

Federal debt, interest on the debt, budget surplus or deficit, value of the dollar, balance of payments, and U.S. gold stock, 1930-63 (from official Government sources)—Continued

Year	Gross public debt and guaranteed obligations (by fiscal year in millions)	Interest on the public debt (by fiscal year in millions)	Budget deficit or surplus (by fiscal year in millions)	Value of the dollar (by calendar year in cents) <sup>1</sup>	Balance of international payments (calendar year in millions)	U.S. gold stock (by fiscal year in millions)
1947	\$258,376	\$4,958	-\$754	62.2	+\$4,567	\$21,266
1948	252,366	5,211	+8,419	57.8	+1,005	23,532
1949	252,798	5,339	-1,811	58.3	+175	24,466
1950	257,377	5,750	-3,122	57.8	-3,580	24,231
Post-World War II years		21,258	+4,240			
1951	255,251	5,613	+3,510	53.5	-305	21,756
1952	259,151	5,859	-4,017	52.3	-1,046	23,346
1953	266,123	6,504	-9,449	51.9	-2,152	22,463
1954	271,341	6,382	-3,117	51.7	-1,550	21,927
Korean war years		24,358	-13,073			
1955	274,418	6,370	-4,180	51.9	-1,145	21,678
1956	272,825	6,787	+1,626	51.1	-935	21,790
1957	270,634	7,244	+1,596	49.4	+520	22,623
1958	276,444	7,607	-2,819	48.1	-3,529	21,356
1959	284,817	7,593	-12,427	47.7	-3,743	19,705
1960	286,471	9,180	+1,224	46.9	-3,929	19,322
1961	289,211	8,957	-3,856	46.4	-2,454	17,550
Post-Korean war years		53,738	-18,836			
Total, 1930-61, actual		123,141	-266,420			
Estimates and latest actual:						
1962	295,835	8,998	-6,975	46.0	-1,904	16,434
63	295,569	9,400	+463			

<sup>1</sup> Based on 100-cent dollars in 1939.

<sup>2</sup> Excludes additional U.S. subscription to IMF of \$1,375,000,000.

<sup>3</sup> April.

<sup>4</sup> 1st quarter.

<sup>5</sup> June 21.

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. Mr. President, as matters stand the situation will grow worse, because eliminating nonessential expenditures has become a lost art at Washington. More nonessential expenditures are started and proposed.

I cite some 200 actions and proposals for increased Federal obligations of public money and credit in Presidential communications to Congress during the current administration to those in search of fertile fields for expenditures which need not be made under existing conditions.

Pressure continues on increasing Federal expenditures for housing, urban renewal, public assistance, public education, health, water resources, river basin development, and so forth.

Huge spending is contemplated in such new programs as space, moon, and ocean exploration, depressed area redevelopment, retraining of the jobless, and so forth.

More Federal spending programs are being formed in current studies on surface and mass transportation, acquisition and development of open spaces, and so forth.

New programs for grants to States and payments to individuals and institutions would be added for public assistance, health, agriculture, higher education, and so forth.

Virtually no area of domestic-civilian activity by the Federal Government has been overlooked in Presidential message proposals for increased spending.

Expansion of foreign-aid programs, including the new Peace Corps; and the military buildup, with renewed emphasis on civil defense, are in addition.

There would be vast increases in trust fund expenditures, outside of the regular budget, for unemployment and aged

health insurance, social security recipients, and continuing increases for highways—both interstate and ABC systems.

Orders were issued last year for a speedup in public works projects already underway; and accelerated planning for public works in the future was directed.

This is only a condensed description of the situation in which we find ourselves still playing Santa Claus. We have been playing Santa Claus, we have been playing banker, and we have been playing policeman for the free world for 17 years.

I submit that the history of the world does not record that any other nation has ever attempted to be Santa Claus, policeman, and banker for the world at the same time, on the scale we have attempted it.

Great Britain was the policeman for the world, because she controlled the seas. That was relatively inexpensive. Great Britain made money from the colonies and did not spend money in the manner that we are giving it away all over the world, yet Great Britain found its way into financial difficulties.

If the United States cannot carry the flag for free people, there will be no other nation in the world to assume that responsibility.

In short, our fiscal position, characterized by debt, deficits and an ever-present threat of inflation, does not inspire confidence at home or abroad; and we need confidence in the dollar as we never needed it before.

The reasons for sound and strong men in positions of high fiscal trust at this time are clear and urgent.

I shall cast my vote against this bill today as a protest against the continuance of the dangerous fiscal practices in which we are indulging.

And with this vote I urge immediate change in budget direction by replacement of the present Budget Director with a man who understands the dangers of chronic deficit financing.

The present Budget Director is a man who has asserted before the Senate Committee on Finance that he believes in deficit spending and that the deficit we have was a planned deficit to help the economy of the country.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. I yield.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I join my colleagues in paying respect to the distinguished senior Senator from Virginia for delivering to the Senate and to the country this timely warning. There is no other man in the U.S. Senate who over a period of years has done more to maintain some degree of fiscal integrity at the national level than the senior Senator from Virginia. I join my colleagues today in saluting him for his excellent address.

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. I thank the Senator.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays on the pending amendment.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

#### "THE ALL-CHANNEL BILL: CONGRESSIONAL INTENT AND INDUSTRY OPPORTUNITY"—ADDRESS BY SENATOR MCGEE

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, on Tuesday, June 26, the senior Senator from Wyoming [Mr. MCGEE], who is a member of the Subcommittee on Communications of the Senate Commerce Committee, addressed the Electronics Industries Association convention at New York on the subject of the all-channel television bill which recently passed this body.

In his speech, the Senator from Wyoming excellently presented the intent and implications of this important legislative proposal, and I commend it highly to the Members of this body.

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

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

THE ALL-CHANNEL BILL: CONGRESSIONAL INTENT AND INDUSTRY OPPORTUNITY  
(An address by Hon. GALE W. MCGEE, Senator from Wyoming, at the Electronics Industries Association convention meeting Tuesday, June 26, 1962, New York City)

It's a pleasure to be here this morning and to continue in conversation with your members my own personal education in the communications industry of the country. I regret very much I was not able to meet with you at the social hour last evening where I'm sure I could have learned a great bit more; but I was attending a very interesting seminar on "How To Succeed in Business Without Trying." After sitting through this delightful spoof, I have reached the conclusion that I'm in the wrong racket.

In a far more serious vein, I want to talk to you briefly about the new all-channel legislation enacted by the Congress. I don't need to tell this group what that legislation is all about, you know all too well. But I do

think it would be helpful if I tried to set out why we, the Congress, chose to move down this road, and much more important, what your role should be in this new undertaking.

As you know, the Congress and the Commission were faced with a difficult problem. An intermixed system of VHF and UHF assignments had not worked. The experience of the last decade conclusively showed that. Over 90 percent of the UHF assignments were not being used, and there was little prospect for improvement.

During the hearing, and even since, I've heard comparisons made with the somewhat slow progress of color TV and the question asked: Will Congress be concerned and pass a law to help color television? But there's a world of difference. Whatever the progress of color TV, it does not result in a waste of one of the most valuable national resources which this country has, the radio spectrum. The plain fact is that if we do not make UHF work, we will have a television system that's inadequate for our national needs. Our population is expanding; per capita income is going up; leisure time is increasing; and new products and new companies are seeking advertising outlets. These economic and social factors strongly support an expanded commercial television system. But we cannot get that expansion, if we are constricted almost entirely to a 12-channel VHF system.

So we need UHF for expansion. We need it to bring new television service to underserved areas. Of the 278 television markets, 127, roughly half, have only 1 TV station, and 70 have only 2. Finally, we need UHF in order to promote the development of educational TV. Of the present number of channels reserved for educational television, 92 are VHF and 187 are UHF. A national study has indicated that the educators may need roughly 650 additional UHF channels in order to meet the needs of education in the years ahead. So you can see the future of educational TV is tied in large part to the future of UHF.

The Commission concluded and the Congress has agreed that the most painless, the most practical, the best way of solving this allocations problem is the all-channel receiver. Some of you, I know, disagree. But look at other possible solutions. Getting more VHF channels? The military said no, for defense reasons; and that's that.

Deintermixture? If you think that's painless, I suggest you talk with a Congressman from an area where the Commission has proposed to take out the VHF channel and substitute a UHF. It involves dislocation, the chance of taking service away from significant numbers of persons, and still would be just a piecemeal or short-range solution.

All-channel legislation will work because it goes to the root problem of receiver incompatibility. It makes time work in behalf of UHF development, both commercial and educational. The UHF operator could look forward to UHF receiver saturation not only in his home city but in the surrounding rural area as well.

We considered the possible drawbacks to all-channel, and particularly the increased cost of the all-channel receiver. We understand that at the outset that cost may be about \$25. But I would hope that with mass production, with all-out industry concentration on the UHF tuner, the price differential will be much less and the product improved. I have confidence in your ability, for I remember your magnificent accomplishments with the VHF-only set, in the period from 1946 on.

Incidentally, as a member of the Commerce Committee taking the testimony from spokesmen of the industry, I was a little surprised at the great stress put on the added cost to the purchaser. I say "surprised"

because I can remember in the early days of television sets, when the prices were often determined by what the buyer would bear, and that the price margin above cost and reasonable profit was many times greater than \$25.

Or I can recall not very long ago, as we held hearings on TV booster legislation, to learn in the course of those studies of the excessive charges made by CATV systems, apparently on the basis again of what the market would bear. Installation charges, for example, ranged from as low as \$15 to as high as \$175. In that instance a mere extra cost of \$25 didn't seem to be a disturbing factor to that segment of the communications industry. Therefore, it was my conclusion that, in terms of priorities, the small extra cost of a converter was not a very genuine deterrent to enacting this necessary legislation.

But, as I said, the most important thing I want to talk to you about is not why we settled on the all-channel legislative route, but what your role should be when all-channel becomes law. For it is an old but true cliché that to quarrel about the past is to lose the future. I know that neither you nor the Commission will make this error. I am sure that both of you will cooperate to achieve, to the fullest extent possible, the goal sought by Congress in the all-channel legislation.

The bill, as it passed the Senate, gives the Commission the authority to issue a rule to require that TV sets, shipped in interstate commerce or imported, "be capable of adequately receiving" all channels. There are, therefore, a number of areas where cooperation between you and the Commission would be most helpful in assuring the promulgation of a sound rule.

First, as you know, the word "adequately" in the bill is designed to give the Commission the narrow authority to specify two receiver characteristics. The Commission has assured the Congress that it will limit its rule to specification of the receiver noise figure at UHF relative to that at VHF and receiver sensitivity at UHF relative to that at VHF. Because the figures selected by the Commission will be relative ones, this means that you, the manufacturers, will in effect be specifying these characteristics of the set, by choosing the UHF figures. The Commission would only be requiring that the UHF component's capabilities as to noise or sensitivity be comparable to that of the VHF component. For example, if you wanted to produce a lower priced VHF set, the UHF component could also be of a similar lower priced nature.

The Commission has made one further important representation as to these two relative performance figures. It has promised the Congress that it will avoid extreme or unreasonable specifications—that it will select standards in the realm of the average characteristics of UHF receivers available on the open market today. In this way, the Commission is sure that its specifications will be well accepted by you manufacturers. Let me add here that we in the Congress were strongly assured by the Commission that it does not intend—and I repeat does not intend to regulate sets, nor does it intend to require the establishment of VHF characteristics.

Obviously, if the standards are to prove generally acceptable, you and the Commission must have a full and frank exchange of views. I am heartened to learn that there already have been contacts between the Commission and your representatives, and only this morning I learned from the Commission that the first date for meetings to thresh out these important matters has been selected. That date is June 28, next Thursday.

These meetings must also concern them-

selves with the critical date to be specified in the rule, after which only all-channel sets are to be shipped in interstate commerce or imported. That date must be chosen so as to achieve the earliest possible implementation of the bill which would not work a hardship on you people by catching you with significant stocks of VHF-only sets. I am confident that the proper date can and will be selected through these meetings.

This brings me to what I consider to be the really vital aspect of the future. So far I have been talking about the Commission's rule, and how you can help to select the right ingredients of that rule. But the core of the matter is not the formal rule. It is what you, the manufacturers, do to bring reality to the hopes of the Congress, of the Commission, of the broadcasters, of the educators, of the public. The Congress, speaking for the country, is saying to you: "We want, as soon as we can, to have every set sold in this country an all-channel set, and a good one capable of adequately receiving UHF signals, so far as the set is concerned." Some of you agreed with this plan, some disagreed. But that is all irrelevant now. I would hope that you would all, whether you agreed or disagreed, pitch in to carry out the congressional mandate, not grudgingly because of some formal agency rule but willingly because this is the course that has been democratically chosen. It is this course upon which we have staked so much for future development of television in this country. It is you, not the Congress or the Commission, who can best assure the achievement of that goal.

So I would hope that as soon as feasible you would voluntarily and immediately take the steps to revise your production lines to produce the all-channel set; and, just as important, that many of you immediately undertake the research and experimentation to improve the all-channel set. It does not seem to me that there is any need to await final adoption of the two receiver characteristics I have mentioned. For, the Commission has said that it will choose reasonable figures within the average characteristics of UHF receivers now available on the open market. Therefore, the conscientious manufacturer will face no danger on this score.

Thus, you have two choices before you. One is to await the cutoff date in a rule—to say, "Yes, I will comply with the law but only reluctantly and as narrowly as I can." The other is to roll up your sleeves and carry out not only the letter but the spirit of the law by implementing it as soon as you, the Commission, can. I am fully confident which course a public-spirited industry such as yours will choose. And I believe that that course, voluntary, immediate implementation, will not only benefit the country, by promoting the earlier achievement of the bill's goals, but will benefit you and your stockholders. For, it will mean a very healthy, growing television broadcasting industry, and in the final analysis, that is the bedrock of your set industry.

There is a standard phrase much used, perhaps even abused, in correspondence which goes like this: "Thanking you in advance for your cooperation, I remain yours truly." Well, speaking for myself, and I am sure all my colleagues, I do thank you here and now, for your cooperation in this all-important enterprise.

#### CENTENNIAL OF THE MORRILL ACT

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, July 2 will be the centennial of the land-grant colleges which were founded, based on the Morrill Act.

Kansas State University is proud of its growth and heritage as a land-grant in-