by the Governments of Hungary, Czechoslovakia, and China.

Dr. Re is the author of the following books: "Foreign Confiscations in Anglo-American Law" (1951); "Brief Writing and Oral Argument" (1951); "Cases and Materials on International Law" (with Lester B. Orfield of the Indiana Law School, 1955); "Selected Essays on Equity" (1955); and "Cases and Materials on Equity" (with the late Prof. Zechariah Chafee, Jr., of the Harvard Law School, 1958).

His many contributions to the fields of international and comparative law include the following articles: "International Law and the United Nations" (1947); "The Nationalization of Foreign Owned Property" (1952); "Nationalization and the Investment of Capital Abroad" (1953); "L'Enseignement du droit international et du droit compare et les relations internationales" (1955); "The NATO Status of Forces Agreement and International Law" (1955); "Les Systemes de Common Law" in "Le Regime Matrimonial Legal Dans Les Legislations Contemporaines" (1957); and "The Roman Contribution to the Common Law" (1961).

During the Second World War, he served in the U.S. Air Force from 1943 to 1947, and is currently in the Active Reserve, U.S. Air Force, Office of the Judge Advocate General.

He and his wife, the former Margaret Ann Corcoran, also a member of the New York Bar, are the parents of nine children.

I want to bring your attention to a few paragraphs in the report which emphasize restrictions on payments of the claims:

All payments under H.R. 11721 in amounts over P25,000 (approximately \$6,400) will be subject to the provisions of section 104(c) of the Philippine Rehabilitation Act of 1946. Section 104(c) of the Philippine Rehabilitation Act of 1946 requires substantiating evidence from claimants that the lost or damaged property on which the claim is based has been or will be rebuilt, replaced, or repaired. Where the rebuilding, replacement, or repair could not be done, the section requires that sums equal to or greater than the amount awarded have been reinvested, or that the amount of the payment to be made will be reinvested in the rehabilitation and economic development of the Philippines. Small claimants, the unpaid balance of whose awards is under P25,000, would be exempt from this requirement, on the theory that such reinvestment has already occurred. However, under section 5 of H.R. 11721, all claimants residing outside the Republic of the Philippines, regardless of the amount of their awards, will have to prove that they have invested an amount equal to the value of their awards in the rehabilitation and economic development of the Philippines before they will be permitted to receive any payment under this bill.

After all approved claims have been paid up to the maximum permitted, the balance of the appropriation shall revert to the U.S.

Treasury. Payment shall not be made under this act on any claim filed under the Philippine Rehabilitation Act of 1946 or under this act which was acquired from a predecessor in interest by purchase, except where such purchase was in the ordinary course of business in connection with the acquisition of all assets of a business firm.

I hope action today will be a reversal of the action taken by the House on May 9. The medium did much to change the opinions of those who opposed this legislation and I insert here several editorials:

[From the Washington Daily News, May 10, 1962]

A DISMAYING VOTE

The United States defaults a debt of honor by action of the House yesterday in killing a bill to authorize payment of the remaining \$73 million in Philippines war damage claims.

The sum is the balance of what we legally owe the Philippines by virtue of a 1946 act of Congress. The total amount of property claims which Congress decided were justified was not fully appropriated at the time.

In the course of lengthy debate on the bill it was argued that too many big Philippine firms would be the beneficiaries, and that our No. 1 Asian ally already had received \$1.6 billion in economic assistance and military aid. But this was a promise we made under previous legislation and every U.S. President since Harry Truman has included the \$73 million in the annual budget, only to have Congress renege on the payup.

The bill's sponsor, Representative CLEMENT ZABLOCKI (Democrat, of Michigan), said he was "dismayed and distressed" at the surprise vote of 171 to 201 yesterday. We share his sentiment, and can only hope the Filipinos are not going to be any less our friends than they have been in the past. More now than at any time since the war it is essential that we stand together in the face of new Asian troubles—in a relationship that cannot be measured in dollars and cents.

[From the Washington Post, May 14, 1962]

REBUFF TO OUR FRIENDS

The House of Representatives was suffering from the political jitters when it rejected the Philippines war damage bill. The justice of payments by this country to compensate the Filipino people for damages caused by American military forces in driving the Japanese out of the islands in World War II was fully recognized by Congress in passing the Philippine Rehabilitation Act in 1946. The question at issue in the House was the appropriation of \$73 million to complete the payment of these claims. To reject the final payment after the claims have been established comes close to being an act of bad faith.

[From the New York Times, May 11, 1962]

MISTREATING THE PHILIPPINES

House defeat of a bill to authorize payment of the remaining Philippines war damage claims was a foolish and indefensible act.

This is money the United States has owed the Philippines for more than a decade.

Compensation for property damaged in the Philippines by American forces during World War II (when the islands were American territory) was sanctioned by act of Congress in 1946. The amount later appropriated did not cover all approved claims, and year after year Congress has failed, as the House did on Wednesday, to vote funds to pay the remaining \$73 million due despite pleas of the State Department and Presidents Truman, Eisenhower, and Kennedy.

The Republic of the Philippines is one of our staunchest and most important allies; its

people and governments have been consistently friends of the United States. Filipinos are justifiably dismayed and angered by this repudiation of an acknowledged debt. The House vote denies to the Philippines funds that had been counted on to bolster efforts of the progressive new Macapagal administration to spur the Philippine economy.

Emanuel Palaez, Philippines Vice President and Foreign Secretary, characterized the House action as evidence that "the United States treats her friends more shabbily than those who are not for her" and said, "One has to blackmail Americans to get anything from them." Unhappily many in the Philippines and people in other countries will agree with him.

The Senate has not acted on the war claims bill. It must, and the House must, reverse itself on this unwise, unjust vote.

Mr. Chairman, seldom in modern warfare has a country been so completely devastated as was the Philippines at the time of liberation from Japanese occupation in 1945.

Its cities were in ruins. Manila, the capital, was a smoking heap of rubble, without food, water, and transportation.

The physical damage was almost entirely inflicted during the closing phases of combat. It was a combination of vengeful demolition by the Japanese and the inevitable havoc of combat as the American forces attacked by land, sea, and air.

The aftermath of the war produced the problems of postwar survival and rehabilitation for the Filipino people. Total estimates of all losses of physical property in the Philippines was placed at over \$1 billion based on 1944 values. Full restoration for property losses in the Philippines was promised by the United States. As a result, the Philippine Rehabilitation Act of 1946 appropriated \$400 million to pay the claimants in the Philippines who suffered property losses.

As President Roosevelt signed the act establishing the Philippine War Damage Commission on June 29, 1944, he declared:

Our character as a nation will be judged for years to come by the human understanding and the physical efficiency with which we help in the immense task of rehabilitating the Philippines.

The original appropriation was found to be insufficient to pay 100 percent of each claim approved. An arbitrary decision was made to pay each claimant 75 percent of his claim. Even with this 25-percent reduction, a balance of \$73 million remains outstanding on the unpaid balances.

Intervening events and delays in Congress have served only to emphasize the firm conviction that the balances left unpaid through our failure in the past to authorize sufficient funds for this purpose should be paid without further delay. The passing of time has not impaired the morality of our obligation to complete the payments which we undertake by law to discharge.

The bill we are considering today has numerous safeguards to prevent submission of new claims, to prevent duplication of payments, and to limit legal fees which may be charged claimants for assistance in processing claims. If the \$73 million is appropriated, the Philippines is already on notice that no fur-

ther request relating to war damage compensation will be considered.

The Philippine Government in 1961 discharged its obligations to the United States under the Romulo-Snyder agreement by the payment of the sum of \$20 million. As a result of this payment, the Philippines have every right to expect the United States to fulfill its obligations.

The Philippine soldiers fought side by side with the Americans at Bataan, Corregidor, and elsewhere, when the chips were down. The sacrifices the Filipinos made in the defense of democracy must never be forgotten.

The United States must not forget that an economically strong Philippines gives the free world another friendly nation which will continue to remain in the democratic fold. A more powerful, a more strongly established and economic Philippines means more allied strength to combat the threat of communism. The Republic of the Philippines is of major importance to the United States economically, militarily, and politically. The United States needs the Philippines as much as the Philippines needs the United States.

I am in favor of this bill and urge immediate action on the long overdue pledge to be fulfilled.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. DANIELS].

Mr. DANIELS. Mr. Chairman, today H.R. 11712, a bill providing for the payment of the balance of awards due under the Philippine Rehabilitation Act of 1946, is being reconsidered. The reason for this reconsideration is obvious. The House wishes to restore the honor of the U.S. Government. Less than 3 months ago, on May 9, we considered H.R. 8617, a similar bill which was defeated. At that time most of the Members of the House voted against the measure because of awards to large corporations, including a brewery and a racetrack firm. However, all the awards have been held to be justified by the Reparation Commission.

Fortunately the democratic system allows for self-analysis, criticism, and the process through which a mistake may be remedied. And the mistake made by this body on May 9 will be remedied today.

During World War II the Philippines suffered severe damages inflicted not only by the Japanese, but by American bombing planes prior to and subsequent to landings by Japanese forces during retreat. As a result of the war, the Philippines found themselves, in 1945, without funds. To alleviate this situation, the 79th Congress approved the Philippine Rehabilitation Act of 1946, which created the Philippine War Damage Commission and authorized the expenditure of \$400 million to pay war damage claims approved by the Commission. The Commission was to examine claims for loss and damage, make payment in full on all property damage awards up to \$500, and make payment up to 75 percent of the awards in excess of \$500. All claim awards of \$500

or less have been paid, but awards in excess of that amount have only been paid to the extent of 52½ percent of the award. H.R. 11721 would make possible the payment of the remaining 22½ percent of the award still outstanding under each such claim.

The opponents to H.R. 11721 use various arguments all of which are invalid, most of which are irrelevant, and some of which are self-contradictory. Some opponents argue that we should never have promised to aid the Philippines, for we had already aided them by liberating them from the Japanese. But the point under consideration is not whether we should have promised aid. The point is that we did promise aid and consequently should fulfill our commitment. Others argue that the claims involved in this legislation are not war damage claims, but what is actually involved is aid for the rehabilitation of a war-torn country. First, it is difficult for me to separate the payment of war damage claims from the overall rehabilitation of a country, for the former will inevitably affect the latter. Secondly, it is untrue that war damage claims are not involved in this legislation, and a careful study of the facts would not result in such a conclusion. It is a fact that although 223 corporations are on the list of claimants, there are some 86,000 individual claimants. It would prove unfair and unwise to deny payment to these many thousands of individuals because a couple of hundred corporations are on the list. Let me also say that although I am apprehensive to note that all these corporations receive war damage awards, the fact of the matter is that these enterprises qualified for such awards by contributing themselves to the economic rehabilitation of the Philippines. Some Members oppose H.R. 11721 because it supposedly will rehabilitate the Philippines. They then say that the Philippine economy is too shattered to be rehabilitated, and in the same breath recommend that the United States support development projects in agriculture and industry related to the specific needs of the Philippine economy rather than additional war damage payments to individuals. A more confused argument could not be advanced.

I know today that we will adhere to the American tradition of fairplay by passing H.R. 11721, and I hope by our action that we will show the Filipinos we are as much their friends today in time of peace as we were 20 years ago in time of war.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MORGAN].

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 11721 and urge its approval by an overwhelming majority of the House.

There appear to be two major questions concerning this bill: The first is a question as to whether or not the United States owes the \$73 million which is authorized, and the second is whether or not the money will be paid to people who neither need it nor deserve it.

Let me say a word about the nature of the claims which are involved. These claims do not represent claims of the Philippine Government against the United States for money that we owe the Philippines as a result of events which occurred during World War II.

The United States has already provided substantial compensation to the Philippine Government for various types of damage done during the war for which we might be regarded as having some responsibility.

These are claims of individuals and corporations that own property in the Philippines which was damaged during the war and which arise because after the war was over, the U.S. Government said to these individuals and corporations: If you will go ahead and repair the damage to your property as quickly as possible, the United States will undertake to reimburse you for the investment you make in repairing war damage.

The underlying idea was to get the economy of the Philippines rolling again as quickly as possible, and I believe most people concede that the effort has been successful.

The Government of the Philippines did not have responsibility for handling or evaluating these claims. The U.S. Government established a Philippine War Damage Commission under the terms of the Philippine Rehabilitation Act of 1946. This Commission, made up of Americans, went to the Philippines, opened its offices and invited the people who had suffered war damage to submit their claims for consideration and adjudication. Many thousands of these claims were submitted and \$389 million has been paid against them. All small claims of less than \$500 have already been paid. There was not enough money to go around, however, and this bill would make it possible to pay the remaining 22.5 percent which is due on those claims which are larger than \$500.

The point I want to emphasize is the fact that the people of the Philippines were invited by the U.S. Government to submit to a U.S. Government agency claims which were adjudicated by the United States. This whole procedure involved a commitment to pay these claims after their adjudication.

We did not say to the people of the Philippines: Submit your claims and we will then decide what to do about them.

We did not say, "Submit your claims and we will pay a certain percentage of them."

We said, "Submit your claims and the United States will pay, after a fair evaluation, what it determines to be due on them."

The payment of these claims has been too long delayed, but I believe that no one will argue that the obligation to pay these claims is less valid because we have owed the money for a good many years.

Let me say just a word about the sort of people who will receive the money which this bill authorizes. There has been a lot of talk to the effect that the purpose of this bill is to pay off large corporations, including a brewery. Let me urge every Member of the House to examine the table on page 12 of the committee report. That table clearly

indicates that over half of the money authorized is expected to go to 85,952 individuals whose claims are less than \$25,000. The table also indicates that there are 83 claims which exceed \$100,000 and that approximately one-third of the money will go to these large claimants provided they can show that they have invested an amount equal to their claims in the reconstruction of their property.

A vote against this bill will not do great harm to the large claimants. Many of them have prospered in the years since the war, and it is probable that in terms of their financial situation today, they do not need the money. I should remind you, however, that the primary purpose of the Philippine Rehabilitation Act was to encourage the reconstruction of the economy of the country so that people could get jobs and earn a living.

None of the large corporations will be able to collect a cent of the money authorized in this bill unless it is able to demonstrate that it did invest an equivalent amount in reconstruction in the Philippines. Undoubtedly the fact that these corporations believed that a substantial payment in U.S. funds could be expected was an important consideration in their pushing ahead with reconstruction. The fact that many of these corporations have been successful since the war should be commended rather than penalized.

The important point, however, is not the 287 individuals and corporations with claims which exceed \$25,000, but the 85,000 individuals with claims of less than \$25,000. These people constitute an important segment of the population of the Philippines. Whether or not we meet our obligations to these people will make a lot of difference to them financially.

More important, however, is the fact that if we do not live up to our commitments to them, their attitude toward the United States will inevitably be affected. We need the confidence and the respect of these 85,000 claimants. This is the vital issue which every Member should keep in mind when he votes on this bill.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. GAIAMO].

Mr. GAIAMO. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 11721.

The prompt passage of this bill is in the interests of our long and close friendship with the people of the Philippine Islands who fought and died with our men in the Pacific, who have been our staunchest allies, and who presently constitute one of the strongest outposts of democracy in the far Pacific.

In 1946, we undertook to rehabilitate the Philippine economy by compensating our close friends for the extensive damage and destruction wreaked on them by World War II. Mr. Chairman, we left that job half done. The purpose of the present bill would be to complete the task—and to do so in the swiftest, most efficient, and most complete way possible.

One proposal from the last Congress would have given a lump sum payment directly to the Philippine Government. This proposal was rejected for various

good reasons. Congress properly concluded, and in this the Committee on Foreign Affairs has agreed, that the best way to fulfill the purpose of the bill was to have it administered by an agency of the U.S. Government presently equipped to do the work properly.

The Foreign Claims Settlement Commission of the United States has all the necessary machinery and experience to finish the job promptly, economically, and with the greatest possible advantage to this country and to the Philippines. The Commission has handled many programs similar to this one in the past—it was actually organized for the express purpose of administering such legislation. This Commission has a long record of experience in getting things done—and getting them done on time.

Mr. Chairman, let us not leave this job undone any longer. And, for our own interest and for that of the Philippines, let us do it properly.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. O'HARA].

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, as an old Spanish War veteran I am most happy at the peaceful ending that seems to have come to this period of misunderstanding.

I know there is none among my colleagues who does not have a sense of deep appreciation and warm friendship toward the Philippines and the people of the Philippines. I know there is none among my colleagues who does not remember that the Philippines came to us in the period of the Spanish-American War, and that following that our young men and young women went to the Philippines as teachers, that for years we worked with the Philippines and, with our help and their determination, they prepared themselves for independence, which freely and cheerfully we gave to them under no pressure save the wishes of the Philippine people and our faith in their ability to build in the far Pacific a fortress of democracy in the working out of their destiny.

We look back at the time when over \$2 billion of property was destroyed, much of it by our own artillery, when the Philippines were standing with us in our time of need as we have stood with them in their time of youth and growth.

I know that in the vote some time ago there could have been no thought in the mind of anyone of showing lack of appreciation and affection for the Philippines and its people. I think that confusion has been removed.

Also, Mr. Chairman, perhaps some of the Filipinos spoke in confusion over what this body had done, perhaps in anger. We all do that. Something happens—we do not like it because we may not understand and are confused—and we speak out in indignation and in anger. I hope, Mr. Chairman, having dissolved our own confusion and reached this happy ending, we will forget and forgive all across the board and not hold it against our stout friend, the great President of the Republic of the Philippines, that he, also confused by what had happened here, spoke in indignation, perhaps in anger. We are acting

today from the impulse of our hearts, which always have been attuned to the heartbeats of the people of the Philippines, not because of any gun at our heads.

So I hope that in passing this bill, we will end this period of misunderstanding and that from this Chamber we will send to the President of the Philippines and to all the people of the Philippines a renewed pledge of our undying friendship. I voted for the measure the first time. I am again voting for it.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BROOMFIELD], a member of the committee.

Mr. BROOMFIELD. Mr. Chairman, for the second time this year, we are considering the payment of the remainder of the Philippine war claims.

To many of us in the House Foreign Affairs Committee, we wish that there would have been no necessity for this second trip.

We wish that the House would have passed this bill earlier this year, and that we could now be considering other business.

But such is not the case.

The original bill was defeated, and I believe one of the reasons for the defeat earlier this year was that many of us on the House Foreign Affairs Committee considered the case in favor of this proposed legislation so self-evident that perhaps we were not diligent enough in making sure that all Members of the House were aware of the rightness of this proposal.

If there was a lack of understanding of the reasons for this bill; if there was a lack of communication between the members of our committee and the rest of the Members of the House on this issue, we sincerely hope that there is understanding by the Members of the House of our reasons for favorably reporting this bill to the floor.

We hope that this time we will succeed, and that each Member of the House will join in this effort to settle a debt owed to a friend of many years.

What we have before us, in essence, is a matter of principle; principle spelled with an "le." We have an opportunity to honor this obligation.

Some Members of the House have protested, on a great many occasions, the failure of some nations to pay their debts to us.

These protests are most certainly justified. There are far too many nations which look upon Uncle Sam as a generous relative whose bag of goodies is boundless, and whose generosity far outweighs his commonsense.

But these protests ring a bit hollow in my ears when, on the one hand, we protest against those who do not honor their obligations, while on the other hand we ourselves fail to honor our own obligations to a nation which we helped create, which has the same ideals, the same goals, the same strong stand against Communist infiltration as we have.

We will have diluted our protests, and the essential rightness of our protests,

by such actions. We will, in essence, be saying to the world, "Don't do as we do, do as we say."

It would seem to the world, and to ourselves for that matter, that we were attempting to wriggle out of a debt simply because we thought we could get away with it.

Now the "i" dotters and the comma studiers perhaps may argue that we have a legal loophole through which we can squirm if we so desire.

Perhaps these gentlemen are right. Perhaps an alibi can be found for not honoring this debt.

But it seems to me that it would be very difficult for many of us who deal with the people of the Philippines to look them in the face and honestly say that our Government has treated them fairly.

An examination of the RECORD during the debate, at the time the original Philippine war claims bill was passed, should leave little doubt in anyone's mind that these claims were to be paid. Nor is there any question that the intent of Congress, at the time of passage of the original bill, was to pay this money to the claimants if the original appropriation proved to be insufficient.

What we are offered today is an opportunity to settle this question of claims once and for all.

What we are paying for was the privilege of burning, bombing, and shelling the homes, the shops, the plants of Filipinos.

To be sure, this wholesale destruction was necessary. To be sure, dollars or pesos won't restore the limbs of those who lost them, nor the lives of those who gave them up, in this struggle for the Philippines.

But we can at least make restitution to those who have just claims. We can at least pay these bills which we admitted years ago we owed. We can at least settle up with the 86,000 individuals, firms, and organizations to which we did damage.

Now, there are those, I am sure, who will rise up in wrath at the prospect of settling up the claim of a brewery. I can even imagine a toast by some as they raise their glasses and proclaim: "Billions for subsidies, but not one cent for breweries."

However, I would like to point out to my colleagues that this particular brewery engaged in other activities besides the manufacture of "poor man's champagne."

This brewery also makes bread. It manufactures yeast for bread. It has dairies and pasteurizes milk. Its products are no more confined to beer than the Great Atlantic & Pacific Tea Co. deals only in tea.

How much money do we owe to these 86,000 claimants? We are not sure. We know that the amount is something less than the \$73 million asked for in this bill we have before us.

The reason we cannot say for sure is because processing of these claims will not take place until after this legislation is passed, as there are no funds available for this processing at this time. We do know that a portion of these claims have been paid in full, while others have received partial payment. Also,

we know that if this bill is passed, any amounts over and above the claims will be returned to the Federal Treasury.

Further, the committee made two key changes in the bill, as it was presented earlier this year, to strengthen it and to assure that these claims will not be permitted to drag out for a period of years.

The first of these changes requires the great bulk of the claimants to provide proof that funds, at least equal in amount to the claim, have been invested, or will be invested, in the rehabilitation and economic growth of the Philippines. The only exception to this provision will be small claimants whose totals are less than about \$6,200, which comprises about 25,000 of the 86,000 claimants.

The second major change limits the time available to the Foreign Claims Settlement Commission to make final settlement of these claims. Some Members of Congress expressed the view that these settlements might drag out for decades and that, following Parkinson's law, we would have a growing bureaucracy to contend with in the future. We have stated in this bill that the Foreign Claims Settlement Commission must wind up its business on these claims within 2 years and 60 days after enactment into law of this bill.

This, I think, will guard against making these claim settlements a lifetime career for some Federal employees and also will assure prompt payment to claimants.

I would like to emphasize that this bill is not a "handout" to soothe the ruffled feelings of a neutral nation, or to attempt to buy its loyalty with dollars.

Despite the anger with which our first rejection of the war claims was met in the Philippines, I feel certain that the people of the Philippines will remain our steadfast friends. They simply will not trust us as much as they have in the past, and I think rightly so, if we should reject this bill a second time.

But I see no reason for rejection. We owe payment of these debts, which have been outstanding for so many years, as much to ourselves as we do to the Philippines. The Government of the Philippines has issued no ultimatums that if we fail to pay this debt they will swing to the Communist camp. They have not threatened economic reprisals against our businessmen. They have worked in the spirit of liberty, with justice, in their dealings with us. The least we can do is to give them justice in return, to treat this nation, which is our godchild, on equal terms.

Last year, the Government of the Philippines agreed to pay to our Federal Government the sum of \$20 million, under the terms of the Romulo-Snyder agreement, a bill owed to us for funds we advanced to meet the payroll of the Philippine Army and its guerrilla forces which were of such valuable help to our own forces during World War II.

The Philippines, after settling up its debt to us, thought that the last obstacle had been removed to prompt payment by our Government of the money owed its citizens.

After living up to its end of the bargain, I think the people of the Philippines can be excused if they are a bit

disillusioned with us and our failure to make good on our part of the bargain.

We have a chance here today to restore confidence in our Nation by approval of this bill. We are not buying friendship by approval of this bill. We simply are meeting an obligation, paying a debt to individuals to whom we owe money.

If the bombings, the shellings, the destruction had taken place in Washington, in Atlanta, in Detroit, Los Angeles, or Seattle, there would be no question of settlement. Because of the valiant stand of Americans and Filipinos alike, at Corregidor and Manila, there were no bombings in the United States during World War II. If it had not been for the delaying action, the rearguard action of the Filipino Scouts, the Americans, and the civilian guerrilla forces in the Philippines, we might have had to consider a west coast war claims bill, or an east coast war claims bill. However, I do not think Congress would have taken such a long time in approving it.

I urge my colleagues to vote in favor of this bill, to meet our obligation and to further solidify our friendship with a valiant ally.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. KYL].

Mr. KYL. Mr. Chairman, I would like to thank the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BROOMFIELD] for the assistance he has rendered me relative to foreign affairs. I have frequently relied on this assistance because he has studied these matters so diligently and so thoroughly. His interpretation has been sound, his contribution is indeed large and worth while.

Mr. MONAGAN. Mr. Chairman, I support H.R. 11721.

May I begin by complimenting the distinguished minority leader for his announced position of support in this regard. Although his position is not free from difficulty from a political or partisan point of view; nevertheless, I believe that he has done what is in the best interest of the United States.

If anyone wants substantial authority for the need for this legislation, may I call attention to the letter which appears on page 90 of the hearings in which it is stated that prompt action on the Zablocki bill "cannot fail to help both the Philippines and our own beloved country." This letter is signed "Douglas MacArthur."

The important point in connection with this legislation is not the legalistic one as to whether or not we have an obligation upon which suit could be brought. The important point is that our failure is considered by the Filipinos to be a breach of faith.

Since this frame of mind is a fact and not a theory, it is vital for the cause of good relations between our countries that this feeling should be eliminated.

Criticism has been voiced of the payments which are proposed to be made to certain corporations in the Philippines. While it is true that there are such payments, it should be noted that there are also payments to the Philippine National Red Cross, the international committee of the YMCA, the Phil-

ippine Women's Education Association and the Hospital de San Juan de Dios.

In addition, it should be remembered that the Philippine people are our friends whose friendship has been demonstrated to us in time of war and it is difficult for me to see why people should object that we are doing for them what is essentially the same thing that we did for our enemies, Japan and West Germany.

I should like to close by quoting from a letter from a friend who is a close student of Philippine affairs and has lived in the Philippine Islands.

He says:

Obviously, the Philippines has been an extremely good ally in the past. In contemporary world politics we are not only anxious to maintain extremely good relationships with the Philippines, but we are also interested in the strategic role of the Philippines in southeast Asia. We also wish to retain the Philippines as a close friend to serve as a shining example of America's beneficent colonialism in a world where ex-colonies are rarely friendly with their ex-master for long.

A much more immediate political element is also involved regarding the Macapagal administration. Macapagal, against extremely strong opposition, has been bending over backward for a period of 5 years to sell the idea of America's importance in the future of the Philippines and the need for far closer Philippine-American relationships. Macapagal has been particularly active in opposing the narrow chauvinistic nationalism which frequently spilled over into anti-Americanism. Here was a man who politically gave his all to publicly defend the United States and to promote closer Philippine-American relations. The psychological shock of the supplementary war damage rejection was a major trauma for him and subjected him to intense ridicule by those who said America would better serve her former enemies than her friends. He was also ridiculed by his erstwhile colleagues who said this was an indication of American disinterest toward the Philippines.

My correspondent also went on to point out that the \$70-odd million involved in this bill might be distributed to private individuals and corporations, but that it would serve to bolster the difficult foreign exchange position of the Philippines. This is an important consideration.

For these reasons, Mr. Chairman, I support this legislation and I hope that the House will give its support to the amended version which we are considering today.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I am voting for this bill because I believe that it is a moral obligation of our U.S. Government. I was absent from the floor when this bill was voted on before because of official business; but if I had been here, I would have voted for that bill.

There were three men that I have known from the Philippines since coming to the Congress, for whom I have had much respect and admiration and enjoyed knowing. The first was the Honorable Mike Elizalde, the then Ambassador from the Philippines. The second was his successor, the Honorable Carlos Romulo. The third was a man that I believe we miss more than any other man in that part of the world, and that was the Honorable Ramon Magsaysay, President of the Philippines.

I am much disturbed and disappointed in things that have happened in the Philippines since this bill was last debated. The action of the present President and the changing of their recognized date of independence, in my opinion was both childish and ridiculous. I want it clearly understood that I am voting for this bill in spite of these actions, and not because of these actions. I believe my voting record in the Congress and my actions in the Congress in behalf of the people of the Philippines will prove that I have had a very warm feeling for them. I do believe that the Philippine Government should have shown more patience and understanding on this issue.

Mr. ADDABBO. Mr. Chairman, on May 9, 1962, I voted against H.R. 8617, a bill similar to H.R. 11721 which we are now considering. I voted against the original bill, H.R. 8617, because the provisions of said bill did not, in my opinion, adequately and properly provide for the payment of this money for and in the rehabilitation of the Philippines.

Under the present bill, H.R. 11721, there is specific provision that the moneys are used or were used in the actual rehabilitation program in the Philippines. In the present bill, as a condition for payment of the claims, it is required that the whole of such payments shall be reinvested in such manner as will further the rehabilitation or economic development of the Philippines.

Though it would appear that the moneys are to be paid in a great part to corporations, a large part of the appropriation herein will be paid to individuals who suffered damage in the defense and liberation of the Philippines. I believe that the payment of these war claims is not only warranted as a moral obligation but now, under the present legislation, H.R. 11721, will go to the grassroots benefit of the people of the Philippines.

I sincerely hope that those who voted against H.R. 8617 will now reconsider, in view of the modifications in the present bill, and that this legislation, H.R. 11721, be approved.

Mr. CLANCY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 11721 and urge that this legislation be adopted. When H.R. 8617, which would have authorized \$73 million for payments to Philippine citizens and corporations of unpaid balances of World War II damage awards made under the Philippine Rehabilitation Act of 1956, came to a vote in this House on May 9 of this year I, along with a majority of my colleagues, voted against the measure. With very few colleagues by my side I rose in support of an amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. BARRY] which provided for the authorization of a payment not to exceed \$73 million to the Government of the Republic of the Philippines, as distinguished from payments to corporations and individuals, in full satisfaction and final settlement of all claims. Payment to individuals would have been left to the Philippine Government. It appeared to me that not only would this amendment simplify administration of the payments, but it would better satisfy the initial purpose of the act; namely, to rehabilitate the

Philippines, not to repay individuals. Payment of the sum directly to the Philippine Government was, in my judgment, the best means of continuing and strengthening the economic recovery already achieved since the devastation of the war. The Barry amendment was rejected.

We have the greatest admiration and friendship for the people of the Philippines, one of our staunchest and most valued allies. We have great interest in seeing that the country as a whole is benefited.

I am therefore pleased that the new bill before us today meets and overcomes the major objection to H.R. 8617, and I can now lend my wholehearted support to the proposal. By requiring a reexamination of all claims over 25,000 pesos—or equivalent value in dollars—and substantiating evidence that sums equal to or exceeding the amount awarded have been or will be reinvested to further the rehabilitation and economic development of the Philippines, the revised bill will fulfill the intent of the Philippine Rehabilitation Act. We should avail ourselves of this opportunity to discharge a longstanding obligation and thereby restore the faith of the Philippine people, as well as people of many other lands, in the pledged word of the United States.

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 11721.

I have always been in favor of the proposal incorporated in this resolution. Had I been here on May 9, 1962, when a similar proposition was considered by this House, I would have voted for it. Attendance at a funeral of a friend back in my district prevented my presence in the Congress on that date and my inability to vote favorably on the bill. I am glad that I have this opportunity today to state my position on this matter and to emphatically approve and vote for it.

Mr. Chairman, this bill authorizes the Foreign Claims Settlement Commission to complete payment on approved claims of individual Philippine and American citizens and corporations for damage to their private property in the Philippines during World War II. All claims under \$500 have already been paid in full. The \$73 million that could be paid under this bill represents the balance—22.5 percent—between the 52.5 percent already paid on approved claims exceeding \$500, and the 75 percent authorized to be paid by the Philippine Rehabilitation Act of 1946 but for which insufficient funds were appropriated. Approximately 88,000 claimants are involved.

This bill contains safeguards to prevent submission of new claims, to prevent duplicate payments and to limit the legal fees which may be charged claimants for assistance in processing claims. It also modifies H.R. 8617, defeated in May 1962, to require that all claimants receiving amounts over ₱25,000—approximately \$6,200—prove that such amounts have been invested in the rehabilitation of the Philippine economy. The Philippines is aware that with the passage of this bill, no further war damage claims will be considered.

The Philippines, in April 1961, settled its obligation to the United States—under the Romulo-Snyder agreement of 1950—with the payment of \$20 million. The Philippines fully anticipated that, having settled its obligation, Congress would act favorably on war claims legislation in 1961. There was considerable disappointment in the Philippines when Congress adjourned last year with no action taken on the war damage claims.

Mr. Chairman, with the passage by the Congress of the Philippine Rehabilitation Act of 1946, the United States accepted a self-assumed but unescapable moral commitment to provide compensation to Philippine and American individuals and corporations who suffered property losses as a consequence of World War II action in the Philippines. This commitment was part and parcel of the epicmaking legislative acts passed by the 78th and 79th Congress which laid the foundation for and gave expression to Philippine independence. The Department of State recognizes this commitment. It has been acknowledged by President Kennedy who has repeated his wholehearted support for Philippine war damage legislation on several occasions. It is also strongly felt in the Philippines.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Chairman, I want to join with the strong bipartisan support that exists here in the House for enactment of H.R. 11721, the Philippine war damage bill. I believe this measure satisfies and closes out a longstanding obligation by this country to a loyal and stalwart ally in the cold war as well as in World War II. It will remove a serious impediment to our good relations with that essential friend in the Far East and serve our security far beyond the immediate funds involved.

I want to take a moment to restate the background and reason for this legislation.

In 1946, when the 79th Congress passed the Philippine Rehabilitation Act—as Public Law 370—it approved this legislation the same day it approved the Philippine Trade Act of 1946 as Public Law 371. While the Trade Act granted the United States a preferential position in the Philippines, the Philippine Rehabilitation Act authorized payment to the Philippines for war damage to public property and to private property owned by Philippine and American citizens and corporations.

As the Congress will recall, the Philippines, during the Bataan and Corregidor campaigns, in the period of Japanese occupation and at the time of liberation, had suffered tremendous physical destruction of property. Both the cities and the countryside had been laid waste. It was estimated that Cebu City, the second largest in the Philippines, was 90 percent destroyed. The sugar industry lay in ruins—in fact it took it 10 years to return to the level of prewar production. Then General Eisenhower, visiting Manila, described it as “the worst damaged city in the world with the possible exception of Warsaw.”

Operating under the authority of the Philippine Rehabilitation Act of 1946,

the U.S. Philippine War Damage Commission set about screening and approving claims and making rehabilitation payments from 1947 through early 1951. When the Commission went out of existence in the latter year, it had expended the funds provided by the Congress but had not met all private claims to the extent permitted under the Philippine Rehabilitation Act, that is, 75 percent of approved claims over \$500. All claims under \$500 were paid in full; claims over \$500 were paid to the extent of 52.5 percent of the approved amounts.

The \$73 million that would be authorized under H.R. 11721 represents the balance—22.5 percent—between the 52.5 percent already paid and the 75 percent authorized under the 1946 legislation.

It had been foreseen by the Congress that the appropriations made in 1946 might be inadequate to meet approved war damage claims. In the 1946 hearings, the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. Judd] asked that the record show that the sums then appropriated might be insufficient and that additional funds might be required. It was made evident that the Congress considered it had a moral obligation to assist the Filipinos, as they gained their independence, to rebuild the destruction of the war.

The present war damage bill—H.R. 11721—fulfills this longstanding commitment. It authorizes the Foreign Claims Settlement Commission to complete the payment on approved claims of individual Philippine and American citizens and corporations. It contains safeguards to prevent the filing of new claims, to prevent duplicate payments and to limit the legal fees which might be charged claimants for assistance in processing claims. It also requires that claimants receiving over ₱25,000—approximately \$6,200—prove that like amounts have been invested in the rehabilitation of the Philippines. The bill would, therefore, serve to strengthen the Philippine economy. The Philippines has been informed that with the passage of this bill, no further war claims will be considered.

The Filipinos feel deeply about this bill, and were stunned by the Congress rejection of an earlier version last May. They regard it as a moral commitment on the part of the United States. President Kennedy and the Department of State fully share this view. Passage of H.R. 11721 would honor this commitment and do much to clear the air in our relations with the Philippines.

The suggestion has been made by some that payment should be made to the Philippine Government rather than to private claimants. But the settlement now before this House is what Philippine officials seek. If the claims are not disposed of, as proposed in this bill, the claimants whose property was wrecked in the war will remain as sources of irritation to disturb relations between the two countries.

The last time this measure was debated here, some of the individual claimants under this bill were specifically referred to. I think it is worth emphasizing that all of these claims have been carefully and fully adjudicated and

found to be valid. The various claimants operated under Philippine law; and their property was destroyed or seriously damaged by the war. When both United States and Philippine law have been met, hope that this suffices for the purposes of discussion here.

The responsibility of the Congress in the field of foreign policy is sometimes a difficult and delicate task to carry out within the context of debate in which this branch of our Government finally reaches decisions. In the light of the Philippines longstanding importance to us and the background of the present legislation, I believe that support of this measure on behalf of our own national interest is eminently clear. The critical question, is whether the Philippine war damage bill is in our own national interest. I believe it most assuredly is and hope it will have the support of the Members of this House.

Mr. SCHADEBERG. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the bill, H.R. 11721, that support being based solely on the merits of the bill. I want to make it perfectly clear that my affirmative vote, as compared to my opposition to the previous bill, in no way is related to the decision of the President of the Philippines to delay his scheduled visit to the United States. I voted against this legislation the last time it was before the House for action. I want it clearly understood that I have changed my position and will vote for this measure because changes in the legislation give assurances that the money has been or will be invested in the Philippines to strengthen the economy.

I wish to reemphasize that my support of the bill is not linked in any way to the action of the President of the Philippines in his implied reprimand of the U.S. House of Representatives by the cancellation of his planned visit. It is unfortunate that he has chosen to indicate his displeasure at the manner in which this House handled the matter of the Philippine war damage claims issue. It certainly has made it difficult for some of us to change our vote, because we do not ever want the United States to be placed in the position of having its actions interpreted as reactions to threats by either friend or foe.

It is my hope that in his wisdom the President of the Philippines will allow enough time to expire between the signing of this bill and his visit to the United States to give evidence to the world that he does not consider this action by the Congress as meek submission to his demands.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, I am delighted that it now appears that we are, even at this late date, discharging our moral obligation to our friends the Filipinos who suffered so severely at a time when the altars of freedom were threatened throughout the world. During those cruel days our countrymen bled and died fighting for freedom beside the brave men of the Philippines.

The complete rehabilitation of the Philippines will take many years and a tremendous amount of money. The Filipinos are a proud people. They are devoted and dedicated to the cause of freedom. We gave them their independence,

and they have proven themselves worthy of this trust. They are sophisticated in the arts of good government, but most important of all they are our friends. Independence Day—July 4th—means a lot both to the people of America and to the people of the Philippines. But when the Philippines became independent, the Philippine people were striving to pull themselves up from the ashes and devastation of war by their own bootstraps. My fond hope is that no dark shadows will ever again be cast upon the friendship which today exists between the peoples of our two great nations.

Mr. RYAN of New York. Mr. Chairman, for the second time in the last 3 months I urge support for a bill to provide \$73 million in payment of the balance of the war damage awards due to the Philippines. On May 9, 1962, this body defeated H.R. 8617, a bill designed to achieve this purpose. Today we have an opportunity to correct this mistake by passing H.R. 11721. This is a bill which seeks to discharge a debt which the Filipinos have been waiting patiently to see repaid for over 10 years. They have in good faith gone ahead and reestablished their homes and shops and factories, and they have been counting on us to complete our promise to compensate them. Over half of the \$73 million to be authorized will go to some 86,000 individuals and organizations who will each receive less than \$25,000. These smaller claimants will be the major beneficiaries of the legislation. Those who receive payment under H.R. 11721 will not be new claimants, for the bill does not permit the opening of any new claims. Rather, they will be those who suffered property damage during the war, who have rebuilt that property, who had the legitimacy of their claims authenticated by the Philippine War Damage Commission during its period of operation between 1946 and 1951, and who have already received partial payment on their claims.

Mr. Chairman, we have been intimately involved in the affairs of the Philippines since 1898. Although it was a colonial possession up to 1946, no rancor divided our peoples; and we were in fact closely united by firm bonds of good will and mutual understanding. One evidence of these ties was our passage of the Tydings-McDuffie Act of 1934, which pledged us to give independence to the islands after 10 years.

When World War II began, we were unable to prevent the Japanese from invading the Philippines. But during the Japanese occupation of the islands, we wanted the Filipinos to know that we were with them in spirit. We therefore reaffirmed our promises of independence and also stated that we would aid in the rehabilitation of the economy in the postwar period. For example, on August 13, 1943, President Roosevelt asserted to the people of the Philippines:

You will soon be redeemed from the Japanese yoke and you will be assisted in the full repair of the ravages caused by the war.

The Filipinos resisted the Japanese because they loved their country and wanted it to be independent. They also wanted to be free to continue their mu-

tually agreeable relations with the United States.

The Filipinos fought bravely with Americans at Bataan and on Corregidor, retreated into the hills and tied down thousands of Japanese troops with their fierce guerrilla resistance. Then they welcomed the American-led liberation campaign, which laid waste to their cities and brought death and devastation to thousands.

The Philippines sustained enormous damages and loss of life in the war. The U.S. Congress was quick to send relief to the ravaged Filipino economy through the passage of the Philippine Rehabilitation Act of April 30, 1946. By this act we created the Philippine War Damage Commission and appropriated \$400 million to be used to help defray the cost of rebuilding property that had been lost during the war. The drafters of the 1946 bill had no way of knowing what the amount of just claims would be. The \$400 million figure was considered nothing more than a sum which would get the payment of the claims started. It was recognized that the Congress might have to appropriate additional funds.

The \$400 million was used first to pay all claims under \$500 and the first \$500 of larger claims. Once that had been taken care of, the rest of the funds were used to pay the larger claims on a pro rata basis. The intention of the bill had been to pay 75 percent of that part of each claim above the initial \$500. But the \$400 million only went far enough to pay 52.5 percent of the claims above \$500. Thus, a further authorization became necessary. The bill before us has only one purpose: that is to bring the level of payment up 22.5 percent, from 52.5 percent to the 75 percent promised under the 1946 legislation.

The 1946 bill required not only that the claimants show proof of having had property destroyed but also instructed the Philippine War Damage Commission to obtain proof that the claimants had already reinvested in the repair or reconstruction of their property a sum equal to that which they were to receive from the Commission. This insured that the money we paid out compensated claimants for real efforts they had made to rehabilitate the Philippine economy.

What is involved in this bill is the payment of sums which we promised to speed the redevelopment of the Philippines. These efforts were in large part successful. But this does not mean that we have no more obligation.

The reaction to the defeat of H.R. 8617 was immediate and highly critical. Prominent Americans were quick to deplore the House action. Newspaper opinion throughout the country was nearly unanimous in condemning it. And the vigorous and pro-American President of the Philippines, Diosdado Macapagal, had no alternative but to cancel his scheduled goodwill trip to the United States. The Foreign Minister and Vice President of the country, Emanuel Palaez, commented:

The United States treats her friends more shabbily than those who are not for her.

Mr. Chairman, our relations with the Philippines have been needlessly im-

paired and are in a state of suspension, depending in some measure on what we do here today. If we pass H.R. 11721, it is likely that our relations can be returned to firm footing. I strongly urge support for H.R. 11721.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

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 the Foreign Claims Settlement Commission (hereafter in this Act referred to as the "Commission") shall provide, out of funds appropriated pursuant to this Act, for the payment of the unpaid balance of awards heretofore made by the Philippine War Damage Commission under title I of the Philippine Rehabilitation Act of 1946. No payment shall be made under this Act to any person, or to his successors in interest, on account of any award unless payment was made on such award under the Philippine Rehabilitation Act of 1946, and the maximum amount paid under this Act, when added to amounts paid under the Philippine Rehabilitation Act of 1946 and section 7 of the War Claims Act of 1948 on account of any claim shall not exceed the aggregate amount of claims approved in favor of such claimant after reduction under the last proviso of section 102(a) of the Philippine Rehabilitation Act of 1946. All payments under this Act in amounts over 25,000 pesos or equivalent value in dollars shall be subject to the provisions of section 104(c) of the Philippine Rehabilitation Act of 1946.

Sec. 2. Within sixty days after the enactment of this Act, or of legislation appropriating for administration expenses incurred in carrying out this Act, whichever is later, the Commission shall prescribe and publish in the Federal Register and give appropriate publicity in the Republic of the Philippines concerning the period, not in excess of twelve additional months, within which application must be filed under this Act. The Commission shall complete its determination and take final action with respect to applications filed under this Act not later than one year after the last date on which applications may be filed.

Sec. 3. The Commission shall give maximum publicity in the Republic of the Philippines to the provisions of this Act, and through utilization of the records of the former Philippine War Damage Commission shall attempt to notify individual claimants of their right to file applications for payment under this Act, by mailing notice thereof to the last known address of such claimants as shown by such records.

Sec. 4. The Commission shall notify all applicants of the approval or denial of their applications and, if approved, shall notify such applicants of the amount for which such applications are approved. Any applicant whose application is denied, or is approved for less than the amount of such application, shall be entitled, under such regulations as the Commission may prescribe, to a hearing before the Commission or its representative with respect to such application. Upon such hearing, the Commission may affirm, modify, or reverse its former action with respect to such application, including a denial or reduction in the amount of award theretofore approved. All findings of the Commission concerning the persons to whom compensation pursuant to this Act is payable, and the amounts thereof, shall be conclusive and not be reviewable by any court.

Sec. 5. (a) Each award made under this Act shall be certified to the Secretary of the Treasury in terms of United States currency on the basis of the rate of exchange (that is, P/2 equals \$1) which was applied in the Philippine Rehabilitation Act of 1946, for payment out of sums appropriated pursuant to section 8 of this Act. Such payments shall be made in accordance with such regulations as the Secretary of the Treasury may prescribe. Payments authorized under this Act shall be made in United States dollars or in Philippine pesos at the option of the Secretary of the Treasury; however, notwithstanding the last sentence of the first section of this Act, payment shall not be made outside of the Republic of the Philippines to any claimant residing outside the Republic of the Philippines unless he establishes to the satisfaction of the Commission that since the date of the loss or damage on account of which the original award was made he has heretofore invested in such manner as furthered the rehabilitation or economic development of the Philippines an amount not less than the claims approved in his favor after reduction under the last proviso of section 102(a) of the Philippine Rehabilitation Act of 1946. After all approved claims have been paid up to the maximum permitted, the balance of the appropriation shall revert to the United States Treasury. Payment shall not be made under this Act on any claim filed under the Philippine Rehabilitation Act of 1946 or under this Act which was acquired from a predecessor in interest by purchase, except where such purchase was in the ordinary course of business in connection with the acquisition of all assets of a business firm.

(b) Such of the records of the Philippine War Damage Commission as the Foreign Claims Settlement Commission may deem necessary for carrying out its functions under this Act shall be transferred to the Foreign Claims Settlement Commission.

Sec. 6. The total remuneration on account of services rendered or to be rendered to or on behalf of any applicant in connection with any application filed under this Act shall not exceed 5 per centum of the amount paid by the Commission on account of such application. Any agreement to the contrary shall be unlawful and void. Whoever, subject to the jurisdiction of the United States, violates this section shall be fined not more than \$5,000 or imprisoned for not more than one year, or both. Where any payment is made in violation of this section, the Commission shall take such action as may be appropriate to recover the same.

Sec. 7. For the purposes of carrying out this Act, the following provisions of the International Claims Settlement Act of 1949 shall, to the extent not inconsistent with this Act, be applicable in the administration of this Act: Subsections (c), (d), (e), and (1) of section 4; subsections (d) and (e) of section 7; and subsection (c) of section 7 except that with respect to applicants not subject to the jurisdiction of the United States, references in such subsection (c) to the Comptroller General of the United States shall be deemed to refer to the Secretary of the Treasury.

Sec. 8. There is authorized to be appropriated not more than \$73,000,000 to make payments on awards certified pursuant to this Act, plus such additional sums as may be necessary for the administrative expenses of the Commission and of the Secretary of the Treasury in carrying out this Act.

Mr. ZABLOCKI (during the reading of the bill). Mr. Chairman, the Clerk has just read the new sections of the bill. The remainder of the bill is identical to the bill that was considered by the House on a previous occasion, and, therefore, I ask unanimous consent that the

bill be considered as read and open to amendment at any point.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. BARRY. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BARRY: On page 2, line 11, after "1946" strike the period and insert "Provided, That no payment in excess of \$50,000 shall be made under this Act to any one claimant."

Mr. BARRY. Mr. Chairman, I think it is obvious why I offer this amendment. This amendment would have the effect of lowering the cost by \$18,971,000. There are 154 claimants who would receive \$26,691,000. If you set the maximum at \$50,000 for each of these claims that would consume \$7,700,000, meaning a net saving of \$18,971,000. One can say, if this is a claim bill, why should we hit the people who have large claims—they have just as much right as someone who has a smaller claim? But, I submit to you, if you examine the report and the 1946 Rehabilitation Act, which is quoted on page 34 of the committee report before you, the bill is not a private claims measure to reimburse individuals or organizations for damage incurred in the war. The primary function is to assist and encourage rehabilitation and rebuilding of the economy and social structure of the Nation.

I would like to say one more thing in regard to the moral obligation that has been expounded here so prolifically this afternoon. The gentleman from Minnesota made his statement from the floor about an additional \$100 million, but the chairman of the Committee on Insular Affairs at that time during the debate, Chairman Bell, of Missouri, said:

My view is that this is purely a bill to rehabilitate the economic situation in the Philippines, and I consistently refuse to support any of the amendments which are proposed which look to the rehabilitation of the individual except where their rehabilitation was purely incidental to the rehabilitation of the economy of the islands.

I do not believe that my amendment will in any measure defeat the original purpose for which this bill was enacted and it is a substantial saving. It would just by fiat knock out many of the objections that have been raised before.

I have before me a local Philippine paper, the Philippine Bulletin of May 16, 1962. It goes on to recite names of those who would benefit by this bill. Here is one for 333,000 pesos. Divide that by 4 to get the amount in dollars. The Philippine-American Drug Co., 332,000 pesos; a gold mining company, 440,000 pesos. Listen to this one, Bengue Consolidated Mining Co., 2,248,000 pesos. This list is two columns long and each name is set down for large amounts.

I submit that this is a chance to keep faith with the original intent of the bill and at the same time not hurt the people who really suffered the most in the Philippine economy by hurting those who had claims for less than \$50,000—and even these people here listed would get \$50,000.

Mr. Chairman, I will take no more time on this amendment because I have a couple of others I wish to offer.

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, there are two reasons that should be stated here why the amendment should be defeated. First, the amendment is not germane to this bill. The bill we are now dealing with does not provide economic assistance to the Philippines; it is, rather, a bill to pay adjudicated claims. This is a matter that should have been proposed to the committee when it considered the Foreign Assistance Act.

Secondly, what the amendment does is to call for a complete readjudication of claims already determined, because the ceiling level suggested in the amendment would in effect say the claim was valid but not valid in its entirety. This amendment would call for a complete readjudication of claims that have already been adjudicated. I, therefore, urge that the amendment be voted down.

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

Mr. Chairman, I am opposed to this bill just as much now as I was when it came up for consideration and was defeated in the House in May of this year.

Where is it proposed to get the \$73 million? The U.S. Treasury is busted, and borrowing billions of dollars. Moreover, there is neither a legal nor a moral obligation to pay this money.

The gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. Judd] talks about devaluation of the peso; how about the 55 percent devaluation of the U.S. dollar? Who is going to come to our rescue when the dollar is further devalued and becomes worthless?

The gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. Judd] also referred to the billions of American dollars that have been spewed out all over the world as justification for lading out \$73 million that we do not owe these people.

I wonder who has been in the forefront of dishing out \$100 billion in so-called foreign aid through the years if it has not been the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. Judd]?

I do not like this bill for another reason. The President of the Philippines in the Manila Bulletin of May 19, 1962, gives us one more chance. The headline says "One More Chance—D.M. [Macapagal] Would Visit United States if Claims Were Approved."

Then there is the following:

President Macapagal said yesterday he would go ahead with his state visit to the United States if the new \$73 million Philippine war damage bill were passed by the U.S. Congress before its adjournment this year.

This is gun-to-the-head, blackmail tactics. I do not know whether he still proposes to come to the United States before this Congress adjourns if this bill is approved, but I promise you, that if he comes under the circumstances set forth in this newspaper story, I for one will not be present on the House floor for I do not yield to blackmail. I suppose that if he does come, the Army, Marine, or the Air Force Band, perhaps

all three, will be turned out to welcome him with that old tune entitled "Sentimental Journey."

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

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

Mr. HALEY. If it takes \$73 million to get the President of the Philippines over here to pay us a visit, probably that is one of the cheapest visits we have had. I notice that prior to these other give-away programs that the people we have brought in who are going to be on the receiving have cost us billions of dollars. So I think probably we are getting off cheap at \$73 million.

Mr. GROSS. I will say to my good friend from Florida that I find nothing cheap about \$73 million that we do not owe as in this case.

Mr. HALEY. I did not say it was cheap. I think it is a very high price, but I call the gentleman's attention to the fact this would be one of the cheapest visits we have had so far. I am opposed to all of them. Let them stay home. I do not want to see them.

Mr. GROSS. I heartily agree with the gentleman from Florida in that statement.

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

Mr. Chairman, I was among those who on May 9 voted against the original version of this bill. In so doing, I stated at the time that the original bill could have been improved and the money which was to be given to the recipients of these funds could have been more wisely spent for the assistance of the Philippine people and improvement of their economy.

An editorial which appears on page 9 of the committee report on the revised bill which we are considering here today and which I quote here, an editorial from the Washington Daily News of May 16, 1962, states:

It is quick good news that "more than a score" of the Congressmen who voted against the Philippines war damage claims bill, in an unfortunate moment last week, have now changed their minds.

This is the reassurance from Representative CLEMENT ZABLOCKI, Democrat, of Wisconsin, who sponsored the measure. Representative ZABLOCKI is chairman of the House Foreign Affairs Committee's Subcommittee on the Far East.

These erstwhile opponents of the bill—which would have settled \$73 million worth of American I O U's long outstanding to the Filipinos—now regret their action, they told Representative ZABLOCKI.

I want the record to show that I certainly am not one of those referred to in the editorial as regretting his action.

I have no regret about the manner in which I cast my vote on May 9. In voting against the original proposal on May 9, I honestly, sincerely, and firmly believed the \$73 million could be better spent in the Philippines. This editorial states better than anything I might say today perhaps why I have changed my position and am today supporting the revised proposal to pay our debt to the Philippines.

The editorial states:

The newly introduced House bill incidentally carries an amendment requiring all payments in excess of 25,000 pesos (about \$6,500) be reinvested for economic rehabilitation of the Philippines. This should dispose of any misgivings that some of the larger firms with sizable claims were getting an inexcusable "handout." And it still benefits the thousands of small claimants concerned who have waited so long for the United States to make good on its word.

Not the slightest justification now remains for opposing this legislation—so let's get on with it.

Mr. Chairman, I agree with this last statement in the Washington Daily News editorial. The point that I want to make here is this: I certainly would not want anyone to get the impression from this editorial that when I cast my vote in opposition to the bill on May 9, that I had regretted my action or had some misunderstanding about what was provided in the proposal. On the contrary, I knew what I was doing then and I know what I am doing now. I opposed the legislation on May 9 because in its original form, this legislation would have provided a windfall of \$73 million to a relatively small group of Philippine companies with absolutely no requirement that the money must be used to help the people and the economy of one of our best wartime allies. I now support it in its revised form because I sincerely believe that this \$73 million is going to help the people of the Philippines, and that is the intent of this legislation in the first and last instance. It is sheer nonsense to suggest, as many editorial writers did when we defeated the original proposal on May 9, that this constituted a repudiation of our traditional friendship for the people of the Philippines. No one in this Congress questions the great debt of gratitude we all owe these fine people for their heroic assistance in World War II under the most difficult conditions. The thousands of American soldiers who served in the Philippines can attest to this. But the fact remains that there was no assurance in the original proposal that the people of the Philippines would benefit from the war-damage payments. The revised proposal before us today does indeed spell out such an assurance and for this reason I am happy to support the bill today. This bill now clearly provides that these American payments for war damages must be reinvested in the Philippines. This provision, therefore, means the people of this brave nation will receive maximum benefits from this legislation.

I believe the committee has today presented us with a much better bill; a bill which I believe will strengthen the economy of the Philippines and in this way, strengthen the fibers of freedom and democracy in this Pacific nation.

I urge approval of the revised bill before us today.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. BARRY].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. BARRY) there were—ayes 13, noes 80.

So the amendment was rejected.

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

Mr. Chairman, I believe it was Robert Benchley who said that when he felt the urge to exercise he just laid down until the urge passed.

As Members may possibly have observed I am not prone to take the floor on every occasion afforded. When I feel the urge to drop a few words of wisdom I usually try to get away until the urge has passed.

In all probability my good friend, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. ZABLOCKI], has an idea that I am never for anything. But I am supporting this measure, and wholeheartedly. I think it is tremendously important we pass this bill. It seems to me the details become rather academic at this point. I do not think anyone can accuse me of throwing the taxpayers' dollars around loosely. But I just do not think we can afford now to reject this proposition.

The obligation or the understanding—moral or otherwise—is something that perhaps we can rationalize among ourselves. But the reaction of the Philippine people and President Macapagal to our recent action, of which I was a part, incidentally should not have surprised us. It was a natural thing. Permit me to say to my colleagues who supported the foreign aid bill recently passed by this House, if they can support handing out aid to India, to Yugoslavia and to many other nations around the world whose friendships are very doubtful, it seems to me that this by comparison is modest but important. We can depend on these friends in the Philippines. They have stood with us and proved a loyalty unlike many to whom millions, yes, billions has been given without assurances or obligation of any kind. They have not threatened to go Communist. This blackmail club has been hanging over our heads and continues to hang over our heads every day. We yield to it and all nations of the world are well aware of it.

Why, this sum of \$73 million compared to the \$4.6 billion foreign aid bill recently voted is no comparison at all. There is not a one of us here who could tell anyone else exactly what these billions are for and how they are to be spent. Oh yes, there are pages and pages of explanations but real answers are not there and never will be until about three-fourths of it is cut out.

In this debate perhaps the fact we can have an understanding of the meaning of \$73 million but little comprehension of sums in the billions. Time after time I have observed here that seemingly it is less difficult to pass measures involving millions and billions than those totaling thousands or hundred of thousands.

I hope Mr. Chairman that when the Foreign Aid Appropriation bill reaches this floor the mood and judgment of this House is to drastically reduce it or support the reductions already recommended by the committee. Then I hope that next year those of us who may be here will resolve now and give notice to executive branch that this foreign spending is going to be cut far below what it is

now and has been for many years. I so pledge my best efforts and hope for more success than we have had in the past. Certainly I am not one who believes we can afford the smugness and comfort of isolation from the rest of the world. I would like to support foreign aid but the scope and philosophy of these efforts, now and in the past dozen years or so, are wholly unjustified and unreasonable.

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

Mr. BURLESON. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. That is why some of us would like to see the authorizing foreign aid bill that comes out of the Foreign Affairs Committee, of which committee the gentleman is a member, come out with few line items in it so that we may know what we are voting on; and we cannot find out.

Mr. BURLESON. I agree with the gentleman fully. That has been my contention in the committee and elsewhere for many years. I shall not argue the point with the gentleman at all. But now we are talking about an obligation to the Philippine people. I again use the word "obligation." It was their understanding and I think we may assume it was the understanding of most of the American people that we carry out our word. It is entirely possible the Congress was too liberal in this matter in 1946 and subsequently. Nevertheless the obligation was created and honor is involved.

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

Mr. BURLESON. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. CHIPERFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I am in accord with the views the gentleman from Texas has just stated. I voted against this bill the last time. I am going to support the bill today in its present form.

Mr. BURLESON. I thank the gentleman.

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

Mr. BURLESON. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Chairman, I should like to commend the gentleman for a very fine statement that puts this matter in its proper perspective. Whatever any individual's reactions may be about imprudent statements that may have been made by some spokesman for the people, the important thing to remember is that the Philippine people are a brave people, a proud people, a sensitive people; and perhaps the best friends that the United States of America has in the Pacific today. I think that they, as a people, are entitled to have this obligation honored and honored fully by the United States of America.

Mr. BURLESON. I thank the gentleman for that statement. It should be added that there were many moderate voices in the Philippines. A number of responsible officials, although expressing disappointment to some degree, also expressed understanding. They spoke of friendship, loyalty, and support of

mutual interests in that vast Pacific area. And this is the fundamental issue. The Philippines is our anchor in that part of the world. Some other nations nearby are costing us billions of dollars and they are anchors too but the anchor, in my humble opinion, is around the neck of the American taxpayer. This is true in many places around this uneasy world.

Mr. Chairman, I repeat, that as opposed as I have been to these dubious efforts of influencing friendships with dollars, it is my belief we must honor this commitment to people who have proved to be our friends.

Mr. BARRY. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BARRY: On page 5, line 11, after the word "exceed" strike out the numeral "5" and insert in lieu thereof the numeral "2".

Mr. BARRY. Mr. Chairman, this will cut down the expense of processing the getting of funds by any of these claimants, from 5 to 2 percent. The reason is this. On the settlement sheet which was presumably given to the claimant when he got his last check, it said, "amount to be paid," and the dollar amount was named there. In view of that, there should not be any spadework necessary, the processing of papers, the proving of claims, and so forth. Therefore, a greater benefit will accrue to the people of the Philippine Islands, and the ultimate beneficiaries if we limit the amount that could be taken away from them by some kind of an operation under which they may assign over their claims to someone else to pick up the money. It is too simple a procedure, if you are a claimant under the old bill, to send in your name, your claim number, and get your 22½ percent. I do not think we should have a 5-percent limitation for someone to take from the people of the Philippine Islands, to perform this act. The work has been done to process the claim, and presumably paid for. So I submit this amendment is to make certain that the people of the Philippine Islands, who we intend shall get this money, actually get it.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment. It so happens that the limitation of 5 percent was on my motion when the bill reached our full committee. That I believe is the limitation on services in connection with pension matters. While I am a lawyer and am familiar with the facts that justify contingent fees of 25 percent and higher, I do not believe the service percentage in prosecuting claims that are paid from the Federal Treasury should be in excess of the 5 percent. In the case of small claims, where there is much work involved and the amount recovered very small, it may bring a return unprofitably to the lawyer. But in claims running into big figures anything in excess of 5 percent would bring a payment in dollars and cents for legal services that would be hard to defend. If I recall correctly, in some Indian claims legal fees have run as high as \$1 million. Such is hard for the American people, to whom a million dollars is still a lot of

money, to digest as palatable food. This bill is clean as a whistle as far as legal windfalls are concerned because of the 5-percent limitation voted unanimously by our committee. It is possible that this is a factor with a few persons in the Philippines who are in disagreement with the great majority of the Philippine people and are condemning this bill. It well may be that in some instances the motivation may be a dislike of the 5-percent limitation.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York.

The amendment was rejected.

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

Mr. Chairman, I rather vigorously opposed this legislation when it was before the House before. It was an unfortunate reaction in the Philippines. There has been a lot of talk here about misunderstanding in the House of Representatives. I do not believe there was as much misunderstanding here as there was in the Philippines.

I opposed it at that time because the old piece of legislation, which we defeated, exempted the payments under the act from the provisions of section 104(c) of the Philippines Rehabilitation Act of 1946. This exemption has now been removed. Anyone who gets a substantial payment under this act must now show either that he used the money in the rehabilitation of the Philippines or that he will use it for that purpose. That is why I opposed the bill before, because without that it could be windfall legislation, it could have been that some big claimant had used the money which he had gotten before, which he had to show that he did use it for that purpose, but the remainder, running in some instances into the millions of pesos, he could have gotten and done whatever he wanted to with it. Now he is required to bring out his books and show that he expended the amount he did get and will expend this amount in rehabilitation. Because that provision is in there I can find it possible, as I told the Speaker a few days after the other bill was defeated, that I would have supported it if this language had been in the previous bill.

There has been a lot of talk about our courageous allies in the Philippines, and I subscribe to it. There has been a lot of talk that whatever we did here we would not alienate the friends we had in the Philippines. I do not know whether they were alienated or not. In my judgment, the President of the Philippines did not show himself to be a very steadfast friend of ours when we turned him down, not because we have anything against the Filipinos, but I think a majority of the votes was because a lot of people were afraid it could be windfall legislation, and it could have been without this language in it.

I understand if this bill passes the President of the Philippines will come to the United States and reschedule his visit. I suppose that will prove he is a courageous man, especially if he has courage in the face of what he said and did about it when he comes to ask for more money, which I am sure he will.

I am not mincing words about it, and I do not think we should mince words. I think he acted in a manner which makes it very difficult for any of the 201 of us who voted against this bill—not because we were against the Philippines but because we are against windfall legislation. I say again, as I said earlier in the debate, if this bill passes this afternoon—and I am going to vote for it and I predict it will pass—it will pass in spite of the action of the President of the Philippines.

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

Mr. Chairman, I voted against this legislation on the last occasion, and with mixed feelings I intend to vote against it this time. I would like to address two remarks to the House and to the American people.

If the President of the Philippines felt that a threat or a tantrum was the way to get this thing passed, there is nobody to blame for it but the Congress and the American people themselves. We have succumbed to these tactics from our enemies. I do not happen to approve of them when they come from our friends. But let the responsibility be clearly understood as lying at our own door and we are still yielding to these tactics in inexcusable fashion with respect to enemies of the United States.

I offer one other bit of generalization for the reflection of this House, that it is folly in one nation to expect disinterested favors from another nation. I did not say that—President George Washington said it.

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

Mr. BARRY. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BARRY: Strike all after the enacting clause and insert in lieu thereof the following: "That there is hereby authorized to be paid by the Government of the United States to the Government of the Republic of the Philippines a sum not to exceed \$73,000,000 in full satisfaction and final settlement of all awards for war damage compensation made by the Philippine War Damage Commission under the terms of title I of the Philippine Rehabilitation Act of 1946 (60 Stat. 128). The payment provided for under the preceding sentence shall be considered in all respects a development grant under title II of chapter 2 of the Act for International Development of 1961, and shall be administered in the same manner as other assistance furnished under that title.

"Sec. 2. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to carry out the first section of this Act, the amount of \$73,000,000."

Mr. BARRY (during the reading of the amendment). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the further reading of the amendment be dispensed with, and I will, of course, explain the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. BARRY. Mr. Chairman, the amendment I have offered here follows generally along the line of the proposal of the Eisenhower administration in 1960 to settle this problem. I will read

to you from Secretary of the Treasury Anderson's letter of June 14, 1960:

The Treasury Department strongly prefers S. 3238 [which is Senator FULBRIGHT'S bill], the bill recommended to the Congress by the executive branch. This would authorize a payment of not to exceed \$73 million to the Republic of the Philippines in full satisfaction and final settlement of all awards made under the earlier legislation.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to say my bill differs slightly from that because my bill puts it under the AID agency to be dispensed under the rules of our grant-aid program and our Foreign Assistance Act. There is a great deal of support for this in the Philippines. I can tell you that the Manila Times has called the initial defeat of the original bill a blessing in disguise. I quote from the Manila Times directly as follows:

The initial defeat may be a blessing in disguise.

They say further:

This would confirm the belief, which has been little appreciated here up to now, that many of those who rejected the first bill did so not because of lack of sympathy toward the Filipino people. On the contrary, it now appears, they wished to assure that it was the country as a whole and not just a few large claimants who would benefit from the payments.

Not only is the Manila Times interested in the passage of the legislation, as I have presented it to you now, but here is a member of the Philippine Congress, and you may all have heard from him as well:

Under the bill [the claim bill] without my amendment in this case, Zuleta, who is the Governor of Iloilo, will receive 69,000 pesos.

And he represents, as they say in this letter—this member of the Philippine Congress represents the sugar interests who are wallowing in wealth.

I believe, however, that the legion of sugar barons who have private claims, like former Speaker José Yulo, in the amount of 68,318 pesos; Senator Ledesma, 85,316 pesos, and former Secretary Alfredo Montelibano, 57,130 pesos—

And he lists five others—

are willing to see their claims go to the Filipino people instead of being given to the millionaires of the sugar bloc.

I cite this to you to show that there is real sentiment in the House of Representatives and the Senate of the Philippines for the amendment that I am suggesting to you now.

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

Mr. BARRY. I yield.

Mr. GROSS. Are the brewery and the racetracks still claimants under this bill?

Mr. BARRY. I am obliged to say that they are. I would like to get some of these stricken out, but I will say this in regard to one large claimant with whom my family has had a direct connection going back for 50 years, that this concern is not willing to accept this money. They are going to turn it over to some project in the Philippine Islands, because they are embarrassed to receive it. This is a fact. I am not naming the corporation, but I assure you it is one

with which a member of my family has been identified for many years.

Mr. GALLAGHER. If the claim has been adjudicated they could still refuse to accept it.

Mr. BARRY. I agreed not to take my 15 minutes during general debate and to explain this amendment at this time will be impossible if I yield for too many questions during the 5 minutes allotted me now.

I have a letter from a man who is the technical adviser to the Office of the President, President Garcia. He says:

The defeat of the bill, however, is a blessing in disguise.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. BARRY was allowed to proceed for 5 additional minutes.)

Mr. BARRY. What does he say we should spend this money for? He says we should spend this money for the rehabilitation of the most mosquito-infested city of Manila.

Two, the completion of the construction of the capitol building.

Three, the reconstruction of the municipal buildings, which are hardly fit for human habitation.

Four, the reconstruction of public schools which are not sufficient to keep up with the rising birth rate, and

Five—and this is the most important—completing the construction of low-cost housing projects to accommodate the low-salaried employees and fight the squalor problem.

To think they have a squalor problem in the Philippine after we have poured \$1,675 million into the islands. They could well use this \$75 million to fight the squalor problem.

This is a direct challenge to our aid program. It should be a challenge for us to see that there is no squalor problem in the Philippines, and my bill would go a long way, as this Member of Congress says, and I read:

The passage of your amendment would eliminate murder, kidnaping, robbery, which are mainly caused by the extreme poverty in the squalor section of the capital of the Philippine Islands.

And here is a letter from the chairman of the board of the Methodist Church:

By giving the \$73 million to our Government at its own disposal there is serious doubt such fund would actually benefit those who need it most.

And that is why my bill calls for the \$73 million to be dispensed under the AID Agency which would insure that the money would go for the benefit of all the people of the Philippines.

I have a letter from a management consultant firm in New York City, signed by Bernard Gladieux, who spent a year and a half as technical adviser on the Philippines on behalf of the U.S. Government on fiscal policy.

He says:

I believe you are wholly right in insisting that these war claim funds be so allocated as to help advance the Philippine economy rather than simply become another windfall to the few. I hope your amendment is accepted by both the House and Senate.

I would like to quote from a letter from the leading lawyer in the Philippine Islands. This man himself sits on the board of directors of companies or personally has claims valued at 80 million pesos or \$20 million. He deplors the passage of this bill in its present form. He gives a long legalistic letter which I cannot possibly read to you now.

Let me give you a few objections beyond the objections that have been named so far.

Many individual claimants are dead. Many of the estates are closed and their heirs have scattered. Many are no longer in the Philippines and their address is unknown. Many corporations, partnerships, and associations are dissolved, liquidated, wound up. The corporate existence has expired by operation of the law.

I would like to conclude by saying that in my research on this bill there is no moral obligation whatsoever, arising out of the debate in 1946, for us to make the payment now. However, in the course of my search for facts I have located a communique between our State Department and the Philippine Government dated August 5, 1959. I will not read it all.

With respect to Philippine claims for additional war damage compensation under the Philippine War Damage Act, the executive branch of the U.S. Government will at the next regular session of the Congress, and in connection with the legislative program for the fiscal year 1961, request appropriate legislation enabling settlement of this matter on the basis of \$73 million, which amount reflects the statutory maximum of unpaid private claims according to the report of the War Damage Claims Commission for settlement directly with the Philippine Government and the U.S. Government will consider itself completely divested of all responsibility for the payment of individual private claims.

I quote this in conclusion because there is no doubt that there is a moral obligation of the administration to press for this legislation by virtue of the communique handed to the Philippine Government by the Executive. But there is no moral obligation under our constitutional system for us in Congress to be bound by the Executive of one administration or of any administration who will go out and say, we will give away the taxpayers' money.

That is our constitutional responsibility as a Congress.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. BARRY].

Mr. Chairman, I merely rise to point out that the gentleman's proposal was thoroughly considered by the subcommittee of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, by the full Committee on Foreign Affairs and by the House of Representatives the last time this legislation was considered.

It was rejected emphatically on each of the those occasions.

Mr. Chairman, I am sure we fully understand what the gentleman from New York intends to do. But this is not the aid program. If the gentleman wants to increase the amount of economic aid to the Philippines, he should do that

within the framework of the Foreign Assistance Act.

There is one more point I want to address myself to: the question that has been raised about the administration's stand on this issue—whether we should pay the claimants or give a lump-sum payment to the Philippine Government.

That question has been answered fully and clearly in a letter signed by Secretary of State Dean Rusk, and addressed to the Speaker of the House. I want to read that letter into the RECORD:

AUGUST 1, 1962.

HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: I am gratified that the House of Representatives is today to act on the Philippine war damage bill (H.R. 11721) introduced by Mr. ZABLOCKI.

The Department of State strongly supports this bill for several reasons:

1. The Department considers that the United States, under the language and intent of the Philippine Rehabilitation Act of 1946 (Public Law 370) and by the intention of Congress as indicated in the hearings on Public Law 370, has a self-assumed, moral commitment to the Philippines to complete payment on Philippine war damages to the extent authorized in the original legislation.

2. H.R. 11721 follows closely the method of payment prescribed by the original legislation, that is, payment directly to the individual claimants; it provides safeguards to assure that the claimants will receive compensation in accordance with the determination of the U.S. War Damage Commission; it eliminates the possibility of duplicate payments, and thus promises to return a substantial sum to the U.S. Treasury.

3. Passage of H.R. 11721 will redeem our pledges to the Philippines and thus remove a major source of misunderstanding in our relations with a courageous nation with which we have had a long and uniquely close association.

The Department recommends the 87th Congress, in the spirit of those earlier Congresses meeting in the darkest days of World War II, recall the heroism and sacrifices of the Philippines in our common cause, and give favorable consideration to this bill.

Sincerely yours,

DEAN RUSK.

Mr. Chairman, I ask for the defeat of the amendment proposed by the gentleman from New York.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. BARRY].

The amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. HULL, 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. 11721) to authorize the payment of the balance of awards for war damage compensation made by the Philippine War Damage Commission under the terms of the Philippine Rehabilitation Act of April 30, 1946, and to authorize the appropriation of \$73 million for that purpose, pursuant to House Resolution 738, he reported the bill back to the House.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. GROSS) there were—ayes 194, noes 35.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were refused.

So the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. WALLHAUSER. Mr. Speaker, I voted in favor of H.R. 11721 and I am pleased that the House passed this bill that would discharge a moral obligation under the terms of the Philippine Rehabilitation Act of April 30, 1946.

The previous legislation, H.R. 8617, could well have provided an unjustified windfall and might not have accomplished the purpose for which it was intended.

H.R. 11721, on the other hand, overcomes this objection and requires that the beneficiaries must give proof that they already have or intend to use it in the rehabilitation of the Philippines. This is the heart of the problem.

We are fortunate to have the friendship of the people of the Philippines, who supported us so valiantly in the recent world conflict and this action on the part of the House will convey to them, in some small measure, our feeling of friendship and an example of our adherence to right moral principles.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days to extend their remarks on the bill H.R. 11721.

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

There was no objection.

FURTHER MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

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

H. Con. Res. 506. Concurrent resolution to correct an error in the enrollment of H.R. 10786, the so-called Work Hours Act of 1962.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 10526) entitled "An act making appropriations for the Treasury and Post Office Departments, the Executive Office of the President, and certain independent agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1963, and for other purposes."

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 10802) entitled "An act making appropriations for the Department of the In-

terior and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1963, and for other purposes."

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the amendment of the House to Senate amendment numbered 9 to the above-entitled bill.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 11289) entitled "An act making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1963, and for other purposes."

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the amendment of the House to Senate amendments numbered 1 and 30 to the above entitled bill.

PROGRAM FOR THE BALANCE OF THIS WEEK

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, I ask for this time in order to inquire of the majority leader concerning the program for the balance of the week.

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

Mr. ARENDS. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. ALBERT. The only legislative business left for the balance of the week of which I have any knowledge at this time are some privileged resolutions from the Committee on House Administration. Tomorrow we expect to announce the program for next week and to ask to adjourn over until Monday.

Mr. ARENDS. I thank the gentleman from Oklahoma.

CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include an editorial.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, the ceremonies attending Captive Nations Week, as proclaimed by the President of the United States and by the mayor of the city of Buffalo, N.Y., were concluded in our city with an appropriate program on Sunday, July 22, 1962.

Our observance was hailed by both the National Committee To Observe Captive Nations Week and the Assembly of Captive European Nations as being one of the most outstanding and effective throughout the country. The events of the week received wide coverage and publicity through our two daily newspapers, and our local radio and television stations.

The evening program, which was held in Buffalo's beautiful Delaware Park at the Albright Knox Art Gallery, com-

menced with a rendition of "The Star-Spangled Banner."

The Honorable Chester Kowal, mayor of Buffalo, delivered the principal address, which follows:

BUFFALO: CITY OF UNIFIED NEIGHBORS

Mr. Chairman, reverend members of the clergy, officers and members of all the organizations which have worked so hard to make our third annual observance of Captive Nations Week such a grand success, candidates for the crown of Miss Captive Nations, ladies and gentlemen, my fellow Americans, this festival of nations, which it is my privilege to open, will bring to a close our week-long program of events through which the people of our city have registered their concern for and unity with all the people held captive behind the imperial Russian Curtain. With the opening of our observance 1 week ago today, the flags of nine captive nations were mounted at McKinley Monument. There they have flown every day of the week, side by side with the Stars and Stripes, as a moving symbol of the unifying force of freedom—and as a herald of our conviction that the spirit of national independence will triumph over imperial communism. As free people we are committed to that objective. As free people we will do what must be done to win that objective. That is our destiny as a free people and we shall not fail to keep that happy appointment with the future.

Every generation of Americans has been called to rally to the cause of liberty—our most precious heritage. The despoilers of liberty, like the darkness of night, rear their heads in every generation—to challenge man's God-given right to be free. That experience underscores the nature of liberty and reminds us that only those who are prepared to sacrifice for, to fight for, and, if need be, to die for their liberties are able to long enjoy their blessings. This generation of Americans finds no exception to that harsh lesson of history. The challenge we face today pits the forces of human freedom against the forces of organized tyranny in a struggle that allows no escape, no quarter, no weakness, no compromise.

Imperial Russian communism has declared total war against the United States and every other nation on the face of the earth. The leader of this conspiracy has publicly declared that he will "bury us." By this he means to destroy everything that gives life and meaning to our American way of life. He means to replace our free way of life with a system of despotism that feeds on terror and human corruption. That is exactly what the Communists are trying to do in all the captive non-Russian nations—bury them in a sea of despotism.

The cold war in which we are engaged is the twilight zone of the burial conflict. It denies all the traditions of classical warfare. Military power stands at the rear of tactical thrusts by political, economic, diplomatic, and propaganda cadres—all calculated to divide us, to confuse us, to weaken us, to demoralize us, to frighten us, and finally to bury us. It is in this twilight zone that the decision will be made as to which of the two contending forces gets buried—human freedom or imperial Russian communism. That is the nature of the war declared against us.

The question before every American is, What can we do to win this cold war and avoid a hot war?

Our distinguished speaker at the civic luncheon on Wednesday past, the Honorable WILLIAM W. SCRANTON, Congressman from the 10th District of Pennsylvania, offered this wise advice. I quote, "Khrushchev boasts that he will bury us. Every bit of strength we give to the captive nations is a spade of dirt to bury him." We agree with this timely observation. We too believe that the strongest deterrent to a hot war and

the best hope for a just and lasting peace arises from the aspirations for freedom and national independence held by the people in all the captive nations.

There are many ways we can strengthen the role of the freedom-loving people in the captive nations. The week-long observance held in Buffalo, through which we give evidence of our unity with them, is but one way. We must keep this spirit alive for the remaining 51 weeks of the year.

The Congress should establish a special Committee on Captive Nations, as called for in pending House Resolution 211. Such a committee would provide undeniable evidence that our concern for the people in the captive nations is a year-round obligation.

We need a Presidential task force on self-determination, made up of public spirited citizens who are dedicated to the principles of self-government and the independence of nations, large and small. The only lasting peace we can hope for is one that derives its consent from the peoples concerned. This consent by the people cannot be expressed unless they are self-governing. Self-determination, therefore, is a primary condition among the nations of the world before we can have peace worthy of the name. I urge President Kennedy to appoint such a task force on self-determination at the earliest possible date.

We must learn to make better use of the United Nations, to expose the truth about imperial Russian communism and to espouse the right of all people to self-government. The United Nations is a political forum, no more and no less, and it is time we began to use it to promote the ideals of human freedom.

Our Government should adopt a policy of "Russia for the Russians," just as it has adopted a policy of "Africa for the Africans." In plain English, we should back the slogan of "Ruskies Go Home," which enjoys universal popularity in all the captive nations. Such a policy would assure our proven allies behind the Russian curtain that we had fully awakened to the challenge of the cold war.

In closing I want to thank the members of the Citizens Committee To Observe Captive Nations Week for their outstanding work. A word of special thanks is due the Kiwanis Club for a great civic luncheon. The press, television, and radio have all been most helpful in promoting this worthy cause. Buffalo can take justifiable pride in being the leader in this great movement. What we have done together this week demonstrates that we are the city of good neighbors—yes, we are the city of unified neighbors in freedom's cause. Thank you.

Miss Olha Shepelavey was crowned as Miss Captive Nations of Buffalo for 1962. A Ukrainian by birth, she was nominated by organizations of that ethnic segment in our community to compete in a field of seven candidates for the title who represented the following captive nations: Croatia, Estonia, Latvia, Lithuania, Macedonia, Poland, and Ukraine.

Miss Zdenka J. Gredel, the Miss Croatia entry, and Miss Sarmite Jurberts, Miss Latvia, were designated runners-up.

The Buffalo Civic Orchestra, led by the renowned conductor and violin concertmaster, Jan Pawel Wolanek, provided selective music entitled "Concert of Nations."

On July 15, it was my privilege to deliver the keynote address at the opening of the Captive Nations Week observance in our city. As one who knows of the plight of the people living in satellite countries, it is my every hope that House Resolution 211 will be speedily adopted by Congress so that these people and

the world will be made aware of our deep concern for them—not only this week but every week of the year.

Mr. Speaker, during the third annual Captive Nations Week observance in Buffalo, N.Y., my colleague, the gentleman from Pennsylvania, the Honorable WILLIAM W. SCRANTON, was the recipient of the third annual Freedoms Award. Upon the invitation of the Buffalo Kiwanis Club, the gentleman from Pennsylvania, Congressman SCRANTON, addressed the July 18 luncheon meeting, and urged the creation of a Special House Committee on Captive Nations. He said that such an agency is a "strong arm which is not being used in the ideological war against communism."

The gentleman from Pennsylvania, Congressman SCRANTON, a charter member of the National Captive Nations Committee, said Americans are not doing nearly enough to combat Russian propaganda.

He continued:

I wonder if you appreciate what a powerful weapon Captive Nations Week puts in the hands of free mankind. Each year the observances have grown in strength and impact.

Speeches made here and in many other parts of the United States and statements made in Congress all remind Americans that millions of people, once free, are now under the domination of the international Communist conspiracy.

Freedom does not exist in a vacuum and our own liberties remain in jeopardy when people elsewhere are deprived of their right to choose their own governments, are prevented from worshiping in the churches and temples of their choice, are forbidden even to choose what kind of work they will do.

But our words carry far beyond our shores. They reach people in Poland, Hungary, Lithuania, Ukraine, Czechoslovakia, Latvia, Estonia, White Ruthenia, Bulgaria, mainland China, and other subjugated nations. We assure them that we know of their plight and are awaiting the day when they shall rejoin the family of free nations.

The gentleman from Pennsylvania, Congressman SCRANTON, in a second recommendation, asked that the United States reaffirm its opposition to the admission of Red China to the United Nations. He also urged that the Voice of America expand its broadcasts to the non-Russian peoples inside the Soviet Union.

The gentleman from Pennsylvania said:

We must have, absolutely, a firm policy in resisting every pressure they [the Communists] undertake. Mr. Khrushchev said he will bury us. Every aid we give the people of the captive nations is a spadeful of earth to bury him.

We, in Buffalo, were happy to have Congressman SCRANTON join us in our observance of Captive Nations Week.

H.R. 8900—A BILL TO AUTHORIZE FEDERAL AID FOR NEEDED EXPANSION OF ACADEMIC FACILITIES

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Oregon?

There was no objection.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, H.R. 8900, a bill to authorize Federal aid for needed expansion of academic facilities, is now in conference. There appeared in the August 1 edition of the Washington Post a letter to the editor which, it seems to me, gives an accurate account of the number of colleges—tax supported and private, church related and nonchurch related. It reads as follows:

In his column of July 17, Drew Pearson states that the Education Committees of Congress are debating "whether grants or loans should be given to religious institutions; i.e., colleges and universities, the great majority of them Catholic." This is simply not true. The great majority of church-affiliated colleges are not Catholic but rather Protestant. According to the 1961-62 Educational Directory of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, there are 807 religious colleges in the United States, of which 475 are Protestant, 308 Catholic, and 24 are divided among 6 other denominations.

One could perhaps ignore this error were it not for Mr. Pearson's completely distorted treatment of the Federal college-aid bills. Nowhere in his column is there the slightest indication that the bills would aid all 2,040 American colleges (721 public colleges, 512 private nonreligious colleges, and 807 religious colleges). Instead, the column is concerned only with the subject of "Federal aid to Catholic colleges," leaving the reader with the false impression that the bills are solely for the benefit of Catholic schools. In every paragraph we find such misleading phrases as "tax money paid by Protestants would go to Catholic institutions" and "outright grants to Catholic colleges."

Why are the 308 Catholic colleges singled out for special treatment by Mr. Pearson while the other 499 religious colleges are completely ignored? Does Mr. Pearson object to Catholic colleges sharing on an equal and nondiscriminatory basis with other American colleges? Does the Constitution really say Federal aid cannot be given to 308 Catholic colleges but such aid may be given to 475 Protestant colleges?

Mr. Pearson also distorts the Hill-Burton Act, which he describes as a bill that "has extended many millions of dollars to Catholic hospitals." Here again Catholic participation in a bill is deliberately singled out to create the false impression that the bill is solely for the benefit of Catholic institutions. Actually, the Hill-Burton Act provides Federal assistance for the construction of public and other nonprofit hospitals filling a community need. Under this act over \$300 million has been granted for construction of Jewish, Protestant, and Catholic hospitals and additional hundreds of millions of dollars have gone to publicly owned hospitals.

JAMES A. MILLER.

BELAIR-BOWIE, MD.

DANGER IN ALBANY, GA.

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

Mr. RYAN of New York. Mr. Speaker, I bring a frightening warning from the Reverend Martin Luther King and Dr. William G. Anderson, the Reverend Wyatt Tee Walker, and other Negro leaders in Albany, Ga., a warning which I

have found with my own eyes to be dangerously true.

In Dr. King's words:

Albany, Ga., may explode into another Little Rock.

Dr. King pointed out to me last night in his jail cell, which he shares with the Reverend Ralph D. Abernathy, that the explosion can come at any minute unless action is taken to protect the rights of American citizens in an American city.

Every one of us and every American must be shocked by what has happened and is happening this very minute in Albany. Interstate bus facilities continue to be segregated. City officials refuse even to discuss steps toward equal rights. The courts have delayed in acting on the arrests of some 700 Americans.

American citizens have been jailed under color of law for exercising their constitutional rights. Police brutality is openly reported and easily discovered. Men and women—an expectant mother with a child in her arms—have been beaten. Americans are held in jail for days—one of them for more than a week—without even being arraigned in clear violation of their constitutional right to a speedy trial. Men and women are held in adjacent cells without privacy. A jail cell is crammed with teenagers.

I asked 12-year-old James Moore what he was doing when he was arrested.

He said:

I was praying at city hall.

We have reached a new time in America when we arrest children for praying.

The need for action in Albany has never been more evident. Decency, our belief in America, in the Constitution, in the equality of men, in justice, all demand immediate action. Our stature as a democracy, our position as a leader of the free world require action. The law itself requires action.

The Justice Department, the Interstate Commerce Commission, and this Congress must act.

Yesterday, at the invitation of the Congress of Racial Equality and the Southern Christian Leadership Conference, I visited Albany where, in the words of the invitation, "American citizens are being jailed and beaten for exercising their constitutional rights."

Julius W. Hobson, southeastern regional representative of CORE, said in his invitation letter:

We feel it is of the utmost importance that you, as a Member of Congress who is deeply interested in equality for all citizens, visit Albany to get a firsthand picture of the situation. If you can make the trip, we will be most appreciative.

What I saw in Albany should both inspire and frighten every American.

At a mass meeting in the Mount Zion Church last night Negro citizens of Albany overflowed the church to express their desire to continue the battle for their rights. They proclaim that freedom is on the march. Their enthusiasm, their indomitable will in the face of brutality and oppression, and their continued restraint are amazing.

I talked with leaders of the Albany movement, the Southern Christian Lead-

ership Conference and CORE in Albany. Reverend King, who is president of the Southern Christian Leadership Conference, Rev. Wyatt Tee Walker, executive director of the leadership conference, Rev. Bernard Lee, special assistant to Reverend Walker, Rev. Ralph D. Abernathy, Rev. Andrew Young, administrator, citizenship education program, leadership conference, Dr. William G. Anderson, and other leaders have shown fantastic determination, leadership, and organization. They are ready, as General Grant said about 100 years ago, "to fight it out on this line if it takes all summer."

In his cell—calm, quiet, unafraid but heartsick at the brutalities of Albany—Dr. King emphasized over and over that the situation is very tense and that the Albany opponents of civil rights are waging a furious yet highly sophisticated resistance. The city officials simply claim that there is not any segregation in Albany, Ga., although all you have to do to learn the truth is walk down any street.

The fact is that the situation in Albany may explode into violence.

The situation has been developing for many months. The conflicts began shortly after the Interstate Commerce Commission's new regulations banning segregation in interstate transportation terminals went into effect. Since then Negroes have been fighting for civil rights—the right to get a soft drink in a public restaurant, the right to use an unsegregated interstate bus facility, the right to use the public library, the right to send their children to an integrated school. The city commission has refused even to talk with Negro leaders.

Yesterday about 40 Negroes were arrested in prayer demonstrations at city hall and the public library. About 300 people have been jailed since July 10. Because the Albany jail is overflowing, prisoners have been taken to jails in other cities—Camilla, Americus, Newton.

Conditions in the Albany jail are intolerable. The cells are packed. Women are in cells adjacent to men without privacy. In one cell I found 12 teenagers. Three men were jammed in another cell that measures 7 feet long, 7 feet wide and 7 feet high. They had not been permitted to make any outgoing telephone calls. No hearing date had been set for them. They had not been arraigned before a judge. One of them was Marvin Rich, of New York, field coordinator of CORE. Another was Floyd Gardner. He had been held in clear violation of his constitutional rights for 8 days.

Nearby, William Hansen was suffering in a cell, his broken jaw stitched and wired. When he was arrested, the police threw him in with drunks, announced he was one of the freedom riders, and a prompt beating followed.

I was told how Mrs. Marion King, the expectant wife of Slater King, one of the leaders of the Southern Christian Leadership Conference, as she carried her 3-year-old baby in her arms, was knocked down and kicked by two police officers at the Camilla jail.

The press has reported how C. B. King, Esq., an attorney, was viciously caned

by D. C. Campbell, the sheriff of Dougherty County who is theoretically in office to enforce the laws of the land.

Despite the persecution and brutality, the Albany movement, founded and led by Dr. William G. Anderson, will continue the fight for civil rights, for the movement and its aims are embedded in the deepest needs and rights of the Negro people of Albany. A few days ago the Albany movement issued this declaration:

There is no truce and we band ourselves together to do whatever must be done to deliver the death knell once and for all to the system of segregation in the city of Albany, Ga., with the earnest hope that the example we set here shall spread across the South.

Mr. Speaker, I include the text of the Albany manifesto at this point in the RECORD.

ALBANY MANIFESTO

The Albany movement totally rejects the response of the city of Albany toward its requests as transmitted through Chief of Police Laurie Pritchett. We have discovered over the last 6 months that it is the intention of the city fathers to maintain the system of segregation throughout the community regardless of the constitutional rights and just demands of the Negro community.

We have learned through bitter experiences that Chief Pritchett has not the power to keep or make the decisions for which he is purportedly responsible. We submit a long history of doubletalk, unkept promises, subtle intimidation and lack of integrity as it relates to the just resolution of our grievances against the system of segregation as it exists in our city.

Whereas we insist it is our right under the Constitution and the Bill of Rights to peacefully protest our grievances, and whereas no Negro can exercise that right without provoking arrest and conviction, be it therefore resolved that we shall never bargain away our first amendment privilege to so peacefully protest; and

Whereas there remain more than 700 cases presently pending on the docket of the recorder's court since December of last year which have not yet been adjudicated, we demand under the 6th amendment as interpreted through the 14th amendment be granted a fair and speedy trial at once or be summarily discharged from prosecution; and

Whereas there continues only intermittent compliance with the ICC ruling which became effective as of November 1, 1961 at the city bus terminal, we do further resolve that we petition the Attorney General of the United States to initiate immediately a suit pursuant to Federal court injunctive order to restrain public officials or private interest from interference with the use of all such facilities; and

Whereas desegregation is the order of the day and with the support of the Constitution, the Supreme Court of the United States, the climate of world opinion, the moral order and the laws of God, we resolve to address all of our energies to the removal of every vestige of segregation from our midst; and

Whereas Christian nonviolence has demonstrated its power in application, technique, and discipline, we resolve that the instruments with which we work shall be those alone consistent with nonviolent principles; and

Whereas the inspiration and support afforded to the Albany movement by Dr. Martin Luther King, Dr. Ralph D. Abernathy, the Southern Christian Leadership Conference, Student Nonviolent Coordinating

Committee, National Association for the Advancement of Colored People and other individuals and organizations similarly dedicated, we do resolve to make it clear, publicly and privately that they are here by invitation and we heartily welcome their presence; and

Whereas in some quarters of the community, State, and Nation there are spurious reports of a truce, we do resolve for all to know that there is no truce and we band ourselves together to do whatever must be done to deliver the death knell once and for all to the system of segregation in the city of Albany, Ga., with the earnest hope that the example we set here shall spread across the South.

Mr. Speaker, the time for action is now. If the situation is allowed to drift and deteriorate, we may well have, as Dr. King warns, another Little Rock.

There are immediate steps which the executive branch may take.

The FBI has been investigating well-reported instances of police brutality. Even the names of police officers are known. But as Dr. King asked in his jail cell, how much investigating is necessary before the Department of Justice can seek indictments before a Federal grand jury?

From my observations I believe that what has happened in Albany warrants immediate action by the Justice Department under sections 241 and 242 of title 18 of the United States Code.

Section 241 provides that it is a criminal offense for two or more persons to conspire "to injure, oppress, threaten, or intimidate any citizen in the free exercise or enjoyment of any rights or privilege secured to him by the Constitution or laws of the United States, or because of his having so exercised the same."

Section 242 provides that it is a criminal offense for anyone "under color of any law, statute, ordinance, regulation, or custom," to willfully subject "any inhabitant of any State, territory, or district to the deprivation of any rights, privileges, or immunities secured or protected by the Constitution or laws of the United States."

I also believe that the situation in Albany warrants immediate action by the Interstate Commerce Commission to enforce its regulations banning segregation in interstate bus facilities. That is what the regulations are for—to be enforced. That is why I testified for them before the ICC last year. Presumably, that is why the ICC adopted the regulations—to enforce them.

Under the regulations the ICC can issue an order to the interstate carriers ordering them to cease and desist from using the bus station in Albany. In addition, the ICC can bring civil and criminal suits against an interstate carrier if the carrier violates these regulations.

The Albany situation, like other civil rights conflicts, also makes more evident the need for real civil rights legislation. I believe that passage of H.R. 7143, to make the Civil Rights Commission permanent and give it real power, would go a long way toward really guaranteeing civil rights to all Americans. If the bill had been enacted, the Civil Rights Commission would be working effectively in Albany, Ga., right now.

If we are to avoid another Little Rock, another major civil rights tragedy, the Justice Department must act now to enforce the law. The Interstate Commerce Commission must act now to enforce its regulations. And I believe that we in Congress must look toward passage of real civil rights legislation.

Democracy is on trial in Albany, Ga., and I call upon the Government and Congress to come to its defense.

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

Mr. RYAN of New York. I yield to the gentleman from West Virginia.

Mr. HECHLER. I should like to observe that the President at his news conference said:

The United States is willing to sit down in Geneva to try to settle great international issues with Russia and other countries, and the leaders of the Albany government ought to be willing to sit down with Negroes demanding fuller rights.

Mr. RYAN of New York. I thank the gentleman for his contribution, and I agree it is past time that the officials sit down with the leaders of the Albany movement.

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

Mr. RYAN of New York. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. STRATTON. I want to join with my colleague, the gentleman from New York [Mr. RYAN], in his appeal for action to end the disgraceful situation which confronts this Nation and the world in Albany, Ga., today. I want to commend the gentleman from New York for the fight he is making. I want to commend him for taking time today to bring this message to the House. I am sorry there are not more Members here to hear it, because there is no message, it seems to me, that could be of greater bearing to our Nation and the future of our Nation than the report he is giving of the situation that apparently exists in Albany, Ga., in this home of democracy and this land of the free.

Mr. Speaker, I would certainly agree with the gentleman from New York that action must be taken. Certainly, we would hope that this problem in Georgia could be settled by men of good will sitting down across the table with one another. But, I think what has happened today has made it perfectly clear, particularly when the events the gentleman from New York just referred to are occurring in Georgia—has made it perfectly clear that this kind of good will does not exist there and, apparently, will not exist for some time. I think in this instance we have to look for leadership from the Government of the United States. I fear it is time that we have some leadership both from the executive branch of the Government and from the Congress of the United States. I feel that we in the United States certainly cannot pose as champions of democracy when these situations exist as they do exist in Albany, Ga., and elsewhere in our Nation.

Mr. Speaker, I want to commend the gentleman from New York and join with him in the fight he is making.

Mr. RYAN of New York. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for his very pertinent observations on this critical situation.

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

Mr. RYAN of New York. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Illinois. And would you also add there an item that in Washington, D.C., white girls be free to go to their church and pray and be free to walk down the streets of Washington?

Mr. RYAN of New York. I do not quite see the relevance of the gentleman's statement.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Illinois. You have talked about colored people walking down the street.

Mr. RYAN of New York. I cannot yield further to the gentleman. I am sorry.

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

Mr. RYAN of New York. I yield.

Mr. STRATTON. I would like to add just a word to what the gentleman from New York has said in connection with the situation that exists at Albany, Ga. I was somewhat disturbed to read in the press this morning that apparently one of the reasons for the unwillingness of some of the merchants and leading businessmen in Albany to sit down and work out some peaceful solution of this problem stems from the reported fact that they are doing so well economically that they do not feel that they need to make these concessions. The reason, of course, for their economic prosperity, as I understand, is very largely due to the expenditure of substantial sums in connection with the U.S. defense program. I would certainly feel that there ought to be some way in addition to some of the suggestions the gentleman has made that the prestige and power of the U.S. Government could be brought to bear in this situation through this indirect method of defense contributions to this particular area.

If our defense funds are creating a situation which impedes the adoption of true democracy rather than the reverse, then this is a very serious development indeed, and I think it ought to be carefully looked into by members of the Defense Department.

Mr. RYAN of New York. The gentleman's suggestion is a good one.

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

Mr. RYAN of New York. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. FORRESTER. Did the gentleman make his trip down to Albany, Ga., at his own instance or at the instance of some organization or person?

Mr. RYAN of New York. I said earlier in my remarks I was invited by the Congress of Racial Equality and the Southern Christian Leadership Conference to see at firsthand the situation in the city of Albany, Ga.

Mr. FORRESTER. The gentleman did go to Albany, as a matter of fact, did he not?

Mr. RYAN of New York. That is correct.

Mr. FORRESTER. Tell the membership of this House how you were treated down there.

Mr. RYAN of New York. I certainly was treated at all times with respect. I was permitted to see the prisoners. I did see the prisoners and reported on my findings.

Mr. FORRESTER. As a matter of fact, the gentleman knew that those people were so cultured and so patient down there that they were tolerating a trespasser, is that not true?

Mr. RYAN of New York. I will not concede I was a trespasser. I was there as a representative of the people of my district who are deeply concerned with this situation, people who have been outraged by developing conditions.

Mr. FORRESTER. Let me ask the gentleman this question: Is the gentleman concerned about the civil rights of white folks?

Mr. RYAN of New York. I do not think there is anything in what I have said or anything in any of the bills I have introduced that distinguishes the civil rights of one individual as opposed to another. I think it is important in this country, and I think the gentleman will agree, that all citizens be treated equally because they are equal under the Constitution and the laws.

Mr. FORRESTER. Let me say to the gentleman in my familiarity with his record and the legislation he has introduced, there has never been anything that was for the benefit of the white race. Has the gentleman taken any step whatsoever in reference to the fine white woman who was stabbed within a block and a half of this Capitol 2 weeks ago?

Mr. RYAN of New York. I do not think it makes any difference what the color of the woman was.

Mr. FORRESTER. The gentleman did not do anything about that?

Mr. RYAN of New York. If an act of violence takes place, it certainly is a matter which should concern all of us.

Mr. FORRESTER. Let me ask the gentleman, is he acquainted with the courts down in Georgia?

Mr. RYAN of New York. I am acquainted with the judicial system of the United States, and I am acquainted with the Constitution of the United States. I feel that people who have been jailed and incarcerated are entitled to prompt arraignments, speedy trials, and disposition of their cases. According to all reports, that has not been the case.

Mr. FORRESTER. Let me ask the gentleman, is he attorney for those people? Do you know whether arraignment has been denied to them—has been demanded and has been denied?

Mr. RYAN of New York. I do not believe responsible citizens told me something that was not true.

Mr. FORRESTER. I am asking the gentleman, do you know? I am not asking what he was told. The gentleman is a lawyer.

Mr. RYAN of New York. I am reporting to you and to this House that there are American citizens languishing in that jail in Albany who have not been arraigned, whose cases have not been heard. One person I spoke with last

night had been in that jail for 8 days and had not been permitted to make a telephone call. He has not been brought before a magistrate or a justice of the peace.

Mr. FORRESTER. This is a terrible crime?

Mr. RYAN of New York. I believe it is.

Mr. FORRESTER. That he cannot get a telephone at some opportune time when he wants it?

Mr. RYAN of New York. I believe to incarcerate an individual for exercising his rights, demonstrating peaceably, and to deny him the elementary right to contacts with the outside world is a crime.

Mr. FORRESTER. Let me ask the gentleman this. Has the gentleman ever been in Albany, Ga., before?

Mr. RYAN of New York. This was the first occasion.

Mr. FORRESTER. How long was the gentleman there?

Mr. RYAN of New York. I was there between 6 and 8 hours.

Mr. FORRESTER. The gentleman really had a lot of time in which to find out something about the truth, did not the gentleman?

Mr. RYAN of New York. I certainly did. The facts are so evident that in a lot less time than that one could become very familiar with the outrageous situation.

Mr. FORRESTER. Does the gentleman say that the courts down in Georgia do not function and does the gentleman want to tell me that those people are remediless and cannot get into court?

Mr. RYAN of New York. A person under arrest should have an elementary right to a prompt arraignment in order to know the charges and to a hearing and to have a trial date set.

Mr. FORRESTER. In other words, the gentleman went down there simply because he understood some people were in jail and he wanted to see that their rights for arraignment were enforced? Is that what the gentleman went down there for?

Mr. RYAN of New York. Not at all. I think the whole world has a right to know about the denial of civil rights of American citizens. Civil liberties are being flagrantly abused. I think this is something that should be known.

Mr. FORRESTER. Let me ask the gentleman this, and I want the gentleman from New York to listen to me, now. Is the gentleman familiar with the war record of the people down in the State of Georgia and at Albany, Ga., in particular in World War II, Korea, and so forth? Is the gentleman familiar with those records?

Mr. RYAN of New York. I think that we have a right to be proud of the war record of every American who wore a uniform honorably in the service of his country, whether he comes from Albany, Ga., or Albany, N.Y.

Mr. FORRESTER. But have not the people in Albany, Ga., one of the finest records for patriotism in this country?

Mr. RYAN of New York. I do not think patriotism is the issue before us. I have not made it an issue. I think there

are patriotic Americans in every city, hamlet, village, and every crossroads in this country, or we would not have the strength which we have today. I think many who served in the Armed Forces and who fought and lived side by side with men of different backgrounds and origins returned with a better understanding of what human values and relationships should be.

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield.

Mr. RYAN of New York. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. STRATTON. Would not the gentleman agree—while we all recognize the contribution of Albany, Ga., and many other sections of our country, both North and South, to the prosecution of the great war—that today we are engaged in another war? This is an ideological war, a war to determine whether we in this country really mean what we say when we talk about democracy and civil rights, or whether they are going to put our record as against our protestants up against the alluring propaganda of communism. Would not the gentleman agree with me, as well as the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. FORRESTER], that today the job we have to do is to demonstrate in Albany, Ga., and in Schenectady, N.Y., and in New York City when we say that men are equal we mean it, and if a man or a woman cannot get a Coca-Cola in a restaurant or a drugstore or a seat on a bus, this is a situation that demonstrates that we in America have not won the fight for the democracy that we profess? This problem has been faced, and faced successfully, in Alabama and in other areas of our country.

I think the point that the gentleman from New York is making, if I may say to my good friend, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. FORRESTER], is that what we have got to do is to use the prestige of this Federal Government if we cannot get peaceful cooperation from the local authorities to see that men and women, regardless of their color, are afforded simple, ordinary, equal rights in any section of our Nation.

Mr. RYAN of New York. I think the gentleman is correct. As I said earlier, democracy is literally on trial at that city in the State of Georgia.

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

Mr. RYAN of New York. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. FORRESTER. I say that the gentleman does not want to talk about war records, because we have as great a war record in that section of the country as any place in the country. If the gentleman has one, the gentleman cannot deny it. It is a fact, and it is just a little disturbing to me to hear a Member of this Congress get up on the floor of the House and advocate that there be taken away from a certain section of this country military installations which go right down to the very heart of the protection of this country and what it stands for.

Mr. RYAN of New York. I think what was advocated was that every branch of the Federal Government use all the powers at its disposal to see that the

rights of all citizens are protected. And I say this as a combat veteran who spent considerable time in the South Pacific during World War II.

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

Mr. RYAN of New York. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. FLYNT. Mr. Speaker, I regret very much that the gentleman has taken this time to make an attack upon the very fine people of a very fine city in the State which I have the honor to represent. I know these people down there. I know the chief of police, who I think everyone who has followed this will agree is one of the outstanding law-enforcement officials not only of our part of the country but of the entire United States. He is recognized as a man who has kept his head, who has done his sworn duty to preserve law and order as best he can in a city which is torn with strife and is in turmoil through no fault of the people who live there.

I regret also most sincerely that the gentleman from New York saw fit to describe himself as an expert on a city which by his own statement he visited for a matter of 6 to 8 hours. I know that in my own place I would not attempt to make a flying-squadron-type trip into his great city and State of New York and set myself up as a judge, a prosecutor, and a jury to pass upon the merits of a case about which I knew as little as I could know if I had no more than 6 to 8 hours in which to study it.

I do not know that some of the statements the gentleman has made are misleading. I know the gentleman did not intend them to be misleading, but from what I know of the law-enforcement officials, the honorable and distinguished mayor, Asa D. Kelly, Jr., mayor of the city of Albany, they were misleading although I am sure unwittingly so, on the part of the gentleman from New York. Some of the allegations and charges which we have heard here today do not conform entirely to the facts as they exist. I do not question and I would not question the right of the gentleman or any Member of this body to make any statement that he saw fit to make, but I could not sit idly by and fail to call the attention of the membership of this House to the fact that there have been, certainly, misleading statements which have been made, and I regret very much the gentleman saw fit to make this attack upon my State.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from New York [Mr. RYAN] has expired.

Mr. RYAN of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 additional minute.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. RYAN of New York. Mr. Speaker, in reply to the gentleman, I can only say that I have reported the facts and circumstances as I found them.

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

Mr. RYAN of New York. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Can my colleague from Georgia tell me whether or not it is true, as the gentleman from New York has reported, that people have been incarcerated for a period of 7 or 8 days without being arraigned?

Mr. FLYNT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield to me to make a reply?

Mr. RYAN of New York. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. FLYNT. From what I know of the law-enforcement establishment on the level of the U.S. District Court for the Middle District of Georgia; from what I know of the superior court and the court of Dougherty County, the city court and the recorder's court of the city of Albany, I am quite certain that if application for a bond had been made that application would have been granted. I am certain—of course, I have not been down there during the last few days—but I am certain that the laws of the State of Georgia and the laws of the United States of America are enforced as well in the city of Albany, Ga., as they are in any place north, south, east, or west.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from New York [Mr. RYAN] has again expired.

THE EDUCATION OF MIGRANT CHILDREN

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. OLSEN. Mr. Speaker, for many years there has been a growing concern in our Nation concerning the lack of educational opportunities for the children of agricultural migrant workers. It has long been the accepted and traditional philosophy in American education that every child shall have an equal opportunity for education commensurate with his interests and abilities. The concept of this great American dream, which is the inherent right and hope of every child, should not be denied to thousands of migratory children. And yet, studies have shown that the school achievement of these children is usually below the fourth grade level. Reports from several States indicated that more than half of the migrant children are retarded 1 to 4 years.

While there has been increased publicity, an awakened interest, and commendable efforts made for the improvement of educational opportunities for the disadvantaged children of migrant agricultural workers in our Nation, much still remains to be done.

It is difficult for us who are interested in all the children in our Nation to realize that a particular group of American children are still being denied the opportunity to receive the bare minimum of education necessary to participate effectively in our society today.

Migrant children enter school late, their attendance is poor, their progress

is slow, they drop out early; consequently, their rate of illiteracy is high.

The 1960 census reports indicated that approximately 8 percent of our population age 25 or over are defined as functionally illiterate; that is, they have received less than a fifth-grade education. The agricultural migrants make up a significant part of this pool of illiterates. Many of the unemployed migrants are moving into the slums of our large cities where they are swelling the relief and welfare rolls. Because of lack of education, they are unprepared for urban jobs. They are part of this group which Dr. James B. Conant described as "social dynamite."

Most migrant children are retarded in school because of migrancy itself and all its related socioeconomic disadvantages—poverty, ill health, inadequate housing, lack of proper food and clothing, lack of attitude and education of parents, lack of health and welfare services, and insufficient funds of some school districts to provide school facilities for migrant children.

Studies have shown that many of these migrant children leave their home-base States in the South in April and do not attend school during the time they are on the trip north, or until they arrive back at the home base in late October.

It is estimated that migrant workers are concentrated in 31 States which employ 4,000 or more domestic migrants each year. School authorities are often perplexed by seasonal impacts of large groups of migratory children who enter their school districts late, and who should be enrolled in their schools. With overstrained school budgets it has been difficult to provide classrooms, teachers, desks, and other instructional materials. Because the number of migrant children who enter their communities varies from year to year, it is difficult for school officials to anticipate the additional burden that will be placed on their school budgets. Lack of financial support to enable school districts to provide for migrant children often makes them an unacceptable burden. The community is not always ready to accept these children and to assume the cost of increased school facilities for migrants who may only be in the community for a short period of time.

In a recent survey made by the U.S. Office of Education of seven States concerning the State programs for the education of migrant children, it was reported that in some States 50 percent of the migrant children who lived in the State during the time school was in session were not enrolled in school.

One of the recommended solutions to improve the educational program for migrant children is to organize small classes at the beginning of the school year so that the children can be integrated in the regular school program when they arrive. This, however, becomes a financial burden on the school districts.

When migrant children do not bring records from previous schools attended, it becomes a problem for the teacher to determine the level of academic achievement of each child and the grade in

which he should be placed. It is recommended that there be interschool and interstate agreements on the necessary information to be supplied and on the methods of sending school transfer records from school to school.

There is a need for further research and planning in many areas of education for migrant children including the development of interschool and interstate agreements; improved curriculums to meet the needs of these children; development of short units of study, aptitude, achievement, and intelligence tests for Spanish-speaking children; and other similar studies.

While several States have made excellent progress in their educational programs for migratory children, it is impossible for a few States to solve this problem alone. These children must have an opportunity for education in each community and State they enter or they become retarded, confused, and frustrated. Retardation is one of the major causes for school dropouts. For example, it is difficult to expect a 16-year-old boy to enter the fourth grade.

There is definite need for a sound and continuous program of education in each community through which these children travel, if we are going to provide them with an equal opportunity for education.

As the States are responsible for the free, public education of all school age children, this legislation is intended to assist the States to improve their programs for the education of migrant children. Recent studies have shown that there is a need for planning at the State level. The problems concerning the organization and administration of educational opportunities for migratory children have been recognized by several States which have enacted necessary legislation to assist these children. The States of California, Colorado, New Jersey, New York, Ohio, Oregon, and Pennsylvania provide financial assistance to school districts for the operation of summer schools.

Many local school districts are still faced with the problems of providing school housing, textbooks, instructional materials; and avoiding overcrowded classrooms and half-day sessions. The lack of educational opportunities for migrant children has many social and economic implications which should be the concern of all local, State, and Federal agencies of our Government, as well as the concern of every American citizen. Reports indicate that the quality and quantity of schooling received by these children is far below the national standards as compared to that received by other children. This condition is a serious indictment against our society and our national program of education in America.

Because migrant parents have very little, if any, education, they very often do not understand the importance of an education for their children. Because their wages are insufficient to provide the bare necessities of life for themselves and their children, they need the income of their children to help sustain the family. They fail to understand the

educational requirements needed in our modern society. Many migrants do not make any effort to enroll their children in school. They have very little knowledge of health, welfare, safety, nutrition, and citizenship. Studies have shown that parents who have attended school have a greater tendency to want their children to receive an education.

If there ever was a cause or a reason for Federal funds for education, it is for a program of education of children of agricultural migrant workers. The problem of agricultural migratory workers is interstate in nature, involving the transportation of human beings across State boundary lines to live and work in other communities. The principle of State and Federal support is reasonable and just when one school district must provide educational facilities for children from other school districts and States.

The money which will be made available under Senate bill 1124 would enable States to obtain much-needed information about migrants which could be shared by other States as a basis for planning better school programs.

The Senate bill would provide Federal assistance, as follows:

Title I—Payments to State educational agencies to help defray the cost of educating migratory children during the regular school session.

Title II—Grants of \$300,000 annually for each of 5 years to State educational agencies or institutions of higher learning for summer schools for migratory children.

Title III—Grants of \$250,000 annually for each of 5 years for State and interstate planning and coordination of programs concerning educational problems of migratory children.

Title IV—Grants of \$200,000 a year for 5 years to State educational agencies to defray operating costs of pilot projects for programs of fundamental, practical education for adult migratory workers.

GIRL SCOUT 50TH ANNIVERSARY ROUNDUP

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to permission granted I insert in the RECORD a tribute to the Girl Scouts on their 50th anniversary roundup birthday dinner on July 24, 1962, at Button Bay, Burlington, Vt. This was sent to me by one of my constituents, Miss Lena G. Doll.

GIRL SCOUT 50TH ANNIVERSARY ROUNDUP

I am glad I am a Girl Scout
In my native U.S.A.,
I am glad for all the Girl Guides
In other lands today.

I am glad that Juliette Low
Had the foresight and the verve
To bring from England to us here
The Scout idea, born to thrive.

To give to every girl a chance
To live a life of broader view
Than all the girls of former years
Ever dreamed, or thought, or knew.

To live life in its full meaning
With the privilege to serve,
To be prepared for any task,
From high purpose not to swerve.

To put into work the ornament
That lightens e'en the most arduous task,
Imprints its meaning in the heart,
Lifts it above the commonplace.

'Tis on that level Girl Scouts thrive,
To further reaches Girl Scouts strive,
They strive to win; but win or lose,
The striving wins, the Girl Scout knows.

So I am glad I am a Girl Scout
I like the purpose and the plan,
We learn the grace of serving,
We gladly help our fellowman.

THE KENNEDY ADMINISTRATION

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. STAGGERS] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Speaker, emerging from a narrow and tortuous lane, the bewildered and exasperated traveler looks out on a broad highway. Not a single highway, it is, in fact, the divergence point of numerous highways. The traffic on all of them is crowded, and the speed is terrific. To add to the confusion, the signposts tell us little. Every single one of them bears the legend: "To the Promised Land."

It is the United States halting nervously before the entrance to the space era of the 20th century.

It is strange that the United States should stand in such awe of the 20th century. We do not claim to have invented everything, but surely we have done our share in inventing the 20th century. This holds for ideas as well as for gadgets. We own a sort of copyright on the idea that when governments do not serve the people, people should replace the government. We perfected ideas of mass production and mass distribution well in advance of other societies. As for gadgets, our trademark is on so many of them that it is not worth while to make a list.

Yet it is a curious fact that the 20th century has never been popular in this country. The country lane on which we have been traveling for so many years, though rough and crooked, is in retrospect very pleasant. It is shady with leisure, and we had the road more or less to ourselves. Little danger of collision. Many of us would like to turn around and go back.

Is there room here to turn around? Unfortunately, no. We are committed. Dare we, then, venture out on that dangerous highway where everybody is hurtling along at demonic speed, and with little or no certainty as to where they are going?

It depends on our vehicle—and on the driver.

There is absolutely no doubt that we have the best built car on the road. It is powered by a half-trillion-dollar economy. Nothing more powerful was ever built. It is geared for speed. It could show its taillights to any vehicle on the roads or on the drawing boards. It carries highly imaginative built-in safety devices—social security legislation, bank deposit insurance, public checks on industry and Government alike. Its controls are connected to the operator's seat by extensive and reliable systems of communication and transportation. Our car is serviced by the most expert technicians of all time. Not a single part of its complex mechanism is inferior to the best their skill and ingenuity can provide. And every day they are adding gadgets to improve its serviceability and dependability.

We have got the car, all right. So how about the man in the driver's seat?

Many anxious questions confront the operator of a new and important venture, particularly so when the venture is a life-and-death matter, as this one is. The questions may delay his start until he can supply reasonably assuring answers.

First, has he the experience? The answer is that nobody, absolutely nobody, has any experience in operating such a powerful and complex piece of machinery for the purposes we must use that machinery. New foreign and domestic policies quite unlike anything man has ever known before are needed to keep our place in a swiftly changing world and to stamp our influence on a developing civilization. Old practices of trade relations, of reciprocal responsibilities and obligations between the governed and the governors, of attitudes toward peace and war, are as out of date as a T-model Ford. Almost anybody could manipulate a T-model, but experience in that hardly qualifies one for a speed car.

The proper answer lies in a man's understanding of the mechanism of his instrument, of its potentialities and its appropriate uses. Few, if any, Americans have a clearer grasp of the movement of history in the United States than our President. No one has stated more exactly the purposes for which we propose to use our military and economic and social powers. Foreign governments are impressed; few of them doubt that he means what he says; and those who doubt are restrained by a nagging fear that disregard would court disaster.

Next question: Has our driver the requisite skill?

Skill lies in a judicious combination of cool judgment, accurate estimate of opportunities, quick perception, and smooth reaction. A characteristic of the present administration is absence of fumbling. One emergency after another, domestic or foreign, has confronted the President. Reaction, swift, and positive, has met each one. Perhaps reaction has been too swift for some. They are not used to such a pace. Like a panicky backseat driver, some have cried out in alarm at narrow escapes from disaster. But we have not stood still in the middle of the road to be run

over, and so far there have been no collisions.

Grudging acknowledgment of this assessment of the President's skill is attested by foreign—and domestic—attitude toward decisions. Decisions are criticized and protected, from New York to Paris to Moscow to Peiping to Elisabethville to Buenos Aires. The nature of the protests constitute a tacit admission of the President's skill and courage. They are not open defiances. Everybody except Mao looks today on nuclear conflict as unthinkable. In consequence, there has been a curious disappearance of fear of full-scale war from public consciousness. The United States may be opposed, but it is not safe to push the opposition to the limit.

Another very important question is: Does the President know where he is going? Where and what is the Promised Land? How do we get there?

The President has described his goal with an exact particularity. It is a world from which hunger, misery, disease, ignorance, and oppression have been banished. It is not the New Jerusalem. Differences and discord still remain. But it is a possible world because knowledge and technology combine to make it so. It remains only for governments to adjust their differences and serve the needs of all people.

The road to the goal is not marked with clear and unequivocal signposts. It must be selected with intuitive sense of direction. This is not so difficult as it may seem. The way to order and peace is not toward disorder and confusion. It is written that the world was originally created out of chaos. But nobody since has duplicated the feat. The self-deceit of communism is that it can create a stable state out of turmoil and destruction. The reign of law is made possible only by the enactment of just laws followed by a due respect to those laws.

Confidence is a vital factor in success. A man's confidence in himself grows out of an inner integrity of motive and purpose. It was said of R. L. Stevenson that "no man had less of the ignoble itch for merely personal success." A President who persistently injects the public interest into every policy decision must be credited with a no less high-minded character. Such a confidence in himself seeps gradually, though sometimes slowly, into public consciousness. We are infected with it, we know not how nor when, sometimes against our will. That the President is accorded such confidence is attested by his personal popularity at home and abroad. Everywhere he goes, he is greeted with crowds wildly eager to see and perhaps to touch a living symbol of this Nation's power and goodwill. Mrs. Kennedy, with her charm, her intelligence, and her instinctive ability to do and say the right thing, effectually brings into sharp focus the image of a government responsive to human needs. A foreign visitor to the White House, as reported by a local newspaper, put the idea clearly: "It is alive. People live in it." The Kennedys are undoubtedly of and for the people, and people are beginning to believe in

the President, perhaps in spite of themselves. There is, too, a growing awareness that an inexorable force is driving us on toward the ends which he points out. Destiny is on the move, and the instrument of destiny is the United States and its leaders.

Move out on the highway, Mr. Driver. We have a deep-lying trust in your courage, your skill, and your integrity.

ELEPHANT ON THE MOVE

Mr. HOFFMAN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. SCHWENGEL] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, the London Economist, which is renowned for its astute analyses of the political scene here and abroad, carries an American Survey piece in the July 21 issue, "Elephant on the Move," which deserves to be brought to the attention of my colleagues. I am particularly impressed that this article concurs with my own thoughts on the staffing of committees in the Congress where the present imbalance works not only to the disadvantage of the minority but of the American voters who support the minority views. In the 1960 election, all of us became aware of the razor-thin edge the majority has in numerical strength. Adequate staff personnel to develop minority viewpoints on major issues is essential in our system of checks and balances. The Economist article follows:

ELEPHANT ON THE MOVE

WASHINGTON, D.C.—This week's events in Congress will encourage the efforts which are being made to get the elephantine Republican Party moving again. The mahouts include young Harvard men, like those who helped President Kennedy to explore his New Frontier; but these have the approval of General Eisenhower. The Republicans have launched two organizations, the all-Republican conference and the National Republican Citizens' Committee with General Eisenhower at its head. The task of the former is to generate favorable publicity and of the latter to produce enthusiasm, ideas, funds, and perhaps even fresh faces.

The American political idiom tends to Eatanswill hyperbole. President Kennedy called some businessmen SOB's, so the Republicans are now proud to call themselves Sons of Business. Since this is what most Republicans are, the gesture is not quite on a par with the defiance of the Nazis by Gentiles in occupied countries who wore the Star of David. Nevertheless, it is suggested that the Republicans are bravely throwing down the gage of battle to a President who has dynastic ambitions and who may strangle both freedom and business if he goes unchecked. Recently General Eisenhower has emerged in the forefront of the struggle. He may well go down in American political history as the man who, before he was elected President, viewed the prospect with forebodings; who, while he was President, developed what seemed to be distaste for the office; but who, after ceasing to be President, appeared to regret the law that forbade him to take another whack at it. He has been taking whacks at his successor

instead, saying that Mr. Kennedy is thrashing aimlessly about and meddling nervously with the economy.

But when General Eisenhower adds that as a consequence the country is uncertain, fearful, and ill at ease, this vague echo of Sir Walter Scott overlooks some of the factors in the situation. Voters are notoriously coy and hard to please but, according to the public opinion polls, President Kennedy is still very popular. While this personal glamour may not rub off on his policies, the Republicans' self-identification with business may not be the best way to assure that their policies will be well received either. The Republicans continue openly to envy the Democratic Party's success with the masses. In former times the Democrats won the northern cities by exchanging boxes of groceries for votes and by putting coal in the cellars of the deserving, franchised poor. Today President Kennedy and some other leaders of the Democratic Party are millionaires; so are several of the current crop of would-be presidential candidates in the Republican Party. The difference, as one writer admired by General Eisenhower has expressed it, is that the Democratic millionaires contrive to appear like wealthy Wat Tylers. And they have style, which the Republicans are conscious that they themselves lack.

In their present search for style, some of the youthful reformers who are trying to get the Republican Party on to the offensive have stunned the old guard by employing what sounds suspiciously like the language which has come to be associated with the brighter brains of the New Frontier. They declare that, if the Republicans are going to move, it will have to be by autokinesis. They have annoyed the hero of the reactionary wing of the party, Senator GOLDWATER, by dubbing him an eccentric who deliberately denies political realities and by calling his supporters knee-jerk conservatives. At the same time, however, this group accuses less inflexible Republicans of succumbing to meekness and scornfully dismisses them as mere reshapers of Democratic proposals. The young reformers admire the British Conservative Party and tend to contrast its snatching of 10 years of office from the jaws of defeat with the performance of the Republican Party in managing to snatch defeat from the jaws of victory.

They also admire the British political habit, under which the opposition forms a shadow cabinet and engages in research to find flaws in Government bills and to produce alternative legislative proposals. They grumble that in America the Republican opposition is denied its due share in the staffing of the all-important congressional committee; it is hopelessly outnumbered in this respect—about 30 to 1 in the House of Representatives and about 16 to 1 in the Senate. The doughty but hitherto lone fighter on this issue has been Mr. TOM CURTIS in the House of Representatives, but now the Republican National Committee is demanding that the opposition should be entitled to name up to 40 percent of the staff of each congressional committee.

Some, though probably not all, of these ideas have the support of General Eisenhower as well as of the wing of the Republican Party which is eastern and urban and urbane and internationalist. But there is, of course, sharp dissent from Senator GOLDWATER. Perhaps more important, most of the proposals are disliked by those who have hitherto been responsible for framing the party's policies as well as for projecting its public image and who therefore regard an attempt to provide a new look as being subversive as well as divisive. Mr. HALLECK, the Republican leader in the House of Representatives, says that there would be no need for changes if only all Republicans developed the unity of purpose that Republican

Congressmen habitually display. Senator DIRKSEN, the leader in the other House, probably agrees. But this is not the view of Republicans like Governor Rockefeller, of New York, who feel that the proper business of the party of business is to put forward proposals of its own, not just to oppose the administration. And there are businessmen who find the Goldwater blend of rigid economic orthodoxy, States rights and some xenophobia, with its corollary of appeals to the prejudices of suburbanites, southerners, and crude anti-Communists, too raw for their more sophisticated political tastes. Such men wish the Republican Party's emblem to continue to be the elephant, but not the bull elephant, and they do not wish it to become a dinosaur or pterodactyl.

The new look may not prevail. It has certainly not yet become generally accepted party policy; at present this consists of little more than bland generalities about the virtues of a free competitive economy and about America being the greatest Nation on earth. Even if it does prevail, a joint Rockefeller-Goldwater Republican candidacy in the 1964 presidential election would not be altogether impossible. The general rule of both the American parties is to include everyone and to exclude nobody, so that there can be an Eastland as well as a Kennedy in the Democratic Party and a Goldwater as well as a Rockefeller in the Republican Party. Some clue to the future may be provided, however, by the elections next November. Forward-looking Republicans speculate that, if the party does well then and if the new look gets some of the credit, the platform in 1964 may include a strong Republican bid for Negro votes in the South as well as the North, instead of an attempt to "trade Lincoln" for southern white support.

There is even talk of capturing the House of Representatives in November, but this seems somewhat fanciful, even if Mr. Kennedy has become more vulnerable than he was. The Republicans have been in control of Congress for only 4 of the past 30 years. They won 28 seats (and lost 6) in 1960 but 27 of those which they won were traditional Republican seats before 1956 (most of them were lost in the debacle of 1958). Mr. Richard Nixon has pointed out that among the State Governors the Republicans are outnumbered 3 to 1, in the Senate by about 2 to 1 and in the House of Representatives 3 to 2. In the Senate 20 Republicans have been put out by the voters in the past decade, thus reducing the number of Republican Senators to 36 and making it a practical impossibility for the Republicans to capture a majority in the Senate this year, when 38 Senate seats will be up for election. It is this dismal past showing that has given the Republicans the inferiority complex that some of them are now trying so hard to shake off.

President Kennedy appears to have lost command of Congress even though the Democrats have thumping majorities in both Houses; in the Senate this week 21 Democrats joined 31 Republicans to defeat his plan for helping old people to meet their hospital bills. When he indicated recently that he thought his problem would be solved if the voters returned more Democrats to Congress, a Republican asked derisively, "How many does he need?" But if the President is blocked by Democratic representatives from the Solid South and elsewhere who are in no hurry to reach the New Frontier, most of the Republicans in Congress also feel that their seats are safe and they are therefore similarly disinclined to heed their own party's need for new, vigorous policies. The real roadblock is a coalition of ultraconservatives from both parties and the Republicans who are anxious to move may find themselves as frustrated as President Kennedy and by the same cause. One well-in-

formed American has called this situation a crisis of institutions and no early resolution of it seems likely.

COMMITTEE STAFFING

Mr. HOFFMAN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. SCHWENGEL] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, my colleagues and I have been gratified by the great amount of public support we have had in our effort to secure more minority staff members on congressional committees.

The press from New York to California has taken up the cudgel and has supported our contention that the present imbalance hampers the operation of our system of government with its built-in checks and balances.

Especially noteworthy is the fine series of articles which appeared in the Los Angeles Times, one of the country's largest and most respected newspapers. The fact that this paper would run a series of five articles on 5 days on the subject of committee staffing is in itself evidence of the great concern which is being felt around the country.

I commend the Los Angeles Times and its able bureau chief, Robert Hartmann, for this excellent series. I feel that all of them should appear in the RECORD and I include them as a part of my remarks:

[From the Los Angeles Times, June 13, 1962]

THE KINGS OF CONGRESS: COMMITTEE CHAIRMEN

(By Robert T. Hartmann)

The firing of its lone Republican staff member by the House Intergovernmental Relations Subcommittee last week, for admittedly leaking a document concerning the Billie Sol Estes case to a news reporter, raises some intriguing questions.

What was not brought out very generally in news reports of the firing of Robert Manuel, a Washington attorney, was that he only recently was added to the all-Democratic staff after anguished protests by Republicans that they are without adequate representation at the working levels of many congressional committees.

The public knows that the House of Representatives is presently divided with a majority of 263 Democrats to 174 Republicans. The committees and subcommittees of the House, which is where the real political infighting of legislation and investigation takes place, also are made up of members of both parties.

The ratio of Republicans and Democrats on these bodies varies, and reflects only roughly the proportion of seats each party has in the House. In general, the minority members number slightly more than half the majority.

However, since each house of Congress makes its own rules under very broad constitutional guidelines, formidable precedent makes the chairman of any committee virtually omnipotent. As long as he commands a majority of even one member he is absolute.

Among his prerogatives is complete control of the committee staff, which is answerable only to him.

Naturally the staff, particularly in those committees whose work is primarily investigating and exposing, is the first to know what is going on.

Normally the chairman hears it next. He may take only the other majority members into his confidence or air it before the whole committee.

He may confer with the ranking minority members but nothing in the book says he has to.

Much depends upon the personalities involved (and these are fixed, usually, by the caprice of seniority of service) and whether the matter at hand is politically explosive or not.

But you can sum it all up by saying that, whichever party is in control of Congress, the minority has a few privileges but almost no rights.

Our Federal legislature operates (with rare exceptions) by inexorable mathematics. One less than a tie is no vote at all, one more is as good as unanimity.

When the Estes scandal first began to smolder, Republican National Chairman WILLIAM E. MILLER, himself a New York Congressman since 1950 (during which he has been a majority member only 2 years) forecast that the American public never would get to the bottom of a major political scandal while the Democrats controlled every branch of the Federal Government.

This, of course, was patent political talk—a wry reversal of the 1960 Democratic campaign theme that 6 years of divided Government in Washington was enough. But the GOP chairman did have a point—barbed though it was.

The investigative arm of the executive branch is primarily the FBI, under the command of the President's brother, among whose admirable traits nobody has ever mentioned nonpartisanship.

The various executive agencies, such as the Department of Agriculture, have limited facilities to investigate their own internal operations and obviously they have been busy on the Estes case.

The Congress has its own way of getting facts, theoretically in pursuit of legislative remedies but often a practical political end in itself. These are its investigating committees, with professional investigating staffs.

They operate independently of the executive branch except as the glue of party loyalty binds them together.

How are the staffs of congressional committees apportioned? Do minority members have the same staff assistance, and early access to the same privileged information, as the majority? Can a fair probe of alleged irregularities be expected, as President Kennedy said in rebuttal to GOP charges, because Republican members sit on all these committees?

The answer is both interesting and complex, and will require some further columns.

[From the Los Angeles Times, June 15, 1962]

LOOPHOLES IN COMMITTEE REFORMS

(By Robert T. Hartmann)

At the end of World War II, when the Hoover Commission and President Truman were focusing attention on long overdue reforms to modernize the executive branch of the Federal Government, Congress took a critical peek in the mirror itself.

The result of this rare moment of introspection was the LaFollette-Monroney bill which was eventually enacted, as the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1948.

Most of the oratory at the time concerned whether or not Congressmen should vote themselves a pay increase and a liberal pension—they did—but of a deeper significance were the joint committee's recommendations on Senate and House committees, and their staffs.

In Wednesday's column I promised further facts to test the validity of Republican National Chairman WILLIAM E. MILLER's warning that the American public may never know the truth about the Billie Sol Estes case because all the investigating arms of the Federal Government, both executive and legislative, are under Democratic domination.

The firing of Robert Manuel, only Republican on the staff of the Fountain subcommittee which is currently probing the Estes scandal for the House, spotlighted the question anew.

The reorganization plan was passed 12 years ago over the opposition of most of the 79th Congress' entrenched elders, including such giants as the late Speaker Rayburn, Senators Connally (Democrat, Texas), McKellar (Democrat, Tennessee), and McCLELLAN (Democrat, Arkansas), who will head the full-dress Estes investigation in the Senate.

It eliminated and combined the 33 standing committees of the Senate into 15. The 48 House committees were cut to 19.

The numerical size of each was fixed (this has undergone some alteration, the latest being Rayburn's semisuccessful "packing" of the House Rules Committee at the outset of the Kennedy administration), but the ratio of majority and minority members was left for each subsequent Congress to determine.

The 1946 act also attempted to revamp the age-old patronage method of supplying committee staffs; it provided for "professional" as well as "clerical" assistants to be selected "on a permanent basis without regard to political affiliations and solely on the basis of fitness to perform the duties of the office."

One director, four professional and six clerical staff members were allowed each standing committee (except House Appropriations, for which Chairman CANNON, Democrat, of Missouri, won an unlimited exemption) and their salaries were standardized; they were solemnly exempted from anything but committee duties, and prudently prohibited from accepting any job with the executive branch for 1 year after leaving Congress' employ.

But alas, politicians will be politicians. The lasting results of these high-minded reforms have been mixed.

As enacted, the 1946 committee staff rules were invariably qualified with such mill-wide loopholes as this: "And such staff members shall be assigned to the chairman and ranking minority member of such committee as the committee may deem advisable. Each such committee is further authorized to terminate the services by a majority vote of the committee of any such professional staff member as it may see fit."

In short, the majority rules, and the committee chairman—as the ranking majority member in seniority—for most practical purposes runs the staff as he pleases. Practice varies.

The House Armed Services Committee, of which Representative CARL VINSON, Democrat, of Georgia, is the longtime chairman, has stuck faithfully to the nonpolitical and professional concept and the director and chief counsel of its 11-man staff were hired during a Republican Congress and happen to be Republicans.

House Foreign Affairs has a similarly professional 13-member staff equally acceptable to its majority and minority members. Seven of the 11 professional aids to the House Interior and Insular Affairs Committee, including 2 of the top people, are personally of GOP persuasion.

The chief counsel and one other staff member of the House Post Office and Civil Service Committee are Republicans, and much of the committee's work is bipartisan in nature.

But, on the other side of the coin, Republican National Chairman MILLER's alarms

about partisan political domination of the investigative process in congressional staffs take on considerable credence. This will be explored in a subsequent column.

[From the Los Angeles Times, June 20, 1962]

COMMITTEES: GOP SQUEEZED OUT

(Robert T. Hartmann)

Last September, in the dog days of the Washington summer and the waning session of Congress, the Reverend ADAM CLAYTON POWELL, Democrat, of New York, chairman of the House Committee on Education and Labor, wrote a short and unsweet letter to the ranking minority member, Representative CARROLL KEARNS, Republican, of Pennsylvania.

It said, in effect, that the two office rooms assigned to the minority staff since 1947 were a waste of space, sorely needed by the majority, and gave the GOP 2 weeks' notice to vacate one of them.

"If you feel that the new room is too small for you, then I will have to drop members from your payroll so that the room will be of size sufficient to handle your staff," the Harlem Congressman blandly concluded.

KEARNS furiously informed the Congress that POWELL's notorious concern for minority rights was somewhat limited in scope; that the Democratic majority had 40 staff employees while the Republican minority had exactly 4.

Those four, other Republicans related, were double the quota of two allowed the GOP minority on this key investigative committee until POWELL promised to increase their representation in return for KEARNS' support of a whopping \$633,000 committee budget for the coming year.

The upshot of the bitter feud was that KEARNS kept his two rooms but lost his two additional staff members as soon as the funds won House approval. At present, according to a GOP survey, POWELL has 47 committee employees assigned to the majority and 2 to the minority.

In two previous columns, exploring the allegation of Republican National Chairman WILLIAM E. MILLER, Republican, of New York, and others that the full story of the Estes case (or any other current scandal) may never be told while Democrats control both executive and legislative investigations of the Federal Government, I pointed out that (1) on congressional committees the majority is all powerful and (2) committee probes are about as partisan as their potent chairmen.

Despite recurrent reform efforts, only a handful of committees maintain a professional staff chosen without regard to party affiliation and limited to the 12 employees prescribed by the 1946 rules. Since most committees have proliferated into numerous specialized subcommittees—about which the law is silent—staffs can grow as big as the chairman can get the money for.

POWELL's 49-member staff may be the most patently political, but the numbers champ is Representative WILLIAM L. DAWSON (Democrat, Illinois), who has 92 people on his Government Operations Committee's (and its subcommittees') payroll.

The longtime boss of Chicago's Negro wards permits the 11-man Republican minority on this key investigating committee to be served by 3 members of this 92-member staff.

When the Intergovernmental Relations Subcommittee undertook to probe Billie Sol Estes' deals involving Department of Agriculture officials, a public protest by House minority leader HALLECK (Republican, Indiana) forced the temporary hiring of a Republican counsel, Robert Manuel. (He was promptly fired for leaking information to a Republican newspaper but may soon be replaced by another GOP committee aid.)

Government Operations in some ways is the most politically powerful of House com-

mittees. It can investigate any agency of the executive branch and frequently does.

The Fountain subcommittee asked and got \$400,000 to look into the Estes case ahead of the upcoming Senate hearings.

Other examples of political "packing" of committee staffs cited by Republican minority members include:

House Agriculture: 10 Democrats, 1 Republican.

House Appropriations: 70 Democrats, 6 Republicans.

House Banking and Currency: 9 Democrats, 2 Republicans.

House District of Columbia: 9 Democrats, 2 Republicans.

House Judiciary: 18 Democrats, 2 Republicans.

House Merchant Marine and Fisheries: 10 Democrats, 1 Republican.

House Science and Astronautics: 17 Democrats, no Republicans.

House Select Small Business: 21 Democrats, 1 Republican.

Counting all its investigators, the House Un-American Activities Committee staff now totals 53. The top 14 positions, however, are evenly divided among Democrats and Republicans, and the staff operates on a professional basis.

With this exception, it will be noted, the most oversized and most lopsidedly Democratic staffs are among the key investigative and politically sensitive committees of the House of Representatives.

We will have a look at the Senate committee setup in a subsequent column.

[From the Los Angeles Times, June 22, 1962]

PARTISAN POLITICS IN THE SENATE

(By Robert T. Hartmann)

The Senate, where most of the "great debates" and sensational investigative hearings of the Congress are held, is by no means less partisan than the House of Representatives. It only seems to be.

Ask any Senator who he is and he probably will answer: "I am an American, a Senator of the United States, and a Democrat (or Republican)." This is more than forensic flourish. Being 1 of 100 senatorial voices permits more individuality than being 1 of 437 Members of the House, and Senate politicking is often done on the basis of personal relationships rather than strict party discipline.

Senators make a fetish of their "fairness" and of putting "country above party" and sometimes they do. But when it comes to staffing their all-powerful standing committees, they are no better than their colleagues in the House and in some ways worse.

We have discussed this imbalance between majority and minority staff employees in the House in several previous columns. Chairman ADAM CLAYTON POWELL's House Labor and Education Committee, for instance, has 47 people working for the Democrats and 2 taking care of the Republican members.

The key Government Operations Committee staff payroll is split 89 to 3.

But on the Senate side, the Judiciary Committee (which passes on all Federal judgeships) is about as one-sided as the Kennedy administration's appointments when it comes to staff: 146 aids assist the majority and 11 are assigned to the minority.

Some other Senate examples of committee staff allegiance are:

Aeronautics and Science: 11 to 1; Agriculture: 6 to 1; Appropriations: 33 to 3; Armed Services: 25 to 1; Banking and Currency: 17 to 3; Commerce: 27 to 3.

District of Columbia: 7 to 1; Finance: 5 to 1; Foreign Relations: 28 to zero; Interior: 17 to 1; Labor and Welfare: 28 to 4; Post Office and Civil Service: 10 to 1; Public Works: 11 to 2; Small Business: 18 to 1; Special Committee on Aging: 19 to 1.

It is only fair to say that the totals provided by Republican sources, of 462 staff members responsible to the Democratic chairmen of Senate committees versus 39 appointed by and answerable to the ranking minority members, probably reflects more partisanship than actual practice.

For example, the Senate Foreign Relations Committee is about to open the first great debate of the current campaign season, demanded by Minority Leader DIRKSEN, Republican, of Illinois, into the revised national security policy paper prepared at President Kennedy's order by State Department planner, Walt W. Rostow.

The GOP clearly sees the specter of appeasement in New Frontier foreign policy trends and this should be a hot one.

But the 28-member staff of this key committee, while technically answerable to Chairman FULBRIGHT, Democrat, of Arkansas, who is as partisan a liberal Democrat as they come, operates on a professional basis which is generally satisfactory to the Republican minority members.

Under both Democratic and GOP administrations and control of the Senate, this committee makes a point of demonstrating the basic solidarity of the country beyond the water's edge, though sometimes this trumpet sounds uncertainly.

Senator JOHN MCCLELLAN, another Arkansas Democrat who heads the potent permanent investigations subcommittee and its parent Senate Government Operations Committee, has been widely praised for his judicial conduct of public hearings and his fairness to minority Senators. Next week he starts probing the Kennedy administration's first major scandal, the Billie Sol Estes case.

The McClellan committee staff has 44 employees assigned to the Democratic majority and 4 to the Republican minority. It was in this context that Republican National Chairman MILLER recently charged that the public may never learn the full truth about political skulduggeries so long as both legislative and executive investigations are under Democratic control. On this basis he urged Republicans to fight hard to take over the House of Representatives this fall.

The Democrats replied that the minority is duly represented on all committees of Congress and that the probe would be pushed without fear or favor. This, only time will tell.

Meanwhile, however, several Republican Senators and Representatives have attempted to do something about the imbalance of staff assistance on key committees. They have run into a stone wall of solid Democratic opposition, as will be detailed in the final column of this series.

[From the Los Angeles Times, June 27, 1962]

DEMOCRATS HOLD LINE ON COMMITTEE STAFFS

(By Robert T. Hartmann)

The ratio of Democrats to Republicans in the House of Representatives is 263 to 174.

The ratio of Democrats to Republicans in the Senate is 64 to 35.

Roughly reduced, the Democratic majority which controls Congress and supplies the almost omnipotent chairmen of its key committees—where the real legislating and investigating occurs—runs from 3 to 2 to about 2 to 1. That is the way history and the voters decided it.

The same proportions of majority and minority members will be found on most congressional committees. As President Kennedy, an alumnus of both Houses, quickly noted when the question of fair investigations was raised, Republicans are duly represented.

But the spadework is done by committee staffs. All the evidence, damning or otherwise, is first dug up by them. And on these

staffs, as detailed in four previous columns, the ratio is somewhat different.

In the House, there are 531 committee staff employees responsible to the Democratic majority and 45 who answer to the Republicans.

In the Senate, which prides itself on statesmanship above partisanship, committee staffs are divided 462 for the Democrats and 39 for the Republicans.

This is almost 12 to 1.

Totals and averages never tell the whole story. On a few House and Senate committees a strict professionalism surrounds the staffs. Nobody asks the personal political allegiance of such staff members, or cares.

This is fortunately true in the national security fields or foreign affairs and military matters. But it depends primarily on the character of the respective chairman, chosen by the inviolate seniority system.

Why does the Republican minority put up with such a disparity? First, since Congress operates by majority rule, it has no choice. Second, ranking Republican members in too many cases are content to settle for special favors and prerequisites of their own at the expense of the general GOP interest.

The Democratic chairmen "take care" of them in full assurance they will receive the same consideration should they ever slip into the minority spot.

Not all of the minority members have kept silent.

Senator CARL CURTIS (Republican of Nebraska) has been waging a one-man war on the subject, with about as much success as most one-man wars have.

Last February he introduced an amendment authorizing 1 minority staff assistant to be hired for every 10 majority employees on any Senate committee where this was desired by the minority. He also proposed that at least one minority staff member receive the same pay as the top majority aid.

Since the Senate and its committees are divided roughly 2 to 1, a 10-to-1 staff split seems not unreasonable.

After a lot of sanctimonious oratory, however, CURTIS' plan was defeated 55 to 30, on a straight party line vote. Not one Democrat was for it. Not one Republican voted against it.

Senate majority leader MANSFIELD made clear his opposition to any concession in these words:

"For many years Senators have operated on a very cooperative basis. There has been a feeling of mutual trust in the committees between Republicans and Democrats. When the Republicans have been in the minority, they have been taken care of; I think that when the Democrats have been in the minority, they have been taken care of, too."

No such sanctimonious sweetness and light has been heard in the House, but efforts by Republicans to get a fair shake on committee staffing have gotten just about as far.

Representatives SCHWENGL, Republican of Iowa; CURTIS, Republican, of Missouri; CRAMER, Republican, of Florida; LINDSAY, Republican, of New York; and ALGER, Republican, of Texas, have pushed plans in the House to allow the minority, whether it be Republican or Democratic, a fixed legal right to a certain proportion of committee employees. SCHWENGL suggested 40 percent.

None has gotten to first base.

The real limitation on committee staffing is the amount of money each chairman can obtain for his annual operations. Since, in this respect, each House of Congress is a law unto itself, the real power here is vested in two little-known committees: House Administration and Senate Rules and Administration.

These committees consider the budgets for all the others, and their own staffs—not

hitherto reported here—are divided 3 to 1 in the House and 10 to 1 in the Senate.

To sum up the findings of my five columns in this subject, the effectiveness of the Republican minority in this Congress is circumscribed by the lopsidedness of committee staffing to a dangerous degree. It would be just as bad if the injustice were reversed.

Amendments and resolutions introduced by GOP Senators and Representatives to ameliorate this imbalance, however, are mere gestures to attract some public attention to the situation. There is small hope that the Democratic majority ever will voluntarily consent to any of them. Politics simply is not that sporting.

INCREASED NUMBER OF FEDERAL EMPLOYEES

Mr. HOFFMAN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BOW] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, the latest report of the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures became available to us today, and I am shocked to learn that 34,921 employees have been added to the Federal payroll in June.

This is a continuation of a trend that began in February of 1961 and shows no signs of tapering off. There have been sizable increases in 9 of the past 12 months, and I hasten to point out that this has no relationship to our defense problems. The increase in June included 31,267 employees in civilian agencies of the Government and only 3,654 in the military agencies.

In reading this report, I recalled that the President was severely critical of large Federal payrolls during the campaign of 1960.

For example, in Indianapolis on October 4, 1960, he deplored what he called the extravagance of the Eisenhower administration and charged that "the number of Federal employees has grown."

In New York on October 12, the then Senator from Massachusetts complained that the Eisenhower administration "has expanded the Federal payroll to an all-time high."

And, speaking in Roanoke on November 4, he asserted that the Eisenhower administration "added 106,000 new Federal employees," a statement that he considered to be reason enough for changing the leadership of the country.

Mr. Speaker, in truth and in fact the Eisenhower administration during 8 years in office cut the Federal payroll by 201,987 persons. Much of this cut was made shortly after the Eisenhower administration took office, and for the last 4 years of that administration the Federal payroll was virtually stabilized. Mr. Eisenhower found 2,554,824 Federal employees in January of 1953 when he was inaugurated. He left office with only 2,352,837.

Now that figure has grown to 2,496,455. The candidate who used an erroneous figure to show an increase of 106,000 in 8 years, and deplored such extravagance,

has become the President who actually increased the Federal payroll by 143,618 in the short space of 17 months, and if we granted all of the requests in his latest and most extravagant budget, he would add another 41,945 in the next few months.

Mr. Kennedy is doing on a grand scale the very thing for which he incorrectly criticized his predecessor.

All of my figures are from the records of the Joint Committee, an institution for which all of us should be grateful. The senior Senator from Virginia is doing a splendid job as chairman of this committee. In a government as huge and extravagant as this one, it is a good thing to have someone who can keep honest figures.

TRIBUTE TO THE HONORABLE CLARE E. HOFFMAN

Mr. HOFFMAN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HARVEY] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. HARVEY of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I am happy and privileged to join belatedly, but with no less sincerity, with many of my colleagues in paying tribute to a great American, the gentleman from Michigan, CLARE HOFFMAN. I regret that I was unable to take part in the special order of business on Friday, July 20, 1962, but it was necessary for me to be out of the city because of the death of my father-in-law in Detroit, Mich.

Since then, I have had an opportunity to review the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of that day and to read the many wonderful words that his colleagues have said about CLARE. Needless to say, it is difficult now to add to those words which have already been expressed by so many Members, extolling CLARE for the diligent and dedicated manner in which he served his district and his fellow man for 26 years here in the House.

In light of his announced retirement, I consider myself even more fortunate to have had an opportunity to meet him, to visit with him and, more important, to watch and learn from his often unpredictable, but so effective work on the floor of the House. As a freshman Member of this great body, I appreciated very much the many helpful suggestions that CLARE gave to me during my first year here in Congress. There is certainly no dispute from either side of the aisle that CLARE's parliamentary skill and knowledge is unsurpassed. I learned from him many of the intricacies involved in the proper working procedure of this body. But I also plainly saw a true exhibition of devotion and dedication to strong personal principles. Certainly, not everyone always agreed with the gentleman from Michigan, CLARE HOFFMAN, but no one has or ever will question his integrity. He is a fighter, an uncrowned champion in bettering the ways of all

mankind and in defending and promoting our constitutional form of government. I am only sorry that my association with CLARE here in the House has been much too brief as far as I am concerned, for I shall miss the opportunity to work with him.

I would like to join my colleagues from Michigan in wishing CLARE many years of good health, good fortune, and a happy retirement, all of which are so richly deserved.

A POLITICAL THEORY OF FOREIGN AID

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CURTIS] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, there needs to be a thoroughgoing public discussion of the theory, if any, behind our foreign aid programs.

During the debate on the recent mutual security authorization bill, I tried to stress in some detail a point I have tried to make for years; the lack of theory in our foreign aid programs exemplified by our failure to relate trade with aid, lending with grants, offshore procurement and disposal of surplus Government stocks, be they agricultural products, military surplus or what, with the individual country's other economic endeavors, private foreign investment with Government investment, and so forth.

We do not even have criteria by which we test what our programs are doing. Our programs seem to be reacting merely to whatever international communism is doing or said to be doing.

The so-called Marshall plan had a specific objective; having a specific objective there was basis for determining the specific programs which went to make it up. Also and quite important having a specific objective there was a point of termination, when the objective had been fulfilled.

What we are doing today seems to be a hand-to-mouth operation.

I am placing in the RECORD an article by Dr. Hans Morgenthau, of the University of Chicago, entitled "A Political Theory of Foreign Aid," which appears in the June 1962 Political Science Review published by the American Political Science Association. This article should stimulate some thinking on the subject.

I find myself shocked by the tone of realism which pervades the article, so much so that I am tempted to call it cynicism and to take issue with it. However, this is the work of an objective student whom I am certain shares the basic ideals that motivate most of us. Certainly to lay the groundwork for a less cynical world we must face up to the realities even if they shock us.

I do believe we can establish a sensible theory for our foreign aid policy that is both realistic and idealistic. Dr.

Morgenthau's essay will contribute greatly toward establishing a little more realism in an area where sentimentality of the most cloying sort predominates.

A POLITICAL THEORY OF FOREIGN AID¹

(By Hans Morgenthau)

Of the seeming and real innovations which the modern age has introduced into the practice of foreign policy, none has proven more baffling to both understanding and action than foreign aid. The very assumption that foreign aid is an instrument of foreign policy is a subject of controversy. For, on the one hand, the opinion is widely held that foreign aid is an end in itself, carrying its own justification, both transcending, and independent of, foreign policy. In this view, foreign aid is the fulfillment of an obligation of the few rich nations toward the many poor ones. On the other hand, many see no justification for a policy of foreign aid at all. They look at it as a gigantic boondoggle, a wasteful and indefensible operation which serves neither the interests of the United States nor those of the recipient nations.

The public debate on foreign aid has contributed little to understanding. In the spring of every year the Nation engages in such a debate, carried on almost exclusively in terms of the amount of money to be spent for purposes of foreign aid rather than of the substantive purposes which a policy of foreign aid is supposed to serve. The administration tries, as it were, to sell a certain amount of foreign aid to Congress, and Congress refuses to buy that amount. Congress generally appropriates about 10 percent less than what the administration has requested, and the administration spends what is appropriated as it sees fit within the general categories authorized. Only when glaring abuses and inefficiencies are uncovered, as for instance in our foreign aid to Laos, is the question of the substance of our foreign aid policy raised in public, and even then it is put in the negative terms of remedying the abuses and inefficiencies rather than in the positive terms of the purposes our foreign aid policy may be supposed to advance and the kinds of measures best calculated to serve these aims.

It is in fact pointless even to raise the question whether the United States ought to have a policy of foreign aid—as much so as to ask whether the United States ought to have a foreign political or military policy. For the United States has interests abroad which cannot be secured by military means and for the support of which the traditional methods of diplomacy are only in part appropriate. If foreign aid is not available they will not be supported at all.

The question, what kind of policy of foreign aid we ought to have, can then not be evaded. As it has developed in recent years, the kind we have is fundamentally weak. It has been conceived as a self-sufficient technical enterprise, covering a multitude of disparate objectives and activities, responding haphazardly to all sorts of demands, sound and unsound, unrelated or only by accident related to the political purposes of our foreign policy. The United States, in short, has been in the business of foreign aid for more than two decades, but it has yet to develop an intelligible theory of foreign aid that could provide standards of judgment for both the supporters and opponents of a particular measure.

I. SIX TYPES OF FOREIGN AID

The first prerequisite for the development of a viable foreign aid policy is the recogni-

¹ This paper was prepared for the Public Affairs Conference Center, University of Chicago, and will appear in a volume of essays on foreign aid to be published by Rand McNally & Co. in 1962.

tion of the diversity of policies that go by that name. Six such can be distinguished which have only one thing in common—the transfer of money, goods and services from one nation to another. They are humanitarian foreign aid, subsistence foreign aid, military foreign aid, bribery, prestige foreign aid, and foreign aid for economic development.

Of these distinct types, only humanitarian foreign aid is per se nonpolitical. The aid which governments have traditionally extended to nations which are victims of natural disasters, such as floods, famines, and epidemics falls in that category. So do the services, especially in the fields of medicine and agriculture, which private organizations, such as churches and foundations, have traditionally provided in Asia, Africa, and Latin America.

While humanitarian aid is per se nonpolitical, it can indeed perform a political function when it operates with a political context. The foreign aid that private organizations provide will be attributed for better or worse to their respective governments insofar as humanitarian aid emanating from a foreign country is recognized by the recipient country or its inhabitants to perform a political function. Thus the agricultural aid which the Rockefeller Foundation has provided for many years to certain Latin American countries is likely to take on under contemporary conditions a political function which it did not perform previously. The same has from the beginning been true of the work the Ford Foundation has been doing in India. By the same token, humanitarian aid extended by a government may have political effects.

Subsistence foreign aid is extended to governments, such as those of Jordan and Niger, which do not command the resources to maintain minimal public services. The giving nation makes up the deficit in the budget of the recipient nation. Subsistence foreign aid is akin to the humanitarian type in that it seeks to prevent the breakdown of order and the disintegration of organized society. But it also performs the political function of maintaining the status quo, without, however, as a rule, increasing its viability. Where a political alternative to a nonviable regime may exist, subsistence foreign aid diminishes the chances of its materializing.

Bribes proffered by one government to another for political advantage were until the beginning of the 19th century an integral part of the armory of diplomacy. No statesman hesitated to acknowledge the general practice of giving and accepting bribes, however anxious he might be to hide a particular transaction. Thus it was proper and common for a Government to pay the foreign minister or ambassador of another country a pension, that is, a bribe. Lord Robert Cecil, the Minister of Elizabeth, received one from Spain. Sir Henry Wotton, British Ambassador to Venice in the 17th century, accepted one from Savoy while applying for one from Spain. The documents which the French revolutionary government published in 1793 show that France subsidized Austrian statesmen between 1757 and 1769 to the tune of 82,652,479 livres, the Austrian Chancellor Kaunitz receiving 100,000.

The Prussian Ambassador in Paris summed up well the main rule of this game when he reported to his government in 1802: "Experience has taught everybody who is here on diplomatic business that one ought never to give anything before the deal is definitely closed, but it has only proved that the allurements of gain will often work wonders." It is worthy of note that the first appropriation act adopted by the first Congress of the United States in 1789 included a modest contingent fund for such purposes.

Much of what goes by the name of foreign aid today is in the nature of bribes. The transfer of money and services from one government to another performs here the function of a price paid for political services rendered or to be rendered. These bribes differ from the traditional ones exemplified above in two respects: they are justified primarily in terms of foreign aid for economic development, and money and services are transferred through elaborate machinery fashioned for genuine economic aid. In consequence, these bribes are a less effective means for the purpose of purchasing political favors than were the traditional ones.

The compulsion of substituting for the traditional businesslike transmission of bribes the pretense and elaborate machinery of foreign aid for economic development results from a climate of opinion which accepts as universally valid the proposition that the highly developed industrial nations have an obligation to transfer money and services to underdeveloped nations for the purpose of economic development. Thus, aside from humanitarian and military foreign aid, the only kind of transfer of money and services which seems to be legitimate is one ostensibly made for the purpose of economic development. Economic development has become an ideology by which the transfer of money and services from one government to another in peacetime is rationalized and justified.

The present climate of opinion embraces another assumption as universally valid: that economic development can actually be promoted through such transfers of money and services. Thus economic development as an ideology requires machinery that makes plausible the postulated efficacy of the transfer for the stated purpose of economic development. In contrast to most political ideologies, which operate only on the verbal level and whose effects remain within the realm of ideas, this political ideology, in order to be plausible, requires an elaborate administrative apparatus serving as an instrument for a policy of make-believe. The government of nation A, trying to buy political advantage from the government of nation B for, say, the price of \$20 million, must not only pretend, but also act out in elaborate fashion, the pretense, that what it is actually doing is giving aid for economic development to the government of nation B.

This practice of giving bribes as though they were contributions to economic development inevitably creates, in the giver and the recipient, expectations which are bound to be disappointed. Old-fashioned bribery was a relatively straightforward transaction; services were to be rendered at a price, and both sides knew what to expect. Bribery disguised as foreign aid for economic development makes of giver and recipient actors in a play which in the end they may no longer be able to distinguish from reality. In consequence, both may come to expect results in terms of economic development which in the nature of things may not be forthcoming. Thus both are likely to be disappointed, the giver blaming the recipient for his inefficiency and the recipient accusing the giver of stinginess and asking for more. The ideology, if taken for reality, gets in the way of the original purpose of the transaction, and neither side believes that it has received what it is entitled to.

For the past decade, military aid took the lion's share of the foreign aid programs of the United States. A shift in favor of non-military aid occurred during the 1961 session when Congress appropriated somewhat over \$2 billion for military aid, while the total voted for all the other foreign aid programs ran in excess of \$3 billion. To the latter amount must be added the equivalent of approximately \$1 billion in foreign currencies, the proceeds of the sale of agricultural commodities abroad, to be used for

economic grants and loans to purchasing governments.

Foreign aid for military purposes is a traditional way by which nations buttress their alliances. Rome used to receive tribute from its allies for the military protections it provided. The 17th and 18th centuries are the classic period of military subsidies, by which nations, and especially Great Britain, endeavored to increase the military strength of their allies. Glancing through the treaties of alliance of that period, one is struck by the meticulous precision with which obligations to furnish troops, equipment, logistic support, food, money, and the like were defined. The loans which France extended to Russia after the conclusion of the alliance between the two nations in 1894 fall in the same category. This traditional military aid can be understood as a division of labor between two allies who pool their resources, one supplying money, materiel, and training, the other providing primarily manpower.

In contrast to traditional practice, military aid today is extended not only to allies but also to certain uncommitted nations. The military aid the United States has been giving to Yugoslavia is a case in point. The purpose is here not so much military as political. It seeks political advantage in exchange for military aid. It obligates by implication, the recipient toward the giver. The latter expects the former to abstain from a political course which might put in jeopardy the continuation of military aid. Military aid is here really in the nature of a bribe.

What appears as military aid may also be actually in the nature of prestige aid, to be discussed below. The provision of jet fighters and other modern weapons for certain underdeveloped nations can obviously perform no genuine military function. It increases the prestige of the recipient nation both at home and abroad. Being in the possession of some of the more spectacular instruments of modern warfare, a nation can at least enjoy the illusion of having become a modern military power.

As bribery appears today in the guise of aid for economic development, so does aid for economic development appear in the guise of military assistance. In the session of 1961, for instance, Congress appropriated \$425 million for economic aid to strategic areas, and it is likely that in the total appropriations of over \$2 billion for military aid other items of economic aid are hidden. This mode of operation results from the reluctance of Congress to vote large amounts for economic aid in contrast to its readiness to vote virtually any amount requested for military purposes. Yet the purposes of aid for economic development are likely to suffer when they are disguised as military assistance, as we saw the purposes of bribery suffer when disguised as aid for economic development. The military context within which such aid is bound to operate, even though its direct administration be in the hands of the civilian authorities, is likely to deflect aid from its genuine purposes. More particularly, it strengthens the ever-present tendency to subordinate the requirements of aid for economic development to military considerations.

Prestige aid has in common with modern bribes the fact that its true purpose, too, is concealed by the ostensible purpose of economic development or military aid. The unprofitable or idle steel mill, the highway without traffic and leading nowhere, the airline operating with foreign personnel and at a loss but under the flag of the recipient country—all ostensibly serve the purposes of economic development and under different circumstances might do so. Actually, however, they perform no positive economic function. They owe their existence to the penchant, prevalent in many underdeveloped nations, for what might be called conspicuous industrialization, spectacular symbols of, and monuments to, industrial advancement rath-

er than investments satisfying any objective economic needs of the country.

This tendency sheds an illuminating light upon the nature of what is generally referred to as the revolution of rising expectations. We are inclined to assume that the urgent desire to improve one's lot by means of modern technology and industry is a well-nigh universal trend in Asia, Africa, and Latin America. Actually, however, this trend is universal only in the sense that virtually all underdeveloped nations want to appear as having achieved industrialization, while only a fraction of the population, and frequently only small elite groups within it, seek the social and economic benefits of industrialization and are willing to take the measures necessary to achieve them. For many of the underdeveloped nations the steel mill, the highway, the airline, the modern weapons, perform a function that is not primarily economic or military, but psychological and political. They are sought as the outward show of modernity and power. They perform a function similar to that which the cathedral performed for the medieval city and the feudal castle or the monarch's palace for the absolute state. Nehru is reported to have said, when he showed Chou-En-Lai a new dam: "It is in these temples that I worship." And the more underdeveloped and less viable a nation is, the greater is likely to be its urge to prove to itself and to the world through the results of prestige aid that it, too, has arrived in the mid-20th century.

The advantage for the giver of prestige aid is threefold. He may receive a specific political advantage in return for the aid, very much like the advantage received for a bribe. Also, the spectacular character of prestige aid establishes a patent relationship between the generosity of the giver and the increased prestige of the recipient. The giver's prestige is enhanced, as it were, by the increase of the recipient's prestige. Finally, prestige aid comes relatively cheap. A limited commitment of resources in the form of a spectacular but economically useless symbol of modernity may bring disproportionate political dividends.

The giver of foreign aid is therefore well advised to distinguish between prestige aid and aid for economic development, though both are justified by the prospective recipient in terms of genuine economic development. The prospective giver, if unaware of the distinction, is likely to fall into one of two errors. By mistaking prestige aid for aid for economic development, he may waste human and material resources in support of the latter when the purpose of prestige aid could have been achieved much more simply and cheaply. Or else he may reject out of hand a request for prestige aid because he cannot justify it in terms of economic development, and may thereby forgo available political advantages. The classic example of this error is the American rejection of the Afghan request for the paving of the streets of Kabul as economically unsound. The Soviet Union, pursuing a politically oriented policy of foreign aid, did pave the streets of Kabul.

II. FOREIGN AID FOR ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT IN PARTICULAR

None of the types of foreign aid discussed thus far poses theoretical questions of great magnitude; rather they raise issues for practical manipulation which can be successfully met by commonsense tested by experience. Foreign aid for economic development has been the primary area for theoretical analysis and speculation, and these have been primarily of an economic nature. Economic thought, true to its prevailing academic tradition, tends to look at foreign aid as though it were a self-sufficient technical enterprise to be achieved with the instruments, and judged by the standards, of pure economics. And since Western economic development,

from the first industrial revolution onward, has been due to the formation of capital and the accumulation of technical knowledge, we have tended to assume that these two factors would by themselves provide the impetus for the economic development of the underdeveloped nations of Asia, Africa, and Latin America. This tendency has been powerfully supported by the spectacular success of the Marshall plan, the political origins and motivations of which were easily forgotten in its justification as a strictly economic measure for the provision of capital and technological know-how. Yet it is not always recognized that this success was made possible only by the fact that, in contrast to the underdeveloped nations of Asia, Africa, and Latin America, the recipients of Marshall aid were among the leading industrial nations of the world, whose economic systems were but temporarily in disarray.

The popular mind, on the other hand, and, through it, much of the practice of foreign aid have proceeded from certain unexamined assumptions, no less doubtful for being deeply embedded in the American folklore of politics. Thus the popular mind has established correlations between the infusion of capital and technology into a primitive society and its economic development, between economic development and social stability, between social stability and democratic institutions, between democratic institutions and a peaceful foreign policy. However attractive and reassuring these correlations may sound to American ears, they are borne out neither by the experiences we have had with our policies of foreign aid nor by general historic experience.

The first of these assumptions implies that underdevelopment is at least primarily the result of lack of capital and technological know-how. Underdevelopment is regarded as a kind of accident or at worst as a kind of deficiency disease, which can be taken care of through subcutaneous injections of the missing ingredients. Yet a nation may suffer from deficiencies, some natural and insuperable, others social and remediable, which no amount of capital and technological know-how supplied from the outside can cure. The poverty of natural resources may be such as to make economic development impossible. Nations such as Jordan and Somalia are in all likelihood permanently incapable of economic development for that reason. Many of the nations which are the perennial recipients of subsistence aid are likely to fall in the same category.

A nation may also suffer from human deficiencies which preclude economic development. As there are individuals whose qualities of character and level of intelligence make it impossible for them to take advantage of economic opportunities, so are there nations similarly handicapped. To put it bluntly: as there are bums and beggars, so are there bum and beggar nations. They may be the recipients of charity, but short of a miraculous transformation of their collective intelligence and character, what they receive from the outside is not likely to be used for economic development.

Other nations are presently deficient in the specific qualities of character and intelligence that go into the making of a modern economic system, even though their general or inherent capabilities qualify them potentially for the necessary transformation sometime in the future. They are, to use a rough analogy, in a medieval stage of cultural development, still awaiting the equivalent of the moral and intellectual revolutions which in the 16th and 17th centuries created the cultural preconditions for the economic development of the West. Yet we tend to take the existence of these preconditions for granted, forgetting that without the secularization and rationalization of Western

thought and society the industrialization of the West would not have been possible.

A civilization, such as the Burmese, which deprecates success in this world because it stands in the way of success in the other world, puts a cultural obstacle in the path of industrial development, which foreign aid by itself cannot overcome. Saving, that is, the preservation of capital or goods for investment or future use, has become so integral a part of our economic thought and action that it is hard for us to realize that there are hundreds of millions of people in the underdeveloped areas of the world who are oblivious of this mode of operation, indispensable to economic development. We have come to consider the productive enterprise as a continuum in the betterment of which the individual owner or manager has a personal stake.

Yet in many underdeveloped areas the productive enterprise is regarded primarily as an object for financial exploitation, to be discarded when it has performed its function of bringing the temporary owner the largest financial return in the shortest possible time. Foreign aid poured into such a precapitalistic and even prerational mold is less likely to transform the mold than to be forced by it, in ways hardly predictable in advance, into channels serving the interests of a precapitalistic of prerational society.

The economic interests which tend to prevent foreign aid from being used for economic development are typically identified with the ruling groups in underdeveloped societies, which derive their political power in good measure from the economic status quo. The ownership and control of arable land, in particular, is in many of the underdeveloped societies the foundation of political power. Land reform and industrialization are in consequence an attack upon the political status quo. In the measure that they succeed, they are bound to affect drastically the distribution of economic and political power alike. Yet the beneficiaries of both the economic and political status quo are the typical recipients of foreign aid given for the purpose of changing the status quo. To ask them to use foreign aid for this purpose is to require a readiness for self-sacrifice and a sense of social responsibility which few ruling groups have shown throughout history. Foreign aid proffered under such circumstances is likely to fail in its ostensible purpose and, performing the function of a bribe to the ruling group, to strengthen the economic and political status quo. It is more likely to accentuate unsolved social and political problems than to bring them closer to solution. A team of efficiency experts and public accountants might well have improved the operations of the Al Capone gang; yet by doing so, it would have aggravated the social and political evils which the operations of that gang brought forth.

Given this likely resistance of the ruling group to economic development, foreign aid requires drastic political change as a necessary condition for its success. Foreign aid must go hand in hand with political change, either voluntarily induced from within or brought about through pressure from without. The latter alternative faces the giving nation with a dilemma. On the one hand, to give foreign aid for economic development without stipulating conditions that maximize the chances for success will surely maximize the chances for failure. On the other hand, to give aid "with strings" arouses xenophobic suspicions and nationalistic resentments, to be exploited both by the defenders of the status quo and the promoters of Communist revolution.

Furthermore, once one has decided to bring about political change in opposition to the ruling group, one must identify some al-

ternative group as the instrument of political change. Sometimes, the only choice is among alternative groups which are equally unattractive. Sometimes, and not infrequently, the absence of any available alternative group leaves only the choice between creating one or doing nothing.

Finally, the promotion of drastic social change on the part of the giving nation may create the indispensable condition for economic development, but it also conjures up the specter of uncontrollable revolution. In many of the underdeveloped nations peace and order are maintained only through the ruthless use of the monopoly of force by the ruling group. Determined and skillful foreign intervention may find little difficulty in weakening or even removing altogether the power of the ruling group. It is not so easy to finish what has thereby been started. While the interventionist nation may be able to control events up to the point of instigating drastic reform and revolution, it may well prove unable to control the course of the revolution itself. More particularly, a democratic nation, such as the United States, is greatly handicapped in competing with Communists in the control of a revolution. The revolution may start, as it did in Cuba, under the democratic auspices of unorganized masses dedicated to social reform and supported by the United States, and may in the course of its development be taken over by the highly organized and disciplined Communist minority, the only organized and disciplined revolutionary group on the scene.

Successful foreign aid for economic development may have similarly unsettling political results. Economic development, especially by way of industrialization, is bound to disrupt the social fabric of the underdeveloped nation.

By creating an urban industrial proletariat, it loosens and destroys the social nexus of family, village and tribe, in which the individual had found himself secure. And it will not be able, at least not soon, to provide a substitute for this lost social world. The vacuum so created will be filled by social unrest and political agitation. Furthermore, it is not the downtrodden peoples living in a static world of unrelieved misery who are likely protagonists of revolution, but rather those groups that have begun to rise in the social and economic scale have not enough to satisfy their aroused expectations. Thus, economic development is bound to disturb not only the economic status quo but, through it, the political status quo as well. If the change is drastic enough, the social and political effects of economic development may well bring about a prerevolutionary or revolutionary situation. And while the United States may have started the revolutionary process, it will again be uncertain under whose auspices it will be ended.

The United States faces a number of formidable handicaps in trying to control social and political change in the underdevelopment nations either as a prerequisite for, or a result of, foreign aid for economic development. First of all, as a Western capitalistic nation, the United States is a conservative power both domestically and internationally, and must appear particularly so to the underdeveloped nations. Both in its civilization and its social and economic structure, it belongs to that complex of nations which until recently were able to hold Africa, Latin America, and the outlying areas of Asia in a condition of colonial or semicolonial dependency. It has military alliances with these nations, and while it has generally shunned and even opposed outright colonial policies, it has actively and successfully participated in the semicolonial exploitation of backward nations. Thus the resentment against the former colonial powers attaches also, to it and its policies of foreign aid are frequently suspect, as serv-

ing in disguise the traditional ends of colonialism.

Furthermore, the United States, by dint of its pluralistic political philosophy and social system, cannot bring to the backward nations of the world a simple message of salvation, supported first by dedicated and disciplined revolutionary minorities, and then by totalitarian control. In the nature of things, the advantage lies here with the Communist powers. They are, as it were, specialists in exploiting a revolutionary situation, which is bound to cause us embarrassment. For while the Communists are able to direct a revolution into the desired channels through their use of a disciplined minority, we, even if we are convinced that revolution is inevitable and therefore do not oppose it, tend to look on it with misgivings since we cannot control the direction it will take.

The Communist powers have still another advantage over the United States in that, at least on the surface, their problems and achievements are more meaningful to the underdeveloped nations than ours. The Soviet Union has achieved, and Communist China attempts to achieve, what the more enlightened underdeveloped nations seek: a drastic increase in national output through rapid industrialization. The Communist powers use totalitarian control as their instrument and Communist doctrine as rationalization. Seeking the same results, the underdeveloped nations cannot help being attracted by the methods which brought about these results elsewhere. In contrast, the slow process, stretching over centuries, through which the nations of the West achieved a high standard of living through industrialization must appeal much less to them. That appeal is further lessened by the economic processes of the free market and the political processes of liberal democracy through which in large measure Western industrialization was achieved. For these processes require a degree of moral restraint and economic and political sophistication which are largely absent in the underdeveloped nations. The simple and crude methods of totalitarianism must appear to them much more congenial.

Thus we arrive at the disconcerting conclusion that successful foreign aid for economic development can be counterproductive if the social and political goal of the giving nation is the recipient's social and political stability. In some cases at least, the failure of American aid for economic development may have been a blessing in disguise in that it did not disturb a stable status quo whose continuance was in our interest. Such aid, intended for economic development, actually performs the function either of a bribe or of prestige aid. Here again, however, these functions are likely to be impaired by disappointed expectations of economic development on the part of the giving and the recipient nation.

It is equally a moot question whether successful foreign aid for economic development is conducive to the development of democratic institutions and practices. Without stopping here to examine the complexities of the relationship between democracy and economic development, it is enough to observe, as recent history has made clear, that no necessary causal relationship exists between the two. The most impressive example is the Soviet Union. Its rapid economic development has gone hand in hand with totalitarian government, and a case could well be made for the proposition that the former would have been impossible without the latter. It is more likely than not that where the intellectual and moral preconditions for economic development are lacking in the population at large and are present only in a small elite, as is true in many of the underdeveloped nations,

the imposition of the will of that small minority upon the majority of the population is a prerequisite not only for the start of economic development but also for sustained economic growth.

As concerns the promotion of a peaceful foreign policy, economic development is likely to be counterproductive if a political incentive for a belligerent foreign policy is present. The contrary conclusion derives from the popular, yet totally unfounded assumption that poor nations make war on rich nations for economic advantage and that rich nations are by definition peaceful because they have what they want. In truth, of course, most wars have been fought not for economic but political advantage, and, particularly under modern technological conditions, only economically advanced nations are capable of waging modern war. We did not consider the Soviet Union a military threat as long as it was economically underdeveloped; it became one when its economic development had transformed it into a modern industrial power. Similarly, Communist China today, except to its immediate neighbors, is only a potential military threat by virtue of its economic potential, both likely to be activated by economic development.

Foreign aid for economic development, then, has a very much smaller range of potentially successful operation than is generally believed. Its success depends in good measure not so much upon its soundness in strictly economic terms as upon intellectual, moral, and political preconditions, which are not susceptible to economic manipulation, if they are susceptible to manipulation from the outside at all. Furthermore, the political results of successful foreign aid for economic development may be either unpredictable or counterproductive in terms of the political goals of the giving nation. In any event, they are in large measure uncontrollable. Foreign aid proffered and accepted for purposes of economic development may turn out to be something different from what it was intended to be, unless it is oriented toward the political conditions within which it must operate. Most likely, it will turn out to be a bribe or prestige aid, or else a total waste. To do too much may here be as great a risk as to do too little, and masterly inactivity may sometimes be the better part of wisdom.

III. CONCLUSIONS FOR POLICY

The major conclusions for policy to be drawn from this analysis are three: the requirement of identifying each concrete situation in the light of the six different types of foreign aid and of choosing the quantity and quality of foreign aid appropriate to the situation; the requirement of attuning, within the same concrete situation, different types of foreign aid to each other in view of the overall goals of foreign policy; and the requirement of dealing with foreign aid as an integral part of political policy.

The task of identifying concrete situations with the type of foreign aid appropriate to them is a task for country and area experts to perform. Can country A not survive without foreign aid? Is its government likely to exchange political advantages for economic favors? Would our military interests be served by the strengthening of this nation's military forces? Does this country provide the noneconomic preconditions for economic development to be supported by foreign aid? Are our political interests likely to be served by giving this nation foreign aid for purposes of prestige? Can a case be made for foreign aid in order to alleviate human suffering? What kind and quantity of foreign aid is necessary and sufficient to achieve the desired result?

To answer these questions correctly demands first of all a thorough and intimate

knowledge and understanding of the total situation in a particular country. But it also requires political and economic judgment of a very high order, applied to two distinct issues. It is necessary to anticipate the receptivity of the country to different kinds of foreign aid and their effects upon it. When this analysis has been made, it is then necessary to select from a great number of possible measures of foreign aid those which are most appropriate to the situation and hence most likely to succeed.

In most cases, however, the task is not that simple. Typically, an underdeveloped country will present a number of situations indicating the need for different types of foreign aid simultaneously. One type given without regard for its potential effects upon another type risks getting in the way of the latter. One of the most conspicuous weaknesses of our past foreign aid policies has been the disregard of the effect different types of foreign aid have upon each other. Bribes given to the ruling group, for instance, are bound to strengthen the political and economic status quo. Military aid is bound to have an impact upon the distribution of political power within the receiving country; it can also have a deleterious effect upon the economic system, for instance, by increasing inflationary pressures. Similarly, the effect of subsistence foreign aid is bound to be the support of the status quo in all its aspects. Insofar as the giving nation desires these effects or can afford to be indifferent to them they obviously do not matter in terms of its overall objectives. But insofar as the giving nation has embarked upon a policy of foreign aid for economic development which requires changes in the political and economic status quo, the other types of foreign aid policies are counterproductive in terms of economic development; for they strengthen the very factors which stand in its way.

This problem is particularly acute in the relations between prestige aid and aid for economic development. The giving nation may seek quick political results and use prestige aid for that purpose; yet it may also have an interest in the economic development of the recipient country, the benefits of which are likely to appear only in the more distant future. Prestige aid is at best only by accident favorable to economic development; it may be irrelevant to it, or it may actually impede it.

What kind of foreign aid is the giving country to choose? If it chooses a combination of both it should take care to choose an innocuous kind of prestige aid and to promote economic development the benefits of which are not too long in coming. Afghanistan is the classic example of this dilemma. The Soviet Union, by paving the streets of Kabul, chose a kind of prestige aid that is irrelevant to economic development. The United States, by building a hydroelectric dam in a remote part of the country, chose economic development, the very existence of which is unknown to most Afghans and the benefits of which will not appear for years to come.

It follows, then, from the very political orientation of foreign aid that its effect upon the prestige of the giving nation must always be in the minds of the formulators and executors of foreign aid policies. Foreign aid for economic development, in particular, which benefits the recipient country immediately and patently is a more potent political weapon than aid promising benefits that are obscure and lie far in the future. Furthermore, the political effects of foreign aid are lost if its foreign source is not obvious to the recipients. For it is not aid as such or its beneficial results that creates political loyalties on the part of the recipient, but the positive relationship that the mind of the recipient establishes between the aid and

its beneficial results, on the one hand, and the political philosophy, the political system, and the political objectives of the giver, on the other. That is to say, if the recipient continues to disapprove of the political philosophy, system, and objectives of the giver, despite the aid he has received, the political effects of the aid are lost. The same is true if he remains unconvinced that the aid received is but a natural, if not inevitable, manifestation of the political philosophy, system, and objectives of the giver. Foreign aid remains politically ineffectual—at least for the short term—as long as the recipient says either: "Aid is good, but the politics of the giver are bad"; or, "Aid is good, but the politics of the giver—good, bad, or indifferent—have nothing to do with it." In order to be able to establish psychological relationship between giver and recipient, the procedures through which aid is given, and the subject matter to which it is applied, must lend themselves to the creation of a connection between the aid and the politics of the giver which reflects credit upon the latter.

The problem of foreign aid is insoluble if it is considered as a self-sufficient technical enterprise of a primarily economic nature. It is soluble only if it is considered an integral part of the political policies of the giving country—which must be devised in view of the political conditions, and for its effects upon the political situation, in the receiving country. In this respect, a policy of foreign aid is no different from diplomatic or military policy or propaganda. They are all weapons in the political armory of the nation.

As military policy is too important a matter to be left ultimately to the generals, so is foreign aid too important a matter to be left in the end to the economists. The expertise of the economist must analyze certain facts, devise certain means, and perform certain functions of manipulation for foreign aid. Yet the formulation and overall execution of foreign aid policy is a political function. It is the province of the political expert.

It follows from the political nature of foreign aid that it is not a science but an art. That art requires by way of mental predisposition a political sensitivity to the interrelationship among the facts, present and future, and ends and means. The requirements by way of mental activity are twofold. The first is a discriminating judgment of facts, ends and means and their effects upon each other. However, an analysis of the situation in the recipient country and, more particularly, its projection into the future and the conclusions from the analysis in terms of policy can only in part be arrived at through rational deduction from ascertainable facts. When all the available facts have been ascertained, duly analyzed, and conclusions drawn from them, the final judgments and decisions can be derived only from subtle and sophisticated hunches. The best the formulator and executor of a policy of foreign aid can do is to maximize the chances that his hunches turn out to be right. Here as elsewhere in the formulation and conduct of foreign policy, the intuition of the statesman, more than the knowledge of the expert, will carry the day.

WILMINGTON, DEL., DOCTORS GIVE THALIDOMIDE TO THEIR PATIENTS

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Delaware [Mr. McDOWELL] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. McDOWELL. Mr. Speaker, the Wilmington, Del., Evening Journal of July 31, 1962, reported on page 1 that 14 Wilmington-area doctors received the new and dangerous drug thalidomide, and gave it to their patients.

Fortunately, none of the drug was given to pregnant women.

This was a most fortunate circumstance.

Two inspectors from the Philadelphia district office of the U.S. Food and Drug Administration are making a check on this situation.

The Wilmington, Del., Evening Journal of July 31, 1962, also carried an Associated Press dispatch which reported:

New York City authorities have disclosed that an armless, legless baby was born July 21 to a Queens housewife who took the drug thalidomide.

The child lived less than an hour. It was the city's first reported death involving thalidomide.

The American Medical Association began intensive research into the drug and its effects.

The Food and Drug Administration said thalidomide pills had been distributed by doctors in 39 States and the District of Columbia, but none had been sold commercially.

Are we in the Congress to stand complacently by and not do everything we can to correct the inadequacies in the law, in the regulations, and in policy which has permitted a condition to come about which is causing death to some children and others to be born crippled and deformed both in body and in mind?

What is particularly revolting to me is that drug companies are now using the public as guinea pigs.

According to the Associated Press report which I have quoted from, thalidomide pills have been distributed by doctors in 39 States and the District of Columbia. None of these pills were sold commercially.

Why should a doctor be permitted to give away to his innocent and unsuspecting patients free samples of new drugs, drugs, furthermore, which are unproven, or which lack approval of the proper Federal and State officials?

I intend to keep asking questions on this matter until I get satisfactory answers.

We have State and Federal regulatory bodies, and we have laws, all concerned with the licensing and regulation of drugs.

Who or what, then, is to blame for the tragic developments in the case of this new and horrible drug, thalidomide?

Why should a physician, or anyone else, for that matter, hand out such a deadly drug as thalidomide?

How can a drug company distribute throughout the country samples of such a horrible drug?

How many more such dangerous drug products are there on the market?

These are some of the questions for which I shall seek prompt and satisfactory answers.

I include as part of my remarks the Associated Press articles which appeared in the Wilmington, Del., Evening Journal

of July 31, 1962, to which I have referred:

[From the Wilmington (Del.) Evening Journal, July 31, 1962]

INSPECTORS FIND NO PILLS LEFT HERE

Federal inspectors continued on the trail of thalidomide pills here today. Their search yesterday revealed no cases of pregnant women receiving the drug, blamed for infant deformities.

The two inspectors from the Philadelphia district office of the U.S. Food and Drug Administration still had to contact 5 of the 14 Wilmington area doctors known to have received the drug.

They reported that none of the nine doctors contacted yesterday had any of the pills still on hand, and none had given them to pregnant women.

The search turned up one case in which a woman received the pills before pregnancy. She later gave birth to a normal child, according to Herbert W. Ayres, Deputy FDA Director at Philadelphia.

Thalidomide has been blamed for deformities in babies born to European women who took it in early stages of pregnancy.

The two inspectors, Jan Larsen and Russell Abel, expect to contact the remaining five doctors today.

Ayres said yesterday his men have reached 44 of 163 doctors in eastern Pennsylvania, southern New Jersey and Delaware who received the drug. He said they found no cases in which it caused abnormal births.

The drug, used extensively in Germany, was recalled last April at the request of the FDA by its U.S. distributor, the William S. Merrell Co. of Cincinnati.

[From the Wilmington (Del.) Evening Journal, July 31, 1962]

THALIDOMIDE BLAMED IN DEATH OF NEW YORK BABY

New York City authorities have disclosed that an armless, legless baby was born July 21 to a Queens housewife who took the drug thalidomide.

The child lived less than an hour. It was the city's first reported death involving thalidomide.

Meanwhile the Arizona television star who took the drug, lost a court battle for a legal abortion.

The American Medical Association began intensive research into the drug and its effects.

A congressional hearing was scheduled for tomorrow to inquire into what one Senator called serious communication weaknesses concerning the drug's suspected crippling power.

The Food and Drug Administration said thalidomide pills had been distributed by doctors in 39 States and the District of Columbia, but none had been sold commercially.

In one of those States, the New York City Health Department said a 37-year-old Queens woman, who reportedly took 90 thalidomide pills before and during pregnancy, gave birth July 21 to a deformed baby which lived only about 40 minutes.

"The tragic case in Queens highlights the hazard of the pills," said the acting city health commissioner, Dr. George James.

In Phoenix, Ariz., Superior Court Judge Yale McFate dismissed a suit by television personality Sherri Finkbine, who sought to legalize the abortion she had planned.

"Miss Sherri," star of a Phoenix TV kiddie show, took thalidomide, which has been blamed for malformation of thousands of new-born infants, mostly in Europe. Mrs. Finkbine and her husband said they didn't want to risk such a birth.

The couple said today they would go elsewhere—to "a more favorable legal climate"—to seek an abortion. They said they had not yet decided where to go.

Arizona law prohibits abortion unless the prospective mother's life is endangered by childbirth. Judge McFate's decision means that the Finkbines, their doctor and their hospital have no guarantee against prosecution if they go ahead with the previously planned abortion in that State.

The judge noted that Arizona law concerning abortion was not challenged in Mrs. Finkbine's suit. He said she sought only to have the court determine that a miscarriage was necessary to save her life.

McFate added that the suit contained no controversy and therefore his court had no jurisdiction in the matter.

In New York, the acting health commissioner said the woman whose deformed baby died had taken thalidomide on the advice of a Park Avenue psychiatrist, Dr. Richard H. Hoffman.

James added that Hoffman prescribed the drug for 50 patients, and that at least a dozen other physicians in the city had administered thalidomide to 200 other New Yorkers.

With the exception of the unidentified Queens woman, James said, "so far none of the patients we have found were pregnant during medication."

Hoffman said he had ordered the thalidomide from a pharmacy in Germany and gave it to the Queens woman as a sedative.

"Her pregnancy (it was her first) was not anticipated," the psychiatrist said. "She was addicted to barbiturates. I prescribed thalidomide because I wanted to get her off them (the sleep-inducing barbiturate pills)."

Hoffman said he found the drug worked effectively as a sedative except in pregnant women. When he learned the Queens woman was pregnant, he said, he stopped administering the drug, produced under the trade name of Contagen. He explained further:

"By that time, the news had come from Germany about the dangers of Contagen's thalidomide base. I learned about it when I tried to reorder the drug from my German suppliers."

In Chicago, the American Medical Association said it assigned its council on drugs to do the research on thalidomide. The drug has been under clinical evaluation since 1956, the AMA said, but it hopes the council's study will provide information on congenital malformations and that "appropriate measures will be developed to safeguard our population."

Senator HUBERT H. HUMPHREY, Democrat, of Minnesota, chairman of the Senate Government Operations Subcommittee that will open hearings on thalidomide, made the comment on "serious communication weaknesses."

HUMPHREY said witnesses will include Dr. Frances Kelsey. The Food and Drug Administration physician blocked commercial distribution of thalidomide in this country after being alerted to its potential danger by what the Senator called her "chance reading" of a British medical journal article.

In England, where Parliament recently turned down a bid to legalize abortion for mothers who had taken thalidomide, Health Minister Enoch Powell was accused in the House of Commons of moving too slowly in withdrawing the drug from the British market.

"Is it not a grave dereliction of duty by the Minister that he did not take note of the steep rise in the number of abnormal births observed, not only in this country but abroad?" asked House Member Maurice Edelman.

Despite the criticism, Powell told the House he refuses to provide Government compensation to mothers of babies deformed by the drug. The British Health Service, however, pays for artificial limbs for crippled babies and for their special training where possible.

In Ottawa, Canadian Parliament Member Stanley Knowles asserted he will demand that the Government pay all medical expenses of babies born deformed as a result of thalidomide. More than 40 such Canadian babies have been born, he said.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to Mr. McDOWELL (at the request of Mr. EDMONDSON), for 10 minutes, today, and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

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

Mr. FOGARTY, his remarks today on the conference report on H.R. 10904 and to include a table.

Mr. LAIRD, his remarks today on the conference report on H.R. 10904, and to include certain charts, graphs, and extraneous matter.

Mr. PHILBIN.
Mr. ROOSEVELT and to include extraneous matter.

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

Mr. MICHEL.
Mr. FINO.
Mrs. ST. GEORGE.
Mr. WALLHAUSER.

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

Mr. MULTER.
Mr. POWELL.
Mr. CELLER.
Mr. McDOWELL.
Mr. GONZALEZ.
Mr. HARDING.

ADJOURNMENT

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

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 6 o'clock and 17 minutes p.m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, August 2, 1962, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of title XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

2358. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting the final report of the U.S. Study Commission-

Texas, pursuant to section 209(c) of the Act approved August 28, 1958, as amended by the act approved September 8, 1959 (H. Doc. No. 494); to the Committee on Public Works and ordered to be printed with illustrations.

2359. A letter from the Administrator, Federal Aviation Agency, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to amend section 1403 of the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 to perfect certain provisions of the International Aviation Facilities Act"; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

2360. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, U.S. Department of Justice, transmitting copies of orders suspending deportation as well as a list of the persons involved, pursuant to the Immigration and Nationality Act of 1952; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2361. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, U.S. Department of Justice, transmitting a copy of the order suspending deportation in the case of Leonard Costa, A-4823954, pursuant to the Immigration and Nationality Act of 1952; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2362. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, Department of the Army, dated June 20, 1962, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and an illustration, on an interim hurricane survey of Freeport and vicinity, Texas, authorized by Public Law 71, 84th Congress, approved June 15, 1955 (H. Doc. No. 495); to the Committee on Public Works and ordered to be printed with one illustration.

2363. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, Department of the Army, dated June 20, 1962, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and an illustration on the Great Lakes Harbor Study-Interim Report on Kenosha Harbor, Wis., requested by resolutions of the Committees on Public Works, U.S. Senate and House of Representatives, adopted May 18, 1956, April 30, 1957, and June 27, 1956. It is in final response to a resolution of the Committee on Public Works, House of Representatives, adopted July 31, 1957, also (H. Doc. No. 496); to the Committee on Public Works and ordered to be printed with one illustration.

2364. A letter from the Secretary of the Army transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, Department of the Army, dated June 21, 1962, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and illustrations on a survey of Redwood Creek, Humboldt County, Calif., authorized by the Flood Control Act, approved September 3, 1954 (H. Doc. No. 497); to the Committee on Public Works and ordered to be printed with two illustrations.

2365. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, Department of the Army, dated June 19, 1962, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and illustrations, on an interim report on the Arkansas River at Dodge City, Kans., and vicinity, requested by a resolution of the Committee on Flood Control, House of Representatives, adopted July 2, 1943 (H. Doc. No. 498); to the Committee on Public Works and ordered to be printed with two illustrations.

2366. A letter from the Secretary of the Army transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, Department of the Army, dated May 31, 1962, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and an illustration, on a review of the reports on the Swinomish Channel, Wash., requested by resolutions of the Committees on Public Works, U.S. Senate and House of Representatives, adopted May 18, 1957, and February 20, 1951 (H. Doc. No. 499); to the

Committee on Public Works and ordered to be printed with one illustration.

2367. A letter from the Secretary of the Army transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, Department of the Army, dated June 22, 1962, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and an illustration, on a review of the report on Searsport Harbor, Maine, requested by a resolution of the Committee on Public Works, House of Representatives, adopted June 3, 1959 (H. Doc. No. 500); to the Committee on Public Works and ordered to be printed with one illustration.

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. BLATNIK: Committee on Public Works. H.R. 5604. A bill to amend the acts of May 21, 1926, and January 25, 1927, relating to the construction of certain bridges across the Delaware River, so as to authorize the use of certain funds acquired by the owners of such bridges for purposes not directly related to the maintenance and operation of such bridges and their approaches; without amendment (Rept. No. 2101). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. LANE: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 9459. A bill to amend section 2733 of title 10, United States Code, to authorize the Secretaries of the military departments to settle certain claims in the amount of \$10,000 or less; without amendment (Rept. No. 2102). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. ROBERTS of Alabama: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. H.R. 1341. A bill to require passenger-carrying motor vehicles purchased for use by the Federal Government to meet certain safety standards; without amendment (Rept. No. 2112). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. MORRIS: Joint Committee on Atomic Energy. H.R. 12718. A bill to amend the Atomic Energy Community Act of 1955, as amended, to provide for the disposal of federally owned properties at Los Alamos, N. Mex., and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 2113). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. MADDEN: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 741. Resolution for consideration of H.R. 11880. A bill to amend the Foreign Service Buildings Act, 1926, to authorize additional appropriations, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 2114). Referred to the House Calendar.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. LANE: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 12539. A bill for the relief of Leslie O. Cox and other employees of the Federal Aviation Agency; with amendment (Rept. No. 2103). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. LANE: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 9590. A bill for the relief of Lt. Col. Edward Hirsch; with amendment (Rept. No. 2104). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. LANE: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 9473. A bill for the relief of Kenneth F. Miller; without amendment (Rept. No. 2105). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. LANE: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 9128. A bill for the relief of Sgt. Ernest I. Aguilar; with amendment (Rept. No. 2106). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. LANE: Committee on the Judiciary. House Resolution 739. Resolution providing for sending the bill (H.R. 10031) for the relief of the John V. Boland Construction Co., together with accompanying papers, to the Court of Claims; without amendment (Rept. No. 2107). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. CHELF: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 1681. A bill for the relief of Gabriel Chehebar, his wife, Marcelle Levy Chehebar, and their minor children, Albert, Zakia, Zaki, Jacques, and Joseph Chehebar; with amendment (Rept. No. 2108). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WALTER: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 9775. A bill for the relief of Nihat Ali Ucuncu; with amendment (Rept. No. 2109). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. MOORE: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 10160. A bill for the relief of Mrs. A. R. Lendian; with amendment (Rept. No. 2110). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. FEIGHAN: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 11866. A bill for the relief of Kim Chung Shin (Mary Rathbun); without amendment (Rept. No. 2111). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. COOLEY: Committee on Agriculture. H.R. 9914. A bill for the relief of San-Man Inn of Manning, Inc.; with amendment (Rept. No. 2115). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois:
H.R. 12745. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to exempt all-channel television receiving sets from the manufacturer's excise tax; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DERWINSKI:
H.R. 12746. A bill to amend title 13, United States Code, to preserve the confidential nature of copies of information filed with the Bureau of the Census on a confidential basis; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. O'BRIEN of New York:
H.R. 12747. A bill to provide for furthering the economic development of the Virgin Islands through the transfer and conveyance to the Government of the Virgin Islands of certain property under the cognizance of the Department of the Interior, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. SCRANTON:
H.R. 12748. A bill to amend the Area Re-development Act to permit the repayment of assistance furnished from State and local sources concurrently with the repayment of Federal assistance in certain cases; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. WILLIAMS:
H.R. 12749. A bill to create the National Capital Airports Corporation, to provide for the operation of the federally owned civil airports in the District of Columbia or its

vicinity by the Corporation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. BENNETT of Florida:

H.R. 12750. A bill to grant authority to the Federal courts to deny bail to defendants in certain criminal cases involving crimes affecting the national security; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BUCKLEY:

H.R. 12751. A bill to authorize the improvement of Flushing Bay and Creek, N.Y., for navigation; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. CLARK:

H.R. 12752. A bill to authorize modification of local participation in flood control projects; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. SHELLEY:

H.R. 12753. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide that amounts received as certain awards under the Japanese-American Evacuation Claims Act of 1948, as amended, shall not be included in gross income; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MARSHALL:

H. Res. 740. Resolution to replace the 11 stars above the Speaker's desk in the Hall of the House with national motto, "In God We Trust"; to the Committee on House Administration.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mr. BROYHILL, by request:
H.R. 12754. A bill for the relief of Ioannis Muntzalias; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MILLER of New York:
H.R. 12755. A bill for the relief of Lucio Marinucci; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 12756. A bill for the relief of the family of Capt. William B. Clifford; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MULTER:
H.R. 12757. A bill to exempt from taxation certain real property in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania:
H.R. 12758. A bill for the relief of Dr. Marcelo A. Manubay and his wife, Eugenia B. Manubay; 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:

397. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the chairman, resolutions committee, General Federation of Women's Clubs, Washington, D.C., relative to urging every clubwoman in each State federation to work actively for a constitutional amendment which will allow nondenominational religious observance in all American institutions receiving public or private revenues if participation therein is not made compulsory; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

398. Also, petition of Clarence J. Schu, supreme secretary, Knights of St. John, Evansville, Ind., relative to requesting an amendment to the Constitution which will clearly define the status of religion in relation to Government in our country; to the Committee on the Judiciary.