1 or the team members were evil. They were ports on all aspects of the contract, in the fact that in the senatorial campaign of 1858 in Illinois he was the successful rival of Abraham Lincoln, and because in the presidential election of 1860 he was the unsuccessful candidate of the northern Democratic Party.

On Tuesday of this week we celebrated the 50th anniversary of the birth of Stephen A. Douglas, and I should like to take this opportunity to make a few comments about the man and his significance to American life.

In a natural desire to magnify the qualities of our noble politician-saint, Abraham Lincoln, there has been a tendency to disparage and depreciate Stephen A. Douglas, his opponent. As Lincoln has been properly cast in the role of hero, what is more inevitable for those who love sharp contrasts than to denigrate Douglas the pariah of villain. So in discussing these memorable debates in which a dull, deplorable Illinois two abeest sons struggled across our hot prairies and which were in fact the prelude to the Civil War, many writers, and occasionally, general public and drama and opera, have been taken at times, by partisan feeling, have generally drawn a sharp comparison between a Douglas who is pictured as squatter, arrogant, militarily unable, dunce, dull, bright, and the tall, majestic, all-comprehending Lincoln.

This is a gross distortion of the truth. Without disparaging Lincoln in the slightest, I hope that in the few minutes at my disposal, I may put the debaters in a more accurate perspective.

In the first place, Douglas' energy and ability were such as to make him a foe worthy of Lincoln's steel. No neutral can study the debates and not Lincoln who won the senatorial election.

Born in Vermont in 1813, Douglas came to Illinois when he was 12, with but a single dollar in his pocket. He disembarked at the little Illinois River hamlet of Naples, and then walked 12 miles to the little village of Winchester. After teaching school at Winchester for a few months, he was admitted to the bar shortly before he was 21. A few months afterward he was chosen states attorney of McLean County. Elected to the legislature at the age of 23, he served with Lincoln where he made a distinctly better record than Douglas. At 27, he became secretary of state for Illinois and shortly afterwards the youngest judge ever to serve on our State supreme court. Then in 1846 he was elected to Congress, and 3 years afterward, at the age of 33, to the Senate of the United States. As Clay, Calhoun, Webster, and Benton faded from the scene, Douglas became the intellectual leader of the Senate, and the voice of young America, and of western expansion.

He received a number of votes for the Democratic nomination for the Presidency in 1852, and barely missed being nominated for the Presidency in 1856, when he was 43 years of age. When he appeared in this campaign for the Senate in 1858, he was the foremost statesman of his party.

Douglas was, as I have said, the advocate of western expansion. He had supported the Mexican War and the acquisition of California, and Nevada, and also a large section of Texas. He worked aggressively for an Oregon treaty which would bind the Pacific Northwest while it was an American section of Texas. He sought to bring the Pacific Northwest under the American flag, and he looked forward to the day when all of North America would be joined to us in political union with continental free trade and with democratic institutions prevailing for all. To cement such union, he put through the Illinois Central Railroad running from Galena and Chicago in the North to New Orleans in the South, and which was designed to tie the Middle West with Mississippi and the Gulf States. In doing this, he avoided the later abuses and scandals of the railroad grants of the 1860s and 1870s, and gave to the State of Illinois the fruits of the Morrill and Homestead Acts of the road and a voice in its control.

I may say that he was scrupulous in seeing to it that he did not profit personally from land grants, a fact which is not likely to be remembered unless it is pushed through legislation for a railroad from Chicago to the Pacific Ocean to connect the Middle with the Far West.

It was here that Douglas' energy and ability and personality came into play the forces which were his ultimate undoing. For the immediate question of the late 1840s and of the 1850's was whether the new lands being acquired were to be slave or free; the ultimate issue was no less than the fate of the Nation as a whole. The southern fire-eaters wanted to extend slavery into the North, and Tombs of Georgia boasted that he was going to call the roll of his slaves from the foot of Bunker Hill Monument. The Northern Abolitionists, on the other hand, wanted slavery to be abolished in the new lands. Douglas was willing to fail in his objectives, each preferred secession and separation to union in a divided country.

Midway between these groups stood Douglas. As a compromiser, he prided himself that the people of the newly established territories should have the right to determine whether or not they wished to legalize slavery, and that the Federal Government should preserve strict neutrality.

To obtain Southern support for his Western railway, he got Congress in 1854 to pass the Kansas-Nebraska Act which repealed the Missouri Compromise of 1820. This compromise had prohibited slavery in new territories north of the line of Missouri and Illinois. The extension of the southern boundary of Missouri, but Douglas now opened them up to local option on the question. While the Compromise had prohibited slavery in new territories north of the line of Missouri, but Douglas now opened them up to local option on the question. While the Compromise had prohibited slavery in new territories north of the line of Missouri, but Douglas now opened them up to local option on the question.
pending bill, H.R. 5517, the Supplemental Appropriation Act of 1963, an amendment, which I send to the desk with written notice under the rule.

I believe that the language of this amendment is from the bill (S. 559) which was introduced on January 28, 1963, by Senators Long of Michigan, Keating, Bartlett, Clark, Cooper, Humphrey, Long, Kuchel, McIntyre, Morse, Mansfield, Proxmire and Randolph.

I believe that this disclosure language—which is part of the Long bill I am offering—derives from earlier proposals by the Senate from Arkansas. I hope we may at last get publicity of expenditures in primary as well as general elections.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The motion will be received and referred.

(See the foregoing notice printed in full when submitted by Mr. Douglas, which appears under a separate heading.)

THE FOOD STAMP ACT OF 1963
Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, I note that the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry (Mr. Ellender) today introduced a bill to amend the Food Stamp Act of 1963. This is the administration bill and it provides a nationwide food stamp program similar to that which has been operated on a pilot basis for the past 2 years.

The present program was established by Executive order, under the direction of the Senate from the University of Wisconsin, and it provides, among other things, for the莫过于 expenditures in primary as well as general elections.

The pilot food stamp program established by the Department of Agriculture is in operation in 34 cities and counties, and it has received strong support from many other counties and cities who have sought to become eligible to participate in the program. This bill provides a nationwide basis for the program.

Under the present pilot program an eligible family purchases stamps at a rate equivalent to the amount of money normally spent for food; the family receives additional food stamps in an amount determined by family size and family income. In the pilot program the average family has received $3,500 worth of stamps for each 5 cents in cash expended for stamps.

The eligibility requirements for participation are set by the States, using such factors as income support by public welfare assistance. However, State standards are worked out with representation of the Department of Agriculture and the State plan must have the approval of the Secretary to ensure that the standards conform to the objectives of the program.

The food stamp program is not a surplus food distribution program. It operates through the normal channels of trade, and retailers who accept stamps redeem them throughout wholesale food concerns or through banks.

The pilot program has been operated on a budget of $50 million. The budget request for next year is approximately $15.5 million, but, of course, if the program were to be widely expanded the appropriations would have to be increased. This is a decision which the Congress would make each year, depending upon the needs.

I commend the administration, and the chairman of the committee as well, for their support of the program.

Mr. HART. Mr. President, I should like to express pleasure at the statement made by Senator from Wisconsin (Mr. McCARTHY) with regard to the food stamp program and the action of the chairman of the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, and share with the Senator from Minnesota the hope that we will soon see acceptance of the program which, in its pilot operation, has demonstrated its effectiveness.

PROXMIRE PAYMENT TO THE TREAURY—A HOME RUN FOR INTEGRITY
Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, the senior Senator from Wisconsin (Mr. PROXMIRE) has repeatedly demonstrated his honesty and courage in his 50 years in the Senate.

Recently he once again showed a striking devotion to the highest standards of public office when he took the remarkable action of paying more than $9,000 to the Federal Treasury out of his own pocket, as an unconditional gift.

This payment by Senator PROXMIRE represented the full salary paid to his top assistant since that assistant went to work on the Senator's payroll on August 27, 1963.

Senator PROXMIRE has also announced he will pay his chief assistant's full salary from April 1 to mid-June from the Senator's own pocket. This is an additional $3,000.

PROXMIRE is doing this although his top staffman has been working hard and well for him on Senate business since he was hired last August, and will continue to work for Wisconsin's senior Senator while taking graduate work at the University of Wisconsin in Madison.

Mr. President, the Library of Congress has indicated only one public record of a Senator paying any of his Senate staff out of his own personal pocket, and that was a multimillionaire. The Senator from Wisconsin is a man of modest means.

The senior Senator from Wisconsin has been under vigorous attack in his State for having this man work for him on his Senate payroll while taking courses at the University of Wisconsin. It's a marvelous gesture.

What Senator PROXMIRE has done in assuming the full and total cost of this assistant's work is remarkable. I salute him for it.

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

PROXMIRE'S $9,007 CORRECTION
Recently Senator PROXMIRE aroused something of a storm in his home State of Wisconsin when he became known for his $9,000 contribution to the budget of the Senate office. Although the amount of money in question was comparatively small, the Senator's gesture is one that few other politicians could have made.

Mr. PROXMIRE has done this as an act of integrity. He is a man who has always been known for his fine sense of public responsibility and for his willingness to stand up for what he believes is right. This is a gesture that is not only commendable but laudable, and it is one that should be emulated by all members of Congress.

The TFX WARPLANE
Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, in the Chicago Daily News of April 28, 1963, there appears an article by Mr. Freedman on the TFX question.

I seek unanimous consent that this article be printed in the body of the Record.

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

NEW McNAIRN Miss Says Her Son, Former Editor of TFX Evaluation

(By Max Freedman)

WASHINGTON—In the last few days the bitterness in the TFX warplane controversy has sensibly declined. The Defense Department has dropped its campaign against the motives of the Senate investigating committee in holding an inquiry into the circumstances of the TFX contract. The Senate has been won over, at least temporarily, by the arguments of Mrs. McNAIRN, who is now a writer on an aviation magazine.

The TFX warplane, a new fighter-bomber, was ordered to be placed in the Air Force's inventory as follows:
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of the people of Kansas, Douglas broke with Buchanan and fought with all his strength for fair play and free elections. In the senatorial election of 1858, he was thrice defeated by the Buchanan Democrats as well as by the newly founded Republican Party under its leader, Lincoln. These latter two groups, widely divided as they were in their ultimate aims, were nevertheless united in a common effort to end the political career of Douglas.

Lincoln's opposition was, of course, deeper than any personal rivalry. Like Douglas, he occupied a middle ground between the two sets of extremists. But unlike Douglas, he maintained that the Federal Government should not merely prevent its extension into the territories. By thus preventing the spread of slavery into new territory, he believed that the coexisting states of that institution would ultimately lead to the freeing of the slaves in the South. But he wanted this to be done peacefully, voluntarily, and without coercion.

These, then, were the momentous issues which a century ago were being threshed out on the prairies of our beloved country, which faced the voters here on this very spot. For it was here that Lincoln asked Douglas the crucial question as to how he could reconcile his love of State and which faced the debaters here on this very spot. For it was here on this very spot. For it was here on this very spot.

In the senatorial election of 1858, he was thus prevented from running for re-election. For it was here on this very spot. For it was here on this very spot.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Illinois yield? Mr. DOUGLAS. I am glad to yield.

Mr. ROBERTSON. I have listened with great interest to the brief but splendid biography of a great American. I just noted the Senator's concluding statement that Douglas died when he was only 48 years old.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, that is correct. Mr. ROBERTSON. If I ever knew that fact before, it had become obscured by the great stature of Douglas as an intellectual giant. I have frequently cited the splinter party behind Breckenridge as a historical example of how the Democratic Party can defeat itself, as it did when Lincoln was elected. While I am a believer in States rights, I do not believe those who supported Breckenridge gave the correct interpretation of States rights. It is a historical fact that while Jefferson attended the Constitutional Convention in Philadelphia in 1787, he strongly favored a provision in the new Constitution to prohibit any foreign entanglement.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, at Jefferson's inspiration, his friend James Madison offered such a proposal, but it was rejected.

Incidentally, without any invidious comparison with those in the North who were engaged in the slave trade, in my opinion there was nothing in the Constitution to prohibit slavery; therefore, I believe Congress did not have the power to say who should have slaves and who should not. I think the President in his state of the question should be left to each sovereign unit.

However, I believe it was unfortunate that the Senator from Illinois in 1860, and that it was tragic that Abraham Lincoln should have been assassinated before he had a chance to do anything to prevent the hideous results of an unfortunate fratricidal war.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Virginia for his receptive and generous remarks.

They give me hope that perhaps the Democratic Party will not split in the future and that possibly the South and the North may go forward with a program of equal rights for all citizens under the protection of the 14th and 15th amendments to the Constitution.

The tragic example of what happened to our party in 1860, with all the consequences which flowed from it, should, I think, be a lesson to us, so that our Southern friends will not push us too far, as the Southern Democrats tried to push Stephen Douglas.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Illinois yield again?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I am glad to yield.

Mr. ROBERTSON. The Senator from Virginia will certainly support a program of equal rights; but at the present time, with all the national restlessness and ferment, I think it is just a different viewpoint.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, lest it be thought that there is personal and family vainglory connected with my remarks, I may say that although I occupy the Senate seat formerly occupied by Stephen A. Douglas, I am not a direct relative of his. I think that probably we sprang from common stock in Massachusetts, somewhere around 1700; but have never been able definitely to establish a connection. So I cannot claim blood relationship, although some great-grandchildren of Douglas have adopted me as a so-called kinsman.

PROPOSED TAX CHANGES

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record an editorial entitled "Not as Bad as Painted," published in the Salt Lake City Tribune of March 25, 1963, and an editorial entitled which is Better Way, Tax Cuts or Welfare?" published in the Atlanta Constitution of March 26, 1963.

The editors support the President's program for a tax cut and will pay for their privilege.

The PRESIDENT PRO Tempore OF THE SENATE. Mr. NAGASAKI in the chair. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Illinois?

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the Salt Lake City (Utah) Tribune. Mar. 25, 1963]

NOT AS BAD AS PAINTED

President Kennedy's proposed changes in capital gains tax treatment are being attacked as an indirect, if not devious, plan to soak the rich and penalize the pursuit of profits. If the reforms were not accompanied by tax reductions, this indictment would have some merit. But even if the tax structure remains unaltered, there is no justification for some present capital gains loopholes.

Repealing capital gains treatment to profits on real estate transactions is one glaring example. It has contributed to excessive speculation and unrealistic price rises, simply because, tax gimmickery, rather than
economic considerations, has been a domin­nant factor in real estate operations. The President's proposal to tax deprecia­ted real estate at ordinary rates, and at lower rates on personal property, would end risk taking or speculation; but it would put a stop to the taxmanship that has mo­tioned much of the real estate business and potentially dan­gerous dealings in real estate.

Similarly, Mr. Kennedy can be commended for his effort to make real estate ventures designed to lure and keep executive talent, tho gn.tns tax on assets held over 1 year should no longer have minimized executive talent. Individual Initiative; on the contrary, they treatment. Stock options have not spurred down the part played

The President's recommendation to lower the capital gains tax on assets held over 1 year is hardly a soak-the-rich move. Indeed, it is a liberalization that should help to thaw investments long frozen by the present capital gains tax, thereby encour­aging new risk-taking ventures. It would cut down the part played by taxes in mak­ing investment decisions.

This new proposal, though, penalizes the short-term risk taker, who plays a vital mid­dle role in maintaining breadth and liquidity, which are essential to an active and dynamic economy. There is a basic difference between the ben­eficiaries in the stock market and the tax-con­scious speculator in real estate, yet the admin­istration fails to distinguish between the two.

The President's capital gains reforms are not without their share of criticism. They slope some glaring abuses without sutting individual incentive. These are the twin objectives that should govern any change in the tax code.

* * *

FROM THE ATLANTA (Ga.) CONSTITUTION, MAR. 26, 1963

WHICH IS BETTER WAY, TAX CUTS OR WELFARE?

In another plea for tax cuts, President Kennedy again has warned that our slow rate of economic growth will result in rising unemployment, recession and other woes unless preventive steps are taken now. In a speech in Chicago, the President said that jobs for the sixties is the No. 1 domestic concern. This rising unemployment, he pointed out, is an economic waste that will be accompanied by higher welfare payments, with consumer markets, occurring in the realm of crime and delinquency and unsuitable labor relations.

In a recent speech, Secretary of Labor Wirtz said in Washington yesterday that the current 6.1 unemployment rate is a deplorable problem that can be met only by creation of 3 million jobs. Unemployment among youths between ages 19 and 21 is not included in the number reported. The number employed is at a record.

Tax cuts may not provide the complete answer but in boosting consumer income they offer a quick and effective stimulus to jobs.

RIGHT-TO-WORK LAWS AND THE REPEAL OF SECTION 14(b) OF THE NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS ACT

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey, Mr. President, is on the record today, "What are we doing today about the breakdown in the institution of collective bargaining?" This question is not only pertinent today, it is a challenge to each of us.

Free collective bargaining has, and continues, to work well. Over 150,000 collective bargaining contracts are in force in the private sector of our economy and the farm work force is covered by a collect­ive bargaining contract. Yet 98 percent of the Americans covered by collective bargaining contracts did not strike in 1962.

More than twice as many man-days were lost from work in 1963 than were lost because of strikes in this Nation last year. Even more important is the com­parison of time lost through unemploy­ment and the time lost through strikes. Secretary of Labor Wirtz put time losses due to strikes in perspective; he said in December that our Nation "lost more man-hours of production each year in the last 11 months from unemployment than we have in the last 35 years from strikes."

In showing that the strike picture has been exaggerated, I do not intend to "whitewash" strikes. What must be realized is that one can no more under­stand or appraise the role of strikes than of examining strikes alone than one can understand human psychology by studying abnormal behavior alone. In short, the strike represents the social context of free collective bargaining.

ALTHOUGH there is no breakdown, there is a crisis in the institution of collective bargaining. Our institution of free collect­ive bargaining was masculated, almost destroyed by so-called right-to-work laws. And without free collective bargaining, we could return to the jungle of unfettered industrial relations that this Nation abandoned years ago.

To protect free collective bargaining, I introduced last week a bill to repeal section 14(b) of the National Labor Relations Act. Section 14(b) makes it possible for States to enact laws prohibiting union security arrangements long sanctioned by Federal law and agreed to by employers and employees. Under Federal law, an employer and a majority of the workers can agree to union shop or agency shop. This form of union security means that the only lawful requirement that may be im­posed on an employee as a condition of employment is that he agree to join the union. If the employee does not want to join the union, a service fee to cover the costs of administering a collective bargaining contract.

It is inconsistent for Congress to favor union security on a national level and yet allow a few States to pass laws out­lawing union security and compelling an employee to join a union, without any vote. By the employee docs not want to join the union, a service fee to cover the costs of administering a collective bargaining contract.

It is inconsistent for Congress to favor union security on a national level and yet allow a few States to pass laws prohibiting union security arrangements long sanctioned by Federal law and agreed to by employers and employees.

The number employed is at a record.

Mr. Wirtz has characterized the term "right-to-work" as a "corruption of the English language which precludes the consideration of the real issues involved."

Secretary Wirtz related an interesting experience. When he taught law he used to give his class a questionnaire. One question read, "Are you in favor or opposed to right-to-work laws?" Two-thirds of the class said they were in favor, and the other question on the same page read, "If an employer and a majority of its employees agree that all employees should or should not become a member of a union, should the Government interfere with their decision?"

Two-thirds of the class answered "no"—just exactly opposite to their answers to the preceding question. This experience of Secretary Wirtz cer­tainly shows that the term "right-to­work" is deliberately misleading and creates a murky cloud over the basic in­terests.

Before giving my reasons for the need to repeal 14(b) of the National Labor Rel­ations Act, let us take a brief look at the philosophy behind the passage of right-to-work laws. These persons seem blind to many areas of our eco­nomic life where job choice is restricted. If the right-to-work advocates are really sincere about preserving occupational choice—which I doubt—they should rally around the fair employment practices idea. However, I have never heard the right-to-work advocates support this concept. I suggest, therefore, that either they are blind to some of the realities of our occupational life, such as denying a man a Job because he is a Negro, or they are exploiting noble thoughts about freedom to cripple unions and collective bargaining.

My basic argument for repealing right­to-work laws is based on the nature of the community called the bargaining unit. Our democratic concept of majority rule. It is not based on mis­leading, specious talk about the right to join or not to join a union.

In the tradition of the principle of our national labor policy, a union has the affirmative, enforceable duty to represent all employees.

The common form of union which rep­resents a majority of the workers doing a particular type of work, must represent all the workers doing that work, whether or not they are members of the union. If there are 75 union members and 25 nonunion workers, the union is required by law to negotiate for the nonunion employees as well as for their own dues-paying members.

There is a very good reason for this policy. In means there will be only one union for each particular skill or trade. If the policy were otherwise, there might be a number of different unions compet­ing for the votes of the workers and influencing various social and political views. This is the case in many countries in Europe today. Suppose an employer had to negotiate a contract with the Democratic auto workers, the Republican auto workers and the non­partisan auto workers; the already