

confined to frontier skirmishes; his political career bounded by the walls of the Virginia House of Burgesses; barring the publication of his journal, or report, to Governor Dinwiddie on his expedition against the French, he was unknown to the world of letters. Still, there was something about him which impressed all who met and did business with him. A certain British officer, one Col. John L. Peyton, met Washington, then still a very young man, at a dinner given in honor of the ill-fated General Braddock. Peyton writes to a friend that Washington's countenance (quote) was "mild and pleasant, promising both wit and judgment. He is of a comely and dignified demeanor, and at the same time displays much self-reliance and decision. He strikes me as being a young man of an extraordinary and exalted character, and—mark this—is destined, I am of opinion, to make no inconsiderable figure in our country." Prophetic words indeed.

"Here," writes Mr. Woodward, "we have a glimpse of the remarkable impression [Washington] always made on men. In appearance he was distinctly impressive. He was 6 feet 2 inches tall, though he invariably described himself as '6 feet in stature'—a curious error for him to have made. His handshake was like hard steel, and his cold gray-blue eyes looked straight at people, in silent appraisal. Whenever he entered a room where he was not known, everyone wondered who he was and felt that somebody special had arrived."

Such were some of the traits of the man upon whom, long after Washington's death, his old and intimate friend and fellow Virginian, Thomas Jefferson, made the just and final appraisal:

"On the whole, his character was, in its mass, perfect, in nothing bad, in few points indifferent; and it may truly be said, that never did nature and fortune combine more perfectly to make a man great, and to place him in the same constellation with whatever worthies have merited from man an everlasting remembrance. For his was the singular destiny and merit, of leading the armies of his country through an arduous war, for the establishment of its independence; of conducting its councils through the birth of a government, new in its forms and principles, until it had settled down into a quiet and orderly train; and of scrupulously obeying its laws through the whole of his career, civil and military, of which the history of the world furnishes no other example."

Today we will have the annual reading to the House of Representatives of Washington's Farewell Address, in which he admonishes all Americans to forever avoid foreign entanglements. One of the many peculiar political paradoxes of our day will find the Congress within a few days, if the peculiar pattern continues, voting to continue billions of dollars to foreign countries, some of whom have ideologies both foreign and alien to the principles for which General Washing-

ton fought so successfully against almost overwhelming odds.

As for me, I yearn for the day we adhere to the recommendation of our first President.

George Washington lived in a day of revolution. I believe it fitting and proper for me, as a Member of Congress, to call attention to my personal belief relative to a revolution through which we are passing today.

It is not revolution by mounting the barricades. There are no visible revolutionaries shouting slogans and charging the heights. No heroes are waving flags and leading the marchers. No bombs are being thrown. It is a revolution not by drama and by violence and by public displays of physical courage. It is a far more subtle revolution than that. I would call it a revolution by ideology. And worse than that—I would call it a legislative revolution. It is a revolution by a trend in law and legislation. It is a revolution—if I may be so bold as to say it—by judicial order. But its victim on every front, as I see the picture, is free enterprise.

What we are losing is part of the American idea, the American dream, the American's sense of individuality for which Washington and our forefathers fought with determined dedication. What we are losing is our individual identity. What we are becoming is a great national mass. Government's place is to maintain the outer fences of the economy in repair. Government's place is not to step inside the sphere of direction and management and assume either authority or responsibility.

That belongs to the people. It belongs to management. It belongs to private initiative.

Where is the Government's place in the tradition of Washington, Jefferson, and Patrick Henry? The Government's place is what the Constitution says it is. The Government's place is to form a more perfect union. It is the Government's place to establish justice. It is the job of Government to insure domestic tranquillity and to provide for the common defense. The Government by its own fundamental document declares these things. The Government should moreover promote the general welfare. And it should secure the blessings of liberty to ourselves and our posterity.

That is what the Government says it should do. And this is what it did do for a long time. And this is its function—and no more. This is what is enjoined in the Constitution of the United States. This is what we live by. This is the law.

But what has happened?

There are those who have taken the "general welfare" clause and distorted it out of its original meaning.

I suddenly discover as a citizen of the 20th century that the clause has meanings and interpretations never dreamed of by the Founding Fathers more than a century and a half before.

I suddenly discover that our economic experts are telling us that the Soviet rate of economic growth is faster than the current American rate of economic growth.

For me this is calamity. For me this has significance in determining what it is that brought about a race in which a free country is losing, relatively, as against a slave country or a monolithic state.

How you ask, "Can tyranny be more successful, or at least more relatively productive, than a free country?"

"No" is the answer. A free economy is bound to be more productive than a slave economy. Men work better when they are free. Business prospers when the laws of economics have full play. Supply and demand is not a joke but an economic fact that free enterprise respects as it does all the other well-known laws of free economics.

The trouble with our answer is that we have abandoned many of the bulwarks of a free economy envisioned by the Founding Fathers and a freedom so bravely secured under the leadership of the greatest of all Americans, George Washington.

When Daniel Webster was but 20 years old the following words were a part of an oration he delivered on July 4, 1802: "To preserve the Government we must also preserve a correct and energetic tone of morals. After all that can be said, the truth is that liberty consists more in the habits of the people than in anything else. When the public mind becomes vitiated and depraved, every attempt to preserve it is vain. Laws are then a nullity, and constitutions waste paper. There are always men wicked enough to go at length in the pursuit of power if they can find others wicked enough to support them. They regard not paper and parchment. Can you stop the progress of a usurper by opposing to him the laws of his country? Then you may check the careering winds or stay the lightning with a song. No. Ambitious men must be restrained by the public morality when they rise up to do evil, they must find themselves standing alone."

There are men today who would usurp the power of the Congress and the people. There are ambitious men today who would, knowingly or unknowingly, bring upon us, the people, the shackles of oppressive government, all in the name of human welfare; but alas, in so doing they are destroying the very individual liberties which were preserved under the leadership of the Father of Our Country and his small band of bleeding patriots and American revolutionaries dedicated to the cause of freedom as against tyrannical government; dedicated to the love of home, of the Christian religion, and of country.

As we, in our small way, honor today the birth date of the Father of Our Country, let our prayer, as sons of the American Revolution, be: "God, give America a new breath of patriotism."

SENATE

FRIDAY, FEBRUARY 24, 1961

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, and was called to order by the President pro tempore.

Rabbi Morris Gordon, of the Greenbelt Jewish Center, Greenbelt, Md., offered the following prayer:

I should like to quote the prayer for our country which is recited in the synagogue every Sabbath. Some of the words will be in the language in which Jesus prayed, in which the Bible was written,

in which the Jewish people pray to this day—in Hebrew:

"Our God and God of our fathers, we invoke Thy blessing upon our country, on the Government of this Republic, the President of these United States, and all who exercise just and rightful authority. Do Thou instruct them out of Thy law, that they may administer all affairs of state in justice and equity, that peace and security, happiness and prosperity, right and freedom, may forever abide among us.

"Unite all the inhabitants of our country, whatever their origin and creed, into a bond of true brotherhood to banish hatred and bigotry and to safeguard

the ideals and free institutions which are our country's glory.

"May this land under Thy providence be an influence for good throughout the world, uniting men in peace and freedom and helping to fulfill the vision of Thy prophets: 'The day will yet come when they shall beat their swords into plowshares, their spears into pruning hooks. Nation shall not lift up sword against nation, neither shall men learn war any more.'" Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the

Journal of Wednesday, February 22, 1961, was dispensed with.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, announced that the House had passed a joint resolution (H.J. Res. 155) to create a joint committee to commemorate the 100th anniversary of the first inaugural of Abraham Lincoln, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message returned to the Senate, in compliance with its request, the bill (S. 681) to authorize the Secretary of Commerce to enter into contracts for the conduct of research in the field of meteorology and to authorize installation of Government telephones in certain private residences.

LIMITATION OF DEBATE DURING MORNING HOUR

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, under the rule, there will be the usual morning hour for the transaction of routine business. I ask unanimous consent that statements in connection therewith be limited to 3 minutes.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, there are several nominations on the Executive Calendar. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business, to consider the nominations sent to the Senate by the President.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

As in executive session,

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. PASTORE, from the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy:

Glenn T. Seaborg, of California, to be a member of the Atomic Energy Commission.

By Mr. BYRD of Virginia, from the Committee on Finance:

James M. Quigley, of Pennsylvania, to be an Assistant Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare.

By Mr. ELLENDER, from the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry:

John P. Duncan, Jr., of Georgia, to be an Assistant Secretary of Agriculture; and Frank J. Welch, of Kentucky, to be an Assistant Secretary of Agriculture.

By Mr. BUSH, from the Committee on Armed Services:

Herbert Frank York, of California, to be Director of Defense Research and Engineering.

By Mr. RUSSELL, from the Committee on Armed Services:

Stephen Alles, of Maryland, to be Under Secretary of the Army.

By Mr. JAVITS, from the Committee on Banking and Currency:

Harold Francis Linder, of New York, to be President of the Export-Import Bank of Washington.

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, from the Committee on Armed Services, I report favorably the nominations of 93 officers in the Army and Army Reserve, and ask that these names be placed on the Executive Calendar.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The nominations will be placed on the Executive Calendar.

The nominations were placed on the Executive Calendar, as follows:

Brig. Gen. Dwight Benjamin Johnson, U.S. Army, and sundry other officers, for temporary appointment in the Army of the United States;

Gen. Isaac Davis White, Army of the United States (major general, U.S. Army), to be placed on the retired list in the grade of general;

Lt. Gen. James Francis Collins, Army of the United States (major general, U.S. Army), to be assigned to a position of importance and responsibility designated by the President, in the rank of general;

Maj. Gen. Russell Lowell Vittrup, U.S. Army, to be assigned to a position of importance and responsibility designated by the President, in the rank of lieutenant general; and

Brig. Gen. Charles Harvey Browne, Jr., and sundry other officers in the Army National Guard of the United States, for promotion as Reserve commissioned officers of the Army.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, in addition, I report favorably a total of 6,137 nominations in the Army and Air Force in the grade of colonel and below. All of these names have already appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. In order to save the expense of printing on the Executive Calendar, I ask unanimous consent that they be ordered to lie on the Secretary's desk for the information of any Senator.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The nominations ordered to lie on the desk are as follows:

Creighton W. Abrams, Jr., and sundry other officers, for promotion in the Regular Army of the United States;

Paul R. Hanson, and sundry other persons, for appointment in the Regular Air Force; and

George W. S. Abbey, and sundry other officers, for promotion in the Regular Air Force.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. If there be no further reports of committees, the nominations on the calendar will be stated.

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Robert E. Giles, of North Carolina, to be General Counsel of the Department of Commerce.

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. President, the Senate Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce unanimously recommends that the Senate confirm the nomination of Robert E. Giles.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a statement on Mr. Giles.

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

BIOGRAPHICAL SKETCH OF ROBERT E. GILES, DESIGNATED BY PRESIDENT KENNEDY TO BE GENERAL COUNSEL OF THE DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

Robert E. Giles was born June 11, 1924, in Spartanburg County, S.C.

He attended public schools in North Carolina, and the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, receiving his B.S. in commerce in 1949, and his doctor of law degree from the university's law school in 1952.

He enlisted in the Army Air Corps in June 1942 as a private, was subsequently appointed an aviation cadet and commissioned a second lieutenant in 1943. He served as first pilot and crew commander of a B-17 bomber, and was assigned to the European theater. He was released from active military service in November 1945 as a first lieutenant. He now holds the rank of major in the U.S. Air Force Reserve.

Under appointment by Secretary of Commerce Luther H. Hodges, he has been serving as Deputy General Counsel of the Department. He was associated with Secretary Hodges as administrative assistant during the latter's term as Governor of North Carolina (1957-61). Prior to that time, he was assistant attorney general for North Carolina (1955-57). From 1953 to 1955, he was assistant director, Institute of Government, and assistant professor of public law and government, University of North Carolina. From 1952 to 1953, he was associated with the firm of Lassiter, Moore & Van Allen, Charlotte, in the private practice of law.

In 1947, he was employed by Southern Appliances, Inc. (wholesale firm), as assistant credit manager; in 1946, he was employed by the Commercial Credit Corp. in its Greenville, S.C., office as unit loan manager; and in 1941-42, he was secretary to the manager of a textile firm in Spindale, N.C.

In 1948, he married the former Alice Ryland of Richmond, Va. They have four children, Martha, 10; David, 8; Lewis, 6; and Nancy, 1½.

He is a member of the North Carolina State bar and is admitted to practice in Federal courts, including the U.S. Supreme Court.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to this nomination?

Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

FEDERAL AVIATION AGENCY

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Najeeb E. Halaby, of California,

to be Administrator of the Federal Aviation Agency.

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. President, it gives me great pleasure to advise the Senate that the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce unanimously recommends that the Senate confirm the nomination of Najeeb E. Halaby to be Administrator of the Federal Aviation Agency.

I may say, Mr. President, that I believe this to be one of the toughest jobs in our Government. Here rests a great deal of the responsibility for the safety of our people who fly, either as passengers or as crew. Approximately 59 million passengers were carried by our commercial fleet last year, and it is estimated that there are 70,000 active aircraft in our country.

Mr. Halaby was born in Dallas, Tex., in 1915. He received his A.B. degree from Stanford in 1937, and his LL.B. from Yale in 1940. He has been admitted to practice before the courts of California and the District of Columbia.

From 1940 to 1942, he practiced law in Los Angeles, Calif. He acquired his first pilot's license in 1933; he was a pilot instructor for the Army Air Corps in 1940; and from 1942 to 1943 he was a production test pilot for the Lockheed Aircraft Corp., in Burbank, Calif.

During World War II he became a naval aviator. He established the Navy's first test pilot school, flight-tested the first American-made jet aircraft, the Bell P-59, and made the first continuous transcontinental jet-powered flight. He also served as assistant chief of the fighter section at the Naval Air Test Center, Patuxent River, Md.

After World War II, Mr. Halaby became Chief of the Intelligence Coordination Division, Department of State. Later he served as foreign affairs adviser to the Secretary of Defense. He was the first Chairman of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization Military Production and Supply Board, and in 1950-51 he served as Assistant Administrator for Mutual Security, in the Economic Cooperation Administration. In 1952, he became Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense for International Security Affairs.

In 1955-56 he served as Vice Chairman of the White House Advisory Study Group whose report led to the creation of the Federal Aviation Agency.

Immediately before his nomination by President Kennedy to FAA, the nominee had his own law firm, N.E. Halaby & Associates, in Los Angeles; he was secretary-treasurer of Aerospace Corp., a firm which is principal technical adviser to the Air Force missile and space program; and he served as president of American Technology Corp., a technical ventures group in southern California. During 1957-59, he was executive vice president and director of Servomechanisms, Inc., a maker of airborne electronics equipment.

Mr. Halaby is a member of the board of directors of the Flight Safety Foundation, the Society of Experimental Test Pilots, Town Hall of Los Angeles, the Aero Club of Southern California, and Quiet Birdmen.

He will, I am confident, make a memorable record as Administrator of the Federal Aviation Agency.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to this nomination?

Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

AMBASSADORS

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations of Ambassadors.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the nominations of Ambassadors be considered en bloc.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nominations of ambassadors will be considered en bloc.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, this trio of Ambassadors—Mr. Gufier, Mr. MacArthur, and Mr. Hare—are extraordinarily able men. They are career Foreign Service officers. They have had meritorious careers. They have served their country well, and each of them will be a credit to the United States in the nation to which he has been appointed.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to these nominations of Ambassadors?

Without objection, the nominations are confirmed.

COAST AND GEODETIC SURVEY

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the Coast and Geodetic Survey.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that these nominations in the Coast and Geodetic Survey be considered en bloc.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nominations will be considered en bloc; and, without objection, they are confirmed en bloc.

THE COAST GUARD

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the Coast Guard.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that these Coast Guard nominations be considered en bloc.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nominations in the Coast Guard will be considered en bloc; and, without objection, they are confirmed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the President be immediately notified of the confirmation of all the nominations on which the Senate has acted today.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the President will be notified forthwith.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate resume the consideration of legislative business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate resumed the consideration of legislative business.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. PROXMIER in the chair). The Vice President has sent to the Presiding Officer a communication addressed to him by the President, transmitting two drafts of proposed legislation. Without objection, the communication will be printed in the RECORD, and referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

The communication from the President is as follows:

THE WHITE HOUSE,

Washington, D.C., February 24, 1961.

The Honorable LYNDON B. JOHNSON,
President of the Senate,
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: I am transmitting herewith two drafts of legislation to carry out recommendations I made in my message to the Congress on February 9.

The first bill would, when enacted, increase opportunities for training physicians, dentists, and professional public health personnel. These are the keystones of any health program. Yet we are not presently training enough even to keep pace with our growing population. The enclosed proposal will enable us to narrow substantially our current deficit in this area.

The other bill which I am transmitting will help expand and improve community facilities and services for the health care of the aged, and other persons. It will make possible a substantial addition to the number of nursing home facilities to care for long-term patients, and it will help relieve the shortages of home health care programs.

The enclosed letters from the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare describes the two proposals in more detail. I commend this legislation to you.

Sincerely,

JOHN F. KENNEDY.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

REPORT ON OVEROBLIGATION OF AN APPROPRIATION

A letter from the Administrator, Housing and Home Finance Agency, Washington, D.C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the overobligation of an appropriation in that Agency, as of June 30, 1960 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Appropriations.

REPORT ON PROGRESS OF FLIGHT TRAINING PROGRAM

A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the progress of the Army Reserve Officers' Training Corps flight training program, covering the period January 1, 1960, to December 31, 1960 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Armed Services.

AUDIT REPORT ON GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, an audit report on the Government Printing Office, fiscal year 1960 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

REPORT OF FEDERAL AVIATION AGENCY

A letter from the Acting Administrator, Federal Aviation Agency, Washington, D.C., transmitting, pursuant to law, the annual report of that Agency, for the calendar year 1960 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

CLAIMS OF REYNOLDS FEAL CORP. AND LYDICK ROOFING CO.

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report and recommendations concerning the claims of the Reynolds Feal Corp., of New York, and the Lydick Roofing Co., of Fort Worth, Tex., relating to the construction of a building for the American National Exhibition in Moscow (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, or presented, and referred as indicated:

By the PRESIDENT pro tempore:
A resolution of the General Assembly of the State of Georgia; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare:

"HOUSE RESOLUTION 137

"Resolution memorializing Congress to extend education benefits to certain veterans; and for other purposes

"Whereas millions of veterans of World War II and of the Korean conflict have been educated under the provisions of the veterans education program established by the Federal Government; and

"Whereas many veterans were able to obtain further education through the benefits of the veterans education program which would not otherwise have been possible; and

"Whereas the education of millions of veterans has contributed to an increase in the educational level of this country and has produced a major national asset which has contributed much to the economy of this country; and

"Whereas reliable statistics have proved that increased income to veterans arising out of their higher education level will more than reimburse the National Treasury of the entire cost of the GI training program by 1970; and

"Whereas the President of the United States, by Executive order on January 31, 1955, stopped the educational benefits for persons serving in the Armed Forces of the United States after February 1, 1955; and

"Whereas it is believed that as long as the draft is continued that all persons serving in the Armed Forces should be extended the educational opportunities enjoyed by veterans serving prior to February 1, 1955; and

"Whereas it has been demonstrated that the investment in the education of such veterans will be more than repaid to the Public Treasury through increased taxes resulting from higher incomes of such veterans: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the General Assembly of Georgia, That this body does hereby memorialize the Congress of the United States to extend GI educational benefits to all veterans who entered, or who enter, military services from and after February 1, 1955, and that such educational benefits be extended so long as the provisions of the draft law exist; and be it further

Resolved, That the clerk of the house is hereby instructed to transmit a copy of this resolution to the presiding officers of both branches of the U.S. Congress and a copy to

each member of the Georgia congressional delegation.

"Read and adopted in senate February 20, 1961. Read and adopted in house February 2, 1961.

"GEORGE D. STEWARD,
"Secretary."
"GLENN W. EDWARD,
"Clerk."

By Mr. KERR:

A resolution of the Senate of the State of Oklahoma; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry:

"ENROLLED SENATE RESOLUTION 14

"Senate resolution relating to the economic message transmitted to the Congress by President John F. Kennedy on February 2, 1961; commending President Kennedy for his enlightened and progressive policy regarding the development and improvement of our natural resources, particularly the forest resources of the Nation; directing that copies of this resolution be transmitted to President John F. Kennedy, to Mr. John Koen, and to each member of the Oklahoma congressional delegation

"Whereas President John F. Kennedy, in his economic message to the Congress on February 2, 1961, called attention to the significance of investment in natural resources; and

"Whereas the President pointed out that 'as our needs mount, as past reserves are depleted, and as technological requirements change, we must constantly develop new supplies if growth is not to be inhibited'; and

"Whereas said message further pointed out that the 'improvement of our forest resources will require expanded Government credit sources for the development of woodland properties, more research on forest management, additional funds for cooperative forest programs, acceleration of the national forest program, and improvement of grazing resources'; and

"Whereas the President's position on this matter, as on other areas of our economy, is designed to move the Nation ahead; and

"Whereas the President's program regarding forest resources is of special significance to Oklahoma, particularly as regards the Ouachita National Forest; and

"Whereas in such a program there are excellent opportunities for including improvements for roads and recreational facilities in the said forests in the project work inventories of the Forest Service, the National Park Service, and the Bureau of Land Management: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate of the 28th Legislature of the State of Oklahoma:

"SECTION 1. That President John F. Kennedy be and he is hereby commended for his enlightened and progressive policy regarding the development and improvement of our natural resources, particularly the forest resources of the Nation.

"SEC. 2. That in the development of our natural resources special emphasis and high priority be given to the areas of surplus labor.

"SEC. 3. That a duly authenticated copy of this resolution be transmitted to President John F. Kennedy; to Mr. John Koen, Director, National Forest Service, Hot Springs, Ark.; and to each member of the Oklahoma congressional delegation.

"Adopted by the senate the 13th day of February 1961.

"ELLIOTT COLLINS,
"President of the Senate.

"Attest:

"LEO WINTERS,
"Secretary of the Senate."

CONDOLENCES ON DEATH OF REPRESENTATIVE W. F. NORRELL BY OUACHITA RIVER VALLEY ASSOCIATION

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a resolution adopted by the Ouachita River Valley Association on the 16th of February 1961. This resolution extends condolences on the occasion of the death of the Honorable William F. Norrell, Representative from the Sixth District of Arkansas, and expresses the great loss sustained by the State of Arkansas and the Nation by reason of his passing.

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

Whereas the Honorable W. F. Norrell, during his many years as U.S. Congressman for the Sixth District of Arkansas, has worked tirelessly in behalf of the interests and goals of the Ouachita River Valley Association; and

Whereas his sudden and untimely death results in a grievous loss to this association and to the people of the State of Arkansas: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the members of the Ouachita River Valley Association, in meeting assembled, do hereby express their regrets at this grievous loss and extend their sympathy to Mrs. Norrell and daughter; and be it further

Resolved, That this resolution be spread upon the minutes of this meeting and the secretary is hereby instructed to transmit a copy hereof to Mrs. Norrell and to Senator JOHN L. McCLELLAN for the purpose of placing the same in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

H. K. THATCHER,
Executive Vice President.

RESOLUTIONS OF CHIPPEWA VALLEY ELECTRIC COOPERATIVE

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I present, for appropriate reference, resolutions adopted by the Chippewa Valley Electric Cooperative, of Cornell, Wis. I ask unanimous consent that the resolutions be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the resolutions were referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RESOLUTIONS OF CHIPPEWA VALLEY ELECTRIC COOPERATIVE

I

Be it resolved, That we reaffirm our support of and urge the next session of Congress to enact and the President to approve a bill which embodies the principles of the Humphrey-Price bill.

II

Whereas the development of hydroelectric energy is highly beneficial to the economy and stability of the electric industry in this region, not only in making full use of the natural resources, but also in creating diversity of supply in case of atomic attack; and

Whereas in the construction of small dams designed primarily for irrigation or flood control the hydro potential has been ignored or eliminated by the Department of the Interior and Corps of Engineers without sufficient study, especially with respect to the possibility of pump storage and run of river generation; and

Whereas in all cases where power can be developed on a feasible basis without injury to aspects of the projects authorized, such development should be included: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That in all projects now authorized, and in any new start made under authorization of Congress, the Congress be urged to direct a complete study of the possibilities of hydro development in connection with such projects and that wherever practical and feasible such hydro development be included to the end that maximum benefits be received from such natural resources.

III

Whereas it is the desire of the rural electric systems that all types of electric system ownership exist in harmony and co-operate in bringing to the United States the most efficient electric power system in the world, under which the Federal Government, the investor-owned systems, and nonprofit systems can all be heavily interconnected and each supplying efficient generation to such interconnection and each deriving therefrom its total power requirements; and

Whereas there has been introduced in the U.S. Senate, Senate Resolution 71, which would, if adopted, provide surveys and studies upon which the objective of this resolution could be achieved: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That we endorse Senate Resolution 71, urge its adoption and advocate the development of a nationwide power system through which all entities interested in the electric power business can cooperate in bringing an abundance of low-cost electricity to every corner of the country.

IV

Resolved, That we reaffirm our longstanding support of the 2-percent REA interest rate and of sufficient REA loan fund authorizations to meet all the borrowing needs of the rural electric and telephone systems.

FORREST E. MOHR,
Chairman.

A. C. RINDY,
HENRY A. PLAGGE.

PRINTING OF ADDITIONAL COPIES OF SENATE DOCUMENT NO. 113, 86TH CONGRESS

Mr. McCLELLAN, from the Committee on Government Operations, reported an original resolution (S. Res. 95); which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration, as follows:

Resolved, That there be printed for the use of the Committee on Government Operations one thousand additional copies of Senate Document Numbered 113, Eighty-sixth Congress, second session, entitled "Documentation, Indexing, and Retrieval of Scientific Information."

REPORT ENTITLED "ACTIVITIES OF THE SENATE COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT OPERATIONS" (S. REPT. NO. 52)

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, from the Committee on Government Operations, I submit a report entitled "Activities of the Senate Committee on Government Operations," which I ask may be printed.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The report will be received and printed, as requested by the Senator from Arkansas.

PRINTING OF SENATOR ELLENDER'S REPORT ON U.S. FOREIGN OPERATIONS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, from the Committee on Rules and Administration, I report an original concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 15) to print as a Senate document "A Report on U.S. Foreign Operations," submitted by Senator ALLEN J. ELLENDER, and I submit a report (No. 53) thereon. The concurrent resolution has been approved by a majority of the Committee on Rules and Administration, and I ask unanimous consent for its present consideration.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The report will be received and printed, and the concurrent resolution will be read for the information of the Senate.

The concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 15) was read as follows:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That there be printed with illustrations as a Senate document, a report entitled "A Report on United States Foreign Operations," submitted by Senator ALLEN J. ELLENDER to the Senate Committee on Appropriations on February 1, 1961; and that four thousand additional copies be printed for the use of that committee.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request for the immediate consideration of the concurrent resolution? The Chair hears none.

The concurrent resolution was considered and agreed to.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS INTRODUCED

Bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. KEFAUVER:

S. 1050. A bill for the relief of Dr. Lourdes Casas Ocampo and Carmen Ocampo Carrillo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KEFAUVER (for himself and Mr. GORE):

S. 1051. A bill to change the name of the lake formed by Kentucky Dam; to the Committee on Public Works.

(See the remarks of Mr. KEFAUVER when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. GORE:

S. 1052. A bill to include in the gross estate for inheritance tax purposes real property situated outside the United States; to the Committee on Finance.

(See the remarks of Mr. GORE when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. MAGNUSON:

S. 1053. A bill for the relief of David Lew Hule; and

S. 1054. A bill for the relief of Huan-pin Tso; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1055. A bill to amend the Federal Employees' Compensation Act so as to permit injured employees entitled to receive medical services under such act to utilize the services of chiropractors; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

By Mr. BUSH:

S. 1056. A bill to amend section 205 of the Flood Control Act of 1948 to increase the project cost limitation for small flood con-

trol projects constructed under general authorization; to the Committee on Public Works.

(See the remarks of Mr. BUSH when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. ANDERSON:

S. 1057. A bill to provide for a National Portrait Gallery as a bureau of the Smithsonian Institution; and

S. 1058. A bill to establish a National Armed Forces Museum Advisory Board of the Smithsonian Institution, to authorize expansion of the Smithsonian Institution's facilities for portraying the contributions of the Armed Forces of the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

By Mr. ENGLE:

S. 1059. A bill to clarify the relationship with and the effect of the Labor-Management Relations Act of 1947 and the Labor-Management Reporting and Disclosure Act of 1959 with State and/or Federal apprenticeship laws; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

(See the remarks of Mr. ENGLE when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. MAGNUSON (for himself and Mr. JACKSON):

S. 1060. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate, and maintain the Oroville-Tonasket unit of the Okanogan-Similkameen division, Chief Joseph Dam project, Washington, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. JAVITS:

S. 1061. A bill to establish a medal to be known as the Presidential Medal for Civilian Achievement to provide recognition for certain persons who have made outstanding contributions in the arts, sciences, and related fields, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

By Mr. JAVITS (for himself and Mr. KEATING):

S. 1062. A bill to authorize leases and grants of rights-of-way on Indian lands in the State of New York; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

(See the remarks of Mr. JAVITS when he introduced the first above-mentioned bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. SYMINGTON:

S. 1063. A bill to amend the act of April 22, 1960, entitled "An act to provide for the establishment of the Wilson's Creek Battlefield National Park, in the State of Missouri"; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. MONRONEY:

S. 1064. A bill for the relief of Samuel Pizar; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GRUENING:

S. 1065. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to convey certain land situated in the vicinity of Unalakleet, Alaska, to Mrs. William E. Beltz; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

(See the remarks of Mr. GRUENING when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. CHAVEZ:

S. 1066. A bill to grant grazing preferences to certain landowners who own land adjacent to Fort Stanton Military Reservation, N. Mex., and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

S. 1067. A bill to amend Public Law 503, 84th Congress, so as to provide annuities for the widows of certain Foreign Service officers who retired prior to the effective date of the Federal Employees Group Life Insurance Act of 1954; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

S. 1068. A bill for the relief of Manuel Lopez-Perez; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KEATING (for himself, Mr. WILEY, Mr. JAVITS, Mr. CASE of South Dakota, Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota, Mr. BUSH, Mr. BEALL, Mr. BENNETT, Mr. CARLSON, and Mr. SALTONSTALL):

S. 1069. A bill to amend the Federal Property and Administrative Service Act of 1949 to authorize the disposal of surplus property to certain welfare agencies; to the Committee on Government Operations.

(See the remarks of Mr. KEATING when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. JOHNSTON:

S. 1070. A bill to amend the Federal Employees' Group Life Insurance Act of 1954, as amended, so as to provide for an additional unit of life insurance; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

(See the remarks of Mr. JOHNSTON when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. HILL:

S. 1071. A bill to assist in expanding and improving community facilities and services for the health care of aged and other persons, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

(See the remarks of Mr. HILL when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. HILL (for himself, Mr. KERR, Mr. YARBOROUGH, Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey, and Mr. PELL):

S. 1072. A bill to increase the opportunities for training of physicians, dentists, and professional public health personnel, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

(See the remarks of Mr. HILL when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. JACKSON:

S. 1073. A bill for the relief of Henry Eugene Godderis; and

S. 1074. A bill for the relief of Chao Yao Koh; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MUNDT:

S. 1075. A bill for the relief of Thelxiope Vonofacidow; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DIRKSEN:

S.J. Res. 53. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to taxes on incomes, inheritances, and gifts;

S.J. Res. 54. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to grant to citizens of the United States who have attained the age of 18 the right to vote; and

S.J. Res. 55. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States, relating to the legal effect of certain treaties and other international agreements; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. DIRKSEN when he introduced the two last above-mentioned joint resolutions, which appear under separate headings.)

RESOLUTIONS

PRINTING OF ADDITIONAL COPIES OF SENATE REPORT NO. 29

Mr. ANDERSON submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 94); which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration:

Resolved, That there be printed for the use of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs five thousand additional copies of Senate Report Numbered 29, issued by the Senate Select Committee on National Water Resources, Eighty-seventh Congress, first session.

PRINTING OF ADDITIONAL COPIES OF SENATE DOCUMENT NO. 113, 86TH CONGRESS

Mr. McCLELLAN, from the Committee on Government Operations, reported an original resolution (S. Res. 95) to print for the use of the Committee on Government Operations additional copies of Senate Document No. 113, 86th Congress, on scientific information, which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

(See the above resolution printed in full when reported by Mr. McCLELLAN, which appears under the heading "Reports of Committees.")

PRINTING OF ADDITIONAL COPIES OF SENATE REPORT NO. 29

Mr. KERR submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 96), which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration:

Resolved, That there be printed for the use of the Committee on Public Works five thousand additional copies of Senate Report Numbered 29, issued by the Senate Select Committee on National Water Resources, Eighty-seventh Congress, first session.

CHANGE NAME OF LAKE FORMED BY KENTUCKY DAM

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, on behalf of myself and my colleague, the junior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE], I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to change the name of the lake formed by Kentucky Dam from Kentucky Lake to Tennessee-Kentucky Lake.

The facts of geography cry out for this change and are well set forth in House Joint Resolution 41 of the 81st General Assembly of the State of Tennessee enacted on March 19, 1959, which I request to have printed in the RECORD.

We hope this will not result in any conflict between the Tennessee and Kentucky delegations in Congress. We seek the cooperation of Kentucky, and hope the delegation will see that it is fair to have both States represented.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the resolution will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 1051) to change the name of the lake formed by Kentucky Dam, introduced by Mr. KEFAUVER (for himself and Mr. GORE), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Public Works.

The resolution presented by Mr. KEFAUVER is as follows:

HOUSE JOINT RESOLUTION 41

Whereas one of the State's most important resources is the Tennessee River; and

Whereas in recent years, the river has been made more useful by the construction of dams by the Tennessee Valley Authority, and thereby, the Tennessee Valley Authority, and particularly the great Volunteer State of Tennessee, have been tremendously enriched; and

Whereas among the many outstanding benefits has been the production of vast quantities of electrical power; the control of

disastrous floods; the growth of industry, both new and old, and the development of exceptional recreational areas and facilities; and

Whereas in recent years, the tourist and hunting and fishing businesses have attracted large amounts of capital resulting in the construction of splendid motels, hotels, tourist courts, boat docks, fishing piers, parks, playgrounds, and numerous other recreational facilities to accommodate the ever-increasing needs of tourists, and the citizens of Tennessee; and

Whereas the State of Tennessee, its counties and cities, energetic civic organizations and private interests, have extensively promoted and advertised the great Tennessee Valley Authority Lakes of the South, including what is sometimes called Kentucky Lake; and

Whereas the name "Kentucky Lake" incorrectly describes the lake and is a detriment to the efforts of those in Tennessee who have endeavored to promote the development of the lake in Tennessee, and to advertise its important recreational opportunities in other States because it is difficult to explain that most of the lake actually lies in Tennessee; and

Whereas the dam causing the impoundment of water forming the lake is located on the Tennessee River, in the sister Commonwealth of Kentucky, a comparatively short distance north of the Kentucky-Tennessee border; and

Whereas the lake is approximately 184.3 miles in length, and 150.3 miles of the lake are in Tennessee; and only 34 miles of the lake are in Kentucky; and

Whereas the counties and cities near the lake supporting large tourist and hunting, and fishing businesses, are vitally interested in the continued growth and development of the lake and its attractions; and

Whereas it appears to be in the public interest that the name of the lake be changed to Tennessee-Kentucky Lake, so that it may be better promoted and advertised: Therefore be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives of the 81st General Assembly of the State of Tennessee (the Senate concurring).

1. That the Senators and Representatives in Congress from Tennessee are hereby requested to take action to secure the change of the name of Kentucky Lake to Tennessee-Kentucky Lake; and

2. That the State department of conservation take every possible step and use its good offices to assist the Senators and Representatives in Congress in every reasonable way to bring about the change of the name; and

3. That at the expiration of two (2) years, if the name is not changed so as to give the name "Tennessee" due prominence to that portion of the lake located in Tennessee, the lake shall be officially known as Lake Tennessee, and all references by all agencies in all official correspondence and literature published or circulated by the State, its counties or cities shall refer to the said body of water lying south of the Tennessee-Kentucky border as Lake Tennessee; and

4. That the Senators and Representatives in the Congress from Tennessee and the Commissioner of Conservation be forwarded a copy of this resolution.

Adopted March 12, 1959.

JAMES L. BOMAR,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.
WM. D. BAIRD,
Speaker of the Senate.

Approved March 19, 1959.

BUFORD ELLINGTON,
Governor.

CLOSING LOOPHOLES IN ESTATE TAX LAWS

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill

which would close a potentially sizable loophole and restore equity, in at least one respect, to our estate tax laws.

Present law, for some reason, specifically exempts from the gross estate of decedents for estate tax purposes real property located in foreign countries.

This may appear to be a small thing, and yet, with increasing convertibility and with the more widespread use of tax havens in connection with the income tax, this sort of thing is going to become daily more important and more frequently used.

With the law as it now stands, a man of wealth can, in contemplation of death, convert his holdings into cash, send the money to the Bahamas or elsewhere and purchase there an office building, apartment house or hotel, and, upon his death, leave his estate to his heirs completely free of any U.S. estate tax. His beneficiaries can then continue to operate this property, hold it or sell it, and bring the entire proceeds back to the United States.

On a taxable estate of \$1 million, this procedure could save those who have inherited such an estate \$325,700. On a producing oilfield it could be enormous.

My bill would make foreign real property taxable for estate tax purposes along with other property of the decedent. Prior to 1934, the code was not specific on this point. There had been, however, in 1918, a ruling by the Attorney General to the effect that the estate tax did not apply to the value of foreign real property. In 1934 the Congress specifically exempted foreign real estate owned by citizens or residents of the United States from the gross estate for estate tax purposes.

The American Law Institute's tentative draft No. 11, 1956, has this to say about the desirability of this exemption:

This exemption permits an undesirable escape from the present estate tax law since under it an individual may invest in foreign real estate (including oil developments) shortly prior to death and thereby leave this property free of U.S. taxes.

There has been some fear expressed that it would not be constitutional to impose an estate tax on the value of real property located in a foreign country. The weight of law and logic seems otherwise.

The Supreme Court has never passed on this issue, but it has ruled that Congress may include property in the decedent's gross estate even where it could not tax the property involved directly.

There is a full discussion of the question in Randolph Paul's authoritative "Federal Estate and Gift Taxation." From this discussion, I believe one would conclude that it is constitutional to include the value of foreign real property in the estate of a citizen or resident of the United States for estate tax purposes. Indeed, as pointed out there, the Attorney General's ruling of 1918, which excluded foreign real property prior to the specific exclusion in the 1934 act, "did not state that Congress may not tax foreign real property if it chooses to do so. Congress taxes the transfer of the property, not the property itself. Any linger-

ing doubt should be removed by Cook against Tait, which upheld Congress's authority to tax income received by a nonresident citizen from real property located abroad."

I have no figures to show the dollar amount of lost revenue which this exemption has cost the U.S. Government over the years. Unless this loophole is plugged, the volume will grow.

More and more Americans, movie stars, oil tycoons, and business executives, are living abroad. These people are in an excellent position to make profitable, estate tax-free, real estate investments.

A very popular book, now on the market, which spells out ways to save on estate and gift taxes has this to say:

There are two investments by which Mr. Planner can reduce the tax on his estate—even in contemplation of death, when the Treasury forbids him the device of making gifts to diminish his taxable estate.

First, investments in real estate situated outside of the United States escape the estate tax. In effect, he reduces a tax by making what can be a good investment.

I will not oblige lazy loophole locators by disclosing what the second possibility is.

This sort of thing should be stopped. I hope a sufficient number of my colleagues will agree with me.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 1052) to include in the gross estate for inheritance tax purposes real property situated outside the United States, introduced by Mr. GORE, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Finance.

PROPOSED INCREASE IN LIMIT ON FEDERAL CONTRIBUTION TO BUSH-McCORMACK FLOOD PROTECTION PROJECTS

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, in the 84th Congress, I had the privilege of joining the Honorable JOHN W. McCORMACK, of Massachusetts, then as now majority leader of the House of Representatives, in an effort to expedite the planning and construction of small but urgently needed local flood protection projects. The result of our collaboration was Public Law 685, 84th Congress, 2d session, which authorized the Secretary of the Army and the Chief of Engineers to develop and construct, within a Federal cost limit of \$400,000, small, complete, economically justified flood control projects that have not already been specifically authorized by Congress.

I have been advised by the Army engineers that the \$400,000 limitation is now too restrictive, and that much useful work could be accomplished if it were increased to take account of the rise in construction costs since the enactment of Public Law 685, and to provide additional leeway for the future.

I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to increase the limitation to \$800,000. A companion bill is being introduced in the House by Representative McCORMACK.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 1056) to amend section 205 of the Flood Control Act of 1948 to increase the project cost limitation for small flood control projects constructed under general authorization, introduced by Mr. BUSH, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Public Works.

APPRENTICESHIP LAWS

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to clarify the relationship with and the effect of the Labor-Management Relations Act of 1947 and the Labor-Management Reporting and Disclosure Act of 1959 with State and/or Federal apprenticeship laws.

This bill, companion to H.R. 3466, introduced in the House of Representatives by Representative JOHN F. SHELLEY, of California, is similar to legislation which we sponsored in the 86th Congress, and we are glad to introduce it this year at the instance of the California Apprenticeship Council.

The nearly 600 joint apprenticeship committees in California—and I am sure that this is also true of many such committees in other States—are doing constructive work in promoting apprenticeship for our youth and in developing much-needed skills for our industries. Their activities are a splendid example of labor-management cooperation.

The funds of these committees are provided either by employer-employee voluntary contributions or through negotiations. Some have a service, such as a coordinator employed by either management or labor or jointly by both. As a result of certain court decisions uncertainty arose as to the legality of these funds and services under criminal provisions of the Taft-Hartley Act, section 302 of which relates to restrictions on payments to employee representatives. The Landrum-Griffin Act amended that section in its section 505 to make its provisions inapplicable with respect to money or other things of value paid by any employer to a trust fund established for the purpose of defraying costs of apprenticeship or other training programs. However, the amendment makes applicable to such trust funds the requirements of the proviso to clause (5) of section 302(c).

It is not my purpose here to discuss the merits of those requirements as applied to other situations. I do believe that they impose undue burdens on joint apprenticeship committees, which are operating faithfully under State and Federal law. I ask that the text of the bill be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 1059) to clarify the relationship with and the effect of the Labor-Management Relations Act of 1947 and the Labor-Management Reporting and Disclosure Act of 1959 with State

and/or Federal apprenticeship laws, introduced by Mr. ENGLE, was received read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

FINDINGS AND POLICIES

SECTION 1. The Congress hereby finds that the national defense and the continued economic and industrial growth of the United States are dependent on the adequacy of its skilled manpower, and that to fail to train sufficient people with the skills needed to meet our present and future manpower needs endangers the general welfare and national security and interferes with the full production of articles and commodities for commerce.

The Congress further finds that apprenticeship training programs and systems are today, as they have been in the past, a mainstay in the national effort to pass our skills and our knowledge from generation to generation; that since 1915 more than half of the States have revised their apprenticeship laws and enacted modern ones; that the national apprenticeship law, known as the Fitzgerald Act, was passed by Congress in 1937; that under the stimulation and the provisions of these modern apprenticeship laws, apprentice training programs are organized and conducted as joint employer-employee industry enterprises; that they are administered, wherever feasible, by labor-management joint apprenticeship committees, with the guidance of Federal and State apprenticeship agencies, and in cooperation with Federal, State, and local education agencies; that protection is provided both employers and employees against discrimination and exploitation; that many other similarly organized and conducted programs for journeymen and other skilled workers are also in operation; and that many of the programs are today nationwide in scope and operation, with many hundreds of thousands of employers and employees voluntarily participating at all levels.

The Congress finds further that employers and employees in each industry are, more and more, accepting their responsibilities to train their own skilled workers and provide needed funds, materials, and services. These programs offer our veterans and our youth employment and career opportunities and provide technical and skilled manpower needed in our expanding technical and industrial economy.

In light of the foregoing determinations, it is hereby declared to be the policy of the United States to encourage employers and employees to organize and conduct apprenticeship and other training programs under the provisions of Federal or State apprenticeship laws. It is also the policy to eliminate any obstructions that may exist or occur to their doing so, or to their providing money, materials, and services to be used to promote, administer, and conduct such programs.

DEFINITIONS

SEC. 2. When used in this Act—

(1) The term "accredited apprenticeship and other training program" means an apprenticeship or other similar training program registered, approved, and conducted in accordance with the provisions of a State apprenticeship law which is recognized by the Federal Committee on Apprenticeship, United States Department of Labor, or, in those States where such an apprenticeship law does not exist, the term means an apprenticeship or other training program registered and conducted in accordance with the standards and regulations of the Federal Committee on Apprenticeship, United States Department of Labor.

(2) The term "commerce" means trade, traffic, commerce, transportation, or communication among the several States, or between the District of Columbia or any territory of the United States and any State or other territory, or between any foreign country and any State, territory, or the District of Columbia, or with the District of Columbia or any territory, or between points in the same State but through any other State or any territory or in the District of Columbia or any foreign country.

APPRENTICESHIP PROGRAMS

SEC. 3. Nothing in any Federal or State law or regulation shall be construed to declare it unlawful for, or to declare it an unfair labor practice for or to prohibit, interfere with, impede, or restrain the full freedom of, employers and employees engaged in commerce or their representatives (1) to organize, administer, or conduct an accredited apprenticeship or other training program; (2) to select, screen, hire, discharge, discipline, place, transfer, and train apprentices in an accredited apprenticeship or other training program; (3) to enforce or effectuate apprentice or other training standards or regulations; or (4) to contribute money, materials, or services to a joint apprenticeship and/or training committee or board to be used for the purpose of promoting, administering, supervising, or conducting an accredited apprenticeship and/or training program: *Provided*, That such funds or other things of value in excess of \$5,000 per annum shall be protected by a legal trust agreement and a fidelity bond to cover any person or persons who receive or disburse such funds.

APPLICATION OF LABOR-MANAGEMENT RELATIONS ACT, 1947

SEC. 4. Whenever the application of any of the provisions of the Labor-Management Relations Act, 1947, the Labor-Management Reporting and Disclosure Act of 1959, and Acts amendatory thereof and supplementary thereto, conflicts with the application of this Act, this Act shall prevail.

THE PRESIDENTIAL MEDAL FOR CIVILIAN ACHIEVEMENT

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill which would create an American version of the famed Queen's Honor List to recognize achievement in public service, arts, sciences, and related fields.

Under the measure, the President of the United States would be authorized to award annually 25 Presidential Medals to individuals whose outstanding contributions deserve national recognition in such fields as public service, national affairs, social service, science, medicine, education, letters, the arts, law, engineering, agriculture, labor, and industry. The program is more limited than the Queen's List which honors hundreds of persons annually.

The bill would provide a tax-exempt cash grant of up to \$10,000 with each award. The President would announce the awards following recommendations from a special board composed of three Senators, three Representatives and nine public members appointed by the President.

The Federal Government now has a program limited to the Fermi and Lawrence Awards of the Atomic Energy Commission, and the President's Award for Distinguished Federal Civilian Service which provides only for Government em-

ployees. Congress in 1959 made provision for a National Medal of Science but the program is not yet underway.

None of the current Government awards is equivalent to those in countries like England, Sweden, Netherlands, Denmark, France, Austria, Argentina, and the U.S.S.R. No one N.S. award signifies the official recognition and respect of the U.S. Government and 180 million Americans for distinguished achievement. As the world's mightiest democracy, the United States should have such a program to help spell out our national purpose to the world.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 1061) to establish a medal to be known as the Presidential Medal for Civilian Achievement to provide recognition for certain persons who have made outstanding contributions in the arts, sciences, and related fields, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. JAVITS, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

WILLIAM A. BELTZ: A GREAT ALASKAN

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, the history of America is replete with inspiring stories of men from humble beginnings whose lives spell achievement. Americans never cease to admire the qualities of one who, endowed with no wealth or inherited advantages, nevertheless makes the most of his inborn capacities and such opportunities as arise to become a leader.

Among those Americans I have known who have risen to heights of achievement by dint of ability and character is a great Alaskan.

William E. Beltz, who died last November, was an Eskimo from the village of Unalakleet, a community far away on the shore of the Bering Sea. In the remote villages of Alaska where he grew up, opportunities for education were limited, indeed. Bill went to a one-room school at the mining town of Haycock where all eight grades were taught by a teacher, Sue Lillian Ausley, to whom Bill gave credit for inspiring him to achieve an education, in the tradition of many others who have been similarly inspired by talented teachers. When he had completed all eight grades, the only formal education available, Bill continued, tutored by Mrs. Ausley, to complete 2 years of high school education.

His trade was that of a carpenter, and he was soon recognized by the other members of the craft as a man to be entrusted with responsibility and leadership. For many years he was business agent of local 1243 of the United Brotherhood of Carpenters, with a territory covering nearly a quarter of a million miles of northern Alaska. In 1955 he served a term as president of the Alaska Council of Carpenters, an organization of 13 local union chapters. He held other union positions, and served as delegate to several labor and political conventions. He was a delegate to the Democratic National Convention in 1956,

as was I. I recall vividly our going together to visit the Chicago planetarium—for both of us a first experience. I knew Bill well, and the better I knew him, the more I admired him. At one time he and his son George, a son by an earlier marriage, stayed with us at the Governor's house in Juneau. George was then a student at Sheldon Jackson Junior College at Sitka and a wonderful son of a wonderful father. George, now in his twenties, is a structural steel worker, and lives in Alaska.

Bill Beltz's heritage as an Eskimo and his experience with labor union affairs made him a political "natural" in Alaska, where there is a strong interest in both. Thus, although he did not plan to run for office, he found himself drafted to run for the Territorial legislature in 1949, an election he won. Following this term in the Territorial house of representatives, he was elected to the Territorial senate where he served until statehood came, when he ran and was elected to the first State senate.

At the convening of the first Alaska State Legislature in 1959 the choice of presiding officer of the senate was easily made. William Beltz was elected unanimously. He was serving in this post with distinction when he was tragically stricken, in the prime of life, by a malignancy—a brain tumor—which could not be cured.

He died leaving a fine family on whose behalf I am introducing proposed legislation which will, in some measure, provide the security they need, and for which Bill Beltz was striving. His widow is a remarkable person in her own right. A Public Health nurse, the former Arne Bulkeley was a village nurse in Unalakleet when they met. Their children, Mark, who is 6 years old; Billy, who is 4; Katherine, who is 2; and Axel, an infant, are fine youngsters who will carry on in the tradition of their parents, and will be outstanding citizens of Alaska and the Nation. But, needless to say, they face serious economic difficulty, and it is this situation to which I am now addressing myself.

Before his death, Bill had staked out a homestead claim where he hoped to establish a home for his family. He had established a residence on his homestead, as required by law, in 1959, and at the time of his death had made plans and had begun the labors for developing this and obtaining his patent, to which he would eventually have been entitled. Death, preceded by disabling illness, set a cruel obstacle to the achievement of Bill's plans for a homestead for his family.

When he died, much work remained to be done to comply with the requirements of the homestead law that 30 acres of land be cultivated before a patent may be issued. While he had complied with the requirements of residence and with other preliminaries, the difficult job of clearing and cultivating the land awaited the time he needed to devote to it—time which never came.

It will not be physically possible for his widow and small children to carry on this exhausting job of cultivating the land, which must be completed by the

termination of the period for obtaining final patent in 1964. Of necessity, to support her four young children, she is carrying on her professional work for the State department of health.

I am asking Congress to authorize the Department of the Interior to convey this land to Arne and her children so they may have the peace of mind and sense of security which would come from its possession. Without this legislation the promise of a homestead will be lost to the survivors of a great man. So I introduce a bill for that purpose and ask that it be appropriately referred.

William Beltz was, truly, a great and worthy son of America. Enactment of this measure will compensate, in some degree, for his contributions to Alaska and to the Nation and is, therefore, I deeply believe, thoroughly justified.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the text of a biographical sketch of William Beltz which was written at the time he assumed the presidency of the Alaska State Senate, and a concurrent resolution of the State legislature expressing their grief on the loss of their colleague whom they had honored with election to the presidency of the first State senate.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the biographical sketch and concurrent resolution will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 1065) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to convey certain land situated in the vicinity of Unalakleet, Alaska, to Mrs. William E. Beltz, introduced by Mr. GRUENING, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

The biographical sketch and concurrent resolution presented by Mr. GRUENING are as follows:

SENATOR BELTZ OF ALASKA

It was a cold January afternoon in Juneau, the capital of Alaska. The Democratic members of the Alaskan State Senate were gathered in a party caucus to select a president of the upper chamber of the infant 49th State.

The one selected would have to be the outstanding Senator among them. He would have to be a skilled parliamentarian. He would have to be an efficient and forceful leader, able to command the respect of Republicans as well as Democrats.

The lawmakers did not take long to choose their leader. William Earnest Beltz, a resident of the Eskimo village of Unalakleet, was nominated without opposition and elected by the unanimous vote of his fellow senators.

It was fitting that his name was placed in nomination by Frank A. Peratrovich, a 62-year-old merchant and a veteran of many previous sessions of the territorial senate. For Peratrovich was Beltz' closest competitor for the leadership. And Peratrovich is an Alaskan Thlinget Indian from the village of Klawock.

The election of Beltz was no surprise to Alaskans. He had 10 years of experience in the legislature. He was known as a man who can get his ideas across effectively in debate, and he had proven himself dedicated to the welfare of Alaska and all its people.

Senator Beltz is the type of leader the Alaskan resident regards with confidence as Alaska makes the complicated transition

from territorial to State government. He is one of their own. He is a carpenter who has made a living with his hands, and can help to shape their future with a level head.

Beltz and his colleague Peratrovich, the former president of the territorial senate, are testimony to the diversity of peoples in the new State of Alaska. Almost every race on earth is represented, according to the last census, and approximately one-sixth of the population is Aleut, Indian or Eskimo. Members of those three aboriginal populations are lively participants in government and in the commercial development of Alaska.

Latest figures indicate that there are approximately 4,000 Aleuts, 14,000 Indians, and 16,000 Eskimos. The three racial strains are considered the native population since they were in Alaska when the United States purchased the territory from Russia in 1867.

Anthropologists believe that the three groups descended from primitive peoples who originally migrated to the area from Asia. It is believed they came across the frozen Bering Strait—the narrow, shallow strait that once linked the continents of Asia and North America.

Senator Beltz descends from that Eskimo stock that settled the northern and western coasts of Alaska. His father was of German ancestry, however, and had migrated to Alaska from the U.S. east coast State of Pennsylvania.

Jack S. Beltz, now dead, went to Alaska during the Yukon gold rush in 1897. He never found the fabled gold, but he found his place in the thriving territory running a pack train for the hordes of miners passing through on their way to the goldfields. He also found an attractive Eskimo girl to marry in 1906.

The couple had seven children, all of whom have remained in Alaska. Their two daughters live in Fairbanks. Their son Harry is an airline mechanic. John and Tom Beltz are engineers. Bert is a big-game guide and one of the bush pilots who fly small planes into the remote areas of Alaska.

The Beltz family was living at Bear Creek on the Seward Peninsula when William was born on August 24, 1912. The boy attended a small one-room public school in the little mining town of Haycock. His teacher, the late Sue Lillian Ausley, taught all eight grades.

She was attracted by the studious nature of young Beltz and offered to help him continue his education. "Whatever I have achieved is due to Mrs. Ausley," he says today. "She gave me the inspiration."

William chopped wood to earn money to buy books. He spent every evening studying with Mrs. Ausley. Thus, he completed 2 years of high school in a village remote from any high schools.

"I didn't really plan to enter politics, for I was a carpenter," Beltz recalls. "But as it happened I had no choice." He was on a committee named by the Arctic Native Brotherhood to find a suitable candidate from the northern district to run for the territorial house of representatives. The committee found no candidate, and someone suggested that Beltz himself should run for the office.

This launched the political career of the carpenter from Unalakleet. He won the election easily and served with distinction in the 1949 Territorial House. The following year he ran for the upper legislative chamber and has served as a senator since then.

In 1953 Senator Beltz married Arne Bulkeley, a U.S. Public Health Service nurse from New York State who served in Alaskan hospitals. The couple has three children—Mark, 4; William, 2½, and little Katherine Olivia who was born last November.

A carpenter for many years, Beltz has been active in labor affairs. For 3 years he was the business agent of Local 1243 of the United

Brotherhood of Carpenters, with a territory covering nearly a quarter of a million miles of northern Alaska. In 1955 he served a term as president of the Alaska Council of Carpenters, an organization of 13 local union chapters. He has held other union positions, and has been a delegate to several labor and political conventions.

The combination of a labor background and an Eskimo heritage led Beltz to devote much of his legislative efforts to those fields. He has worked hard for the aboriginal populations, and has sponsored several of Alaska's important laws such as the minimum wage requirement and aid to the native blind.

He hopes to introduce more bills of this nature to the legislature, but they must wait. Putting the new State's governmental machinery into action is the most urgent business at hand. As senate president he must expedite the complicated and important legislation necessary for governing Alaska as a State.

Then he can turn once more to his primary interests. These are to further the development of Alaska's resources, stabilize her economy, and promote the welfare of the Alaskan people.

SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 1

Concurrent resolution relating to the death of Senator William E. Beltz

Whereas since the adjournment of the first State legislature the legislature and the State have incurred a great loss through the passing of Senator William E. Beltz; and

Whereas Senator Beltz had served his district and all Alaska as a member of the Territorial and State legislatures with notable distinction and ability; and

Whereas his integrity and qualities of leadership prompted his election as president of the senate for the historical sessions of the first State legislature; and

Whereas his record of service and endeavor will always stand as an inspiration to those who aspire to the finest standards of good citizenship and public service: Be it

Resolved by the senate in second legislature, first session assembled (the house concurring), That this resolution serve as an expression of the esteem and high regard of the members of the legislature for the late Senator William E. Beltz and as a means of extending to Mrs. William E. Beltz and her family the sincerest condolences and best wishes of the members of the legislature on behalf of the people of the State of Alaska.

AMENDMENT OF THE FEDERAL PROPERTY AND ADMINISTRATIVE SERVICES ACT OF 1949

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to amend the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 to authorize the disposal of surplus property to certain welfare agencies.

Under the present law, Federal surplus property can be donated only to medical institutions, health centers, civil defense organizations, schools, colleges, and related organizations. My bill would broaden the eligibility to include certain tax-supported or tax-exempt welfare and recreation agencies, which serve the public in institutions or in groups and which meet at least one of the following criteria:

First. Such agency is licensed by a State standard-setting agency:

Second. Such agency receives funds through a State or local community fund or similar federated fund-raising body; or

Third. Such agency is affiliated with, or is part of, a national standard-setting organization.

The net effect of this bill would be to make a great many of our Nation's critically important welfare and relief agencies eligible to receive needed surplus property. The receipt of such property would permit them to devote more of their overall budget to important welfare, relief, and recreational expenditures.

This bill is cosponsored by Senators BEALL, BENNETT, BUSH, CARLSON, CASE of South Dakota, JAVITS, SALTONSTALL, WILEY, and YOUNG of North Dakota, all of whom cosponsored this bill last year.

This proposal is one in which I have had a longstanding interest. It grows out of recommendation drawn up by a National Welfare Assembly Committee, which included members drawn from American Foundation for the Blind, Child Welfare League of America, Council of Jewish Federations and Welfare Funds, Council on Social Work Education, National Council of Churches of Christ in America, National Federation of Settlement and Neighborhood Centers, National Jewish Welfare Board, National Recreational Association, Salvation Army, United Community Funds and Councils, Young Men's Christian Association, and Young Women's Christian Association.

In addition, the following list of organizations have also expressed a special interest in this legislation:

American Hearing Society.
Board of Hospitals and Homes of the Methodist Church.
Child Welfare League of America.
National Catholic Community Service.
Federation of Jewish Philanthropies of New York.
Catholic Youth Organization.
United HIAS Service.
Council of Social Work Education.
Manhattan Club.
Day Care Council of New York.
United Neighborhood House of New York.
The Elmira Neighborhood House, Elmira, N.Y.
Jewish Young Men and Women's Association of Rochester, N.Y.
The Baden Street Settlement, Inc., Rochester, N.Y.
St. Peter Claver Community House, Detroit, Mich.
Lutheran Service Society of Colorado, Denver, Colo.
Area Service Association, Ferndale, Mich.
Sophie Wright Settlement, Detroit, Mich.
The Neighborhood House Association, Denver, Colo.
Seattle Atlantic Street Center, Seattle, Wash.
Denver Federation of Community Centers, Denver, Colo.
Detroit Federation of Settlements and Neighborhood Centers, Detroit, Mich.
Bidwell Riverside Center, Des Moines, Iowa.
Pillsbury Citizens Service, Minneapolis, Minn.
Alameda Family Service Agency, Alameda, Calif.
Chicago Federation of Settlements and Neighborhood Centers, Chicago, Ill.
Board and Staff of Wilkie House, Des Moines, Iowa.
Denver Orphans Home Association, Denver, Colo.
Westchester County Recreation Commission, White Plains, N.Y.
Concord Center, Indianapolis, Ind.

Hawthorne Social Service Association, Indianapolis, Ind.

Circle Friendly House, Kansas City, Mo.
Council of Social Agencies, Des Moines, Iowa.

Rochester Community Chest, Rochester, N.Y.

Guadalupe Center, Kansas City, Mo.

Friendly House Community Center, Portland, Oreg.

Whatsoever Circle Community House, Kansas City, Mo.

Della C. Lamb Neighborhood House, Inc., Kansas City, Mo.

Southwest Denver Community Center, Denver, Colo.

The Neighborhood House, San Diego, Calif.
Avalon Community Center, Los Angeles, Calif.

Home of Neighborly Service, San Bernardino, Calif.

Jewish Family and Children's Service of Denver, Denver, Colo.

Southern California Federation of Settlements and Neighborhood Centers, Los Angeles, Calif.

Catholic Youth Organization, Los Angeles, Calif.

Last year, a special subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Government Operations held hearings on a number of legislative proposals to amend the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, including a bill identical to the bill which I introduce today. These hearings proved extremely useful. A number of the groups listed above appeared or sent statements to the committee in support of the bill which I introduced to permit them to receive Federal surplus property. It was pointed out by many of these groups that, even if the effect of such an amendment is limited because of the present size and nature of the supply of Federal surplus property, whatever assistance is made available would be greatly appreciated.

I have been informed that the General Services Administration already has made a number of welfare agencies eligible for this property by specific administrative action. This is a policy which, I think, the Congress should determine.

The reason that the relevant administrative agencies have given in previous years for opposing this measure is that there is not enough surplus property, or, to put it another way, there are too many welfare agencies. To my way of thinking, this is not realistic. I am glad that there is a large number of active and dedicated welfare agencies. They do a tremendous amount of good work. Certainly, they are entitled to this limited Government help. Once the Congress so specifies, then the relevant Federal agency will and must be charged with the responsibility of carrying out this policy in an orderly and proper fashion. This would probably mean giving the General Services Administration the responsibility for establishing priorities for the donation of certain types of surplus property to qualified welfare agencies, as there obviously would not be enough property to fill the requirements of all such agencies. But, is it not true that the Federal Government today establishes priorities in much the same fashion on the basis of need or seniority for housing grants, farm credit, slum

clearance, highways, national parks, and many other worthy purposes?

Mr. President, I hope that this bill will again receive active consideration from the Senate Government Operations Committee and that the relevant agencies of the Federal Government will not, as they have in the past, oppose it on the arbitrary and unrealistic basis which I have discussed above.

Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent that the text of this bill appear at this point in the RECORD and that the bill lie on the table until the close of business Friday, March 3, in the event that other Senators would like to add their names to this measure.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred, and, without objection, the bill will be printed in the RECORD, and will lie on the table as requested by the Senator from New York.

The bill (S. 1069) to amend the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 to authorize the disposal of surplus property to certain welfare agencies, introduced by Mr. KEATING (for himself and other Senators) was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Government Operations, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That paragraph (1) of subsection (j) of section 203 of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 (40 U.S.C., sec. 484), is amended by inserting immediately after "or for research for any such purpose" the following: "or for utilization by welfare or recreation agencies".

Sec. 2. Paragraph (3) of such subsection (j) is amended—

(1) by inserting immediately after "or for research for any such purpose" the following: "or for utilization by welfare or recreation agencies";

(2) by striking out "and (B)" and inserting "(B)"; and

(3) by inserting immediately after "Internal Revenue Code of 1954" the following: "and (C) welfare or recreation agencies".

Sec. 3. Paragraph (2) of subsection (k) of such section 203 is amended—

(1) by striking out "or" at the end of subparagraph (D);

(2) by striking out "law," in subparagraph (E) and inserting in lieu thereof "law; or"; and

(3) by inserting immediately after such subparagraph (E) the following:

"(F) the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, in the case of property transferred pursuant to this Act to welfare or recreation agencies—".

Sec. 4. Such section 203 is further amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(p) As used in this section, the term 'welfare or recreation agencies' means tax-supported or tax-exempt welfare or recreation agencies which serve people in institutions and in groups, but in the case of any such agency which is a tax-exempt voluntary agency, includes only an agency which meets at least one of the following criteria—

"(1) such agency is licensed by a State standard-setting agency;

"(2) such agency receives funds through a State or local community fund or similar federated fund-raising body; or

"(3) such agency is affiliated with, or is a part of, a national standard-setting organization."

AMENDMENT OF FEDERAL EMPLOYEES' GROUP LIFE INSURANCE ACT

Mr. JOHNSTON. Mr. President, the Federal Employees Group Life Insurance Act of 1954 made available to Federal employees a plan of low-cost life insurance. One-third of the premium is paid by the Government and two-thirds is paid by the employee.

Because the plan was new, it was started on a conservative basis in order to assure its financial soundness. There was general agreement that as experience warranted the program would be liberalized. Many of us believe that can be done without impairing the financial soundness of the program.

In general, the plan provides insurance approximating an employee's salary rounded off at the nearest upper \$1,000. This means that an employee whose salary is greater than \$4,000 but not over \$5,000 would have insurance of \$5,000, and an employee with a salary between five and six thousand would have insurance of \$6,000, and so on, with a maximum of \$20,000 in the cases of employees receiving a salary of \$19,000 or more.

The original act called for a reduction in the face value of an employee's insurance upon the attainment of the age of 65 whether he continued as an employee or he had retired. The reduction was at the rate of 2 percent a month until the face value of the individual's policy had been reduced to 25 percent of its original amount. Last year, the act was amended waiving the reduction so long as the individual continued as an active employee but upon separation the reduction set in at the prescribed rate of 2 percent a month until the value of the policy was reduced to 25 percent.

The amendment last year was good, but it did not go far enough. I think the reduction to 25 percent is much too severe. It often leaves an estate without a sufficient amount to cover funeral and other terminal expenses. For example, an employee with a salary of between four and five thousand would have insurance with a face value of \$5,000. This would be the amount he could carry into retirement. Upon reaching the age of 65—or immediately if then 65 or over—the automatic reduction of 2 percent a month would begin. Thus, 3 years and 3 months later, his insurance which once amounted to \$5,000 would have a value of only \$1,250. Under present conditions, this is a pitifully small amount. In many instances, it falls short of defraying final expenses let alone leaving a few dollars to dependent survivors.

Mr. President, the measure I am about to introduce is designed to alleviate the situation to some extent. Under its terms, each employee would have an additional block of insurance approximately equal to 25 percent of his salary and the insurance he now has. Specifically, an employee with a salary of less than \$5,000 would have additional insurance of \$1,000; an employee whose salary is over \$5,000 but less than \$10,000 would have additional insurance of \$2,000; an employee whose salary is over \$10,000 but less than \$15,000 would have addi-

tional insurance of \$3,000; an employee whose salary is over \$15,000 but under \$20,000 would have additional insurance of \$4,000; and, an employee whose salary was \$20,000 and over would have additional insurance of \$5,000.

This additional insurance would not be subject to reduction by reason of advanced age. As will be noted upon study, its benefits are twofold. First, it provides all employees with an additional amount of insurance during their careers—this is the time they are rearing their children—this is the time when they are paying for a home and otherwise getting established—this is the time when added protection is needed. Second, it provides all employees with an additional amount of insurance that will go to their survivors without reduction.

The additional block of insurance provided by the bill would be at the same rate and on the same basis as the basic insurance now held by employees. In other words, the employee would pay two-thirds of the premium, and the Government would pay one-third. The additional cost, in either instance, is small in comparison to the benefits provided.

Mr. President, I send to the desk, for referral to the appropriate committee, a bill designed to accomplish the objectives I have outlined.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 1070) to amend the Federal Employees' Group Life Insurance Act of 1954, as amended, so as to provide for an additional unit of life insurance, introduced by Mr. JOHNSTON, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

EXPANSION AND IMPROVEMENT OF COMMUNITY FACILITIES AND SERVICES FOR THE HEALTH CARE OF AGED AND OTHER PERSONS

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to assist in expanding and improving community facilities and services for the health care of aged and other persons, and for other purposes. I ask unanimous consent that a letter from the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, relating to the bill, be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the letter will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 1071) to assist in expanding and improving community facilities and services for the health care of aged and other persons, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. HILL, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

The letter presented by Mr. HILL is as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION, AND WELFARE,
Washington, D.C.

The President,
The White House,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: Enclosed is a bill to carry out those recommendations in your

February 9, 1961, special health message to the Congress relating to the expansion of community facilities and services for the health care of the aged and other persons.

The bill would amend section 314(c) of the Public Health Service Act to remove the ceiling on the authorization of appropriations and to authorize earmarking of part of the appropriations for particular activities. The funds which would be available to the States under this increased authorization could thus be directed toward such activities as the establishment and maintenance of programs for improving the scope, quality, and availability of community health services such as those provided in nursing homes, home health care programs, outpatient diagnostic services, and health referral and information centers.

The bill would also authorize the Surgeon General to make grants to public or other nonprofit organizations for studies, experiments, and demonstration projects designed to develop new or improved methods of providing health services outside the hospital for the chronically ill and aged.

The annual appropriation authorization for grants for the construction of public or other nonprofit nursing homes would be raised to \$20 million from its current level of \$10 million. This amount, together with other public and private construction funds, would make possible a net addition over the next 10 years of one-half of a bed per 1,000 population for the care of long-term patients.

The bill would also remove the current \$1,200,000 annual ceiling on funds for research grants in the development and utilization of hospital services, facilities, and resources. In addition, it would authorize such research grant funds to be used for the construction and equipping of experimental or demonstration hospitals or other medical facilities.

Faithfully yours,
ABRAHAM RUBINOFF,
Secretary.

HEALTH PROFESSIONS EDUCATIONAL ASSISTANCE ACT OF 1961

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, on behalf of myself and Senators KERR, YARBOROUGH, WILLIAMS of New Jersey, and PELL, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to increase the opportunities for training of physicians, dentists, and professional public health personnel, and for other purposes. I ask unanimous consent that a letter from the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, relating to the bill, be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the letter will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 1072) to increase the opportunities for training of physicians, dentists, and professional public health personnel, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. HILL (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

The letter presented by Mr. HILL is as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF
HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE,
Washington, D.C.

The PRESIDENT,
The White House,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: Enclosed is a proposed bill entitled the "Health Professions Educational Assistance Act of 1961" the

major purpose of which is to increase opportunities for training of physicians, dentists, and professional public health personnel.

The bill carries out your recommendations for aid to education for the health professions and for extension of research facilities as covered in your health message dated February 9, 1961.

The proposed bill provides for:

1. Grants for construction of medical, dental, osteopathic, and public health teaching facilities.
2. Medical, osteopathic, and dental scholarship grants.
3. Extension and strengthening of research facilities construction grant program.

GRANTS FOR CONSTRUCTION OF MEDICAL, DENTAL, OSTEOPATHIC, AND PUBLIC HEALTH TEACHING FACILITIES

A new 10-year grant program for the construction of medical, osteopathic, dental, and public health school facilities would be provided in a new part B to title VII of the Public Health Service Act. This program is directed toward increasing the facilities for training physicians, dentists, and professional public health workers.

Sums authorized to be appropriated each year for grants would be limited by annual ceilings for the 10-year period, July 1, 1961, to June 30, 1971, of \$60 million for matching construction grants for new schools or for major expansion of existing schools, of which \$15 million would be available for dental school construction, with priorities based on the amount of expansion which the construction would make possible, and upon considerations of geographical distribution of training opportunities. Another \$15 million would be authorized for renovation and replacement of existing teaching facilities which are so obsolete as to require substantial curtailment of enrollment or of the quality of teaching.

Construction grants could be made for any facility needed in teaching of medical, dental, or public health students, including teaching hospitals or other clinical teaching facilities.

The Federal share of construction costs in the case of new schools or major expansion of existing schools could be up to 66 2/3 percent of necessary costs of construction. Other grants under this authorization would not exceed 50 percent of construction costs.

In addition to construction grants, the Surgeon General would be authorized to provide financial assistance for projects for the planning of medical, dental, or public health education programs by regional, State, or local public or private nonprofit agencies, organizations, and institutions, and to give technical advice and consultative services to such agencies.

MEDICAL, OSTEOPATHIC, AND DENTAL SCHOLARSHIP GRANTS

The proposed bill would also add a new part C to title VII of the Public Health Service Act. This part is directed at increasing the number of well-qualified medical and dental students by lowering the economic barriers which prevent many well-qualified young people from entering a career in medicine or dentistry.

This part would authorize Federal grants to accredited schools of medicine, osteopathy, or dentistry, to be used by these schools to make scholarship awards to talented students who are enrolled or have been accepted for admission by the school and are in financial need.

In the first year each school would receive for this purpose an amount equal to \$1,500 times 25 percent of its first year class enrollment, and only first-year students would be eligible for this scholarship aid. In the second year the school allotment would be increased to provide for 25 percent of the first- and second-year classes, and the aid would be available to the students in these two

classes. A similar increase would be made in the third year; and in the fourth and subsequent years the four classes would be included.

Within the school's allotment limitations, more or less than 25 percent of the students of a class might be aided, with scholarships in varying amounts up to a maximum of \$2,000 a year for any one student.

In addition to amounts for student scholarships the draft bill would authorize grants to schools to meet part of the instructional costs of these students. For this purpose each school will receive an amount equal to \$1,000 for each scholarship holder but not in excess of \$1,000 for 25 percent of the first-year class in the first year, with this maximum increasing by the fourth year to \$1,000 for 25 percent of the 4-year enrollment.

EXTENSION AND STRENGTHENING OF RESEARCH FACILITIES CONSTRUCTION GRANT PROGRAM

Closely related to our need for expanded medical and dental training facilities is the increasing need for facilities for the conduct of research in the sciences related to health. The rapidly unfolding opportunities for new research discoveries can be met only by increasing our supply of qualified research personnel and by expanding the facilities required for the conduct of research. The statutory authority for the existing research facility construction grant program administered by the Public Health Service requires extension and modification during the present Congress. The authority for appropriation of construction grant funds expires on June 30, 1962, and no new grant applications may be received after June 30, 1961.

The proposed bill would extend the legislative authority for this program, now contained in title VII of the Public Health Service Act, for 3 additional years. For these 3 additional years the authorization for appropriation of grant funds would also be increased from \$30 million to \$50 million annually. The need for this program extension and expansion is clearly indicated by the existing backlog of over \$60 million in preliminary and final grant applications, by the widespread evidence of overcrowding of available facilities in research institutions throughout the country, and by the rapid expansion of training programs for additional research personnel.

The present provisions of section 706(a) of the act, relating to the amount of Federal grants for the construction of facilities that are to be used partly for research and partly for other purposes, would be modified by the bill to permit Federal participation in the total cost of a facility that is to be used for research and other related purposes (including research training). In the case of other multipurposes facilities, Federal participation in construction costs would continue to be limited to the research part (or "proportionate use") of the facility.

A new provision would be added by the bill to title VII of the act in order to apply to construction aided under this program requirements as to prevailing wages and overtime pay for workmen employed thereon (these are also included in the proposed teaching facility construction grant program).

Finally, the proposed bill would repeal the existing authority for construction of categorical research facilities (in sec. 433(a) of the Public Health Service Act) and would authorize Federal construction and operation, directly or otherwise, of research facilities of particular value to the Nation or a region thereof.

The three major parts of the bill, in combination, offer a program to facilitate the needed expansion of training capacity for education for the health professions and facilities for health research and to stimulate the recruitment of well-qualified stu-

dents. We believe that enactment of this proposed legislation will enable the Federal Government, in cooperation with other governmental authorities and private groups, to go far toward meeting the Nation's growing health service and research requirements.

Faithfully yours,
ABRAHAM RUBINOFF,
Secretary.

CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT GRANTING 18-YEAR-OLD CITIZENS THE RIGHT TO VOTE

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, a number of years ago I introduced a joint resolution for amendment of the Constitution to grant citizens of the United States who have attained the age of 18 the right to vote. I still believe it is a subject which ought to be submitted to the people for their consideration, because this is their country; this is their Republic. The way to change it has been provided for in the amendatory provisions of the Constitution of the United States, and therefore I believe this matter should be submitted to them, and I introduce, for appropriate reference, a joint resolution for that purpose.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The joint resolution will be received and appropriately referred.

The joint resolution (S.J. Res. 54) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to grant to citizens of the United States who have attained the age of 18 the right to vote, introduced by Mr. DIRKSEN, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

LEGAL EFFECT OF CERTAIN TREATIES AND OTHER INTERNATIONAL AGREEMENTS

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I introduce a joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution relating to the legal effect of certain treaties and other international agreements.

This has been referred to over the years as the very celebrated Bricker amendment. I am still vitally interested in it, and therefore I introduce it for reference to the appropriate committee.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The joint resolution will be received and appropriately referred.

The joint resolution (S.J. Res. 55) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States, relating to the legal effect of certain treaties and other international agreements, introduced by Mr. DIRKSEN, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

APPOINTMENT OF ADDITIONAL CIRCUIT AND DISTRICT JUDGES— AMENDMENTS

Mr. PASTORE (for himself and Mr. PELL) submitted amendments, intended to be proposed by them, jointly, to the bill (S. 912) to provide for the appointment of additional circuit and district

judges, and for other purposes, which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and ordered to be printed.

Mr. KEFAUVER submitted an amendment, intended to be proposed by him, to Senate bill 912, supra, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and ordered to be printed.

TWO-YEAR PERIOD TO REINSTATE NATIONAL SERVICE LIFE INSURANCE TO VETERANS OF WORLD WAR II—ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF BILL

Under authority of the order of the Senate of February 16, 1961, the names of Senators PELL and HART were added as additional cosponsors of the bill (S. 977) to amend title 38 of the United States Code in order to provide a 2-year period during which certain veterans may be granted national service life insurance, introduced by Mr. LONG of Louisiana (for himself and other Senators) on February 16, 1961.

WOODROW WILSON MEMORIAL— ADDITIONAL COSPONSOR OF JOINT RESOLUTION

Under authority of the order of the Senate of February 16, 1961, the name of Mr. LONG of Missouri was added as an additional cosponsor of the joint resolution (S.J. Res. 51) authorizing the creation of a commission to consider and formulate plans for the construction in the District of Columbia of an appropriate permanent memorial to the memory of Woodrow Wilson, introduced by Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey on February 16, 1961.

NATURAL RESOURCES—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, on yesterday the President sent to the Congress a message on conservation which was printed in the RECORD of the House proceedings of yesterday. I therefore ask unanimous consent that the message be referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs without its being read.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(For President's message see pp. 2583-2586.)

NOTICE OF HEARINGS ON AREA REDEVELOPMENT LEGISLATION

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I wish to announce that the Subcommittee on Production and Stabilization of the Committee on Banking and Currency will resume its public hearings on area redevelopment legislation on Tuesday, February 28, at 10 a.m., in room 5302, New Senate Office Building.

The committee will hear the Secretary of Agriculture, the Secretary of Commerce, and the Secretary of Labor, as well as several private witnesses who have asked to be heard.

ADDRESSES, EDITORIALS, ARTICLES, ETC., PRINTED IN THE RECORD

On request, and by unanimous consent, addresses, editorials, articles, etc., were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

By Mr. RUSSELL:

Address dealing with the relationship of the Government's fiscal, social, and foreign policies to the present state of the national economy, delivered by Senator BLAKLEY at a meeting of the La Porte-Bayshore Chamber of Commerce.

By Mr. KUCHEL:

Address by him to the Irrigation Districts Association of California, fall convention of its 50th year, Statler Hilton Hotel, Los Angeles, December 7, 1960.

By Mr. GOLDWATER:

Statement by him on the organization and training activities of the 9999th Air Reserve Squadron on Capitol Hill.

By Mr. MAGNUSON:

Statement prepared by him on the Soviet fisheries threat.

COMMEMORATION OF 100TH ANNIVERSARY OF FIRST INAUGURAL OF ABRAHAM LINCOLN

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, the House has just messaged to the Senate House Joint Resolution 155, to create a joint committee to commemorate the 100th anniversary of the first inauguration of Abraham Lincoln. The anniversary will occur on Saturday of next week.

The resolution passed the House unanimously. It was modified along certain lines, so as to delete a provision requiring the holding of a joint session. The resolution calls on the Centennial Commission to meet and plan the appropriate observance.

I hope that, by unanimous consent, this measure may be considered now, during the morning hour, because the time is so very short.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, reserving the right to object—although I shall not object—I wish to state that the minority leader discussed this matter with me, and I fully approve what he is proposing in this instance. But I hope this step will not be regarded as a precedent in connection with future resolutions.

Mr. DIRKSEN. That is correct; I make this request only because the circumstances are so extraordinary and because the commemoration will have to be planned and staged by a week from Saturday of this week.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The joint resolution will be read.

The joint resolution (H.J. Res. 155) was read the first time by its title and the second time at length, as follows:

Whereas Saturday, March 4, 1961, will mark the centenary of Abraham Lincoln's taking the oath of office as sixteenth President of the United States; and

Whereas the anniversary will be widely observed and noted throughout this land and overseas; and

Whereas the occasion will coincide with exercises commemorative of the American Civil War of 1861-1865; and

Whereas Mr. Lincoln stood at the head of the Government of the United States and its

Armed Forces during those years of tragedy and travail; and

Whereas he foresaw the difficulty of the task before him as "greater than that which rested on Washington"; and

Whereas he sought the guidance of Almighty God, saying, "Without the assistance of that Divine Being * * * I cannot succeed. With that assistance I cannot fail."; and

Whereas one who stood in the audience at his first inauguration would later write, "the shouts which have resounded for him at the Capitol are still ringing in my ears."; and

Whereas from a wooden platform, projected from the eastern portico, beneath an unfinished dome, he pleaded and reasoned that day for reconciliation and the preservation of the Union, saying:

"I take the official oath today, with no mental reservations, and with no purpose to construe the Constitution or laws, by any hypercritical rules. * * * I hold, that in contemplation of universal law, and of the Constitution, the Union of these States is perpetual. * * * It is safe to say that no government proper, ever had a provision in its organic law for its own termination. * * * Before entering upon so grave a matter as the destruction of our national fabric, with all its benefits, its memories, and its hopes, would it not be wise to ascertain precisely why we do it? Will you hazard so desperate a step, while there is any possibility that any portion of the ills you fly from, have no real existence? Will you, while the certain ills you fly to, are greater than all the real ones you fly from? Will you risk the commission of so fearful a mistake? * * * Physically speaking, we cannot separate. We cannot remove our respective sections from each other, nor build an impassable wall between them. A husband and wife may be divorced, and go out of the presence, and beyond the reach of each other; but the different parts of our country cannot do this. They cannot but remain face to face; and intercourse, either amicable or hostile, must continue between them. * * * We are not enemies, but friends. We must not be enemies. Though passion may have strained, it must not break our bonds of affection. The mystic cords of memory, stretching from every battlefield, and patriot grave, to every living heart and hearthstone, all over this broad land, will yet swell the chorus of the Union, when again touched, as surely they will be, by the better angels of our nature."; and

Whereas the better angels do, in fact, touch us: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That on Saturday, March 4 next, the one hundredth anniversary of Abraham Lincoln's first inauguration shall be commemorated by such observance as may be determined by the committee on arrangements in cooperation with the National Civil War Centennial Commission, the Civil War Centennial Commission of the District of Columbia, and the Lincoln Group of the District of Columbia.

Immediately upon passage of this resolution, the President of the Senate shall appoint four Members of the Senate and the Speaker of the House shall appoint four Members of the House of Representatives jointly to constitute a committee on arrangements.

Immediately upon passage of this resolution and after the Members of the Senate and House have been appointed, the Speaker shall direct the committee on arrangements to meet and select a chairman from one of their own group and such other officers as will be appropriate and needed who will immediately proceed to plan, in cooperation with the National Civil War Centennial Commission, the Civil War Centennial Commission of the District of Columbia and the

Lincoln Group of the District of Columbia, an appropriate ceremony, issue invitations to the President of the United States, the Vice President of the United States, Secretaries of departments, heads of independent agencies, offices, and commissions, the Chief Justice and Associate Justices of the Supreme Court, the diplomatic corps, assistant heads of departments, Commissioners of the District of Columbia, members of the Lincoln Group of the District of Columbia, centennial commissions from the various States, Civil War roundtables, State and local historical and patriotic societies, and such other students and scholars in the field of history as may have a special interest in the occasion, organize a reenactment of Mr. Lincoln's first inauguration on the eastern portico of the Capitol, select a speaker and other participants, prepare and publish a program and submit a report not later than June 1, 1961.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Illinois?

There being no objection, the resolution (H.J. Res. 155) was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The preamble was agreed to.

CHRISTIANITY TODAY

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I am continually impressed by the wisdom, ability, and dedication to the basic principles upon which this Nation was founded, displayed by the Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, J. Edgar Hoover. A tower of moral strength, he symbolizes, perhaps more than any other single American, the determination of this country to remain free in the face of an aggressive world communism.

I know of no person with greater knowledge as to the inherent dangers represented by that false and godless philosophy, or one more competent to alert the American public in meeting its challenge.

Recently, in its issues of October 10 and 24, and November 7, 1960, "Christianity Today" carried three penetrating articles by Mr. Hoover. I ask unanimous consent to have them printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

These articles forcibly portray the fundamental antagonism which necessarily exists between the spiritual basis for the structure we know as democracy and the false secular religion of the Communist. Mr. Hoover makes it abundantly clear that Christianity is one of the great forces at our command, with which to meet the greatest menace of our times. I commend these articles to the careful attention of all Americans.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE COMMUNIST MENACE: RED GOALS AND CHRISTIAN IDEALS

(By J. Edgar Hoover)

(At the invitation of Christianity Today, the distinguished Director of the FBI, J. Edgar Hoover, speaks his mind on the Communist threat to the Christian heritage. Based on his long experience in dealing with subversive forces, Mr. Hoover here relates for Christianity Today's wide readership how the Communist Party operates

against the American religious heritage. He expresses some firm convictions on how churchmen and churchgoers may effectively confront the Red menace in prayer, thought, and action. Scheduled in three successive issues, Mr. Hoover's future themes are "Communist Propaganda and the Christian Pulpit," and "Communist Domination or Christian Rededication." Readers of Mr. Hoover's best-selling book "Masters of Deceit" have found it to be a definitive analysis of the Communist menace facing the world today.)

The 20th century has witnessed the intrusion into its body fabric of a highly malignant cancer—a cancer which threatens to destroy Judaic-Christian civilization. One-fourth of the world's land surface has been seared and blackened by this cancer, while one out of every three human beings is caught in its tentacles. At this very hour, some are wondering whether we as a free nation can survive the frontal and underground assaults of this tumorous growth of communism.

Just 100 years ago communism was a mere scratch on the face of international affairs. In a dingy London apartment, a garrulous, haughty, and intolerant atheist, Karl Marx, callous to the physical sufferings and poverty of his family, was busy mixing the ideological acids of this evil philosophy. Originally of interest only to skid row debaters and wandering minstrels of revolution, Marx's pernicious doctrines were given organizational power by a beady-eyed Russian, V. I. Lenin, who, with his Bolshevik henchmen, seized state power for communism in 1917. From that wintry day in St. Petersburg, communism began to flow in ever greater torrents. After Lenin came the crafty and cunning Joseph Stalin and now the ebullient master prevaricator, Nikita Khrushchev. Communism is today literally a violent hurricane, rocking not only the chanceries of the world but seeking to capture the bodies, minds, and souls of men and women everywhere.

UNIVERSAL DOMINATION THE GOAL

The full implications of the Communist challenge are shocking. The ultimate Communist goal—as defined by Marx, Lenin, and other Communist leaders—is the ruthless overthrow of our Judaic-Christian heritage and the establishment of a worldwide Communist society. By its very nature, communism is expansionist and universalist. In fact, the Communists feel that they can find their true fulfillment only by conquering non-Communist areas and bringing the whole planet under their dominion.

This overriding Communist goal of universal domination becomes the key to party activities. Feeling that history has destined communism for ultimate victory, the Communists believe that permanent peace with non-Communists is impossible, that life must be an inevitable struggle between the two. "It is inconceivable," Lenin proclaimed, "that the Soviet Republic should continue to exist for a long period side by side with imperialist states. Ultimately, one or the other must conquer."

REJECTION OF OBJECTIVE MORALITY

Hence, there arises the ugly manifestation of Communist "ethics"—namely, the Communist belief that morality must be subordinated to the class struggle, the inevitable conflict between communism and its opponents. What is moral? Anything which serves to destroy the enemy and promote communism. Lenin was most explicit: "Morality is that which serves to destroy the old exploiting society and to unite all the toilers around the proletariat, which is creating a new Communist society."

Communist morality, of course, is rooted in total rejection of a belief in God and in the values of the Christian moral code. Supernatural concepts and divine revelation play no role in communism. "We repudiate

all morality that is taken outside of human, class concepts," Lenin proclaimed. "We, of course, say that we do not believe in God, and the we know perfectly well that the clergy, the landlords, and the bourgeoisie spoke in the name of God in order to pursue their own exploiters' interests."

This rejection of God gives communism a demonic aspect—transforming it into a fanatical, Satanic, brutal phenomenon. Morality is not determined by ethical standards grounded in an absolute, but in the expedient interpretations of the party—meaning, in actual practice, the whims and desires of the ruling clique or party leader. This leads to the terrifying doctrine that the end justifies the means. Proof of the cynical ruthlessness of such morality is the following description by longtime American revolutionaries:

"With him the end justifies the means. Whether his tactics be 'legal' and 'moral,' or not, does not concern him, so long as they are effective. He knows that the laws, as well as the current code of morals, are made by his mortal enemies. Consequently, he ignores them insofar as he is able, and it suits his purposes. He proposes to develop, regardless of capitalist conceptions of 'legality,' 'fairness,' 'right,' etc., a greater power than his capitalist enemies."

A SOCIETY WITHOUT GOD

Hence, under communism we see a decisive break from and thrust against the Judaic-Christian heritage. Communism is not just another political party, social organization, or economic philosophy which can be understood within the framework of our traditional Western heritage. So to regard communism is radically to misunderstand its terrific driving power, insidious persuasion, and terrifying intent. The Communists are not interested in remodeling or reforming our society, but in organizing a completely different society—a society which by denying God hopes to create a new type of man: Communist man. St. Paul, the great apostle, could say, "If any man be in Christ, he is a new creature." The Communists would pervert this profound truth to say: "If any man be in the Communist Party, he is a new creature."

CONFRONTING THE RED CHALLENGE

The question arises: How can a philosophy so anti-God, antireligious, antihuman be so provocative and appealing to some people in our country? Perhaps in this strategic question we can find some of the challenges of—and answers to—this demonic way of life.

Let's take a look at some of the Communist challenges today and see what we as Christians can do about them.

1. The Communists appeal to man's idealism, and ask the very best of his life. Communist propaganda proclaims Marxism-Leninism "the greatest cause in the history of mankind," worthy of man's highest devotion. The Communist appeal is always to the noblest, the best, the most admirable in man. "The great vision and courage of us Communists has never been matched by that of any past heroes in the annals of mankind. In this respect we have every reason to be proud."

Answer. Have we in America and in the church given sufficient emphasis to Christian ideals, and called for heroic effort in the attainment of great goals? In particular, have we imbued our young people with the moral idealism which helps to mold their lives for Christ? Perhaps we have contented ourselves with catering to man's mediocrity, rather than attempting to bring out the noblest and deepest strands of character. Like Isaiah of Jerusalem, we must ever keep the awe, the majesty, and the holiness of God before us and call men to ever greater efforts in His service. Are we pressing on toward the high calling in Christ, toward the goals of a Christian society? The Christian

church—as history has proved—has the power to capture men and lead them to divine levels. By exalting God and His purposes in the lives of men, the church can unmask the utter falsity of communism's siren calls.

2. The Communists do not doubt the validity of their cause; they press ever onward for their secularized Utopia, confident of ultimate victory. "We Communists must possess the greatest courage and revolutionary determination of mankind. While we clearly see the difficulties confronting the cause of communism, we are not in the least daunted by them."

Answer. Are there too many pessimists, waverers, and people of little faith in the ranks of the church today? Is there the enthusiasm among our people to match this Communist aggressiveness and certainty? The Church of Christ has a great message to sing, a great responsibility to fulfill. Never must she feel pessimistic, daunted, or uncertain.

3. The Communists expect from their members a deep sense of personal sacrifice and dedication. "To sacrifice one's personal interests and even one's life without the slightest hesitation and even with a feeling of happiness, for the cause of the party . . . is the highest manifestation of Communist ethics." This is a sacrifice of the members' time, talents, and personal resources, financial and otherwise. Casual effort is not a Communist trait.

Answer. Do we in the church and society really expect a deep sense of personal sacrifice and dedication? Do too many individuals come to church exerting only a casual effort and not giving sacrificially of their time, talents, and personal resources? The Communists have discovered that a demand for the very best actually brings forth the very best from the individual. If the Communists can create such responses on the basis of a cold, cynical materialism, just think of the accomplishments which can be wrought by the power of the Holy Spirit.

4. The party stresses the need for fidelity and loyalty to the mission of communism and the necessity of members to shun all temptations which would distract them from their assigned tasks. "But if for the sake of the party he is required to endure insults, shoulder heavy burdens, and do work which he is reluctant to do, he will take up the most difficult and important work without the slightest hesitation and will not pass the buck."

Answer: In our society today is there too much tendency to "pass the buck," to let George do it? Do we not often start out enthusiastically in civic or church work and then let temptations sidetrack us from our task? Are we embarrassed when we are criticized for doing Christ's work? Are we ready to shoulder heavy burdens? Are too many following the easy road of conformity with secularism and not holding sufficiently high the banner of Christ?

5. The Communists proclaim that working for the party brings internal peace, joy, and happiness to the member. He finds here creative achievement and self-fulfillment. "He will also be capable of being the most sincere, most candid, and happiest of men."

Answer. The Christian Gospel tells of the deep joy, peace, and blessings which come from belief in Christ as Saviour and Lord. Is the church doing enough to overcome the loneliness of contemporary man, his feelings of insecurity and frustration in a world growing more secular every day? Fear, personal unhappiness, and uncertainty stalk the streets today. Crime, juvenile delinquency, and disrespect for law and order are rife. Are we meeting these challenges in the Christian spirit, offering with maximum effort the true answer of the Gospel, telling people that belief in God is the true way to a peace of mind which passes all understanding?

PERVERSION OF THE TRUTH

These are some of the challenges of communism today, and the problems they pose for Christians. Communists, in fact, attempt to capture the historic values of Christian civilization, such as love, mercy, and justice, and after grossly perverting their true meaning, they actually turn these values against their parent.

With shameless perfidy, the Communists hall themselves as the great exponents of love—most truly, one of mankind's most sublime virtues. Under communism, it is proclaimed, "there will be no oppressed and exploited people, no darkness, ignorance, backwardness. In such a society all human beings will become unselfish. The spirit of mutual assistance and mutual love will prevail among mankind." We know, in fact, however, that communism means terror, fear, and slavery. Communism represents a new age of barbarism, which is repealing the centuries of progress of Western man toward tolerance, understanding, and human brotherhood. Communist Man—the product of this system—is a brute, ideologically trained, who unhesitatingly conducts purges, runs concentration camps, butchers the Hungarian Freedom Fighters. He is immune to the emotions of pity, sorrow, or remorse. He is truly an alarming monster, human in physical form, but in practice a cynically godless and immoral machine.

ROLE OF THE MINISTRY

If communism is to be defeated, the task must rest largely upon the theologians and the ministers of the Gospel. Communism is a false secular religion with pseudosociological explanations of the great verities of life, such as the creation, life on earth, and the world to come. Communism is an all-encompassing system with explanations—though wrong ones—for this great universe of God. The party offers answers—though perverted ones—for the hopes, joys, and fear of mankind.

In the final analysis, the Communist world view must be met and defeated by the Christian world view. The Christian view of God as the Creator, Sustainer, and Lord of the universe is majestically superior to the ersatz approach of dialectical materialism concocted by Marx and Lenin. The task of our clergy today is to translate this Holy Truth into the daily lives of our men and women. This truly is their responsibility as Christian clergymen.

Strong, responsible, and faithful Christians, wearing the full armor of God, are the best weapons of attack against communism and the other problems of our day. "Seek ye first the kingdom of God, and his righteousness." In this way you will be playing a vital role also in helping defend our cherished way of life.

COMMUNIST PROPAGANDA AND THE CHRISTIAN PULPIT

(By J. Edgar Hoover)

The Communists are today spraying the world with ideological and propaganda missiles designed to create a deadly radioactive cloud of Marxism-Leninism. From bases behind the Iron Curtain and in the non-Communist world, this cloud of Communist propaganda is drenching many lands, with a particularly heavy fallout in this Nation.

The deadliest of these Communist missiles—whose warheads are exceptionally heavy—are being directed against the Christian pulpit. Communist gunners, with special ideological training and schooled in atheistic perversity, are sighting in the clergy—hoping to shatter, immobilize, and confuse this powerful forum of idealism, morality, and civic virtue. No assignment is more strategic in the Communist world today than the disruption of the church of

God—both within and outside the Iron Curtain.

Why does the church—which has no military forces—merit the most explosive of Communist rockets, the most venomous of Communist hate, the most vituperative of Communist scorn? Because religion, of all facets of Western civilization, represents the eternal "thorn in the flesh" of communism, that jagged rock which is constantly puncturing, exposing, and unmasking Communist claims, performances, and hopes. The Communists realize that unless the Christian pulpit—that mighty fortress of God—is liquidated, pitilessly, mercilessly, finally, the very existence of communism itself stands in jeopardy. The spiritual firepower of the Christian church—based on the love of God—is sufficient to destroy all the Soviet manmade missiles and rockets and extirpate this 20th century aberration.

And the Communists know it—and fear it.

THE RELIANCE ON ATHEISM

To understand the Communist attack against the Christian pulpit, we must, so to speak, transplant ourselves into the control room of party strategy. Let's see the Communist high command at work as it executes its attack against the church. Let's note its mode of approach, its variable tactics, and ultimate goal.

The basic Communist weapon is the materialism of the Communist dialectic. Communism is atheistic, utterly denying God. This has been a fundamental premise of communism since the days of Marx and remains so today under the mendacious huckstering of Nikita Khrushchev. "It is not religion that creates man, but man who creates religion. It is the opium of the people" (Karl Marx). "Religion is a kind of spiritual gin" (V. I. Lenin). "In my outlook on life there is no place for religion" (William Z. Foster, chairman emeritus of the Communist Party, U.S.A.). "We remain the atheists that we have always been" (Khrushchev).

Just why, we may ask, does the party rely so greatly on these missiles of atheism? Just why do other phases of Communist strategy alter, but never the dependence on this weapon?

The answer is simple and fundamental to any progress which communism hopes to achieve. Atheism is an all-out weapon of highly destructive and devastating power. If properly launched, atheistic missiles can mangle, cut, and obliterate the spiritual tendons of life—belief in God, faith in Judeo-Christian values, love of the church. The very existence of Communist man—that fanatical atheist imbued with the ethics of expediency—is proof of the paralyzing power of atheism in destroying the taproots of spiritual strength which flow into the individual personality in a Christian civilization. Hence, in Communist strategy, these missiles of atheism are the ultimate weapons, the essential ideological artillery designed not to damage partially but to destroy ruthlessly.

However, as we watch from the Communist control room, we note that, in launching these missiles of atheism toward America, the Communist rocketeers are experiencing considerable trouble. These mighty missiles are propelled, but then, like meteors, they seem to burn up as they approach the atmosphere of America, a proud Christian land. In simple language, here is the problem of party strategists: how can an atheistic Communist Party operate in the United States where the vast majority of the people believe in God?

To attack directly, with an open appeal for atheism, is to risk defeat, frustration, and loss of faith. To stand on the street corner and proclaim, "We the Communists believe in atheism," will not gain recruits. To denounce God in open party appeals will

cause open resentment and hostility. What is to be done?

A STRATEGY OF DECEIT

The Communist answer: Employ a strategy of deceit—a technique designed to hoodwink non-Communists. This is today one of the party's most potent attacks against the Christian pulpit.

The strategy means primarily three things:

1. A false claim that the Communists stand for tolerance of religion. The party's tactic in the Christian world is to deemphasize the importance of religion, to talk and write little about it, and emphasize other topics, such as social, economic, and political issues. A leader of the Communist Party, U.S.A., recently commented: "We know there is no God or Supreme Being, but we can't go out and tell this to church people." "We do not declare and must not declare in our program that we are atheists" (Lenin). If questions are asked, Communists pose as being tolerant, and say that religion is a private matter for the individual. "The people's state holds that the question of religious belief is a private matter; belief or nonbelief in religion relates to the personal freedom of an individual."

Actually, however, religion is not a private affair for the Communist. "Religion is an ideological foe of communism, and the reconciliation of the two is impossible." As a Marxist, he must be an atheist. He has absolutely no personal choice. "Personal freedom of an individual" is a deceptive party shibboleth. Any non-Communist believing this double talk is being trapped—and softened up for the next tactic in this strategy of deceit.

2. To achieve a mutuality of agreement with the Christian pulpit on common issues (as defined by the Communists). This tactic is being actively pursued by the Communist Party, U.S.A., today. "Look," the Communists are saying, "we are tolerant of religion, we do not want to attack your faith. Rather, let's work together on issues in which we are both interested—peace, civil liberties, economic justice. We Communists are believers in love, justice, and the brotherhood of man. We, too, want a world of peace and good will. Let's not fight but work together."

Here is the deadly "come along" of communism, directed today at the Christian pulpit. This enables the party to move close to unsuspecting ministers and laymen who see only the exterior verbiage and not the concealed danger. How does the party work here? In many ways: Encouraging churchmen to endorse, support, and even participate in Communist-front groups; to sign Communist-sponsored petitions; to neutralize clerical opposition to communism (if a minister can be influenced to even keep silent about the dangers of communism, the party has gained).

At the same time the party, through infiltration tactics, is attempting to reach inside the churches. In one instance, a Communist official instructed party members to join churches and become active in their organizations. Another member was working in the church office, while still another party official helped conduct the financial affairs of his parish. Most important, of course, is the youth field. A national party leader recently commented that Communist youth must find common ground with church youth groups, not only for ideological reasons but also for the use of their facilities.

3. Exploit the church for their own Communist ends. This brotherliness of Communists is most purposive: The Communists want to hitch as much of the influence of the Christian church as they can capture to the party's cause. This means that if clergymen or laymen participate (knowingly or unknowingly) in fronts, sign Communist-sponsored petitions, speak favor-

ably of Communist objectives—these points must be exploited to strengthen the party's position. To a prospective customer, a Communist canvasser will say, "The Reverend X has signed this petition, why don't you sign too?" "The Reverend Y has endorsed this organization. You know him. Why don't you help us and contribute some money?" "The Reverend Z has spoken favorably of this proposal. This shows that it's in the spirit of the church."

To the Communists, any support gained from church circles enables them to break down the moral antipathy of the community and gives them a desperately desired respectability.

Hence, this strategy of Communist deceit it aimed to undermine, hoodwink, and exploit the Christian pulpit.

A WAR FOR THE MINDS OF MEN

Now, we may ask, what is the answer to this ideological attack? What can the clergy of America do to defeat this Communist strategy?

First, we must make this assertion. The Christian pulpit is today one of America's most formidable barriers against communism. The spiritual dedication of thousands of clergymen, in large and small churches across the Nation, is a powerful antidote to the danger. America owes a great debt of gratitude to the stalwart example of our religious leadership.

Yet the Communist attack toward the church continues. What can you, as clergymen, do to help blunt this tactic?

In our Nation one of communism's most potent allies is apathy toward and lack of knowledge of communism. Very strangely, many citizens will be highly conversant about the diseases of azaleas, the weathering qualities of automobile paints, the latest ways to play a new card game—yet know nothing about communism, that deadly plague which threatens to extinguish our way of life. That is one of the anomalies—and tragedies—of modern-day America.

Perhaps we can pose several questions.

Have you, as a minister, preached any sermons describing the frightful challenge which communism poses for the spiritual heritage of America?

Have you encouraged members of your church to read about communism and to learn about its evil nature?

Have you urged the formation of discussion groups to acquaint men and women with this challenge?

The approach must not be one of fear, but knowledge. Communism is not a monstrosity to be hidden from sight, never spoken about publicly, or shunted into a side closet. Communism is not a controversial subject, best to be left untouched. Communism is not so overpowering as to throw us into a state of hysterical fear, anger, or violence. Like an epidemic of polio, the solution lies not in minimizing the danger or overlooking the problem—but rapidly, positively, and courageously finding an anti-polio serum.

THE GREAT CHRISTIAN ANSWER

We in America have this anticommunism serum, the answer to the Communist challenge. It lies in the strength of our Judeo-Christian tradition, the power of the Holy Spirit working in men. Too frequently, both clergy and laymen do not realize the full resources at their command in the Christian tradition—the tremendous power of God to turn men toward good, to make personalities bloom with the living courage of sainted men. The job of you as clergymen is to help channel this divine power into the hearts, minds, and souls of men. Literally, the Gospel has the power to turn the world upside down. That should be your mission.

No greater challenge has ever faced the Christian church. Communism has caused the deaths of millions of people. No enemy

in all these 2,000 years has held such a deadly challenge to the Christian pulpit. As spokesmen of God, your task is to enable men to know the truth, so the truth will set them free.

SOVIET RULE OR CHRISTIAN RENEWAL?

(By J. Edgar Hoover)

"What is past is prologue" was William Shakespeare's magnificent summation of man's position in the vast stream of history. The time has arrived for us, as Christians and as Americans, to peer ahead and see what we as individuals and church members can do to help make this a better world in which to live. Atheistic communism has now been with us as a state power for almost a half century. Talk as we will concerning the past, we cannot undo, revise, or alter the events of the years. "What is past is prologue"—and we must build for the future.

Today two vast ideological worlds confront each other, worlds which embody different duties and conceptions of man. Casting our eyes down the avenue of the next generation, we may pose the issue between the worlds as Communist domination or Christian rededication. Shall the world fall under the cold hand of dialectical materialism where every man must conform to the atheistic, irrational, and immoral laws of a way of life which is contrary to the divine intelligence? Or shall the answer be a rededication to Christian moral values, a digging deep of the wells of personal faith in the bottomless ocean of God's love and the creation of a society which is in harmony with the laws of God?

Will it be the cold world of Communist conformity, or the eager, active, and genuine world of religious dedication?

Unfortunately today many people, watching the Communist world in action, have become defeatist. They see bustling energy, teeming exhilaration, and powerful personal energies keyed to promoting self-sacrifice, fanatical zeal, and party accomplishments. In deep anguish, they say, "How can we compete against such a powerful and dynamic ideology?"

The answer to this skepticism (highly unwarranted, as we shall see) lies in understanding the dynamics of motivation in a Communist society.

Communism has the power to stimulate intense, fanatical, and sustained effort. If we would peer into the day-to-day activities of the Communist Party, U.S.A., for example, we would see a vast panorama of demonic rushing and counterrushing. Members are eternally busy making speeches, collecting money, and passing out handbills. The moment one emergency is surmounted, another arises, more breathtaking and earth-shaking than the former. Like ants scurrying on a hot summer day, party members are whirling fanatical action at all levels of the party.

This incessant party activity arises, to a large extent, because of what the Communists call ideological cultivation—which means an educational program designed to immerse the individual in Communist thought for the purpose of making him a more effective party member. Communists speak of ideological cultivation as a weapon of attack. Actually it is the foundation stone of Marxism-Leninism.

TRAINING NEW RECRUITS

A recruit joins the party. Immediately he is sent to a party school to learn, among other things, the ideas, opinions, and prejudices of the Communist masters (Marx, Engels, and Lenin; Stalin is now out of date). Regardless of how busy a member may be in everyday party work or how long he's been in the party, he must continue to attend indoctrination schools and do homework. Among party slogans is "One night a week for Marxist study."

The idea is to make the member think like the party "masters," to imbue him with the Communist personality of these men. To the Communists, the reading, studying, and discussion of Communist classics, such as Marx's "Capital" and Lenin's "State and Revolution," as well as the latest works of the current party leaders, help raise the communist qualities of the members. "Strive to become the best pupils of Marx, Engels, and Lenin." These source books of Communist doctrine, in the party's eyes, give the members a sense of Communist purpose and direction and a zeal to push forward to achieve the party's goals.

Hence, to the Communists, the member must, in the party's language, constantly raise his own ideological level, that is, increase his knowledge of the party's doctrines. Gradually, under such an educational program, the member becomes an advanced or mature Communist able to handle the most difficult of party assignments. Such an individual, because of his indoctrination, automatically thinks as the party wants him to think, subordinates his personal desires to the interests of the party, and works only for Communist goals.

Here arises the dynamics of motion in communism. In the party there is a close relationship between theory and practice. Ideological training is designed to make the member a man of action—revolutionary action. The member is steeled in revolutionary discipline, armed for battles in the fields of infiltration, agitation, and propaganda.

At first blush communism may seem almost like an invincible monster. Admittedly, it can engender tremendous personal effort and zeal, but it has a tragic flaw, a flaw which heralds its eventual destruction.

Communism is anti-God; this is its fatal weakness. Hence, it is contrary to divine laws which give meaning, validity, and depth to the dignity of human personality. The world of communism, despite its overt bustle, energy, and action, is a cold world of sterility, conformity, and monotony. One is no longer regarded as a child of God, to bloom from spiritual roots. Rather, a deadly sameness is enforced, and the individual becomes a robot of the state, servile in thought, and groveling in attitude. The great seedbeds of dissent are deracinated. Critical thought and independent judgment are hunted down and destroyed. Freedom of expression is prohibited. Purges, concentration camps, and faked trials betray the poisonous hand of communism which corrupts everything it touches, creates error, evil, and sin, and transforms love into hate, justice into slavery, and truth into falsehood.

Contrasted to the world of Communist conformity, we as Christians have the unmatched power of Christ. The task for us is spiritual rededication—the creation of a world of love, justice, and truth. This is the Christian ethic which is part of our heritage. Ministers have a vital role in helping to roll back the iron curtain of communism and making real the world of divine love.

HOW COMMUNISM WORKS

In discussing such a mission, let us see what we can learn from the Communists by noting the way in which they inspire their members.

1. Note the Communists' emphasis on returning to the original source of their beliefs to secure inspiration for their members. Communists encourage members, young and old, to study the party's classics. To read such books, they say, is to gain personal guidance and raise the members' Communist qualities "in every respect to the same level as those of Marx, Engels, Lenin."

Answer: Think how much more enriching, rewarding, and satisfying are the original

sources of Christian belief than the writings of the bigoted minds of the Communist "masters." The Bible is the word of God. But besides the Bible, the writings of men of God, both clerical and lay, over 20 centuries are also guidelines to personal action. Do we as Christians take enough time to read the Bible—and these other affirmations of our faith? Do we quench our spiritual thirst (symbolized by the troubles, tensions, and anxieties of the day) with the truth ground in such sources? Are we digging deep enough in the wells of our faith? Most truly, the Bible gives inspiration, zeal, and guidance for life. To neglect it, is to reduce our national vitality and strength.

2. Communists stress not only the reading of Marx, Engels, and Lenin, but reading them constantly—on a daily or weekly schedule—and never neglecting this habit even though the member becomes older. "Comrades! Of course it is no easy matter to take Marx, Engels, and Lenin as our models in self-cultivation and to become their most faithful and best pupils. It calls for an iron will and firm determination. It calls for a lifelong devotion to studying Marxism-Leninism."

Answer: How many Christians read the Bible only on special occasions? How many Christians set aside a certain amount of time each day or week for reading religious literature? Do some Christians regard the Bible as a book only for children; do they think that as adults they have outgrown it? Do we view the Bible as an antique book which has no message to our modern age? Do we display the same iron will and firm determination to learn the Christian faith as the Communists do for their ideology?

These are key questions, striking at the very heart of our religious faith and practices.

3. The Communists have no use for a mere ceremonial avowal of Marxism or members interested only in acquiring a minimum knowledge of ideology. "Every one of our party members should not merely be a member of minimum qualifications * * * but should rather seek to make progress and ceaselessly raise his or her own consciousness and understanding of Marxism-Leninism."

Answer: Here again serious challenges are posed. How many church members today are merely members in name, not knowing or even caring what membership in the church of God really means and entails? Do some members object to learning about the tenets of their faith, and say that a few minimum requirements are enough? Has our Christian heritage been diluted by the inroads of secularism and materialism? Is our faith in God a growing, creative experience? Or are we satisfied with lesser visions of inspiration? The answers to these questions will help chart our way.

4. At all times the Communists stress the relationship between theory and action. To study the Communist masters is to ready oneself for revolutionary action. Communists are not interested in preparing members to parade their Marxist IQ's or pass academic examinations. Their knowledge must become a weapon to turn the world upside down for communism. "We study for the sole purpose of putting into practice what we have learned. It is for the party and for the victory of the revolution that we study."

Answer: In Christianity the study of the Bible is a guide to action—action in building a deeper Christian experience for the individual, and a better, more wholesome community. Are we as Christians adapting to actual practice the teachings of Christ? Are our day-to-day actions in the secular world determined by our Christian beliefs? Is the church—the Christian pulpit—effective today in determining men's actions? Are there individuals who think the church is a good organization to have in the community but

should not be taken too seriously in everyday community action? These are challenges to us today.

5. The party stresses the development of the politically mature comrade, the individual on whom it can depend to carry out its mission. The whole purpose of ideological cultivation is to produce the member who will become a better Communist and work for the revolution.

Answer: Christians are also working for a revolution—a revolution of the spirit, not the sword. Deeply committed Christians are needed to carry on the work of the church, to uphold the Judeo-Christian faith. We may raise the question, Are we working tirelessly enough to create these deeply committed Christians? Are we training our members to buckle on the full armor of God, to commit their full lives to Christ? Working for Christian goals is a full-time job, not just a task for Sundays or evening meetings.

THE STRUGGLE IS REAL

How can we compete against such a powerful and dynamic ideology as communism? By way of answer we must say that as Christians and as Americans we can compete. We can defeat this atheistic enemy by drawing upon our spiritual resources.

Make no mistake about it, the struggle ahead is real. The Communists are determined, rugged, and treacherous enemies. The ideology of communism, as we have seen, generates great power. But the faith of communism is a perverted faith, giving predominance to evil, sin, and wrong. It draws its strength from deceit, chicanery, and hypocrisy. That is its fatal flaw, the rotten core which spoils the fruit of its branches.

The future, to a large extent, will be determined by what we as Christians have to say and do. Those who are ministers of the Gospel can help determine this fateful decision: Shall it be a world of Communist domination or Christian rededication? Shall it be the cold world of Communist inhumanity, sterility, and conformity, where the bodies, minds, and souls of men become as stone, lifeless in the darkness of atheistic perversity, or shall it be Christian regeneration, where the power of the Holy Spirit floods in with joy, love, and harmony?

No group in America has a more key responsibility than the clergy. The answer to communism must be on a spiritual level. As representatives of a great tradition, the clergymen of America must light men's souls with deep enthusiasm for the teachings of Christ. A God-centered nation, ever humble before the majesty of the divine Creator, can keep alive freedom, justice, and mercy. This is the heritage of America.

EXCESS OUTFLOW OF GOLD

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, there is much discussion at the present time about travel between nations, and particularly travel of Americans in foreign countries. This discussion is brought about by our balance of payments, which has resulted in the demand for gold by foreign countries and has reduced substantially our gold reserves.

I have received a letter from Mr. Tom Maupin, of Maupintour Associates, regarding this publicity and the effect that it is having and may have on tourist travel.

I think everyone must agree that we need to encourage travel between nations because of its importance from an international standpoint. The letter from Mr. Maupin is so important that I think it should be called to the attention of the Senate.

I ask unanimous consent that the letter be made a part of these remarks.

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

MAUPINTOUR ASSOCIATES,
February 16, 1961.

Senator FRANK CARLSON,
The Senate of the United States,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR: There seems to have been a feeling generated of late which makes Americans believe tourism travel abroad by Americans is the one big factor to blame for the excess outflow of gold.

Editorialists and financial feature columnists dwell on this subject. The President's recommendation to Congress that duty-free purchases abroad by American travelers be limited to \$100 was given headline publicity and this added to the great amount of national attention being directed toward the dollars spent by Americans for services and accommodations while traveling abroad.

The inference that those who take a trip abroad are doing damage to the national interest was obvious and quickly noted. This has been snowballed to the point where many are made to feel that it is now improper, unpatriotic, and un-American to consider traveling abroad.

A rash of stories have appeared extolling the virtues of "see America first" and "buy American." I am fully in favor with the wish that Americans would get to know the wonders of all the regions of this greatest Nation on earth. I hope Americans will buy American products.

However, I believe it is shortsightedly unreasoned and against our real national self-interests for the opinionmakers to create the feeling that it is now morally wrong for Americans to spend dollars to see and learn about the wonders of other peoples of the world.

I receive letters from prospective tourists from all over the Nation, and I talk with local prospects and many are telling me that it is not proper now to consider a trip to a foreign land because it is not good for the Nation to have dollars spent abroad. I receive the impression that some feel it is clearly out of step with the times in the eyes of their neighbors for one to think about a foreign trip this year.

A guilt complex has been created in Americans who contemplate visiting abroad. Perhaps this has been created unknowingly and through the error of no one realizing it and no one doing anything positive to counteract it. Yet it does truly exist, and it is increasingly difficult to erase.

I am confident that it cannot be the considered policy of President Kennedy's administration to discourage American tourism abroad. Surely, if this is the Government's policy, the Government would not be spending millions of dollars financing American technical and material aid for some of the underdeveloped countries to assist them to build their tourism industry to attract more Americans and thereby helping to build the stability of their own economy and a higher standard of living for their own people and a greater understanding of the world by their own people.

I am sure our Government does not desire to disrupt radically the economy of a nation such as Mexico, whose No. 1 industry is the American tourist, and thereby risk gaining another ill-willed and unfriendly neighbor. Such could be near fatal.

It has been the thesis of statesmen that it is vital for survival for Americans to get to know their world neighbors. The people-to-people policy of understanding through personal travel and contact with those of other cultures and outlooks on life has not been a hypocritical Government policy, I'm sure.

I hope that I am correct that the position of the administration and of the Congress has not changed. I hope that it is true that our Government's leaders still champion the belief that a world of good will and direct benefits to our Nation's self-interests still results when American citizens by their own initiative go and see the world and learn to know our fellow world citizens.

I hope our Government is not trying to encourage isolationism.

But, by default, it appears that our Government is definitely encouraging a return to isolationism. Unwittingly, our Nation's leadership is endorsing this feeling from the grassroots that to be a good American this year one will stay within the confines of these borders. By saying nothing to the contrary, our Government is saying that it is not to the Nation's interest for the dollars of tourists to escape into the hands of foreigners, that it is not patriotic to travel abroad. By saying nothing, our Government is permitting the people to believe it is popular, proper, and self-righteous to be anti-foreign spending.

Because there has been a great vacuum of affirmative policy statements, the incentive to travel to other countries and to meet other peoples is being destroyed.

Our Government has given no positive encouragement to Americans to travel abroad. There has been no headline-hitting endorsement by the President on behalf of the value of foreign travel to improve world good-neighbor relations. There has been no use of the President's prestige to dramatize the people-to-people concept as being an essential and patriotic one, that understanding of the world's people through private travel by Americans is a worthy endeavor and highly necessary to the national interest.

There has been nothing done by Government to counteract this ground swell of feeling that now the best national interest of all good patriots can better be served if we all will remain in our own backyard since it costs too dearly in gold to have the privilege and benefits of foreign contact and knowledge.

It is apparently still patriotic for the businessman traveling at his corporation's expense to establish and continue business relationships abroad. Evidently it is only the individual who must pay his own way from his personal income after taxes who is being shamed from seeing foreign lands and people.

The self-centered spirit of isolationism is quick to develop and slow to disappear, easy to encourage, and hard to reason away.

If America's leadership is to discourage a rebirth of isolationism, then it is vital that America's leaders realize the need to take immediate, hard-hitting, and dramatic affirmative means now and for a continuing period to let the people know that it is to their national and own individual self-interest for Americans to travel abroad and to learn from in-person experience about the peoples of the world.

Let's not wake up too late and realize that we are back in the dislike-foreigners decade. There are those, no doubt, who would enjoy seeing such a regression. For survival's sake, we cannot risk doing so.

With best regards,

TOM MAUPIN,
Partner.

PRINTING IN THE RECORD OF REMARKS IN CONNECTION WITH MATTER PREVIOUSLY REQUESTED TO BE PRINTED

Mr. PROXMIER. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry, and I should like to have the attention of the Parliamentarian to what I am going to ask.

On Wednesday last I made a statement of about 600 words on the floor of the Senate during the morning hour, not one word of which was published in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. The reason why it was not published was that I asked unanimous consent that a newspaper article be printed, after my remarks, in the Appendix of the daily RECORD. I was informed on Thursday by the Director of Planning Service of the Printing Office that the rules of the Joint Committee on Printing prevent the Appendix carrying this article, which I understand, and which I think is perfectly wise and sensible, since my senior colleague from Wisconsin had gotten the floor just before I had and apparently had inserted this same matter in the Appendix of the daily RECORD.

However, in view of the fact that I physically spoke these words, and the words, presumably, were taken down by the reporter, I cannot understand why the rule should prevent my comments on the article from being published in the RECORD. The fact that at the end of my remarks I requested that the article appear in the Appendix of the daily RECORD, it seems to me, should not have prevented my remarks from being printed.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair knows the Joint Committee on Printing has a rule to prevent duplication of printing.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I recognize that. I think it is a sound rule, but I do not think that the rule should apply to remarks made previous to the other request.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. It seems to the Chair that the remarks should have been printed.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I thank the Chair.

Mr. PROXMIRE subsequently said: Mr. President, in view of the earlier decision of the Chair, I ask unanimous consent that my remarks of Wednesday be printed in the Appendix of the daily RECORD. I was in these remarks referring to an article printed in the Appendix of the daily RECORD on February 22, as it appears on page A1151.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ESTONIA, LITHUANIA, AND LATVIA

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, on January 26 and February 16 of this year I commented on the Senate floor on the struggle of the Lithuanian people and their hope for freedom from the Soviet Union. In my remarks, I included the people of Estonia and Latvia, who were the first victims of Soviet Russia. On February 24 the free Estonians throughout the world and their friends will speak for the subjugated people of Estonia, with the hope that their voices will be heard in the United Nations and in Soviet Russia, which will lead the Soviets to withdraw their troops and agents from Estonia and to permit the people of Estonia their freedom. In this regard, I heartily endorse the Senate resolution introduced by my colleague, the distinguished minority whip, the senior Senator from the State of California [Mr. KUCHEL], in which he asks

for the liberation of the people of Lithuania, Estonia, and Latvia.

Mr. President, I think the spotlight should be focused on Mr. Khrushchev and the Soviet Union and he should be asked how he can take the initiative in the colonialism issue against free countries when Prof. Lev E. Dobriansky of Georgetown University, Washington, D.C., says there are mountains of evidence which can be produced to substantiate the Soviet Union's imperialism and colonialism both within and outside the Soviet Union. All we need to do, Mr. President, is to look toward Poland, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Yugoslavia, Albania, Bulgaria, and those nations entirely eradicated by the Soviet expansion; namely, Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia. And, Mr. President, we should also look to Laos, and the Congo, and Cuba, and parts of Asia and Africa where the Soviet Union is trying to foster upon those people the communistic doctrine, which, if successful, will subjugate the people and their thinking to the communistic state. I repeat what I said on the 16th: that it is hard for us in this great country, with its many freedoms, where even the most renowned Communists or hardened criminals are given full protection under the Constitution and our laws, to visualize, to understand, the struggles, the oppressions, the deprivations that are inflicted upon the people who were once a part of proud nations, but are now under the heel of a Communist dictator. This is all the more reason why we should glory in our own freedom and at the same time give courage to all the people throughout the world who desire to enjoy the freedoms that we have.

I hope the day will come soon when the people in Estonia, Lithuania, and Latvia, and other countries behind the Iron Curtain, will again be restored to their freedom and to their rights and dignities.

THE SOIL BANK PROGRAM

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, today I wish to discuss a situation wherein the soil bank program has again been turned into a racket.

In this report I shall point out the maneuvering whereby a Mr. Wayne E. Tallman purchased a 6,960-acre ranch in Colorado for a total cost of \$139,200, and then, through subleasing arrangements, placed 3,879 acres of this same land under a 10-year contract with the conservation reserve program, wherein he will, over the 10-year period, collect from the Government \$271,000, or \$131,800 more than the entire purchase price of the whole ranch. In addition, he or his tenants will have the use of the remaining acreage not placed in the soil bank.

It all began in 1956, when the estate of John W. Baughman Farms Co., operating in Kansas and Colorado, decided to sell between fifty and sixty thousand acres of the company's land holdings in Colorado to meet inheritance and income taxes. This land was located over a three-county area—Kiowa, Kit Carson, and Lincoln—in Colorado.

In January 1957, Mr. Robert Baughman, president of the John W. Baugh-

man Farms Co., offered to sell to his district manager, Mr. Wayne E. Tallman, the 6,960-acre Vogel Ranch, at a price of \$20 per acre, or a total of \$139,200. The purchase price was to be payable over a period of 10 years in 10 equal installments, with no interest to be collected except on delinquent payments, and the offer was contingent upon Mr. Baughman's being able to work out arrangements to lease a substantial part under the conservation reserve program whereby he could use the cash payments to pay for the farm.

However, Mr. Tallman was confronted with the \$5,000 limitation that Congress had placed upon the annual amount which could be paid to any one farmer under the soil bank program.

But this proved to be no obstacle. To get around this \$5,000 limitation, Mr. Tallman devised a scheme wherein he would break up the farm into smaller units, cash-lease the different units to various tenants, and then have the tenants sign a contract with the Government under the conservation reserve program, with the proviso that they would turn the money received thereon over to him as cash rental.

But before buying the property, he wanted to be sure that his scheme would work, so on February 14, 1957, at the regular meeting of the Kiowa County ASC Committee, he outlined this cash-lease plan and received assurances that they would approve such a plan. It was agreed at this meeting that, if Mr. Tallman could buy this land, they would accept the same acreage under the conservation reserve program and pay him or his tenants an annual rental of \$7 per acre for the next 10 years. This would mean that the Government would be paying \$70 per acre over the next 10 years not to cultivate the same land which he was then in the process of buying for \$20 per acre.

On February 25, 1957, following this advance arrangement with the county committee of Kiowa County, Colo., Mr. Wayne E. Tallman—operating under the newly organized Wayne E. Tallman Farms Co.—bought from the John W. Baughman Farms Co. the 6,960-acre Vogel Ranch at a price of \$139,200, or \$20 per acre, payable over a 10-year period as outlined above.

Mr. Tallman then divided this ranch into six tracts, and on March 25, and 26, 1957, he leased the entire acreage to six different tenants for a 10-year period, on a cash rental basis, under terms that would net him \$27,100 annually, or a total of \$271,000 over the 10-year contract.

In each instance the leasing periods were dated back to March 1, 1957. He had contracted to buy the farm on February 25, 1957.

His leases with the tenants were with the understanding that they in turn, would place under the conservation reserve program, enough of their leased acreage to enable them to collect from the Government an annual payment equal to the agreed annual cash rental. The contract carried the proviso that these Government checks would be turned over to Mr. Tallman for his annual rents.

The tenants' profit would be the free use of that portion of their leased acreage which was not being put under the conservation reserve program.

Details of the acreage leased by the six tenants and the acreage placed in the conservation reserve program are shown in the following chart.

This chart shows the number of acres leased to each tenant. It shows the amount of acreage placed in the soil bank by each of these same tenants, and the amount of their annual payments from the Government, as well as the annual cash rental in each instance. It will be noted how closely the Government payments coincide with the annual cash rental being paid to Mr. Tallman.

I ask unanimous consent to have the chart printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

Tenant	Cash leases			Acreage placed in conservation reserve	
	Total acreage	Crop-land	Annual rental	Acreage	Annual payment
A.....	1,609	1,236	\$5,000	714	\$4,998
B.....	900	957	4,200	602	4,214
C.....	643	643	2,900	421	2,950
D.....	1,280	1,187	5,000	714	4,998
E.....	1,200	1,166	5,000	714	4,998
F.....	1,300	1,208	5,000	714	4,998
Total.....	6,992	6,397	27,100	3,879	27,156
Total initial conservation reserve participation.....				3,879	27,156

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Later, two of the tenants placed additional acreage in the conservation reserve program, bringing the total acreage in the program up to 4,338 acres, producing total annual payments of \$29,558. The tenants kept these extra payments as part of their profits for participating in this scheme.

Thus we find that the purchase of the farm, the cash-lease arrangements with the six tenants, and the contracts with the Government under the acreage reserve program were all negotiated and signed within an approximate 30-day period and on terms and arrangements which were all negotiated and agreed upon between the prospective buyer and the ASC committee a couple of weeks before the purchase.

I summarize this transaction:

On February 25, 1957, Mr. Tallman bought 6,960 acres of land for \$139,200. Within 30 days enough of this same tract of land had been leased to the Government under a scheme whereby Mr. Tallman, as the owner, would collect indirectly from the U.S. Government, over the next 10-year period, \$271,000, or \$131,800 more than he paid for the entire 6,960-acre ranch. At the end of this 10-year period Mr. Tallman will have \$131,800 in cash profit, plus a 6,960-acre ranch, all paid for by the American taxpayers.

By what line of reasoning would the Government ever agree to pay a speculator \$70 per acre not to cultivate land which he was buying at \$20 per acre?

The question may well be asked, Why did the ASC committee of Kiowa Coun-

ty, Colo., approve any such arrangement wherein the Government would, over a period of 10 years, pay this speculator \$70 per acre not to cultivate \$20 land?

Perhaps the agreeableness of the county committee can be better understood when we examine the following transaction:

The record shows that in early 1958 the chairman of the ASC committee in Kiowa County, Colo., leased from the same Baughman estate, on a crop-share basis, 1,120 acres of land. On April 24, 1958, this committee chairman signed a contract with the Government agency of which he was a representative wherein he placed 391 acres of this tract in the conservation reserve on terms under which he receives annual payments of \$2,740.

It was the same Mr. Wayne E. Tallman, acting as a representative of the landlord—the John W. Baughman Farms Co.—who on April 28, 1958, approved this conservation reserve contract with the unusual proviso that the customary landlord's share of the conservation payments was to be waived, thus allowing the tenant—the chairman of the Kiowa County ASC Committee—to keep 100 percent of the annual \$2,740 in conservation reserve payments.

Ordinarily, when land is leased on a crop-share basis, the landlord and the tenant share in the benefits to be derived from the participation in the conservation reserve program and Mr. Orville S. Brown, vice president and general manager of the John W. Baughman Farms Co., confirmed that this was the only instance wherein a crop-share tenant of their company who participated in the conservation reserve program was permitted to retain 100 percent of the annual payment.

The chairman of the Kiowa County committee was not the only representative of the Government that was cut in on this profitable scheme.

It is interesting to note that a similar special arrangement was extended to another Government employee, who had approved the lucrative arrangements of Mr. Tallman's scheme to bypass the \$5,000 limitation.

On November 7, 1956, the office manager of the Kit Carson County ASC office had entered into a crop-share lease with the John W. Baughman Farms Co. for 320 acres of land.

On February 5, 1957, this county office manager applied for a 10-year conservation reserve contract with the Government on 300 acres of this same tract.

On March 14, 1957, this employee arranged for the purchase of the 320 acres which he had been leasing plus an additional 160 acres from the Baughman estate for a total price of \$10,560.

On May 29, 1957, the ASC committee approved the conservation reserve contract, wherein this employee will receive Government checks under the conservation reserve program over the 10-year period totaling \$33,740 cash, or \$23,180 more than the total purchase price of the entire 480 acres.

Mr. President, this is a glaring illustration of what can be expected under

any program designed to pay a man not to work.

In conclusion, I want to express my appreciation to the Comptroller General and his staff for their cooperation in developing this report.

TOLEDO BLADE PROTESTS FUTILE CIVIL DEFENSE BOMB SHELTER SCHEME

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, the city of Toledo, Ohio, like most large American cities, has many problems, but lack of a king-sized community underground bomb shelter is not one of them.

Nevertheless, highly paid officials of the Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization apparently just could not rest at night thinking of Toledo, Ohio, mercilessly exposed without a bomb shelter.

They were so worried, they decided to waste \$20,000 to \$25,000 of taxpayers' hard-earned money to give the citizens of Toledo a bomb shelter they could call their own.

This shelter is to be built under the county courthouse in Toledo and will accommodate, I am informed, 4,000 persons.

Mr. President, deeply touched as I am by the concern civil defense officials show for Toledo citizens, I must protest the foolishness, waste, and outright absurdity of this scheme.

This is typical of the operations of our boondoggling Civil Defense Agency. Indeed, Mr. President, I would not be at all surprised if, after completing this ridiculous bomb shelter, the Civil Defense Agency immediately distributed a mass evacuation plan for Toledo residents in event of enemy attack.

Americans will wonder if civil defense officials would have them run, or hide—or both.

In a perceptive editorial in its edition of Monday, February 20, 1961, the Toledo Blade, one of Ohio's greatest newspapers, finds it highly debatable that the proposed shelter would do any good in a nuclear or biological attack.

The editorial wisely points out that a thermonuclear attack would completely destroy underground shelters in basements and backyards; further, that there is strong doubt anyone would be safe in a bomb shelter if the attack were biological in nature. Ventilating systems would simply draw the deadly air into shelters.

Mr. President, I fully agree with the conclusions of this excellent editorial in the Toledo Blade.

The facts which it makes crystal clear are either unknown to, or ignored by, officials of the useless civil defense agency, who seems to feel that, as long as there is money authorized or appropriated, it must be spent, no matter how foolishly and wastefully.

The conditions of modern warfare make both evacuation and shelter programs for civilians of little use in saving American lives.

Enemy submarines off our coasts could hurl rockets with nuclear warheads 1,500 miles inland with accuracy. We would be lucky to have 3 minutes warn-

ing. Intercontinental ballistic missiles fired from within the Soviet Union would arrive in 15 to 18 minutes, less time than it takes most of us to get home at night through city traffic. These facts render evacuation patently absurd and unthinkable.

Shelters are as futile. Those in target areas would be crushed, their occupants charred and suffocated by the blast and heat. The few survivors of a major attack would emerge into a world of total, incomprehensible chaos and polluted atmosphere.

Significantly, Mr. President, I know of no civil defense official in Ohio who has himself taken the trouble to build a shelter.

Yet these high-salaried civil defense officials continue to try to stampede Americans into a mass shelter program. They persist in throwing money down the drain on senseless schemes such as that now proposed for the city of Toledo.

I am proud that one of Ohio's great newspapers, the Toledo Blade, recognizes the futility of the Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization and its preposterous plans.

I ask unanimous consent to have the Toledo Blade editorial printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

[From the Toledo Blade, Feb. 20, 1961]

ATTENTION SENATOR YOUNG

County commissioners can't be blamed, we suppose, for going along with James Ault's fancy plan for a \$20,000-plus bomb shelter under the county courthouse that will accommodate up to 4,000 persons or so. As long as the Federal Government is shelling out the money, the net cost to the county should be nil.

Just what good the shelter would do in event of a real attack on this city is highly debatable. Under optimum conditions, only a few minutes' warning—perhaps no more than 3—would be received that an attack is on the way. And during that brief, panic-filled period, the chances are slim indeed that anyone outside the courthouse would have time to get to the shelter anyway.

Certainly, once even the smallest kind of nuclear bomb—say, the type that obliterated so much of Hiroshima or Nagasaki—is exploded over Toledo, it would be too late to try to find the courthouse, let alone Mr. Ault's basement shelter.

As was pointed out in the Senate recently by Senator Young, conditions of modern warfare make shelters of little or no use in saving lives. For if a city were to be hit by an intercontinental ballistic missile with a hydrogen warhead, the total destruction and remaining radioactive elements would be such that underground shelters in basements and backyards would offer little protection. Or if the missile carried a biological or chemical warhead, as we pointed out last week, there is doubt it would be best to be underground in the first place, where the ventilating system would draw noxious elements straight into the shelter.

Still, when Uncle Sam holds out the \$20,000 to \$25,000 this shelter is estimated to cost, there is a great temptation to take it on the theory that if Toledo doesn't grab it, someone else will. This is one of the discouraging aspects of the entire civil defense program that now drains some \$120,000 a day from Federal funds and an equal

amount from State and local revenues—with most of it going for salaries and expenses.

Toledo can obviously use any \$25,000 it can get from the Government. Only with conditions as they are these days, it's too bad this much has to wind up in concrete and fixtures in the courthouse basement.

A FIVE-POINT PROGRAM FOR STRENGTHENING THE UNITED NATIONS

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, the United Nations, during its 15-year lifetime, has made an effective contribution to the cause of peace. Working through its agencies, the U.N., in many instances, has spelled the difference between peace and war.

However, the changing events, forces, and influences, the lessons of experience, the opening doors of new opportunity and responsibility—all these, and other factors, warrant—in fact, demand—strong efforts to further improve the international machinery of peace.

To enable the U.N. to operate more effectively, I recently made the following recommendations which, in my humble judgment, should be carefully and thoughtfully explored:

First. Formation of World Resources Board to study human need globally, and make recommendations for better utilizing the human, agricultural, industrial, and technological resources of the world for serving mankind.

Second. Establishment of a monitoring board to curb aggression by propaganda among politically differing nations.

Third. Creation of a Peace Council to objectively study—according to basic research principles: (1) The cause and cure of wars; (2) the accommodation of differing social, political, economic ideas among nations; and (3) generally explore for ways to further improve man's relationship to man.

Fourth. Creation of a subagency of the Security Council—similar to that in U.S. courts—to serve as a clearinghouse for charges, particularly to "weed out" false ones, among nations.

Fifth. Establishing a U.N. police force to carry out the peace missions of this international agency.

As time and events confront us with new facts of life, then new efforts are needed to cope with them.

In a fast-changing age, the U.N.—the world's best hope of peace—cannot be a static agency; rather, efforts are needed to keep it up to date to meet the newly emerging challenges of the times.

TRIBUTE TO FRANK McCULLOCH

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, Mr. John Herling has written a most illuminating article concerning the new Chairman of the National Labor Relations Board, Mr. Frank McCulloch.

The article, which appeared in the Washington Daily News of February 16, is an excellent review of Mr. McCulloch's background as it has helped to shape his philosophy toward important mat-

ters with which he will now be called to deal in a position of great responsibility.

I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Herling's article be printed in the RECORD at this point.

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

A FINE APPOINTMENT

(By John Herling)

The trouble with talking about Frank McCulloch, just named Chairman of the National Labor Relations Board by President Kennedy, is that one naturally talks about him in superlatives. Talk of that sort is dangerous because, you tell yourself, nobody can be that good. So you wait around awhile expecting that a knowledgeable chap—a veritable wise guy—would come along and triumphantly point out some flaws in this man.

Frank McCulloch was plunging ahead along new frontiers many years before the New Frontier itself was officially proclaimed by Jack Kennedy. Even when the country acted fat, sassy, smug in the late twenties, the young McCulloch had begun to have his doubts about the old terrain. Such doubts were partly inherited, partly environmental. Brought up in Evanston, the well-known suburb of Chicago, he went on to Williams College from which he recovered by taking the 3-year course at Harvard Law School. Right after leaving in 1929, he, like so many others, was caught up in the iron embrace of the depression.

Unemployment in Chicago seemed somehow to have an especially bitter quality. Dubbed hog butcher of the world, Chicago was a man-eater as well. Unemployment seemed colder, wetter, nastier, more voracious in Chicago. Frank McCulloch did not personally suffer the deprivation of unemployment or of economic insecurity. He never felt the wet through holes in his shoes. But it didn't take him long to see that life presented a social agenda of challenging proportions. He helped develop legislative and organizational programs for the unemployed.

Simply put, Frank McCulloch had, and has, a sense of mission. He became convinced early that social justice was basic to a sensible society. The world was out of joint. He believed the grabs and clutches of an acquisitive society could only be coped with by countervailing organizations of various kinds. This led him to encourage trade union organizations as a prerequisite to equality with management in collective bargaining. From the first what distinguished him was kindness accompanied by an implacable determination to use his head. He would have liked to think that men were better than they are, but he was not discouraged because they were not.

Through the thirties, and in the forties, he became widely known as a lawyer, a community leader, and an educator. He was industrial relations secretary of the Council for Social Action of the Congregational Church. During World War II, he was public member of the regional War Labor Board. He became the head of the labor education division of Roosevelt University. He attended a thousand and committee meetings.

Then, in 1949, when the almost incredible happened and PAUL DOUGLAS was elected Senator from Illinois, Mr. McCulloch became his administrative assistant. For 12 years, Mr. McCulloch has worked with one of the country's great Senators. He has gained a uniquely intimate and practical knowledge of labor relations, of our economic system, and of their impact on people. He understands the nature of legislative intent. He has never trimmed on his principles, never belittled the lessons of the past.

Now he moves to a new and important post, a dedicated, seasoned, courageous public servant. President Kennedy could not have made an appointment more promising.

TRIBUTES TO TENNESSEE CITIZENS APPOINTED TO HIGH POSITIONS

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, Tennessee is proud that a number of its citizens, both native and adopted, have been appointed to high positions in the new administration.

This pride is reflected by a number of editorials appearing in the newspapers of my State. An excellent example is an editorial from the Cookeville Citizen, whose editor and publisher is Mr. Coleman A. Harwell.

I ask unanimous consent that this editorial be printed in the RECORD at this point.

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

FOUR HIGH APPOINTEES CHEERED BY TENNESSEE

Four recent appointments of President Kennedy have special significance for Tennessee.

They are Rand Dixon as Chairman of the Federal Trade Commission; Joseph Swidler as chairman of the Federal Power Commission; Brooks Hays as Assistant Secretary of State for congressional relations; Aubrey J. Wagner as a member of the board of TVA.

Dixon's major public recognition has come as counsel to Senator ESTES KEFAUVER's Antitrust and Monopoly Subcommittee. In that capacity he has won the respect and the gratitude of the whole Nation.

He has wisely said, "There is nothing more dangerous to democracy than monopoly, nothing more important than competition."

In the clamor of selfish interests and political foes to discredit the leadership of Senator KEFAUVER, Dixon has been a staunch and wise aid. He has made clear by assembled facts that the Nation's economy is endangered by big combines rigging prices. He has also shown how the individual consumer has been victimized.

Senator KEFAUVER was fully justified in sponsoring his appointment to the important FTC post. The people of Tennessee will be proud of his work in the future as it has been in the past. Interestingly, he follows in the footsteps of another distinguished Tennessean, Ewin L. Davis, who gave him his first job in Washington.

Joseph Swidler was one of the important men in the development of TVA when he served as its General Counsel. It was a matter of regret when he left the Authority to take up private practice of law; now it is gratifying to know that his knowledge and experience will be put to use again in the wide field of power policy, which will have important relation to TVA's future.

Brooks Hays, though but recently a resident of Tennessee, where he came to serve as a TVA board member, has had important past relationships in the State. As president of the Southern Baptist Convention he spent much time in Nashville and throughout the State; as a trustee of Peabody College, he was influential in the field of teacher training.

Hays will be effective in the key position of "ambassador" of the State Department to Congress. His skill and wisdom will be usefully employed in building understanding between the two on vital matters of foreign relations.

President Kennedy wisely advanced the General Manager of TVA to the board. This was the same procedure adopted in case of Gordon Clapp, who was one of the great influences in creating TVA's character and

usefulness. Aubrey Wagner, as did Clapp, started with TVA almost at its inception; he has come through every stage of its development to reach its highest administrative post.

His appointment to the policy position was fitting recognition, it was also assurance of continued vigor and service by TVA.

People of the valley will be especially happy to know of President Kennedy's plans to use the great story of TVA as a beacon light of freedom for all the world to observe. Too often in the past, it has seemed that those in high places sought to hide it under a bushel of doubt and distortion.

These four appointments emphasize for Tennessee that President Kennedy has assembled an executive group of demonstrated ability to share and perform duties of his administration.

THOMAS STARR KING

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, on Wednesday I had the honor of participating in a ceremony in Statuary Hall commemorating clergyman, patriot, humanitarian, and naturalist Thomas Starr King, of California.

This ceremony, under the auspices of the Grand Lodge, Free and Accepted Masons of California commemorated the historic efforts of Reverend King, himself a member of the Masonic order, to keep our State in the Union a century ago.

Few people today realize how close California was to joining the South in 1861. I cite, as an example of the sentiment of the State at that time, these interesting statistics. In the 1860 presidential election, Abraham Lincoln received 38,734 votes in California. The votes for the other candidates were: Douglas, 38,023; Breckenridge, 33,975; Bell, 9,136. In other words, because of the divided vote, Lincoln carried the State. But he polled only three votes out of every eight. However, 100 years ago Reverend King delivered his first speech in his crusade to keep California in the Union. And, because of his efforts, California did remain in the Union.

Thomas Starr King was a remarkable man. As pastor of the First Unitarian Society of San Francisco, he was one of the great clergymen of the West. He was also an explorer and naturalist of the first order. He was among the first to call attention to the beauties of Yosemite Valley. And today, in his honor, there is a mountain named Starr King in the Yosemite National Park. I might add that there is also a peak in the White Mountains of New Hampshire in honor of Reverend King's exploits and writing in that region.

During the Civil War, Reverend King made another remarkable contribution. He spearheaded the drive for a sanitary commission, the precursor of the Red Cross. In fact, primarily because of his work, California contributed \$1,233,831.31 to the commission. This total was more than one-fourth of the entire amount collected in the United States.

Selected as one of two whom California has honored in Statuary Hall, Thomas Starr King is revered in our memory as a dedicated and courageous Christian cleric who saved California for the Union. And from California came much of the strength and the sin-

ews which preserved our country through the dark and bloody interne-cine conflict 100 years ago.

REPORT OF THE SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR UNDER THE COAL RESEARCH ACT

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, pursuant to the provisions of law, on February 15 the Secretary of the Interior submitted his report on the first year's operations authorized by Public Law 86-599. That act, to encourage and stimulate the production and conservation of coal in the United States, authorizes the Secretary of the Interior to contract for coal research as a means of improving the economic position of the coal industry and, to this end, it instructs the Secretary to establish an Office of Coal Research in the Department.

This law provides for a coal research and development program which, if it is adequately financed and vigorously conducted, will substantially improve the economic position of the coal-mining industry at large and prove highly beneficial to coal consumers, coal-mine workers, distressed coal-mining communities, and the general public.

As stated in the favorable report of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs that was presented for the committee by the able junior Senator from Utah [Mr. Moss], the opportunities for developing new and more effective uses for coal through research are virtually unlimited. However, within the coal-mining industry only the largest producers have the means to conduct coal utilization research on an effective scale. Yet about 90 percent of the almost 5,000 producers of bituminous, lignite, and anthracite coal are small and medium-sized operators.

Mr. President, this type of coal research will be highly useful to the coal-mine operators throughout the country. It is no secret that the coal-mining regions constitute some of the most depressed areas in the Nation. I am confident that this program can substantially strengthen coal operations and improve the economic conditions of the communities where they are located. We have good cause to hope that this program can be a principal means of permanent improvement of the coal industry. It is encouraging that Secretary Udall states that he expects to begin processing research proposals by July 1, 1961.

For the full information of the Senators and the many persons concerned in the coal industry and the coal-mining communities, I ask unanimous consent that the report of the Secretary of the Interior be printed at the conclusion of my remarks.

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

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR,
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,
Washington, D.C., February 15, 1961.

HON. LYNDON B. JOHNSON,
President of the Senate,
Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: Section 7 of Public Law 86-599, "An act to encourage and

stimulate the production and conservation of coal in the United States through research and development by authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to contract for coal research, and for other purposes," requires the Secretary of the Interior to submit to the President and the Congress, on or before February 15 of each year, beginning with the year 1961, a comprehensive report concerning activities under the authority of this act. This letter constitutes the first of such reports.

Public Law 86-599 stems from hearings held in 1956 and 1957 by the Special Subcommittee on Coal Research of the House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. The report that followed (H. Rept. No. 1263, 85th Cong., Aug. 27, 1957) recommended a program "of improving the economic position of the coal industry through research, with adequate provision of Federal funds to encourage State and institutional programs in this field. * * * The act itself instructs the Secretary of the Interior to establish an Office of Coal Research in the Department, and through it to conduct a program of research aimed at developing "new and more efficient methods of mining, preparing, and utilizing coal." The legislative history indicates that the reason for seeking "new and more efficient methods" is to get more coal used so that miners and other coal workers can be returned to work and distressed coal-mining communities returned to health. The program has in it the seeds of a significant contribution to the economy and welfare of the country.

The Office of Coal Research is to "contract for, sponsor, cosponsor, and promote the coordination of [coal] research," and is to deal with any recognized interested group having suitable personnel and equipment. All results, including patents, must be made available to the general public, except as the Secretary of the Interior may find the withholding of such information necessary in the interest of national defense.

Public Law 86-599 was approved on July 7, 1960, and the Department promptly set to work on administrative details attending creation of a new organization and its operation. The first decision was to establish the Office of Coal Research in the Office of the Secretary in order to make it possible to hit hard at the short-range contract-research program without conflicting with the coal research program of the Bureau of Mines, while at the same time providing for coordination of the two in order to get a unified national coal research program.

An organization structure for the Office has been developed. We are setting up criteria for the submission of research proposals and are developing basic provisions for contracts.

Section 2(3) of the act specifies that technical advisory committees shall be established whose function it will be to assist in the examination and evaluation of research progress and of all research proposals and contracts. These committees are to be composed of recognized experts in various aspects of coal research. After consultation with many persons and organizations in and acquainted with the coal industry, and after careful scrutiny of the many names suggested, in December 1960—following invitations to serve made in October—the then Secretary of the Interior appointed a General Technical Advisory Committee composed of 14 outstanding persons. These include four executives from the coal-producing industry, five representing consumer segments (chemical companies, electric utilities, railroads, and retailers), one equipment manufacturer, two university officials, a representative of the United Mine Workers of America, and a representative of the trade associa-

tions. The full composition of the committee is as follows:

Dr. Maurice H. Bigelow, technical director, Plastics and Coal Chemicals Division, Allied Chemical Corp.; Dr. H. B. Charnbury, head, department of mineral preparation, Pennsylvania State University; Mr. F. S. Elfried, chairman of the board, Peabody Coal Co.; Mr. J. D. Jillson, president, Anthracite Institute; Mr. Harry LaViers, president, South-East Coal Co.; Mr. Samuel Lenher, vice president, research and development, E. I. du Pont de Nemours & Co.; Mr. R. E. Salvati, president, Island Creek Coal Co.; Mr. S. T. Saunders, president, the Norfolk & Western Railway; Mr. Walter K. Scherer, president, Fred Scherer, Inc.; Mr. G. A. Shoemaker, president, Consolidation Coal Co.; Dr. G. R. Spindler, dean, School of Mines, West Virginia University; Mr. Philip Sporn, president, American Electric Power Co., Inc.; Mr. W. L. Wearly, president, Joy Manufacturing Co.; Mr. Michael F. Widman, Jr., director of marketing and research, United Mine Workers of America.

Applications for staffing the office of coal research are being received and are being screened. An Acting Director was appointed in December 1960, when technical guidance became necessary. Further selection and appointment of staff is being deferred until a permanent Director is appointed. The selection and appointment of a Director and of key staff members is the most pressing and critical problem. The program may succeed or fail in proportion as these men are suited to its challenge. Extra time spent now in selecting them will, I feel, show up in results later. The outgoing Secretary of the Interior believed it proper to permit the new administration to select the Director of the Office of Coal Research, and he in turn to select his key staff.

We hope to announce the appointment of a Director in the near future and to be able to begin processing research proposals and to enter into contracts by July 1, 1961.

Public Law 86-599 authorized \$2 million to remain available until spent, to be appropriated for the fiscal year beginning July 1, 1960. The act, as mentioned above, was approved on July 7, 1960; in August the administration included in a supplemental appropriation request an item of \$1 million for the Office of Coal Research to carry out the purpose of the act, and Congress appropriated this amount on September 8. We are asking for an appropriation of \$1 million for the coming fiscal year. If granted, this would provide a total of a little less than \$2 million for operations during that year.

Sincerely yours,

STEWART L. UDALL,
Secretary of the Interior.

Mr. MOSS subsequently said: Mr. President, I wish to associate myself with the remarks of the able Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON], chairman of the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee.

The attempts of those interested in seeing the coal industry improve its position through an expanded program of research has had to jump two big hurdles—a presidential veto, and then the inaction of the outgoing administration.

The bill which the Congress passed in 1959 provided for a separate agency to conduct a coal research program. We who advocated this were fully aware of the long-range program then conducted by the Bureau of Mines, but we feared that that agency would not attack the current problem with the necessary vigor. Using the argument of dupli-

cation of effort, President Eisenhower vetoed that first bill.

In 1960 we passed a coal research program bill suitable to President Eisenhower, but the program was not started. The imminence of a change in administration was given as the reason, and another year slipped away.

It is good to know that the Secretary of the Interior, Mr. Udall, is now completing a staff for coal research in the Department of the Interior.

Not only is coal vital as an economic factor in my State, and in many States of the Union, but it is a basic resource that should be utilized fully for our national defense and our country. I am pleased indeed to see us moving forward in this very basic field.

PRESERVING THE WILDERNESS— ANNOUNCEMENT OF PUBLIC HEARINGS ON THE WILDERNESS BILL

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, there is a growing awareness across the Nation of the need to act now if the primitive, far-from-the-highway areas of our public domain are to be shielded from encroachments that would destroy their true scientific, scenic, and recreational value. The pressures are increasing to intrude the sounds, smells, and signs of our mechanized age into these places reserved for the many among us who seek a tranquil, yet rugged, experience.

At 10 a.m., on February 27 and 28, the Senate Interior and Insular Affairs Committee will hold public hearings on S. 174, the wilderness bill, which I introduced January 5. I hope the hearings will be brief, because the need for such legislation has been clearly demonstrated over the past 5 years, when extensive hearings were held here in Washington, D.C., and elsewhere. The distinguished assistant majority leader has been a moving spirit in this effort. The President is very much interested in this legislation. As the Washington Post and Times Herald pointed out yesterday, we have ample safeguards in S. 174 for cattlemen and other interests. I ask unanimous consent that the Washington Post and Times Herald editorial be printed in the RECORD at this point, and also one from the New York Times.

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

[From the Washington Post]
PRESERVING THE WILDERNESS

Each year more people, more houses, and more industry encroach on the remaining open land in the United States. Only diligent conservation will preserve for future generations the wilderness areas which were the mark of frontier America and which are an important part of the Nation's patrimony. Once again Congress has a chance, at very little cost to the taxpayer, to secure this heritage of forest, river, and wildlife by a speedy enactment of the national wilderness protection bill, now reintroduced by Senator ANDERSON.

As Mr. ANDERSON noted in presenting the measure, it has been 5 years since the first wilderness bill was introduced by Senator HUMPHREY; through two Congresses and four printed volumes of testimony the Committee

on Interior and Insular Affairs has considered such a bill. "Objections, eliminations, and the inclusion of various special provisions." There should be no responsible opposition to the Senator's new bill.

The measure is not a sweeping change. It envisages no reorganization of present land agencies; no new bureaus would be created. It merely sets aside certain wilderness areas, "unspoiled by manmade changes," in perpetuity. There are ample safeguards for cattle grazing and industrial interests and provision for periodic review of the wilderness tracts.

Indeed, all the lands that could be dedicated to wilderness use and protection are already within established national forests, parks, or refuges. They make up only 5 percent of the Federal lands. This bill is, in reality, only the beginning of what is needed for the future, but it is the necessary first step. Unless lawmakers act soon, much of the opportunity for preservation of these natural havens and retreats will be forever lost.

[From the New York Times]

KENNEDY ON NATURAL RESOURCES

The bright promise of leadership exercised by President John F. Kennedy has been taking shape in the brief month since he was inaugurated; and few things he has said or done during these crowded weeks have more clearly revealed his breadth of vision in dealing with a major national policy question than his message to Congress yesterday on the coming crisis in the conservation and development of America's natural resources. What he said about each of the separate resource problems was very much to the point, but the fact that the President grouped them in a coherent whole is what gave especial distinction to his treatment of this subject. His message showed him to be aware of the intolerable conflicts, duplications, and rivalries that have for many years plagued the Federal Government's natural resource activities—he even listed some (but by no means all) of these conflicts—and he raises the hope that consistent policies based on the national welfare, and not on specific vested interests, will be established in these fields.

The most serious criticism we have of the broad policy statements in his message is that he led up to, but did not follow through with, a proposal that the natural resource functions of the Federal Government be grouped in one department, where they belong, instead of being scattered in innumerable separate little empires. But he did propose some executive and budgetary steps that should help to relieve, if not cure, this fundamental difficulty. A major reorganization in this area is an inescapable necessity. Meanwhile, the innovations he proposes in respect to coordinated direction, expert advice, scientific research, and budgetary controls, all make sense.

If the President is inclined to be more enthusiastic than some of us are about big hydroelectric dam and giant flood control projects, he also laid welcome stress on less dramatic aspects of water control, such as flood plain zoning and small watershed development.

His forest policy recognizes the serious danger of timber shortages, despite optimistic statistics that have been put forth in recent years, suggesting that all's well with our forest situation. The President's comments on "a program of balanced usage" for the public domain are sound; and we warmly welcome his endorsement of the pending wilderness protection bill, and of proposed new park areas. These recommendations will, we hope, be followed up by speedy action in a Congress moving under the leadership that Mr. Kennedy seems intent on giving it.

ESTONIAN INDEPENDENCE DAY

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I am happy to join in the tributes that mark the 43d anniversary of the independence of the Republic of Estonia, which is celebrated this year on February 24.

The courageous people of Estonia have steadfastly maintained their hope for freedom and independence despite hundreds of years of suppression under Russian rulers. Then on February 24, 1918, they established the Estonian Republic and proclaimed their independence.

One of the smallest nationality groups in Europe, the people of Estonia were permitted to enjoy their independence for only two decades. In July 1940 their tiny country was overrun and annexed by the Soviet Union, and they have since been sealed off from the rest of the world behind the Iron Curtain. But Communist regimentation and oppression have not succeeded in stamping out the flame of freedom, which continues to burn in this unfortunate land. The Estonian people continue to pray for their deliverance and freedom. On this anniversary I am happy to join with Americans of Estonian descent in their hopes that their distressed kinsmen will one day regain their independence.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, I am delighted today to join in commemorating the 43d anniversary of the independence of the Estonian people. It is only fitting that we pause a moment to do homage today to these brave peoples, who are at the moment, the slaves of Communist tyranny.

During their modern history, the Estonian people enjoyed freedom and independence for a period of only about two decades. These years of liberty were the happiest time in their national life. The stouthearted and industrious Estonian people, living in their historic homeland in the Baltic, had been enduring the insufferable yoke of Russia's czarist regime for more than 200 years when the First World War began. In that war they saw their chance for freedom. Their golden opportunity came when the czarist regime was crushed by the Russian revolution. The Estonians felt free to take decisive action, and on February 24, 1918, proclaimed their national independence.

That historic event ushered in a new era. In the newly found Estonian Republic they lived and worked under their democratic institutions. All these were their own creation; the Estonians were justly proud of them, and worked hard to safeguard them. For two decades they were happy. Then came the Second World War, and with it the Red army. By mid-1940 Estonia was overrun and occupied. The small country was incorporated into the Soviet Union, thus putting an end to the free Estonian Republic.

Since then, the Estonians have not been free in their homeland. Instead, they have been suffering under Communist totalitarian tyranny. Today, they live in misery, but continue devoutly to pray for their deliverance. We echo their genuine sentiments on the anniversary of their independence day and

hope that some day they will again attain their freedom.

CIVIL RIGHTS ACTION NEEDED

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I wish to compliment the Republican leadership for its announced determination to include civil rights legislation as one of the "must" elements of the legislative program to be added to the 16 items specified by President Kennedy. I would hope also that my own leadership may permit such vital measures as the right of the Attorney General to sue in representative civil rights cases to be added to our program.

The embarrassment which an American community like Lynchburg, Va., must feel in the eyes of the country this morning resulting from the action of a court there in jailing a 16-year-old child because she took part in a sit-in demonstration in a drugstore emphasizes the urgency of this civil rights program. For, sit ins are the result of the frustration of individual Negroes in the rate of progress in their getting equal opportunity.

As a lawyer I accept, of course, the court's decision without comment. I can, however, express the hope that this case will go up on appeal to the highest court in the land if necessary.

I must also register my protest against the Kennedy administration's failure to include civil rights in the President's "must" legislative program at this session of the Congress.

We need additional antidiscrimination laws. I disagree strongly with the view that Executive orders alone can do the job. Executive orders may be effective in certain areas such as housing or airports where federally backed, but they are clearly inadequate to deal with discrimination in jobs and in education.

The positive statement on civil rights adopted by the National Council of the Protestant Episcopal Church at its meeting yesterday is highly commendable. The council has taken forthright action in urging President Kennedy to issue an Executive order ending discrimination in housing.

Executive action is also essential to end discrimination practices at airport facilities.

The longer we delay in eliminating these and other discriminatory practices, the more difficult the task becomes. Civil rights legislation, in addition to Executive action, is urgently needed now.

I am delighted that the minority leader, on behalf of my party, is going to push it. I pledge my full support.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point an article from the New York Times entitled "Copper Sun, Scarlet Sea, What Is Africa to Me," written by James Reston.

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

COPPER SUN, SCARLET SEA, WHAT IS AFRICA
TO ME

(By James Reston)

WASHINGTON, February 16.—When American Negroes stage a pitched battle against

the United Nations in the galleries of the world organization, and parade through the streets of New York shouting "Congo, Yes. Yankee, No." It is obvious that something is seriously wrong.

Moreover, when this fist swinging goes out to the Nation over the television circuits, the viewers are entitled to some kind of explanation.

The easy explanation is that the demonstration was Communist inspired. Within 24 hours of the assassination of Patrice Lumumba in the Congo, the Communists were able to fire up attacks on the Belgians, the United Nations, and the United States everywhere from Moscow and Warsaw to Cairo and Washington, and no doubt there was some Communist inspiration behind the flareup in the U.N.

The full explanation, however, is more complex than that. Despite startling progress in many areas, the American Negro is still living under the most appalling conditions in many cities, and suffering indignities which his rising knowledge of the world will not permit him to accept.

In addition, at least the young intelligent American Negro is beginning to feel part of a larger struggle in which the Nation's ideals are proclaimed to the world but denied to many of his own race at home. The rise of black Africa has arrested his attention and added to his frustrations. More than is generally realized, he has been identifying the battle for freedom in Africa with his own struggle for equality within the United States.

Accordingly, the murder of a prominent Negro in the Congo arouses emotions among American Negroes now that would not have been aroused to the same extent before Africa was so much in the news.

THE NEW RACISM

There is, too, in America today not only an anti-Negro racism but an antiwhite racism led by a small but increasingly powerful sect of black Moslems and by other less extreme organizations backing African freedom movements.

These are not Communist sects, but some of them are putting their race ahead of the Nation to the detriment of both, and, as usual, the Communists are trying to provoke their frustrations and use them for their own purposes.

The irony and tragedy of this is that the main hope for the liberation and freedom of the Congo lies with the United Nations, which the Negro extremists are attacking.

There is no way to avoid the cold war, or civil war or even a major war in central Africa unless the United Nations is left in the Congo to guide the transition to responsibility and independence. Yet the demonstrations are apparently designed to weaken the U.N. at the moment it is needed the most.

The dangers of these demonstrations for the American Negro at home are less dramatic but nevertheless significant. Rightly or wrongly, these pictures on the television of American Negroes battling in the galleries of the U.N. in the middle of Adlai E. Stevenson's speech are open to the interpretation that the demonstrators are more concerned about the Congo than about America.

This is, of course, a fantastically false impression, but it is not difficult to imagine how any suggestion of race before country would be used by anti-Negro racists to slow down the whole process toward racial desegregation in the United States.

THE DECLINING CONTROLS

Thus the battle of the galleries yesterday, if it has done nothing else, has alerted Washington once more to the consequences of frustration in the Negro community. Strange things are happening in the teeming Negro ghettos of the northern cities.

Social controls that worked for generations are no longer working.

For example, the northern Negro no longer fears going to jail for racial demonstrations. Particularly the young intellectuals among them, who are spearheading the battle for equality, regard a jail sentence as a badge of honor, and many of them are as willing to go behind bars for the Congo as for decent housing in Chicago.

In short, we are beginning to see a confluence of the world struggle for freedom in black Africa and the struggle for equal rights in the Negro communities of America. No longer is the American Negro asking, as Countee Cullen did 35 years ago, "Copper sun, scarlet sea, what is Africa to me?"

This is an event of momentous importance, and officials here are just beginning to realize that even their foreign policy will be affected if the causes of these Negro frustrations are not dealt with more effectively.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JAVITS. I yield.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I wish to take this opportunity to join in the sentiments which our friend from New York has uttered with respect to the leadership the able minority leader continues to give to the cause of civil rights legislation in this historic Chamber.

We would not have had any civil rights legislation, in the last session, Mr. President, had it not been for the indefatigable labors of the minority leader, the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], aided ably by my friend from New York and other Senators on this side of the aisle, who fought the good fight for equal treatment under law, and who will continue to do so.

RESOLUTION OF LOCAL UNION 223 OF THE NEW YORK STATE DEPARTMENT OF LABOR EMPLOYEES

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a resolution submitted to me by Mr. Joseph H. Alleva, president of Local Union 223 of the New York State Department of Labor Employees. This resolution calls upon the Congress to enact a medical care for the aged program financed under the social security system.

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

LOCAL UNION 223.

Hon. KENNETH B. KEATING,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR KEATING: At the last regular membership meeting of this local union, held on February 21, 1961, I was directed to forward the following adopted resolution to you:

Whereas there are 16 million persons in the United States aged 65 or older and millions of these are unable to obtain and pay for adequate medical care; and

Whereas the continued expansion of this segment of our population, coupled with the continued increases in the cost of medical care, will intensify this crucial national problem in the future; and

Whereas we in this union of civil servants firmly believe that the Federal Government should take immediate steps to satisfy this need through a method not involving the means test, which we hold to be repugnant, undemocratic, and an invasion of the rights of the individual: Therefore be it

Resolved, That we call upon the Congress of the United States to immediately establish a system of prepaid medical care for the aged, using the social security mechanism as the means of raising the necessary funds.

Your kind consideration of this important problem would be most appreciated.

Sincerely yours,

JOSEPH H. ALLEVA,
President.

THE FIRST MEXICAN-AMERICAN INTERPARLIAMENTARY CONFERENCE

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, the first Interparliamentary Conference between Mexico and the United States took place earlier this month. The meetings were held in the city of Guadalajara, capital of the State of Jalisco and the second largest city in Mexico.

It is difficult to speak too highly of the warmth, the cordiality, and the generosity of the hospitality of our Mexican hosts. Moreover, the meeting was highly productive in both the frankness and friendliness in which the problems of these two neighboring nations were presented. Throughout, an atmosphere of utmost good will and harmony prevailed. The entire delegation was led by our distinguished majority leader, MIKE MANSFIELD, whose performance throughout exhibited the high quality of leadership of which we know him to be capable and deeply appealed to our Mexican friends.

The Senate delegation consisted of JOHN BUTLER, DENNIS CHAVEZ, CARL CURTIS, CLAIR ENGLE, ALBERT GORE, BOURKE HICKENLOOPER, MIKE MANSFIELD, EUGENE MCCARTHY, CLAIBORNE PELL, ANDREW SCHOEPPEL, and myself.

The House delegation, headed by Representative SAUND of California, consisted of: JOEL BROYHILL, EDWARD DERWINSKI, DANIEL INOUE, HARRIS McDOWELL, JOSEPH MONTOYA, ANCHER NELSEN, ROBERT NIX, WALTER NORBLAD, J. T. RUTHERFORD, and WILLIAM SPRINGER.

On the closing night—Thursday, February 10—we were received by the Legislature of the State of Jalisco and we were addressed and welcomed by Deputy Guillermo Cosío Vidaurri, whose closing paragraphs embodied the spirit that governed the conference. Reply was made to him by our able colleague, Senator ALBERT GORE, whose eloquent address elicited prolonged applause and universally favorable comment.

I ask unanimous consent that the closing paragraphs of Deputy Vidaurri's address, and the entire text of Senator GORE's reply, which was the closing event of the conference, be printed at this point in my remarks.

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

EXCERPT OF REMARKS BY DEPUTY GUILLERMO COSÍO VIDAURRI, JALISCO STATE LEGISLATURE

As natives of Jalisco, as Mexicans, as members of the international community, we view with great pleasure the arrival of a new era, an era in which international relations must be oriented toward the attainment of this objective; and you, honorable legislators and illustrious visitors, those of you who attend this first Mexico-United States parliamentary meeting, are the ones

who are laying the foundations for the great structure America demands, because the problems of Mexico are not exclusive to this country, but extensive to all the countries of this continent.

It is truly stimulating to see that, while in other areas of the earth there is tension and insecurity, in this city, which in Juarez's time was the site of the supreme powers of the nation, legislators of two neighboring countries have met in a friendly spirit, in order to find, through an interchange of ideas, concepts and experiences, formulas for coexistence through which greater understanding, friendship, and co-operation may be achieved between two countries with a common destiny and common interests.

We are confident that through this direct contact between men who in some manner or other are engaged in the government of their respective countries, successful formulas will be found, formulas which may be permanent and definite in international relations; for this reason, we are happy that the doctrines of Lincoln and of Juarez, great figures in the history of our two nations, have oriented your thoughts and your works, since these visionary doctrines are still good in this era when man is desperately trying to attain justice as the supreme value which will enable him to find universal happiness.

As lovers of peace, as great admirers of the democratic system, we congratulate ourselves on the fact that this first Mexico-United States parliamentary meeting took place, because we are certain that from the cordial and sincere talks held between the legislators of both countries, the ties of friendship which unite us will be strengthened, we shall emerge with a better understanding toward the problems of Mexico and of Latin America, and continental solidarity will be reinforced, since there is no other means to attain universal peace.

Because America, as President Lopez Mateos has said, "is the continent of human liberties," it must also be the impregnable fortress of democracy, where justice can take a firm stand, for as long as these values remain constant, democracy exists, and where the sun of justice shines, there you will find liberty.

ADDRESS OF SENATOR ALBERT GORE TO THE LEGISLATURE OF THE STATE OF JALISCO

This solemn session of the Legislature of the State of Jalisco bestows upon the U.S. delegation a signal honor. On behalf of the U.S. delegation, I thank you, and tell you that this honor, together with the cordiality, friendliness, and hospitality we have received from one and all since arriving at Guadalajara, has generated within each of us, not only deep gratitude, but a burning pride in the goodwill, the strength, and high qualities of our Mexican friends and neighbors.

The first meeting of the Mexican-United States Interparliamentary Conference has now concluded, and by all is hailed as a success. A successful international conference is always a step in the right direction, but, in our distraught times, it is a matter of particular significance.

Having attended several unsuccessful international conferences, I have undertaken to contemplate the reasons for the success of this one, and how it differed from others. To begin with, there was a total absence of suspicion and distrust. There were no fears, no tension.

As a Senate adviser delegate for the past 2 years, I have been several times at the conference table in Geneva with the Russians on the subject of atomic weapons tests, and also, the conference on surprise attack. There every phrase was studied for hidden meanings.

Here there have been no hidden meanings; instead, there was mutual respect and trust.

Moreover, neither you nor we have talked in riddles.

This leads me to observe that another reason for our success, in my opinion, is that we met as practical politicians, and talked the language of politics, a greater facility for the understanding of which we do not concede even to our master Mexican political counterparts.

Politics in its true sense is the art of government. I readily concede that its practice is not always artistic in my country. Even so, it is through the democratic system, of which the practicing politician is an effective agent, that the peoples' will is given expression and their aspirations brought to fruition. Nevertheless, we have in my country sophisticates who deprecate those of us who are engaged in governing a great and multitudinous people and who speak quite disdainfully of politicians. I hope my fellow politicians in Mexico are not troubled with such low evaluation of their service and hence undertake quickly to vault to the status of a statesman. If so, let me remind them that a former predecessor of Senator MANSFIELD as Democratic leader of the Senate and one of our great former Vice Presidents, Alben W. Barkley, once defined a statesman as a dead politician.

It may just be that the road to understanding between our people may be more quickly paved by political leaders who speak and understand the language and sentiments of the people than by diplomats speaking in riddles.

One other reason, I believe, for our successful conference, is that instead of trying to settle all the problems of the world we have hewed to our agenda and have discussed the problems on which we met to review. As a result, we better understand you and your problems and we hope and believe you have gained a better understanding of us and our many difficulties.

An understanding of a problem, whether it be national or international, is a prerequisite to its solution.

It would be erroneous to conclude, because our discussions here have been confined to the more acute bilateral questions concerning the United States and Mexico, that the problems of peace and security of our Western Hemisphere and of the world have been out of our hearts. Indeed no.

You recognize us, I am confident, as heirs of a successful revolution against colonialism. We recognize you as heirs of a revolution against oppressive dictatorship and unconscionable exploitation of the people and the resources of Mexico. The people of both our countries have achieved a unique, distinctive culture and way of life. Both of our people have advanced in the art of self-government to a state through which the traditional aims and ends of true popular revolution can be achieved by political reforms generated by the will of the people and mandated on election days in the ballots of free men and women.

What you have achieved in Mexico is rightly the source of intense patriotic pride. The Mexican leader, the Mexican citizen, the Mexican product, the Mexican artist, has attained and is attaining world renown.

We rejoice with you in your traditional love of home, family, and country; your devotion to the dignity and freedom of man; your constant search for justice in individual matters as well as in social causes; your respect of the principles of equality and the consent of those governed as a necessary basis for a society of self-government by freemen.

It is my belief that the people of the United States are sincerely and deeply motivated by good will toward you and toward all mankind.

We wish to be associated with a better life for all people everywhere. Our own way of life is under constant change and improvement. We welcome change for the better in all nations.

But we are aware that all that glitters is not gold. A reform which brings misery instead of improvement to the people is a failure. A revolution which brings dictatorship, oppression, and want instead of freedom and improvement to a people is a failure.

In our search for peace and security in this perilous day, let all freemen bear foremost in mind the fundamental tenets by which our forefathers established the orders of freemen. If we are loyal to these precepts, if we maintain trust in each other, have the courage of our convictions and faith in God, peace and security will be ours.

PRESIDENT KENNEDY'S GREAT MESSAGE ON NATURAL RESOURCES

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, "We reject," said President Kennedy, in his special message on natural resources, "a no new starts policy."

This is a complete reversal, and a most welcome one, of the Eisenhower policies. President Kennedy has formulated a program of action which means that from now on the United States will again move to develop its natural resources as it did under Franklin Delano Roosevelt and Harry S. Truman, and further seek to atone for the omissions of nearly a decade.

Actually, the Kennedy program is more complete than any preceding outline for resource development, and purposes to go further than did his enlightened predecessors. But his policy is conceived in the same great spirit of Theodore Roosevelt and Franklin Delano Roosevelt. It means that, departing from the stagnation of the past 8 years, we shall not henceforth allow our rivers to continue to run wastefully to the sea. We shall move, through intelligent river basin planning and engineering, to put an end to the destructive and wasteful—and highly costly—alternations of flood and drought. We shall not allow henceforth our water resources of lake and stream to be wasted or polluted, and our soil and forest resources to be depleted through continuing neglect.

The President particularly mentions not only water development and hydro development, the speeding up of saline water conversion and water and air pollution control. Particularly gratifying to Alaskans is his espousal of the rehabilitation of our depleted fisheries. Alaskans and others on the west coast will hail his plea "for rehabilitation of depleted stocks of salmon in the Pacific."

It is a great message, a great program, from a great President.

FORESTRY AND FOREST INDUSTRIES IN THE SOUTH

Mr. TALMADGE. Mr. President, the January issue of the Atlantic Economic Review, monthly publication of the Bureau of Business and Economic Research of the Georgia State College of Business Administration, featured a penetrating analysis of the future prospects for forestry and forest industries in the

South. Entitled "Are We Planting Too Many Trees?" the article was written by Forester Robert V. Potter, of the USDA Forest Service's Division of State and Private Forestry. Since it answers many of the questions which have been raised by both farmers and economic planners looking to the future development of the South, I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the body of the RECORD.

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

ARE WE PLANTING TOO MANY TREES?

(By Robert V. Potter)

The southern landscape has changed markedly in the past decade. From the air one no longer sees an unending mass of cultivated fields. The cornstalk is being replaced by the pine tree. And in the midst of this change prophets claim that tree farmers will flood the market with southern pines. From other sources we hear that many more trees must be grown if future needs are to be met. Most people, however, aware that the issue is not a simple one, really don't know what to think.

The confusion brought about by the situation needs clarification. In this article an attempt is made to explain the issue by examining (1) reasons why trees are planted; (2) factors which influence market demand for forest products; (3) forecasts of future demand, and (4) sources of supply of forest products. Armed with this information, the reader will be better prepared to judge for himself whether too many trees are being planted.

CHANGING LAND USE

Growth of industry and impracticability of small farming have led to a mass exodus of people from the farms to the city. Today the South has 600,000 fewer farms than there were 17 years ago. Field by field, farm by farm, as lands become unprofitable for growing cultivated crops, decisions are being made concerning the next best use. Near cities some abandoned farmland is going into residential or industrial uses, but these allocations can absorb only a relatively small share of the total.

The most promising alternative uses for cropland seem to be pasture and tree farming. Farmowners have moved in both directions. But the decision to transfer cropland to permanent pasture or to trees cannot be made easily. Either choice requires an outlay of capital and effort for several years before cash returns are realized. In addition, once started, neither alternative may be reversed or altered without incurring a loss. It is this circumstance, apparently, which leads some landowners to question the wisdom of planting any more former cropland to trees.

TREE PLANTING AT AN ALLTIME HIGH

Forest tree planting, nevertheless, has become very popular. In Georgia, more than 234 million tree seedlings, produced by State nurseries, were planted during the 1959-60 season. In the 11 Southern States of Texas, Oklahoma, Louisiana, Mississippi, Arkansas, Alabama, Tennessee, Georgia, North Carolina, South Carolina, and Florida, the total area planted annually on all ownerships increased over fivefold from 282,716 acres in 1950 to 1,582,935 acres in 1959.¹ These States have definite advantages in growing trees. They have mild climate, long growing seasons, and abundant rainfall. Furthermore, the economics involved in their changing land-use patterns makes it almost inevitable that much marginal cropland will either be planted to desirable trees, or will

be abandoned to seed-in naturally in a haphazard fashion.

This boom in tree planting has not occurred without certain repercussions. Landowners who have planted and those who are considering planting trees as a financial investment are asking, "Are we getting pine poor?" They remember that this country already has a huge surplus of farm commodities, and they don't want to see their timber depreciate in value because it may become surplus.

Rural businessmen and officials of town and county governments also are concerned. Decline in rural population is closely associated with the expansion of forest land by tree planting. The decline in rural population means less purchasing power to support country stores and banks and less political support for town and county officials. Increase in size of landownership, also associated with expansion of forest land, sometimes means lower returns to county governments from property taxes.

As this question about tree planting is examined, it becomes increasingly clear that it is asked for a variety of reasons and that a simple, unqualified, "Yes" or "No" answer is inadequate. Tree planting is not a cause of declining agriculture; it is a result. Rural businessmen and public officials have little alternative but to adjust to the changes that are occurring. Landowners, on the other hand, are left with the inevitable decision of what to do with their property. They must decide whether tree farming will be their most profitable form of land use and whether trees represent the best vegetative cover they can maintain on their land.

REASONS FOR PLANTING TREES

Why do people plant trees? Many of them are influenced in the first instance by the encouragement and assistance of Government agencies and forest industries. So, before the objectives of individual landowners are considered, it is necessary to examine the motives of those who encourage the act.

State and Federal agencies promote tree planting on private as well as public lands because of their responsibility for guarding the public interest. The versatility of forests as protective, yet usable, ground cover makes them ideally suited to meet the long-term multiple-use interests of public agencies. Since the lifespan of society is much longer than that of individuals, it is necessary that public agencies place greater emphasis on values of the future. These agencies sometimes differ from individuals by wanting to provide for the more intangible values, such as recreation, wildlife, and esthetics, and to establish a slower rate of use of material assets. They are more content to incur resource expenditures which promise only distant returns, and they encourage private landowners to do so by furnishing them tree seedlings at cost and by providing the technical assistance necessary to insure successful planting.

Like the public groups, timber industries and pulp and paper industries encourage tree planting. Not only do they increase the stocking of their own lands by planting, but they also furnish seedlings and technical assistance to the owners of adjacent private lands. They are interested because the establishment of a large papermill or lumber mill requires large investments of specialized capital which cannot be transferred readily to another location or to another use; and also a specialized work force must be recruited and trained. Such undertakings would be neither possible nor wise unless there were available to the mills a supply of wood which would be adequate for many years into the future. So it behooves forest industries to promote tree planting.

Owners of small private tracts plant trees for a variety of reasons. Their objectives are not always simple, singular, or rational.

Some folks plant their old homestead for sentimental reasons, some to manifest pride of ownership, and still others do so for personal esthetic satisfaction. A growing number of people, however, have become investors in a forestry enterprise; they plant trees to acquire periodic income from the sale of wood and gum resin or from the commercial use of their forests for hunting and outdoor recreation. Alert landowners on the fringes of growing cities have also discovered that speculative real estate values are likely to be greater for wooded lands. Sometimes a combination of these reasons lurks in the mind of a landowner when he decides to plant.

It seems inescapable that the reasons for planting trees depend, in the final analysis, upon almost everything else concerning the landowner. His aims are often complex and vague, they change with time, and are molded by the total environment in which he lives.

THE DEMAND FOR FOREST PRODUCTS

Trees are valuable for more than their own physical content. They are part of a forest complex of interrelated, complementary products. The major products and uses of the forest—timber, water, recreation, and wildlife—often occur as joint products of the same tract of land. Of these, only timber and its chemical components are usually exchanged as regular cash crops in the market. More and more, however, price tags in the form of fees are being put on private woodlands for their use in hunting preserves and picnicking and camping areas. For example, 22 shooting preserves throughout Georgia are being opened to hunters this season.² It's obvious that demand for this kind of woodland use is likely to continue so long as people have enough time and money to spend on hunting pleasures.

The landowner who plants trees for a wood crop will need to consider additional factors. He will want to know at the outset whether he will be able to sell his products in large enough quantity and at a price sufficient to justify the investment. But such a guarantee can no more be made for tree farmers than for the producers of most other commodities because the factors which determine market demand are, themselves, numerous and variable. More than just per capita income or the amount of leisure time must be considered.

Specifically, the demand for a commodity depends upon (1) the price at which the commodity is offered for sale; (2) the purchasing power of individual consumers as represented by their disposable income and their access to credit; (3) the tastes and preferences of the individual consumers; (4) the total number of consumers; (5) the prices at which substitute and complementary commodities are offered for sale; and (6) the extent to which technology is able to improve the utility of the product.³ Each of these factors is dynamic and extremely difficult to measure precisely for a country, region, or State. Not even the best informed landowner, therefore, can anticipate future markets with any degree of certainty. Like the investor in stocks, cattle, or chickens, the tree farmer makes an estimate of future conditions and launches out on a calculated risk.

A better understanding of the demand picture for wood and wood extracts may be acquired by examining the many different uses to which they are put. Each year in the United States the total wood used divides about evenly into products which are needed for the production of other goods and services and products which end up as

¹ "Shooting Preserves Set To Open Oct. 1," Atlanta Constitution, Sept. 20, 1960.

² Based on estimates of Forest Service, USDA, Atlanta, Ga.

³ Albert C. Worrell, Economics of American Forestry (New York: John Wiley & Sons, Inc., 1959), pp. 77, 78.

consumers' goods.⁴ Lumber is the classical consumers' good. Wood fiber and chemical extracts from pulpwood and resin are typical producers' (processing component) goods. They are used in the production of paper, nylon, yeast, alcohol, adhesives, plastics, and vanillin. They lose their identity as forest products long before the consumer stage is reached.

Demand for a product such as lumber behaves differently than does the demand for wood used as a producers' good. This is due to a difference in the price elasticity of demand, a factor which depends largely on the extent to which the commodity is made more attractive to consumers through manufacturing.⁵ Demand depends also on whether the commodity is considered a luxury or a necessity, whether there are any close substitutes, and on the price level. The demand for products such as facial tissues, paper towels, rayon underwear, and nylon stockings is likely to remain fairly stable so long as changes in their retail prices remain within a certain low range or until more desirable substitutes are developed. The demand for lumber, on the other hand, is becoming more and more elastic. Its manufacturing costs and retail prices have increased to a high level with relatively little change in quality of the end product, while at the same time substitutes such as aluminum siding, concrete slabs, and plywood and veneer are competing at an increasing rate.

The elasticity of demand for wooden materials also is affected by the extent the materials are used in a complementary fashion with other goods and services. For example, charcoal will be in demand as long as people use their charcoal grills. The wood-working hobbyist likewise will continue to buy plywood and lumber for milling on the lathes and saws he already owns.

As more of the total wood consumption shifts from uses which are high priced and of limited utility to products which are diverse, of good quality, and relatively inexpensive, it appears likely that the total demand for timber itself will become less elastic, hence more stable. If this stability occurs at a price level which is high enough to allow the manufacturer or processor a fair margin for profit, then the tree farmer will be in a better marketing position than he now enjoys.

The implication, of course, is that tree farmers probably will enjoy favorable markets for their products so long as our growing economy enables a high standard of living and large investment in technology. Because of the extent to which wood is a producers' goods, forestry is particularly vulnerable to any major decline in consumer demand, not merely for wood products but for goods in general. But consumer demand depends on consumer income which can be obtained only by furnishing the productive services used in producing other goods and services. The demand for wood as a producers' good depends, to a large part, therefore, on the level of economic activity in the whole economy. "There can be no such thing as a prosperous forestry without the rest of the economy being prosperous, too."⁶

⁴ Ibid., p. 181.

⁵ Price elasticity refers to the extent to which the consumption of a product will vary with the price asked for it. "Inelastic demand," for example, means that people will buy the same quantity regardless of a change in price. "Elastic demand," on the other hand, means that a small increase in price may bring about a substantial change in the quantity purchased. It is not to be confused with "income elasticity of demand," which is the relative change in demand brought about by a change in the level of income.

⁶ Worrell, op. cit., p. 181.

TABLE 1.—Estimated percentage change in log and bolt requirements for domestic wood product consumption in the United States; based on 3 studies

Wood product	Department of Commerce ¹ (1956-65)	Stanford ² (1952-75)	Department of Agriculture ³ (1952-75)
	Percent	Percent	Percent
Pulpwood.....	+48	+60	+96
Sawlogs for lumber.....		+16	+31
Plywood and veneer logs.....		+90	+80
Other industrial wood (poles, piling, posts, ties, cooperage, charcoal, etc.).....		-1	+14
Total all wood products.....		+14	+30

Source: derived from volume data in:

¹ Albert C. Worrell, "Economics of American Forestry" (New York: John Wiley & Son, Inc., 1959), p. 386, table 20-4, and U.S. Department of Commerce, "Pulp, Paper, and Board Supply Demand," pp. 20, 25, 28, H. Rept. No. 573, 1957.

² Worrell, p. 382, table 20-2, and Summary of Stanford Research Institute, "America's Demand for Wood," table 37, 1954.

³ Worrell, p. 389, table 20-6, and "Timber Resources for America's Future," p. 465, Forest Resource Report No. 14, U.S. Department of Agriculture, Forest Service, 1958. Based on the medium projections which are the basic estimates.

PROJECTIONS OF FUTURE DEMAND

Since 1952 three major forecasts of future market conditions for forest products have been made. Three different agencies—U.S. Department of Agriculture, U.S. Department of Commerce, and Stanford University, California—concluded in the light of reasonable predictions of future economic conditions that the consumption of wood products will increase materially. All of these estimates anticipate a continuous increase in demand for wood products. They differ, however, in estimates of future changes in consumer tastes and preferences. Other differences in their estimates of consumption are due mainly to estimated differences in future price levels of wood products. A summary of these three forecasts of the future is given in table 1.

At this point it appears safe to conclude that the demand for wood products will increase in the future. Precisely what will happen to consumption of wood in the future is less certain because of its dependence on supply; and supply will depend on the production decisions and actions which are taken today. Therefore, today's production decisions and actions will affect future consumption.

LOCAL EXCEPTIONS WILL OCCUR

In spite of the general optimism for future demand of wood products, there will always be local and temporary exceptions. Because in our free enterprise system interaction between supply and demand is a dynamic relationship, complete balance between the two is not likely to occur either in point of time or at any one location. In central and southwest Louisiana, for example, there is now enough surplus pulpwood growing to support six more pulp mills the size of the Calcasieu Mill at Elizabeth, La.⁷ The Calcasieu operation provides employment for 1,200 people. In some areas, industrial development has not continued at a pace fast enough to utilize fully the raw materials available. In other places such as Florida and Georgia, supply has not yet matched demand and there is keen competition among mills for wood.

SOURCE OF FUTURE SUPPLY

Most southern pine is exchanged in southern and eastern markets. But even there

⁷ W. S. Stover, "Bring Us Mills To Match Our Trees," Forests and People, Second Quarter, 1960, published by Louisiana Forestry Association, Alexandria, La., p. 12.

it meets with competition from wood grown in the western part of the United States and in other countries. Therefore, southern timber producers have reason to be interested in present and prospective wood supplied from places beyond their own region.

About 90 percent of the wood products now used in this country is produced here. The remainder is imported chiefly from Canada in the form of softwood products such as pulpwood, woodpulp, and paper. Imported also are some high-quality hardwoods from Central and South America. Canada might increase her exports, but hardly enough to satisfy our expected increased demands. Other free world countries have little softwood timber to spare. It is apparent that we shall continue to depend on our own forests for the bulk of our softwood supply.⁸

Timber from Alaska will probably not enter into eastern lumber markets. A considerable increase in the price of domestic lumber relative to the prices of competing materials would be necessary to make shipments of common grades of lumber from Alaska economically feasible, due to high freight costs. Furthermore, predominant Alaskan species are especially adaptable to pulping, and Alaskan timber is more likely to be used for producing pulp than lumber.

Domestic lumber production is concentrated in the West. Production in 1959 was expected to represent over half of all lumber and two-thirds of the softwood lumber produced in the United States.⁹ About two-thirds of the Nation's sawtimber supply and about 80 percent of the country's softwood growing stock volume is located in the West. Most of this volume is in old-growth sawtimber trees of relatively high quality. In addition, increased utilization of sawmill and plywood mill residues can provide relatively low-cost wood for a major expansion of sulfate pulp and whole-wood fiber production during future decades. Over a longer period, large volumes of wood left as logging slash in old-growth operations may also contribute greatly to the pulpwood supply.¹⁰ It appears that west coast timber will continue to compete with the southern pine in eastern markets.

The South contains about 23 percent of the Nation's growing stock, 18 percent of the sawtimber volume, and 40 percent of the Nation's commercial forest land. Growth rates are high, logging conditions are relatively easy, year-round woods employment is possible, and the labor supply is relatively good. Market location is also highly favorable, with relatively short distances to the great industrial centers in the North and Midwest.¹¹

In 1959 the South expected to produce about 12.1 billion board feet of lumber to account for 33 percent of national production. There has been no marked trend in total production since 1940, although production of softwood lumber has generally declined, while hardwood lumber production increased.¹² About 61 percent of the Nation's pulpwood supply in 1959 came from southern forests. Here, pulpwood production has increased rapidly from 8.1 million cords in 1945, to about 22 million cords in 1959. About 10 percent of the production in 1958

⁸ "Look to Your Timber, America," Miscellaneous Publication No. 766, Forest Service, USDA, February 1960, p. 3.

⁹ "The Demand and Price Situation for Forest Products," Forest Service and Commodity Stabilization Service, USDA, November 1959, pp. 5, 6.

¹⁰ "America's Demand for Wood," Stanford Research Institute, Stanford University, California, 1954, p. 25.

¹¹ "Demand and Price Situation of Forest Products," op. cit., p. 6.

¹² Ibid.

was in the form of chipped residues from sawmills and veneer plants.¹³

Reports from forest surveys and other studies recently completed, or underway in Southern States, reveal that, as a result of increased emphasis on forestry, timber growth cut relationships are improving generally across the South. A State-by-State summary of these latest reports follows:

Louisiana: Current pine growth in a 13-parish area of central and southwest Louisiana, is about twice the pine cut. A surplus exists in this area.¹⁴

Arkansas: The Forest Survey completed in 1959 reveals a 30 percent increase in softwood growing stock (which includes sound, well-formed trees at least 5 inches in diameter) since the 1949 survey.¹⁵

Mississippi: Since 1948 the area of well-stocked forest land has increased from less than one-third to 56 percent of the total forest area. Softwood growing stock is up 8 percent. The net growth of softwood sawtimber (12 inches and larger in diameter) exceeded the cut by 57 percent in 1956.¹⁶

North Carolina: At present, North Carolina's timber is growing faster than it is being cut. Growth of softwood pole timber (trees 5 to 9 inches in diameter) exceeds cut by 68 percent. Softwood sawtimber (9 inches and larger) growth exceeds cut by 11 percent.¹⁷

South Carolina: A current trend level of softwood lumber production is up 11 percent. Pine pulpwood production has increased fourfold during the period 1937-58. Total growth is increasing. Total volume of timber is also increasing, but average size is decreasing. Prospective growth, based on the continuation of the past average annual change in timber volume by diameter class, would sustain a substantial increase in total cut, but it would not sustain a current size class distribution of even the present cut.¹⁸

Florida: Preliminary information on the 1958-59 forest survey shows Florida is "not quite holding its own in pine volume in the 10 years since the 1948 forest survey."¹⁹

Southern pines planted since 1952 will not be large enough to have any great effect on the market supply of plywood and veneer timber or sawlogs for lumber before 1975. Pulpwood supply during this period, however, will vary from area to area. In the Southeastern States of Alabama, Florida, Georgia, and South Carolina it is likely to be less than adequate for pulp and paper mill requirements. In Mississippi, Louisiana, and Texas there is already enough supply on hand to warrant additional industrial expansion.

REASONS FOR OPTIMISM

Present growth-cut relationships of softwoods in some localities may be sufficient reason for landowners to be cautious when considering the planting of additional lands. In some places industrial development has not yet occurred fast enough to utilize fully the added growth of softwoods. Nevertheless, there are some very significant reasons

why tree planting should not be dismissed as an unsound investment.

Trees are a highly durable form of capital. Unlike most other agricultural products, timber is not generally a perishable commodity; it does not have to be cut quickly before it spoils. Also, there is a considerable period of time between the age at which a tree attains merchantable size and the age at which it begins to deteriorate from overmaturity. So, trees ordinarily can be stored on the stump and at the same time increase in volume and value. Unlike the marketing of products such as poultry and cattle, timber normally can be held for sale until prices are favorable. The inherent risk-reducing features of the tree provide built-in flexibility for its management and handling.

Rapid industrial expansion in the South is keeping the economy at a high level. Annual expenditures for new plants and equipment in Georgia and elsewhere in the South have nearly doubled since World War II. They have increased in total annual rate in the region from \$1.4 billion in 1947 to \$2.3 billion in 1958.²⁰ A large share of these expenditures have resulted in the location, expansion, and diversification in the South of most of the Nation's largest forest products corporations.

The demand for forest products will continue to increase so long as the industrial strength of this Nation continues to grow. Industrial growth in a competitive society means more wages for the average worker. It also means more products of greater variety and higher quality for the consumer. As people's new and growing wants for these products keep pace with their rising disposable income, they are relayed back through the layers of industry to the producers forming each of the layers—the retailers, wholesalers, converters, and timber owners. These producers respond by enlarging their capacity and output, for they too are seeking to satisfy their own insatiable wants. And so long as there are renewable, versatile resources to keep the industries going, the demand for goods can be made to grow as rapidly as the capacity to produce them.

EXPORT OF MACHINE TOOLS TO SOVIET UNION

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, during the morning hour on Wednesday I sent to the desk a resolution, the purpose of which was to express that it was the sense of the Senate that the exportation to the Soviet Union of machine tools for the making of ball bearings which may be used for military purposes is inadvisable, and that the approval heretofore granted by the Department of Commerce of a shipment of such tools should be withdrawn.

I then suggested that the proposed resolution be placed directly on the calendar where it could get prompt action. However, later, after talking with the majority leader, I agreed to carry the resolution over until today, with notice then being served that it would be offered during this morning hour, at which time I would ask for its immediate consideration.

However, yesterday I was talking with the Secretary of Commerce, Mr. Hodges, and he advised me that this shipment has been suspended pending a further

study. The Secretary confirmed the fact that while this shipment had been approved by certain officials in the Department of Commerce, the Defense Department had at the same time taken a very strong position, and keep on insisting on that position, that these machine tools could only be used for military purposes, and that in the interest of our national defense their shipment should not be approved. However, now that permission to ship these tools has been suspended there will be no need to call the resolution up at this time. I certainly appreciate the fact that the Secretary of Commerce has reconsidered this earlier decision. The benefit of any doubt as to whether or not these machine tools can be used for military purposes should be resolved in favor of the American people.

I am glad we were able to accomplish this objective without Senate action on the resolution.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I yield.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I wish to compliment the Senator from Delaware on his customary alertness in following through on these questions and carrying them to a conclusion, and I concur in his delight that the order has now been suspended for the so-called small, miniature precision ball bearings that were earmarked for export to the Soviet Union.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I yield.

Mr. KEATING. I commend the distinguished Senator from Delaware for the unflagging interest he has taken in this important matter. The Internal Security Subcommittee conducted hearings on this question, as a result of which it was determined that the Defense Department seriously opposed this license. At the time these hearings were held, the Secretary of Commerce held up the shipment temporarily. I have no doubt in my own mind that it would be a great mistake to send these ball bearing machine tools to Russia. If the Secretary has in fact canceled this license I compliment him for his action, which should have been taken before this.

In my opinion it would be a great mistake to supply any strategic material to the Russians. I would like to see more weight given to the judgment of the Defense Department on these problems. In case of dispute, the sensible procedure, in my opinion, would be to refer the case to the National Security Council for decision rather than to leave it up to the Secretary of Commerce. This is not merely another commercial business transaction. Larger issues of national security and our foreign relations are involved in trade with the Soviet bloc which must not be subordinated to purely economic consideration.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I thank the Senator. I wish to point out also that the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. Dodd], who is chairman of the subcommittee conducting the hearings, has also expressed great concern over the proposed shipment.

¹³ Ibid., p. 9.

¹⁴ W. S. Stover, loc. cit.

¹⁵ H. S. Sternitzke, "Southern Forestry Notes," No. 121, Southern Forest Experiment Station, Forest Service, USDA, May 1959.

¹⁶ "Mississippi Forests," Southern Forest Experiment Station, Forest Service, USDA, 1958, pp. 3-9.

¹⁷ "Timber in North Carolina," Forest Resource Report No. 15, Forest Service, USDA, Washington, D.C., January 1959, p. 7.

¹⁸ Final draft, Forest Survey Release No. 55, entitled "South Carolina's Timber Supply," Southeastern Forest Experiment Station, Forest Service, USDA, 1960.

¹⁹ "Florida Forest Service News," vol. 10, No. 5, Tallahassee, Fla., May 1960.

²⁰ New Factories Double in the South," Atlanta Journal, June 1, 1960.

U.S. MEMBERSHIP IN THE ORGANIZATION FOR ECONOMIC COOPERATION AND DEVELOPMENT

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, there is presently under consideration approval of U.S. membership in the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development. It is entirely possible that the text of the convention has not come to the attention of some of the Members and also the country generally, and I believe it would be useful to include the whole text in the RECORD.

It should be pointed out that this does not include certain special protocols but at least it will familiarize interested persons with the 21 articles which constitute this convention, and I ask that it be made a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the text of the proposed convention was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ARTICLE 1

The aims of the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (hereinafter called the "Organization") shall be to promote policies designed:

- (a) to achieve the highest sustainable economic growth and employment and a rising standard of living in member countries, while maintaining financial stability, and thus to contribute to the development of the world economy;
- (b) to contribute to sound economic expansion in member as well as nonmember countries in the process of economic development; and
- (c) to contribute to the expansion of world trade on a multilateral, nondiscriminatory basis in accordance with international obligations.

ARTICLE 2

In the pursuit of these aims, the members agree that they will, both individually and jointly:

- (a) promote the efficient use of their economic resources;
- (b) in the scientific and technological field, promote the development of their resources, encourage research and promote vocational training;
- (c) pursue policies designed to achieve economic growth and internal and external financial stability and to avoid developments which might endanger their economies or those of other countries;
- (d) pursue their efforts to reduce or abolish obstacles to the exchange of goods and services and current payments and maintain and extend the liberalization of capital movements; and
- (e) contribute to the economic development of both member and nonmember countries in the process of economic development by appropriate means and, in particular, by the flow of capital to those countries, having regard to the importance to their economies of receiving technical assistance and of securing expanding export markets.

ARTICLE 3

With a view to achieving the aims set out in article 1, and to fulfilling the undertakings contained in article 2, the members agree that they will:

- (a) keep each other informed and furnish the organization with the information necessary for the accomplishment of its tasks;
- (b) consult together on a continuing basis, carry out studies, and participate in agreed projects; and
- (c) cooperate closely, and where appropriate, take coordinated action.

ARTICLE 4

The contracting parties of this convention shall be members of the organization.

ARTICLE 5

In order to achieve its aims, the organization may:

- (a) make decisions which, except as otherwise provided, shall be binding on all the members;
- (b) make recommendation to members; and
- (c) enter into agreements with members, nonmember States, and international organizations.

ARTICLE 6

1. Unless the organization otherwise agrees unanimously for special cases, decisions shall be taken and recommendations shall be made by mutual agreement of all the members.

2. Each member shall have one vote. If a member abstains from voting on a decision, or recommendation, such abstention shall not invalidate the decision or recommendation which shall be applicable to the other members, but not to the abstaining member.

3. No decision shall be binding on any member until it has complied with the requirements of its own constitutional procedures. The other members may agree that such a decision shall apply provisionally to them.

ARTICLE 7

A council composed of all the members shall be the body from which all acts of the organization derive. The council may meet in sessions of ministers or of permanent representatives.

ARTICLE 8

The council shall designate each year a chairman, who shall preside at its ministerial sessions, and two vice chairmen. The chairman may be designated to serve one additional consecutive term.

ARTICLE 9

The council may establish an executive committee and such subsidiary bodies as may be required for the achievement of the aims of the organization.

ARTICLE 10

1. A secretary general responsible to the council shall be appointed by the council for a term of 5 years. He shall be assisted by one or more deputy secretaries general or assistant secretaries general appointed by the council on the recommendation of the secretary general.

2. The secretary general shall serve as chairman of the council meeting at sessions of permanent representatives. He shall assist the council in all appropriate ways and may submit proposals to the council or to any other body of the organization.

ARTICLE 11

1. The secretary general shall appoint such staff as the organization may require in accordance with plans of organization approved by the council. Staff regulations shall be subject to approval by the council.

2. Having regard to the international character of the organization, the secretary general, the deputy or assistant secretaries general and the staff shall neither seek nor receive instructions from any of the members or from any government or authority external to the organization.

ARTICLE 12

Upon such terms and conditions as the council may determine, the organization may:

- (a) address communications to nonmember states or organizations;
- (b) establish and maintain relations with nonmember states or organizations; and
- (c) invite nonmember governments or organizations to participate in activities of the organization.

ARTICLE 13

Representation in the Organization of the European Communities established by the

treaties of Paris and Rome of April 18, 1951, and March 25, 1957, shall be as defined in supplementary protocol No. 1 to this convention.

ARTICLE 14

1. This convention shall be ratified or accepted by the signatories in accordance with their respective constitutional requirements.

2. Instruments of ratification or acceptance shall be deposited with the Government of the French Republic, hereby designated as depositary Government.

3. This convention shall come into force—
(a) before September 30, 1961, upon the deposit of instruments of ratification or acceptance by all the signatories; or

(b) on September 30, 1961, if by that date 15 signatories or more have deposited such instruments as regards those signatories, and thereafter as regards any other signatory upon the deposit of its instrument of ratification or acceptance;

(c) after September 30, 1961, but not later than 2 years from the signature of this convention, upon the deposit of such instruments by 15 signatories, as regards those signatories; and thereafter as regards any other signatory upon the deposit of its instrument of ratification or acceptance.

4. Any signatory which has not deposited its instrument of ratification or acceptance when the convention comes into force may take part in the activities of the Organization upon conditions to be determined by agreement between the Organization and such signatory.

ARTICLE 15

When this convention comes into force the reconstitution of the Organization for European Economic Cooperation shall take effect, and its aims, organs, powers, and name shall thereupon be as provided herein. The legal personality possessed by the Organization for European Economic Cooperation shall continue in the Organization, but decisions, recommendations, and resolutions of the Organization for European Economic Cooperation shall require approval of the council to be effective after the coming into force of this convention.

ARTICLE 16

The council may decide to invite any government prepared to assume the obligations of membership to accede to this convention. Such decisions shall be unanimous, provided that for any particular case the council may unanimously decide to permit abstention, in which case, notwithstanding the provisions of article 6, the decision shall be applicable to all the members. Accession shall take effect upon the deposit of an instrument of accession with the depositary government.

ARTICLE 17

Any contracting party may terminate the application of this convention to itself by giving 12 months' notice to that effect to the depositary government.

ARTICLE 18

The headquarters of the Organization shall be in Paris, unless the council agrees otherwise.

ARTICLE 19

The legal capacity of the Organization and the privileges, exemptions, and immunities of the Organization, its officials and representatives to it of the member shall be as provided in supplementary protocol No. 2 to this convention.

ARTICLE 20

1. Each year, in accordance with financial regulations adopted by the council, the secretary general shall present to the council for approval an annual budget, accounts, and such subsidiary budgets as the council shall request.

2. General expenses of the organization as agreed by the council, shall be apportioned in accordance with a scale to be decided upon

by the council. Other expenditure shall be financed on such basis as the council may decide.

ARTICLE 21

Upon the receipt of any instrument of ratification, acceptance or accession, or of any notice of termination, the depository government shall give notice thereof to all the contracting parties and to the secretary general of the organization.

In Witness Whereof, the undersigned plenipotentiaries, duly empowered, have appended their signatures to this convention.

Done in Paris, this 14th day of December, 1960, in the English and French languages, both texts being equally authentic, in a single copy which shall be deposited with the depository government, by whom certified copies will be communicated to all the signatories.

NBC "WHITE PAPER" DESCRIBES TURMOIL IN PANAMA

Mr. PROXMIER. Mr. President, television's ability to probe searchingly beneath the surface of the day's news has been well illustrated by the National Broadcasting Co.'s "White Paper" series. The title for the series is taken from the traditional white papers of the British Government, which for generations have been the printed form of painstakingly accurate reports on controversial situations. Earlier broadcasts in the NBC series deepened our understanding of the U-2 overflights and the sit-ins. Last week a third "White Paper" homed in on "Panama: Danger Zone."

Just 15 months ago, in November 1959, Americans were shocked to discover that the slender ribbon of real estate in Central America called Panama seethed with tension. On the anniversary of Panama's independence, thousands of Panamanians tried to force their way into the United States-protected Canal Zone, in a turbulent effort to demonstrate sovereignty over the territory containing the lifeline of Western commerce and defense, the Panama Canal. The riots caused great concern among many who had long assumed that the operations of the canal were free of the social and economic problems that beset much of the world.

"Panama: Danger Zone" explores the background that led to these dramatic events. It describes our efforts in the intervening year to come to new terms with the residents of that land. Documentary film clips help show that Panama today is also involved in the ageless conflict between those in and out of power, between the haves and the have-nots, between the well-fed and the hungry.

The program was narrated by the distinguished news commentator, Chet Huntley. It was produced by Al Wasserman and Irving Gittlein, and written and directed by Harry Rasky.

Because the script gives some idea of the excellence of this broadcast, I ask unanimous consent that it be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

NBC WHITE PAPER No. 3—"PANAMA: DANGER ZONE"

VOICE. It's truly the eighth wonder of the world. Identical since the day it was

opened to world commerce. The number of miles saved between New York and San Francisco by using the Panama Canal is a little short of 8,000 miles. All the operations that you are now viewing, nothing has been changed in almost half a century.

Mr. HUNTLEY. The Stars and Stripes have flown unchallenged over the Panama Canal for the last half century. It is true, little if anything has changed here. But around the canal, the world has been changing. And here, in the Republic of Panama, a country whose friendship we have taken for granted since its birth, The Panama Canal has now become a danger zone.

LORD KONTIKI (singing).

Panama, Panama,
My lovin' Panama.
Panama, Panama, O Panama!
Breaking point of the Americas,
The land divided and the world united.
Sam, Sam, Uncle Sam,
He wants to keep the canal.
If it's a question of sovereignty
He won't recognize Panamanian nationality.

Mr. HUNTLEY. In Panama, each day during May and December there is a darkness at noon as the clouds blacken the sky. The silent people wait for the storm that is almost inevitable.

And at this moment in history, in Panama, another kind of storm is also threatening.

A little over a year ago, in November 1959, on the anniversary of Panama's independence, thousands of Panamanians demonstrated against the United States and tried to force their way into the Canal Zone. The leader of the mob, Member of Panama's Chamber of Deputies, Aquilino Boyd.

Mr. BOYD. The Panamanians felt that they should go to the Canal Zone on November 3, 1959, because that was a way of showing the world that we are sovereigns in that part of our territory and we wanted to bring the Panamanian flag over there as proof of our sovereignty and the way that we were received there by General, by name, Potter, it was outrageous.

General POTTER. It had been bruited around for quite a while that there would be disturbances on November 3. Various groups there, some of them Communist inspired, had said they were going to march into the Canal Zone. They attempted to do it and under the law, and I believe in the law, I was required to stop them. We tried to do it with the police at first, without any show of arms, but finally when the police were overrun, and about 20 percent of them were in the hospital, why we had to call out the troops.

Mr. KONTIKI.—

The Governor gave the order
On the third of November
The Governor gave the order
On the third of November
The Army was given full command
Meaning to stop the demonstration
By the border, they put up a sign
Panamanian don't cross the borderline.
Although they put up the sign
Panamanians did cross the borderline.
And they're singing "Viva Panama."
Soverana el a sona vel canal.

1959, the third of November
A riot took place in Panama
The citizens were not mystified
It was led by Deputy Aquilino Boyd.
When they went up Fourth of July Avenue
American greet Panamanian for true
The soldiers with their bayonets
Throw in boom-bullets and tear gas.
The Governor gave the order
On the third of November
William Potter gave the order
On the third of November
The army was given full command
Meaning to stop the demonstration.

By the border they put up a sign
Panamanian don't cross the borderline
Although they put the sign
Panamanians still cross the borderline.

And they're singing:
"Viva Panama, soverana el a sona vel canal.
Viva Panama, soverana el a sona vel canal."

Mr. BOYD. General Potter gave the Panamanians the impression that he has cucarachas in his head because the way he acted and his reactions were very much unfavorable to the United States and to the Government that he represents.

General POTTER. Well, I'm not too sure as to the proper location of the cucarachas, that would be a subject of some discussion. Aquilino Boyd, who I know quite well, is a fine young man, fine appearing and so on and so forth; he is a politico in Panama, he is one of the 57 deputies; I am sometimes suspicious of the statements of politicians, as are most people.

Mr. BOYD. A group of patriots that went there were received by the U.S. Army with fixed bayonets, with birdshots, with hoofs, with clubs, tear gas and the Panamanian people were very fond of the U.S. Army. The army that has fought twice for democracy, the heroes of Guadalcanal and Okinawa were certainly not at their best part. This man, by the name "Potter" called on them to put up that show that was a disgrace of the relations of the United States with Panama.

Mr. HUNTLEY. The aftermath of riot brought increased tension and division to Panama. General Potter ordered the construction of a fence along a section of the Canal Zone.

It stretched along the borderline with Panama where no physical barrier had existed before. And it became a symbol—not only of distrust between the United States and the people of Panama, but also of a changing mood in Latin America.

In January 1959, when Fidel Castro came to power in Cuba, no one realized that before this year was out, the emotions of revolution and inflamed nationalism would have infected all of Central and South America. Certainly, few would have believed it possible for anti-American riots to be directed against the Panama Canal, the heart of our strategic position in Latin America. Why did these riots occur? What do they portend for the future? Will there be further riots? How secure is the Panama Canal? What lessons can we learn from the events in Panama?

The Republic of Panama is located at the crossroads of the hemisphere. It links North and South America—and divides the Atlantic and Pacific Oceans. It is the bridge between the Caribbean, an extension of the Atlantic on the north, and the Pacific on the south. And the American-built Panama Canal—50 miles long—slices Panama in half. The Canal Zone extends roughly 5 miles on either side of the canal. And it is there, at the ninth parallel, that the American flag flies, dividing a sovereign nation in two.

This is the Panama Canal—a manmade strait—a funnel for ships moving from one ocean to the other. From 2,000 feet up you can look out at the two oceans at once—from the Atlantic in the foreground, through Gatun Lake, then Gaillard Cut, to the Pacific in the distance.

The seat of American Government in the Canal Zone, and the present Governor, Gen. W. A. Carter, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers.

Mr. CARTER. This canal, of course, is the responsibility of the Government of the United States. It was built by the United States, it has been operated as a public utility for world shipping ever since its inception. I can see the ships come through here. And every time they blow the whistle it means more money in the till. The strategic value of the canal is as great now as it ever was.

The chief user, much to everyone's surprise, is the United States. About 70 percent of the traffic through the canal in a year, either is going to the United States, or from the United States. It goes, of course, to all the ports in the world. However, the canal is of vital importance to the countries in Central and South America—particularly those countries on the west coast of South America. For example, I believe the figures are that Peru and Chile—about 70 to 80 percent of their entire export and import goes through this canal. It makes no profit, it runs at no cost to the United States; the only requirement for a ship coming through this canal is that she pay her money, for her tolls, in cash before we put a pilot aboard. Any ship of any nation that comes here goes through the canal. Of our 14,000 employees, about 10,000 are Panamanian citizens, but as long as it's the responsibility of the U.S. Government to provide this world utility for the transportation of the world, I personally believe that the United States must continue to operate the canal.

Mr. HUNTLEY. The fact that we have always operated and owned the canal since it opened in 1914 is something Americans have taken for granted, and the story of the canal's construction is an epic chapter in American history.

A graveyard of equipment remained as evidence of those who tried before us and failed. Ferdinand de Lesseps, the Frenchman who built Suez, met with ruin and heartbreak when 22,000 men died during his attempt.

When the Americans began in 1904, they were confronted with a section of the world's worst jungle. The legend among diplomats at this time in Panama was that each of their predecessors was shipped home in a coffin.

For Panama was a sinkhole of tropical fevers—they called it the white man's grave.

Col. William Gorgas set out to eliminate the dread yellow fever. Each mosquito killed by his Gorgas Gangs, as they were called, cost the United States an estimated \$10. But his work saved 70,000 lives.

Col. George Washington Goethals, appointed by Theodore Roosevelt to take command of construction, went down the line to inspect the work every morning. And under his charge new world records were set for excavation.

Mr. SEELEY. The boys from the canal used to go in on Saturday nights for their regular high time at the cantinas and other spots of interest in the city, but I wouldn't say that it was very wild. It always had a charm for me, because it was something so different than I had ever encountered in my life before. Roosevelt, at that time, set the precedent of a President leaving the United States territory and coming into a foreign country, said when he was here that he came for a firsthand look at how things were going. While he was here, he took great delight in slipping away from the official crowd that had him in tow and was found somewhere else all of a sudden. They didn't know just how he got there, but he got there, and usually in conversation with some employee of some division.

Mr. HUNTLEY. In August of 1914—after 40,000 men had labored for 10 years—the oceans were finally to be joined at Gamboa.

Mr. SEELEY. Well, of course, a great deal of excitement prevailed at Gamboa—where the dike was to be blown up—the explosion came from President Wilson pressing a button on his desk in Washington. Explosion. It was quite a thing to see that much material fly into the air and see that great sweep of water come in and fill up the cut. I think everyone that saw that dam blow up received a great thrill from the sight.

Mr. HUNTLEY. The thrill and the excitement of that opening day—August 15, 1914,

was reported 'round the world. America boasted its greatest achievement—and our growing military, economic, and political might were symbolized in the American flag that flew over it. But the Panamanians prefer to emphasize another side of the story.

The Spanish explorer, Balboa, had built a city in Panama in 1501—and the existence of the Camino Real—the Royal Road across the Isthmus—represented a proud Spanish tradition that predated our own. In fact, Simon Bolívar, in 1826, wanted Panama to be capital of the Americas.

In 57 years, 53 rebellions were fought by Panamanians trying to free themselves from Colombia.

Theodore Roosevelt boasted, "I took the Isthmus," when he helped create the country of Panama in 1903 using U.S. military might to back their cause of independence.

A treaty was rushed through granting the United States the right to build a canal. But Panamanians claim the treaty gave them few benefits.

The canal administration brought in 45,000 laborers from the West Indies to do the heavy work—under American supervision. This influx of English-speaking Negroes created problems of assimilation that still exist and cause resentment even today.

The Americans built a comfortable colony for themselves—while shanty towns sprang up for the other workers—which still remain.

The most bitter Panamanian complaint was against payroll practices—the double standard set by the so-called gold and silver rolls. The gold roll which meant high pay for Americans. The silver roll—for the others, including native Panamanians—meant a tropical wage scale and lower rates even for comparable work.

When the Americans arrived, the Panamanians say they set a social standard reminiscent of the British in colonial India. Here then was the Panama Canal—a vital strategic, military, and economic resource of the United States—which also benefits Panama to the tune of \$63 million annually, directly and indirectly—one-sixth of their national income. But the Panamanians feel they should have larger economic benefits from the canal, which they consider their greatest national resource.

The historical resentments of Panamanians toward Americans were brought into focus by the question of whose flag should fly over the Panama Canal.

According to the Treaty of 1903 between the United States and Panama, the United States is granted rights in perpetuity to act as if it were sovereign in the Canal Zone. The vague phrase: "as if it were sovereign" is interpreted by this country and most experts on international law as giving the United States full rights in the zone. It is not so interpreted by the Panamanians.

Former Panamanian President Dr. Harmodio Arias, considered by many the most powerful man in Panama, talks to NBC News Reporter Harry Rasky.

Dr. Arias. I may tell you that the treaty of 1903, when the U.S. officials took charge of the Canal Zone, they did not raise the American flag. Only the Panamanian flag was raised, and in 1906 during the—an investigation in the Senate of the United States—the first Governor of the Panama Canal, General Davies, admitted that the flag of the United States was not being—was not being raised in the Canal Zone.

And that only the Panama flag—and that there were doubts in his mind whether the United States had rights to—to have the flag in the Canal Zone. Subsequently, after 1906, the United States started to put up the flag and eliminate the Panamanian flag. Since then, that has been a source of resentment on the part of the Panamanian people.

Mr. HUNTLEY. Representative DANIEL FLOOD, of Pennsylvania, who has long had an interest in Panama.

Representative FLOOD. The juridical position of the United States of America is clear. Once you have established a constitutional position, and the position of the United States of America in the Canal Zone, is a constitutional position, the result of a treaty with the Republic of Panama, ratified by the Senate of the United States. Therefore, under our Constitution, that treaty becomes the law of the land. The Canal Zone is an extension of the coastline of the United States of America.

Mr. HUNTLEY. Just opposite Panama City, the capital of Panama—and separated from it only by a street—an American town has been built in the Canal Zone: Balboa. Its residents—U.S. citizens—have definite views about their rights and the place in which they live.

Mr. RASKY. Do you, as a resident here, feel that this is a part of the United States?

Mr. LOVELADY. I don't feel that it's a part of the United States, but I do feel that it is land over which the United States has acquired complete jurisdictional rights in perpetuity and that the United States can do with the place what it pleases so long as it does it within the bounds of the treaties that exist between Panama and the U.S. Governments.

Mr. HUNTLEY. What the Canal Zone residents have done is to recreate a tiny slice of America on the ninth parallel.

The morning paper is the Panama American—in English—the banks are American—and so are the stamps—movies and television shows are a little late in coming—but 100 percent American.

The supermarkets have attractively low prices which has been a source of resentment to those who live across the road in the Republic of Panama, where prices for the same goods are high.

The central eating place along the main street called a club house, once maintained a color line. It no longer does, but Panamanians are still critical of the attitudes of U.S. citizens in the zone.

Mrs. AROSEMENA. Well, we call them sonians more or less and I believe they are a different kind of American because they're real American that come here after 1 or 2 months; they live in the Canal Zone; they think they are better off than anyone else and really we don't believe so. In the United States they are very hospitable, here they are very stubborn, they are snobs, and they don't like to mix with the Latin American people.

Mr. HUNTLEY. The Panamanians point to the Tivoli Hotel as an example of American aloofness in the Canal Zone. Some of the permanent guests say they haven't stepped into the Republic of Panama in years. The Republic of Panama is just across the street. For all the mixing that goes on, says one American, that street might as well be the Grand Canyon.

At the schools in Balboa and other Zone towns, the day always begins the same.

They pledge allegiance to the country many have never seen . . . descendants of the men who once dug the canal.

Across the road in Panama—only a stone's throw away—Panamanian children begin their day the same way, singing their national anthem—but in a different setting.

The name of the slum is Puente Del Rey, which translates, "Bridge of the King." Here, too, are descendants of the canal diggers.

The setting is Panama, but this could just as easily be Caracas, Venezuela, or Rio, Tegucigalpa, Lima, Santiago, Havana. For Panama, in its basic internal problems, is almost indistinguishable from any other Latin land.

For most Latin Americans, there is only one hope for breaking the circle of poverty—the Government lottery. In Panama, it begins promptly at 11 a.m. Sunday morning—and is all over a few minutes later.

As in all Latin America, there is heavy unemployment. This is accentuated by a system of patronage rather than a constant civil service. When the administration changes, all government jobs also change. And a man must wait his turn.

The current president, in office only a few months, has started regular days of audience with the unemployed. Weeks of waiting—a Latin learns to wait—may lead to a personal interview—and perhaps a job.

President Chiari, a millionaire, but considered a liberal, talks to a lucky few—but knows there is not enough work to go around.

Like all Latin countries, Panama suffers not only from urban poverty but also from underdevelopment in the rural areas, where over half the population lives. The interior, potentially rich, is almost without roads.

The wheel, and even the plow, are strangers here. The machete is the chief farm implement, frequently the only one. Most of the farmers are squatters, contributing nothing to the national economy and barely able to survive themselves.

The chief industry, as in most Central and South American countries, is owned by North Americans. In Panama, the proprietor of the largest banana plantation in Central America is the Chiriqui Land Co., a part of the United Fruit Co. It is the largest private land owner in the country, employing 11,000 workers, most of them descendants of the Indians from the hills.

In the past, much criticism had been directed against the company for the working conditions of its Panamanian employees—but today, conditions are improved. The workers earn more and live better than laborers outside the plantation even though they are crowded six families to six rooms, all sharing a common kitchen.

The company provides a free school for the children of employees—and a clinic, with free hospitalization for those making less than \$100 a month.

There is also a company store, but its goods are priced too high for most of the laborers.

Even though time has brought changes for the better, the fact that a U.S. concern is still the largest private employer in Panama is a continuing source of irritation, and many Panamanians still refer to the Chiriqui Land Co. as El Pulpo, the Octopus. President Chiari explains why there has been a growth of anti-Americanism.

Mr. CHIARI. Sometimes I believe, we have developed, more than anything else, these countries where the economical way of living is very, very poor. And then, of course, they have seen that in some other places in like your own country, there are wonderful ways of living, they will like also to have the same thing. But what happens, when they buy most of the product from your own country they have to pay a very high price for those products on account that you have a very high standard of life. But when we try to sell our products, I mean our country, I mean every country in South America also, then we resent that the prices we get for our products does not compare with the high cost of the product that we pay for when we import it from the United States. And in that way, I say, you cannot take everything for you that is good and let the other people take the poorest or the shortest piece of whatever has been tried to deal between the two countries. And that is one of the reasons of these little ill-feelings and resentments that have occurred between Latin American People and U.S. people.

Mr. HUNTLEY. This is Father Laburu, a Jesuit priest. He is speaking about an additional source of resentment in Panama. "Panama" says the priest, "is a small country. There are a few rich people, and there are many poor." And this is what disturbs Father

Laburu, the tremendous contrast between the poor in Panama and the few rich families who dominate the country and have traditionally been concerned only with themselves. His message speaks for itself.

Laburu's voice up: Father Laburu sounds a warning when he says, "Those on top have worried very little about the ones below. Those below have always hated the upper classes. And I tell you, this is a tremendous struggle that is going on."

Mr. HUNTLEY. Over Panama, and Latin America generally, a storm was gathering—but most Americans did not know it, or ignored it. The problem of oppressive poverty, a small wealthy ruling oligarchy, a one-produce economy, a sense of offended national pride, an unstable political system—these had existed for generations. But now, a new idea was injected—the revolutionary message of Fidel Castro.

In 1959, a new voice was heard to add to the stirrings of resentment—against us, and of the poor against the rich. And the voice came from outside Panama. Beamed by powerful transmitters from Cuba, the voice of Fidelism was heard by the Panamanians.

Castro's voice was aimed most directly at students, and his message helped spark the feelings of nationalism and rage that caused the students to lead the anti-American riots of November 1959.

This is Panama University, established 25 years ago * * * the center of Panamanian intellectual life.

Rich Panamanians send their children abroad to be educated and the students here come mostly from the emerging middle class. A majority of them must work, and they attend classes only at night, leaving an almost deserted campus during the daytime.

KONTIKI:

Panama, O Panama!

Breaking point of the Americas.

The land divided and the world united.

Mr. HUNTLEY. The president of the university, Dr. Garay.

Dr. GARAY. These young students of ours, most of them are not even in the university. Suffer from reality. Reality pushes more the student toward a political way of thinking than does any other thing. Give the country a satisfactory political system and you will find the whole country including the 19- and 18-year-olds, backing that system and even defending it to the last drop of blood.

STUDENT. The majority of students, Panamanian students, I think, agree with the Cuban Revolution because they see in the Cuban Revolution what we can say in the Latin Revolutions. The same things Castro is trying, trying, to resolve is the same things we have. We have an historical equality with the other Latin American countries. We have equal problems and we have the same enemies.

GIRL STUDENT. At the beginning I sympathized with Castro, but not any more because I don't like his ideas. He is a sort of Communist and I don't sympathize with the Communists.

STUDENT. I don't care if he is Communist, as the Cuban says, if Fidel is Communist, well I don't care if they put me in the police, understand?

Mr. RASKY. In other words, what you are trying to say is that if what Fidel stands for is Communist, that's okay with you.

STUDENT. Okay, I don't care. If to be Communist is to be freedom, okay, I like the Communist. If that is the correct expressions.

Mr. HUNTLEY. The revolutionary spirit extends to others. Deputy Thelma King, representing a small minority opinion in Parliament.

Deputy KING. I am with Castro, definitely. Mr. RASKY. How many people in Panama, would you say, were for Castro? What percentage of the population was for Castro?

Deputy KING. I think the majority of the people in Panama are for Castro. Because we understand that if it was not for Castro, the United States would not change their policy toward Latin America.

Mr. RASKY. How about if there was going to be a revolution here in Panama, that a firing squad would be necessary.

Deputy KING. I don't like it. I personally don't like it but I know in a revolution so many people have to die. Maybe when one comes, I will be one.

Mr. HUNTLEY. Ambassador to Britain, Roberto Arias, alleged leader of one aborted revolution.

Mr. ARIAS. I have been accused of being involved in a revolutionary attempt, or in various revolutionary attempts, here in Panama, I still believe that Panama needs a revolution. I think it needs a revolution because it needs profound social reform. God grant that it be a bloodless one.

Mr. HUNTLEY. Revolutionary talk, Castroism, anti-Americanism, internal resentments, added to the charged atmosphere. As the first anniversary of the riots of November 1959 drew close, tension rose in Panama. What made the situation even more dangerous was that Latin-American experts were predicting that riots in the Canal Zone in November of 1960 could spread through all Latin America, endangering our whole position there. In the State Department, the Panamanian desk was busier than any other except the Cuban. What emerged was a reappraisal of our approach to the Panamanian problem. The entire American high command in Panama changed.

The State Department sent a new Ambassador—ex-FBI man, and former envoy to the Dominican Republic, Joseph Farland.

Mr. FARLAND. I no sooner got off the gangplank onto the shores of Panama, than I realized that there existed in Panama a political climate which did not augur well for the best relations between our two countries. The atmosphere was charged, politically and emotionally, and the possibility of real conflict was in evidence.

Mr. HUNTLEY. The Pentagon appointed a new head for its Caribbean Command—a man with a good record in human relations—Maj. Gen. Theodore Bogart.

General BOGART. I discovered the situation existing here which was, which represented a great cleavage in relations between this community and the Panamanian community. I realized that what we were seeing was a continuation of a situation that grew out of the last November situation here in Panama.

Mr. FARLAND. It's always customary for an incoming Ambassador to hold a staff meeting and this I did. My instructions to the staff were short and explicit. I told each and every one to forget the necessity of writing reports * * * to get out and to meet the people and to shake hands, and to carry to those people the message of friendship.

Operation Friendship—Amistad—was the name General Bogart gave to a plan for starting the flow of people across the borderline. It involved athletic meets at which Panamanian and American children competed in sporting events.

American jazz played an important role in joint entertainment. American and Panamanian musicians performed together in the Republic of Panama.

Panamanian choirs came to the Canal Zone for the first time to sing Spanish songs * * * before mixed audiences.

Operation Friendship was admittedly a public-relations gesture—a hurried effort to ease a restrained situation. Some questioned its effectiveness.

Sergeant ROE. People who actually count in the—in this thing do not pay much attention to Operation Friendship because the word "friendship" as I know it, and as I've found it in the dictionary—ah—definitely indicates a two-way street. At the present

time, the attitude is not so. The friendship is being offered by the people of the Canal Zone, but it is not being accepted.

Mr. HUNTLEY. On September 17, 1960, the Panamanian press received a bulletin that President Eisenhower had ordered the flying of the Panamanian flag at one spot inside the Canal Zone, in a head-on attempt to deflate anti-American feeling.

In record time—flag poles were set up in the area called Shaler's triangle—close to the border with the Republic of Panama—and a quick ceremony was arranged to raise the Panamanian flag.

The move drew attack from some quarters in Congress.

Representative Flood. This is Munich in spades, if I make myself clear. I think the decision was made in the hope that they would appease the mobs which are dictating the foreign policy of the Republic of Panama. It is appalling that any action by our Department of State and/or by the President, and/or by the White House, that vague thing called the White House, which—we're not sure what that means—they advised the President—and they advised him improperly, and wrongly in this case.

Mr. FARLAND. I am particularly gratified at the President's decision. And, while I am not in a position—in my capacity here—as you can well recognize, to enter into any controversy, regarding the advisability of the decision, I can only say this, that the decision taken by the President is in accord with the reporting from this Embassy.

Mr. HOLCOMBE. Well, in my own opinion I felt that was one of the most sensible decisions and positive actions that the American Government had taken toward the Panamanian Government to sponsor good relationship and fraternal feeling for many, many years in the past. I thought it was an excellent thing.

Mr. HUNTLEY. Despite the controversy, the Panamanian flag was flying. The question was—Would this rushed move head off the predicted November riots on the anniversary of Panama's independence? In the days that preceded the anniversary, all military precautions were taken. The Panamanian National Guard prepared, and, on the U.S. side, in the zone, all military equipment was kept in condition, in the event of any emergency.

Meanwhile, a message of forbearance was preached in the American cathedral of St. Luke's in the Canal Zone, and in the Panamanian church of Father Laburu. He says to the women of his congregation, "I urge you to be calm this year. Tell your husbands not to demonstrate * * * to be patient. The Americans in the Canal Zone are changing. Let us live in harmony. On the morning of the day the riots are anticipated * * * the streets of Panama are unusually quiet. * * *

Along Fourth of July Avenue, the borderline, Panamanian National Guardsmen wait. Canal Zone police take up positions at Shaler's triangle * * * where the Panamanian flag flies.

U.S. forces are ready for trouble, but every effort is made to avoid it. As a personal gesture of friendship, General Bogart exhibits the Panamanian flag outside his home.

And for the first time in the half century history of the canal, Panamanians are invited, in celebration of their own Independence Day, to parade through the U.S. Canal Zone.

Along Fourth of July Avenue * * * in front of the post office where last year's riots were centered, there is the first rush of morning traffic. Panamanian National Guardsmen move into position. But no American troops.

And then the parade into the Canal Zone. Past the homes of zone residents * * * past the American church, the Panamanian flag is paraded.

Students from the University of Panama * * * some of whom took part in last year's riots.

Some zone residents are skeptical, still expecting trouble.

And now into Shaler's triangle, the likely location of any disturbance.

Cameras from half a dozen countries * * * come to report trouble.

The Panamanian anthem, played in the U.S. Canal Zone.

And then it is over. In contrast with the year before, not one placard, not one anti-American sign, not a single rock thrown, no words of anger.

AQUILINO BOYD. Well, that proves you that the Panamanian people do not hate the American people. Mr. Eisenhower in September issued a Presidential order, an Executive order, so that the Panamanian flag flies right next to the American flag in the Canal Zone and I think that that is the explanation why we didn't have to go this year over there.

THELMA KING. I guess the Panamanians, especially the youth, are giving the United States a new opportunity—to arrange our complaints in a friendly way.

STUDENT. Well, the demonstration doesn't happen * * * it is because the circumstance that we have last November don't have this year. First the U.S. Governor put out his troops, the special guards they have, we don't see any masks, gas masks, we don't see any guns—or things like that—well, we can, well we can't do the demonstration like we did last time.

Mr. RASKY. Would you say that this was a victory for the State Department?

STUDENT. Well, no, not completely a victory—they changed their way of fight, that's all. In a big combat, a little victory doesn't mean that they are winning the fight.

Mr. FARLAND. Well, the use of the word victory is not fully descriptive. What we did, both Panamanians and U.S. citizens—working together—was to reverse a very dangerous trend. We must never forget that Panama, situated as it is, is the crossroads of the world, and much of our policy is reflected in Panama. The fires that we found have been banked. There is much yet to be done.

FATHER LABURU. Si. * * *

Mr. HUNTLEY. Yes, says Father Laburu. There is much to be done. Perhaps now our own rich are going to change. They must know if they do not give with their money today—tomorrow they will pay with their blood.

The people of Panama—the people of Latin America—have been slow to change. In their religious rituals, they cling to an old Spanish March—two steps forward—one step back. But today they are on the move, stirring from the darkness of their past. Throughout Latin America, a great explosive force is ready to erupt. They look to us for leadership—for help. They can no longer be ignored.

Mr. ARIAS. I feel that if this help doesn't come quickly, all of the countries of Latin America will go into a chaotic condition. The help is needed immediately, urgently. Otherwise the masses are going to revolt against the respective governments and it will be a very difficult problem then. Not only a problem for ourselves, which will be great suffering, but also for the United States.

Mr. CHIARI. Well, you must realize that there have been a lot of times when we just talk and talk but there is not action. And I don't believe that now is the time for talk—it is time for action—and I mean it. I mean it.

Mr. HUNTLEY. The events of last November in Panama must be judged in the perspective of history. Rushed gestures of friendship, hurried recognition of national pride and a deliberate attempt to avoid a riot paid off as a stopgap measure. But the

lasting problems of Panama's great economic and social needs—and the importance of helping them to help themselves cannot be solved so easily. What is required is not response to a riot, but the careful advance planning of a consistent program toward Latin America—taking into consideration the requirements of the people and the knowledge that the tide of events brings inevitable change in the hemisphere. If Panama is truly the mirror of our attitudes toward Latin America, we must realize that magnificent and strategic as the canal is as an economic and military resource, it may in the long run prove less important to our country, and, in fact the world, than our handling of the social challenges that make the Panama Canal a danger zone. This is Chet Huntley.

THE FOREIGN LEGION OF U.S. PUBLIC RELATIONS

Mr. PROXMIER. Mr. President, Reporter magazine has established a distinguished record for perceptive, accurate reporting of controversial situations which lurk just behind or beyond the pages of the daily newspapers. In the past it has presented outstanding articles on the China Lobby, the loyalty-security program, and the politics of oil, to name just a few among many.

In a recent issue of the Reporter, Douglass Cater and Walter Pincus continue this record of searching depth-reporting, with an analysis of the behind-the-scenes efforts of public relations firms to influence the U.S. Government on behalf of foreign nations. The article details the many successful efforts to plant stories favorable to foreign governments in the legitimate American news media, including radio, television, newspapers, and the wire services. It is disconcerting to learn that "news" stories from and about several foreign countries are frequently written and "placed" by well-paid public relations men. The article points out that one firm estimates it successfully places 1 to 200 in American newspapers each week. In several countries, the wire service "stringer" has been on the payroll of the government he is supposed to be covering.

The result of this is that calculated propaganda on behalf of foreign nations frequently is printed all over our country without any indication of its source. This occurs in spite of the explicit provision in the Foreign Agents Registration Act that any communications intended to influence "any section of the public * * * with reference to the political or public interests, policies, or relations of a government of a foreign country" must be clearly labeled as such. Justice Hugo Black has said of this requirement that it rests on "the fundamental constitutional principle that our people adequately informed may be trusted to distinguish between the true and the false [and] the bill is intended to label information of foreign origin so that the bearers and readers may not be deceived that the information comes from a disinterested source."

Mr. President, this article makes it clear that in many cases our people, and our Government, have been deceived. To bring this alarming situation to the attention of my fellow Senators and a

wider audience, I ask permission that it be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

THE FOREIGN LEGION OF U.S. PUBLIC
RELATIONS

(By Douglass Cater and Walter Pincus)

On January 30, 1959, the president of the Mutual Broadcasting System, Alexander L. Guterma, accompanied by the chairman of Mutual's board of directors, Hal Roach, Jr., and several other associates, flew to Ciudad Trujillo, capital of the Dominican Republic. There he entered into an unusual agreement with representatives of dictator Rafael Trujillo. For a consideration of \$750,000, paid in advance, Guterma agreed that for an 18-month period Mutual would broadcast a "monthly minimum of 425 minutes of news and commentary, regarding the Dominican Republic." Trujillo's government would serve as its own news agency, supplying Mutual with items of news interest "by telegrams, air-mail dispatches, or telephonic beeper calls." Guterma also gave the Dominicans power of censorship by guaranteeing not to broadcast news inconsistent with their country's best interests, "in your sole and exclusive judgment."

Subsequently, a series of legal actions proceeded out of this deal—a hearing under the Bankruptcy Act involving Mutual, a civil action filed by the Dominicans to get their money back, and a Justice Department case against Guterma for failing to register as a foreign agent. From these proceedings, a fairly detailed account of what happened can be pieced together.

The origins of the agreement Guterma made in Ciudad Trujillo may be traced back to several earlier encounters between Saul S. Nevins, an attorney seeking capital for Guterma, and Porfirio Rubirosa, the celebrated international bridegroom who at the time was serving as Dominican Ambassador to Cuba. During one meeting, Rubirosa complained about the unfavorable press coverage his government was getting in the United States. Nevins had earlier shown how Mutual could do something about it. Nevins had phoned in a story from Ciudad Trujillo about anti-Batista sentiment in the Dominican Republic that subsequently was broadcast twice from Washington, with Nevins identified as Mutual correspondent in the Dominican Republic. Mutual's Washington news director testified later that the practice of taking such information was not unusual. "We get a good deal of our news from people [who are not] newsmen. These can be fire chiefs, Senators, Congressmen."

Evidently the idea that such news coverage could be a salable commodity did not take long to develop. When Guterma's group met with Otto Vega, special assistant to Generalissimo Trujillo, they came right to the point. "They said they were in a position to secure * * * in the United States an outlet for our news," Vega testified later. Guterma produced a map of the mutual network and pointed out the number of stations that would be involved.

BROKER RUBIROSA

Guterma also provided another quick demonstration of the product he was prepared to sell. According to Vega's testimony: "He said, 'Give me an idea, some piece of news you would like to broadcast.' I said that I did not have anything. He said, 'Well, since we have Mr. Rubirosa here and Mr. Roach here, why not say Mr. Rubirosa is going to make a picture for Hal Roach in the Dominican Republic and they are negotiating that.' The very next day, returning to New York in Guterma's private plane, the group heard Walter Winchell recite their make-believe news item over the Mutual network.

During that same flight, Guterma showed Nevins a draft copy of the specific terms he was prepared to offer the Dominicans. The lawyer later professed amazement at their boldness. It amounted to nearly 15 minutes daily to be "carried by the entire network * * * in a normal course of our broadcasting day." There was only one restriction: "We will not carry any news extolling the Communist cause but agree that the primary purpose is to exemplify the stability and tranquility of the Dominican Republic and its unequivocal position and stand against communism."

Nevins was fearful that the contract might run afoul of the law requiring agents of foreign governments to register with the Justice Department. To get around this requirement, he arranged to draw up papers creating for Guterma a new corporation, Radio News Service, which could claim exemption from the act on the grounds that it was a bona fide news-gathering agency.

The terms were acceptable to both sides, and on February 5, the negotiators having returned to Ciudad Trujillo, Vega brought to Guterma's suite at the El Embajador Hotel a cloth sack containing the \$750,000, mostly in thousand-dollar bills. Not all of it, however, went to Guterma. Later, in trying to account for it, he claimed that he had been obliged to pay "brokerage fees" of \$50,000 to Rubirosa, \$25,000 to Vega (Vega denied receiving it), \$37,500 to Nevins, and \$57,500 to his other associates.

What remained was evidently insufficient to meet Guterma's pressing financial needs. In mid-February 1959, he lost control of F. L. Jacobs, the holding company in which he combined his various enterprises, and was forced to resign as president of Mutual. Not long afterward, he was indicted for stock fraud in connection with his F. L. Jacobs dealings and he is now serving a 5-year prison term. When that is completed, an additional 8- to 24-month sentence awaits him for failing to register as a Dominican agent.

How seriously did Guterma ever intend to live up to the terms of this agreement with Trujillo? The Dominican Government, in filing suit for the return of its money, now claims that the contract was not performed, was incapable of performance and was entered into by claimant on the basis of mistake in law and fact.

Because Guterma pleaded nolo contendere to the illegal agent charges filed by the Justice Department, there was only fragmentary evidence of the extent to which Guterma managed to turn Mutual into a propaganda outlet of the Dominicans. Robert Hurlleigh testified that as Mutual vice president, he once received a call at his Washington office from Guterma in Ciudad Trujillo. He said "he had a Congressman there who had * * * made a speech before the legislature, or whatever the name is, and he thought this would be a good broadcast, so we took the Congressman in on a beeper. * * * Tapes of the visiting Congressman, Gardner Withrow, Republican of Wisconsin, were used on newscasts during the day. On another occasion Hurlleigh sent Guterma a note calling his attention to a Capitol Cloakroom interview with Senator ALLEN ELLENDER, Democrat of Louisiana, on the Caribbean situation. Guterma promptly forwarded tapes of the two network broadcasts to Vega as proof the contract was being fulfilled.

Apparently Hurlleigh, who succeeded Guterma as president of Mutual, was unaware at the time of what lay beneath this sudden interest in the Dominicans. The first he learned of it, according to his testimony, was in May 1959, when he and a Mutual reporter visited Ciudad Trujillo on a press junket arranged by the Dominicans. Hurlleigh was shocked when Vega made inquiries about the contract. To stave off

further involvement in this embarrassing affair, the Dominican Government was paid \$12,500, and it returned the 1,100 shares of Mutual stock that Guterma had turned over to Vega as good faith collateral.

In becoming a publicity agent for a foreign government, Guterma was going into a business that has been expanding rapidly in this country during the last few years. Several hundred agents of foreign governments are duly registered at the Justice Department (as Guterma was not), and the number is constantly increasing. Many of these foreign agents are simply promoting tourism, while others are lawyers carrying on the various legal and lobbying activities in Washington that are considered necessary to backstop diplomatic missions. As the files at Justice indicate, a good many—comparative newcomers but more numerous all the time—are professional public relations experts engaged in the business of influencing American opinion.

In the main, of course, this expansion of public relations in the United States on behalf of foreign governments is no more surprising or sinister than the growth of the domestic variety as an adjunct to private or public business. They are, in fact, parallel efforts to meet the same basic need. The systematic cultivation of public opinion is frequently more fruitful than more direct attempts to influence Government officials. But the ways of communicating with the public are intricate indeed. As Harold Oram, Inc., put it in a memorandum soliciting the public relations account of the Government of Ghana: "The services of a professional public relations firms are * * * becoming more of a necessity than ever before. The vast and complex network of media outlets, both mass and specialized, require, for effective utilization, long years of experience and understanding."

UNLABELED COMMERCIALS

In seeking this effective utilization of the media outlets, not every public relations agent of a foreign government has done its work as openly and candidly as the Oram firm. A great temptation for many of them lies in the fact that the press and the other media have proved to be peculiarly vulnerable to the infiltration of blatant propaganda.

For example, in 1954, the Government of Guatemala, then headed by Carlos Castillo Armas, hired John A. Clements Associates at a fee of \$8,000 a month to engage in a public-relations campaign on its behalf. This job, according to the Justice Department registration, was to be handled by Clements and Patrick McMahon, who were at the same time serving as editor and Washington editor, respectively, of the American Mercury. As a further coincidence, that magazine published a number of articles on Guatemala during the period, three of them of a political nature. While on the Guatemala payroll, McMahon also acted as consultant to the House committee which investigated communism in Guatemala and, according to his statement to the Justice Department, "prepared [its] report and helped edit the hearings."

Or take the special case of the Nationalist Chinese Government, which has long displayed an anxious regard for its public image in this country:

Item: Early in 1959, the North American Newspaper Alliance carried a series of stories written from Formosa by Don Frifield. The reader was not informed that NANA's correspondent was also employed by Hamilton Wright, the U.S. public relations firm handling the Nationalist China account. Frifield has received \$19,700 during the past 2 years for editorial services.

Item: In June 1958, during one of the periodic crises over the offshore islands of Quemoy and Matsu, there was shown at

Radio City Music Hall in New York a documentary film entitled "Fortress Formosa," which had been produced by 20th Century-Fox. It was subsequently distributed to movie theaters all over the country. In the screen billings, a credit line indicated that it had been "Arranged by Hamilton Wright," but the viewer had no way of knowing that Hamilton Wright serves as Nationalist China's registered agent. The film, in Technicolor and CinemaScope, had actually been shot by the public relations firm's camera crews and then turned over without cost to 20th Century-Fox.

Item: Last October 14, the morning after the third "Great Debate," in which the presidential candidates tangled over Quemoy and Matsu, NBC's "Today" carried on its news roundup a report of Chiang Kai-shek's angry rejection of Kennedy's position on those islands. While the television viewer heard Chiang quoted as voicing firm determination to resist the surrender of the islands, he watched a film clip depicting Nationalist Chinese troops and tanks parading in full battle array. This film was another production of Hamilton Wright supplied gratis to the NBC film library and used without credit.

Item: Since 1957, the Saturday Evening Post has carried a series of signed editorials by Geraldine Fitch in which she has defended Chiang's policies and criticized others for their lack of sympathy with those policies. The Post has identified Mrs. Fitch as an author who "spent many years in China and now lives in Formosa." But it has made no mention of the fact that she is also employed in Taipei as "consultant editor" of the Government Information Office, Republic of China.

Item: In a catalog of free programs offered to independent television stations, Radiant Films, 358 West 44th Street, New York, includes a half-hour documentary, "Miracle in Free China" ("... where Madame and Generalissimo Chiang Kai-shek and their 10 million followers are marking time for the return to the mainland") and "Face of Free China" ("How American defense in the Pacific is tied into the general defense of the free world through the U.S. alliance with the Republic of China"). The only hint of who produced and paid for this entertainment is the cryptic mention that it was "Filmed by the world-renowned Hamilton Wright Organization." Neither Hamilton Wright nor Radiant Films, which is not registered as a foreign agent, has supplied the Justice Department with information about the distribution of these films, which were paid for by the Government of Nationalist China.

Item: On a number of occasions in recent years, the New York Times has published letters to the editor, supporting the Chinese Nationalist stands, from Harold Riegelman, a New York attorney who has been both the city's acting postmaster and the Republican candidate for mayor. Though Mr. Riegelman is registered as a foreign agent of Nationalist China, he has not felt an obligation to label his communications under the Foreign Agents Registration Act. Neither the Times' editors nor its readers could be expected to know from his letters of Mr. Riegelman's connections with the Nationalist Chinese.

PRIVATE VERSUS PUBLIC RELATIONS

Foreign governments have provided Americans with information about themselves for a good many years. The British, starting with a modest library shortly after the First World War, have expanded the British Information Services in the United States into an efficient operation that now spends \$1 million a year, with publishing and film facilities in New York and a B.I.S. representative stationed in Washington's National Press Building, where he is an accessible companion and counselor to the capital's re-

porters. Thirty-five other countries have established more or less similar information facilities, and have reported expenditures in 1959 totaling nearly \$7 million. We do the same thing on a large scale in our U.S. Information Service missions around the world.

But the use of private public relations firms in the United States on behalf of foreign governments dates largely from the end of the Second World War. Sometimes it was a matter of special necessity. The Roy Bernard Co. of New York, which works for West Germany, took the account when its government was not entitled to send an official information mission to this country. A number of firms quickly moved into what was fast becoming a highly profitable field of enterprise. In addition to Nationalist China, Hamilton Wright's clients include Italy and Mexico. Hill & Knowlton, Inc., handles Japan; Harold L. Oran, Inc., has South Vietnam; Curtis J. Hoxter, Inc., works for Austria, Guatemala, and Brazil; Max Rogel, Inc., which formerly had the South Korean account, also takes care of Nicaragua.

During the past 2 or 3 years there has been a scramble among American public relations firms to sign up the emerging African nations. When Vice President Nixon visited Africa in 1957, one enterprising public relations man got himself included in the entourage and tried to sell his services along the way.

The size of a foreign government's public relations operation in the United States is by no means related to the country's size or relative power. The Dominican Republic, for example, has spent during the past 5 years more than \$2,500,000 for assorted public relations projects here. In 1946, the Dominicans hired Harry Klemfuss of New York to set up a Dominican Republic Information Center at \$1,500 monthly. In 1952, a Miami Herald columnist Jack Kofoed, was paid \$2,300 monthly, which included \$800 for expenses, to prepare a book on Trujillo and to write magazine and newspaper stories about the Dominican Republic. ("General Trujillo isn't as well known to the American people as he should be," ran one of several Kofoed columns that year dealing with the Dominicans. "Even his enemies can't deny that Trujillo has, single handed, lifted his country from the lowest state it could reach to the place it occupies now.") In 1957, A. Tyler Hull, a maker of documentary films, was paid \$35,000 to prepare a 30-minute color film and a 26-minute black-and-white film for television, guaranteeing in his contract "a minimum of 300 television broadcasts in the United States to an estimated audience of more than 15 million viewers within a period of 24 months."

During the same year, Trujillo hired Sydney Baron, Inc., to combat adverse publicity arising from the mysterious disappearance in New York City of Dr. Jesús de Galindez, an outspoken opponent of the Dominican dictatorship. Baron listed receipts for 1957 and 1958 amounting to \$562,855, of which more than \$200,000 went to the well-known attorney Morris Ernst, who was retained "to undertake an investigation of the so-called Galindez affair insofar as it touches upon implications and accusations against—the Government of the Dominican Republic and persons holding high office in that government." In 1959, even as Gutierrez was making his deal with the Dominicans, By-Line Newsreel Productions was hired to produce a 15-minute sound movie each month for the purpose of "making increasingly known the progress achieved in the Dominican Republic." The agreement specified that these newsreels, which cost \$3,000 apiece, would be shown in 900 movie houses throughout the United States.

As any reporter can testify, much of foreign public relations performs a useful serv-

ice in keeping the press informed about facts they need to know. Taken as a whole, it is no more mysterious or unscrupulous than public relations work done for domestic clients. It varies, of course, from firm to firm and client to client, since in this unlicensed and unlimited profession the practitioners are pretty much able to devise their own rules and ethics as they go along. But in one respect the work done for a foreign government does differ from that performed in behalf of, say, an American manufacturer. For one thing, the American public's familiarity with the domestic client's product is apt to exert some check on the activities of those who promote it. But such restraints do not apply so rigorously to a foreign client, particularly if it happens to be the government of a country not visited by many American tourists, Congressmen, and journalists who may snoop around a little during their travels.

Obviously in our days, nearly all nations are engaged in some sort of direct or indirect public relations activities abroad. The United States, it is hoped, operates constantly and efficiently in this field. But the activities and the policies of a large country are always the object of scrutiny and debate. The same does not apply to small countries, or rather to their governments—all too often when the very survival of those governments depends to a large extent on the assistance they receive from us. The facts we need to know are often concealed, or get to us too late. All of a sudden there may be a blowup in a country with which we have been deeply involved. When that happens, it not only upsets the best laid plans of the public relations men but greatly harms America's prestige.

HOW MUCH WOULD IT COST?

A foreign government's assumptions about how to handle press relations in the United States are heavily conditioned by the way it treats the press back home. Generalissimo Trujillo had no reason to doubt that he could buy the services of a radio network. When General Batista was still boss in Cuba in 1958, he approached a New York public relations firm with a query about how much it would cost to get favorable stories in the New York Times (Batista felt sure that Herbert Matthews of the Times was in the pay of Castro).

False expectations, it must be added, have sometimes been encouraged by overzealous public relations firms. On file at the Justice Department is a copy of a prospectus prepared by Max Rogel, Inc., soliciting the Nicaraguan account. It makes this claim: "We now have a comprehensive news service that makes it possible to flash a story or a photograph to every major daily newspaper in the United States. This story will come across the wire into the offices of these newspapers. It will be treated as a news story and will be received as such. This is an operation that is very similar to the workings of the two major news services in the United States. It is, in actuality, a service extended to us by one of these two news services on an exclusive basis." What the prospectus apparently referred to was the public relations news wire in New York, which transmits releases around the city and which, of course, has no official connection with either AP or UPI.

A similar impression of accessibility to the heartbeat of the news system was contained in the Rogel proposal to the Korean Government that the first step in its operations would be "to secure a newspaper person who could act as our leg man or stringer in Seoul." * * * This individual will be someone who is known in Seoul and approved by your government. He will be attached to one of the wire services." In a recent interview, Rogel's executive vice president, Clyde Matthews, has stated that his firm never obtained such a wire-service stringer

in Korea. But he pointed out that it is not out of keeping with public relations practice. In Nicaragua, according to the firm's filings with the Justice Department, payments were made to one Leonardo Lacayo, who also serves as a UPI stringer in Managua as well as editor of the progovernment newspaper, *Novedades*. Matthews estimates that half of the news stories that come out of Nicaragua are in one way or another the products of the firm's initiative.

SWEETNESS AND LIGHT

Naturally those who are in the business of creating favorable impressions about their clients are not apt to underestimate their own accomplishments. Many of the reputed feats of the public relations men prove after investigation to be pretty trivial stuff, a conspicuous waste of a foreign government's money. But it would be a mistake to think that public relations' foreign legion is ineffective. Perhaps the most dramatic example of what it can accomplish occurred in 1955, when the Cubans were faced with the imminent threat that their quota of sugar exports to the United States would be slashed in order to favor domestic producers. Forty-nine Senators had gone on record for revising the Sugar Act ahead of its scheduled expiration at the end of 1956. In desperation, the Cuban sugar industry hired Samuel E. Stavisky, a Washington newspaperman turned public relations counsel.

Stavisky, who has described what ensued in a document entitled "The Sweetest Story Ever Sold," launched a campaign that was responsible in large measure for thwarting congressional action in 1955, and led the next year to a new and highly favorable quota for Cuban sugar that lasted until Castro upset everything. Stavisky estimates that "effective public relations helped the Cuban sugar industry gain an extra million tons of sugar quota in the American market." It was, according to Stavisky, a public relations job with a \$100 million payoff for his client.

The operation was directed more at the press than at the politicians. Stavisky reasoned that he had a good but complex story to get across on a subject about which most reporters were notably ignorant. Liked and respected by his former colleagues, he gathered small groups of them for lunch at Washington's Colony Restaurant and discussed the political ramifications of sugar with an old newsman's sense for the interesting "story angle." With the help of a liberal expense account, he "encouraged" reporters to visit Cuba. Some were provided with travel subsidies when they couldn't make it on their own. One correspondent even charged off his gambling losses.

More important, Stavisky soon worked out a news angle that made the fate of Cuban sugar important local news all over the United States. Using an IBM punchcard breakdown of shipping invoices, he traced the origin of the more than \$400 million in U.S. exports to Cuba the previous year by State, city, congressional district, product, industry, and company. Soon a steady flow of stories began to appear in local papers around the country about the importance of the Cuban market to Texas oil, California beans, Arkansas rice, and Ohio lard. In the western tier of the North Central States, whose Congressmen were generally hostile to sugar imports, it was discovered that 708 manufacturers had sold Cuba more than \$22 million in 1953. This was considered news throughout that region.

A newsman's intimate connections on Capitol Hill served Stavisky in good stead. In early 1955, Stavisky relates, when Vice President Nixon visited Cuba during a Caribbean tour he was briefed with a Stavisky memo and the Havana reporters were loaded with Stavisky-inspired questions for Nixon.

Publicity counterattacks against the domestic sugar interests were also part of the Stavisky operation. When Senator ELLENDER took two "experts" representing those interests into a closed Senate committee session, the fact was soon published in a *Drew Pearson* column that proclaimed, "ELLENDER Works for Sugar Lobby."

Stavisky measured his impact on newspapers in column-inches. His scrapbook is crammed with clippings from newspapers all over the country, many bearing a word-for-word identity with his press releases. Frequently they have omitted any mention of their origin.

WHO PICKS UP THE TAB?

In assessing the abuses that crop up, those involved in public relations often pass the blame to the press. One veteran public relations man for a Central American client estimates that his firm places between a hundred and two hundred stories a week in the newspapers, often used verbatim, and sometimes with a prominent reporter's byline added. He finds that it is getting easier all the time to do the newsman's job for him. "From my point of view as a public relations man, this is good," he remarks, "but from journalism's point of view it is not good. The number of reporters with time to dig beyond the surface facts seems to be getting smaller and smaller. We fill a vacuum in the flow of news."

He ascribes this condition in part to the economics of U.S. news coverage. Despite the hordes of reporters who congregate in Washington or accompany the President on his good will missions, the ranks of American journalists covering the rest of the world are remarkably thin. By his estimate, nine-tenths of our news from the smaller foreign countries is handled by stringers who piece out their income with other jobs. The Associated Press claims that it services 80 countries, maintaining regular correspondents in more than 50 of them. In many places, at least until events reach a crisis point, news coverage is very much a hit-or-miss proposition.

In Cuba, for example, it turned out after the Castro revolution that the Associated Press stringer at the Presidential Palace had been on Batista's payroll. The Dominican Republic long controlled stringers working for U.S. publications by its control over all domestic papers.

To get coverage for the countries they represent, both great and small, public relations agencies frequently provide travel subsidies for the press. But many feel that the practice has been increasingly getting out of hand and has dubious benefits. Curtis Hoxter says he receives as many as 10 calls a week from reporters looking for junkets. Among a dozen or so public relations firms we interviewed, none had failed to get requests for travel subsidy or other gifts, ranging from a case of liquor on up, as incentives to do a good story.

Among reporters, whose income averages far less than that of their public relations counterparts, there are no generally agreed-upon ethics about these practices. Freelancers particularly, having no guarantee that their articles will be bought, accept it as part of the game. The Society of Magazine Writers does not include in its code of ethics and good practices anything on the subject of accepting or labeling such financial assistance. James Doyle, who wrote a story for North American Newspaper Alliance after a week's trip to Nicaragua last August, paid for by the public relations firm of Max Rogel, argues: "You are not deceiving editors. They know somebody pays your way. But no good reporter is going to be seduced by room, board, or an airplane ride." Doyle claims that for "marginal" stories like Nicaragua, its government must pay the freight or nobody will go.

"After all, who gives a damn about Nicaragua?"

Neither Doyle nor John McBride, Latin American columnist for the *New York Mirror*, who also went on the Nicaraguan junket, believes it would be appropriate to state who paid for such trips in published copy. "When you do something like that," McBride says, "it takes away from your writing no matter what you say. It would hurt if readers knew the paper wouldn't send you down but the Nicaraguan government would."

Economics plays an even bigger role in the newsreel business. Placing films seems to be a nearly sure-shot proposition for the knowledgeable public relations man. The firm of Hamilton Wright, for example, has some of the finest camera crews and equipment in the business. One of its typical contracts, drawn up with the government of Chile, provides that newsreels with commentary will be prepared and delivered free of charge to Fox Movietone, MGM Newsreel, Paramount, Warner Pathé, and Universal International: "This organization guarantees that five or more of the above newsreels shall be accepted and shown by at least one of the above-mentioned companies throughout its entire chain of theaters in the United States." Much the same guarantee has been made to Nationalist China.

According to Hamilton Wright, Jr., such a guarantee is "based on past experience." The normal procedure in placing a newsreel for a client is to prepare seven hundred feet on a subject and supply an informational sheet that will permit the editors to edit it for themselves. Last spring, for example, the firm offered footage on the Formosan elections that Fox Movietone used in its regular newsreels.

The documentary "Fortress Formosa" was turned over to 20th Century-Fox with a grant of full ownership rights for a 5-year period. But Wright minimizes the propaganda value of these efforts. "For theatrical distribution, they must be subtle," he declared. "They cannot have much political content."

He was seconded on this point by John Kuhne, a veteran documentary producer for 20th Century-Fox, who claims that he turns down most film submissions even though they are free. The ones he accepts, like "Fortress Formosa," are picked solely for their entertainment value. He rejects the suggestion that the source of such films might be clearly labeled: "It would look like a direct propaganda bit." He points out that 20th Century-Fox does not label the Defense Department films that are supplied regularly to all major distributors.

Jerome Kahn, assistant news editor of 20th Century-Fox, has said he will incorporate public relations film in his newsreels only when it contains a legitimate news story. There have been times, he claims, when Hamilton Wright has had the only footage of areas Chiang bars to regular photographers. He doesn't object to having a public relations outfit handle the Dominican Republic because this is the only way to get films. The newsreel company simply can't afford to send its own crew.

Among public relations firms, there is general agreement that the theater newsreel is in a declining state and pretty well forced to live on handouts. Even those who do this handing out sometimes feel the pinch. An executive at Harold Oram, Inc., which handles the account of South Vietnam for an annual fee of a mere \$38,000, has said, "You never see a film on Vietnam in your theaters because we don't have the money to make it."

Television networks generally keep a sharp eye out for attempts at infiltration by public relations operators. "They try to use us," said Piers Anderson of NBC News, who handles the Huntley-Brinkley newscasts, "but we use them." He will accept footage but

not the accompanying scripts. In reference to the film clip of Chiang's forces that was shown on "Today" right after the Nixon-Kennedy debate over Quemoy, Bill Fitzgerald, news director for the program, points out that it was only a brief sequence and that it had been stored for some time in the NBC film library. He does not feel that the network was under any obligation to identify those who originally provided the film. "They are satisfied with the exposure. There is no prerequisite to mention their name." What about responsibility to the public? "I don't think the public is too interested in knowing," Fitzgerald said.

By far the most fertile field for the planting of public relations film has been in direct submission to independent television stations. It has, in fact, become such an active market that there are now a number of middlemen who specialize in distributing free films being offered for television use. These distributors are paid for each showing, not by the station but by the supplier of the film.

One of the biggest of these distributors, Sterling Movies U.S.A., Inc., puts out quarterly a fat catalog of offerings that have been prepared to fill half- and quarter-hour time slots in a TV station's schedule. The catalog usually makes no mention of who has paid for the production of these films. It is obvious that many are veiled advertisements for tourist resorts or industrial sponsors. In its foreign listings, the spring 1960 catalog listed eight films on Algeria ("The background story on this critical area in world affairs. * * * Enlightening information on the movement toward nationalism"), four on the Sahara, two on Morocco, three on Tunisia, one on Turkey, and six on South Africa ("Points up similarities between United States and South African history"). On investigation, it turned out that several of the Algerian films had actually been paid for by the French Government, which then hired New York producers to edit them, dub in English voices, and pay for the distribution. Essentially the same procedure is known to have been followed by South Africa and governments of several of the other countries involved.

"Public advocacy" by a foreign country's diplomats, argues the Ghana memorandum prepared by Harold L. Oram, Inc., is generally regarded as "improper interference in the internal affairs of the United States" and "a highly ineffective method to convert or persuade the American public. * * *". Therefore, the memorandum goes on, "One of the cardinal rules of effective public relations, particularly in the political sphere, is to remove the source of the ideas (in this case the Government of Ghana or its representatives) as far as possible from the advocates (whether they be private individuals, organizations, or media)."

THE DIM SPOTLIGHT

Oram may be right. But one trouble with his argument is that it does not entirely square with the terms of the Foreign Agents Registration Act of 1938, amended in 1942, which specify that a public-relations agent employed by a foreign government is required, after registering with the Justice Department, to make full disclosure of activities and expenditures and to label all communications intended to influence "any section of the public * * * with reference to the political or public interests, policies, or relations of a government of a foreign country. * * *". The act grew out of congressional concern over Nazi propaganda agents in this country. "Resting on the fundamental constitutional principle," according to an interpretation by Justice Hugo Black, "that our people adequately informed may be trusted to distinguish between the true and the false, the bill is intended to label information of foreign origin so the hearers and readers may not be deceived by

the belief that the information comes from a disinterested source." The chairman of the House Judiciary Committee, Representative EMANUEL CELLER, who helped draft the law, counted on fighting fire with fire by using "the spotlight of pitiless publicity" to expose foreign propaganda.

But the law has had a hard time keeping up with expanding public relations activities in the postwar period. Nathan B. Lenvin, chief of the Justice Department's registration section, is quite confident "that the vast majority who come within the purview of the statute have registered." Over its 22-year history, there have been 23 prosecutions for failure to do so and 21 convictions.

But the spotlight in which Congress placed its trust has certainly been less than pitiless. Few people come to look at the files in Lenvin's outer office, and few of the documents give the kind of details that Congress ordered. Many of the reports filed there make only the barest statement about expenditure or activities in behalf of foreign clients. Some public relations agents who submitted fuller details in former years have dropped the practice. (One, who admits that his reports are not very lengthy, says frankly that he has no intention of telling his competitors what he is doing.)

The act's most neglected provision has been the requirement to label the source of political information. Time and again in our investigations we came across what appeared to be clear violations. But the Justice Department has never brought a test case in this area. No one is certain, for example, how precisely a distributor or a television station is supposed to identify films prepared by foreign agents. The Federal Communications Commission has also failed to explore this field despite its regulation that "a station disclose to its audience exactly who is paying for or furnishing the broadcast material * * * [on] political matters or controversial issues of public importance."

The FCC's own precedents governing domestic public relations would seem to be pertinent. In 1958, the Commission censured Westinghouse Broadcasting for failing to label film used on a news program that had been provided free of charge by the National Association of Manufacturers. Such a practice, the FCC held, required "the highest degree of diligence on the part of the licensee * * * in ascertaining * * * the actual source * * * and identifying this source plainly to the viewing audience."

Perhaps the law is too cumbersome to cope with the way some news finds its path to the public nowadays: foreign agent to producer to distributor to middlemen to media representative. Frequently, it is a difficult matter to determine the origin of something that finally appears in print or on the screen. And it could quickly become a rather absurd pursuit if the Justice Department were to try to monitor all the stages of this very broad enterprise. Too much that passes for high-powered public relations work is too picayune to matter.

In the long run, the responsibility for keeping the communications channels open and working properly must be borne primarily by those engaged in the business of communication. It is up to those who control the spotlight of publicity to see that it is bright enough and properly focused. The press and other media surely ought not to pass along cheap propaganda simply because they haven't the time or the cash to check stories for themselves. Ultimately, it is not just a matter of economics but even more one of ethics.

There are no cut-and-dried rules to be laid down in this game. A reporter or a broadcaster would be a fool to chuck pertinent information in the wastebasket simply because it came to him from a public relations source. Foreign public relations, as practiced by reputable private firms as well

as official Government information agencies, has done a great deal to break down the barriers of isolation and lack of interest that once kept our public opinion aloof and ill informed.

But the press must apply its criteria of selection very carefully in an area of communication that vitally affects our understanding of what is going on in the rest of the world—and of what we are asked to do about it.

FEDERAL AID TO EDUCATION

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, in this morning's Washington Post, Walter Lippmann, with his characteristic logic and force, makes a devastating argument against the contention of those who oppose Federal aid to education. I read the concluding paragraph of Mr. Lippmann's article:

In advocating a larger use of the Federal power to raise money for education, the administration is dealing not with some fancy theory but with the hard practical fiscal problems of the States and the localities. Those who oppose the program in principle have almost certainly not understood the problem.

I ask unanimous consent that the complete article be printed in the RECORD.

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

FEDERAL AID TO EDUCATION (By Walter Lippmann)

Despite Senator GOLDWATER, who has just declared that Federal aid to education is unconstitutional, the practice of Federal aid is in fact older than the Constitution. As early as the Land Ordinance of 1785, the Confederation provided that the 16th section of each township or one thirty-sixth of the acreage in the public land States should be granted to the States by the National Government for the benefit of the common schools.

Every since the Federal Union was established it has been giving aid to education in a large variety of ways, and it is sheer deception to declare that what has always been done is unconstitutional.

While Federal aid has been given since the founding of the Nation, what has never been done has been to set up Federal control of education. It is indeed quite contrary to American principles and practices for the Federal Government to control what is taught in the public schools, how it is taught, who teaches it. The control of education is reserved to the States, and no one engaged in the present discussion is proposing to tamper with that principle. The Kennedy program is unequivocal and scrupulous in reserving to the States the control of education.

Thus in the proposed contribution to public elementary and secondary schools, the Kennedy program leaves it to each State to decide whether the Federal contribution shall be used to build schools or to raise teachers' salaries. The loan program for college housing and for academic facilities is operated by local initiative. The 4-year program for scholarships is to be State administered.

Why, then, with such careful respect for States rights, is it necessary to bring in the Federal Government at all? The answer is that the number of children and youths who have to be educated has outgrown the resources which can be raised in a very large number of the States. The American Nation can quite well afford to educate all its young at least at the level of the most advanced States, for example, California. It

is nonsense to argue that the United States is too poor to educate its children. But it is not educating them properly, and almost certainly it cannot and will not do so if the whole task of raising the necessary funds is left to the 50 State legislatures and the local school districts.

Here is the essence of the Kennedy program. It has nothing to do with the control of education. It does not propose to have the Federal Government pay all the costs, supplanting the States and localities. It does propose to supplement State and local funds with a comparatively small contribution.

This supplementary support has become necessary because of the spectacular increase in the school population which began after World War II and seems certain to continue for the next 10 years. The cost of educating this growing number of children is rising and will continue to rise, according to the estimates of the highly reliable and conservative Committee on Economic Development. Even if prices remain constant, even if educational standards are not raised, the costs per pupil will rise by almost half during the sixties. For teachers' salaries will have to rise in order to keep pace with earnings in other professions. A larger part of the pupils will be in high schools, where the cost per pupil is much higher than in the elementary schools.

As against this, State and local taxes are, as Beardsley Ruml put it, encountering stiffer resistance. As tax burdens become heavier, the reconciliation of opposing views about taxes becomes increasingly difficult. One reason for the slower growth of State and local revenues is the necessary reliance of those governments, especially the localities, upon the property tax. The smaller geographic units of government are forced to rely upon immobile tax bases which cannot move to other jurisdictions to escape taxation. Although the fiscal capacity of the States is not quite so limited as that of the localities, the political organization of many States does not permit adequate use of State financial resources to supplement the resources of the localities. Urban areas are underrepresented in the governments of most States. The rural-dominated legislatures will not enact the statewide taxes necessary to support the higher educational costs and aspirations of the urban areas.

It is entirely unrealistic politically, Ruml insisted, to expect to achieve a major breakthrough in American public education by operating 1 at a time upon the 45,000 school districts or even upon the 50 State legislatures.

In all of this we must not fall into the mistake of thinking that this is a proposal to tax the rich, and supposedly more public-spirited States, for the benefit of the poorer and less energetic States. The truth is that the poorer States are on the whole making a greater effort to support their schools than are the richer States.

Thus there are 31 States with an income per schoolchild which is below the national average. Yet they are spending 3.6 percent of their personal income on schools whereas the 18 richer States spend only 2.75 percent. The richer States can afford better schools with less personal sacrifice.

In advocating a larger use of the Federal power to raise money for education, the administration is dealing not with some fancy theory but with the hard practical fiscal problems of the States and the localities. Those who oppose the program in principle have almost certainly not understood the problem.

THE PRESIDENT'S NATURAL RESOURCES MESSAGE

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, aside from the new President's poor taste

in casting innuendo in the direction of former President Eisenhower, his natural resources message is a mish-mash of distortion and political propaganda.

The Eisenhower administration's record in conservation and reclamation is unmatched by any previous administration, Democratic or Republican.

This record was compiled last year by my colleague, the senior Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT]. I ask unanimous consent to insert this document in the RECORD at this point.

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

x

Accomplishments of the Republican administration in natural resources and conservation, 1953-60

(By U.S. Senator KARL E. MUNDT, of South Dakota, senior Republican member of the Senate Government Operations Committee)

More progress has been made between January 1953 and May 1960 in the intelligent conservation, prudent use, and orderly development of America's priceless natural resources, than in any comparable 7-year-plus period in our history.

With the Republican Party giving true meaning to national conservation goals, these have been some of the salient accomplishments:

1. Vast new sections of the arid West have been opened to productive life through the Republican administration's insistence on accelerated construction of reclamation dams and reservoirs.

2. Unprecedented increases in the production of hydroelectric power have contributed to a blossoming of industrial development throughout many of the Western States.

3. Our great network of national parks has been expanded and revitalized.

4. Fish and wildlife conservation has moved forward at a rate unmatched in previous history.

5. Effective steps have been taken to insure wise development of our mineral resources.

6. During fiscal year 1959, the Department of the Interior's Bureau of Land Management took in revenues of over \$136,700,000 from the conservation and development of the Nation's public domain lands. Since 1785, total revenues from the lease and sale of public domain lands and resources have exceeded \$2 billion. The significance of the fact that more than half of this sum has come in since January 1953 needs little emphasizing. At the same time—recognizing the growing values of public domain lands under departmental management—a set of stringent antispeculation policies have been adopted to provide full protection of the public interest.

7. The urgent short-term and long-range water needs of the Nation are being met through imaginative new programs.

8. Statehood has been won for Alaska and Hawaii, thus opening vast new resource reserves to increased productivity and development.

9. Important new programs have been launched to conserve and develop the human resource represented by our Indian population.

This list consists of only the highlights of a massive total conservation upsurge that has, directly or indirectly, helped to better the lives of all Americans under the Republican administration.

These striking accomplishments, achieved through forward-looking programs, are in close accord with the basic conservation philosophy of the Republican Party.

Promotion of cooperative planning and effort—teamwork—in natural resource conservation and development has been a cornerstone of the positive resource policies of the Eisenhower-Nixon Republican administration. This teamwork approach has paved the way for a resource development effort by both public and private enterprise without parallel in our history. The 1953-60 period seems certain to go down in history as our most golden era in resource progress.

The Republican Party is keenly aware of the fact that today's generation has a solemn obligation to conserve our physical and scenic resources for tomorrow's children. At the same time, the Nation's high standards of living give ample proof that intelligent conservation and orderly development of natural resources are compatible.

Reclamation

Today—after nearly 50 years of the Federal Government's reclamation program which was proposed and started by the Republican Party under President Theodore Roosevelt—some 7,500,000 acres of irrigable land in the 17 Western States are served by reclamation projects. Power-generating capacity stands at more than 5 million kilowatts. Crops produced with reclamation water are worth nearly \$1 billion a year.

These are impressive figures.

But far more impressive is the record of accomplishment in the more recent 1953-60 Republican years. This Republican administration has underway the largest water resources construction program in history—a record \$1.2 billion was requested in the 1961 budget for flood control, navigation, irrigation, power, and related water resources projects.

In the field of reclamation, since 1953 the Republican administration has sponsored, and Congress has authorized, 51 reclamation projects, or project units, including the billion-dollar Colorado River storage project, the largest reclamation undertaking ever approved in a single piece of legislation.

Included also were the Glendo unit of the Missouri River Basin project in Wyoming, recently dedicated; the Talent division of the Rogue River Basin project in Oregon; the Trinity River division of the Central Valley project in California; the Lavaca Flats, Mirage Flats extension, and O'Neill units of the Missouri Basin project in Nebraska.

Taken together, these 51 new projects or project units will have a storage capacity of nearly 42 million acre-feet—an increase of 50 percent over the Bureau of Reclamation's storage capacity in mid-1953.

These 51 new projects will ultimately provide full or supplemental irrigation water for nearly 890,000 acres of land—an area larger than Rhode Island and a 12 percent increase over the total irrigable acreage of reclamation projects for the 1953 crop year.

Their hydroelectric powerplants will deliver each year about 8½ billion kilowatt-hours of energy—an increase of one-third over the total energy generated at Bureau hydroelectric plants during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1953—the last fiscal year planned by the Truman administration.

Over the same 7-year period, on some of these projects and on units of others authorized earlier, the administration has undertaken 44 new construction starts including 9 supplementary projects, and involving a total present and future investment of nearly a billion dollars.

For the 8 fiscal years ending June 30, 1961, the Department of the Interior has had or requested a total of \$1,765 million appropriated for the work of its Bureau of Reclamation. In other words, nearly \$1 out of every \$3 made available for reclamation activities since 1902 (\$4,723 million) will have been appropriated during the Eisenhower administration.

This impressive financial support for western resource development has been possible in spite of record peacetime defense costs, and in spite of the fact that in every fiscal year but one, the Congress, controlled in every session but one by the Democrats, has failed to appropriate as much money as the Republican administration requested for reclamation work.

The importance of the reclamation program to the West cannot be overestimated. Bureau of Reclamation projects deliver annually about 260 billion gallons of water for 106 municipalities and 68 industrial entities scattered throughout the West. Irrigation water is delivered to more than 128,000 farms, embracing more than 8 million acres. These farms produce crops valued at nearly \$1 billion annually. The daily activities of nearly 10 million persons who live on farms in industrial areas and in cities provided with water from reclamation projects are vitally affected by these artificially developed supplies of lifegiving water.

These, then, are some of the spectacular accomplishments in reclamation by the Eisenhower-Nixon Republican administration in the short span of a little more than 7 years. The results of this achievement have contributed immeasurably to the economic stability, not only of the West, but the Nation as a whole.

In addition to authorization of the billion-dollar Colorado River storage project, which will store and transport water for consumption in a four-State semiarid area larger than New England, a second far-reaching legislative accomplishment of the Eisenhower-Nixon administration was the enactment of legislation to provide loans and grants for local construction of small (less than \$5 million in Federal participation) reclamation projects and distribution systems for existing reclamation irrigation projects. This program—long advocated by western water user groups—was not finally authorized until 1955, yet a total of nearly \$40 million had been appropriated for loans and grants by early 1960, and other requests were awaiting final action.

A third highly significant legislative milestone of this Republican administration in regard to reclamation was passage of Public Law 85-500, known as the Water Supply Act of 1958.

This act provides authority for the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers and the Bureau of Reclamation of the Department of the Interior to make provision for storage, not only for immediate but also for future water supply needs in connection with Federal multipurpose projects, thereby permitting the Federal Government and local interests to share equitably in the benefits of multiple-purpose construction.

Hydroelectric Power

Some indication of the almost incredible scope of the natural resource accomplishments of the Republican administration may be found in an examination of the results achieved from a single phase of conservation in a single area of America.

The Pacific Northwest today, with its plentiful and low-cost hydroelectric energy—increasing more than twofold in the years since 1953—is the strong right arm of a burgeoning era of progress and prosperity. In little more than 7 years, the Federal Government's Columbia River power system grew from two multipurpose dams—Bonneville and Grand Coulee with an installed capacity of 1,814,400 kilowatts—to 17 multipurpose projects completed or under construction with an ultimate installed capacity of 7,818,650 kilowatts.

Currently, the Pacific Northwest region has 161 hydroelectric plants with nearly 10,600,000 kilowatts of installed capacity—two-thirds of them completed or placed under construction during this administration.

Presently under construction, scheduled, or under active consideration are 74 additional projects with an installed capacity of nearly 12 million kilowatts. Half of this capacity is either actively under construction now, or firmly scheduled.

Since 1953, power generated at Federal dams in the Pacific Northwest has totaled 228.3 billion kilowatt-hours—a figure nearly $3\frac{1}{2}$ times greater than that for the preceding 10 years. During this same period, generation from non-Federal dams nearly doubled.

Over \$1.5 billion has been allocated to power facilities in the short span of something more than 7 years, a fourfold increase over the total for the previous 10 years due to the progressive construction of hydroelectric dams by the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers and the Department of the Interior's Bureau of Reclamation, together with the transmission facilities of Interior's Bonneville Power Administration. As of May 1, 1960, more than \$647 million has been repaid to the U.S. Treasury from power revenues—all of this under the Republican administration.

Recreational Resources

Probably in no other area of our national life are the immediate demands being placed on an invaluable resource by the explosive nature of our population growth more dramatically illustrated than in the increasing pressures on America's recreational resources.

Fantastic as they have been, the Nation's population gains do not begin to approach the corresponding rate of increase in outdoor recreational activities by countless millions of Americans.

In our national parks, for example, there were just 1 million visitors in 1920. By 1959 this figure had risen to over 62 million—an increase of more than 6,000 percent—and the upward curve was continuing.

In the progressive years of the Republican administration, the Department of the Interior spearheaded intensified efforts of recreational planners at all levels of government to provide wholesome outdoor recreational facilities for the multiplying millions of Americans today—and to assure at least corresponding benefits for the generations yet unborn.

Through the dynamic programs of its agencies, the Department, in less than 8 years, has achieved advances in this important era of national life unmatched in previous history. These were some of the accomplishments:

1. The National Park Service, with its 10-year program, Mission 66, made spectacular forward strides in preserving, protecting, and improving the irreplaceable national park system. At the same time, since January 1953, more than 600,000 acres have been added to the system, and a number of new areas have been established within the jurisdiction of the National Park Service, including the establishment of the 29th national park in the Virgin Islands. The total budget for the National Park Service for the first 4 years of Mission 66—a sum approaching \$300 million—exceeded the total for the 13 years prior to this administration.

2. The Bureau of Reclamation, whose prime responsibility is development of irrigation for the water-hungry West, established important new water recreational facilities in the arid areas of the Nation through the creation of great manmade lakes at reservoirs.

3. The Fish and Wildlife Service carried out far-reaching programs to provide abundant supplies of fish and game for recreational hunting without depleting wildlife resources.

4. In less spectacular but equally important ways, the Bureau of Land Management and the Bureau of Indian Affairs made positive contributions to improving and increasing America's recreational facilities.

Under Mission 66, the National Park Service—which administers about 180 areas of scenic, scientific, or historical importance—made rapid strides during the Republican administration years in restoration and development of park areas.

When this long-range program was inaugurated in 1956, the Nation's parks were neither staffed nor equipped to protect their irreplaceable features, nor to provide proper facilities for the increasing millions of visitors—expected to reach or surpass a total of 80 million when Mission 66 is completed. Lodging and eating facilities were inadequate and outmoded. Interpretive services for proper park enjoyment were lacking, while priceless park features were deteriorating.

From mid-1956 to early 1960, the Park Service, through the investment of more than \$100 million, provided new and better park roads, trails, parkways, visitor centers, museums, campsites, utility systems, and a variety of interpretive services throughout the Nation. The sign, "A Mission 66 Project," became a familiar landmark to millions of traveling Americans. Again, all of this under the Republican administration.

During the same period, private enterprise invested more than \$17 million to provide new hotels, lodges, motels, restaurants, and other accommodations which allow park visitors to do more than merely drive through park areas.

In the years of the Eisenhower-Nixon Republican administration the Department of the Interior moved to salvage some of the remaining potential park areas when it requested Congress to approve legislation which would authorize the acquisition of at least three additional national shoreline areas.

In 1959, the national wildlife refuges administered by the Department's Fish and Wildlife Service recorded some 10 million visitors—in contrast with about 3.5 million in 1951.

Like other owners of land in scenic areas away from metropolitan centers, Indian tribal groups during the progressive years of this administration have become increasingly aware of the attractiveness of certain reservation areas to sportsmen and tourists. The White Mountain Apache Tribe in Arizona, for example, has on its reservation about 80 percent of that State's trout stream mileage. It created a large manmade lake in a mountain setting, stocked it with fish, and laid out 500 summer cottage sites for lease. In this and other ways, the Indians during this administration—with the encouragement of the Bureau of Indian Affairs—developed important new recreational resources for the enjoyment of many Americans.

Recognizing America's swiftly growing interest in water recreation, the administration won congressional approval of recreation as one of the specific beneficial uses of the gigantic upper Colorado River storage project.

This enormous project will contribute not only large amounts of water for irrigation and hydroelectric power generation, but also, because of the positive conservation leadership of this administration, will create a great network of manmade lakes which will provide many hours of wholesome recreation for our growing population in years to come.

Use of manmade reservoir lakes of the Department's Bureau of Reclamation has mounted phenomenally during the Republican administration. In 1955, some 10 million people visited and enjoyed the water recreational facilities of reclamation reservoirs. By 1959 a total of 19.5 million persons used these recreational resources—an increase of almost 100 percent in about 5 years.

Fish and Wildlife Conservation

Typical of the greater recognition given during this administration to the need for

improved conservation of our fish and wildlife resources was the reorganization of the Department's Fish and Wildlife Service under the Fish and Wildlife Act of 1956.

Under this far-reaching legislation, the sport fisheries and wildlife and the commercial fisheries activities of the Department were divided into separate bureaus of the Service under a commissioner. A new Assistant Secretary of the Interior was designated to supervise all fish and wildlife programs.

A spectacular action under this administration was the laying of the necessary groundwork for establishment of the 9-million-acre Arctic Wildlife Range, an area 3 times as large as any existing American national wildlife area. When the action is completed, the total of national wildlife areas will soar close to 27 million acres—protected for present and future generations of Americans.

In the period of little more than 7 years, a total of 23 refuges, with a total acreage of 114,152 in 22 States, were added to the national wildlife refuge system, and action was begun for the establishment of several others.

Another outstanding action was passage of the new \$3 duck stamp law designed to greatly accelerate additions to the network of national waterfowl refuges in the four flyways. The Duck Stamp Act of 1958 ended the diversion of duck stamp funds for other than refuge purposes. Under it, all net revenues on stamp sales are earmarked for selection and acquisition of habitat for waterfowl.

Highly important in the conservation and development of the Nation's fish and wildlife resources were these additional departmental actions during the Eisenhower-Nixon Republican administration:

1. A controversial issue which had been unsolved for many years—oil and gas leasing on refuges—was settled by prohibiting such activity on national wildlife refuges in the 48 contiguous States except in case of oil drainage.

2. In the interest of the salmon fishery of the Northwest, the Department of Interior actively urged that no further dams be built on the Middle Snake River in Idaho below the mouth of the Imnaha until other possibilities for water storage on that river system had been thoroughly explored and considered.

3. Amendments to the Coordination Act of 1946 were sponsored by the Department and now make possible enhancement of fish and wildlife values, as well as the mitigation of losses of such values in Federal water development projects. These amendments make improvement of fish and wildlife a specific purpose of Federal water resource projects—making fish and wildlife an equal partner in this resource development field.

4. The Federal-aid program administered by the Fish and Wildlife Service resulted in new high marks of conservation progress. The magnitude of this program may be judged by the expenditures since January 1953. A total of some \$150 million—Federal aid and State funds combined—was invested by the various States on Federal-aid projects for the restoration of game, and nearly \$50 million for the restoration of fish. This, of course, did not include restoration projects wholly financed by the States. In the Federal-aid fish restoration work, States completed or initiated construction of 186 lakes with a total surface of 25,000 acres. For the restoration of game, States acquired in fee title, through the Federal-aid program, approximately 1¼ million acres of land at a cost of more than \$45 million, about one-third of which is being used for waterfowl management.

5. In addition to the 23 new refuges established in the national refuge system, the Department of Interior also brought about the establishment of more than 40 new units in the system of cooperative areas—Federal lands operated as wildlife management areas

by the States under agreements developed by the Fish and Wildlife Service.

6. Research in the early years of the administration proved a definite link between unwise use of pesticides and the destruction of several species of desirable birds, land animals, and fish. As a result of these findings, the Department supported legislation which authorizes long-range studies on the effects of pesticides and recommends formulations and practices which would not endanger fish and wildlife. A measure of the growing importance attached to this program may be seen in the fact that the 1958 appropriation of \$280,000 was increased to \$2,565,000 in 1959.

At the same time, departmental programs aimed at combating various forms of threats to our commercial fisheries resources made important progress since January 1953. For example, explosive increases in the abundance of sea lampreys in the Great Lakes in recent years brought about the destruction of the once valuable lake trout fisheries in Lake Huron and Lake Michigan and greatly reduced the trout population in Lake Superior. During the productive years of this Republican administration, the Bureau of Commercial Fisheries developed electrical barriers to kill spawning adult lampreys, and chemical lampricides to kill developing lamprey larvae in the spawning stream gravels. These methods show excellent promise of reducing the lamprey population to low levels so that the valuable lake trout fishery can be restored.

Here, too, the Republican concept of teamwork between Federal, State, and local agencies, together with private industry, has led to a unified approach to the problems of our commercial fishing industry.

7. A program of standards development for inspection of fishery products was initiated by the Department's Bureau of Commercial Fisheries, and was carried out in close cooperation with the industry. The result has been development of five voluntary U.S. standards for major fishery products. These standards define the characteristics of good quality fish and are available to everyone.

Sound Public Land Management

During fiscal year 1959, the Bureau of Land Management took in revenue of over \$136,700,000 from the conservation and development of the Nation's public domain lands. Since the Bureau was created in 1946, revenues have totaled more than \$1.2 billion. Over 80 percent of these revenues have come in since the Republican administration took office in 1953. Since that year revenues have exceeded appropriations by more than 6.4 to 1.

Major developmental actions affecting the resource programs of the public domain in recent years have included the opening of some 20 million acres of northern Alaska lands to mining and mineral leasing development. The area is known as PLO 82 and is adjacent to Naval Petroleum Reserve No. 4. The opening of these lands to exploration and development may pave the way for major new economic development for the new State.

Of no less importance to the conservation of public lands has been the recent improvement of fire detection and suppression methods in the Western States. The Bureau has placed into effect regulations to carry out the Department's responsibilities under Public Law 167, which provides for multiple use of surface resources on public lands and protects the public interest in those resources through regulatory provisions. Public Law 167 represents the most important change in the mining laws since enactment of the Mineral Leasing Act of 1920, and constitutes one of the most vital conservation measures in history.

Minerals and Metals Programs

Twice, in 1957 and 1958, the Republican administration presented a comprehensive minerals program to the Democratic-controlled Congress. The Congress failed both times to enact this recommended legislation. The only significant portion of the two major minerals programs authorized by Congress was the long-range domestic minerals exploration plan. This legislation established the Office of Minerals Exploration within the Department of the Interior. The program of this Office provides for the sharing of the risk between the Government and private industry to carry out minerals exploration projects which would not normally be undertaken with private capital alone.

The administration has also recommended passage of S. 1537, which would establish policy guidelines by the Congress, to be followed by the Government in recommending and establishing minerals programs. The effect of such legislation would make the maintenance of a sound and healthy minerals industry a major consideration of the Federal Government. It has not been enacted.

The Department of the Interior's Bureau of Mines continues its emphasis on research involving high-temperature and special structural metals, and is attempting to develop new uses for materials having unusual properties.

An outstanding accomplishment of the Bureau during 1959 was the development of a method for making shaped casings of molybdenum at the Electrometallurgical Research Laboratory at Albany, Oreg. Recently, deposition of high purity tungsten into simple controlled shapes by a novel process developed by the Bureau has generated tremendous interest among the designers of missiles. Its possible application in helping to solve the problems incident to high-temperature alloys is significant.

Emphasis was placed by the Department's Geological Survey on the development of new geologic concepts, techniques, and tools to aid in the search for mineral deposits and to determine the water supplies of the Nation.

As a result of geochemical research, a tungsten deposit was located in western Colorado, and new methods of interpreting rock alterations and geochemical anomalies led to a major discovery of silver-lead-zinc ore in Utah. About \$11,760,000 for geologic and mineral resources surveys and mapping was expected to be expended during the 1960 fiscal year.

After failure of the Democratic-controlled Congress to enact either recommended program, quotas on imports of lead and zinc were imposed by President Eisenhower, October 1, 1958. In conjunction with moderately increased consumption, these quotas served to improve the situation of these two commodities during 1959. Mine production of lead and zinc have increased.

By proclamations dated March 10 and April 30, 1959, the President provided for regulating imports of crude oil and its principal products into the United States. Subsequently, regulations were issued implementing the proclamations and establishing in the Department of the Interior an Oil Import Administration under the direction of an Administrator and an Oil Import Appeals Board.

This program was initiated to encourage a healthy climate for domestic oil exploration.

Mineral Resource Development

Under the Eisenhower-Nixon policy of "creative conservation," the years since January 1953 have witnessed a period of rapid economic growth and scientific advancement despite substantial defense stockpiling of strategic materials. During this period, the Nation's mines and mineral

plants have sustained a high level of output and, largely through improved technology, developed new resources to meet future needs.

At the beginning of the Republican administration, petroleum production from the public lands amounted to some 80 million barrels a year.

Today, just a little more than 7½ years later, annual production has soared to more than 142 million barrels—enough oil to heat 5 million homes.

In 1949, 124 billion cubic feet of natural gas was extracted from public domain lands.

By early 1960, this total had been raised to nearly 446 billion cubic feet—an increase of more than 300 billion cubic feet in a decade.

In 1949, there were some 22,000 outstanding mineral leases on public lands in the United States covering slightly over 19 million acres.

Today, after little more than 7½ years of this Republican administration, over 107 million acres are covered by more than 132,000 leases.

As with water and land resources, the spectacular advances in mineral resource development since January 1953 have been made possible in large measure by the successful sponsoring by the administration of vital new legislative measures.

Passage of the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act in 1953 marked the beginning of Federal mineral leasing of offshore submerged lands and the rapid expansion of private exploratory development investments in mineral production.

Providing legal sanction for the application of modern-day multiple-use land management, Public Law 585 of 1954 opened the door to mining and mineral leasing development on the same tracts of land. This law was followed a year later by two laws, one authorizing the extraction of uranium and other source materials from lignite coal deposits, and the other permitting mining claims on some 7.2 million acres set aside as power and water sites in 24 States.

In 1955, Congress passed Republican-backed legislation often described as the most important single conservation measure since passage of the Taylor Grazing Act of 1934. Public Law 167, the Multiple Surface Use Act, had the effect of unlocking immense values of surface resources on millions of acres in dormant and abandoned mining claims.

Early in the administration the Department of the Interior initiated an incentive program to encourage exploration for domestic sources of critical and strategic minerals and metals by providing for Government participation in the costs and risks involved.

The program is unique in that for the first time a joint effort was made by the Government and private industry for minerals exploration. The results have been highly satisfactory, adding substantial mineral reserves to the Nation's resources.

Meeting Our Water Problem

Realizing that the enormous demands for water will continue to increase as our population expands and our standard of living rises, the Eisenhower administration has pursued with urgency a vigorous program to find an economical means of converting saline water.

The Department of the Interior's Office of Saline Water has already made a sevenfold reduction in the cost of converting salt water to fresh water, and the outlook for the future is bright, despite the fact that the Democratic-controlled Congress has refused in 4 years out of the last 7 to appropriate as much money as requested for this program.

Saline water conversion pilot plant tests give strong indication of a breakthrough in preventing the formation of scale on distillation equipment. Scale formation is one

of the major technological problems in distillation processes. This exciting new development will be utilized in the first of five saline-water-conversion demonstration plants to be built by the Department of the Interior. U.S. Senator FRANCIS CASE, of South Dakota, has established himself as a farsighted statesman in pushing this program from the start.

One of the plants will work by an electrodialysis process and will be located in the northern Great Plains in Webster, S. Dak. It will be designed to convert brackish water to fresh water at the rate of 250,000 gallons per day.

Imagine the blessings which will be brought to the arid area of this country, and to the world, if we can be successful in this program. Republican leadership will assure success, if it is at all possible.

Statehood Won for Alaska and Hawaii

Congressional approval of the Republican platform promise and President Eisenhower's request that both Alaska and Hawaii be admitted into the Union was largely due to the persistence of the Eisenhower administration's ardent statehood advocate, Secretary of the Interior Fred A. Seaton. As spokesman for the administration, Secretary Seaton helped lead both statehood campaigns.

Indian Affairs

The policies of the Republican administration have struck at the root of the problems of the American Indian and mark a turning point in the history of Indian affairs in the United States.

In 1953 only 79 percent of the Indian children between the ages of 6 and 18 on reservations were enrolled in school. For the last school term the figure was 93 percent, and during this fall term there will be facilities to meet the educational needs of all school-age Indian children on reservations throughout the United States, most, of course, being located in the Western States.

During this administration, the Department has taken positive steps to repair the damages of past educational deficiencies among adult Indian people. Today an adult education program is being conducted at 80 locations, and 3,000 Indians and native Alaskans are enrolled.

Since 1956 the Bureau of Indian Affairs also has conducted a program of vocational training in trade schools and on-the-job training in industrial plants.

In Conclusion

Never in our history has there been such progress in so short a time to benefit so many people as the progress made under the Republican administration in its two terms.

Mr. DIRKSEN subsequently said: Mr. President, a moment ago the distinguished Senator from Arizona commented on a statement on page 3 of the President's message on resources. In speaking of the "no new starts" policy, the President said:

Such a policy denied the resource requirements and potentials on which our economic growth hinges, and took a heavy toll in added costs and even human life and homes by postponing essential flood control projects.

Mr. President, that is a rather curious statement. I can readily understand how the press quickly reached the belief that the statement implied a serious criticism of President Eisenhower.

But, Mr. President, if such a conclusion from that statement were correct, we might well argue that if we did not provide the Weather Bureau with all the money it wanted it would not be able to seed the clouds sufficiently to plow a hole

in the eye of a hurricane and, therefore, the State represented by my distinguished colleague the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS], who at the moment is sitting in the chair of the majority leadership, might be seriously injured by a hurricane and might properly be described as a victim of the administration. Similarly, it might be argued that if we did not appropriate enough money for the seeding of clouds with silver iodide, or something of the sort, the rain that was needed in Texas would not begin to fall, and then the dusts would blow, and people would lose their homes, and someone might be killed in the wind-storm that would follow.

All this is an interesting type of logic, and I am glad the distinguished Senator from Arizona remarked the fact, because I must say that if that was intended by the language that was used it was not fair to the gracious gentleman, with a great human heart, who left the White House on January 20—Dwight D. Eisenhower.

But I am rather sure that the incumbent President could not have intended the statement to be regarded in that fashion. However, that is the way it was "dished up" in the headline on the front page this morning.

TRIBUTE TO THE PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, on Monday, when fellow Senators recognized the 50th anniversary of the beginning of the congressional service of my senior colleague, Senator CARL HAYDEN, I could not be present. Therefore, at this late date I wish to add my congratulations to my lifelong friend.

A half century is a long time to spend in the service of the people, but it is especially noteworthy when we consider the fact that Senator HAYDEN's term of service coincides exactly with the life of his State.

CARL HAYDEN was first sworn in as a Member of the House of Representatives on February 19, 1912, the same year that the Arizona Territory became the great State of Arizona, and he has served continuously in Congress ever since. His service in the House ran from 1912 to 1926, with time out only for military service as a major in World War I. He was first elected to the Senate in 1926, and has served in the Senate ever since.

Mr. President, things were much different when Senator HAYDEN first came to Congress. Transportation was a problem, for example, and it took him the better part of a week on the train to reach Washington from Arizona. Now it is a matter of hours by air.

The Senate should know also that Senator HAYDEN's public life began before he arrived in Congress. It began in 1904, when he was elected a member of the Tempe, Ariz., Town Council. The town formerly had been called Hayden's Ferry, in honor of the Senator's father. Before coming to Congress, CARL HAYDEN also served as treasurer of Maricopa County, and had a taste of the rough and tough life of an Arizona sheriff.

Mr. President, I wish to take this occasion to congratulate the senior Senator from my State on a long and honorable and distinguished career as a public servant.

THE 14TH ANNUAL VOICE OF DEMOCRACY CONTEST

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, on Washington's Birthday, in this city which bears Washington's name, not the least important observance was the national awards luncheon at the Statler-Hilton Hotel.

This was the high moment of the 14th annual Voice of Democracy contest which is sponsored by the National Association of Broadcasters, Electronic Industries Association, and the State associations of broadcasters in cooperation with the Veterans of Foreign Wars.

Endorsed by the U.S. Office of Education it annually attracts the attention, study, and essays of thousands of our students. Out of these are selected 51 winners from the individual States and the District of Columbia. Their topic is "I Speak for Democracy."

I congratulate the program, the sponsors, and the contestants—even those to whom there go no awards. For our country must be a little richer for the unsung thousands who give their thought to our system of government.

At the Washington Birthday luncheon a narrower selection is announced of the four outstanding contestants.

The Rhode Island representative, William C. S. Mays 3d, of Providence, was among the top four chosen by the distinguished panel of national judges represented at this function by the Honorable Tom C. Clark, Associate Justice of the Supreme Court of the United States.

William Mays is a senior at Hope High School in Providence and looks forward to attending the University of Rhode Island. As a symbol of the inspiring thinking of these young people I ask unanimous consent to include at this point in the RECORD the text of the essay of William C. S. Mays 3d as delivered at the awards luncheon.

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

I SPEAK FOR DEMOCRACY

Democracy—stop and ponder this word for a few moments and attempt to gain an image of what democracy means to you. Noah Webster has defined democracy as a "government by the people or a government in which the supreme power is retained by the people and exercised either directly or indirectly through a series of representation."

Unless you have had some connection with another type of government or way of life, you will fail to gain a complete picture of democracy. Even I, as an American, admit defeat because, to me, democracy is my way of life and hence I take many of the happenings of my daily life for granted. I cannot understand not having the privilege of free speech, a trial by jury, an education of my own choosing, worshipping as I please, starting and owning my own business, and so many of the other items that we, as citizens of this great Nation fall to completely appreciate unless we are without.

A quick glance out of a window gives view to a large number of objects that are asso-

ciated with democracy. The cars passing on the street are symbols of our economy brought about by our system of free enterprise. The street itself was paid for by the taxpayer who either voted for the highway project or had his elected officials vote for him.

Perhaps the greatest example of our democracy is shown every fourth year in our elections. This year, our State, as many in the Nation, was faced with the election of a Governor and his slate, a U.S. Senator, two Representatives to the House, and many posts in local levels. This was in addition to the election of a President of our Nation.

The people weighed each candidate by his platform and promises and then decided upon the ones that they would like best to serve them for the next few years. Their choice has reflected the desires of the people and hence, the people receive their wishes. A privilege granted to only a few—this is America—our way of life—a wonderful way of life.

If there were only some way that we could look at our America, our democracy from an outside point of view, then, only in this way, would we gain a true picture of how wonderful it is to live in a society in which the will of the people is the law of the land. Again, Noah Webster has defined democracy as the most powerful ruling force on the earth—"a government by the people."

Democracy is a government by the people. I speak for democracy.

A CITIZEN OF JAPANESE ANCESTRY SPEAKS FOR DEMOCRACY

Mr. LONG of Hawaii. Mr. President, the American people generally accept the statement that what we wish to find in the Nation we must first put into the schools. This applies particularly to the development of those attitudes and accomplishments that are basic in good citizenship. The schools of the Nation are the foundation of both the security and the idealism of the Nation.

This fact is recognized by the inspirational program entitled "The Voice of Democracy." The 14th national awards program sponsored jointly by the National Association of Broadcasters, the Electrical Industries Association, the Veterans of Foreign Wars, and State associations of broadcasters was held in Washington on February 22, George Washington's Birthday.

The winner in each of the 50 States was present. These high school boys and girls represented the best of hundreds of thousands of students who participated in the contest.

The citizens of the new State of Hawaii, the Aloha State, were thrilled when Miss Carol Ogata, of the Pahoa High School, a small rural school on the island of Hawaii, was declared to be the national winner. Through her subject, "I Speak for Democracy," she spoke feelingly of what democracy is and what it means to her.

The concluding paragraph of her statement reflects the spirit of the American school and is inspiring:

Therefore, I vow to defend my country, not with arms and fists, for I am quite helpless with these; not with angry words, for they are of no avail; but in every way I can—through my actions and with my heart. Every time I am given an opportunity to voice my disagreement, I will try to remember that I, too, must give others an equal

opportunity to voice their opinions. Every time I communicate with God in my own way, I must remember to put in a few words of thankfulness. Every time I am given a chance to make my own decision, I must weigh the facts carefully, for with my privileges come certain responsibilities. I will defend democracy, for democracy lives through you and through me.

I ask unanimous consent that Miss Ogata's entire statement be printed in the RECORD.

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

I SPEAK FOR DEMOCRACY

I am an American of Japanese ancestry. My grandparents were immigrants to this country. Our Nation fought a bloody war with the people of my grandparents' homeland. Yet, I am no less an American than a person who can trace his ancestry back to the minuteman who fired the shot heard 'round the world. I am no less an American because this is America. I am no less an American, for that minuteman or his father or grandfather before him was an immigrant also.

Our Nation's greatness was built by the tired, the discontented, the adventurous, the hopeful, and the desperate from numerous countries. To all these America gave a new lease on life, and all these people contributed to America's greatness. The virgin land and open skies presented opportunities, but these were unattainable except through hard work. Hard work did not deter these people, for in America, as nowhere else in the world, a man was truly free. The people worked and suffered but never yielded. Great cities sprang from the earth, until in some places there were forests of buildings instead of forests of towering trees. Industries grew, agriculture flourished, and our country became what it is today—prosperous and still growing.

Hard work and creative thinking built our country, but our country was born and preserved in blood. Americans fought to gain their independence. They fought against common foes. They even fought brother against brother. Yet in the end the United States of America remained united. Such is the history of our Nation, built by the sweat, blood, and ingenuity of countless individuals.

This is our heritage. I, as an American, proud of my heritage, will defend it. Where else can there be so much prosperity and abundance? Where else will you find a Catholic and a Protestant running for the Nation's highest office and have each man considered for his abilities and not for his religion? Where else will you find territories so eager to become a part of the nation? Where else will you find the Government so close to and so representative of the people?

My answer is, Nowhere else but in my homeland—America. To some people America may be the farms and fertile valleys. To others bustling cities, filled with humanity, may spell America. A Negro mother may hear America in the voice of a Marian Anderson. A Jewish citizen may look with pride upon the life story of Albert Einstein. An Italian citizen may add his lusty voice to thousands of other voices cheering a Rocky Colavito.

America is a combination of all these things. America represents something intangible, yet something we live by, day in and day out. It represents something people have given and will give their lives for. It represents something people take for granted at times. It represents democracy. Democracy, our daily way of life, can survive only if all of us are determined to keep it alive.

Therefore, I vow to defend my country, not with arms and fists, for I am quite helpless with these; not with angry words, for

they are of no avail; but in every way I can—through my actions and with my heart. Every time I am given an opportunity to voice my disagreement, I will try to remember that I, too, must give others an equal opportunity to voice their opinions. Every time I communicate with God in my own way, I must remember to put in a few words of thankfulness. Every time I am given a chance to make my own decision, I must weigh the facts carefully, for with my privileges come certain responsibilities. I will defend democracy, for democracy lives through you and through me.

MONTANA RAILROAD MERGERS AND SERVICE CURTAILMENT

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, today an examiner for the Interstate Commerce Commission is conducting a public hearing in Miles City, Mont., the second of two hearings in my State, concerning the application filed by the Chicago, Milwaukee, St. Paul & Pacific Railroad Co. to discontinue passenger train service between Minneapolis, Minn., and Seattle-Tacoma, Wash.

Also on February 17 the Northern Pacific, Great Northern, the Chicago, Burlington & Quincy, and the Spokane, Portland & Seattle Railroad Cos. filed an application with the Interstate Commerce Commission requesting approval of the proposed merger of these four railroads.

Montana is served by three transcontinental railroads, the Milwaukee Road, the Northern Pacific, and the Great Northern. These railroads play a very important part in the economy of the Treasure State, and they have provided the major source of freight and public transportation. Montana has also been good to these railroad companies.

Now in two separate actions these roads want to curtail, abandon, and consolidate railway service in Montana. If the abandonment and the consolidation are approved, it will mean unemployment in a State which is already confronted with serious depressed economic conditions, and it will take away service from an area which is still fighting to get an orderly public transportation pattern to serve its public. These are very serious matters, and I wish to address myself to these problems for a few minutes today.

The field hearings which are now being conducted by the ICC examiner in Montana concern the Milwaukee Road's announced intention to discontinue the operation of the Olympian Hiawatha passenger train between Minneapolis, Minn., and Seattle-Tacoma, Wash. At the present time the Milwaukee Road serves 10 Montana communities. If these passenger trains are taken out of service, four of these cities will have no passenger train service, and it is a considerable distance to any other line. The proposed discontinuance will also affect other branch line service now operated in the State by the Milwaukee Road. In most of these communities the Milwaukee Road is a very large influence on the local economy. In fact, at least two of these cities are major points on the Milwaukee Road. If these trains are

taken off, it will mean unemployment, disruption of service, and economic distress.

The merger of the Northern Pacific and Great Northern Railroads in Montana will have repercussions which are difficult to predict at this time. Will the passenger train service be reduced to one major line instead of two? What will happen to the rail centers such as Laurel, Livingston, and Havre which serve these lines? Another matter that concerns me greatly is, What will we have if the ICC approves these applications? We will have a monopoly over all passenger train service between Minneapolis and Seattle-Tacoma. This is difficult to justify, in my estimation.

My colleague, the able junior Senator from Montana [Mr. METCALF], shares my concern over these developments in the railroad industry.

The railroads of this country have had some tough sledding on occasion, but in recent years sincere attempts have been made to assist them in putting their operations back on a sound business basis. However, I do not think there was ever any intention to let the railroads escape their responsibilities to the consumer and the traveling public. In the instance of the railroads operating in Montana, I have not noticed that any of them were on the verge of bankruptcy. The railroads should quit playing one side against the other; they should face up to their problems. Train discontinuances have become a serious matter in the delivery of mails in some areas of the country.

I know I speak for LEE METCALF as well as myself when I say that because of its growth Montana and the Northwest need the services of competitive transcontinental railroads. We suggest that the Milwaukee Road, the Great Northern, and the Northern Pacific fight to maintain their competitive position in the transportation field with new imaginative policies instead of withdrawing to an easier road to financial prosperity. A brochure circulated by the Milwaukee Road suggests that the approval of its request to discontinue passenger train service from Minneapolis to the west coast will permit them to eliminate a losing operation and enable them to better serve its patrons and the general economy. What about their patrons in Minnesota, the Dakotas, Montana, Idaho, and Washington?

I have ridden the passenger trains on each of these transcontinental railroads, in fact many times. Admittedly, they are not always filled to capacity, but it seems that something could be done to overcome this situation by revising the present rate structures and improving service. Certainly no one would say that passenger trains have become passé. I, myself, like to ride on trains; they offer many conveniences and services that cannot be obtained on any other means of public transportation. Why not offer cheaper train fares to operate the passenger trains at near 100 percent of capacity rather than the present usual 20 to 25 percent? The trains run. Fill them up.

The Interstate Commerce Commission is the authority in these matters, and I do not intend to exercise any undue influence upon them. However, I suggest that the examiners and the Commissioners of the ICC not only listen to the hard, cold facts of a financier's reports and the smooth arguments of legal counsels, but that they also give serious consideration to the man on the street, the inarticulate small businessman, or the small chamber of commerce who can not afford legal representation, the people who will be hurt by curtailment, abandonment, and consolidation of railroad service.

The Northwest is growing. We have an abundance of resources. The railroads can be a part of the future, but not if they retreat. The elimination of Milwaukee passenger trains and the consolidation of the Great Northern, Northern Pacific, C.B. & Q., and S.P. & S. will only add to Montana's distress—a distress figure which now stands at 14.6 percent of our work force unemployed, second only to Alaska with a figure of 18.3 percent. We are not proud of that percentage, and we do not want to see it worsen, but that is what will happen if the railroads have their way.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD newspaper articles, editorials, and communications relating to this subject.

There being no objection, the articles, editorials, and communications were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

INTERSTATE COMMERCE COMMISSION,
Washington, D.C., December 19, 1960.

HON. MIKE MANSFIELD,
U.S. Senate.

HON. LEE METCALF,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

GENTLEMEN: I have your telegram of December 12, 1960, expressing your views in opposition to the proposal of the Chicago, Milwaukee, St. Paul & Pacific Railroad Co. to discontinue effective January 8, 1961, trains Nos. 15 and 16 operating between Minneapolis, Minn., and Tacoma, Wash., Finance Doc. No. 21391. I also have Senator MANSFIELD's letter of December 8, 1960, enclosing a copy of a telegram from Mr. W. R. Lintz, of Deer Lodge, Mont., who also expresses his views in opposition to the proposed discontinuance.

Numerous protests to the proposal of the railroad have been received and consideration is now being given by the Commission as to whether it should institute an investigation of the proposed discontinuance. In the event the Commission decides to institute an investigation of the proposal of the railroad, an order to that effect will be issued on or about December 28, 1960.

Your request that the Commission issue an order instituting an investigation of the proposal of the railroad is noted, and you may be assured that careful consideration will be given thereto, as well as to the contentions of all parties before a decision in the matter is reached.

I have arranged for you and your correspondent to receive copies of all notices, reports, and orders that may be issued in the proceeding.

Sincerely yours,

JOHN H. WINCHELL,
Chairman.

DECEMBER 12, 1960.

JOHN H. WINCHELL,
Chairman, Interstate Commerce Commission,
Washington, D.C.:

On December 6, 1960, the Milwaukee Road filed a statement with the Interstate Commerce Commission giving notice of its intention to discontinue transcontinental passenger-train service between Minneapolis, Minn., and Seattle-Tacoma, Wash. This action will terminate the operation of the Olympian Hiawatha trains 15 and 16 in the State of Montana.

The Milwaukee Road has a long career in Montana and it continues to bear an important economic influence on a number of communities in the State. The discontinuance of this passenger-train service will have a very serious effect on service and employment in 10 Montana cities. While the Milwaukee Road may have compelling reasons for taking this action the welfare of many of our constituents will be adversely affected.

We, therefore, request that the Interstate Commerce Commission issue an order of investigation in this case, under existing authority, requiring that service on this portion of the Milwaukee Road be continued for an additional 4 months so that this matter can be thoroughly studied. We are deeply interested in this matter and under separate cover we are sending you a sampling of constituent views.

Regards.

MIKE MANSFIELD,
U.S. Senator.
LEE METCALF,
Member of Congress.

FEBRUARY 17, 1961.

EVERETT HUTCHINSON,
Chairman, Interstate Commerce Commission,
Washington, D.C.:

The application filed for approval of the merger of the Great Northern, the Northern Pacific, the Chicago, Burlington & Quincy, and the Spokane, Portland & Seattle Railroad Cos. is potentially one of the most far-reaching proposals to affect the State of Montana and the Northwest in many years.

The Northern Pacific and the Great Northern have long competitive histories in the development and service to the Nation's fourth largest State. The approval of this consolidation would place rail transportation in the hands of a virtual monopoly in view of the Milwaukee Road's announced intention to curtail and discontinue service between Minneapolis, Minn., and Seattle-Tacoma, Wash.

This merger raises many serious questions which must be answered to the satisfaction of the people of Montana. What changes in employment and service will there be in our State? How many railroad employees will be displaced? What Montana communities will lose passenger and freight service? What improvements may be anticipated?

While the officials of the railroad companies involved may have compelling financial reasons for seeking the approval of this merger we are opposed to any plan which will bring about a major displacement of railroad personnel, curtailment of passenger and freight service, and resulting effects on local economies in a State already hard hit by chronic depressed conditions. Please keep us advised of all developments in this matter. Regards.

MIKE MANSFIELD,
LEE METCALF.

[From the Great Falls (Mont.) Tribune, Jan. 15, 1961]

UNION OFFICIAL PREDICTS MERGER COULD END RAIL SERVICE HERE

M. W. Hampton, of Chicago, vice president of the Brotherhood of Locomotive Firemen & Enginemen, predicted here Saturday night that if the Great Northern and Northern Pacific railroads merge, the Great Falls

area will ultimately be without rail service of any kind.

"This, of course, would not occur overnight," he said, "but 25 percent of more than 1,000 jobs in the Butte division of the Great Northern would be affected immediately, and going by records of past mergers, eventually everyone else would be out of jobs."

In a speech before about 300 attending the 10th annual Great Falls Farmer-Labor Institute at Farmers Union headquarters, Hampton called the proposed merger a classic example of monopolistic empire building.

He said the merger of the G.N., N.P., Burlington, and Spokane, Portland & Seattle Railroads is "diametrically opposed to the public interest."

Hampton charged that the combined roads would have a free ticket to serve only areas of the Pacific and Northwest where high profit, bulk commodities predominate.

"Instead of competition-inspired expansion, the area would be afflicted with retrenchment of rail transportation services. The scrapping of rail lines and retirement of equipment means loss of service to shippers, interference with economic development and an increased public criticism of the poor service rendered by the railroads."

Hampton said that if there is a merger, someday the Great Falls area will be without rail service because of poor branch line service, causing more persons to turn to trucks and other transportation and eventually the combined railroads asking to eliminate service altogether because of insufficient revenues.

"We have had experience," he said, "and we know the parallel consolidations wipe out 25 to 30 percent of the jobs. In the Northwest, that means upwards of 19,000 workers."

Pointing out that the major economy in rail mergers is the reduction in employees and eventual curtailment of service, Hampton said "If the merger of northwest railroads is allowed the growth rate of the entire region will be slowed."

The union spokesman called on citizens of the States served by the four railroads to awake to the danger of losing their most important ticket to future growth.

"You cannot sell your town as an industrial center or farm products marketing center without rail transportation. Unless every community, every chamber of commerce and every citizen works to keep rail transportation a competitive, dynamic force in the growth of this great region, we will find the Northwest slipping behind other areas of the Nation," he said.

Articles of incorporation were filed in Dover, Del., for the Great Northern Pacific & Burlington Lines, Inc., Friday. Filing of the papers paves the way for an application to the Interstate Commerce Commission for approval of the merger.

The ICC apparently will get the application next month and G.N. and N.P. stockholders will vote on the merger later.

[From the Daily Missoulian, Jan. 26, 1961]

CIVIC GROUP'S LETTER FIGHTS RAIL MERGER

A letter has been sent to Missoula businessmen from the Missoula Civic Group protesting the proposed merger of the Northern Pacific; Great Northern; Chicago, Burlington & Quincy and Seattle, Portland & Spokane Railroads.

Application for permission to merge is reportedly to be made by the railroads with the Interstate Commerce Commission in February.

In a statement last week, Vice President C. H. Burgess of the Northern Pacific Railway said that all four systems over the next 5-year period will cut personnel about 8 percent or by some 5,200 employees; the net loss in Montana an expected 304 persons.

Burgess also predicted that the employment in Missoula and Livingston will actually show a slight increase during this period.

LETTER'S TEXT

The letter from the Missoula Civic Group read as follows:

"The Missoula Civic Group was formed in October 1960 with the specific purpose of informing all interested parties in our area of forthcoming plans and intentions of both this group and that of the Northern Pacific Railway in regard to their attempting to merge with three other financially solvent railroads.

"We feel our approach has been entirely objective, having offered the Northern Pacific every opportunity to acquaint you with the pending merger. Thus far the only statements made by the railroads have been primarily supposition. The Missoula Civic Group feels that after 5 years of study on a now completed plan, the railroads asking the Interstate Commerce Commission permission to merge before telling you of the effect of their cutback of employment, facilities, and service.

"Railroad chief executives have said a loss of 8,100 jobs would be felt in the first 2 years. Most serious effect of this loss would be on the Northern Pacific from Casselton, N. Dak. to Sandpoint, Idaho. Speaking conservatively, Northern Pacific officials say Missoula will lose 30 to 37 percent of her more than 500 railroad employees.

"An unbiased survey made for railroad labor organizations by a Chicago research firm shows that 18,000 jobs will be lost on the four systems contemplating merging.

"It is for these reasons and the reasons listed in the attached enclosure that the Missoula Civic Group is approaching all business people on behalf of railway employees, asking that their objection to this proposed merger be supported with the same good will that these Missoula citizens have supported your business over the past years."

The letter was signed by F. A. Caron, chairman of the civic group, and R. S. Murray, chairman of the group's public information committee, both employees of the Northern Pacific Railway.

Enclosed with each letter were two inserts, one of which read:

"Do you know—

"That more than 520 people work for the railroad in Missoula? That 456 of these people are married and have families? That, including families, there are 2,500 railroad people? That there are 725 railroad children in Missoula schools? That there are over 400 railroad homeowners? That railroad homes are valued in excess of \$7 million? That local home loaning firms hold 276 mortgages on these homes? That railroads have 450 accounts in local banks? That railroads spend \$4,500 a month for rent in Missoula?

"EIGHTY-FIVE THOUSAND DOLLARS IN TAXES

"That railroads spend \$85,000 a year in property taxes? That railroads spend \$30,000 a year in State income taxes? That railroads spend \$390,000 a year in Federal income tax? That railroads spend \$14,000 a month for gasoline? That the railroads' power bill is \$11,000 a month? That the railroads' milk bill is over \$8,000 a month? That railroads pay insurance premiums in excess of \$25,000 monthly? That the railroad payroll in Missoula is over \$330,000 a month?

"The merchants and citizens of Missoula must know these facts so that they may rise in protest to the proposed merger of the Northwest railroads that will take a large percentage of these dollars away from their economy and their friends and neighbors away from their home city."

The other insert was a report headed "The New Threat of Railroad Consolidations,"

compiled by the Montana Railway Employees Association.

The report contends that no one benefits from railroad consolidations except the financier and stockholders which control the railroads; that a monopoly will be created by the proposed merger, and, despite the fact the railroads claim the merger is a move toward greater efficiency, none of the railroads in question are in financial difficulty.

[From the Billings (Mont.) Gazette, Feb. 14, 1961]

PROPOSED RAILROAD MERGER IS MAJOR WORRY TO LAUREL

(By Zoe Von Ende)

LAUREL.—This city is running scared.

The people aren't sure what the proposed four-railroad merger will mean to it, but they're expecting the worst. And hoping for the best.

It's a city dominated by three industries: railroad, oil refining, and agriculture.

Payroll and number of employees considered, railroad is probably the most important.

The excitement generated in December and January when Laurel rail unions and the chamber of commerce filed letters of protest of the merger has subsided.

Now, a sort of grim wait-and-see philosophy has taken over.

Laurel's Northern Pacific rail yards reputedly are the largest between the Twin Cities and the Pacific coast. "What will happen," the people ask, "if the NP; Great Northern; Chicago, Burlington & Quincy; and Spokane, Portland & Seattle Railroads merge?"

FEWER JOBS?

They assume consolidation will mean fewer trains, less work, fewer jobs.

They expect news any day now that merger plans have been filed with the Interstate Commerce Commission. After that, Laurel, and cities and towns all over the Pacific Northwest hope ICC hearings will be held in their areas.

More important than that, though, is a desire that the NP come up with some definite information concerning postmerger plans.

Local authorities admit they don't know what St. Paul headquarters have in mind. St. Paul has said little.

STRUCK BY FIRE

The situation was worsened last September when a \$250,000 fire struck the Laurel car repair shop. A total of 154 was out of work then; a few were rehired; others have been laid off since. NP authorities maintain the latter layoffs are seasonal. But Laurel's not so sure. The people guess the unemployment is connected with the merger.

The Northern Pacific has assured Laurel the shop will be rebuilt. Prefabricated steel has arrived in the Rail City for the new building.

"Salve," one Laurel businessman termed the Northern Pacific's assurances.

"Those prefab deals come down as quickly as they go up," said another.

NO DATE

Northern Pacific officials say they're unable to set any date when the new shop will be in operation. They also say they don't know how many will be reemployed.

Meanwhile, many of the unemployed have left Laurel or taken other jobs. But other jobs are few and far between. The primary bright spot is the city's construction program. Work is expected to begin about mid-April on a \$410,000 sewer improvement project.

Many Laurel residents realize their voices will carry little weight with the ICC in protesting the merger. But a glimmer of hope

came recently when the ICC agreed to hold off a reduction in rail service in western Montana for several months.

Because they're aware the railroads and ICC probably will not consider loss of jobs in Laurel, and in cities similarly affected, as reason for abandoning merger plans, the protest has been based on loss of service.

The chamber of commerce has added another stipulation. If it becomes apparent the merger will have a positive effect on Laurel, it will withdraw its opposition.

Rumors ran rampant in the city of 4,670. They are stories of more railroad layoffs of cuts in service, of Northern Pacific official statement of plans. They usually amount to nothing.

SCAPEGATS

Scapegoats are many. Some maintain the Government—the people—gave railroads their land in the first place and the roads have a responsibility to provide jobs and pay property taxes. The railroads have their side of it, too. They cite heavy return to the Government in reduced war freight rates.

"Mergers don't do anybody but stockholders any good," a union man said.

If the Government—the ICC—approves the merger, then it's up to the Government to find new jobs, others say.

The merger itself has been a scapegoat. Its impending consequences have been blamed, among several factors, for voters' turning down a proposed site for a new high school.

It's been held responsible to a large degree for the achievement council's decision to shelve plans for a medical center. Other factors are involved here, too.

AUTOMATION HERE

When the emotion is gone from conversations with railroad men, businessmen and housewives, they'll admit automation is a reality.

The replacement of men by machines and consolidation of efforts is something that must be faced, regardless of the hurts.

Like cities all over the United States which rely on a few basic industries, they wish Laurel didn't. But they also realize there's no point in worrying about what isn't.

Mobility of labor remains a gigantic problem. Laurel is just a minute example of the problem of the country's 5.4 million unemployed.

It's also a problem of increased specialization which has come to American economy with bounding technical advances.

A 45-year-old man who's spent 20 years in a railroad yard probably is in no position to begin training for another occupation.

This is where social responsibility comes in, many observers say. If you can't train the worker for another job, at least make sure his children have opportunity to be liberally educated and prevent the catastrophe later on.

OTHERS CONCERNED

Railroad employees aren't the only ones worried about Laurel's economy. One or two retail businesses have closed in the past few months.

Keeping retail business in Laurel is not a new problem by any means.

"Laurel's proximity to Billings is, and always has been, its biggest problem," many residents will tell you.

It's only a 20-minute drive to Billings. Despite businessmen's campaign to "Shop Laurel First," Billings' shopping centers and lower prices are undeniably attractive to Laurel shoppers.

SAVING GRACE?

But this very proximity is looked upon by a few long-range viewers as the city's saving grace.

As Billings grows, they ask, what's to keep people who work there from having their homes in Laurel? They cite suburban growth all over the country as a good example of such a possibility. A small community with generally good schools is an ideal place for home and children.

More than few Laurel residents already are employed in Billings. They "commute." It works the other way around in a few instances.

But the long-range future—20 years ahead—isn't what's worrying Laurel now.

It's accustomed to seasonal layoffs. This winter's are suspected as being more than that.

The panic has subsided. It's now a matter of waiting and seeing. And hoping.

[From the Montana Kaimin]

PASSENGER SERVICE DISPUTE

(By Sue Lintz)

The Milwaukee Road filed a statement on December 6 with the Interstate Commerce Commission stating its intention to discontinue passenger service between Minneapolis and Tacoma. The action will have a profound effect on all students who travel via the Milwaukee Road because Olympian Hiawatha trains 15 and 16 would be terminated in May.

An announcement was made of the proposed discontinuance but because of complaints by individuals, associations, corporations, communities and railway employees the discontinuance was suspended by the ICC pending extensive investigation of the public need for passenger trains.

In order to retain passenger service on the Milwaukee Road, the opposition to the discontinuance must be overwhelming. A hearing will take place in Butte Friday for the purpose of taking testimony in opposition to the proposal.

Utilities in Montana received a tax cut 2 years ago. As a result of the cut, property was devaluated. In order to qualify for the tax reduction, utilities were required to show a loss of revenue. It has been charged, and appears to be true, that the Milwaukee Road board of directors shut down ticket stations, broke mail contracts and did not advertise the cut in price of tickets that was afforded all railroads by the ICC. In short, deliberate limitation of service discouraged patronage and qualified the Milwaukee for the tax reduction.

Montana is now engaged in a reevaluation of real estate which will raise individual taxes to make up for the tax reduction of utilities.

If discontinuation of these trains is allowed, it may result in considerable unemployment in Montana and hardships may result at inaccessible communities as a result of a lack of service. Weather and terrain conditions make other public transportation unavailable.

Students who would be inconvenienced by the discontinuance of Milwaukee Railway passenger service are requested to sign a petition at the Lodge desk.

WASHINGTON, D.C., February 21, 1961.

C. F. REARDON,
Great Falls, Mont.:

We have requested Interstate Commerce Commission, examiner for Interstate Commerce Commission, to permit you to represent us at public hearing, Elk's Building at Miles City, Friday, February 24, 9:30 a.m. Please read the following statement: "Because of prior commitments and congressional business of importance to the State of Montana and the Nation, it is impossible for us to come to Miles City to appear at this important public hearing. We do, however, wish to make it known and reiterate our statement presented to the Butte hearing that because of potentially serious economic

repercussions, increased unemployment and loss of passenger train service to certain areas of Montana, we must express our opposition to the proposed discontinuance by the Chicago, Milwaukee, St. Paul & Pacific Railroad Co. of passenger trains Nos. 15 and 16 operating between Minneapolis, Minn., and Tacoma, Wash. The Milwaukee Road has a long history in the State of Montana. It has provided transcontinental train service, employment for hundreds of people and in certain areas it is a major contributing factor to the economic stability of cities and towns. In some areas of central Montana it is the only means of public transportation. Major areas of the State of Montana are now plagued with depressed economic conditions and the approval of this plan to discontinue Milwaukee Road passenger train service in our State would only increase and extend these conditions. We ask that very serious consideration be given to all the testimony received in Miles City today." We also extend our greetings to our many friends in eastern Montana and please assure them of our deep interest and concern in this matter.

Regards.

MIKE MANSFIELD.
LEE METCALF.

THE OSCAR AWARD

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. President, I should like to call the Senate's attention to an

event of great importance to one of California's leading industries. The industry is motion pictures, and the event is the annual "Oscar" show of the Academy of Motion Picture Arts and Sciences.

Awarded annually for outstanding accomplishment, the 12-inch, 7-pound "Oscar" has become a symbol of achievement and is largely responsible for elevating the artistic quality of motion pictures over the past 33 years.

I need not remind the Senate of the global struggle going on today for man's mind. Motion pictures are playing a vital role in that struggle. We can be proud of the fact that the American motion picture, despite increased international competition, is still far and away the most popular in the world.

The 33d annual awards show will be presented this year on Monday evening, April 17, over the combined radio and television facilities of the American Broadcasting Co. and the Canadian Broadcasting Co. It will be seen in all of our 50 States and in Canada, and will be heard by additional millions throughout the world. It has always been a wonderful show, and this year's should be no exception. I urge all Senators to tune it in. I am certain they will enjoy it.

FOREIGN CURRENCIES AND U.S. DOLLARS UTILIZED BY COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC WORKS IN 1960 IN CONNECTION WITH FOREIGN TRAVEL

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, in accordance with the Mutual Security Act of 1954, as amended, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record the report of the Committee on Public Works concerning the foreign currencies and U.S. dollars utilized by the committee in 1960 in connection with foreign travel.

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

U.S. SENATE,
COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC WORKS,
February 20, 1961.

HON. CARL HAYDEN,
Chairman, Committee on Appropriations,
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR HAYDEN: In compliance with section 502(b) of the Mutual Security Act of 1954, as amended, there is enclosed herewith a report of the foreign currencies and the U.S. dollar equivalents utilized by the Committee on Public Works for the period January 1, 1960, to December 31, 1960.

Very truly yours,

DENNIS CHAVEZ,
Chairman.

Report of expenditure of foreign currencies and appropriated funds by the Committee on Public Works, U.S. Senate

[Expended between Jan. 1 and Dec. 31, 1960]

Name and country	Name of currency	Lodging		Meals		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Senator Dennis Chavez:											
Mexico.....	peso.....	2,068	165.57	1,176	94.14	625	50.00	1,998	160.00	5,867	469.71
United States.....	dollar.....		135.00		42.50		8.00		8.00		193.50
Do. ¹	do.....				25.68		5.00		2.42		133.10
Total.....		2,068	300.57	1,176	162.32	625	63.00	1,998	170.42	5,867	696.31
Senator Stephen M. Young:											
Mexico.....	peso.....	980	78.40	970	77.71	625	50.00	250	20.00	2,825	226.11
United States.....	dollar.....		177.50				6.50		5.00		189.00
Do. ¹	do.....				25.68		5.00		2.42		133.10
Total.....		980	255.90	970	103.39	625	61.50	250	27.42	2,825	448.21
Theo. W. Sneed:											
Mexico.....	peso.....	1,962	157.14	1,205	96.50	656	52.50	787	63.00	4,610	369.14
United States.....	dollar.....		117.50		50.00		30.00		50.00		247.50
Do. ¹	do.....				12.84		2.50		1.21		116.55
Total.....		1,962	274.64	1,205	159.34	656	85.00	787	114.21	4,610	633.19
Charles R. Perrin:											
Mexico.....	peso.....	325	26.08	340	27.60	718	57.50	250	20.00	1,633	131.18
United States.....	dollar.....		110.00		67.50		5.00				182.50
Do. ¹	do.....				12.84		2.50		1.21		116.55
Total.....		325	136.08	340	107.94	718	65.00	250	21.21	1,633	330.23
Totals:											
United States.....			540.00		237.04		64.50		70.26		911.80
Foreign.....		5,335	427.19	3,691	295.95	2,624	210.00	3,285	263.00	14,935	1,196.14
Grand total.....			967.19		532.99		274.50		333.26		2,107.94

¹ Appropriated funds, USAF for miscellaneous and meals served on plane in flight.

RECAPITULATION		Amount
Foreign currency (U.S. dollar equivalent)		1,196.14
Appropriated funds:		
S. Res 247.....		812.50
Government department:		
U.S. Air Force.....		99.30
Total.....		2,107.94

RESERVE OFFICERS ASSOCIATION

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, the February 1961 issue of the Officer, official publication of the Reserve Officers Association of the United States, con-

tains an excellent article written by Representative ROBERT L. F. (BOB) SIKES, of Florida, which merits the attention of Congress. The article sets forth a brief description of 13 bills which are on the

Reserve Officers Association priority list for approval in the 87th Congress. I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, that the article written by the distinguished and able Representative from the Third

District of Florida—who, by the way, is also a brigadier general in the Army Reserve—be printed at the conclusion of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. PROXMIER in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I have been a member of the Reserve Officers Association for many years and have had the honor of serving as national president of this great organization. I, therefore, feel fully qualified to comment on the outstanding contributions which the Reserve Officers Association has made to our national security during the 38 years of its existence. No group has been a stronger advocate of defense alertness and readiness through the years than has the Reserve Officers Association. The officers, directors, and members of the Reserve Officers Association have also been very instrumental in helping Congress and our defense leaders to shape Reserve legislation and policies to insure good incentives and morale for our Reserve and Active duty forces.

This organization merits the support of all Americans, particularly all officers of our armed services, whether they be Regular or Reserve officers.

EXHIBIT 1

FOR MORALE, EQUALIZATION—13 BILLS ON ROA PRIORITY LIST AS 87TH CONGRESS BEGINS SESSION

(By Representative ROBERT L. F. SIKES)

Since World War II, the Reserve Officers Association has moved into a steadily advancing position of prestige in the Nation. It has done so by wielding a sturdy and steady influence in national defense policy-making and thus, serving to keep our Nation strong.

ROA has enjoyed a succession of accomplishments which might be astounding unless you consider the soundness of our position, based upon our constitutional objective of seeking solely to work for sound national programs.

This success leads us to new and broader missions, presenting a broader and more intensive challenge.

Our association must reconcile itself to the fact that we can never rest on laurels. The horizons are broad, we must move on and on.

The 87th Congress, moving into being with the new national administration in the executive branch, now is at work.

Great problems face our Nation. It is possible that never before in the history of our Nation have situations been more complex, circumstances more trying, and issues more elusive.

We are in a great international gray area.

The Communist powers which continually threaten, and constantly watch for the opportunity to engulf us, are not easy to grapple with. Their campaign is taking on increasing subtleties and wearing new disguises. Communism is sending out new temptations, and offering new and alluring types of bribery.

Against this background, ROA's team begins the work of another year—the 39th since the association's founding.

If we are to serve national defense, we must work for policies which insure forces adequate in numbers as well as in effectiveness. The element of morale is of greater importance in the complexities of these times than ever before. The morale of the personnel of ROA likewise figures importantly in the overall picture of the Nation's defense posture.

With the emphasis upon morale, 13 bills vitally affecting ROA were introduced during the opening days of the Congress. We shall push for hearings on these measures, and hope for their enactment after reasonable consideration.

The following is a thumbnail description of these proposals, many of them as familiar as the Magna Carta to those who dedicate themselves through ROA to our cause:

1. The Reserve officers incentive bill (H.R. 5132 of the last Congress, by Representative MENDEL RIVERS), this is the long-sought "anti-RIF" measure, needed just as vitally now as in 1957 when this problem became acute. This measure passed the House in the 86th Congress but failed to secure Senate approval; now the job has to be done all over again.

2. The retired pay recomputation bill (H.R. 11318 of the last Congress, by Representative PAUL KILDAY). This would restore the time-honored relationship of retired and active duty pay. Passed by the House, it was held up in the Senate pending studies of the entire retirement system. Presumably, efforts will be made in the Senate to peg to this proposal the institution of a contributory retirement plan.

3. To define the status of retired members of the armed service, amending the Economy Act to give Regulars the same rights as reservists to draw whatever pay they may earn in retirement (H.R. 5195 of the last Congress, by Representative JOHN R. FOLEY).

4. To provide disability coverage for reservists traveling to and from training. This is a need whose statement indicates the justification (H.R. 3364 last Congress, by Representative RIVERS).

5. To permit the crediting, for purpose of determining eligibility for retirement, certain service performed prior to attaining the established minimum age. This would recognize vital service performed in the youthful years of military personnel who are now, in effect, being penalized for what might be called "premature patriotism."

6. To recognize the merited status of naval ROTC graduates who are accepted for the Regular service. This measure passed the Senate last session (S. 3733, by Senator STROM THURMOND, and has substantial backing already in the House).

7. To amend the provisions of an act which adds additional and unwarranted penalties against military personnel, by removing earned retirement rights when the military service upon which such rights were based are not at issue. (H.R. 4601 from the last Congress by Representative TOM MURRAY.)

8. To forgive erroneous payments to widows of military personnel, who received and used modest benefits believed at the time to be entitlements by both user and Government and where they have no resources to repay such sums (H.R. 7529 of the last Congress by Representative THOMAS LANE).

9. To equalize the treatment of Reserves and Regulars in the payment of per diem while on active duty and acting on orders to perform duty where per diem is authorized. (H.R. 3357 last Congress, by Representative RIVERS.)

10. To amend the Medicare Act to permit treatment of reservists where facilities, personnel, and space are available for such treatment.

11. To amend the Uniformed Services Contingency Option Act to liberalize the conditions under which personnel may consider these options with regard to their retirement pay.

12. To restore travel pay which was severely curtailed last year, vitally reducing training of Reserves. This will require consideration by the Appropriations Committee of the sums and the language in the appropriations bill.

13. To grant constructive service to members of the Coast Guard Women's Reserve,

thus recognizing as in other services the service performed during a period of uncertainty in the SPAR program. (H.R. 71727 from the last Congress, by Representative CHARLES CHAMBERLAIN).

THE BRAZILIAN ECONOMY AND ITS RELATION TO THE UNITED STATES

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, as a Member of the U.S. Senate vitally interested in Latin America, I am pleased to ask unanimous consent that the following study be inserted in the body of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. This study, prepared by a Brazilian private economist, represents a recent evaluation of the Brazilian economy and its relation to the United States. In my view, it portrays an accurate picture of the problems facing the growth of the Brazilian economy and the stability of its political and social institutions.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

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

Since the war, Brazil entered a phase of accelerated growth. For instance, between 1950 and 1954, the gross national product increased 5.4 percent per year and between 1955 and 1959, it increased at the average annual rate of 6 percent. Population is increasing at the rate of 2.5 percent per year. The rapid rate of income growth has permitted Brazil to maintain a climate of political and social stability and respect for democratic institutions quite remarkable for an underdeveloped country. This is not to say, however, that social unrest is a phenomenon unknown in Brazil.

U.S. economic cooperation played a significant role in this development process. The work of the Joint Brazil-United States Economic Development Commission, set up during the Truman administration, greatly facilitated the expansion of the Brazilian economy in the 1950's. However, in the last few years, the relations between the two countries grew increasingly colder, due to the tendency of the Republican administration to approach them from an exclusively banking angle.

Even Operation Pan America, which was based on the concept that if political and social stability in Latin America is to be maintained significant economic progress has to take place, found no response north of the Rio Grande during the tenure in office of the last U.S. administration.

Operation Pan America aimed at obtaining in the Latin American countries a per capita income high enough to put into motion a cumulative and automatic process of economic development.

In order to evaluate the effort required to reach this goal, it is enough to consider that, assuming this income level to be around \$500 per capita (U.N. estimates), the Brazilian gross national product would have to grow, at a yearly rate of 5.5 percent. This means that between 1958 and 1980, national income or GNP should increase three times. The maintenance of this rate of growth would require a rise in gross investments from \$2.9 billion in 1958 to \$9.6 billion in 1980, or about 18 percent of the gross national product.

Since a large share of the capital goods required for investment purposes would have to be imported, import requirements should total \$3.5 billion in 1980, as compared to actual imports of about \$1.2 billion in 1959.

Considering that Brazilian exports average from \$1.2 to \$1.4 billion a year, and that their prospects for expansion of the coun-

try's traditional exports can hardly be considered promising, normal export proceeds, in the foreseeable future, will be clearly inadequate to finance these massive imports, unless a greater degree of international co-operation can be achieved.

Besides Operation Pan America, a number of specific matters affecting Brazil-U.S. relations should be reviewed, such as (a) financing of petroleum exploitation in Brazil; (b) stabilization of commodity prices; (c) the inflationary process in Brazil; (d) export of public capital; (e) the development of the northeast of Brazil; and (f) technical assistance for the development of small and medium industries in Brazil.

PETROLEUM

As it is well known, the petroleum industry in Brazil is controlled by a state monopoly, the Petrobras, a mixed company in charge of geological field investigation, exploration, extraction, refining, and ocean and pipeline transportation of oil. It would be pointless to argue on the comparative merits of public or private petroleum exploitation, and to go over the often-repeated arguments for and against the state monopoly. The simple truth is that the present policy has wide national support in Brazil, and that the slightest hint of a different policy being attempted would release popular resistance of incalculable repercussions. Even apart from these noneconomic factors, Petrobras justifies its existence by meeting all tests of efficiency. Since 1955, when the state monopoly began to operate, the output of crude oil increased by more than 10 times.

COMMODITY PRICES

Between 1954 and 1959 the prices of Brazilian export products fell by more than 40 percent. Brazil's capacity to import would have increased by 16 percent in 1959 in comparison with 1958 if the export and import prices maintained the level of the latter year. The greater volume of exports was in 1959 entirely nullified by the fall in export prices.

Besides curtailing the country's capacity to import essential goods from its development, the deterioration of its terms of trade has at least two other harmful effects: (a) It diminishes Brazil's capacity to borrow abroad, since a relatively greater share of its exports proceeds has to be reserved to repay and service previous credits; and (b) it tends to accelerate the internal inflation, since a larger volume of goods has to be subtracted from internal consumption to be exchanged for the same amount of imported goods.

In pursuance of its intention of seeking stabilization of the world coffee market, Brazil was one of the sponsors of the International Coffee Agreement, now in the second year of operation. Its success can be gaged from the fact that today 28 producing countries and territories, representing over 90 percent of world production, are members of this commodity pact.

Active participation by industrialized countries in these commodity stabilization pacts would be a great significance for the countries exporting primary goods.

INFLATION

In the United States inflation occurs after full employment is reached, that is, it is provoked by attempts to obtain resources for consumption or investment when practically all productive factors are employed. In Brazil, as well as in other underdeveloped countries, the full utilization of resources is prevented by deficiencies in basic sectors, such as transportation and power. To fight inflation without seeking to correct these deficiencies would be to maintain the country in a perpetual underdevelopment stage. The proper policy, which is definitely anti-inflationary over the long run, is therefore to seek the removal of these bottlenecks which prevent part of the production to reach the market. Of course, this does not mean that

sound fiscal policies and monetary and credit restraint are not very useful complementary devices.

The refusal of external sources of loans and credit to extend economic assistance to Brazil—both for economic development projects and for compensating the fall in export receipts—does not help Brazil fight inflation; it only concurs to aggravate it, since economic imbalance remains for a longer period of time.

PUBLIC CAPITAL

The major part of the nonmilitary public aid received by Brazil in the postwar period came from the United States. From July 1, 1945, to December 31, 1959, Brazil received \$54 million in grants, or 0.09 percent of the total extended by the United States to the world. In relation to loans and other credits utilized during 1940-59, Brazil's share accounted for 6.1 percent of the total—an expressive percentage—or about \$1 billion. However, a close look at the composition of the loans to Brazil shows that 91 percent of them have been hard loans made by the Export-Import Bank at relatively high rates of interest, currently running between 5% and 6 percent. Furthermore, Brazil has repaid about \$450 million, plus over \$130 million interest.

Over the next 5 years, Brazil faces, furthermore, an obstacle, which if not surpassed, may deter considerably the country's development; namely, the repayment of the principal and interest of old debts. To overcome it, closer cooperation with the United States is necessary and a joint program providing for the inflow of public funds into Brazil has to be carried out based on the following points: (a) to be substantial in size; (b) to lead to a more adequate system of repayment of the principal and interest of current Brazilian external debt; (c) to assure financing for essential development activities; (d) to create conditions for further inflow of know-how and private capital; (e) to provide soft loans by means of the mechanisms such as the ones of Public Law 480 (agricultural surpluses), in order: (1) to help meet some internal costs of very expensive development projects; (2) to save foreign exchange by offering traditional Brazilian imports, such as wheat, against payment in local currency; (3) to permit the broadening of relief operations in some very distressed sectors of the country.

THE NORTHEAST OF BRAZIL

The northeast of Brazil covers a region of the size of Texas. Its population in 1960 was over 20 million inhabitants; that is, larger than any Latin American republic, except Mexico and Argentina.

The Brazilian northeast is singled out as the most extensive and populated area, in the Western Hemisphere, with an income level of less than \$100 per inhabitant. In all states of the northeastern region, per capita income falls well below the Brazilian average. The disparity of living standards between the northeast and the center-south constitutes—beyond any doubt—one of the most serious problems to be faced at the present stage of Brazil's economic development.

The northeast, except for some humid valleys and coastal regions, is afflicted periodically by insufficient rainfall and by droughts. The type of economy now prevailing in the semiarid region is highly vulnerable to droughts. Hence, the characteristics of a social calamity.

Recently, the Federal Government has developed a comprehensive 5-year plan to tackle northeastern problems. A coordinating agency—Superintendency for the Development of the Northeast (Sudene)—was set up with headquarters in the region (Recife, Pernambuco).

Foreign economic assistance may speed up considerably the execution of the plan and

play an important role in relieving some of the chronic ills of the region, such as malnutrition, poor sanitary conditions, etc.

TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE FOR SMALL AND MEDIUM-SIZED INDUSTRIES

Industrial development in Brazil is reaching the point that governmental regulations and programs have to be drafted to assist small and medium-sized industries, in order to avoid excessive concentration and to assure competition.

The experience accumulated in the United States in this field might prove valuable and technical assistance projects in this area should be considered.

NATION'S PLAUDITS EARNED

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, an article published by the Nashville Banner, Thursday, January 19, 1961, proclaiming national tribute to Richard M. Nixon on a job superbly done.

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

TO RICHARD M. NIXON: NATION'S PLAUDITS EARNED

Side by side with Dwight D. Eisenhower, sharing in extraordinary degree the responsibilities of administrative stewardship, has stood Richard M. Nixon; and he shares, too, the national accolade for a job superbly done. As he steps down from the Vice Presidency, acknowledgments of an unsurpassed service are fittingly bestowed.

Richard Cardinal Cushing of Boston recently nominated him as "Good Will Man of 1960," extending his remarks to point out, in a speech at Baltimore, that "When he lost the closest election of the past century, he was magnificent in defeat. . . . When he proclaimed the election of his opponent, the Vice President spoke with extraordinary good will, good sportsmanship and good patriotism."

But in addition to all that, he has honored every responsibility assigned; in the uniform of his country, in its lawmaking service, in his executive association, where in anxious moments of grave Presidential illness heavy burdens were thrust upon him; or in missions many carrying the American message all over the world. These were and are excerpts of notable record, reflecting the measurement of the man.

His is the moral stamina of deep conviction. In no test of that courage, intelligence, fidelity—the response to duty wherever it has beckoned—has he ever failed his country. That concept of duty and sense of honor are in the highest tradition of personal virtue, the ideal of the worthy public servant, and belonging in the American escutcheon.

More cannot be said of any man by way of tribute, and the vast constituency cognizant of these qualities has said it of Richard M. Nixon.

America owes him a great deal, for the fight he has waged—beginning as a Congressman—on communism and its subversive operations. It is not forgotten that he led out in the investigation that exposed Alger Hiss and was consummated by prosecution and conviction. Nor will it ever be forgotten that as America's official envoy he crossed swords with the enemy in the very shadow of the Kremlin. No less with dignity and honor did he face down Communist-incited mobs on his Latin American tour.

At home and abroad he has exemplified Americanism at its best, bespeaking principles that are fundamental regardless of the political storm that may sweep upon them from time to time.

Through these 8 years of service in next to the highest office, he and his charming wife have earned and held a place in the heart of the Nation; a place of respect and admiration. They still are there.

Official goodbys do not alter the affectionate regard in which America holds Dick and Pat Nixon.

FEDERAL JUDGESHIP BILL

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to print in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an article published in the Pittsburgh Post Gazette, Tuesday, February 14, 1961, commenting on the addition of judges to the Federal courts, in which I concur.

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

ADD FEDERAL JUDGES

After 6 years of delay, an omnibus Federal judgeship bill supported by the new Kennedy administration should have a good chance of passage. Favorable action would speed the ends of justice long denied by overcrowded dockets.

The Kennedys propose to create nine new seats on the courts of appeals and five new district judgeships, two for western Pennsylvania. It would also make permanent a presently temporary judgeship in this district and bring the court's full complement to eight judges. The need locally is underscored by the court's time lag in completing a case—second worst in the Nation.

Since 1955 the Judicial Conference of the United States, the American Bar Association and the Department of Justice have been urging Congress to increase the manpower of the Federal courts.

But the omnibus judgeship bill has met opposition reflecting at least in part a reluctance by the Democratic majorities in Congress to give Republican President Eisenhower an opportunity to fill so many judgeships with Republicans. Even after Mr. Eisenhower promised to divide the new judicial appointments between the two parties, the Democratic Congress continued to balk, apparently preferring to take its chances on last fall's election.

The Democrats won, of course, and so it is reasonable to suppose that the political objection to the judgeship bill will have been largely overcome. Still, the Eisenhower proposal to make appointments on a bipartisan basis has much to recommend it. If such appointments became traditional, it should work ultimately to increase the independence of the Federal judiciary. The Kennedys have made no such proposal. Whether or not one is forthcoming, the courts still need the manpower and we think the omnibus judgeship bill should be passed.

SALESMEN URGED TO SELL "ONE EXTRA" TO STIMULATE ECONOMY

Mr. McNAMARA. Mr. President, our Government is rightly concerned about the depressed state of the economy and 5½ million unemployed.

The Federal Government has serious responsibilities to promote—through many means at its disposal—an expanding economy and full employment. More attention to these responsibilities in recent years could well have prevented the current recession.

But while it has a vital role to play, the Government by no means must be considered to have the sole responsibility in this area.

Business, for example, must redouble its efforts to stimulate the economy with good products attractively priced. And increased sales, of course, will mean increased employment.

A healthy recognition of this was recently displayed by a group of automobile salesmen in a telegram to President Kennedy in which they called on their colleagues in every field to sell one extra of their products.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of the telegram be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

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

We, the 140 members of the diamond chapter of the Plymouth All Star Salesmen's Club in San Francisco for the club's annual sales achievement award trip, today resolved that within the next 2 weeks each of us would sell at least one new car over and above that which we would normally sell. This is our personal contribution to help boost the economy. We feel that salesmen more than any other group hold the key to improvement of the current economic situation. We feel that a little extra effort by each and every salesman in the United States would be a great stimulus to the economy. We are calling on salesmen everywhere to join with us and to extend themselves to sell one extra of whatever their product of service might be.

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, is there further morning business?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there further morning business?

IMPORTANCE OF THE NIKE-ZEUS SYSTEM

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, on February 2, 1961, I delivered, in the Senate, a speech on the Nike-Zeus anti-ICBM missile system and called attention to the January 30, 1961, issue of Missiles and Rockets magazine, which devoted almost its entire contents to providing information on this important defense system. I placed in the RECORD of that date, on page 1659, one of those articles and an editorial; but, because of space limitations, I could not place all of the article in the RECORD.

I have now obtained reprints of the magazine articles and my remarks on the Senate floor. On Wednesday, I sent a copy of my remarks and the articles to every Member of the Senate.

Mr. President, the Nike-Zeus system is now in the advanced stages of research and development, and it is the only intercontinental ballistic missile defense system under active development in the free world. Former Army Secretary Wilbur M. Brucker, Assistant Army Secretary Richard S. Morse, Lt. Gen. Arthur G. Trudeau, and other leading defense advocates have warned repeatedly that the first country to achieve a practical defense against ballistic missiles will gain not only a tremendous psychological advantage, but more important, a very great military advantage. There is no question but that the Soviets are moving rapidly toward development of an anti-missile-missile system. We have had valuable lead time on the Soviets in this vital competition, but we have already lost at least a year of that

lead time by not moving into production of component parts.

The series of articles in Missiles and Rockets magazine points up the fact that very soon President Kennedy will have to make a decision as to whether production of component parts of the Nike-Zeus system should be begun prior to the Zeus' big test later this year as against an Atlas ICBM.

I have been greatly encouraged by news reports, yesterday and today, which indicate that the Joint Chiefs of Staff have recommended to the Secretary of Defense, Robert McNamara, that we immediately move toward production of component parts of the Zeus system, in order to save valuable time in getting the Zeus operational as soon as possible.

I urge my colleagues in the Senate to study this material on the Nike-Zeus and to give full support to the recommendation to begin immediate production of component parts of this vital defense system. The Zeus has more than amply proved itself in all tests to date, and there can be no question as to the importance of having at the earliest possible opportunity some form of defense against the threat of ICBM attack. If the Zeus should prove effective in saving only one city, it would be more than worth its cost, for we can have Nike-Zeus protection for less than the cost of rebuilding a single city or industrial complex. In addition, the Zeus system will serve as a great deterrent against enemy ICBM attack, because the enemy would have to have so many more ICBM's for attack purposes, and could not be sure that the most important target areas would be destroyed in such an attack.

We have begun production of component parts of every other important weapons system in connection with which time has been a key factor—such as the Navy's Polaris missile and the Atlas ICBM. We must move on now with the Nike-Zeus.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, will the Senator from South Carolina yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time available in the morning hour to the Senator from South Carolina has expired.

Mr. MUNDT subsequently said: Mr. President, I should like to associate myself with the remarks made by the distinguished Senator from South Carolina [Mr. THURMOND], who has demonstrated considerable leadership and knowledge in promoting recognition of the importance of developing the antimissile missile, the Nike-Zeus. I read his speech of February 2. It made a great deal of sense. I have spent much time, as a member of the Senate Appropriations Subcommittee on Defense Appropriations, studying the potentialities and possibilities of this weapon. It seems to me this is one area of our national defense in which we should all unite in moving forward with the greatest amount of expedition.

In this uneasy era, when we are involved in a war of words, and are enjoying what might be called a peace of parity, because both sides, our side and the

Communist side, have developed great striking power in missiles, we must plan carefully for our continuing freedom and security. We have laid to rest, I hope, all talk about the missile gap which it is now known did not exist. We must look to the future.

We must recognize that both sides of this ideological conflict are developing weapons for total annihilation; and to the side that first develops an effective antimissile missile will go a great reward and indisputable world leadership. If we develop it first, it will become a great weapon of peace. If the Soviets should develop the antimissile missile first, it will become a scourge of war and they will use it to browbeat, to intimidate, and perhaps to annihilate the peace-loving and free nations of the world.

So I think we should commend the Senator from South Carolina for his alertness and for continuing to press for this very important development in the whole field of missiles, namely, the development of an effective defense against the potentiality of a missile attack.

It is imperative that, in this particular area, America should get out in front and stay out in front, because nothing could so completely jeopardize peace and freedom in our world as to have the Communists be first in developing an effective defense against missiles, by producing an effective antimissile missile.

So I salute the Senator from South Carolina on his initiative. I hope he continues to press forward in this field. I assure him, as one member of the Senate Subcommittee on National Defense Appropriations, that I will do what I can to help make funds available to move the development of such an antimissile missile forward just as fast as our scientific know-how, our manufacturing capability, and our national finances will permit.

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I thank the distinguished Senator from South Dakota for his kind remarks. I appreciate the vision of the Senator from South Dakota in realizing the importance of the Nike-Zeus weapon, the only antimissile missile that has been developed by the free world.

Mr. President, on account of the 3-minute rule, I was unable to yield to the distinguished Senator from South Dakota at the time I made my statement, and I ask unanimous consent that these remarks appear immediately following my remarks on the Nike-Zeus missile.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

THE HOUSE UN-AMERICAN ACTIVITIES COMMITTEE RESOLUTION OF ILLINOIS SENATE

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, if it is no violation of the rule—and I trust it will not be so considered—I must mention the House of Representatives in connection with a resolution adopted by the Illinois Senate of the 72d General Assembly. The resolution is in the nature of a commendation of the Honorable FRANCIS E. WALTER, a very distinguished Representative from Penn-

sylvania, chairman of the House Un-American Activities Committee, and also the work of that committee.

Under the rule, the names of Members of the House must not be specifically mentioned. So, at the very outset, I proclaim the fact that I do not proceed in the spirit of violating the rule, but, knowing of the attacks that have been made on the committee and its distinguished chairman, I think the resolution of the Illinois State Senate should be incorporated in the RECORD, and I ask unanimous consent to do so.

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

SENATE RESOLUTION 15-A

Whereas the gravest threat facing our State, our Nation, and the world today is international communism, which has as its objective the establishment of a world totalitarian dictatorship and the abolition of all freedoms guaranteed by and enjoyed under our constitutional form of government; and

Whereas the methods used by the exponents of this international traitorous conspiracy includes lies, deceit, terrorism, espionage, sabotage, riots, infiltration into government, respectable organizations, and our every way of life and other treacherous and unlawful procedures; and

Whereas we are continuously warned of the Communist threat in our own State and Nation by J. Edgar Hoover, who warns that communism remains a threat. Student riots in San Francisco last May were an example of the insidious manner in which the Communist Party exploits our youth; and

Whereas we here in Illinois are astonished by the headlines in our better press: "Communist Convention in Chicago Soon," "Plan New Red National Youth Organization, FBI Reports," "New Horizons for Youth," "Congressman FRANCIS E. WALTER, Democrat, of Pennsylvania, Chairman House Committee on Un-American Activities, Reports 25,000 Skilled Reds in the United States"; and

Whereas our Nation is forced to spend approximately \$40 billion of our taxpayers money for our national defense, plus financing other nations of the world with many billions of dollars more to defend our Nation against this treacherous organized conspiracy. It appears that in the interest of our own security and in the best interests of the health and general welfare of our own State and Nation, that we should resort to every means of self-preservation, by eliminating the Communist menace as a danger in our own State and Nation; and

Whereas it has come to our attention that the Communist organized conspiracy, joined by their fellow travelers, the ultra-liberal press; eggheads; uninformed; misinformed; brainwashed phony ultra liberals and that conglomeration of misfits has launched its annual drive to abolish the House Committee on Un-American Activities; and

Whereas the House Committee on Un-American Activities, as a result of their courageous fight have exposed and spotlighted the activities of these Communist traitors in our midst, including the Alger Hiss and hundreds of others working to destroy our country, thereby awakening the American people to the treacherous communist plot against our very way of life: Therefore be it

Resolved by the Senate of the 72d General Assembly of the State of Illinois, That we congratulate and commend Chairman FRANCIS E. WALTER and all members of the House Committee on Un-American Activities for their determined fight to save America

from being destroyed from within by the agents of a foreign power; and be it further

Resolved, That we make an appeal to all Members of our U.S. Congress, who were sent to Congress in all good faith by their constituents, to keep the faith and give every support necessary to keep the committee at full strength so it may continue to do an all-American job; and that suitable copies of this resolution be sent to the Honorable FRANCIS E. WALTER and the Speaker of the House of Representatives of our U.S. Congress, Washington, D.C.

CLIFTON R. WHARTON

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I was very happy to note the announcement that the President intends to nominate a very distinguished career man in the foreign service to be Ambassador to Norway. He is Mr. Clifton R. Wharton, a native of Baltimore, a graduate of Boston University, and now a legal resident of San Francisco, Calif.

Mr. Wharton, a Negro, will hold the highest rank ever attained by a member of his race as a U.S. career diplomat. Other Negroes have served as Ambassadors, but they held their posts as political appointees. His road to an ambassadorship has been the hard way—by study, diligence, and dedication to his work. He first came into the Foreign Service in 1925, under President Calvin Coolidge. Three years ago President Eisenhower named him Minister to Rumania. I am happy now to learn that this administration has also recognized the worth and ability of this diplomat, as did President Coolidge and President Eisenhower.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a biographical sketch of Mr. Wharton, along with an article about his appointment, which appeared in the Washington Star for February 21, 1961, be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the sketch and article were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BIOGRAPHICAL SKETCH OF CLIFTON R. WHARTON

Born: Baltimore, Md., May 11, 1899.
Education: LL.B., Boston University, 1920, LL.M., 1923.

Marital status: Married.

Experience:

Non-Government: 1920-24, member of bar of Massachusetts; law practice.

Government: 1924, examiner, Veterans' Bureau; appellate law clerk, Department of State; 1925 Foreign Service officer, unclassified and secretary in diplomatic service; third secretary, Monrovia; 1927, vice consul of career; vice consul, Monrovia in addition to duties as third secretary; 1929, to Department; Foreign Service officer, class 8, and consul; 1930, consul, Las Palmas; 1934, Foreign Service officer, class 7; 1936, consul and second secretary, Monrovia, temporary; 1937, consul, Las Palmas; consul and second secretary, Monrovia, temporary; 1938, consul, Las Palmas; 1939, Foreign Service officer, class 6; 1941, second secretary and consul, Monrovia; 1942, consul, Tananarive; Foreign Service officer, class 5; 1945, American Maritime delegate, Ponta Delgada; consul, Ponta Delgada; 1946, Foreign Service officer, class 4; Foreign Service officer, class 3; 1949, first secretary and consul, Lisbon; 1950, consul general; consul general, Lisbon in addition to duties as first secretary; 1951, Foreign Service officer, class 2; 1953, consul general, Marseilles; 1956, Foreign Service officer, class 1; 1958, Envoy Extraordinary and Minister

Plenipotentiary to Rumania; 1959, Foreign Service officer, class of career minister. Military: 1918, U.S. Army. Memberships and clubs: Not stated. Office: American Legation, Bucharest. Home: Care of the American Legation, Bucharest. Legal residence: San Francisco, Calif. Political affiliation: Career. Present position: Envoy Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary to Rumania.

[From the Washington Star, Feb. 21, 1961]
NEGRO CAREER DIPLOMAT NAMED TO NORWAY POST

President Kennedy has chosen Clifton R. Wharton, a Negro career diplomat, to be Ambassador to Norway.

Mr. Wharton, 61, is now Minister to Rumania. He has been in the Foreign Service 34 years.

As Ambassador at Oslo, Mr. Wharton will hold the highest rank ever attained by a member of his race as a U.S. career diplomat.

Other Negroes have served as Ambassadors, but they held their posts as political appointees.

Mr. Wharton's road to an ambassadorship has been the hard way. His first State Department job in 1925 was as a law clerk at \$1,860 a year.

Three years ago, President Eisenhower named him Minister to Bucharest. Prior to that appointment, Mr. Wharton had been consul general at Marseilles, France.

In going up the ladder to his consul general's post, Mr. Wharton served at such points as Monrovia, Liberia; Las Palmas, Canary Islands; Tananarive, Madagascar; Ponta Delgada, Azores; and Lisbon, Portugal.

He was born in Baltimore on May 11, 1899.

He attended Boston University, received a law degree there in 1920, and practiced law in Boston before entering Government service.

OSLO, NORWAY, February 21.—The newspaper Dagbladet printed today a two-column picture of the new American Ambassador to Oslo, Clifton R. Wharton.

The headline over a short story on Mr. Wharton was, "Welcome to Oslo."

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, is there further morning business?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there further morning business? If not, morning business is concluded.

TRIBUTES TO THE LATE SENATOR THOMAS C. HENNINGS, JR., OF MISSOURI, AND SENATOR-ELECT E. KEITH THOMSON, OF WYOMING

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the legislative business of the Senate be now suspended, in order that tributes may be paid to the life, character, and public service of the late Senator THOMAS C. HENNINGS, JR., of Missouri, and the late Senator-elect E. KEITH THOMSON, of Wyoming, respectively.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President—

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, before the Chair recognizes the senior Senator from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON], I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that further proceedings under the quorum call be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, the people of Missouri and the Nation have lost an outstanding U.S. Senator, and a champion of the rights of man.

It is with a deep sense of loss that I join with my colleagues in the Senate in mourning the passing of my distinguished senior colleague, THOMAS C. HENNINGS, JR.

Those of us who worked with him here in the Senate will miss Senator HENNINGS' wisdom, his courage, and his leadership. And the people of Missouri will miss the services of one who served them long and well in Washington.

TOM HENNINGS served in public life for many decades. He was assistant circuit attorney of the city of St. Louis from 1929 to 1934. He then was elected to three terms as U.S. Representative from the 11th Missouri District, serving from 1935 to 1940.

In 1940, at the request of the St. Louis Bar Association, he became a candidate for St. Louis circuit attorney, and was elected. The following year, he volunteered for active duty in the U.S. Navy, and served for more than 3 years.

Following his discharge, he returned to private practice, as a senior partner of a distinguished law firm in St. Louis. He continued the active participation and leadership in public affairs that characterized his entire life, one of his major interests being the Big Brothers of America.

TOM HENNINGS reentered public life in 1950 when he was elected to the Senate. He was elected to a second term in 1956, helping to carry the State for the Democrats.

His was a truly distinguished career. He rose rapidly to a position of leadership here in the Senate and in his party. And he rendered distinguished service as chairman of the Rules and Administration Committee, and as chairman of the Constitutional Rights and Juvenile Delinquency Subcommittees of the Judiciary Committee.

He had one of the great judicial minds of the Senate during the past decade. And he expressed on many occasions the conscience of the Senate as well, for he led many fights for the preservation of human rights and liberties essential to our democratic way of life.

His integrity was deeply respected by his colleagues.

His passing is deeply mourned.

We shall miss Senator HENNINGS, but take inspiration from a life of public service in the highest tradition of America.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that editorials from the St. Louis Globe-Democrat, September 14, 1960; St. Louis Post-Dispatch, September 15, 1960; New York Times, September 15, 1960; Washington Star, September 16, 1960; Washington News, September 15, 1960; St. Louis Argus and Kansas City Call, October 14, 1960, be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

[From the St. Louis Globe-Democrat, Sept. 14, 1960]

SENATOR THOMAS C. HENNINGS, JR.

The untimely passing of Missouri's senior U.S. Senator, THOMAS C. HENNINGS, JR., at the early age of 57 removes from the Senate a great constitutional lawyer, a highly intelligent and convinced liberal, and a courtly gentleman.

Senator HENNINGS was a gifted man who early showed the promise which he later fulfilled. Soon after his graduation from law school he became an assistant circuit attorney where he built an outstanding reputation in securing indictments and convictions.

In 1934 when he was only 31 years old he was elected to Congress for the first of three terms and retired in 1940 to run successfully for circuit attorney. In this important office he secured 2,340 convictions in 2,548 cases, a record which has never been equaled.

After service in the Navy overseas during World War II, he returned to the private practice of law in St. Louis, and in 1950 he was elected to the Senate after a bitter primary fight. He was overwhelmingly re-elected in 1956.

TOM HENNINGS was proud of the fact that in the Senate he was the first to oppose Senator Joe McCarthy at the peak of the latter's career because he felt that McCarthy had ruthlessly violated the rights of the individual. In the Senate he also fought unceasingly to combat secrecy in public affairs, and he was an equally staunch fighter against the causes of juvenile delinquency, one of his last public appearances in St. Louis several years ago having been on this subject.

In foreign affairs Senator HENNINGS sided with President Eisenhower and fought with particular vigor proposals which would have curtailed the President's power in foreign affairs, notably the Bricker amendment.

In recent years TOM HENNINGS was seriously handicapped by recurring illnesses. It was characteristic of him, however, even in his last desperate fight against cancer, that he remained active and dedicated to the very end, directing his office from his home and casting his vote as part of a pair on every important bill before the Senate.

Missouri and the Nation have lost an articulate fighter and a conscientious public servant. The Globe-Democrat voices the sorrow of the entire Missouri community and expresses its own and the State's condolences to Senator HENNINGS' lovely wife and to his distinguished and much loved parents.

[From the St. Louis Post-Dispatch, Sept. 15, 1960]

SENATOR HENNINGS

THOMAS C. HENNINGS, JR., was one of the most gifted Missourians ever to serve in the Nation's Capital. First as a Member of the House and then as a Senator he made a public record of which this State can be immensely proud. He was that rare combination, a dedicated liberal with a keen and probing mind and a healthy respect for what is practical. His colleagues were well aware of his abilities; at the time of his death from cancer he was one of the most influential men in the Senate leadership.

The Senator's friends were convinced he had everything necessary for a distinguished political career. His scholarly bent was reflected in his extensive reading and in his felicity of expression on the speaker's platform. He was a redoubtable debater, who sometimes took a wry delight in trapping an opponent but who looked upon political argument with a sense of proportion that

precluded malice. He had no taste for demagoguery, and disliked campaigning. He was the first native St. Louisan elected to the Senate, and typified this city rather than Missouri.

A lawyer who made an outstanding record as circuit attorney in St. Louis 20 years ago, Senator HENNINGS served on the important Senate Judiciary Committee. This post furnished him with a base for various activities in behalf of civil rights and progressive causes generally. He was chairman of the Constitutional Rights Subcommittee, and became known as an active defender of individual rights and a supporter of the Supreme Court, particularly of its integration decision of 1954.

One of Senator HENNINGS' first assignments after his election in 1950 was an investigation of the Maryland "smear" election of that year, in which Senator McCarthy of Wisconsin played a part in the defeat of Senator Tydings, a conservative Democrat. In 1952 he was chairman of a subcommittee that investigated McCarthy's financial affairs; his findings became part of the case for Senate censure of McCarthy. In 1953 he led the successful fight against the so-called Bricker amendment, which would have limited the treaty-making powers of the President.

For these activities, for his inquiries into juvenile delinquency, for his fight in behalf of freedom of information and for his knowledge of constitutional law Senator HENNINGS became known nationally. But much of his influence flowed from less public activities. He was chairman of the Rules Committee, the first Missouri Senator to head an important committee in many years. He served as secretary of the Senate Democratic conference, one of the three top party positions in the Senate. But much of his effectiveness stemmed from his own character; although a liberal, he was accepted by the conservatives who constitute the real core of power in the Senate.

Senator HENNINGS was deeply interested in the electoral process, and after several years of effort was successful last January in effecting Senate passage of legislation to regulate spending in Federal elections, including primaries. One of his last official acts was to write a letter which was to be read at the Democratic State platform conference at Jefferson City. In this letter he expressed confidence that the Missouri electorate will refuse to be swayed by religious prejudice.

Missouri has had many good Senators, and several great ones, since Thomas Hart Benton and David Barton were elected in 1820. Senator HENNINGS' place in this company will be determined in time. But of his superior talent and devotion to the public welfare there can be no doubt.

[From the New York Times, Sept. 15, 1960]
SENATOR HENNINGS

Senator THOMAS C. HENNINGS, of Missouri, was a fighter who had the respect of his opponents. Such respect genuinely given is rare—and it makes the man who commands it more effective than most fighters for causes. In his decade in the Senate, THOMAS HENNINGS was effective in some important fights. He was a pivot in the minority group that defeated the 1954 effort to curb the President's treaty-making powers. He fought successfully against bills designed to hobble the Supreme Court. He put himself squarely in the path of movements to lessen freedom of the press, freedom to vote and other freedoms. His death at the age of 57 is a misfortune both for his friends and for the country.

[From the Washington Star, Sept. 16, 1960]
SENATOR HENNINGS

Senator THOMAS C. HENNINGS, Jr., dead at 57, was one of the many who have with

genuine distinction combined the professions of law and politics. His training and practice in the former contributed greatly to the quality of his service for three terms in the House of Representatives (1935-41) and for the past 10 years in the other Chamber of Congress. In the Senate, he was identified as one of the leading liberal spokesmen of the relatively conservative Judiciary Committee. The extension and protection of civil rights and the problems of juvenile delinquency were matters of greatest personal and political interest to him. Never fiercely partisan in his approach to legislative questions, the Missouri Democrat's effectiveness in floor debate and in committee deliberations was enhanced as a result. Assistant Senate Democratic leader MANSFIELD spoke with accuracy for his colleague when he described Mr. HENNINGS as "a man whom we shall all miss, regardless of party."

[From the Washington News, Sept. 15, 1960]
SENATOR HENNINGS

Senator THOMAS C. HENNINGS, of Missouri, was robust in his thinking and in his activity. But cancer cut him down at 57.

He was afflicted with one of the worst types of this disease, from a medical standpoint, and had suffered with it for several years.

As a victim, he becomes merely another item in the dreadful statistics of this enigmatic ailment. As a man of prominence and ability, his death again dramatizes the complete impartiality of cancer and the steady toll it takes among our ablest citizens.

Senator HENNINGS was a man of sturdy principle. Those who most violently differed with his views had to respect the tenacity with which he held to them. Only cancer could overcome his tremendous vigor—and even against those odds he made a fight of it.

[From the St. Louis Argus and Kansas City Call, Oct. 14, 1960]

TOM HENNINGS, AS I KNEW HIM

(By J. Delmas Escoc, assistant counsel, Senate Subcommittee on Constitutional Rights)

Senator THOMAS C. HENNINGS, JR., of Missouri, whose voice in behalf of constitutional rights and human equality was recently stifled by death, was one of the finest and most sincere men I have ever known. I consider it a pleasure and a privilege to have known him and to have worked with him for the past 5 years.

TOM HENNINGS did more than merely champion the cause of democracy. He believed in it and he practiced it. To TOM HENNINGS the equality of man was more than a political issue. It was a way of life.

HENNINGS was not only an able Senator and an eloquent speaker, he was also an effective politician, but in many ways a paradox of the political prototype.

To a great degree, HENNINGS avoided the political spotlight. Many of his friends, including this writer, felt that he did not live up to his fullest political potential, that he would have made an excellent candidate for the Presidency or the Vice Presidency but TOM HENNINGS never sought these offices.

In discussing HENNINGS as a logical Presidential choice, Max Freedman, editor of the Manchester Guardian recently wrote:

"In depth of conviction, skill and courage in debate, and profound dedication to civil liberty, Senator HENNINGS holds a position of unique distinction among the Members of the Senate. But he has cast aside all thought of larger political ambition."

I do not agree with Freedman that HENNINGS had "cast aside all thought of larger political ambition." It is an accepted axiom of political life that every public figure nurtures such thoughts and such ambitions. But, what distinguished TOM HENNINGS from

most politicians is that he kept these thoughts and ambitions to himself.

HENNINGS' advocacy of civil liberties and civil rights throughout his public career was in itself somewhat of a paradox. A descendant of wealthy slaveholders, TOM HENNINGS possessed the charm and manners of a southern gentleman. Indeed, he counted among his best friends several of his southern colleagues in the Senate. Yet, he never alienated his southern friends despite his constant sponsorship and support of civil rights legislation. This was because HENNINGS always used an approach of gentle persuasion rather than one of castigation.

But, TOM HENNINGS' knowledge of and devotion to the Constitution of the United States overshadowed his southern heritage. A brilliant lawyer, HENNINGS was considered the Senate's most eminent authority on the Constitution. He fought for first-class citizenship for all simply because he felt that that there was no place for second-class citizenship under our Constitution.

In the spring of 1958, HENNINGS sent the following message to delegates attending a summit conference of Negro leaders in Washington, sponsored by the National Newspaper Publishers Association:

"Your presence here indicates a unity of purpose for the attainment of an objective too long denied Negro Americans the full and equal rights which are guaranteed to all citizens by the Constitution of the United States.

"I am deeply devoted to our Constitution and its noble precepts, and I believe, as you do, that those who deny to any citizen the rights and privileges granted by the Constitution make a mockery of that great document and affront the memory of our forefathers who conceived it as a charter for a free republic.

"It is for this reason that throughout my years of service, both in the House and the Senate, I have sponsored legislation to enforce the guarantees of our Constitution and to make it a living and vital force for all Americans, without regard to race, color or creed. As chairman of the Senate Subcommittee on Constitutional Rights, I pledge to continue my efforts toward this end.

"I wish you success in all your deliberations and I hope that this conference may mark the beginning of a new era for full equality and first-class citizenship for all."

This statement reflects as accurately as any that I have known TOM HENNINGS to make just how he felt about our Constitution.

HENNINGS was a liberal in the best sense of the word. He fought as avidly and as fervently for other liberal causes as he did for civil rights. He vigorously opposed McCarthyism and the use of the fifth amendment as an adjectival epithet. He attacked unwarranted secrecy in government and defended the right of the people to know what their Government is doing. He condemned the lack of due process of law in Federal loyalty-security proceedings. He defended the Supreme Court and fought legislation designed to curb the powers of that tribunal. He deplored the use of wiretapping and electronic eavesdropping devices as an invasion of the right of privacy. He was sharply critical of the police practice of holding prisoners and extracting confessions from them before they were properly arraigned and apprised of their constitutional rights. He urged repeal of the Connally amendment to U.S. participation in the International Court of Justice. He assailed the Department of Defense for its practice of considering preinduction activities in determining the nature of a serviceman's discharge. He denounced the State Department's passport policies which restricted a citizen's right to travel. He opposed the Bricker amendment and limitation on the treaty-making powers of the President. He

fought gag orders by some Federal agencies forbidding employees to complain to their Congressmen. He waged a continuous and successful campaign in the Senate for a clean elections bill requiring more adequate safeguards of the election process and more detailed public disclosure of political campaign financing. He urged Federal prison reforms and humane efforts to combat crime and juvenile delinquency without sacrificing the rights of the individual.

Shortly before his death, Senator HENNINGS directed the staff of the Subcommittee on Constitutional Rights to conduct a study of the constitutional rights of the mentally ill. In connection with that study he appointed Miss Belya T. Simmons of St. Louis, one of three Negro members of the subcommittee staff, to personally represent him at the first Missouri Conference on Mental Health which was held recently at Jefferson City. Miss Simmons was in Missouri in the interest of this study when HENNINGS died.

The measure of TOM HENNINGS is perhaps best described in the eulogies and tributes of those who knew him and worked with him.

Roy Wilkins, executive secretary of the NAACP, wrote in a telegram to Mrs. Hennings: "Throughout his public career, Senator HENNINGS was a constant and uncompromising foe of all forms of bigotry. As a Senator he could always be depended upon not only to vote for human rights legislation but also take an active role in fighting for such measures. His work contributed significantly to the enactment of civil rights statutes by the Congress. He will be sorely missed by all Americans who believe that democracy is indivisible and is the cherished heritage of our entire citizenry."

Clarence Mitchell, director of the Washington bureau of the NAACP and one of HENNINGS' closest friends and advisers, in a beautiful tribute to him in his weekly newspaper column wrote: "Senator HENNINGS often said that he reached his decision to champion civil rights after a personal battle with himself. He won the battle."

Then Mitchell went on to quote the following passage from the Senate hearings on civil rights in 1959 in which HENNINGS took issue with a witness from Mississippi on the need for additional Federal civil rights legislation:

"May I have the opportunity to say to you, Mr. Campbell, in the friendliest and most respectful and courteous way, that my own views about these problems are based upon the Constitution of the United States, the Holy Bible, a study of the history of this country and the fate of the free world."

"I think in this day and time when we find ourselves confronted with the power of Soviet Russia where communism is religion, we cannot afford to deny full equality to all our people."

Mitchell concludes: "Senator HENNINGS does not need to follow his own advice now. However, there are many of his colleagues who should understand that it is a legacy that they would do well to remember in the days ahead."

TOM HENNINGS is dead, but his faith lives on.

Mr. LONG of Missouri. Mr. President, today my colleagues and I will try within human limitations to express the life and work of the late Senator THOMAS C. HENNINGS, JR. With the observance of Lincoln's birthday still fresh in our minds, I am reminded of his eloquent Gettysburg statement which is so appropriate at this time:

The world will little note nor long remember what we say here, but it can never forget what they did here.

True, our Nation and, indeed, the world will never forget that Senator HENNINGS was a fighter—a fighter who had the respect of his opponents. Born in St. Louis in 1903, TOM HENNINGS graduated from Cornell University and Washington University Law School. He served the people as assistant circuit attorney in St. Louis, as Congressman, as circuit attorney, and as Senator.

His entire career in public service was marked by a high degree of independent judgment. The London Times summed up his career in the Senate with this statement:

Senator HENNINGS emerged as an acknowledged expert on the Constitution and constitutional law, and fought this and other battles in a number of capacities, including chairman of the Senate Rules Committee and of Judiciary Subcommittees on Constitutional Rights, Juvenile Delinquency, and Federal Penitentiaries.

I first met TOM HENNINGS when we were prosecuting attorneys for our home counties in Missouri. It was with pride that I watched his meteoric rise in the Democratic Party and in the Senate of the United States. Therefore, it is with the deepest humility that I accepted my election by the people of Missouri to fill Senator HENNINGS' unexpired term.

One could speak at length on TOM HENNINGS' work in the Senate. But, to me, the high points of his career were his fights in opposition to measures he thought contrary to the Constitution or to the welfare of the people. He could always be depended upon to protect the rights of the people from governmental interference. I know of no higher tribute that can be said of any man.

Upon the death of TOM HENNINGS many newspapers throughout our land and abroad spoke of the loss. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that editorials published in the London Times, Los Angeles Times, Rhode Island Pendulum, Salt Lake Tribune, the Louisville Courier-Journal and the Louisville Times be printed in the RECORD.

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

[From the London Times]

SENATOR THOMAS HENNINGS: CHAMPION OF CIVIL RIGHTS

Senator THOMAS HENNINGS, who died on Tuesday at the age of 57, was the descendant of a wealthy slave-owning family but was probably best known as an ardent champion of civil rights.

He took his stand, writes our Washington correspondent, less on moral grounds than on the argument that the oppression of any minorities was incompatible with the Constitution. He emerged as an acknowledged expert on the Constitution and constitutional law, and fought this and other battles in a number of capacities, including chairman of the Senate Rules Committee and of Judiciary Subcommittees on Constitutional Rights, Juvenile Delinquency, and Federal Penitentiaries. He was also a member of the Senate Democratic policy committee and the Democratic steering committee and chairman of the Democratic conference.

HENNINGS was more courageous than some of his colleagues; in 1958, for instance, he dared to tell his Missouri constituents that he was going to vote for substantial foreign aid, an unpopular area of spending in that State. He also led a subcommittee investi-

gation into Senator McCarthy's finances and methods at the height of the latter's campaign.

Another of his interests was in reducing secrecy in Government operations. He insisted on the public's right to know how its business was being conducted.

THOMAS HENNINGS was born in 1903 in St. Louis and graduated from Cornell University and Washington University Law School, where he also coached athletics and lectured in English while a student. From 1929 to 1934 he was an assistant circuit attorney in St. Louis. In 1935 he was elected to the House of Representatives and served until 1940 when he was elected circuit attorney of St. Louis, but a year later he resigned and served in the Navy until 1944. After a period in private law practice, he came to the Senate as the only Democratic candidate to unseat a Republican that year.

Lavish praise was expressed for him yesterday by a number of his colleagues, including Senator KEFAUVER, who said that "his fierce devotion to the principles of freedom of information, and to the highest honesty in government were only a few of his many fine qualities * * * he was an outstanding statesman with a brilliant legal mind."

HENNINGS is survived by his parents, his wife and two stepdaughters. His successor will be chosen at the general election on November 8.

[From the Los Angeles Times]

SEN. HENNINGS DIED TOO SOON

Senator THOMAS C. HENNINGS, JR., died before he could be spared. He was only 57, but he really belonged to an older generation of Democrats, to the generation that interpreted the U.S. Constitution rigorously, believing it meant what it said, with especial emphasis on the parts defining the rights of the people of the United States over against the pretensions of the Government of the United States.

That he will become a saint of journalists there is no doubt. For he was the most effective congressional leader in the movement to tear away the paper curtain behind which so many Government bureaus operate in self-serving secrecy. Through his tireless efforts some holes were punched in that curtain and if he had lived a little longer he might have established at long last the people's right to know what their Government is doing for good or ill in the backrooms of the agencies. He was chairman of the Senate Constitutional Rights Subcommittee, and no committee was ever more precisely named.

Senator HENNINGS was also chairman of the Juvenile Delinquency Subcommittee and we on the Times have special reason to be grateful for his work in this capacity. When we were engaged in our Pulitzer Prize labor of establishing that most of the narcotics used in southern California are smuggled in from their Mexican source, Senator HENNINGS gave our findings his authoritative confirmation. He had brought his committee to Los Angeles, and afterward he was influential in prodding the State Department into some exchanges with Mexico City.

Missouri will be hard put to duplicate this Senator. Standing by and for the Constitution is not as fashionable as it used to be. The best memorial to Senator HENNINGS would be a successor with his patient persistence and the courage to be a senatorial conscience.

[From the Rhode Island Pendulum]

THE PASSING OF A GREAT SENATOR

We have silently grieved over the death of U.S. Senator THOMAS HENNINGS, JR., of Missouri. And only now can we give some form of vent to it. When we first learned of his passing, which was more than a week ago, we were so hurt inside on account of it that

we were actually prostrate at the magnitude of the loss.

And debility took over. It was hard to shuffle along with the "as usual" of our grinding routine at the Pendulum. But even in its hurly-burly of men and machines, we heard our inner ear listening to the groan of a moan inside—and inescapable. Our grief was like a wind that tore at our heart.

We could neither cry nor write words of sorrow about it.

Tears and words must have their relevance—and where was the relevance in East Greenwich? Who even knew of Senator HENNING? There are now in the U.S. Senate no less than 100 in that so-called exclusive club.

But sometimes in life, regardless of the place and time, we are struck by death, and we the living become as dumb as death. Outwardly anyway. And nobody from the outside can know what is going on inside another person's heart. And besides, what can you say?

And yet, who of us, at one time or another has not felt the proximity of death? And sometimes, too, do we not wish we were dead along with the dead? No more to break. No more to rage. At such moments it feels good to feel with the feelinglessness of death with the dead. As though in a mime: in imitation of it.

Oh for the compassion that goes with the dead and to find identity with it.

Now we openly mourn the passing of TOM HENNING. Our grief, our sorrow may culminate like the wind to no end and to no purpose—may not even be understood. But even so, we grieve and we mourn his passing.

But the truth is, as it must be, that his death, which came so untimely, is a great sorrow for all of us Americans, and not for us alone. Those of us who are imbued with the spirit of true democracy, which means in essence the rise of man to his great stature everywhere in the world, must mourn his passing as well.

We have all lost a valiant soldier in the war of liberation of humanity.

There was no greater champion of civil liberties in the United States than Senator HENNING. This is a big statement. But it is only as big as the Senator himself was. He was always fighting in the lists of civil liberties. He protected the constitutional rights of us all. He fought with a quiet but consistent courage. As a lawyer of distinction, he could use effective legal argument. The subtle way he used the legal scalpel won him the admiration and respect of many who opposed his ideas. And he did it all with no attention to himself.

Long before many a Johnny-come-lately—the political opportunists of today's fierce presidential campaign—he was at the forefront of the battle for civil liberties and civil rights. Now it seems everybody is on the bandwagon. "But for how long," with justified bitterness do we ask, "will they be on it?"

It seems ironic that he should have died at this time.

We came to know personally Senator HENNING while we owned a couple of newspapers in Missouri. And our admiration for him grew as we exchanged some correspondence with him. After a while our admiration hardly knew any bounds.

Senator HENNING was a genuine democratic nobleman. Not the phony kind. Not those who trace their ancestry, late or early, to some robber baron. His coat of arms was not of arms, but of great moral courage, of ethics, of culture, of civilized human accomplishments.

Senator HENNING was a true American nobleman. And his nobility was such as we can all have as Americans. Of treating others with absolute quality. And this is the way

we can answer a Khrushchev, a Nasser—with their fake words, with their damnable lies.

We mourn his passing, and so should you all.

[From the Salt Lake Tribune]

"SHOW ME" SENATOR

In the death of Senator THOMAS C. HENNING, Jr., the press of the United States has lost a staunch ally in its fight for freedom of information. As chairman of the Senate Subcommittee on Constitutional Rights, HENNING was quick to turn the spotlight on any Government agency which he believed to be interfering with the people's right to know.

HENNING's efforts, however, covered the whole field of civil rights—free speech, right of privacy, freedom of association, as well as freedom of information. As an article in Frontier magazine some months ago remarked, "Above all else, perhaps, HENNING symbolized sanity in the era of inquest." And the procedures of his subcommittee have been described as a model for all congressional investigators to follow.

Born in St. Louis in 1903, the Senator exemplified a popular saying of his native State—"I'm from Missouri, show me." Congress needs men who take that attitude, providing, of course, that in being "shown" they follow the elemental rules of fairness and decency.

[From the Courier-Journal, Louisville, Ky., Sept. 16, 1960]

WAYS TO HONOR TOM HENNING

The country at large and the Senate in particular have suffered a grievous loss in the death of THOMAS C. HENNING, Jr., of Missouri. He had been in the Senate for scarcely a decade, yet already had made a deep impression as a champion of the constitutional rights of the people. He fought for recognition of the equality of all citizens—an all-embracing cause, which included an incidental but strong hostility to the bureaucratic tendency to conduct public business without fully informing the public.

We hope that his State will pay a suitable tribute to his memory by choosing a successor having the same interests, even if not the same abilities. There aren't many men of such caliber in Missouri or anywhere else.

Congress itself, of course, owes a memorial to the Senator, but not one of those in marble or bronze of which Washington already has at least enough. Mr. HENNING's last important legislative achievement was the passage by the Senate June 25 of his clean elections bill—a measure proposing chiefly to introduce honesty in the reporting of campaign expenditures. The House never acted on the measure. If the next Congress should make the bill a law, there could be no more suitable commemoration of a notable career on Capitol Hill.

[From the Louisville Times, Sept. 15, 1960]

SENATOR HENNING, HUMANITARIAN

In his 10 years in the U.S. Senate, THOMAS C. HENNING, Jr., attained a status that was unique. A liberal who was personally acceptable to the conservatives, he was a militant believer in justice.

Justice to him was not an abstract principle. It meant equality of opportunity, the scrupulous observance of the individual's rights—including the right to know what goes on in Government. It meant emphasizing economic rather than military aid to the Nation's allies. It meant giving the underprivileged young people in America's cities a chance to develop as good citizens.

In all these fields he struggled with more or less success against the forces of intolerance and reaction. His death from cancer removes from the Senate Judiciary Committee the most effective opponent of the con-

servative domination of Chairman JAMES O. EASTLAND, of Mississippi.

Respected by his colleagues as an outstanding authority on constitutional law, he will be remembered best as a humanitarian who, believing in his country's greatness, believed also that man might aspire closer to perfection.

Mr. LONG of Missouri. Mr. President, if there are any duplications with respect to editorials submitted for the RECORD by my distinguished senior colleague from Missouri, I ask unanimous consent that the duplications be eliminated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. LONG of Missouri. Mr. President, on the last day of TOM HENNING's life he dictated and had delivered to the Democratic State committee in Missouri a statement dealing with religious tolerance. This appeared in the Washington Post and Times Herald of September 18, 1960, under the title "Last Testament of TOM HENNING."

I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD at this point.

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

[From the Washington Post, Sept. 18, 1960]

LAST TESTAMENT OF TOM HENNING

(By Senator THOMAS C. HENNING)

(This letter, the last written by the Missouri Democrat before his death on September 13, was sent to John W. English, chairman of the Missouri Democratic State committee. Senator HENNING dictated the message from his hospital bed.)

On the occasion of the adoption of our State Democratic platform, containing and reiterating those underlying principles found in the philosophy of Thomas Jefferson, may I congratulate the distinguished and able members of our State committee and express a reaffirmation of my ever-increasing faith in our great party.

As your senior Senator and as chairman of the Senate Subcommittee on Constitutional Rights, I am always concerned with the preservation of those rights bestowed upon us through the organic law of the land. I have found that the greatest protection for our rights and freedoms lies in the hands of our people and in the manner in which they exercise these rights.

In the one sentence comprising the first amendment to our Constitution our Founding Fathers directed the course of American life. I would like to repeat it now: "Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof; or abridging the freedom of speech, or of the press; or the right of the people peaceably to assemble and to petition the Government for a redress of grievances."

Noting that the very first restriction placed upon the Congress creates the right to worship as one chooses, and noting that article I of the Constitution of our great State emulates this right in specific and emphatic words, we must judge it to be a very prime right of our society of freemen.

I am confident that the wise electorate of Missouri will confirm this constitutional provision on freedom of religion by refusing to accept the religious beliefs of a candidate as a worthy election issue. In clear and concise language, article VI of our Federal Constitution lays down this mandate: "No religious test shall ever be required as a qualification to any office or public trust under the United States." And in article I of our State constitution we say in words of equal clarity: "No person shall on account of his

religious persuasion or belief be rendered ineligible to a public office of trust or profit in this State."

These are, of course, restrictions on governmental curtailment of the freedom of religion in our land; they do not enchain the private thought or public utterances of those who would for religious causes condemn or distrust his fellow man. But the moral theme of the law was sounded by Thomas Jefferson before the creation of our Union. In a draft for his State legislature of a bill for establishing religious freedom, he wrote, in part:

"The proscribing any citizen as unworthy the public confidence by laying upon him an incapacity of being called to offices of trust and emolument, unless he profess or renounce this or that religious opinion, is depriving him injuriously of those privileges and advantages to which, in common with his fellow citizens, he has a natural right."

Does it not justifiably follow that the voter who would require of a candidate that he be or not be of a given religious faith, or belong or not belong to a specific church, is enacting a requirement in conflict with a basic precept of our democracy?

When Jefferson said that "truth is great and will prevail if left to herself; that she is the proper and sufficient antagonist to error," he not only called upon those of his time to search for truth but upon our great party which was to be created in the image of his enlightened views.

I have faith in my fellow citizens, an unshakable faith in their determination and ability to seek and find the truth behind any issue before expressing their ultimate opinion at the polls. I have faith that false issues will be discarded and that the true ones will be faced with calm appraisal and solved only on the basis of proper consideration and intelligent reasoning. I have faith that unwarranted emotionalism and prejudice will be cast aside as sores which beget only solutions for which posterity may sadly pay and long suffer.

Lastly, I have faith and every confidence that our great Democratic Party, founded on truth and consistently the bearer of truth, will elect its candidates in our State and on a national level, and will present the Nation with its next President of the United States.

Mr. LONG of Missouri. Mr. President, on Bill of Rights Day last December 15, 1960, memorial services for Senator HENNINGSS were held in St. Louis. I ask unanimous consent that a digest and other material of these services provided by the chairman, Rabbi Ferdinand M. Isserman, be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the digest and other material were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DIGEST OF MEMORIAL SERVICES FOR THE LATE HONORABLE THOMAS C. HENNINGSS, JR.

The Senator Thomas C. Hennings, Jr., Tribute Committee, organized under the chairmanship of Dr. Ferdinand M. Isserman, rabbi of Temple Israel, St. Louis, Mo., consisted of the following: Honorary chairman, Gov. James T. Blair; honorary vice chairmen, Hon. Forrest C. Donnell, Senator Edward V. Long, and Senator Stuart Symington; chairmen, Mayor Raymond R. Tucker, Rabbi Ferdinand M. Isserman, and Irving Dilliard; members of the committee, Michael J. Aubuchon, Joseph P. Clark, Congressman Thomas B. Curtis, Russell Dearmont, Dr. Elmer Ellis, Fred A. Eppenberger, Thomas J. Guilfoil, David M. Grant, John Raeburn Green, Judge Roy Harper, Mark R. Holloran, Bishop Ivan Lee Holt, Gale F. Johnston, Congressman Frank M. Karsten, Hon. Aloys P. Kaufmann, Louis LaCoss, Jacob M. Lashly, John H. Lashly, Samuel H. Liberman, J. Wesley McAfee, Federal Judge George H. Moore,

H. Sam Priest, the Very Reverend Paul C. Reinert, S.J., John I. Rollings, Morris A. Shenker, Chancellor Ethan A. H. Shepley, Congresswoman Lenor K. Sullivan, Rev. Dr. O. Walter Wagner, Judge Randolph H. Weber, and Mrs. Margaret Bush Wilson.

The committee held a meeting in Mayor Tucker's office in St. Louis and planned to dedicate a plaque in memory of the late Senator THOMAS C. HENNINGSS, JR., at the Soldier's Memorial in St. Louis, and to hold a tribute meeting in Graham Chapel of Washington University on December 15, Bill of Rights Day. The plaque was scheduled to be dedicated at 10 a.m. on Thursday, December 15, at the Soldier's Memorial in St. Louis. The inscription on the plaque reads as follows:

"THOMAS C. HENNINGSS, JR.

"(June 25, 1903–September 13, 1960)

"United States Senator from Missouri, 1950–1960; officer in the Armed Forces; forceful advocate of clean elections; protagonist of good government; effective champion of human rights; valiant fighter for civil liberties; vigorous foe of religious and racial intolerance; counselor of delinquent youth; supporter of the Supreme Court; good and tried friend; believer in the equality and dignity of all men, in the spiritual succession of Thomas Jefferson."

Rabbi Isserman presided at the morning dedicatory service. The following invocation was given by Dr. O. Walter Wagner, executive director of the Metropolitan Church Federation of St. Louis:

"There was a Lincolnian quality about the religion of TOM HENNINGSS. Both men shunned the pretense of attending regular public worship for political purposes. Both men exhibited a deep reverence for life and expressed their religion in uncompromising loyalty to high ethical principles. In the privacy of their offices both men, in great crises, cried out to the Living God. These mountainlike men help us to look behind our pretensions and make us mindful to match our lives with theirs. Tall men were they and stalwart, like towering pines deep rooted by the lash of many a gale, they stood serene, majestic. Men said they died—but such men never die; they march the blazing trail in step with God, down through the vast eternities. O God, help us, and all who in future generations will come here to stand in awe of the courageous convictions of THOMAS HENNINGSS, and may we emulate him by our devotion to the extension of freedom and human dignity, to the end that all men shall stand tall and free and unafraid. Amen."

In his opening remarks, Rabbi Isserman said:

"The meetings this morning at the Soldier's Memorial and this evening in Graham Memorial Chapel of Washington University were organized so that St. Louisans will have a chance to pay their tributes to the memory of the late THOMAS HENNINGSS, JR., one of the most distinguished sons of our city. Because his final services were held in Washington, D.C., and only a handful of St. Louisans were present, many in our city believed that they should have a chance to pay their homage to and show their love for this great Senator. To meet this need in the hearts of many people, this Hennings memorial program was organized. On December 15, Bill of Rights Day, because Senator HENNINGSS was such an outstanding champion of the rights of man, the two functions were held to honor his memory. The committee membership was limited, because everyone was ready to serve on it. Mayor Tucker and Irving Dilliard served with me as chairmen. The mayor held the first meeting in his office, and there the decisions were made to unveil the memorial plaque at the Soldier's Memorial in the morning, and to hold an evening tribute

meeting in the Graham Chapel of Washington University. Very fittingly present here this morning besides the family of the late Senator HENNINGSS are his parents, Mr. and Mrs. Thomas C. Hennings, Sr., his widow, Mrs. Thomas C. Hennings, Jr., his sister and her husband, Mr. and Mrs. David Teasdale, and others. Present also this morning are leaders of the city's business, professional, civic, and cultural life, as well as many holding public office. Mrs. Thomas C. Hennings, Sr., mother of the late Senator, will unveil the memorial plaque. It contains the following inscription: 'THOMAS C. HENNINGSS, JR. (June 25, 1903–September 13, 1960). United States Senator from Missouri, 1950–1960; officer in the Armed Forces; forceful advocate of clean elections; protagonist of good government; effective champion of human rights; valiant fighter for civil liberties; vigorous foe of religious and racial intolerance; counselor of delinquent youth; supporter of the Supreme Court; good and tried friend; believer in the equality and dignity of all men, in the spiritual succession of Thomas Jefferson.'

Mr. Morris Shenker, a close friend of Senator HENNINGSS, and executor of his estate, paid the following tribute:

"Mr. Chairman, I am deeply appreciative of the privilege of addressing this gathering in tribute to the late Senator THOMAS C. HENNINGSS, JR., in whose memory his family and friends have gathered here today. When the last chapter of a human life has been closed we quite properly set apart time to review, to consider, and to evaluate, and in so doing we come to an appreciation of that which has been well done. In every step of his long and varied career of public service Senator HENNINGSS has exhibited the highest regard for the rights of his fellow man, large and small, rich and poor alike. Senator HENNINGSS was born in 1903, graduated from Cornell and Washington Universities and was admitted to the Missouri bar in 1926. He was an assistant circuit attorney under Judge Franklin Miller from 1929 to 1934; was elected to the U.S. Congress wherein he served three terms, and answered the call of the citizens of Missouri to assume the office of circuit attorney where he served in 1940 and 1941, when he volunteered for active duty and served as lieutenant commander in the Pacific combat theater. He was elected U.S. Senator in 1950 and re-elected by the greatest majority ever given a candidate, up to that time, in 1956. In the U.S. Senate he was a member of some of the most important committees and invariably when others were timid and right and justice demanded he had the courage to speak as was so well said by the New York Times: 'It was good to see courage in a room at a time when many men are timid.' Senator HENNINGSS came to the support and led the fight that defeated the Bricker amendment, the effect of which would have been to limit the power of President of the United States. He led the fight successfully to preserve the power of the U.S. Supreme Court against all attacks, and realizing the injustices of uncured congressional investigations, while firmly believing that those investigations are necessary, he sponsored codes of fair procedure for congressional committees which code provides that each person that is accused receive the opportunity to face his accuser. He was a recognized authority on constitutional law and was at all times ready to defend the principles of justice under a government of laws and not of men. He will long be remembered for his amiability and consideration for the feelings of others. He never lost the common touch and displayed always that warm, friendly, considerate spirit and that wonderful sense of humor which were his. His admirable human qualities won him devoted friends. He had the quality and power of forgetting for the time self, friends, inter-

ests, and relationships and fight for others stronger perhaps in the cause of justice and equality."

Mayor Tucker, of St. Louis, read the following telegrams received from President Eisenhower and President-elect John F. Kennedy:

THE WHITE HOUSE,

WASHINGTON, D.C., December 14, 1960.

RABBI FERDINAND ISSERMAN,
Temple Israel, Kingshighway and Wash-
ington, St. Louis:

Through Congressman THOMAS B. CURTIS I have learned of the meeting to be held in St. Louis today in memory of my friend, the late Senator THOMAS C. HENNING, JR. In his lifetime of devoted service to Missouri and the Nation, Senator HENNING won the respect and admiration of his countrymen everywhere. His death was a loss to America and the free world. It is an honor to join in this salute to his memory and to express my gratitude for his work.

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

WASHINGTON, D.C., December 14, 1960.

RABBI FERDINAND M. ISSERMAN,
St. Louis:

I should like to join in the tributes to Senator HENNING. He was always quick to recognize and applaud the contributions of others to human rights and human dignity and so it is particularly fitting that we offer a memorial to his career of dedication to public service. He will always be missed. His deep sympathy for the underprivileged and his keen understanding combined to produce a valiant champion of democracy. In a larger sense his memorial is the generations of Americans who will be better able to experience full economic and political freedom and equality.

JOHN F. KENNEDY.

The meeting closed with the following benediction by the Very Reverend Ned Cole, dean of Christ Church Cathedral in St. Louis:

"O God, who through humble men has revealed Thy will, continue to raise up among us such persons. May the Lord bless us, and keep us. May the Lord make His face to shine upon us, and be gracious unto us. May the Lord lift up His countenance upon us, and give us His peace and His strength, this day and evermore. Amen."

The evening tribute meeting was held in Graham Chapel of Washington University. Music was furnished by Howard Kelsey, university organist, and the university choir, under the direction of Gil Brungardt. Mayor Raymond R. Tucker made the following introductory remarks:

"Ladies and gentlemen, we are gathered here this evening to pay tribute to the late Senator THOMAS C. HENNING, JR. As we do so, I am sure that all of us who knew Senator HENNING are very conscious of a deep sense of loss. To the family of Senator HENNING, whose loss was much greater and more personal, we can only extend our deepest, and most sincere sympathy. It must, however, be a source of consolation to those who knew and loved Senator HENNING, to realize that our Nation is a better place in which to live because of him. Even as we pay tribute to Senator HENNING this evening, we know that our words are unequal to the task. The most lasting and the most fitting tributes to Senator HENNING are to be found, not in our words, but in his accomplishment during a lifetime of public service. In the words of Lincoln: 'The world will little note, nor long remember, what we say here.' However, the world can never forget the contributions made by Senator HENNING. We have only to recall the record of the U.S. Senate during the past decade, and we discover, in that record, monuments to Senator HENNING which are most lasting than any of marble. It is in this spirit, I believe, that we are gathered

here this evening. We know, full well, that the greatness of Senator HENNING is far above our poor power to add, or to detract, by our words here tonight. Senator HENNING's place in history is assured, and it is a place of honor. Thus we are gathered here not only to pay tribute to Senator HENNING, but also to recall the principles to which he devoted his life, and to reaffirm our faith in those principles. We are assembled here to dedicate ourselves to the unfinished work which Senator HENNING so nobly advanced."

The scripture reading from the Old Testament was read by Chancellor Ethan A. H. Shepley, of Washington University, and from the New Testament by Bishop M. W. Clare. Letters of tribute were read by Mr. Morris Shenker, which were received from President Eisenhower, President-elect John F. Kennedy, Vice-President-elect Lyndon B. Johnson, Congressman John W. McCormack, House majority leader, Chief Justice Earl Warren, Senator Estes Kefauver, the staff of the late Senator HENNING, Gov. James T. Blair, Jr., of Missouri, Father Paul C. Reinert, president of St. Louis University, and many others.

The program consisted of the following tributes: "Scholar and Public Servant"—Elmer Ellis, president, University of Missouri; "The Challenge of His Senate Record"—Edward V. Long, U.S. Senator from Missouri (due to the illness of Senator Long, his speech was read by Thomas J. Gullfoill); "The Lawyer"—Federal Judge George H. Moore; "The Supporter of Constitutional Principles"—Irving Dilliard, former editor, editorial page, St. Louis Post-Dispatch; "The Man"—Rabbi Ferdinand M. Isserman. The benediction was given by the Right Reverend Lloyd A. Sullivan, Epiphany of Our Lord Church. A reception in honor of the HENNING family, and for the committee, was held at the home of Rabbi and Mrs. Ferdinand M. Isserman, 82 Aruncel Place, Clayton, Mo.

SCHOLAR AND PUBLIC SERVANT

(By Elmer Ellis, president, University of Missouri)

Mr. Chairman, friends, I welcome this opportunity to pay personal tribute to the memory of Senator THOMAS C. HENNING and to express the great satisfaction we at the University of Missouri felt in his career. It is no exaggeration to say that we considered him a distinguished member of the community of scholars. He possessed many traits that we would have our students exemplify in the way of personal characteristics. He was one of us in a very real sense. As a teacher and athletic coach at Washington University, while working on his law degree, he became acquainted firsthand with many of the problems, opportunities, and responsibilities of the university scholar.

Mr. HENNING did not merely pay lip service to the values of education. An avid reader and student, his speeches were full of Biblical and classical quotations, which illustrated rather than decorated his basic thought pattern, because they came from ready familiarity with the original sources. Vituperation was absent from his public utterances, because his learning provided him with more effective tools for achieving the ends sought. Educated both in the liberal arts and in the law, he exemplified their values in the causes which he chose to advocate.

Senator HENNING had faith in scholarship and in free discussion. He spoke in the tradition of Jefferson and Lincoln when he said: "It is my belief that the first amendment is a positive admonition to Americans to debate, discuss and argue, and indeed to disagree; to participate in diverse associations; to constantly engage in free inquiry."

He was admired for his courage in defending his convictions, and all saw in him the degree to which the educated man can make

his ideals an effective force in American life. It took courage as well as skill to oppose a fellow Senator whose methods threatened American freedom, but Senator HENNING stood fast against such methods and can be credited with pointing the way to their ultimate censure by the Senate of the United States. Again, the Senator played an important role in defeating those who would curb the powers of the Supreme Court of the United States because of decisions defending the individual's right to civil liberties. Within the Senate itself, he led successfully the fight for civil rights legislation in 1957.

His whole career bears testimony to the depths of his convictions. On one occasion he said: "It is automatic with me to be in sympathy with the rights of the individual." Through his efforts the U.S. Army modified its procedure in checking on the loyalty of its members, so that the individual enjoyed a greater measure of protection without the Army being handicapped as a result. He sought to guarantee voting rights to Negroes in States where they were disenfranchised by segregationist maneuvers. In such things he sometimes stood with the majority of fellow Senators, often with the minority, but he always placed principle above political expediency.

We admired Senator HENNING because he was a humanitarian. He spent much time and effort studying the causes and possible remedies for juvenile delinquency. The establishment of a fund to carry on such work in the years ahead reveals how deeply he was committed to the preservation and development of America's greatest resource, its young people.

Commendable also were his efforts to keep the way open for full and free expression of the will of the American people. Senator HENNING joined a number of other Senators in an effort to change procedure in the Senate so that a filibuster could be halted by simple majority vote for closure after 15 days. Only last January he succeeded in getting through the Senate a bill to control spending in Federal elections, including primaries. Although these efforts were blocked by opposing forces, they found a warm response on the part of the American people. Because they must be classified as unfinished business, they point up the loss suffered by the untimely death of Mr. HENNING.

In the academic community Senator HENNING is remembered best perhaps because he demonstrated that the liberally educated humanitarian can be an effective force in American life. Certainly that was one of his greatest contributions. As one commentator put it, he was a "rare combination: a dedicated liberal with a healthy respect for the practical." In Senator HENNING's case, a respect for the practical in no way blunted his idealism; it served only to make his ideals more effective. A Washington dispatch immediately after his death mentioned that he was one of the few Members on the liberal side who was personally acceptable to conservative Members of the Senate. Because of that they were willing to see him moved into positions of influence within the Senate itself, and from those vantage points he was able to make his influence felt. Certainly, he pointed the way to a more effective role on the part of the liberal scholar in American life.

Senator HENNING identified himself with many of our activities at the university that were in the line of his major public interests. In 1955 we had a conference on juvenile delinquency, at which he delivered the keynote address and stayed throughout to play a leading role in its deliberations. When the order of the COF was conferred upon him by the chapter of the order in our law school, he read to our students and visiting lawyers and jurists a scholarly legal paper that stimulated thought and discussion. In January 1958 he contributed to our Law

Review another scholarly treatise "Detention and Confession: the Mallory Case."

Because we at the University of Missouri feel so close to him, we are especially pleased that Mrs. Hennings and her family decided to place the Senator's papers in the western historical manuscripts collection at the university where they will become available for study on the part of historical scholars. They will serve as a fitting memorial to an able and distinguished statesman and to a large degree assure that his place in history will be better understood and more adequately explained than those statesmen whose records go into more or less permanent hiding.

THE CHALLENGE OF HIS SENATE RECORD (By U.S. Senator EDWARD V. LONG)

It is with a feeling of the deepest humility that I speak on this occasion. This is no ordinary ceremony. We memorialize here tonight a great U.S. Senator, who was one of Missouri's most distinguished sons.

Anyone who studies the career of the late THOMAS C. HENNING, JR., even casually, soon becomes aware of the fact that a major portion of his adult life was devoted to the service of his fellow citizens both in peace and in war.

Since my appointment and election to succeed Senator HENNING in the U.S. Senate, I have had the opportunity to study something of his philosophy of government and to learn of his activities in the Senate.

As a result, I feel most humble succeeding a man of his attainments, his courage, and his statesmanship. If ours is a better government today, and our Nation a better place for freemen to live, it is because TOM HENNING walked and worked among us.

If public officials feel more keenly the need for keeping our democracy vital and alive by making their public record and their actions available we can thank TOM HENNING for his great contribution to this principle.

If our election laws are improved so that the guarantees of freedom and fairness are paramount it was TOM HENNING who made adherence to these principles and philosophies a major part of his program.

TOM HENNING believed and he fought for complete freedom of the press to inquire fully and critically into every phase of our public activity. He believed that if the people were to be really free, they must also have unrestricted and uncensored information. No bureaucrat or public officeholder was too big to be exempt from this probing by our press. He believed that withholding of information from the public was in actuality one of the major crimes against freedom. Our great Senator knew that secrecy in government was a potent weapon of dictators.

TOM HENNING wanted our rivers and our forests to belong to all the people and to be used for their benefit, and he fought exploitation of our natural resources by anyone.

TOM HENNING's approach to the vital human problems of health, housing, social security, civil rights, and civil liberties mark him as one of the great constructive liberals of our time.

It has been said that some men live so that the age in which they live is lifted and thereby all men walk on higher ground. TOM HENNING's life, which he devoted to his State and his Nation—that he devoted to the welfare of all mankind, irrespective of race, creed, or color—has raised all of us to a higher plane of public service and to a greater appreciation and love for our fellow man. His life and his record is a challenge and an inspiration to all of us who follow after him.

I am honored to have a part in paying tribute to the memory of this great Missourian.

THOMAS C. HENNING, JR., THE LAWYER (By Judge George H. Moore)

Writing in the New Yorker magazine only last year, that most astute and thoughtful political commentator and Washington observer, Richard Rovers, stated that there was no doubt in his mind, were a vote to be taken among all the Members of the U.S. Senate as to the ablest Senator among them, THOMAS C. HENNING, JR., would easily prevail.

A bold remark to be sure, yet one that appears to have a solid foundation and to be supported by the consensus.

But why was this man's ability so marked in a body not lacking in high talent? I submit that the answer which inevitably suggests itself is that, while Senator HENNING was a man of charm, compassion, and intellect—all of which greatly contributed to his success in the Senate—this judgment as to his being first in ability stems from the fact that he was primarily a skilled and far above average lawyer—a man who exemplified in his practice, and carried with him into his years in the Congress, the highest qualities and ideals of our profession.

Hear from men who knew him and observed him, not as a political figure, but as a working member of the bar and a skilled prosecutor. The answer is always the same—a man of impressive dignity and courtroom appearance; a master of the English language and of persuasive logic; and the possessor of a warm personality that made men instinctively rely on him. Although years have passed, his successful arguments in criminal cases are still remembered around the courts of this city, where he achieved success at an early age.

However, there is far more here than the mere picture of a successful courtroom advocate. The witnesses testify further to an innate kindness and courtesy; of his sense of the dignity of man even in the tortuous atmosphere of the criminal courts; and of his belief in the responsibility of the prosecutor toward the defendant's rights as well as those of the State.

Finally, and most marked, we hear from all sources not only of his skill, judgment, and fearlessness, but of his acute sense of integrity and honor. Never did the public outcry deter him from dismissing a case when he was convinced of the defendant's innocence; and his well-known hatred of sham and hypocrisy lasted throughout his lifetime. As one of his contemporaries in the circuit attorney's office expressed it to me, THOMAS HENNING "never compromised with the truth, and since the lawyer's ultimate function is to bring out the truth he easily fulfilled that ultimate."

Therefore, what we see is a picture of a highly gifted lawyer who had he not turned to other fields would unquestionably have been a leader of the American bar. Yet even in the Senate, the interests of the legal student and skilled practitioner were always with him. Quick to sense injustice, his advocate's skill stood him in good stead on many occasions. Or consider the scholar's intense and faithful interest in the problems of the Senate's Judiciary Committee; his patience with the technicalities of legislative drafting; and his deftness and clarity in debate of the often highly technical or emotional problems that came before the Congress—all the mark of the true lawyer imbued by a sense of the dignity and obligation of his profession.

Senator HENNING's legal background and his association is impressive. He had been for many years a partner in the law firm oldest in continuous connection of any firm in this State. Its roll of members through the years has included many illustrious names at the bar—Chief Justice Warlick Hough; John H. Overall; John F. Green; Judge Ernest F. Green, to say nothing of John Raeburn Green and the Sen-

ator's own father. Is it any wonder that a man nurtured by such a professional background should have loved and respected his profession, and with his native abilities, become skilled in it?

But beyond the pride he took in his profession, which all of us who knew him well realized, THOMAS HENNING took deep nourishment from his roots in the American past. Always to be observed in him was a sense of his connection with history, and the need to maintain his own integrity so that faith would have been kept with that past.

Here then was a man whom the legal profession first trained and brought to fulfillment, and then presented to the Nation so that his great destiny might be achieved. We of the law must always take great pride and comfort in the fact that, such is the enduring nature of our profession that from our ranks we can call forth and dedicate such a man as THOMAS C. HENNING, JR., a statesman, but above all, a lawyer in the highest sense of the word.

THE SUPPORTER OF CONSTITUTIONAL PRINCIPLES (By Irving Dillard)

The Psalmist likened time and life to the grass of the fields. "In the morning it flourisheth, and groweth up," he said. "In the evening it is cut down and withereth." The Old Testament poet was contemplating a life markedly different from the one which brings us together now. The New Testament disciple, Matthew, came far closer to describing the good works of THOMAS C. HENNING, JR., when he said: "First the blade, then the ear, after that the full corn in the ear." For no man is perfect, and even the best can hardly hope to improve on Isaiah's well-remembered plan of: "Precept upon precept; line upon line; here a little and there a little."

In his decade in the Senate of the United States—and that is the period of his life that particularly concerns us at the moment for it is the period of the flowering of his devotion to constitutional principles—the late senior Senator from Missouri guided by the rule of first the blade, then the ear, and finally the full corn, if not for him then for others. And to achieve it he knew that it could be only by precept and line—a start now, a gain later, and still further advances tomorrow and the next day for those who would come after him if not to all in his own time.

For it was no accident that found THOMAS C. HENNING, JR., successfully sponsoring the bill in Congress for a memorial to President James Madison. If one of the Founding Fathers were to be given a status of preeminence over the others, surely the high honor would go to James Madison. As Madison worked to give us so many of the constitutional principles by which our Nation has lived—and by which it has survived—so it was Senator HENNING who stood by those principles and protected them when others, seeing through a glass darkly, if indeed seeing at all, would have torn apart those long-cherished principles and even would have discarded them.

Senator HENNING had little more than taken his oath as a Member of the Upper Chamber of Congress when he found himself almost wholly in charge of an investigation, under the Constitution, into the qualifications and the behavior of one of the most notorious of his colleagues.

It was an ordeal that other Senators had avoided but THOMAS C. HENNING saw it through. He did his duty fairly, thoroughly, and tellingly. In the end the carefully documented report of the subcommittee which he headed was a factor in the undoing and the repudiation of that reckless, irresponsible, demagogic misleader, and misrepresenter of far too many American citizens.

When the Eisenhower administration came into office in 1953, it was Senator HENNINGS, a member of the other major political party, who stood out as the strongest protector of the authority of the President to conduct, as the Constitution provides that he must do, the foreign relations of the United States. The leaders of Mr. Eisenhower's own party in the Senate sought to limit severely the authority of the President in the vital field of international affairs. They did this by proposing and striving to pass the would-be Bricker amendment to the Constitution. In committee and on the Senate floor, it was THOMAS C. HENNINGS, Jr., who fought the battle for constitutional principle. In the end the struggle against the detractors of the Presidency was won by a single vote and that makes the role of Senator HENNINGS the more significant. To contemplate the paralyzing obstacles that would have arisen in the wake of the adoption of the Bricker amendment is to measure the debt which President Eisenhower and his successors owe to the Missouri Senator whose memory we are here to honor tonight.

THOMAS C. HENNINGS was a realist in political life and so he became aware early in his career in Congress of the need for our country to face the hard realities about elections and the laws which regulate them. Recognizing the paramountcy of free elections as a constitutional principle, he studied long and deeply over our electoral shortcomings and the means of correcting them. He sought ways to stop corruption of the ballot and to guarantee clean and honest elections, resulting from campaigns whose controlled costs were reasonable and not prohibitive. It was a service that will benefit us as long as our representative institutions survive.

Great as were these good works of the late Missouri Senator, still another must be recorded, and one doubtless of yet greater importance. For it was THOMAS C. HENNINGS, Jr., who more than a score of his colleagues combined turned back the congressional raiders who sought to cripple the Supreme Court of the United States with the Jenner-Butler bill to take away some of the Supreme Court's most vital jurisdiction. The Jenner-Butler bill's backers did not agree with certain of the Supreme Court's decisions in sensitive areas such as race relations and internal security. They showed their disagreement and displeasure by proposing to take away from the Supreme Court its right to hear appeals which historically have been the Supreme Court's responsibility.

It was a bitter battle and in time it came to occupy the close attention of the whole Senate which on the final tests, several by narrowest margins stood with Senator HENNINGS. Every vote counted in the end and a man less staunch in his convictions than THOMAS C. HENNINGS, Jr., would have let down somewhere along the way and the battle to protect the Supreme Court against vindictive trespass would have been lost. The Chief Justice, the eight Associate Justices, and all the judges of our country and their uncounted successors may be grateful that Senator HENNINGS held the constitutional line when colleagues on both sides of the aisle tried to tear a gaping hole in it.

In the aspects of his career now under consideration it is not for us to go into the services of Senator HENNINGS in the fields of juvenile betterment, prison reform, civil service merit system, and international parliamentarianism all of which knew him as an effective friend. Yet we must cite one more area and in doing so we must, so I believe, raise it to our highest level of all. This was in the field of the individual freedoms of the citizen that are guaranteed by the Bill of Rights whose 169th birthday our Nation celebrates today. For in the decade that he served us in the Senate, Washington knew no more persistent defender of free speech, free press,

free assembly, free petition, and free religion, with free religion's twin protections of the separation of church and state, and the prohibition of religious tests for public office. He was just as firm against unreasonable searches and seizures, against the belittling of the crucial protections of the fifth amendment, and against any erosion of the rest of the constitutional guarantees that make a reality of the presumption that an accused person in free America is innocent until proved guilty in a court of law where due process is observed to the fullest.

At a time when the popular thing was to discount if not to minimize our civil liberties, Senator HENNINGS led the Senate in the creation of a special Judiciary Subcommittee on Constitutional Rights. He, with the assistance of an able staff which he assembled and eminent counsel which he chose, conducted these hearings in such a way as to awaken many American citizens to the dangerous and often subtle attack on their rights by officials who either did not care about ultimate effects or who were ready to subvert constitutional principle. Wherever the assault was launched there appeared Senator HENNINGS to turn it back. And so he took up arms against the invasion of privacy by wiretapping, against the denial of passports by those who would use the control of passports as a weapon in the cold war, against inhumane deportations and exclusions of refugees and other worthy applicants to our shores. He was quick to see official conduct that might be suited to totalitarian regimes in the dictator states but had no place under a Federal Union which he helped round out to 50 members bound together by the Constitution and its Bill of Rights.

THOMAS C. HENNINGS, Jr., no longer sits in the Senate of the United States, but his good works will serve generations to come years without end. First the blade, then the ear, after that the full corn in the ear.

THOMAS C. HENNINGS, JR., THE MAN (By Dr. Ferdinand M. Isserman)

How fitting and appropriate it is that we are assembled here on the campus of Washington University, of whose law school THOMAS HENNINGS was a graduate, completing the 3-year course in 2 and, at the same time, coaching its track team. I am not carried away by the spirit of friendship when I state as I do that THOMAS HENNINGS was of prophetic stature. For the Hebrew word, "Navi," or prophet, means to speak forth the truths of God under any and all circumstances. Would we not equate these with the basic rights of the individual? Did not Jefferson mean that when he wrote about unalienable rights? What are the qualifications of a prophet in the Biblical sense? One thing is certain: he is not a soothsayer or fortune teller. He does predict the future, inasmuch as he endeavors to assay the impact of the conduct of man on the course of human events. The prophet has a sense of kinship with all human beings, like Amos, who rose above the nationalism of his surroundings and said that the Ethiopians were precious in the sight of God. The prophet must have a creative imagination so that he can place himself in the position of his neighbor, feel his woes, experience his agonies, respect his dignity, understand his ambitions and hopes, and be sensitive to his faith. A prophet must be the spokesman of the underprivileged. He must speak for those who cannot speak for themselves. He must battle for human beings who are too feeble to battle for themselves. He must champion their cause in the face of entrenched power, whether of despotic individuals, of tyrannical states, or of oppressive races. He must be aware of the equality of all peoples and ready to uphold it. To do all these things, the prophet must have the greatest of human virtues, the quality

of moral courage, absolute fearlessness in speaking the right, absolute indifference to the criticisms and carping of the classes or the masses, always loyal to his convictions, standing for justice as God gives him to see it, undeterred by organized power of men or organizations or states, immovably dedicated to the truth.

Certainly in this sense THOMAS HENNINGS was a prophet. He fought for the Supreme Court when its right to protect the individuals hated by the mob was questioned. He revealed a sense of internationalism when he successfully led his fellow Senators to cooperate with the President of the United States in defeating the Bricker amendment. As chairman of the Prisons Committee of the Senate, he personally visited the prisons, spoke with the inmates, heard their side of the injustices of society against them, and successfully secured legislation to improve the method of sentencing.

As circuit attorney of St. Louis at a time when society was greatly disturbed by crime waves, he was an efficient prosecutor, but carried out his office without rancor or sensationalism. He did not endeavor to exploit the weaknesses of juvenile delinquents for his own aggrandizement. He believed in firm measures to protect society against youthful desperados, but he also recognized society's failures to them. So he became active in the Big Brothers Association, hoping to supply to wayward, loveless, and friendless youth a friend who would take a personal interest in them and who would fill the vacuum in their lives. For this he received a national award of the Big Brothers Association of America, and was hailed, "Big Brother of the Year." He took steps for the suppression of the marijuana traffic in a desire to protect youth from its degenerating influence. He served with me on the board of the Urban League of St. Louis a generation ago to help Negroes overcome the injustices from which they were suffering in his city. It was the era of segregated schools and universities, and of the frustrations from limitations of employment. Only dead-end jobs which provided no future were available for Negroes. His sensitive spirit never allowed him to forget these injustices. In the Senate he was a leader in civil rights legislation. Due to his persuasiveness and popularity among his fellow Senators, the bill enforcing the voting rights of Negroes all over this country was passed. His devotion to the Bill of Rights in the Constitution was demonstrated frequently on the floor of the Senate and by the legislation he sponsored, and was well symbolized by his proposal approved to create a James Madison Memorial like those of Lincoln, Washington, and Jefferson in our National City. James Madison, inspired by Thomas Jefferson, was the actual father of the Bill of Rights. For its incorporation in the Constitution, he was responsible.

TOM HENNINGS was insistent on the people's rights to know what transpired in their governments, and led the fight to nullify secrecy of information in Government bureaus and among Government officials. For this he will long be regarded as a saint among journalists, and the Missouri Press Association gave him a special award.

He recognized that incompetent government would be robbing the people of their birthright, so he strove for clean elections, and secured passage of a bill for the merit system among public servants. For this he was recognized by the Hoover Commission and given one of their awards. His devotion to the Constitution of the United States he learned here at this university, sitting at the feet of professors universally recognized for their brilliance. He was the most effective champion of constitutional rights in the Senate in his generation, and was hailed as the outstanding defender of the rights of man in our day.

He was a native of St. Louis, and the enlightened spirit of this city, its harmonious blending of people of many nations, its unsurpassed record in interfaith relationships, its peaceful and unequaled transition from segregation to desegregation, molded his philosophy, even as he helped to sustain its moral atmosphere. The spirit of the forty-eighters which made our community the heart of liberalism in America, and this university a nationally honored champion of academic freedom, were factors in the personality of THOMAS HENNINGS. He opposed the burning of books at our information centers. He was so loyal to the Constitution that his own firm defended the right of bigots to exercise freedom of speech. He was a member of a church both here and in Washington, and elected to have the service over his remains not in the historic walls of the Capitol, but in a Presbyterian Church of which he was a member. In this way did he affirm his religious convictions.

He was so modest that few among his fellow townsmen know of his many accomplishments, or his stature in Washington. As much as I admired his public service, I was not fully aware of its many constructive ramifications. He was not seeking the applause of the masses, or even the commendation of his contemporaries. For one of the greatest Senators of his time, he was the least publicized. His ability and achievements were appreciated more in the Halls of the Senate than in the hearts and minds of the people of Missouri whom he served with such distinction, and who reelected him to office. He had a great capacity for friendship. He fought issues and not men. He was not a crusader who condemned and made appeals to emotions, but a pleader who directed his arguments to the reason of man. His last message issued on the day of his death was addressed to the people of this State not to abuse the freedom of religion by making religion a qualification for public office. Among his friends and intimates were men of every race, nationality, and creed. Negroes regarded him as a national hero. Perhaps his religious philosophy can best be expressed in those verses from the Old Testament which are repeated in the New, "Love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, with all thy soul and with all thy might," and, "Love thy neighbor as thyself."

Senator THOMAS C. HENNINGS, Jr.'s life is a glowing page in the annals of man. His record of many achievements is a diadem long to be cherished by the people of the city of his birth. His public service must be a source of joy to his dear ones, to his widow, their children, and to his distinguished parents. Theirs is the satisfaction of knowing that their son, husband, and father served humanity well. His will provided for a foundation to help youth, but his devotion to freedom is a perpetual spiritual foundation, from which all of us can draw strength. "The ablest exponent in the Senate of the philosophy of Thomas Jefferson and of Woodrow Wilson," wrote a journalist about him. Appreciation for his life and work can best be expressed by intensified loyalties to the basic rights of mankind. All of us in the spirit of noblesse oblige, must man the ramparts to shield them. Eternal vigilance is the price of liberty. Such vigilance TOM HENNINGS revealed in his life, and by emulating his example, we honor best his memory.

SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES,
Washington, D.C., December 12, 1960.

RABBI FERDINAND M. ISSERMAN,
Temple Israel, St. Louis, Mo.

MY DEAR RABBI ISSERMAN: I regret very much that our Court sessions prevent my attendance at the memorial ceremonies for Senator HENNINGS.

Senator HENNINGS was not only a devoted public servant but had a passion for consti-

tutional government and the place of the individual in it. The judiciary had no better friend. His devotion to the Bill of Rights and his insistence upon its observance made his career in the Senate of the United States one of the most important in the history of that great body.

Trusting that the memorial service will be as heart warming as his patriotic service, and with kind regards to all, I am,

Sincerely,

EARL WARREN.

WASHINGTON, D.C.,
December 13, 1960.

RABBI FERDINAND M. ISSERMAN,
St. Louis, Mo.:

I regret my inability to be present to render a tribute in person to the late Senator THOMAS C. HENNINGS, Jr. The Nation has great cause to grieve because, through his passing, it has been denied further benefits of his keen mind, his forceful character, and his noble purpose. More than just a distinguished Senator, TOM HENNINGS was one of the most effective champions of true individual liberty in this century; a stout foe against those who abused freedom in freedom's name; and a steadfast advocate for those whose freedom was abused. We who yet live cannot do less than to dedicate ourselves to the task of keeping alive his boundless faith in the determination and ability of the American people to seek and find the truth, to discard false issues and to solve their problems on the basis of proper consideration and intelligent reasoning.

ESTES KEFAUVER,

U.S. Senator.

JEFFERSON CITY, Mo.,
December 15, 1960.

RABBI FERDINAND M. ISSERMAN,
St. Louis, Mo.:

Thank you for your telegram. Deeply regret inability to be in St. Louis today for memorial service honoring Senator HENNINGS whose outstanding record as statesman and lawyer during his years of public service will long be remembered by all of us. I am very sorry it is impossible for me to participate in the tribute being paid him.

Sincerely,

JAMES T. BLAIR, Jr.,
Governor.

WASHINGTON, D.C.,
December 14, 1960.

RABBI FERDINAND ISSERMAN,
St. Louis, Mo.:

We, who were members of the staff of the late Senator THOMAS C. HENNINGS, Jr., wish to take this opportunity to express our deep respect and devotion to the memory of our beloved Senator.

Day by day, as we worked with Senator HENNINGS, we came to know his deep wisdom and unwavering dedication to Jeffersonian democracy.

His courage and brilliance were an inspiration to each of us.

His death has left a void in our hearts which will never be filled.

THE STAFF OF THE LATE SENATOR THOMAS C. HENNINGS, JR.

EXCERPT FROM LETTER FROM FATHER PAUL C. REINERT, PRESIDENT OF ST. LOUIS UNIVERSITY

I join with all the other friends and admirers of TOM HENNINGS in testifying to the lasting contribution which he made to good government and to the protection of human rights and civil liberties throughout a distinguished public career. May his life inspire others to similar careers in the service of all of our people.

EXCERPTS FROM TELEGRAM SENT TO MAYOR
RAYMOND R. TUCKER, FROM CONGRESSMAN
JOHN W. MCCORMACK, HOUSE MAJORITY
LEADER

Senator HENNINGS was one of my most valued friends. He was not only a dedicated public official, but a great American. As a result of his service in both branches of Congress he has left a most valuable imprint upon the pages of American history.

EXCERPTS FROM LETTER FROM VICE-PRESIDENT-
ELECT LYNDON B. JOHNSON

I cannot think of a more appropriate day to have this meeting on than Constitution Day, as TOM was a great defender of its principles both as an individual and as a Senator and chairman of the Rules Committee and Constitutional Rights Subcommittee of the Senate. He was a great Senator and an even greater friend.

Mr. LONG of Missouri. Mr. President, for many of us here in this Chamber, for Missourians and for people throughout the breadth of this land, we lost a great friend and an articulate champion with the death of TOM HENNINGS September 13, 1960. The very least we can do is hold this memorial service today. But, to quote President Kennedy:

In a larger sense, Senator HENNINGS' memorial is the generations of Americans who will be better able to experience full economic and political freedom and equality.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, it is with a deep feeling of sadness that I rise to pay tribute to my good friend the late Senator from Missouri, THOMAS C. HENNINGS.

TOM HENNINGS was a close friend, and our friendship extended over a period of many years. He was not only a close friend, but he was a truly remarkable man in the real sense of that word.

TOM HENNINGS had a keen legal mind. He had an amazing capacity to go to the heart of an issue and to lay forth all of the implications in a logical, clear, concise manner.

This talent he devoted to the service of his country, both in the House of Representatives and in the Senate. And this talent also brought him to the Judiciary Committee, where he became chairman of one of the most important of its subcommittees—the Subcommittee on Constitutional Rights.

It is significant that he sought this position. TOM HENNINGS was a man who believed deeply in the absolute necessity of strengthening constitutional rights and of taking every possible step to assure that they applied equally to all persons, regardless of race, creed, or color.

He thought that the dignity and integrity of the individual was one of the most important of all of the aspects of our form of government. And he also thought that the legitimate reason for forming a government was to protect that dignity and integrity.

TOM HENNINGS has gone, and we will not again have the pleasure of his physical presence on the Senate floor. But, in a larger sense, he has not gone, because the work that he did lives after him and will remain to help guide our footsteps for many years to come.

We are, as we should be, paying tribute to him in these memorial services, but

the greater tribute will be to rededicate ourselves to the promotion of the basic constitutional rights in which he so strongly believed.

The first act of the Committee on Rules and Administration in the present session of Congress was to adopt a resolution expressing its deep regret and sorrow on the death of its colleague and former chairman, the late Senator from Missouri, THOMAS C. HENNINGS, JR. I ask unanimous consent that the text of that resolution be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

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

RESOLUTION OF THE COMMITTEE ON RULES AND ADMINISTRATION OF THE U.S. SENATE EXPRESSING ITS DEEP REGRET AND SORROW ON THE DEATH OF ITS COLLEAGUE, AND FORMER CHAIRMAN, THE LATE SENATOR FROM MISSOURI, THOMAS C. HENNINGS, JR.

Whereas THOMAS C. HENNINGS, JR., was serving with distinction as chairman of the Committee on Rules and Administration of the U.S. Senate when, on September 13, 1960, he was called to rest by his Creator; and

Whereas the people of the State of Missouri as well as those of all the other States of the Union will long remember his dedication to democratic principles and his fight for human rights; and

Whereas we his colleagues on the Senate Committee on Rules and Administration will sorely miss his inspired leadership and devoted participation in our work: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the members of the Senate Committee on Rules and Administration assembled, That we hereby express our deep personal loss, and that we extend to his widow, his family, and his other loved ones our heartfelt sympathy.

Members of the Committee on Rules and Administration: MIKE MANSFIELD, CARL HAYDEN, B. EVERETT JORDAN, HOWARD W. CANNON, J. J. HICKEY, CLAIBORNE PELL, CARL T. CURTIS, KENNETH B. KEATING, JACK MILLER.

Done on January 18, 1961, as the first order of business at the initial meeting of the committee in the 87th Congress.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that following my remarks a statement by the distinguished senior Senator from Wyoming [Mr. McGEE] in tribute to the Honorable THOMAS C. HENNINGS, JR., be printed in the RECORD. Senator McGEE is unavoidably absent on official business.

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

STATEMENT OF SENATOR MCGEE IN TRIBUTE TO THE LATE HONORABLE THOMAS C. HENNINGS, JR.

I wish to join my colleagues today in paying tribute to a man who was a truly distinguished Member of this body—the late Senator THOMAS HENNINGS, of Missouri.

Being a rather junior Member of the Senate, I did not have the opportunity to know this great Missourian as well as I wished, but I knew of him and the high principles for which he stood long before I ever became a Member of the Senate. His distinguished career in the House of Representatives and the things he stood for during his illustrious Senate service were well known to all, far and wide.

The monumental achievements of Senator HENNINGS on the Senate Rules Committee which resulted in the clean elections bill that passed this body during the last

Congress was but one of his many outstanding endeavors.

As a member of the Senate Judiciary Committee, he was a constant champion for civil and human rights; and as the chairman of the Subcommittee on Constitutional Rights, he led the fight against executive secrecy and for freedom of information. Senator HENNINGS was acutely aware of the close relationship between traditional rights guaranteed by the Constitution of the United States and the right of the people to know what their Government is doing. His lifetime experience and dedication to due process of law, free speech and free press, and equal protection of the laws, found a natural connection with a right to know.

In his arduous committee work, he was not interested in the glare of publicity which often accompanies investigative inquiry—rather he felt it more important to establish a clear, detailed legislative record in the form of committee surveys, studies, hearings, and reports that was vital in the long run in order to form a basis for effective legislation.

As the Members of this body know, the fight for open Government, devoid of secrecy in all but the most critical areas, is a formidable one. Senator HENNINGS thought it was one worth fighting, and he has left us an example and guideline to carry the fight forward.

It was an honor to have served with, and known TOM HENNINGS. We miss him dearly; but we will not forget his goals, his aims, and his dedication to them.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, one of our God-given endowments is the one of remembrance, and I have often puzzled how impoverished this world would be if we did not have the capacity for remembrance and could not summon up out of the wells of memory those things we would like to remember.

As I think of TOM HENNINGS, I like to remember him as I first saw him in 1935. He came to the House of Representatives 2 years after my advent to that body. He was vigorous, he was trim, and there was energy in his stride. He reflected vigor. There was a booming quality about his voice, and there was that friendliness that endeared him to Members on both sides in that distinguished legislative body.

I quickly learned that TOM HENNINGS lived up to every expectation as a good lawyer, as a dedicated legislator, and as a warm friend.

He had two attributes that impressed me then and continue to impress me. The first was his complete dedication to what he deemed to be sound policy, and the intense effort he devoted to it. This attribute comes sharply to mind, for within the past hour I have submitted for reference a proposal for a constitutional amendment in the nature of what is known as the Bricker resolution. Of all the scholarly, documented speeches that were made on that subject, probably none was more profound than that of TOM HENNINGS, and no one pursued the subject with greater vigor than he. He was convinced that my position was wrong. I was convinced that his position was wrong. But he advanced his cause like the great warrior that he was, and in every one of his speeches there was a reflection of the amount of time and energy that he devoted to that subject.

The other attribute that Senators will remember is how patiently and vigor-

ously he labored in behalf of the clean elections bill. What a commentary it was upon his patience. For 11 days he stood every day on this floor to advance that bill. I fought him every step of the way, and I regarded him as a noble protagonist of his cause, because never did he lose his restraint, never did his patience falter. I have never seen TOM HENNINGS, JR., become irritated or frustrated.

He was the chairman of a subcommittee that handled the very difficult and controversial civil rights bill. In our consideration of that highly controversial bill there were times when he might have been frustrated, times when he might have displayed some anger, times when he might have become impatient because of the slow progress that was being made in the committee, yet never once did I see him lose that fine quality of restraint, no matter how tedious the going and how difficult the cause.

That is how I shall remember TOM HENNINGS all the days of my life—big in body and heart, amiable and patient, energetic and dedicated, friendly and scrupulously fair, always courteous, and ever courageous. He was indeed a happy warrior.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, on September 13, 1960, a few days after sine die adjournment of the 86th Congress, death removed from our midst a great American and a close friend of many of us here, Senator THOMAS C. HENNINGS, JR., of Missouri.

Surely the loss felt by his family and his associates is deep. The Nation has equal cause to grieve, because it has been denied further benefits of his keen mind, his forceful character and his noble purpose.

It is not enough to say that TOM HENNINGS was a distinguished Senator. He was that, in the purest sense, and much more: Indeed, he was one of the most effective champions of true individual liberty in this century; a stout foe against those who abused freedom in freedom's name; and a steadfast advocate for those whose freedom was abused.

A eulogist of another time observed: The evil that men do lives after them; the good is oft interred with their bones.

If this is a rule, then TOM HENNINGS was a notable exception. Long after the memory of his name may have faded, Americans will still be enjoying the fruits of his courageous labors.

Providence must have fitted him for his highest call to duty. Thirty years ago, as an assistant prosecutor in his native St. Louis, he viewed the ebb and flow of convictions and acquittals not with impersonal detachment. Rather, he became endowed with a humane concern that equal justice prevail where the State's tremendous resources may become weighted against those of the accused.

Thus was he made ready for the task he was called upon a quarter-century later to undertake; the task, as chairman of the Senate Subcommittee on Constitutional Rights, of reidentifying and redefining the fundamental liberties of a people made confused and fearful by the

wild trumpetings of misnamed fighters for freedom.

When the need for a true definition of loyalty arose; when tyranny threatened in any guise—in the excesses of civil and military authority or of ministerial agencies at home or abroad—TOM HENNINGS spoke out, and the offenders heeled.

Even on his deathbed, TOM HENNINGS was rallying the national conscience. Shortly before he passed away, he dictated a message to the chairman of the Democratic Party of Missouri which, in the light of later events, stands as a monument to his faith in the durability of Jeffersonian doctrine, our constitutional principles and the goodness of the American will.

One passage in this testament, I believe, best summarizes the philosophy that guided his actions in life.

I have found—

He wrote—

that the greatest protection for our rights and freedoms lies in the hands of our people and in the manner in which they exercise these rights. Had I the power to persuade the acceptance of a cardinal principle to guide us in this respect, it would be: Do not use these rights to abuse the rights of others.

In a passage more specifically related to the problem then at hand, religious prejudice in the presidential campaign, he affirmed:

I have faith in my fellow citizens, an unshakable faith in their determination and ability to seek and find the truth behind any issue before expressing their ultimate opinion at the polls. I have faith that false issues will be discarded and that the true ones will be faced with calm appraisal and solved only on the basis of proper consideration and intelligent reasoning. I have faith that unwarranted emotionalism and prejudice will be cast aside as sores which beget only solutions for which posterity may sadly pay and long suffer.

Lastly—

He concluded—

I have faith and every confidence that our great Democratic Party, founded on truth and consistently the bearer of truth, will elect its candidates in our State and on a National level, and will present this Nation with its next President of the United States.

TOM HENNINGS did not live to see his prophecy fulfilled. That the prophecy was accurate is of less importance than the measure of the faith which inspired it. We who yet live cannot do less than to dedicate ourselves to the task of keeping that faith alive.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, the passing of a Senate colleague always causes me deep concern. This concern is especially pronounced when we lose a colleague who was in the prime of life; whom we admired because of outstanding mental attainments, loved because of a capacity for warm friendship, and whose untimely death caused a loss to the entire Nation.

One of the truly great heroes of World War II was Maj. Thomas D. Howie, of Staunton, Va., who landed with the 116th Infantry of the 29th Division on Omaha Beach and led his battalion into St. Lo where he was killed. In a letter written to his wife just a few days be-

fore his death, Major Howie praised the 116th Infantry and said:

I am both humble before God and proud before my fellow men that America produces the breed of men I have had the privilege to go into action with.

Such a man was THOMAS C. HENNINGS, JR., of Missouri—a brave naval officer as well as a brilliant attorney and an outstanding statesman.

Before entering public life, Senator HENNINGS compiled a fine record as a student and an athlete. A star half-miler at Cornell, TOM HENNINGS completed his undergraduate academic work with equal vigor and success. He entered law school at Washington University, finishing the normal 3-year course in 2 years, while teaching criminal law and public speaking as well as coaching the track team.

This versatile man entered private practice in 1928 and in the next year became assistant circuit attorney in charge of felony prosecutions. After 6 years of service, in which he compiled a record of 80 percent convictions, TOM HENNINGS was elected to Congress from Missouri's 11th District. Having served for three terms, he retired from Congress in 1940 to run successfully for circuit attorney, in which office he secured 2,340 convictions in 2,548 cases—a record which still stands in Missouri.

Shortly after the attack on Pearl Harbor our esteemed former colleague took a leave of absence to enter the Navy. He served ably until 1944 when physical disability incurred in the line of duty resulted in his discharge.

After a vigorous fight both in the primary and in the general election, TOM HENNINGS was elected to the Senate in 1950. His outstanding service to Missouri and to the Nation returned him to office in 1956 by more than double his 1950 margin of victory.

During his 10 years in the Senate, TOM HENNINGS demonstrated a principle which I have frequently stressed—the value of practical training and experience in political science. It is only in the hard school of experience that a man learns how to translate theory into practice, whether it be in literature, art, a profession such as law, medicine, or engineering, or the profession of political science, too often referred to as politics. In law school, TOM HENNINGS learned the theory of law, in trial work he learned how to apply those theories. He brought to his service in the House of Representatives his splendid experience as a lawyer, which included a comprehensive knowledge of constitutional law. It is no wonder, therefore, that in his 10 years of service in the Senate, as a member of the Rules Committee, of which he became chairman, and as an outstanding member of the Judiciary Committee, he made many contributions to our country's progress. His ability to debate the causes which he espoused created comfort in proponents, concern in opponents, and admiration in us all.

Over and above all else, Mr. President, TOM HENNINGS was endeared to me by reason of the fact that he loved and admired the South, having had Virginia ancestors who served in the Confederate

Army and a Virginia relative who in more recent years was an outstanding member of the Lynchburg, Va., bar. Whenever I think of TOM HENNINGS, I shall think of him as a Virginia gentleman, and, in the Old Dominion, that is our highest tribute.

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I rise to say a few words in behalf of my good friend, the late Senator THOMAS HENNINGS. I did not know Senator HENNINGS before coming to the Senate, but I was not here long before I learned to admire him, although I violently disagreed with him on many subjects.

Senator HENNINGS was a true public servant and a loyal American. He was devoted to his friends and was loyal to his friends, and he was esteemed by them.

Senator HENNINGS possessed the qualities that the Supreme Court of South Carolina said are essential for a good lawyer.

First, integrity. Integrity is the heart of character. A man may possess many qualities, but without integrity he is most certainly doomed to failure. Senator HENNINGS was a man of strong integrity.

Second, industry. A man may have integrity, and he may have other qualities, but if he is not willing to work he will probably not go very far. Senator HENNINGS was a prodigious worker.

Third, knowledge. Senator HENNINGS was a man of broad experience. He was widely read. He could discuss with interest and intelligence almost any subject on the scene today and in past history.

He possessed these three essential qualities of a good lawyer to a marked degree.

He was an attractive man. He was a great athlete, and possessed a fine physique. He was personable. He attracted people and was attracted to people.

Personally I felt many times that his heart was with the South in many matters before the Senate, but, because of his constituency, he felt he must represent them.

It was with much regret that I learned of the death of TOM HENNINGS. He was fortunate in having a devoted and loyal and fine wife, who was a great inspiration to him. I know that she has undergone a great deal of suffering in the loss of her fine husband, and she has my deepest sympathy.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, 98 years ago Abraham Lincoln delivered a historic speech at Gettysburg. Honoring those soldiers who had given their lives on that battlefield, he recognized that they had written a page of American history, and that nothing subsequently said could alter their place in that history.

This is true today, Mr. President, as we honor one who wrote an unalterable page in our history during his lifetime of public service. I speak of our late colleague, the Honorable THOMAS C. HENNINGS, JR., of Missouri.

We here admired TOM HENNINGS' keenness of mind, purity of spirit, and sincere dedication to cause. Whether or

not I agreed or disagreed with him personally on various issues, I valued his presence in this Chamber. For, in the very finest tradition of the Senate, he possessed the personal attributes of the great and near great who have so enriched this body.

TOM HENNINGS was a gentleman: This was to be seen in the very way he walked onto this floor—dignified in mien and courtly in bearing—soft-spoken and gentle, courteous to every colleague in his discussions of state and personal matters.

TOM HENNINGS was a scholar: None of us shall forget the wealth of his knowledge. We will always remember the penetrating depth of his arguments in speech and debate. Perhaps most noted as an authority on the Constitution, the scope of his intellect was such that he quickly perceived the essence of all problems he considered. He did not seek publicity, but the press often favored him. Richard Rovere, writing in the *New Yorker* in 1959, paid him high tribute, saying:

TOM HENNINGS might win by a landslide any vote taken here (in Washington) for the ablest and most intelligent U.S. Senator.

TOM HENNINGS was a statesman: Devoting the major part of his life to public service, he felt it was the noblest of careers. He wanted to serve, and as he liked to say: "I am not in politics as a dilettante, nor do I seek to go into government for the glamour or the excitement. I am too old for excursions." In this Senate, he gave us not only precept, but also example. He served hard and well as chairman of the Rules Committee, chairman of four Judiciary subcommittees, and as a member of many others. We who served with him 10 years here can state sincerely he served with honor as well as distinction.

TOM HENNINGS was a humanitarian: His hand was ever stretched forth to help others. Nowhere was his sympathetic nature more tellingly revealed than by his probings into the problems of juvenile delinquency and his constant concern with the rights of those too weak to speak for themselves. He was insistent that all citizens use and be granted the liberties guaranteed them by the Constitution and the Bill of Rights. How fitting that his last statement, dictated from the bed from which he never rose, concerned the right of any American, of any religion, to hold the highest office in the land.

TOM HENNINGS was a fighter: Against odds, wrongs, and injustices, TOM HENNINGS waged his own war, deploying his talents with courage and determination. He led the fight against attempts to curb the Supreme Court's power and against unjustified secrecy in government. He fought to pass a clean elections bill.

But perhaps his greatest fight was his last one, a fight against an implacable enemy that held certain victory in its diseased grasp. Cancer placed no fear in the great heart of TOM HENNINGS. I saw TOM just a month before he died. Death was all around the room, but defeat was not to be seen or felt. He told me confidently: "Bob, I'll be back up there on the Hill before long." He is.

For his spirit now speaks here in the self-same, soft-spoken tones of yesterday as his presence is felt in our midst.

We cannot forget TOM HENNINGS. His contributions shall live on in our annals. His rich legacy shall endure throughout all our land, shared by all our citizens.

As it was spoken at Gettysburg: "The world will little note what we say here," but I say that America will not forget what TOM HENNINGS did here.

Nor in this tribute should we fail to pay special praise to TOM HENNINGS' great and dear wife, Elizabeth. Through the years she was always a tower of help, strength, and purpose, on whom he relied. And in his final days, when cancer sought to still his fighting heart, she was there, as always, to comfort and sustain him.

We think of her as we honor him, and we shall always cherish both.

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. Mr. President, it was my privilege to know TOM HENNINGS throughout his entire service in the Senate of the United States; and to know him was to esteem his friendship and respect his ability.

He was a man of remarkable facility for fusing the real with the ideal, and for blending vision with faith. He was a master of the practical matters of life, as well as its theory.

He was a warm friend; a man of excellent heart; a good citizen whose public life was dedicated to the public good. His character was marked by the gentleness of charity and the reserve of humility.

The high regard held for him by his associates in the legal profession is evidence of his great capabilities in the field of law, particularly in the area of constitutional law.

I was deeply impressed by his contributions on this subject. He was able simply and succinctly to distinguish between law as the protection of liberty, and decree which stirs rebellion.

He was a man with a meditative turn of thought; a lawyer with a strong and subtle talent for uniting facts with clear reasoning, and presenting them in convincing exposition.

He was a priest of his subject; he honored it with dignity; and he found great satisfaction in fighting for truth and justice. It was his nature to temper all things with kindness.

Few men have greater ability than TOM HENNINGS possessed to press their intellect, their wit, and their charm into fine public service both in his home State of Missouri and for his country at Washington.

He was a man with an attentive ear and vigilant eye; and, therefore, he possessed knowledge which allowed him to use his words sparingly but with maximum effect. When he spoke, he did so with the elevation of authority.

I shall always remember him as a man with tolerance for mental freedom, and I shall always treasure our reciprocal confidence and friendship. I pay tribute to his memory.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, the sweet words of the sainted Lincoln come to mind: "The mystic chords of memory swell within me."

The mystic chords of memory swell within the hearts of Senators on this

occasion, as we recall a dear friend now departed, our extremely able late colleague, TOM HENNINGS, of Missouri. Through the years, I was pleased to call TOM HENNINGS my friend. I knew him quite intimately. TOM HENNINGS was a good friend, and a dear one. He was an excellent Senator for his State and for his country.

I saw him, with his keenness of perception, and his unique and valued experience as a lawyer, preside over highly important Senate committee hearings in which the public interest was deeply involved. I saw him elicit from witnesses, both friendly and hostile, the kind of answers and the sort of information which he was then able to use as he came to the Senate vigorously to champion the cause of liberty, justice, and decency in American government as he saw it.

Time and again, during my few years in the Senate, I sat in my seat listening to him as he undertook to champion the issues to which he had placed his name. On many of those occasions I found myself in complete agreement with his point of view; because TOM HENNINGS had a way of demonstrating to his fellow Senators not simply the sincerity which moved him to eloquence, but the truth and the logic which inspired him to leadership of just causes.

TOM HENNINGS did so many things so well. He had been a lawyer and a district attorney. He served his country with distinction in World War II as a naval officer. He was an excellent and an imposing Member of the House of Representatives, where he made a reputation for himself which followed him through the years. That reputation was enhanced—indeed, it grew immeasurably—during his years in the Senate.

But, Mr. President, TOM HENNINGS was foremost and always a great champion of individual liberty. Whenever the pressures of modern life threatened freedom; wherever the unpopular were denied the right to speak, and speak forthrightly; whoever, no matter how highly placed, tried to still dissent, TOM HENNINGS was the first to make the cause of liberty his cause.

Mr. President, we in the U.S. Senate lost a close friend last September 13. The Nation lost a dedicated and wise voice. It is not good enough to say that THOMAS C. HENNINGS, JR., of Missouri, will be missed. He will be sorely and deeply missed.

Freedom, to our beloved colleague, TOM HENNINGS, was a broad, powerful, and all-inclusive doctrine. In an article entitled "The People's Right to Know," published in the *American Bar Association Journal* for July 1959, he wrote:

Freedom of information about governmental affairs is an inherent and necessary part of our political system. Ours is a system of self-government—and self-government can work effectively only where the people have full access to information about what their government is doing.

Freedom, to TOM HENNINGS, Mr. President, was always for the people—whether it was their freedom to know, or their freedom to speak, or their freedom to dissent, or their freedom to organize.

In April 1960, in a publication of the New York Civil Liberties Union, entitled "The Challenge of the 1960's: Progress for Individual Rights," under the heading "Civil Liberties in New York," TOM HENNINGS wrote:

In the first amendment (to the Constitution), we find the guide to representative government and a free and democratic society. Justice Cardozo once described the first amendment as "the matrix, the indispensable condition, of nearly every other form of freedom." It is my belief that it is a positive admonition to Americans urging us to debate, discuss and argue and indeed to disagree; encouraging them to participate in diverse associations; admonishing them to constantly engage in free inquiry."

And, concluded TOM HENNINGS:

This I believe is the challenge of the 1960's. If we meet it, we need have little fear for our liberties or for the future of the Republic.

Thus, Mr. President, a gallant statesman, an able exponent of freedom, wrote his own epitaph. Even more, TOM HENNINGS has written for all Americans, for all times, an honorable code of honorable conduct in the public service to the people of the United States.

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. President, when TOM HENNINGS died, last September, the Los Angeles Times wrote that he "died before he could be spared."

The truth of those words will be felt for many years to come.

Surely in the years ahead there will be times when we shall be in great need of the unflinching courage and strength of TOM HENNINGS. There will be many times, in the years ahead, when we shall be sorely in need of the dogged persistence TOM HENNINGS showed when he brought death to the Bricker amendment and defeat to the numerous attempts to strike out at the Supreme Court, in reprisal for decisions supporting our civil liberties.

There will always be times when we shall need the brand of integrity of TOM HENNINGS. He scorned political expediency, in his consistent fight to protect the public against the efforts of the special interests.

Above all, in the years ahead, in the struggle to keep the world free from communism and dictatorship, there will be trying times when we shall miss the most heart and the hand of TOM HENNINGS—for TOM HENNINGS was one on whom we could count unfailingly to keep alive and intact the ideals of freedom and democracy.

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, I shall always treasure the friendship of TOM HENNINGS. It first came to me while we were associated in the House of Representatives.

When this body was in adjournment, death came to this beloved and most respected Senator, a man whose memory will shine brightly and enduringly in the minds of all Americans who knew him and who were so ably served by him.

Indeed, Mr. President, I am sure that as we sit here today, each of us feels keenly and in a deeply personal sense the absence of our late colleague, Senator THOMAS HENNINGS. His was a magnificent and friendly personality.

It can truly be said of our beloved colleague that he lived with an abiding faith in the democratic process which he so zealously guarded, and, by doing so, provided, in these times of trial and torment, a ringing affirmation of our way of life.

A sense of calling and dedication to his office and the people he represented illumined his 10 years of fruitful service in the U.S. Senate.

TOM HENNINGS was my good, personal friend. All of us knew him as a warm and understanding human being, and, above all, as a fighter for the causes in which he believed.

He exemplified a spirit—far too rare today—of individual courage and conviction dictated by conscience, and an unflinching sense of duty.

In an era when the individual civil liberties of American citizens were under attack from many quarters, TOM HENNINGS dedicated himself to the defense of the liberties he cherished, and which he knew our forefathers had cherished and written into the Constitution of the United States as an enduring monument to their belief in the rightness of individual freedom as a way of life.

To him, the Bill of Rights was more than 10 precepts to be dusted off annually for patriotic speeches, then packed away for another year. He knew the Bill of Rights was the breath of life to our democracy, and it was to these beliefs that he dedicated his own life.

He never wavered in his faith; and throughout 6 years in the House of Representatives, and 10 years in the Senate, he guarded and protected the basic liberties of his fellow Americans.

In war, as in peace, TOM HENNINGS fought for his America. He was elected district attorney of St. Louis in 1940. He volunteered for active duty in the U.S. Navy, 6 months before Pearl Harbor, and he served with distinction in combat until 1944, when physical disability required his discharge.

Mr. President, speaking for myself and, I am sure, for all others who knew TOM HENNINGS, I wish to say simply and most sincerely that he will be deeply missed, both as a friend and as a Senator.

I hope all of us will carry forward the flag he carried so bravely in behalf of the basic freedoms which are the heart and soul of America.

We mourn the passing of a truly great American.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, anyone who has heard the sincere, brilliant, and sympathetic words of praise and appreciation that have been spoken today on this floor with respect to TOM HENNINGS realizes the utter impossibility of equaling those tributes.

However, Mr. President, I think many of us would like, in all conscience, to add our testimonials of deep respect and admiration, not only for TOM HENNINGS as our friend, but also for TOM HENNINGS as a symbol of a freeman who stood for the things which he so well understood freedom to mean.

I know of no person who was more kindly, even in violent disagreement, than TOM HENNINGS.

I know of no one who would go further to accommodate, in every detail within the limits of his capabilities, and without violating or deviating from his principles, the wishes and desires of his associates.

I know of no one who saw more clearly the principles for which he stood. As has been so well said here today, he stood for the basic principles of human freedom under our American constitutional system, and he exemplified those principles constantly.

It was a sad period for all of us during the time when he was ill; and it was a period of mourning when we knew that he had died. But in his service in the Senate and in his associations with his colleagues, he left a stamp of respect that will remain to his honor, the honor of this body, and the honor of his family and his State.

The consistency with which he defended those principles, of which many Senators have spoken heretofore, is certainly outstanding.

I counted TOM HENNINGS among my friends, and I counted him among the outstanding leaders I have known in public life.

Mr. President, it is very true that very few of us agree on all subjects at all times; but it is true that, as time goes on, one comes across countless individuals for whom, even in disagreement, one retains the highest respect. TOM HENNINGS was that kind of an individual.

He has been missed in this body, and he will be missed.

Only one final word. I want here on this Record to convey to his beautiful and delightful wife, Elizabeth, my sympathy and condolence, and that of Mrs. Hickenlooper. We hope that Mrs. Hennings can find solace in the esteem which today's Record will show to exist for TOM HENNINGS.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, there are many reasons why I wish to say something about the life and works of TOM HENNINGS. He represented a State adjoining the State which I have the honor in part to serve. In addition to that, TOM HENNINGS was a Member of the House of Representatives 23 years ago, when I was sworn in as a Member of that body. We have been friends ever since.

In more recent times, it was my privilege to serve in this body on a committee of which he was chairman. He served with distinction as chairman of the Senate Committee on Rules and Administration. He was always very courteous. He was considerate of every witness, of every member of the committee, of every staff member, and of every employee. He respected the views of others, regardless of whether or not those views coincided with his own.

TOM HENNINGS had a very unusual mind. He was a brilliant man, an able lawyer, a distinguished individual.

A great loss has been suffered not only by his family and the circle of friends most closely associated with him, but by his State and Nation. He was a man of great capabilities.

I wish to endorse all the other fine tributes that have been paid to him, and what has been said about him, and to

extend to Mrs. Hennings and other loved ones my most sincere sympathy.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, it was my privilege to serve with TOM HENNINGS both in the House of Representatives and in this body. In his passing, the country lost one of its most courageous citizens and this body one of its most courageous Senators. TOM HENNINGS never hesitated to battle for his convictions, and anyone who took him on had to be ready for the devastating courtesy, and sharp thrusts which he used so skillfully.

We were not members of the same political party, but there was no Member of the Senate for whose opinions I came to have greater respect than those of TOM HENNINGS.

He came to the Senate after the elections of 1950, as I did. During the 10 years we served here together, I found it was always worthwhile to consider the opinions that he expressed. He saw clearly the menace that might exist in certain areas where wealth might be accumulated and then be used with the hope to influence Members of this body in various hidden or unpublicized ways.

The last time I saw TOM HENNINGS we rode to the Senate Office Building on the subway train. I thought he looked better than he had for some months previously, and said so. From no part of his response did I get any indication of the kind of a battle he was then fighting. He said that he was going to take things easier, but gave the impression he was on the road to recovery from whatever illness he had had. There was no complaint, only courage.

The courage he showed at that time was typical of his conduct in the Senate.

I never saw him hesitate to take a stand to which his conscience and principles led him, no matter with whom he might be in conflict or how long the discussions would take. He was unfailingly courteous to those with whose views he did not agree, and he expressed his opinions ably. He was a true servant of the common good and the cause of freedom.

Mrs. Case and our daughter, Jane, would wish to join me in expressing deep sympathy to Mrs. Hennings and his daughter, Sue, who is associated with our daughter in school.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I wish to join my colleagues who today are paying special tribute to our late colleague, TOM HENNINGS.

I had the pleasure of first knowing TOM HENNINGS when I entered the House of Representatives. He was a Member at the time. I served with him during the remaining years he stayed in the House of Representatives. I followed his career after he left the House, and still later, when he returned to the Congress, I had the privilege of serving with him in the Senate of the United States.

TOM HENNINGS was a person with a brilliant mind, as others have said today. He had a sharp, incisive way of going straight to the issue of the discussion. He was forceful in presenting his views. He was a man of conviction, a man of courage, a man of great courtesy. I have seen him engage in heated debate, but

never reach the point that he was not most courteous to his antagonist, whoever it might be.

Tom was an able legislator. I was with him on different occasions attending meetings of the Interparliamentary Union in other parts of the world, and I saw his work there.

He was a man whom we could ill spare. As the Senator from California said, he went away from us when we could not spare him. We shall long miss him in this body. I shall long remember him as a very fine citizen, an able legislator, a man with brilliance of mind and force in the projection of his ideas to others.

I wish to extend the deepest sympathies both of Mrs. Sparkman and of myself to Mrs. Hennings and to his other loved ones.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, I wish to join my colleagues today in expressing deep personal loss, and a feeling of great loss to the country, in the death of one of the brilliant Members of this body.

I first knew TOM HENNINGS when we came to the House of Representatives together in the 76th Congress in 1939. I again knew him when both of us were elected to the Senate in 1950. It was a pleasure to reunite in our service together in the upper chamber and to be closely associated through our many years of service. Our offices were only across the hall. We were neighbors. We were able to visit, to exchange our viewpoints, and to discuss mutual problems.

It was my privilege to serve on my first important committee in the Senate with TOM HENNINGS. It was the committee which was then investigating the McCarthy participation in the Tydings election. I found then, as I have always found later, TOM HENNINGS' dedication to duty to his country. His was a desire to carry forward his duty without regard to the consequences, to its popularity, or to any political liabilities which might be entailed in the following of a line of duty to its ultimate end.

I appreciated deeply his searching mind. He was always seeking, with his great legal training, for the facts and for all of the information available on any subject, before reaching a conclusion. Once he reached a conclusion, he went forward on his course.

I learned to appreciate his great courage in arriving at decisions and in facing up to problems, whether he was fighting almost singly or with the majority, in whatever test was involved.

I appreciated, as we all did, his great independence of action, his desire not to be of any definite opinion before he entered a case and knew all sides of the case, rather than permit anyone to persuade him against what he himself would find to be the proper course of action.

He was the kind of liberal leader we cannot spare at this time, because he did have great courage, regardless of any threats of political reprisal. He could stand alone, if necessary, to fight for the things in which he believed.

He was a great student of foreign affairs, and his contributions were many in this vital field, including the work he did so frequently on the Interparlia-

mentary Union, his attendance at the conventions, and the contributions he made.

Above all, we are going to miss him in this body as one of the greatest constitutional lawyers who ever walked the floor of this Chamber. We have all seen him in the debates, and we all know his deep understanding and the force of his personality. This, among his many assets, was one of his great specialties.

In the last months of his life we realized his courage to fight on despite the tremendous handicaps he carried, with his declining health. We realized how he came to the Senate to cast important yea-and-nay votes, though he was not physically able to be present in the Chamber normally. He would go to the ultimate to be sure that his duty to cast his vote was done, so long as he was able to rise and to walk.

It is great sympathy we have for his wife and for his family, and we deeply regret his passing.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I, too, wish to pay my tribute to our departed colleague, Senator HENNINGS, under whom I served. He was the chairman of the Committee on Rules and Administration when I was a member of that committee.

As has already been said, he was a great lawyer and a distinguished man. He was a tremendously warm friend and a very interesting friend. This is something from which I hope his family will take solace: whenever anyone talked with Senator HENNINGS, he would always open the conversation by talking not about himself but rather about what the other person was doing and how he was getting along; and Senator HENNINGS would raise the question of whether anything was needed, and would ask what he could do about it.

He was always a man who had not only a liberal approach to public questions, as has been stated, but also a liberal mind. He was ready for new ideas and new ways of doing things.

I wish to here and now pay tribute to him for one of the most ingenious decisions I have seen made in the Congress. In my own case, in the Committee on Rules and Administration, I know he appointed a committee of two members to consider what we ought to do about rule XXII of the Senate, that hotly debated rule regarding filibusters. The two members were the Senator from Georgia [Mr. TALMADGE], who was an ardent proponent of the rule and of making it stronger, if possible, and myself.

Mr. President, so great were the gifts of TOM HENNINGS that when we reported we did narrow, very materially, the grounds of difference. The reports were so sharply differentiated and the argument was so close that the vote in the committee was 5 to 4. My side prevailed, but nonetheless the incident indicated the luminous mind and the ingenuity of TOM HENNINGS.

There is another thing which can be said about TOM HENNINGS on this floor, after there is stated the affection and respect in which he was held: He was beloved by his colleagues. This is probably the greatest tribute one can pay to any Senator.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, a great Senator and a good friend is gone forever from this Senate Chamber. His rich, powerful, persuading voice is heard here no more. His genial smile, his ready handclasp, his hand resting upon one's shoulder—no one ever entered these Senate Halls who bestowed upon it an air of greater cordiality than did TOM HENNINGS.

The cause here that had the Senator from Missouri as an ally was assured of a courageous, capable, constitutional, courteous advocate whose argument it was a delight to hear, an education to analyze, and a pleasure to accept.

A giant at labor, the column upon column his name would fill in the index of each session was a tribute to his industry, to the wide horizon of his interests; and their often tender nature was testimony to the human, lovable character of our colleague, who was a treasured friend. It all bespeaks the exalted patriotism of this good American whom we shall always remember.

I would recall a poem TOM HENNINGS recited—dedicated to good Americans—to the unknown soldiers as they rested in the Capitol's rotunda—and I borrow lines from that poem to close this tribute to TOM HENNINGS.

We breathe a last prayer
For God in heaven
To give him His care.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, it seems eminently fitting that the colleagues and friends of TOM HENNINGS should set aside a day to give these tributes of remembrance to him, because in the best sense of the word he was a man to remember. It was my high privilege to serve with him on both the Committee on the Judiciary and the Rules Committee, of which he was the chairman. In the field of legislation we often stood shoulder to shoulder on the same side, and not infrequently we differed and stood on opposite sides on issues which came before us. But in all instances one was bound to respect the forceful fighting qualities of TOM HENNINGS and also his great courtesy—particularly those who disagreed with him.

In particular I feel we should cite, as other Senators have done, the gallant and admirable fight which he made in behalf of the so-called clean elections bill, a fight to which I was very proud to commit myself fully. He was able in intellect, vigorous in debate, and dedicated in mind and heart. He has left to each of us, his fellow Members of the Senate, a legacy which time cannot efface. He has enriched the Senate by his many years of service here. He has given added luster to the name each one of us proudly bears—U.S. Senator.

On a personal note, it is my desire to extend my deepest sympathy to his wife Elizabeth and to all his family, and to say to them what they must realize that their grief can be largely assuaged by a recollection of a truly notable figure both in his State and in the Nation.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, no one can subscribe more devotedly or wholeheartedly to what has been said about TOM HENNINGS by other Senators than can I. No doubt he will be re-

membered in the history of the Senate and the House as one of the finest constitutional lawyers we have even encountered. I do not recall a time when I had a legal problem with respect to the constitutionality of proposed legislation that I did not call upon TOM HENNINGS for his advice.

He would have been a great judge if he had been appointed a judge, because he had a deep devotion to the principles of the Constitution, and an ability to make clear in everyday language the meaning of its provisions.

I remember him more, however, as a friend. TOM HENNINGS and I both came to Congress as young men. We were both new, and we lived next door to each other for several years, until he decided to go back to his home county and become the district attorney.

I saw him later during the war years. He served in the Navy, as I did, and on returning to the Senate, no one was more happy than I was to see TOM HENNINGS.

So all of us will miss him for his great qualities, his great energy, and his keen mind. But I will miss him, too, as an old friend. I extend my sympathy to his family and his loved ones.

Mr. McNAMARA. Mr. President, so much has been said here in honor of Senator THOMAS C. HENNINGS, JR., with respect to the services which he performed for the Nation as a whole, that there is little I can add. However, I would add that though he was concerned with the problem of all the people, he seemed to be especially devoted to the cause of the underprivileged and the minority groups of our Nation. It was an honor and a privilege for me to be able to serve with TOM HENNINGS in the U.S. Senate. We all looked to his keen mind and his experience to guide us in a number of areas. As we embark now upon a new era, these attributes will be sorely missed.

I close by expressing my deep sympathy for his parents, for his wife, and the rest of his family, at the untimely passing of this great and distinguished American.

Mr. MUSKIE. Mr. President, it was not my privilege to know TOM HENNINGS long or to know him intimately. Our careers in the Senate overlapped for too short a time to permit that.

Nevertheless, in common with all his colleagues, I came to admire him to respect him as a man of unsound abilities with a firm and courageous dedication to principle. I had looked forward to the possibility of a growing and deepening personal relationship with him.

The public service in a democracy attracts men of widely differing backgrounds, talents, and personalities. In almost infinite variations, they make their contributions and their impacts; and the sum total has been ever more vigorous and vital democratic institutions, better equipped to serve the needs of our country and our times. Underlying this great diversity, however, the perspective of history discloses some qualities that are more indispensable than others if leadership in a democracy is truly to measure up to the test which constantly confronts us.

One of these is a deep-seated belief that the people are capable of governing wisely; that they are capable of participating constructively in the decision-making processes of government; and that race, color, and creed do not reduce this capability. TOM HENNINGS shared this belief.

Another is the ability to see and understand public problems in their true dimensions. TOM HENNINGS could cut through to the core of a problem about as quickly as any man I ever knew.

Still another quality of leadership is the ability to devise imaginative but practical solutions to problems. We have all seen samples of Tom's handiwork. His abilities in this respect brought comfort to those enlisted in the same cause and frustration to those who were not.

And we must not overlook the qualities of intellectual honesty and moral courage. Tom was not one to shrink from the conclusions which his study and analysis of a problem indicated. He was not one to be afraid of the political consequences of an unpopular stand.

And so I respected him. And for these, as well as personal reasons, I shall miss him.

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, there is obviously little that can be added to what has already been stated with respect to our regret at the untimely passing of the able Senator from Missouri, TOM HENNINGS. I merely wish to echo the sentiments already expressed and add that, like others, I had come to know TOM HENNINGS over the course of 12 years of service with him. Like others, I learned to see TOM HENNINGS as a great American, a great patriot, a man of outstanding ability, and one possessed of a particularly perceptive legal mind. But, most of all, he was a man who had the great characteristic of friendliness and warmth in his approach to his colleagues.

I used to talk with him in the afternoons, as many of us did, in a certain area of the Capitol; and never in my experience have I been privileged to talk on a warmer personal basis with any man than I did with TOM HENNINGS. Like others, I have come to know his very wonderful wife. I know his passing has been a tremendous blow to her. Like others, I wish to extend my sympathy to her and to his family. All of us realize that TOM HENNINGS' death is a great loss to his family, his friends, his State and his Nation. Surely he shall be long remembered and deeply grieved.

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, there is very little I can add to the able remarks which have been made this afternoon regarding our late colleague, Senator THOMAS HENNINGS.

We all knew him as a great and skillful lawyer. He was an outstanding authority on the Constitution. He was devoted to civil liberties and over the years he stiffened the will of the Senate to protect important civil rights.

Senator HENNINGS was a fair, just and honorable man. At all times, on the floor of the Senate or when presiding as chairman of his committee, he went to great pains to see to it that all Senators had an opportunity to state their point of view.

And above all, he was a kindly, gentle man of great good nature.

We in the Senate have already missed him as a distinguished lawyer, an outstanding statesman and a stalwart friend. I express to his family my deepest sympathy.

Mr. BEALL. Mr. President, the death of Senator THOMAS C. HENNINGS, JR., was a double loss for me. In the first place, it grieved me deeply as a U.S. Senator to see the Nation lose the services of such a knowledgeable and dedicated individual. More personally though, it was a great shock for me to lose such a close friend.

I first met TOM HENNINGS shortly after I entered the House of Representatives in the 78th Congress and, from that day, I always found him to be kind, courteous, and sincere. His work in behalf of his constituents and the Nation as a whole will be long remembered, and I join with my other colleagues in expressing my deepest sympathy to his family.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, on behalf of all citizens of Missouri I wish to thank my colleagues for the magnificent tributes that have been paid to the late Senator THOMAS E. HENNINGS, JR. I am sure that his father, Judge Thomas E. Hennings, Sr., one of the outstanding citizens of my State, and his mother, a very great lady in her own right, and, above all, his wife, who contributed so much in the furtherance of his great career, will be extremely gratified to know of the affection and respect in which he was held by his colleagues, so ably expressed this afternoon.

E. KEITH THOMSON

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, the majority leader was gracious and kind enough to include in the program for remembrance services today a Member of the House who was elected to the U.S. Senate but who, because of his untimely death, did not take the oath of office. In that connection I first yield to the distinguished junior Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. HICKEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point the statement prepared by the senior Senator from Wyoming [Mr. McGEE], in tribute to the late KEITH THOMSON.

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

STATEMENT BY SENATOR MCGEE

I wish to add my voice to the many in both Houses of the Congress in tribute to the late KEITH THOMSON, former Congressman and Senator-elect from my State of Wyoming.

The demise of KEITH THOMSON came as a double blow to the State of Wyoming, for it meant that we lost not only one of the most successful political figures in our State's history, but that we also lost one of our most outstanding State citizens.

That destiny decreed an end to KEITH THOMSON's career of public service at such an early time in his life—a life that was characterized by relentless drive and energy—was difficult to understand.

A native son of Wyoming and a graduate of her State university, KEITH THOMSON's personal and political careers were meteoric. As an infantry officer in the Second World

War, he was the youngest battalion commander in the Army.

As his party's standard bearer, he rapidly rose from the ranks of the State legislature in Wyoming to her Congressman for three terms and just previous to his death won election to the U.S. Senate.

His untimely death came as a great shock to all who knew KEITH THOMSON. Even his most ardent political foe would never question his dedication to fight for what he believed in and his refusal to waver from his principles. I believe I speak for the whole State of Wyoming when I say that our State lost one of its most remarkably successful public servants when we lost KEITH THOMSON.

Mr. HICKEY. Mr. President, I wish today to pay tribute to an outstanding citizen of Wyoming and of the Nation, a man whom I was honored to count as a friend for many years.

It was a real tragedy when, on December 9 last, death suddenly struck down KEITH THOMSON, who, had he lived, would occupy the seat I now hold in the U.S. Senate; his sudden demise was a tragedy for his country and his State, as well as for his devoted family and his many friends.

Mr. THOMSON was born in Newcastle, Wyo., on February 8, 1919. He attended the University of Wyoming, graduating in law in 1941. That same year he entered the Army, where he had a brilliant career and became the youngest battalion commander in the U.S. Army. His decorations include the Purple Heart, the Legion of Merit, the Bronze Star Medal for heroic achievements in action, and the Italian Cross of Valor. Returning from the war, he established a law practice in Cheyenne, Wyo., and the next year was named by the Jaycees as the outstanding young man in the community. In 1951 he was elected to the Wyoming Legislature to represent Laramie County, and in 1954 he was sent to Congress, where he served for three terms. He was elected by a handsome majority to the U.S. Senate in November of 1960, the month before he died.

I knew KEITH THOMSON as a lawyer in Cheyenne, as a member of veterans' organizations, as an alumnus of the University of Wyoming, as a Member of Congress when I was Governor of Wyoming, and as a friend. I join with the multitude of those who mourn his passing and who extend deep sympathy to his wife and three sons. We have all suffered a great loss, but his family will find consolation in the knowledge that he leaves a fine and proud record of service to his country and his State.

Mr. President, as I sat here this afternoon, listening to the high tributes being paid to the late Senator from Missouri, the Honorable THOMAS C. HENNINGS, JR., I thought of what might have been had the Almighty permitted KEITH THOMSON to serve in the Senate for the term for which he was elected. I am sure that the many accolades, statements, and reverences that were made this afternoon would have been well stated in his behalf.

Because he was such a great citizen of Wyoming, and a native of Wyoming, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD, a house joint memorial intro-

duced by the entire membership of the House of Representatives, and the Senate, of the State of Wyoming in behalf of the career of this young man, whose 41 years had been devoted to Wyoming.

I am certain, therefore, that this resolution, which was introduced by the entire membership of both bodies, is testimony to the honor, respect, and devotion which the people of Wyoming had for this young man, as expressed by their representatives, irrespective of their political philosophies, at the most recent session of the Wyoming State Legislature.

There being no objection, the Wyoming House joint memorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HOUSE JOINT MEMORIAL 5

The career of a young man of 41 has come to a close. During those comparatively short years, he has reached the supremacy of achievement in a life that would cover twice those years in experience and accomplishment of an average citizen.

His humble beginning as a cowboy, soon became obscured by his appearance in World War II as the youngest and ablest combat infantry officer of his rank in the entire U.S. Army. On his return to civil life, his brilliance in the legal profession brought local and national recognition. His vision and talent formed one of the greatest industries of Wyoming, which he developed into a great enterprise that still is one of the largest in our State. He entered the field of politics with equal success—became legislator—Congressman for three terms—then U.S. Senator-elect by one of the greatest tributes ever paid by an appreciative electorate in this State. National recognition of his talents was of such magnitude that many offers for his services were made—and refused—for he had become dedicated to service of Wyoming and the cause of private enterprise.

He drove himself relentlessly each day and night to justify the confidence of his electorate. He once said, "To be a good Congressman requires 18 hours a day," and he gave that, and more. Possibly that is why we are sorrowing together today in a loss of a friend who meant much to the State and the Nation.

Truly a great man, who has given every ounce of devotion, and application of his brilliant mind to the multiple problems that confront our Republic, has laid his life on the altar of sacrifice for those he so ably represented.

His keen mind, that grasped instantly the tactics of military warfare, of litigation, and of national policies is now at rest. We have lost one who had compassion and kindness, firmness and conviction—one who expressed the thoughts and ideals of people from all walks of life—because he had served in all of them in his meteoric career from cowboy to U.S. Senator-elect.

We wonder how Divine Providence could strike down one who had reached a plateau of his career that looked forward to a distant horizon of realization of his objectives. Some day we will know. Suffice it to say now that he has brought inspiration, hope and renewed courage to those who have had their faith restored and their individual dignity honored.

Throughout this brief career, E. KEITH THOMSON had the support and encouragement of a lovely wife and family, for whom, with others, he has created a nation of security, promise, opportunity and peace.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, when the Senate convened on January 7, and the oath was administered to the new Members of the Senate, there was one who should have been here on that day

who was physically not present, but who was here in spirit. I refer to KEITH THOMSON, a longtime friend of mine from Wyoming, who on the 8th of November of last year was the choice of a very substantial number of the electorate of that sovereign State when he was elected to the U.S. Senate by a majority of 17,000 votes.

That wise old man, Solomon, caused Agur, the son of Jacob, to say that there were four things he did not know. One was the way of an eagle in the air; another was the way of a serpent upon the rock; still a third was the way of a ship in the midst of the sea; and a fourth was the way of a man with a maid.

But there is still another which is quite difficult to understand, and we know so little about it. It is that a young man, with a whole vista of life stretched out before him, should be stricken down when there was so much to be done, and so much for which to live.

KEITH THOMSON should have been here on our opening day to raise his hand and take the oath as a Senator of the United States from the State of Wyoming; and what a magnificent person he really was. As has been indicated, he was only 22 years old when he became the youngest battalion commander in an infantry brigade in the 91st Division in World War II. Having been a soldier, having been an enlisted man and an officer, I know what it takes and I know what it means, at age 22, to command a battalion of infantry in battle.

The service he rendered for his country in that conflict over a period of almost 5 years is best attested by the large number of decorations he received for distinguished and valorous conduct and service.

KEITH THOMSON came back from the conflict to practice law and to enter into an extraordinary number of civic activities which in themselves distinguished him as a truly unselfish, civic-minded young man. Thereafter, he was elected to the 84th, 85th, and 86th Congresses, where he made a durable and outstanding record.

Thereafter he became a candidate for the U.S. Senate. In October of 1960, I went to Wyoming to assist him and to do some television shows and to make some speeches in his behalf. I remember the evening we sat in the little town of Worland. He seemed so confident, so vigorous, and so completely certain that he would win a victory. When the tumult and the shouting died, and the captains and the political kings departed, he had won by a majority of 17,000.

I was still with him when he was making plans. He was expressing his committee preferences to me, and he was shaping his course as if he would live forever. What a great way it is to look out upon life. His plans, his dreams, and his hopes were just as rugged as the mountains of Wyoming and just as spacious as its valleys that he crossed in his victory quest.

As late as the 7th of December of last year, he wrote me at great length to confirm our conversations which we had out there, and he enclosed copies of some of the very eloquent letters which had

reached him as a result of the vigorous campaign he made. At that very moment, his beloved and gracious family were in Washington, making plans for his advent to the Senate, because that would be a red letter day in his life.

It was on December 10, without warning, without any premonition, that the dread and clammy pain that strikes the human heart and halts the flow of life-giving blood, was upon him like the silent, unheralded killer that it is, and all that was mortal of KEITH THOMSON came that day to an end, after 41 years of a life filled to overflowing with activity, achievement, and service.

Mr. President, what does one say about these amazing fortuities which we behold from time to time? How shall one comprehend the termination of a young life when there is so much for which to live—a lovely family and a country to which he was devoted, service in which he found satisfaction, and even life itself? How tragic that it should come in that season of the year when the animation of the Christmas spirit, which somehow reenergizes all mankind at that time, was bringing a great surge of joy, good will, and happiness, and pervaded every nook and cranny of the universe. Why is it that a young heart should be stilled, a vigorous mind rendered insensible, eloquent lips should be silenced, and the fruitful activity of a questing soul should be brought to an end?

Well, Mr. President, there was a man long ago who seemed to make it understandable. His name was Paul. He was a magnificent missionary, an eloquent preacher, and a man of unshakable faith. He also was most diligent in writing to his associates and to people where he had crusaded. He it was who wrote:

For this corruptible must put on incorruption, and this mortal must put on immortality.

Mr. President, it is just that simple when we think about KEITH THOMSON, 41 years old, a great soldier and a great public servant, who had to come to an untimely end. It is not given to us to choose the appointed hour. There is an ordained time for all things, and a season for every purpose. We shall not fully know or understand or appreciate why, at two score years and one, KEITH THOMSON should have to be denied the victory won, for which he had labored so earnestly. But his labors for his community, his State, his country, and his fellow men shall not have been in vain. They are durable; they will live. The fruits of those great labors did not die and will not fade away. Like his immortal spirit, they will carry on.

In this memorial service we remember his gracious and charming wife, Thyra Thomson. She did so much in his behalf. What a companion and helpmate she really was. How she helped him at every stage in his public career. To her we extend our sincere sympathy as we remember another young lawyer who was denied the privilege of holding up his hand in this Chamber on the third of January and taking the oath as a Senator, because of that malady which strikes down more often than any other malady with which we are familiar.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, KEITH THOMSON was born at Newcastle, Wyo., about 40 miles west of where I live. His early years were spent in the western hills of South Dakota and Wyoming. Part of his life was spent in South Dakota. Many people in the immediate vicinity of Spearfish and Belle Fourche, S. Dak., at the edge of the Black Hills, remember KEITH THOMSON personally.

Mr. President, to those of us in South Dakota who knew him, it seems unbelievable that so suddenly he should be stricken and taken from our midst.

I do not know that I have talked with anyone who was present immediately at the time when KEITH was taken. But, in any event, I know that KEITH THOMSON would meet every situation with courage, and would go forward unafraid.

He had an unusual heritage in his love of his country. It was my privilege to go to the Arlington National Cemetery when KEITH was laid away. I noted with interest that he was buried in an area where there are many graves marked with the family name, Thomson. So he had a heritage of forebears who distinguished themselves in the military service of their country.

As the distinguished minority leader has already stated, KEITH THOMSON received many decorations for his service during the 5 years he was with the 1st Division. Those decorations included the Combat Infantryman's Badge, the Purple Heart, the Legion of Merit, the Bronze Star Medal for heroic conduct in action, and the Italian Cross of Valor.

As commander of an Italian infantry regiment in the 91st Division, KEITH THOMSON knew the long march through mud and the other tortures the 91st Division suffered in Italy.

Some years ago I heard one of the infantry corps commanders say that when it came to the awarding of honors or recognition, he thought the infantryman was the forgotten man of World War II. The glamour of the war went to the airmen and to the sailors. But there was a side of World War II that involved drudgery, lonely nights, and the real shot of battle. That was what the infantrymen experienced; and the 91st Division went through that, particularly in Italy.

KEITH went through it; and he returned with his love of his country intensified. He wanted to serve it in peace, as well as in war.

In his first year of the practice of law in Wyoming, he received the junior chamber of commerce award as the outstanding young man. He was president of the alumni association of the University of Wyoming. In those ways and in other ways he received the plaudits of those who knew him.

Mr. President, I have talked with my colleague, Representative BERRY, of the Second Congressional District of South Dakota, about KEITH THOMSON's service in the House of Representatives. I am only faithful to what Representative BERRY has told me when I say that he thinks that in KEITH THOMSON the State of Wyoming and the Nation had a real public servant. Representative BERRY looked forward to great things in the

service of KEITH THOMSON as a Member of the U.S. Senate.

It was a great tragedy—one which I have not been able satisfactorily to explain—when KEITH THOMSON was stricken. But, Mr. President, usefulness in life on this earth is not always measured by length of life here. Every day that KEITH THOMSON served in the Armies of the United States and every day that he served in public office in the State of Wyoming, in the State legislature, and in the Congress of the United States, he proved his devotion to the causes of peace as well as to the urgencies of wartime service.

If the people of Wyoming could speak today, I am sure they would say they had faith in KEITH THOMSON and they appreciated his service. The outpouring of votes he received last November was eloquent testimony to their recognition of his worth.

It is a source of great regret to us that KEITH THOMSON is not a Member of this Congress and of the Senate. To those of us who knew him, to the people of Wyoming, and to the people of the western part of South Dakota, his life will always stand as that of a man who served with thorough dedication in whatever opportunities for service come to him, whether in peace or in war.

To Mrs. Thomson and their three brave boys, who have lost their father, Mrs. Case and I wish to extend, at this time, our sincere sympathy; and we hope that the record of the illustrious life he led will assuage some of their sorrow in the lonely days they will experience from time to time.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, I rise to pay tribute to a distinguished legislator who has had an outstanding and a most unusual record in the defense of his country. I wish to pay tribute to KEITH THOMSON as a fine citizen, as a fighter, and as one with a great capacity for friendship.

Perhaps the question asked most commonly in connection with the lives of all persons is "Why?" In the case of KEITH THOMSON, his State elevated him to membership in the U.S. Senate; he won the prize. Yet he was denied the opportunity to become a part of this body and to serve here. The question is, "Why?"

That question has been asked through all the ages. The only answer is that the great guiding and creative force, the mind that keeps the stars in their places, the author of all natural laws, does have, and has had since the very beginning of time, another place, another sphere, where men exist and serve.

So, Mr. President, today we pay tribute to the public service of KEITH THOMSON. We extend our heartfelt sympathy to Mrs. Thomson and their three boys, and we commend to them the ancient faith that they will see him again.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, we who knew KEITH THOMSON as a Member of the House of Representatives had looked forward to his coming to the Senate as a new addition of energy and vigor to the Republican side of the aisle, with tremendous pride in coming from a mountain State in which he won a great elec-

tion. It was a keen disappointment to us all when his untimely passing deprived us of what we knew to be great expectations in terms of service to the Senate and to the people.

I join with my colleagues in extending deepest sympathy to his widow and to his family, and in offering them that little solace which comes from the feeling that he was very highly regarded and that in the short life which the Lord gave him to serve he served magnificently the people of the United States and the cause of peace in the world.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, the untimely death of KEITH THOMSON was a tragic loss to his beloved State of Wyoming, to the Nation, and to this body, where he had been called to serve. It was a deeply felt personal loss to those of us who knew KEITH as a friend, in which number I am proud to be included.

We served together in the House of Representatives, where he exemplified the distinguished attributes of the character and mind that were to lead subsequently to his selection as a Senator from the great State of Wyoming.

KEITH THOMSON's military record has been referred to. It was unique. It was a record of which his family and friends can always be very proud. The testimony of this record and his record as an outstanding public servant is all that we need to know to appreciate how great is the loss of KEITH THOMSON personally and, in the larger sense, as a public figure.

I wish to extend to Mrs. Thomson and his fine boys my deepest sympathy.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I did not have the pleasure of knowing the late KEITH THOMSON at all well. I did know him by his excellent reputation as a man of honor and of integrity. I knew him by the great reputation which he honorably achieved by serving as an infantry officer in World War II. My wife and I knew Mr. and Mrs. Thomson somewhat, however, and saw them on occasion when their children and our daughter were attending some of the same classes in this city.

Mrs. Kuchel and I, together with all our colleagues in the Senate, extend to Mrs. Thomson and her family our most sincere sympathy and our deepest condolences. We hope very much that after the duties which the late KEITH THOMSON performed for his country in the House of Representatives and upon American battlefields abroad, all his family will take a real pride in his constant devotion to his family and to his country.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, in behalf of the distinguished Senator from Colorado [Mr. ALLOTT], who is on the interparliamentary delegation to Canada this week, I ask unanimous consent that, in connection with these testimonials, his remarks may be inserted in the body of the RECORD.

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

KEITH THOMSON—STATEMENT BY SENATOR ALLOTT

Some men are given a short but brilliant life—like a shooting star which, in but a moment, passes in the sky. Such a man

was KEITH THOMSON. It was as though he subconsciously knew that too much time was not to be his, but in that time he would accomplish many things.

KEITH THOMSON was what we might call a typical son of the West. He began his career in a way of which many American boys dream. He was a cowboy. But, as many American boys who outgrow those dreams, KEITH THOMSON outgrew his early beginnings.

Law appealed to him and he decided to become a lawyer. He tackled this new task as he did everything in his life—with verve and energy. Then, as war loomed and became a reality, KEITH THOMSON went into this new task with all the energy so typical of him, and he became one of the youngest and ablest officers of his rank in the U.S. Army.

But, KEITH THOMSON was not content to be just another lawyer. Knowing that civic accomplishments came through an active part in politics, he entered that field.

KEITH THOMSON began his political career as so many of our national legislators have, by entering State politics. Then larger fields called, and with the confidence he engendered in everything he did, he was elected by his neighbors and friends to the House of Representatives where he served for three terms. Here, he drove himself as relentlessly as he had in every past endeavor. His first and foremost thought was to keep this Nation strong and free, and as a member of the House Subcommittee on Defense Appropriations, he never spared himself from the tasks at hand.

His State of Wyoming recognized his hard work and talents and elected him to the U.S. Senate. Before him seemed to lie many years of selfless work in behalf of his State and country.

But, then, like the shooting star, his pathway ended suddenly. His meteoric career was cut short, and with his death the Nation lost a man whose devotion knew no bounds nor his hours any end when it came to serving the people and his country.

It is difficult to understand sometimes why such a promising young man, at the apex of his career, must be called by a Higher Power. But in leaving, he has left behind him a life whose inspiration to others will always be remembered.

The loss of KEITH THOMSON is a loss to the Nation as a whole. His loss to his family at the early age of 41 is a great tragedy.

I know that only time will heal this sorrow. Mrs. Allott and I extend our deepest sympathy to Mrs. Thomson and his family in the tragedy which has brought sorrow to all of us.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. President, I join with my colleagues today in paying tribute to the late KEITH THOMSON, who was elected last November to a Senate term after serving three terms in the House of Representatives. His tragic passing caused widespread grief throughout eastern Idaho where he was well known. With a delegation of Wyoming constituents, he attended, on December 7, 1960, a conference at Idaho Falls, Idaho, sponsored by the Bureau of Reclamation and the Army Engineer Corps, to discuss water resource projects of interest to our two States. He was very happy at that time because of the exceptionally fine race he had made for the senatorial seat, and was looking forward eagerly to the opportunity to serve his State in the Senate.

In his short span of twoscore years, KEITH THOMSON had achieved an enviable record of service in World War II and in various activities which provided an opportunity to use his unusual talents

and his dynamic leadership. It is most unfortunate that Wyoming and the Nation have lost the dedicated services of this outstanding American. He had upheld the highest traditions of the Republican Party and was destined to become one of the party's ablest leaders in the Senate. I extend the condolences of the people of my State to Mrs. Thomson and their three sons who have a rich heritage in the achievements of an illustrious father.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed, in executive session, to consider the nominations on the Executive Calendar.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider executive business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. PELL in the chair). The clerk will state the nominations reported today.

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE

The legislative clerk read the nomination of James M. Quigley, of Pennsylvania, to be an Assistant Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

The legislative clerk read the nomination of John P. Duncan, of Georgia, to be an Assistant Secretary of Agriculture.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Frank J. Welch, of Kentucky, to be an Assistant Secretary of Agriculture.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

ATOMIC ENERGY COMMISSION

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Glenn T. Seaborg, of California, to be a member of the Atomic Energy Commission.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

EXPORT-IMPORT BANK

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Harold Francis Linder, of New York, to be President of the Export-Import Bank of Washington.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Stephen Ailes, of Maryland, to be Under Secretary of the Army.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Herbert Frank York, of California,

to be Director of Defense Research and Engineering.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

ARMY, ARMY RESERVE, AND AIR FORCE

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the military nominations be considered and agreed to en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nominations will be considered en bloc; and, without objection, they are confirmed.

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, I ask that the President be immediately notified of the nominations confirmed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the President will be so notified.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, I move that the Senate return to the consideration of legislative business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate resumed the consideration of legislative business.

TRIBUTES TO SENATOR KUCHEL, OF CALIFORNIA

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I am always greatly delighted when a very distinguished newspaper in a Senator's State has some very nice things to say about him. I noticed three articles from the Los Angeles Times that speak in high and complimentary terms of my distinguished associate, the distinguished Senator from California [Mr. KUCHEL].

I ask unanimous consent that all three of the articles be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Los Angeles (Calif.) Times, Jan. 25, 1961]

KUCHEL'S STAR BLAZES IN FEDERAL FIRMAMENT
(By Robert T. Hartmann)

Of all the stars in the cloudless Republican sky 8 years ago, none shone brighter than the constellation from California: Warren, Nixon, Knowland, and Knight.

Dimmed perhaps by proximity to another senatorial star was one of lesser magnitude, perpetually mispronounced as Kookle or Kutchle or Kuckle.

But stars burn out or pass to other celestial courses and from the latitude and longitude of Washington, only one—much brighter now—remains visible in the Federal firmament.

The sole survivor is THOMAS HENRY KUCHEL, senior Senator from the Nation's second State and second in command of the GOP rear guard on the floor of the U.S. Senate.

All the Capitol switchboard girls, even most of the radio and television oracles, have at least learned to say Keekle.

At 50, Senator KUCHEL is still a vigorous young man by Republican reckoning, although slightly senile for the new executive branch. His rapid rise to the responsibilities of minority whip—the opposite number of Senator HUBERT HUMPHREY, Democrat, of

Minnesota—attests not only the Senate's intuitive selection but also his own solid skills.

KUCHEL's political performance is puzzling to many people, for it has none of the color, fire or temperament which characterizes senatorial celebrities. But he has passed the supreme test for elective officials: he is still around.

A lawyer and scion of a newspaper family, he remains the ranking California Republican in the Federal firmament while the stars that shone so brightly in 1953 make or practice law or publish the news in which his name figures more and more often.

The secret of KUCHEL's success was doubtless taught him by the one Californian who escaped political injury and is now safely isolated from battle as the Chief Justice of the United States.

As one of the most popular Governors of California in history, Earl Warren was in many ways the prototype of modern Republicanism and the middle-road, above-partisan-ship stance which historians will probably say President Eisenhower invented.

In the Senate, to which he was initially appointed by Warren when Richard Nixon became Vice President after only 2 years of his hard-won first term, KUCHEL has been a faithful practitioner of the Warren technique and one of the most consistent supporters of President Eisenhower's policies.

By the percentage ratings of both the liberal Americans for Democratic Action and the conservative Americans for Constitutional Action, KUCHEL stands almost exactly in the middle of the senatorial spectrum.

At the start of each session, when he aligns himself with Senators HUMPHREY and JAVITS, to fight filibustering, the bane of all civil rights bills, he is labeled a liberal. But in fiscal matters and whenever appeasement of Red China raises its head, he is generally as conservative as his former colleague, Senator Knowland.

KUCHEL staunchly supported Mr. Eisenhower's controversial vetoes in the politically loaded last session, and campaigned for Mr. Nixon in the touch-and-go California contest. But in 1959 he authored the compromise that salvaged Senator Kennedy's labor bill and has disagreed with the recent Republican administration's partnership policy on public power.

So, if his Arizona colleague and warm friend, Senator BARRY GOLDWATER, were to ask, "Where do you stand, sir?" KUCHEL might have to answer, "With a foot in both camps." This is not for lack of strong opinions so much as an innate compulsion toward compromise, a properly senatorial taste for reasonable solutions rather than deadlock, and the diverse character and concerns of his huge and growing California constituency.

KUCHEL is rather more keen for the Federal view of things than many Republicans and most Dixiecrats, though he stops short of most of the liberal Democrats with whom he allies himself semiannually in the civil rights coalition and on some other issues.

He would like to see Uncle Sam get more deeply into the smog problem, for instance, and is a strong backer of Federal reclamation, power, highway, school, and other projects that are anathema to States righters.

This is odd in view of his considerable service in State government, as a California State senator and as controller, but it springs from his naval experience in World War II when he was briefly shipmates on a pier in Long Beach.

As is the case with most politicians who practice nonpartisanship—and they are usually from closely divided States—KUCHEL is moving toward closer alliance with his Republican colleagues as his own reelection approaches.

He is making friendly overtures to the GOP delegation in the House which has become a 14-man minority of the 30-mem-

ber delegation, and there is ample evidence that misery likes company along the New Frontier.

For the first time since he donned his senatorial toga, KUCHEL is operating without powerful Republican allies either in Washington or Sacramento where the Democrats have completed their conquest of both executive and legislative bodies. It is a new and difficult challenge, but he faces it with outward equanimity.

The Senator's views of the Republican Party's future and his own will appear in a subsequent column.

[From the Los Angeles (Calif.) Times, Jan. 27, 1961]

KUCHEL SEEKS TO LEAD STATE'S GOP FORCES (By Robert T. Hartmann)

Senator TOM KUCHEL, Republican, of California, is moving out of his handsome wood-paneled office in the New Senate Office Building, opened only a year ago, and back to the old, high-ceilinged Senate Office Building across the street, where he will take over the corner suite just vacated by former Vice President Nixon.

The move is politically symbolic as well as a practical way of getting more space instead of ultramodern plumbing and push-button elevators. KUCHEL, the chief Republican survivor of the 1953 California invasion of the Capitol, is also moving to succeed Nixon as commander of the Golden State's embattled pocket of GOP resistance here in Washington.

He succeeded Nixon in the Senate 8 years ago when the Eisenhower landslide ended 20 years of Democratic dominion, and was both fortunate and frustrated during his first few years.

KUCHEL, as a Senate freshman, had the immense advantage of learning the ropes as a member of the majority, albeit a slim one, during the 2 Eisenhower terms when Congress was under Republican control.

He also had the help of his experienced colleague, Senator Knowland, his apartment house neighbor, though they frequently parted company on the Senate floor. There Big Bill was the majority leader and plunging fullback for the administration team, though he sometimes ran off in other directions with the ball.

Since conflict is the essence of news, the then senior Senator from California (Knowland seldom failed to emphasize the "senior" bit, and to his everlasting credit KUCHEL has not subjected Senator ENGLE, Democrat, of California, to this) usually monopolized the headlines, however.

KUCHEL maintained his cordial connections with Warren after the former Governor, who appointed him upon Nixon's elevation, was taken out of public politicking by being named Chief Justice.

Warren also appointed Knowland, another California publisher's son, but it was KUCHEL who remained faithful in his fashion to the peculiar pattern of politicking which Warren (and before him Hiram Johnson) imposed on California Republicanism, and which President Eisenhower sought to make the model for the GOP.

But let the Senator define his position in his own words.

"California has always been free of the excessive partisanship that exists in some Eastern States," he says. "The future for Republicans lies in the middle road rather than extremes—extremes are bad for America. Every group in the United States has its lobbies here, but somebody has to lobby for the general public.

"For the next few years our party policy is going to be made in Congress," the 50-year-old GOP Senate whip continued. "We in the minority have to work harmoniously together, offer thoughtful and constructive opposition, and avoid the kind of 'musical chairs' which almost ruined us in 1958.

"The Republican Party has tried to consider the necessity of a fiscally sound program, to find means to protect the value of the dollar without stultifying progress. I think the chief difference between our two great parties is that, although we agree on many things in principle, some of my Democratic friends believe that if a little is good, a lot more is better.

"I'd make a guess that President Kennedy will not recommend to Congress all the promises that were made in Los Angeles by his party. By contrast, the Republican platform last fall was a fine document, and Republicans have given California excellent State government for many years. Maybe this explains the almost unbelievable phenomenon of the national Republican ticket carrying California after the devastation of 1958."

(KUCHEL referred to the off-year election when Senator Knowland sought the governorship, and Governor Knight was obliged to run for the Senate, and both were replaced by their Democratic rivals.)

"We have a tremendous problem in California," KUCHEL added. "As a Republican and a citizen, I certainly hope we may choose an able candidate for Governor and young, vigorous men for the eight new seats we will get in the 1962 Congress."

The Senator, whose constituency is fixed by the Constitution, takes a considerably calmer view of the prospect that Sacramento Democrats will ruthlessly gerrymander the State after the 1960 census than his 14 California colleagues in the House, some of whom are already marked for oblivion.

"We're pretty well mixed up, without too many blocks of solid voters in certain areas, and I doubt it will be possible to gerrymander California very well," KUCHEL declared.

As recently as 1956, when feuding GOP factions in California divided their presidential delegation three ways among Nixon, Knowland, and Knight, the only delegate all could agree on was the Anaheim Senator—he was otherwise left out of the deal.

Now, however, he is the sole survivor, and nothing succeeds in politics like success. Senator KUCHEL is girding himself for his fourth appeal to the voters of his burgeoning State with every sign of confidence that his Warren-Eisenhower way is what most Americans, and certainly most Californians, want.

[From the Los Angeles Times, Feb. 19, 1961]

SENATOR KUCHEL PLANNING TO SHOW SELF IN STATE

(By James Bassett)

True to an honored political custom, THOMAS HENRY KUCHEL, California's senior U.S. Senator and GOP whip, won't say positively, "Yes," when asked if he's going to run for reelection next year.

But the 50-year-old descendant of Anaheim's founding family has let it be known bluntly that he intends to "spend a lot of time here" prior to the 1962 primaries.

As KUCHEL sees it, now is the time he'd better not try to match his perfect 1960 rollcall record in the Senate. Last year another Senator skipped more votes than he cast—and wound up as President of the United States, largely as a result of arduous preprimary campaigning.

KUCHEL is impressed by Mr. Kennedy's eminently successful methods.

In anticipation of visiting all sections of California, he has bolstered his Washington office by appointing Ewing Hass, his longtime friend and ex-deputy in the State controller's office, as his top administrative assistant.

KUCHEL's oratory has improved tremendously, too, during his 7 years in the Senate, until now he is a remarkably effective speaker rather than a merely competent one.

What's more, he has developed a sharp, shrewd eye for legitimate issues which cut

across party lines and which are calculated to enhance his own prospects in 1962. A prime example was his frontal attack on President Kennedy's proposal to channel defense contracts into depressed areas rather than submit them to competitive national bidding.

"Illegal," was KUCHEL's crisp estimate of this administration plan, which could seriously affect California defense business.

In Los Angeles last week as Lincoln Day keynote for a combined State-county GOP meeting, KUCHEL left no doubt what kind of Republican he is: He considers ex-President Eisenhower's moderation the proper stance in 1962 as well as 1952; he believes the GOP platform written in Chicago to be a magnificent document.

Both the man and the platform, KUCHEL feels, spell "a forward-looking American political party * * * in the Lincoln tradition."

As a result of his middle-of-the-road proclivities, the peppery Senator faces a curious coalition of opponents that includes some Republicans of the extreme right wing, and Democrats leaning toward the left. There seems to be a familiar resemblance between these minor GOP detractors and those who urge the impeachment of Chief Justice Warren.

Significantly, KUCHEL himself is a protégé of Earl Warren, who elevated him to the State controller's post after his World War II naval service, and later appointed him to Vice President Nixon's vacated Senate seat in 1952.

Warren used to remark that 15 percent of the electorate occupies the right side of the political spectrum, 15 percent the left, and 70 percent the moderate middle. That, the ex-Governor contended, is the reasonable place to be found when the votes are counted.

KUCHEL obviously agrees.

Like Warren, before him, the Senator also aims to pay more attention to the ethnic minorities of California, who have too long been neglected by his party. KUCHEL says the Eisenhower record in civil rights was great—but badly undersold in past campaigns—and he doesn't intend to repeat this error.

You'll find him stumping the Negro and Mexican areas of Los Angeles County this year, selling the story of what the last GOP administration did, with vigor and persuasiveness.

If all this leads to the assumption that KUCHEL figures on a tough fight in 1962, you're dead right. He does.

Although at the present writing the identity of his Democratic challenger is still highly conjectural, KUCHEL doesn't underplay the opposition's 4-to-3 registration edge, nor their desire to complete a clean sweep of the State's top elective offices.

Most speculation centers around two possible contenders for KUCHEL's job.

One is Robert McCarthy, 40-year-old lawyer and present State director of motor vehicles. Last year he migrated to the San Fernando Valley from San Francisco. McCarthy has 10 children. It was quite an exodus from the city where he was born and where he'd been State senator.

Although he claims his uprooting came about as a result of heavy division of motor vehicles duties here, McCarthy grins coyly when asked if Los Angeles' predominant political appeal didn't have some bearing on the move. He's been a hugely efficient boss of this busy department, but he says he won't take a second term.

The other is Los Angeles' State Senator Richard Richards, 44, whose jurisdiction includes 6 million residents—more than live in 40 of our 50 States.

Richards has long been known to have an eye on some higher office. He'd been rumored as a potential candidate for mayor,

but friends suggested this might not be the best springboard for statewide vote getting, because of the intense Los Angeles-San Francisco municipal rivalry.

Over the years Richards has moved from the ultraliberal wing of the Democratic Party toward a more moderate position, and he has been an effective State senator, authoring smog control and important highway legislation.

Less likely KUCHEL challengers are such veteran Los Angeles Congressmen as CHET HOLIFIELD, 57, and CECIL R. KING, 63, whose seniority makes it improbable that they would "go for broke" in a Senate race, and JAMES ROOSEVELT, 53, who failed in his one statewide try against Governor Warren in 1950.

NATURAL RESOURCES MESSAGES OF THE PRESIDENT

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. President, President Kennedy yesterday presented to the people of America a stirring challenge on the conservation of our natural resources. He offered to the Congress a great opportunity to serve the people by implementing his recommendations for sound development and prudent use of our basic natural wealth. His message to the Congress gave encouragement that we now will begin to move forward again in a number of essential programs that it has been my privilege to promote during my 17 years in the Congress.

I will not try to recite all of the items mentioned by the President which have been my legislative pets in the past. But I would like to direct attention, Mr. President, to several current bills of which I am author or coauthor that will serve to implement the President's program.

The President rejects a no new starts policy on water projects. A worthy new start in California is the Auburn-Folsom south unit of the Central Valley project, proposed for authorization in S. 103, which I have introduced with the cosponsorship of Senator KUCHEL.

The President advocates increased attention to municipal and industrial water supplies. My bill, S. 13, would encourage States, municipalities, and local agencies to proceed on these projects by authorizing Federal grants for flood control benefits and interest-free loans for irrigation aspects of municipal and industrial water projects.

The President asks the Congress to extend the current saline water conversion program. I was the author of the original act—Public Law 448 of the 82d Congress—which created the Office of Saline Water in the Department of the Interior in 1952. Several bills have been introduced this year to extend and expand the Federal saline water program. Among them is my bill, S. 100.

President Kennedy urges a more effective water pollution control program, including increased Federal assistance to State and interstate agencies. He specifically mentions Senator KERR's bill, S. 120, and adds several recommendations for strengthening enforcement procedures. This is right in line with the proposal which Senator HUMPHREY and I and a number of other Senators have offered in the form of S. 861, to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act.

In hydroelectric power, the President recommends optimum public power de-

velopment in all multipurpose projects, and he proposes the early interconnection of regions served by Federal projects with common carrier electric transmission lines. This is a goal we have long sought in the Far West, and I anticipate that some positive proposals will be made to the Congress on the subject this session. The Trinity project now under construction, the Auburn project that I have proposed (S. 103), and the great California State water plan all are part of this pattern.

The President calls for new leadership, research, financial and technical assistance in the control of air pollution. This is precisely what would be provided by S. 455, of which I am cosponsor with Senators KUCHEL, CLARK, SCOTT, and CARROLL.

Among several recommendations to accelerate forest development, the President proposes the building of more access roads. This is the subject of S. 501, of which I am a cosponsor with Senator MORSE and other Senators.

I am especially pleased that the President chose to mention specifically the need for establishing the Point Reyes National Seashore in California, along with the proposed Cape Cod and Padre Island Seashore Parks. I have asked the distinguished chairman of the Senate Interior Committee to schedule early hearings on my Point Reyes bill, S. 476.

Among other conservation measures proposed in the message which I cannot refrain from endorsing are comprehensive river basin planning, flood plain zoning, small watershed projects, assistance to small independent timber owners and processors, rehabilitation of depleted stocks of salmon and sardines in the Pacific, a national program for oceanography, and a comprehensive Federal recreation program.

The President has wisely pointed out that all these resource programs, involving many Federal agencies, require coordination at the highest executive level. He has suggested that this be achieved by the creation of a Presidential Advisory Committee on Natural Resources under the existing Council of Economic Advisers. Whatever machinery of coordination is provided, it will have to have real authority to match its tremendous responsibility. In my view, a separate Council of Resources and Conservation Advisers, reporting directly to the President, would be better. I have introduced a bill, S. 239, with 31 of my colleagues as coauthors, to accomplish this. It will be up to the Congress to work out the best mechanics for coordinating the truly magnificent program of natural resource development presented to us by the President.

In summary, Mr. President, no less than nine of President Kennedy's major recommendations on resource conservation are covered in legislation already before the 87th Congress, in bills of which I have the privilege to be the author or a cosponsor. I think my colleagues know that resource development is a field that has been close to my heart and foremost in my legislative endeavors during my entire public career—particularly in the years when I was chairman of the House

Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. During all of this time we never have had stronger executive leadership in the field than our President offered to us yesterday. I feel sure that the people of America will respond and that the Congress will act to implement this program.

Mr. President, I noted in the New York Times of today an editorial dealing with President Kennedy's message on natural resources. I ask unanimous consent that the editorial appear in the RECORD at the conclusions of my remarks.

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

KENNEDY ON NATURAL RESOURCES

The bright promise of leadership exercised by President John F. Kennedy has been taking shape in the brief month since he was inaugurated; and few things he has said or done during these crowded weeks have more clearly revealed his breadth of vision in dealing with a major national policy question than his message to Congress yesterday on the coming crisis in the conservation and development of America's natural resources.

What he said about each of the separate resource problems was very much to the point, but the fact that the President grouped them in a coherent whole is what gave especial distinction to his treatment of this subject. His message showed him to be aware of the intolerable conflicts, duplications, and rivalries that have for many years plagued the Federal Government's natural resource activities—he even listed some (but by no means all) of these conflicts—and he raises the hope that consistent policies based on the national welfare and not on specific vested interests will be established in these fields.

The most serious criticism we have of the broad policy statements in his message is that he led up to, but did not follow through with, a proposal that the natural resource functions of the Federal Government be grouped in one department, where they belong, instead of being scattered in innumerable separate little empires. But he did propose some Executive and budgetary steps that should help to relieve if not cure this fundamental difficulty. A major reorganization in this area is an inescapable necessity. Meanwhile, the innovations he proposes in respect to coordinated direction, expert advice, scientific research and budgetary controls all make sense.

If the President is inclined to be more enthusiastic than some of us are about big hydroelectric dam and giant flood-control projects, he also laid welcome stress on less dramatic aspects of water control, such as flood-plain zoning and small-watershed development.

His forest policy recognizes the serious danger of timber shortages despite optimistic statistics that have been put forth in recent years suggesting that all's well with our forest situation. The President's comments on a program of balanced usage for the public domain are sound; and we warmly welcome his endorsement of the pending wilderness-protection bill and of proposed new park areas. These recommendations will, we hope, be followed up by speedy action in a Congress moving under the leadership that Mr. Kennedy seems intent on giving it.

THE PRESIDENT'S MESSAGE ON NATURAL RESOURCES

Mr. MOSS. Mr. President, from time to time many Members of the Congress have had occasion to call attention to the rapid depletion of our natural re-

sources, and to the consequences to the Nation's future which will result from that depletion.

Last session, in an address entitled "Our Blessed Land," I pointed out to the Senate that America owes her success as a nation, in great part at least, to the abundance of natural resources with which a kind providence has endowed her. I reminded my colleagues of the fact that we are using up our resources at a tremendous rate, a rate which makes it imperative that we reexamine our policies and programs in this field.

It was with a particular sense of satisfaction, therefore—a feeling that I am sure many in this body shared—that I examined the remarkable message on natural resources which President Kennedy presented to the House of Representatives yesterday.

I was gratified with the President's emphasis on the need to coordinate planning and development of the entire range of our natural resources, and his determination to strengthen the programs of the Federal Government in this field.

The President will make it a regular function of the Council of Economic Advisers to report to the President, the Congress, and the people on the status of resource programs in relation to national needs. He will establish a Presidential Advisory Committee on this question, and ask the National Academy of Sciences to evaluate our present programs of resources planning and policy formulation.

One section of the message dealt with water, a subject of most vital concern to my State of Utah and the West. President Kennedy drew from the report of the Senate Select Committee on National Water Resources, which was presented to this body only a few days ago, to emphasize the need for doubling the Nation's water supply by 1980.

He called for maximum development of all our river basins for all purposes. He recognized the importance of planning water resource projects far in advance to preserve the necessary sites.

The President urged a vigorous program of control to meet the growing health menace of water pollution. He specifically asked the Congress to provide increased Federal financial assistance for construction of local waste treatment facilities.

He urged an accelerated program of research and development to make saline and brackish water suitable for use in home and industry. He urged the conservation of soil and watershed that is so vital to water storage in the West.

Mr. President, I particularly invite the attention of my colleagues to two sentences in the President's message. He said:

In the resource field, predictions of future use have been consistently understated.

And he said:

Even under conservative projection, we face a future of critical shortages and handicaps.

My principal reason for making these short remarks today is to emphasize these two statements, and to urge Con-

gress to take vigorous action at this session to begin to meet our natural resource crisis.

Development of our water, our soil, our forests, our fuels, and our minerals is not primarily a sectional or partisan question. Every citizen of our country, every business and professional enterprise, every home and farm and community in the Nation is dependent for its existence upon an adequate supply of basic resources.

President Kennedy recognizes that only part of this job can be done by the Federal Government. He said yesterday that only through the fullest participation of State and local governments and private industry can it be done wisely and effectively.

But, by its very nature, much of the task of resource conservation must be carried out through the instrumentality of government. And, because so many of the areas with which we deal cross State lines, we in Congress who make interstate law must take a major share of responsibility.

We now have the leadership in the executive branch—in the White House, in the Department of the Interior, in other departments—which recognizes the vital nature of our resource problem and is willing to take the necessary steps. This is the year in which the Congress of the United States should move boldly to provide future generations of Americans the benefits which can come only from a continuing supply of the abundant resources of this blessed land.

COMPULSORY ARBITRATION AS A MEANS OF SETTLEMENT OF AIR TRANSPORTATION LABOR DISPUTES

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, for several days this week there was a concerted work stoppage on the part of the flight engineers on seven domestic airlines. A review of the history of this matter reveals little justification for the drastic action which these individual flight engineers took. According to the records of the National Mediation Board, the Airline Pilots Association on August 28, 1959, filed an application with the Board asking that it investigate a representation dispute among flight deck crewmembers of United Airlines. The Board, proceeding under section 2, ninth, of the Railway Labor Act, on November 16, 1959, appointed a committee of three to investigate the dispute. On December 5, 1960, the committee concluded hearings, and on January 17, 1961, issued its findings. Based upon the committee's findings, the National Mediation Board on February 6, 1961, issued its decision in favor of the proposal of the Airline Pilots Association that an election be held among all flight deck crewmembers of United Airlines to determine which organization should be their representative. To show their displeasure over the determination of the National Mediation Board, individual flight engineers engaged in certain actions amounting to a concerted work stoppage. For several days they ignored the strong request of the President, through his

Secretary of Labor, that they return to work. They also refused to heed the pleas of their union, the Flight Engineers International Association to the same effect. Some of them refused to cooperate with a U.S. district court, and were held in contempt by that court. The President appointed a three-man board of inquiry to investigate the dispute. Finally, on Thursday afternoon those engaging in this concerted action—with the exception of the employees of one airline—agreed to return pending the inquiry of the President's board.

Let it be clearly understood, Mr. President, that this was in no way a legal strike in a bona fide dispute over wages, hours, or conditions of employment between a responsible labor organization and an employer. Those who engaged in this concerted action did so as a means of showing their displeasure over an action taken by a U.S. agency acting under authority granted by the laws of the United States. They defied not only their own union but also the strong request of the President of the United States, through the Secretary of Labor, that they return to work and that they rely on more orderly procedures to present their grievances. Secretary Goldberg was quoted in the press as having said:

There is no legitimate reason for the men who have walked off their jobs to remain off their jobs.

Some of them have also been held in contempt of a Federal court, the U.S. district court in Miami, presided over by Judge Emmett C. Choate.

These individuals caused great hardship and inconvenience to the traveling public. Those who rely upon air transportation for quick transport between points in the United States were forced to crowd into other means of transportation or to change or cancel their travel plans. Those who ordinarily travel by rail or bus experienced great difficulties in competing for limited space with those forced from air transportation. The effects of this stoppage have extended beyond the borders of our country to international travel. This small number of willful individuals did great harm to the economy of our country at a time when Government and business are making strenuous efforts to improve economic conditions. An Associated Press news article reported that losses in revenue and salaries to the six affected airlines exceeded \$5 million a day and that the livelihoods of an estimated quarter of a million people were affected.

Mr. President, in regard to my own State, where the vacation period is now underway, I know I have received repeated complaints from business officials, from industry, and from others that a very much greater than average loss has been sustained.

Concerted actions of this type against air transportation are in many ways actions against the public and the public interest. In recognition of the vital public concern in air transportation, Federal and local governments have invested several billion dollars in airports and other

air transportation facilities. The Federal Government subsidizes airlines. It regulates air transportation very closely, fixing rates, awarding routes, and licensing personnel. It maintains flight control facilities, equipment, and personnel. The two principal objectives of such regulations, subsidizations, and service activities of Government agencies are to maintain air transportation facilities as a vital public service in normal times and as a ready adjunct to national defense in times of emergency.

This difficulty, Mr. President, dramatically revealed the inadequacy of present legislation affecting strikes and concerted work stoppages in air transportation. I am advised by competent legal authority that it is extremely doubtful that there is any judicial review of National Mediation Board decisions on such jurisdictional matters. Without in any way justifying the action of the flight engineers, I believe it is appropriate to observe that if they had had an orderly means of contesting the decisions of the National Mediation Board, they might not have resorted to such extreme action. I understand that they contend that there was fraud in the procedure by which this proceeding was initiated. This seems to me to be a contention which the courts should have power to hear and determine.

Furthermore, Mr. President, it seems clear to me that if S. 88, which I am sponsoring, had been enacted before this matter arose, there would have been adequate procedures for preventing such an unwarranted work stoppage. I originally introduced this proposal on January 9, 1959, as S. 80 of the 86th Congress. This bill proposes that section 10 of the Railway Labor Act be amended to provide a means of settlement of air transportation labor disputes by compulsory arbitration. Such a dispute would be subjected to compulsory arbitration only if the President finds that it would substantially interrupt commerce and result in severe hardship. Under the terms of my bill, an individual who continues a strike or concerted work stoppage after such a determination by the President would be guilty of a misdemeanor.

Since this transportation crisis has so clearly shown the need for the remedial provisions of S. 88, I urge that the administration throw its full weight behind this bill and that the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare give top priority to hearings and to deliberations looking to a favorable report.

Let us hope, Mr. President, that we shall have the courage in the Congress, and the patriotism, to enact legislation to prevent such actions which handicap and cripple our Nation in its struggle to preserve the freedom and well-being of the American people.

Today I had conferences with both the distinguished Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL], the chairman of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, and the distinguished Senator from Michigan [Mr. McNAMARA], the chairman of the subcommittee which would have jurisdiction in this field. They have both told me, understandably, that they have business which will occupy their time and the time of their

subcommittees for about 2 weeks. The bills to which they are giving attention are on the priority list given to Congress by the President—the wage and hour bill, so-called, and the education bill, so-called.

I regret to say that I have not been able to receive from either of these distinguished Senators any assurance that even at the termination of the hearings on those two subjects a hearing will be afforded on the bill which I mentioned. I shall continue the effort to have such a hearing, and if all efforts should fail, I shall have to attempt to bring the bill to the floor of the Senate without the benefit of hearings.

Newspapers all over the country have discussed this particular controversy. In my own State an unusually large number of newspapers have come out clearly and forcefully in favor of legislation which would protect the public interest, which is not being presently protected against airline strikes. One such editorial, entitled "Sabotage by Whim," appeared in the Tampa Tribune of Tuesday, February 21. I ask unanimous consent that the entire editorial be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

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

SABOTAGE BY WHIM

How long will the United States continue to permit a few willful men to sabotage essential public transportation by dropping their whims into its machinery?

This question was heard 2 years ago when a third of the Nation's commercial passenger planes were grounded by labor walkouts. It sounds more insistently now that a strike of flight engineers is crippling or shutting down half a dozen airlines, including the two big Florida carriers, Eastern and National.

The right of public transportation workers to walk off their jobs under any circumstances is subject to challenge. But in this case the strikers do not even have the sanction of their union; they are defying an order to go back to work.

And to make matters worse, their strike is not directed against the airlines. It is really against the National Mediation Board, which on February 6 told the Flight Engineers International and the Air Lines Pilots Association to hold a joint election for a single bargaining agent. Since the engineers are outnumbered by the pilots, they contend the decision will have the effect of wiping out their union and perhaps their jobs.

So far as this issue is concerned, it seems entirely logical to have one union representing flight crews instead of continuing the bickering over jobs which has taken place in the past between pilots and engineers' unions.

But, logical or not, the decision of the Mediation Board was part of the established procedure for adjudicating the dispute between pilots and engineers and was entitled to respect from both. In their protest walkout, the engineers are scoring legal process as well as union authority.

By any test, therefore, the strike is indefensible. Because of the personal pique of 3,000 flight engineers, some 70,000 other airline employees are being forced into idleness and hundreds of thousands of passengers stranded.

This, we submit, is an intolerable situation.

The public interest demands reliable and uninterrupted air service. To achieve it,

the Federal and local governments have poured billions of dollars of tax money into airports and airway safety devices; the airlines have spent billions on equipment. But all of this expenditure and effort can be nullified by a handful of men with a job to save or a grudge to serve.

We say the public interest deserves better protection.

One way to help give it that protection is a law which Florida's Senator SPESSARD HOLLAND proposed after the 1958 airlines strike and which he is urging again at this session of Congress. His proposal is simply to require compulsory arbitration of labor disputes on commercial airlines and thus end the strike privilege.

Both union and management customarily oppose all proposals for compulsory arbitration, each apparently fearing some disadvantage from it. Perhaps both will oppose the Holland bill.

But the public, through its tremendous investment of tax money and its right to uninterrupted air service, has the paramount interest here. Congress should see to it, through the Holland bill or similar legislation, that the public no longer will be grounded by the whim of irresponsible men.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, to point up the position taken by that very effective paper and its able editorialist, I wish to read into my remarks a part of that editorial:

In their protest walkout, the engineers are scorning legal process as well as union authority.

By any test, therefore, the strike is indefensible. Because of the personal pique of 3,000 flight engineers, some 70,000 other airline employees are being forced into idleness and hundreds of thousands of passengers stranded.

This, we submit, is an intolerable situation.

The public interest demands reliable and uninterrupted air service. To achieve it, the Federal and local governments have poured billions of dollars of tax money into airports and airway safety devices; the airlines have spent billions on equipment. But all of this expenditure and effort can be nullified by a handful of men with a job to save or a grudge to serve.

We say the public interest deserves better protection.

Certainly it is true that the public interest is entitled to be protected by action of the Congress, and there is no other place for the public to turn. Certain it is that notwithstanding the billions of public funds invested, and notwithstanding the fact that air transportation has become a necessity in the fast age in which we live, a few men, by arbitrary action against the decree of their own officials in their union, against a decree of one of the U.S. district courts in our State, in violation of the request of the President and the Secretary of Labor, have found it within their power so to act as to destroy the effectiveness of seven large airline systems to carry out their proper public function for a period of several days, causing great loss to many who were innocent parties to the transaction. Surely there will be courage enough in Congress to come to grips with the problem. If the Congress does not realize it, the public does. This is a situation in which the public interest has been entirely neglected, if not forgotten, in the time behind us.

Three of the newspapers in which we are accustomed to show the greatest in-

terest in the Senate have published editorials today which I should like to have included in my remarks as a part of my statement. The first such editorial is found in the New York Times today under the title "Airlines Strike Lessons." I ask unanimous consent that the entire article be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

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

AIRLINES STRIKE LESSONS

The way President Kennedy and Secretary of Labor Goldberg dealt with the airline flight engineers' wildcat strike was impressive—and promising. Instead of letting matters take their dangerous course, they moved promptly to put an end to the vast disruption and loss which the walkout caused. And they did so not by power but by persuasion: through the meetings Secretary Goldberg had with leaders of each side; then by the appointment of the Presidential commission and, finally, through Mr. Goldberg's negotiations with managements and strikers to get the walkout called off until the commission should report. The success of these efforts is cause for warm congratulations.

What the administration did is promising because it is a foretaste of energetic action in the future—with no dragging of official feet—in dealing with labor disputes in essential industries. But the difficulties which have beset the President and Mr. Goldberg in relieving the situation are disturbing. They reveal a woeful lack of protection for the public against strikes that widely disrupt transportation—such as did the recent New York Harbor tugboat strike.

We won't pass judgment here on the merits of the engineers' objections to the ruling of the National Mediation Board. Incidentally, this ruling was based on a thorough study by another three-man, nonpartisan, expert committee—this one appointed under the provisions of the Railway Labor Act.

But, whatever the merits of the strikers' case may have been, it is grimly fantastic that less than 3,000 men were able, through a strike unauthorized by their union, to stop most of the Nation's airline operations—and not because of a dispute with their employers, but to force the Board to rescind a collective bargaining representation order on an airline not involved in the strike. Not only that. The order does not apply to any other airlines and the engineers have made no request for its reconsideration by the Board—which it is entitled by law to do.

This was an intolerable situation, especially in view of a comparison between cause and effects. How strikes such as this can be avoided is an urgent item of future public business.

Mr. HOLLAND. I quote into my remarks this part of that editorial:

But, whatever the merits of the strikers' case may have been, it is grimly fantastic that less than 3,000 men were able, through a strike unauthorized by their union, to stop most of the Nation's airline operations, and not because of a dispute with their employers, but to force the Board to rescind a collective bargaining representation order on an airline not involved in the strike. Not only that. The order does not apply to any other airlines and the engineers have made no request for its reconsideration by the Board, which it is entitled by law to do.

This was an intolerable situation, especially in view of a comparison between cause and effects. How strikes such as this can be avoided is an urgent item of future public business.

In the Washington Evening Star of today appears an editorial entitled "Airline Strike," which I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

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

AIRLINE STRIKE

C. N. Sayen, president of the Airline Pilots Association (AFL-CIO), says the strike by flight engineers "was not a strike against the airlines but a strike in defiance of the U.S. Government to force it to revise under pressure a decision arrived at by due process of law."

If this is so, there is plenty of room for misgiving with respect to the settlement worked out by Labor Secretary Goldberg and announced by President Kennedy.

Under the settlement agreement, the engineers will return to work on five airlines pending an investigation of their grievances by a three-man Presidential commission. The complaint of the engineers is not directed to the airlines, but to a ruling by the National Mediation Board, a ruling with respect to which, again according to Mr. Sayen, the engineers have distorted and misrepresented the facts. So what may be expected from the study by the President's commission? If, in order to satisfy the engineers, it returns with recommendations which undercut the National Mediation Board, a precedent pregnant with trouble for the future will have been established.

It is desirable, of course, to settle any strike. This one was costing the airlines \$5 million a day, had resulted in the payless lay-off in a time of high unemployment of 84,000 other workers and had created much inconvenience for the public. Even so, we very much doubt the wisdom of these ad hoc settlements by the Secretary of Labor, for actually they settle nothing. Irresponsible strikes designed to coerce the Government should be dealt with through legislation, not through procedures which come very close to appeasement.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I quote a portion of that editorial to point up the position taken by that able newspaper here in the Capital of our Nation:

Irresponsible strikes designed to coerce the Government should be dealt with through legislation—not through procedures which come very close to appeasement.

I have no doubt that from one ocean to the other, and from Alaska to Hawaii, newspapers throughout the Nation are finding occasion to criticize and castigate the action of the flight engineers and also to question the wisdom of the temporary settlement which has been made. The third of the editorials which I have noted today, appears in the Baltimore Sun, which I think is one of the best newspapers in the Nation. It is a thoughtful editorial entitled "Strike Intervention," which I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

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

STRIKE INTERVENTION

In the airlines strike the country has hoped for two things: that the White House intervention would get the men back to work—which now is happening on most lines; and that the White House interveners would then consider the implications of intervention.

The airlines strike came when the strikers defied (a) a Mediation Board ruling under

the National Railway Labor Act (which applies to airlines) and (b) a Presidential no-strike order under the same act pending a factfinding board study of a subsidiary dispute. The effect of Government intervention was to ease the pressure of this defiance not only on the country but on the strikers themselves.

Describing a similar White House intervention in the famous Rail case of 1941, Senator MORSE told the Senate in 1946 that strikes had occurred in the past and would occur in the future whenever the strikers believed they had sufficient power in connection with specific disputes to obtain modification of a Government decision through mediation or intervention of the Chief Executive.

Senator MORSE knew what he was talking about. By no means an antiunion man, he had been chairman of the factfinding board in 1941, and after the board's report had been handed down, the Chief Executive intervened. Finally the dispute was settled on terms more favorable to the unions than the decision on the merits had afforded.

And even this somber precedent-setting fight of 1941 was settled without an actual strike.

Mr. HOLLAND. I think this editorial points up the fact that not only is the strike itself invidious, not only is the neglect of the public interest very clear—and it is avoidable if proper legislation is passed—but also this editorial points up another question which is at the heart of the entire problem. That is that when strikers think they have enough public tooth to force mediation, and through that mediation obtain a better settlement than they were given by an order of the proper public agencies, such intervention by the Government at such time is weak and is not in the public interest. I quote at some length from this last editorial as a part of my statement:

Describing a similar White House intervention in the famous rail case of 1941, Senator MORSE told the Senate in 1946 that strikes had occurred in the past and would occur in the future whenever the strikers believed they had sufficient power in connection with specific disputes to obtain modification of a Government decision through mediation or intervention of the Chief Executive.

That is lifted out of the statement of the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] of 1946.

Continuing from the editorial:

Senator MORSE knew what he was talking about. By no means an antiunion man, he had been chairman of the factfinding board in 1941, and after the board's report had been handed down, the Chief Executive intervened. Finally the dispute was settled on terms more favorable to the unions than the decision on the merits had afforded.

And even this somber precedent-setting fight of 1941 was settled without an actual strike.

Mr. President, here is something which deserves the immediate, the thoughtful, the patriotic attention of every Member of the Senate and of the House of Representatives. This is a matter of the ignoring of the public interest, not only by the workers who have a more direct interest than anyone else, but also by Congress, as it has ignored the public interest up to now, and by the kind of lackadaisical attitude on the part of the public, too often, after the crisis of the moment has been settled.

This is something that is wrong. This is something that is crippling us. This is something that is crippling us at a time when all of us in Congress and throughout the Nation are struggling to make our country more resourceful, more effective, more economical, more able to meet the problems of this modern age.

Mr. President, it is my strong hope and urgent plea that the Members of the Senate will realize that here is a challenge to every patriotic devotion to the public interest, and that all of us will see here a chance to do something for the public which we are supposed to represent, and that all of us may be able to consider the proposed legislation which I have offered.

I am perfectly willing to have changes made in it in any way which will accomplish the desired result. Perhaps there is a better way to do it. I do not know. However, we must do something to guarantee the public against such indefensible, such irresponsible practices as those which we saw in the recent stoppage of work by the flight engineers, and those which we saw only a little while ago in the Port of New York, with its effect on two great rail lines of the country, by the stoppage of work by a handful of men who work on the tugboats which belong to one of the great rail lines.

Mr. President, if we are to have an efficiently functioning Government, we cannot permit this kind of disaster—and that is what it is—to be occasioned by a mere want of courage on the part of legislators to come to grips with the problem which every one of us knows exists and which we ought to be willing to try to solve.

HOW MUCH LONGER FOR CASTRO?

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, on January 1, 1959, the Cuban Dictator Batista was overthrown by a popular revolution. A few days later a bearded revolutionary who had led the struggle against Batista came down from the Sierra Maestra Mountains where he had waged a long and bloody civil war and became the Prime Minister of Cuba.

Most of us deeply sympathized with the sufferings of the Cuban people under the repressive Batista regime where denial of civil rights, widespread corruption, and social injustice were the rule of life. We shared the economic aspirations of the Cuban people. We all wished Cuba well. Fidel Castro promised to rid Cuba of the abuses of the dictator Batista, bring in social justice, strengthen democratic institutions, hold democratic elections, and raise the standard of living of the average Cuban.

Mr. President, I remember the occasion when Mr. Castro was here and made a tour of the country shortly after his rise to power. The distinguished Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] and I had a little talk with him, and we said to him, "When are you going to hold elections?" "Oh," he said, "when the people are ready." "Well," we said, "when will the people be ready?" "Oh," he said, "perhaps in 3 or 4 years." We said, "In 3 or 4 years?"

"Oh, yes," he said, "they are not ready yet, but they are all for me."

But Cuba today is a nation on the verge of economic collapse and the people have again been denied the liberty which they so earnestly sought.

As we pierce the facade of lies and false promises espoused by Castro, we see that the few trappings of democracy which were set up have now been stripped away and the true, harsh, supreme power of the Communist state revealed. We see a nation that had long enjoyed a deep friendship with the United States turned into a Communist base aimed not only against the United States but against all the nations of this hemisphere. We see and hear daily of attacks on the Catholic Church, the church that 85 percent of the Cuban people belong to, one now challenged, insulted and harassed by the state. We see the aspirations of the Cuban factory workman, and the Cuban peasant trodden underfoot by the regimentation of the Castro bureaucracy. At the universities the desires of the Cuban students, professors, and intellectuals are scorned and their efforts at finding the truth deprecated. To cap all of this, Cuba is in the midst of an economic disarray that will take many years to overcome and will bring much misery to the Cuban people.

The Cuban people are not the only ones to have suffered at the hands of Castro. President Eisenhower was forced to take the severe step of breaking diplomatic relations with Cuba as a consequence of the unceasing campaign of harrassments, vilification and baseless accusations that Castro carried out against us. President Kennedy has stated his concern at the existence of foreign and domestic tyrannies in our Caribbean neighbor, Cuba. Latin American nations have been forced to take actions of a similar nature against Castro in view of the attempts Castro has fostered to subvert their own legitimate governments.

How long must the free world tolerate this menace? How long must our Cuban neighbors suffer under his heavy hand?

In my opinion, if we pursue the right policies Castro will not last out this year. The tide is running out on this bearded demagogue. And my conviction that this is so is supported by substantial evidence.

First of all, however, let us go back to the early days of Castro's rule. Castro came to power in a wave of popular enthusiasm. The Cuban people were beaten down by years of repression, corruption and terror under Batista. They rejoiced in their new hard-won freedom, and hoped that under Castro, Cuba could develop the democratic institutions she so cherishes and the economic development she so desperately required.

Some of Castro's early actions were deceptively encouraging. He eliminated public corruption on almost all levels. The catchword of the Revolution was to build. A fever of building swept through Cuba: housing units for the poor who had formerly lived in mud flats, schools, hospitals—all these sprang up in the land. The serious problem of Cuba's

poor public health was being dealt with by a task force of sanitary technicians and by a nationwide educational program teaching the fundamentals of good health to every village and hamlet in Cuba.

However, in endeavoring to do all this, Castro took the wrong path. He allied himself with the Communist world. He abused the human rights of his people. He began to see enemies everywhere and wore himself out fighting these supposed challenges. He began a campaign of vicious attacks against the Catholic church, against the United States, and against his fellow nations of the hemisphere. He attacked the middle class because it resented his growing intimacy with international communism. He attacked labor for standing up for its rights. He attacked the peasants for resisting the collectivization he forced on them. As the months went by, a disenchantment swept the Americas as the realization came that the progress that was visible in Cuba was only skin deep, that the improvements Castro took credit for were merely for show and that Cuba was moving backward rather than forward. Cubans began to flee the repressive atmosphere that Castro had implanted in Cuba. Some days, as many as 600 Cubans waited patiently in line in front of the U.S. Embassy in Havana to obtain visas to come to the United States. Since Castro has come to power more than 45,000 Cubans have fled Cuba.

Castro's great error has been his betrayal of the Cuban revolution. Instead of helping Cuba attain the commendable aspirations of becoming a viable democracy and a healthy growing economy with opportunity for all, Castro has driven the Cuban nation into the ranks of the Communist slave states and in the process has driven out 45,000 of his own people. By so doing he has also aided in bringing about his own ultimate defeat.

Let us now turn for a moment to the reasons for the significant decline of Castro's strength in Cuba and see how he has sown the seeds of his own destruction.

When Castro took over power in January 1959, the Cuban National Bank had \$100 million in reserves. Today, a little more than 2 years later, Castro has wiped out all the gold reserves Cuba had and, in addition, has incurred current obligations of over \$200 million. This does not include the amount he has to pay U.S. citizens for the \$1 billion of U.S.-owned property he has expropriated. Reliable sources indicate that national bank reserves now stand at \$3 million. In the process, Castro has caused Cuba to become bankrupt and lose its formerly excellent credit rating and economic stability.

When Castro came to power, he claimed he had the welfare of the Cuban workers and peasants at heart. However, because of the economic devastation created by Castro's high-handed and Communist-oriented policies, the Cuban workers and peasants today in many ways are worse off than ever. Unemployment in Cuba has reached the catastrophic figure of 30 percent of the

work force. The Cuban finds himself in the midst of an inflationary spiral with the government printing money without the proper economic backing, with prices rising and real wages falling. To climax this, he cannot get what he needs unless he resorts to black market operators, for Cuba has now become the land of shortages.

Some may wonder what happened to the much-publicized aid that the Soviet Union, Red China, and the Soviet satellites have all promised Cuba to aid her in her economic development. To this day not one factory has been built nor has the Cuban economy enjoyed the benefits that an intimate relationship with the Communist bloc was supposed to bring. The highly publicized Soviet offer to buy the Cuban sugar crop at high prices has actually resulted in Cuba's receiving 1 cent less per pound for her sugar than the United States would have paid her. Multiply this by billions and the figure is significant. In addition, the crop that the U.S.S.R. bought was dumped on the world market, and Cuba and other sugar-producing states suffered adversely as a result.

To date, the only benefit to Cuba from the sale of sugar to the Sino-Soviet bloc has been the shipment of machine guns, tanks, and other arms to Cuba in return. Reports from Cuba also stress the disenchantment with the supposed technicians that the Communist bloc had promised Cuba to speed her economic growth. The technicians that have arrived in Cuba turn out mostly to be either spies or Communist propagandists while the few that are genuine technicians spend their time, according to what we have been reliably told, copying the blueprints of the Cuban plants and the industrial techniques that these plants use, and sending reports on this activity back to their respective countries. In other words, they have gone to Cuba to help their own nations develop their industry by copying Cuba's, not the other way around.

Industry in Cuba, once privately owned, has to a large extent been nationalized by Castro in his attempts to further regiment business and life of the Cuban people. Communists are being placed in the top level positions of the seized companies without regard to qualifications. Poor management and the vastness of Cuban bureaucracy has imposed upon the Cuban people an economic crisis of vast proportions.

The peso, which under normal circumstances in the United States is equivalent to our dollar, is now worth only 25 cents. Castro's extensive public works program has virtually ceased due to a lack of funds. Businesses are run by followers of the Castro line who are often inexperienced in the complexity of business economics.

In spite of Castro's promises before the American Society of Newspaper Editors on April 17, 1959, on the occasion of his early visit to the United States, when he had a conversation with the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] and me, that Cuba would not expropriate private businesses owned by foreign investors, approximately \$1 billion of U.S.

privately owned property in Cuba has been seized by Castro.

Castro raises his hands with alarm and sounds cries of economic aggression and coercion against the United States for its action in cutting off imports of Cuban sugar. Yet, the record speaks for itself. The United States was in no way contractually bound to purchase Cuban sugar and, in fact, purchased this sugar at a price above that paid on the world market. The Cuban Government, on the other hand, completely voided property rights in Cuba without any attempt to reimburse the owners. This action was only one of a long series of harassing actions undertaken by the Cuban Government which eventually led to the breaking of diplomatic relations with Cuba on January 3, 1961, by the U.S. Government.

Castro is openly calling for revolution throughout all of Latin America. This poses an obvious Communist threat to the Americas. Only positive collective action by the nations threatened with this declaration of war will be able to combat the Red menace.

Exports from Cuba to the countries of North and South America amounted to \$484 million in 1959. Although a substantial portion of the dollar value of these exports was Cuban sugar shipped to the United States, which have now been cut off, the balance represents fresh fruits, tobacco, and molasses, which trade is necessary and vital to the existing Cuban economy. The continuance of trade with the Castro government prolongs the threat to every government in North and South America. The Organization of American States is equipped to handle this problem. It has already taken stern action against the two dictators of the Caribbean and, I believe, after thoughtful consideration of the expansionist activities of communism in South America, would be prepared to act again. A complete embargo by the Organization of American States against exports from Cuba could prove to be an important factor in freeing the Cuban people from the tyrannical dictation of Castro and rid the entire Hemisphere of a cancerous growth. In proposing that the OAS consider an embargo against Cuban exports, it should be kept in mind that the embargo is not proposed to hurt the Cuban people who have suffered so much, but rather to effect an early end to Communist infiltration and unrest in the Americas.

In order for an embargo of this nature to be most effective, I believe an invitation should be extended to Canada to participate in these deliberations with the Organization of American States. Canada plays an important role in the defense of the Western Hemisphere and should be invited to share in the development of economic policies as well.

Turning to the place of labor unions in Castro's Cuba, it must be pointed out that they are in the main now controlled by Communists or Communist sympathizers. A few unions have dared to defy their leadership and Castro. The electrical workers, the transport workers, and the hotel and restaurant workers have all openly protested Castro's policies and manifested their discontent

by strikes and demonstrations. But they have been hounded by Castro's goon squads. When the electrical workers marched recently on the Presidential Palace shouting "Cuba si, Russia no," they were fired upon, and some were killed, others injured. Cuban labor has become painfully aware that Castro is no friend of the Cuban workingman.

A similar tragedy has befallen the Cuban peasant. After Castro had set forth his initial promises of land reform and given every peasant the vision of a small farm of his own, Castro turned around and forced them into collectivized farms. It is true that the large landholder of the past has disappeared, but in his place Castro has placed the state. And today low productivity is a crime, not only because the state is the landholder but also because the landholder is also the policeman with the gun at the peasant's back.

Castro has drawn the battle lines in his struggle against the Catholic Church in Cuba. As a Roman Catholic priest recently told a visitor in Havana, "We no longer search for a way to live with the Castro regime. We search for a way to die with honor."

The church represents a serious threat to Castro, first because it is anti-Communist and as such is in conflict with Castro's pro-Communist orientation and his close relations with the Communist world. Yet even more importantly, the church is a challenge to Castro because it stresses the dignity and individuality of man; while Castro, in establishing his dictatorship over Cuba, stresses the supreme power of the state and the insignificance of individual man.

Castro has fought the Catholic Church with his demagoguery, attempting to ridicule its priests and sisters, accusing them of the vilest acts. To combat the Castro menace and the threat it poses to the morality and the spirit of Cuba, the church has had to resort to the pastoral letter. These pastoral letters must be having a profound effect, since Castro continually rants against them.

In the forefront of the fight that the church is forced to wage against Castro is the 77-year-old archbishop of Santiago, the Most Reverend Enrique Perez Serantes. This venerable priest has acknowledged that "an open battle against the religion of Christ has started," and that "the hour to demonstrate the capacity of our resistance and our preparedness for the fight is at hand." The church must fight communism, the archbishop continued, because the church loves liberty and because it repudiates slavery from wherever it comes.

These are not the words of a simple priest who has a dislike of Fidel Castro, nor can the archbishop ever be called an agent of Wall Street, as Castro is known to call his enemies. Instead, this priest saved the life of Fidel Castro during the Batista dictatorship, and was a staunch supporter of the revolution. When men like him speak and act in the way they do now, another proof of the weakness of the Castro regime is made clear.

Another important group fighting Castro and what he stands for is composed of the Cuban middle class—the

doctors, the lawyers, the professors, the small businessmen, the men Castro needs to staff his hospitals, run his factories, design his houses, and furnish expertise to his nation. Yet 45,000 of these people have fled Cuba. This defection of the intellectuals and the middle class from Castro is even more significant when one remembers that it was the Cuban middle class, its intellectuals and its students, who were the first supporters of Castro. It was only after Castro started to win his long struggle against Batista that the Cuban peasant and worker joined his movement. Now Castro's initial supporters are among his early detractors. This is another most welcome indication of the declining popularity of the Cuban tyrant. Reliable and informed sources state that Castro has lost the popular support of more than a majority of the Cuban people.

If one wants proof of the disenchantment of the Cuban middle class with Castro, one has but to walk through the streets of Miami, Fla., where most of the Cubans who have fled Castro are now seeking sanctuary. These Cuban exiles will take any job in the United States, however menial it be, rather than return to a Cuba that is run by Castro. Eminent Cuban judges serve as bus boys in Florida restaurants; a distinguished Cuban doctor, who formerly was in charge of a famous clinic, now scrubs down the operating room in a Florida hospital. These people prefer poverty in a free state to the life they formerly led in a slave state.

At this point one can well ask, Who supports Castro? How does he stay in power? He lacks a political party and a professional army. He lacks support of the business community and the professional groups. The Catholic Church has turned against him. And the Cuban workers and peasants are becoming increasingly disenchanted with him. It is even argued that Castro's great friend of the past, Comrade Khrushchev, of the Soviet Union, is becoming increasingly dissatisfied with Comrade Castro, and is trying to disassociate himself from what may prove to be an embarrassing relationship with the Cuban Premier. Khrushchev may be noticing that Castro is on his way out; and the Soviet leader rightly knows how dangerous for the reputation of the Soviet Union it would be to be too closely allied with a loser, to be too identified with a weak ruler who can momentarily be deposed.

But we cannot underestimate Castro's power. Castro has behind him the monolithic strength of the state. He has its police, its judiciary, its industry, its land, and its firing squads. But—and this is most important—he has the support of the Communist Party of Cuba, a hard-bitten core of experts in terror. With this, Castro is holding Cuba against the Cubans.

The opposition to Castro is growing. Within Cuba, various underground movements commit daily acts of sabotage. Earlier this month, a \$1 million state-owned tobacco plant went up in flames; a few days before that, mothers in a small Cuban city marched on the city hall, to protest Castro's policies;

throughout Cuba, bombs went off in scattered places; trains were derailed. One hundred and seventy miles from Havana, in the Escambray Mountain Range, an intrepid band of rebels is pinning down 10,000 of Castro's troops. Castro cannot wipe out this insurrection. Supplies are being parachuted, daily, to the rebels. Still more supplies with which to combat Castro come by sea, at night.

Within Cuba, the anti-Castro forces have rifles, automatic weapons, mortars, and explosives. The anti-Castro forces outside Cuba have accumulated more weapons, including B-26 bombers and transports, with which to launch an attack against the Cuban tyrant. The resistance to Castro is growing in its effectiveness. But Castro is still strong, and must not be underrated.

Historically, the Cuban people have always looked to a single leader to fulfill their aspirations and desires. Fidel Castro, as the symbol of opposition to the despotic regime of Batista, satisfied this yearning. Today, there is again in Cuba the yearning for a man to lead the people from the wilderness of domination. However, until now, there has not appeared an individual with the romanticism, spirit of adventure, and qualities of leadership needed to inspire and arouse the Cuban people.

Forty or fifty opposition groups, representing most factions of Cuban political life, are currently engaged in operations designed to overthrow the Castro Communist regime. Their purpose is clear—the overthrow of this Communist dictatorship in the Western Hemisphere. Certainly, their efforts should have the wholehearted moral support of Americans throughout our land.

These groups are providing active opposition, in varying forms, to the Castro government. Castro is at this moment engaged in a conflict with a well-armed and well-supported guerrilla army in Cuba, ranging in estimate of size from 800 to 8,000 men. In addition, many organizations are providing to the Cuban people anti-Castro literature. Radio broadcasts are beamed daily to Cuba, from ships operating in international waters, giving the Cuban people the truth about the Communist conspiracy which stifles freedom and liberty in Cuba. These activities unquestionably will have their effect on Castro; but unless one leader in the forces of democracy emerges, the internal bickering and jockeying for position by anti-Castro groups will nullify their important contributions.

It becomes increasingly urgent that the various anti-Castro groups throughout the Western Hemisphere unite, to form a solid coalition of opposition to the bearded demagogue in Cuba. It is conceded that all groups are in basic agreement that freedom must return to Cuba. Therefore, this common ground should provide the catalyst to form a cohesive, working force invigorated by the desires of the Cuban people to be free from tyrannical domination.

In helping to achieve the end that all of the anti-Castro forces seek, I believe a Cuban forum sponsored by groups interested in the liberation of Cuba would

go a long way in solidifying uncoordinated efforts. Such a forum, I believe, would have an effect of shaping the direction of the anti-Castro movement and could serve as a parliament of true Cuban public opinion. Such an attempt at coalition would have a tremendous appeal to the people of Cuba and would provide new hope of effective action for the oppressed against the Sino-Russian-supported Castro.

The objective of such a Cuban forum would be to unify the opposition to Castro and prepare a Constitution for a Cuban Government-in-exile. The impetus for such a meeting must come from the Cuban exiles themselves.

I have talked with some of them, and the idea of a Cuban forum appeals to many of them.

Individual ambitions will have to be subordinated to the goals of a free and democratic Cuba under a constitutional Government. The U.S. Government cannot of course officially participate in this movement. It is up to the Cubans themselves to take the necessary steps, but the United States can and should be sympathetic to any responsible and representative group which promises to restore liberty to the Cuban people.

Castro has adopted as the slogan for the year 1961 "The year of the firing squad." As one of his deputies claimed, "We will erect the most formidable execution wall in the history of humanity." These are the words of the men that run Cuba today. It is hopeful that a united opposition to Castro's dictatorial powers will change the slogan for 1961 from "the year of the firing squad" to "the year of Cuban liberation." The signs point in that direction. I am convinced that firm U.S. action in cooperation with the O.A.S. can spell the downfall of Castro before the year 1961 passes into history.

TWO-COAST SHIP CONSTRUCTION INDUSTRY: A MUST FOR NATIONAL DEFENSE

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, on January 26, 1961, some remarks were made in the Senate that I reject and repudiate. The Speaker was the distinguished senior Senator from Maryland [Mr. BUTLER]. The occasion was the submission of S. 596.

This bill would repeal the 6-percent differential for shipbuilding for the Pacific coast on a certain limited number of vessels, a differential which has existed for a quarter of a century by reason of section 502d of the Merchant Marine Act of 1936.

The distinguished Senator contends that costs have now been equalized between Atlantic and Pacific coast shipbuilding. Therefore, he says, the differential is no longer needed and should be repealed.

The distinguished Senator is wrong. He is wrong in his opinion, and he is wrong on the alleged facts which he uses to support his erroneous view.

The differential legislation is, in truth, vital to this Nation. The basic reason for congressional enactment of the 6-percent differential is national defense. That was the reason for the enactment in

1936, and remains the reason for the necessity of maintaining the differential now.

This law is related to national defense in this way:

First. It is of the utmost importance that the United States have a shipbuilding industry capable of providing us with world shipbuilding superiority in the event of war.

Second. Such shipbuilding capability must be dispersed on all coastal ranges of the United States, and must not be concentrated in one area.

Third. We cannot allow shipbuilding to be seriously hampered by the risk of concentrated attacks in the event of armed conflict.

One of the first utterances of this proposition by an official of the U.S. Government was that of the Honorable Joseph Kennedy, the first Chairman of the U.S. Maritime Commission.

There is a decided advantage, both commercial and military, in having our (ship) building and repair facilities well distributed over the three coasts. * * * You have 3,000 miles of (Pacific) coastline. Commercial and military considerations alike dictate the maintenance of a strong construction industry on these shores, even though it may involve some extra expense.

Quotation by Arthur Eldridge, Los Angeles Harbor Department manager, from radio broadcast by Mr. Kennedy. Testimony by Mr. Eldridge on January 18, 1938, before the House Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, H.R. 8532.

In the same hearings in 1938, the Honorable John F. Dockweiler, Member of the House of Representatives from the State of California, stated:

Therefore, from the national defense angle alone it is essential that the Congress care for and subsidize any construction and operation of ships in Pacific waters plying between ports of the United States and foreign ports so that when such an emergency arose we would have ample auxiliary help from such shipping. If the Pacific coast shipyards are not encouraged to remain on the Pacific coast because of lack of work and employment, the U.S. Government, in time of emergency, would, beyond the question of a doubt, be impaired both as to construction and repair of the ships of the line and their auxiliaries. The President, in his speech the other day to us in Congress, emphasized the point that in the whole picture of national defense we must consider the Pacific coast as well as the Atlantic coast as our frontiers, and I think you gentlemen know what I mean when I say that the most important frontier today is the Pacific coast. (January 19, 1938.)

Only 5 years ago, in 1956, Congress spoke out again on this crucial national defense need, when it enacted Public Law 805, which is now section 502f of the Merchant Marine Act. This second policy statement by the Congress provides that—

(f) The Secretary of Commerce * * * shall periodically * * * survey the existing privately owned shipyards capable of merchant ship construction * * * to determine whether their capabilities for merchant ship construction * * * provide an adequate mobilization base at strategic points for purposes of national defense and national emergency. The Secretary of Commerce * * * upon a basis of a finding that the award of the proposed construction, reconstruction,

reconditioning, or remodeling work will remedy an existing inadequacy in such mobilization base as to the capabilities and capacities of a shipyard or shipyards at a strategic point * * * may with the approval of the President, allocate such construction (etc.) to such yard or yards in such manner as it may be determined to be fair, just, and reasonable to all sections of the country, subject to the provisions of this subsection. * * * In the event that a contract is made providing for a price in excess of the lowest responsible bid which otherwise would be accepted, such excess shall be paid for by the Maritime Administration as a part of the cost of national defense, and shall not be considered as a part of the construction differential subsidy.

The U.S. Navy and the American merchant marine—as represented by Pacific coast operators—gave vigorous testimony on this second policy pronouncement by Congress, underscoring the national defense question. Rear Adm. Albert G. Mumma, U.S. Navy, Chief, Bureau of Ships, Department of Defense, in testimony on June 13, 1956, before the Subcommittee on Merchant Marine of the House Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee, stated in part:

The proposed bill is concerned with the objective of maintaining a strong mobilization base of widely dispersed operating shipyards capable of meeting wartime defense requirements. This is a problem of vital and continuing concern to both the Department of Defense and Department of Commerce, and I might insert as well of the whole Nation, particularly in view of the limited availability of new oceangoing ship construction each year.

A vastly increased need for shipyard skills and facilities is expected during any future defense emergency. To meet this need, a shipbuilding and repair potential capable of rapid expansion must be maintained in peacetime.

Moreover, in the thermonuclear age, strategic dispersal of the operating shipyards comprising this potential is of the utmost importance.

Mr. President, the people of our Nation today would approve and endorse this statement by Admiral Mumma.

Mr. Ralph B. Dewey, president, Pacific American Steamship Association, testifying before the Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee on the House at the same hearing, said:

It seems to me, Mr. Chairman, that these hearings would not be complete without some voice from the ship operators. I think that perhaps the Pacific coast ship operators have as great a stake in the ship construction dispersal within this country as any others. There is a natural interest and inclination by any ship operator operating from the Pacific coast to use yards which are in his own neighborhood.

This is more than just an inclination. It is an economic advantage to have available close by during the operation period of the vessel skilled men who participated in the construction phase. * * * So, as to orient the hearing, Mr. Chairman, a little bit farther into the area of ship operation, we do sincerely urge that this committee by whatever language seems appropriate empower, indeed mandate, the Maritime Administration in coordination with the Department of the Navy to develop material and data which will bring clearly forth and show the necessity for dispersal of ship facilities within this country.

This history should lay to rest the question of whether this differential

should be maintained, provided that the cost differential between Atlantic and Pacific shipbuilding costs is such as to seriously hamper the continuation of shipbuilding facilities and skills on the Pacific coast. Can you imagine, Mr. President, how it would affect our Defense position if the west coast shipbuilding industry withered away and died?

Is there no cost differential, as the senior Senator from Maryland contends? This matter was the subject of three separate hearings in the 86th Congress:

First. In August 1959 officials of the Maritime Administration testified that their agency had made a preliminary examination and expressed a tentative conclusion that the differential was about 4 percent. The Maritime Administration stated that this was not the result of an exacting survey, but a preliminary estimate only, and that it would like more time to examine the question thoroughly.

Second. In April 1960 representatives of Atlantic and gulf coast shipbuilders testified in favor of repeal of the differential and offered isolated instances of price equalization between East and West. They spoke in generalities and marshalled no real argument at all for repeal of the law.

Third. In June 1960 seven witnesses testified on behalf of the Western Shipbuilding Association. Five of these witnesses were top executive officials of shipbuilding companies. The testimony by the Western Shipbuilding Association was the first fully factual case, completely documented and supported by actual cost information developed from experience in building ships.

That testimony went through each of the component parts, material of all types, plus the labor cost, and concluded with a 7-percent-plus differential still existing in favor of the Atlantic and gulf yards.

The sequence of events following the June hearing is conclusive on the question of costs, at least, to the extent that a complete case was made by the West, but a case in generalities only by the East. Up to this point, no Government authority has spoken out as to the actual cost differential.

Moreover, so important did the chairman of the House Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee [Mr. BONNER] consider the necessity of getting at the truth of the cost question that on September 13, 1960, he instructed the General Accounting Office, official accounting arm of the Congress, to investigate the question and report back to him in January of 1961.

The Western Shipbuilding Association witnesses in the June hearings had urged such an investigation. Moreover, they agreed to abide by the results of this investigation, so confident were they of the figures they had carefully compiled and submitted.

The report on the investigation of the General Accounting Office is nearing completion now, and should be a matter of public record. I hope that the GAO report will be full and extensive and will take into account every factor which goes into the building of a ship—whether it is in California or Maryland.

It seems clear that if the House Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee chairman concludes at the end of lengthy hearings that an unbiased Government investigation is needed to determine the cost question, it is not possible for anyone, anywhere, to assert at all logically that there is no cost differential or that, if there is, it is of a certain percentage. We need a complete, unbiased investigation to make a sound judgment. In view of the great faith which the Congress places on its own body, the General Accounting Office, it would appear that its report should be of the utmost importance in answering the question.

My colleague from Maryland stated that this question should be viewed dispassionately and with an open mind by all, and concluded by saying that if no reason continued to exist for the differential then it should be repealed. On that point, I am certain he will agree with the logic of the corollary, that if the cost and national defense reasons do still exist for the differential then it should be maintained.

It may be that the comment of the Senator from Maryland was prompted by the record in the House last year on H.R. 8093, another repeal bill. The hearings on that bill were held by a subcommittee of the Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee. This subcommittee, by unanimous decision, including the vote of the chairman, first concluded that in view of the uncertainties of the cost question, it should be referred to the General Accounting Office for investigation. Thereafter, the majority of eastern and gulf members of the full House committee forced a vote discharging the subcommittee and reported the bill.

This procedure resulted in some of the strongest language I have ever seen in a minority report on a bill before Congress. In the committee's report on the bill—report No. 2089, 86th Congress, 2d session—the minority report was filed by Representatives GEORGE P. MILLER, of California; THOR C. TOLLEFSON, of Washington; WILLIAM S. MAILLIARD, of California; and THOMAS M. PELL, of Washington. They said in part:

We, the undersigned, wish to register our very strong objection to the way in which this bill was reported out by a majority of the members of the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries. Never before has this committee acted in such a high-handed manner nor with such utter disregard for one of its subcommittees. Nor has the full committee ever acted with such little knowledge of the facts involved in a bill. If ever a measure was railroaded through a committee, this was the outstanding occasion.

Even more remarkable are the supplementary views filed by Representatives JOHN H. RAY, of New York, and WILLIAM K. VAN PELT, of Michigan, both of whom could be assumed to share the Atlantic rather than Pacific viewpoint. Their report stated, in full:

At the close of hearings held by the Subcommittee on Merchant Marine on H.R. 8093 we felt strongly that the evidence was full of contradictions in respect of costs and the need for continuing the 6-percent differential (or any other ship-construction differential) in favor of west coast yards which was estab-

lished by the Merchant Marine Act of 1936. It seemed to us when the matter came before the subcommittee for a vote, and it seems to us now, that members of the subcommittee needed outside expert help to analyze and evaluate the evidence and make recommendations. Our votes were cast, with the majority of the subcommittee, to send the record to the General Accounting Office for study and report back to the committee by January 1, 1961.

We regret that the subcommittee's decision to that effect has been set aside by the full committee by the votes of members of that committee who had not heard the evidence.

Members of the Subcommittee on the House Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee, the only congressional body holding hearings to date, state positively that the cost question is still in doubt. The GAO will, I trust, resolve that doubt soon.

Meanwhile, Mr. President, I venture to hope that a law enacted years ago—enacted in the public interest—enacted, indeed, for the purpose of advancing the security of our Nation, will not be unduly subjected to false criticism or slander.

THE PRESIDENT'S NATURAL RESOURCES MESSAGE

MR. BENNETT. Mr. President, having read the President's message on natural resources which came to the Congress yesterday, I am delighted to know that Mr. Kennedy is going to continue many sound Eisenhower administration programs for the benefit of the Western States, including the development of their water, land, mineral, and forest resources and the recreation programs. But I am disappointed in his message, which is full of platitudes and generalities, and contains some misstatements.

The Kennedy message recommends countless surveys, commissions, and studies when immediate action is clearly required. For many decades before Eisenhower, we in the West were studied to death. We need action, not more studies and still more bureaucracy.

The Kennedy message was one of the most politically oriented ever presented to Congress. Secretary of the Interior Stewart Udall said in his February 7 press conference that he was going to "play politics to the hilt" with natural resources, and the Kennedy message bears this out. The President said:

We reject a "no new starts" policy. Such a policy denied the resource requirements and potential on which our economic growth hinges, and took a heavy toll in added costs and even human life and homes by postponing essential flood control projects.

The Washington Post and Times Herald this morning "guessed" that Kennedy was attacking the Eisenhower administration. However, those of us who are familiar with reclamation and flood control programs know that in fact he was actually indicting the Truman administration and the Democratic leadership in Congress. This is so because it was President Truman who first applied the "no new starts" policy. In fact, the phrase itself first appears in a directive issued by Truman's Bureau of the Budget Director in 1947. President Tru-

man applied the "no new starts" policy in 5 of his 6 years in office. In contrast, the "no new starts" policy was only applied in 1 out of 8 years by Eisenhower, and the reason it was applied in that 1 year was the \$12 billion deficit. While I have had my differences of opinion with President Truman and the congressional Democratic leaders, I think this is a shocking attack on them.

Today I have directed a letter to President Kennedy asking that he immediately direct the Secretary of the Army to furnish me with a list of those flood-control projects the delay of which caused the death of American citizens and the destruction of homes. I have asked him, also, for the names of the people whose lives were lost. In addition, I have asked him to make public, so that the record might be perfectly clear, the Budget Bureau directives from 1945 through 1960 dealing with flood control and reclamation projects. I have also asked for the comments of the Department heads given to the Bureau of the Budget on its directives by the Secretary of the Army and Secretary of the Interior and their subordinates during that same period. Moreover, I have asked for a tabulation of new starts during each of the past 15 years by year, listing the names of the projects, the time they were authorized, the time construction started, and how much money was allocated for construction.

The Kennedy administration has said that it is anxious to make all non-security information available to the public, so I am sure the President will furnish me with the material I have requested. It will show that there have been 49 new starts in the reclamation area alone under the Eisenhower administration, compared to 38 new reclamation starts under Truman.

In the 5 fiscal years 1949 to 1953, the Truman administration recommended only six new reclamation starts. In 3 of those years, 1949-51, the administration recommended only one new start each year; in 1 year, 1953, it recommended none. In all, the Truman administration had a total of 38 new starts—18 requested by the administration, 20 added by the Congress. Actually, the Eisenhower administration initiated construction of 29 percent more projects than the Truman administration and requested 39 percent more new starts than the Truman administration.

One of the most important Eisenhower new starts was the billion-dollar Upper Colorado River project. It is the largest single project ever authorized in one bill. This project was consistently opposed and hamstrung by the Truman administration. Former Senator Watkins and I introduced a bill to authorize the project in 1952, but this was opposed by President Truman, and no action was taken. Precious years of water development were wasted as a result of this imposed delay—water which we direly need in the Upper Colorado Basin and particularly in Utah, where we are into the third year of a serious drought. Recently I suggested that the Glen Canyon Dam should be renamed the Eisenhower Dam because of the key role President Eisenhower played in getting approval of

the dam, which is part of the Upper Colorado project. In view of the misinformation which the Democrats spread in the 1960 campaign, and which is now being perpetuated by the Kennedy ad-

ministration, it might be well to call the dam the "No New Starts Dam."

I ask unanimous consent that a list of some of the new starts approved under the Eisenhower administration be

printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

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

Reclamation projects, or units, Department has reported favorably on from 1953 to August 1960

No.	Project or unit	Congress	Date enacted	Public Law No.	No.	Project or unit	Congress	Date enacted	Public Law No.
1	Avondale project, Idaho (rehabilitation of existing project).	83d.	July 31, 1953	-----		Colorado River storage project and participating projects—Continued			
2	Bufo-Trenton project, North Dakota.	83d.	do.	-----		Participating projects:			
3	Dalton Gardens project, Idaho (rehabilitation of project works).	83d.	do.	-----	27	Central Utah (initial phase) Vernal unit.	84th.	Apr. 11, 1936	485
4	Carlsbad project, New Mexico (rehabilitation of spillway).	83d.	July 1, 1954	-----	28	Emery County, Utah.	84th.	do.	485
5	Crescent Lake Dam project, Oregon (reconstruction of dam).	83d.	do.	-----	29	Florida, Colo.	84th.	do.	485
6	Glendo unit, Missouri River Basin project, Wyoming.	83d.	July 16, 1954	503	30	Hammond, N. Mex.	84th.	do.	485
7	Foster Creek division of Chief Joseph Dam project, Washington.	85th.	June 20, 1958	695	31	La Barge, Wyo.	84th.	do.	485
8	Santa Margarita project, California.	83d.	July 27, 1954	540	32	Lyman, Wyo.	84th.	do.	485
9	Haystack Dam and Reservoir, Deschutes project, Oregon.	83d.	July 28, 1954	547	33	Panama, Colo.	84th.	do.	485
10	Talent division, Rogue River Basin project, Oregon.	83d.	Aug. 10, 1954	-----	34	Pine River extension, New Mexico.	84th.	do.	485
11	Medford and Rogue River Valley Irrigation District rehabilitation, Rogue River Basin project, Oregon.	83d.	Aug. 20, 1954	606	35	Seedskaadee, Wyo.	84th.	do.	485
12	Ainsworth unit, Nebraska (Missouri River Basin project).	83d.	do.	-----	36	Silt, Colo.	84th.	do.	485
13	Mirage Flats extension unit, Nebraska (Missouri River Basin project).	84th.	May 18, 1956	531	37	Smith Fork, Colo.	84th.	do.	485
14	O'Neill unit, Nebraska (Missouri River Basin project).	83d.	Aug. 21, 1954	612	38	Red Willow Dam, Nebr.	84th.	May 2, 1956	505
15	Lavaca Flats, Nebraska (Missouri River Basin project).	83d.	do.	-----	39	Wapinitis project, Juniper division, Oregon.	84th.	June 4, 1956	539
16	Palo Verde diversion project, Arizona-California.	83d.	Aug. 31, 1954	-----	40	Hayden Lake unit, Rathdrum Prairie project, Idaho (rehabilitation of existing project).	84th.	July 2, 1956	-----
17	Michaud Flats project, Idaho.	83d.	do.	741	41	Washoe project, Nevada and California.	84th.	Aug. 1, 1956	858
18	Santa Maria project, California.	83d.	Sept. 3, 1954	774	42	Farwell unit, Nebraska, Missouri River Basin.	84th.	Aug. 3, 1956	952
19	Trinity River Division, Central Valley project, California.	84th.	Aug. 12, 1955	386	43	Crooked River project, Oregon.	84th.	Aug. 6, 1956	962
20	Yuma Mesa Irrigation District, Gila project, Arizona (additional works).	84th.	Jan. 28, 1956	394	44	Little Wood River project, Idaho.	84th.	do.	993
21	Washita River Basin project, Oklahoma.	84th.	Feb. 25, 1956	419	45	San Angelo project, Texas.	84th.	Aug. 16, 1957	152
22	Ventura River project, California.	84th.	Mar. 1, 1956	423	46	McMillan Delta project, New Mexico-Texas.	85th.	Feb. 20, 1958	-----
	Colorado River storage project and participating projects:				47	Mercedes division, lower Rio Grande rehabilitation project, Texas.	85th.	Apr. 7, 1958	-----
23	Storage projects:				48	Chief Joseph Dam project, Greater Wenatchee division, Washington.	85th.	May 5, 1958	393
24	Claremont unit, Colorado.	84th.	Apr. 11, 1956	485	49	Bully Creek extension, Vale project, Oregon.	86th.	Sept. 9, 1959	248
25	Fuming Gorge unit, Utah.	84th.	do.	485	50	Spokane Valley project, Washington.	86th.	Sept. 16, 1959	276
26	Glen Canyon unit, Arizona.	84th.	do.	485	51	La Feria division, lower Rio Grande rehabilitation project, Texas.	86th.	Sept. 22, 1959	357
	Navajo unit, New Mexico.	84th.	do.	485	52	San Luis unit, Central Valley project, California.	86th.	June 3, 1960	488
					53	Norman project, Oklahoma.	86th.	June 27, 1960	529
					54	Burns Creek Reservoir, Idaho.	Not enacted.		
					55	Cheney division, Wichita project, Kansas.	86th.	Sept. 14, 1960	787
					56	Fryingpan-Arkansas project, Colorado.	Not enacted.		
					57	Garrison diversion unit, Missouri River Basin project.	do.		
					58	Mann Creek project, Idaho.	do.		
					59	Nebraska Mid-State project.	do.		
					60	San Juan-Chama project, New Mexico.	do.		
					61	Western division, the Dalles project, Oregon.	86th.	Sept. 13, 1960	745

¹ Bureau of Budget did not approve (in letter of June 9, 1960).

NOT ENACTED

54. Burns Creek Reservoir, Idaho:
Eighty-third Congress: No legislation.
Eighty-fourth Congress: Department made no recommendation.

Eighty-fifth Congress:
Favorable report submitted by Department May 7, 1957.

Hearings in House Interior Committee May 13, 1958.

Hearings in Senate Interior Committee May 22, 1957.

Passed Senate, amended, August 20, 1957 (S. 2757).

Eighty-sixth Congress:
Hearings in Senate Interior Committee March 16, 1959.

Favorable report submitted by Department April 21, 1959.

Passed Senate, amended, July 24, 1959 (S. 281).

Hearings in House Interior Committee August 27, 1959.

Hearings in House Interior Committee March 24, 1960.

Hearings in House Interior Committee March 27, 1960.

No hearings were held in House Interior Committee during August 1960 session of Congress for lack of quorum.

55. Cheney division, Wichita project, Kansas:

Eighty-third and Eighty-fourth Congresses: No legislation.

Eighty-fifth Congress: Department made no recommendation.

Eighty-sixth Congress:

Favorable report submitted by Department August 6, 1959.

Passed Senate April 11, 1960 (S. 1092).

Passed House, amended, and returned to Senate August 31, 1960 (S. 1092).

Senate cleared for President August 31, 1960 (S. 1092).

Signed September 14, 1960 (Public Law 86-787).

56. Fryingpan-Arkansas project, Colorado.

Eighty-third Congress:

Favorable report submitted by Department June 9, 1953.

Passed Senate by unanimous vote July 10, 1954.

Eighty-fourth Congress: Passed Senate by unanimous vote July 12, 1956 (S. 300).

Eighty-fifth Congress: Passed Senate by unanimous vote June 27, 1957 (S. 60).

Eighty-sixth Congress:

Favorable report submitted by Department March 25, 1960.

Hearings in House Interior Committee June 6 and 7, 1960. No action taken.

57. Garrison Diversion unit, Missouri River basin project.

Eighty-third and Eighty-fourth Congresses: No legislation.

Eighty-fifth Congress: Department made no recommendation.

Eighty-sixth Congress:

Favorable report submitted to House committee by Department June 9, 1960.

Favorable report submitted to Senate committee by Department June 16, 1960 (identical to House report).

58. Mann Creek project, Idaho.

Eighty-third, Eighty-fourth and Eighty-fifth Congresses: No legislation.

Eighty-sixth Congress: Favorable report submitted by Department July 21, 1960.

59. Nebraska Mid-State project.

Eighty-third, Eighty-fourth, and Eighty-fifth Congresses: Department made no recommendation.

Eighty-sixth Congress: Favorable report submitted by Department April 24, 1959.

Favorable report submitted by Department April 20, 1960.

Hearings in House Interior Committee May 19, 1960.

Hearings in Senate Interior Committee May 23, 1960.

60. San Juan-Chama project, New Mexico.

Eighty-third and Eighty-fourth Congresses: No legislation.

Eighty-fifth Congress: No recommendation made by Department.

Eighty-sixth Congress: Department made no recommendation (in report dated March 9, 1959).

Hearings in Senate Interior Committee March 16, 1959. Passed Senate May 19, 1959 (S. 72).

Favorable report submitted by Department May 19, 1960.

Hearings in House Interior Committee May 23, 1960.

61. Western Division, the Dalles project, Oregon.

Eighty-third, Eighty-fourth, and Eighty-fifth Congresses: No legislation.

Eighty-sixth Congress:

Hearings in Senate Interior Committee June 13, 1960.

Hearings in House Interior Committee June 13, 1960. Favorable report submitted by Department June 24, 1960.

Passed Senate July 1, 1960 (S. 2195).

Passed House, amended, and returned to Senate August 31, 1960 (S. 2195).

Senate cleared for President August 31, 1960 (S. 2195).

Signed September 13, 1960 (Public Law 86-745).

Mr. BENNETT. The greatest water conservation program in our history was initiated by the Eisenhower administration. Nearly \$2 billion was appropriated for Federal reclamation work during the 8 Eisenhower years. This was just a little short of the total appropriations for the preceding 50 years. In the half century before 1953, only 87 projects were completed—fewer than 2 a year. But since 1953, 30 reclamation projects have been completed, an average of 4 per year, while 53 new projects or units have been authorized, and construction has been started on 49 new or supplementary projects.

It is gratifying to now learn that President Kennedy intends to support reclamation projects, which is in striking contrast to the position he took when he voted against the Upper Colorado storage project and against the Echo Park Dam when the Senate voted on it in 1955.

OTHER WATER CONSERVATION DEVELOPMENTS

It was the Eisenhower administration which took the lead in gaining congressional approval by the Republican Congress in 1954 of the Watershed and Flood Control Prevention Act of that year. Add to this the fact that the Eisenhower administration pioneered and obtained approval of the Small Reclamation Projects Act in 1955. Both of these programs have been of inestimable value in the conservation of water and soil throughout the Nation. Then, too, the program to extract potable water from saline water was initiated and given full support during these same years, and has made remarkable progress. In fact, during the Eisenhower administration scientists made a sevenfold reduction in the cost of converting salt water to fresh water and the outlook for the future is bright, despite the fact that the Democratic controlled Congress has refused in 4 years out of the last 7 to appropriate as much money as requested for the program. The Kennedy administration is most fortunate to be able to start from so high a level of accomplishment.

To read President Kennedy's natural resources message, one would think that the Eisenhower administration had done absolutely nothing for 8 years in the natural resources field.

I have had the Library of Congress prepare a table for me based upon Bureau of the Budget information listing conservation expenditures by the Federal Government from fiscal years 1943 through 1962. This table shows that during the 7 Truman years, \$10,464 million was spent for all conservation purposes. During the first 7 Eisenhower years, conservation expenditures jumped almost 50 percent to \$15,445 million. When the figures for fiscal year 1962 are added, the total is \$18,356 million, under Eisenhower. This hardly supports the patently ridiculous thesis of President Kennedy.

I ask unanimous consent that there be printed at this point in the RECORD a statement prepared for me by the Library of Congress showing expenditures during these fiscal years.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows.

Conservation expenditures by the Federal Government, fiscal years 1934, 1943-58 actual, 1959-60 estimated

[In millions of dollars]

	Conservation of agricultural land and water resources	Conservation of land, water, forests, minerals, fish, and wildlife	Total		Conservation of agricultural land and water resources	Conservation of land, water, forests, minerals, fish, and wildlife	Total
1934.....	(1)	(1)	(2)	1952.....	340	1,366	1,706
1943.....	474	535	1,009	1953.....	320	1,476	1,796
1944.....	462	405	867	1954.....	253	1,315	1,568
1945.....	325	308	633	1955.....	291	1,202	1,493
1946.....	350	340	690	1956.....	305	1,104	1,409
1947.....	388	694	1,082	1957.....	375	1,296	1,671
1948.....	285	855	1,140	1958.....	448	1,543	1,991
1949.....	241	1,199	1,440	1959.....	547	1,609	2,216
1950.....	337	1,351	1,688	1960.....	692	1,713	2,405
1951.....	345	1,267	1,612				

¹ Not available.

² Separate breakdown not available. This does not include Emergency Conservation expenditures of \$332 million for undetermined purposes.

NOTE.—The figure for fiscal year 1934 is a rough estimate, and the figures for 1943-50 may not be strictly comparable with those of 1951-60. Figures from 1952 budget include Item 452: "Provision of navigation aid and facilities."

Source: U.S. Bureau of the Budget. "The Budget of the Government of the

United States, 1960," p. 1013. Ibid., 1952, p. 1007. Figure for 1934 by phone from the Bureau of the Budget, Mrs. Lowe.

1961 (estimated)..... 741 1,951 2,692

1962 (estimated)..... 773 2,138 2,911

Total Truman, 7 years..... 10,464

Total Eisenhower, 7 years..... 15,445

Total Eisenhower, 8 years..... 18,356

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, this complete misrepresentation is only measured by the cartoon which appeared in the Washington Post of February 24. Just a casual examination of the Department of Interior expenditures over the past 14 years, for example, shows the poverty of facts displayed by the Kennedy message. During the 7 Truman years covering fiscal years 1947 through 1953, a total of \$2,818,303,000 was expended for water development. Under the first 7 years of the Eisenhower administration, it was a great leap forward in the conservation field and \$4,422,268,000 was expended for conservation, an increase of 57 percent.

This, of course, does not include the fiscal 1962 budget which was submitted by President Eisenhower and was at an alltime level.

Appropriations for Forest Service, conservation, and range development programs constituted \$728 million under Eisenhower, compared to \$483 million for a comparable 7-year period under

Truman. This is an increase of 67 percent. In addition, Secretary Benson made a complete survey of our national forest needs up to the year 2000, which I hope the Kennedy administration will fully implement during the years it is in power.

In the field of soil conservation, the average annual appropriation under Truman was \$53 million, but it has nearly doubled under Eisenhower to \$99.3 million per year. This, coupled with the Watershed Act, has given us the greatest era in water development in the history of the United States.

RECREATION

It was the Eisenhower administration which launched a great program to develop the recreational potential of our public lands. For example, the Mission 66 program was launched in 1956 to develop the great potential of our national parks and monuments by the centennial year 1966. The total Parks Service budget during the first 5 years of

the program, a sum just over \$386 million, exceeded the total for all of the 24 years prior to the Eisenhower administration. At the same time, Secretary Benson initiated and secured approval of Operation Outdoors, to make national forest recreation available to countless thousands more Americans and to advance game management and conservation. This has not as yet been adequately implemented by Congress.

It is important to note that wildlife areas were expanded by 27 million acres and that 23 new national wildlife refuges have been established during the past 8 years. A long-range minerals program was submitted to Congress but Congress refused to take action. Appropriations were recommended for seven key minerals but once again Congress refused to appropriate funds for this important program.

I have noted the Kennedy message is filled with platitudes and generalities but where it is specific, he almost invariably asks for a continuation of the Eisen-

hower administration resources policies. The President wants to continue the program for our national forests and the Small Watershed Act developed by Secretary Benson, and the Mission 66 program for national parks developed by Secretary Seaton. He wants to adopt most of project 2012 for our public lands, and the saline water program pioneered by Seaton. His water pollution program differs only slightly, and he endorses S. 120 which I have cosponsored. This is all to the good, but hardly new.

In two areas, however, President Kennedy is specific. He wants to embark on a vast program of nationalized power and of nationalized interconnecting power lines. He also places a freeze on all nonmineral activity on 180 million acres of western land. This is a blow to private enterprise and to the economies of the Western States, and is, in effect, a no-new-starts policy for public land development.

What we in Utah need are specific proposals. In recent weeks, I have asked the Kennedy administration to begin work immediately on the Provo Bay and Goshen Bay dikes on Utah Lake. This would save enough water to supply a city of 400,000 people.

These projects are included in the related projects as part of the upper Colorado storage program, but I hope they can be stepped up in priority.

I also have asked that construction be started immediately on the Emery County project. Both of these projects are vitally needed to meet the threat of drought, and would furnish employment to areas where unemployment is high. No indication is given by President Kennedy that he realizes the urgency of our problems in Utah.

More progress has been made in conserving and developing our natural resources and our public lands between January 1953 and January 1961 than in any comparable 8-year period in our history. The Republican Party and the American people can take pride in this great record. It is regrettable that President Kennedy would attempt to besmirch this great achievement and at the same time attack President Truman and the Democratic leaders in Congress for their alleged inaction. We Republicans are happy to share credit with the Democrats in Congress for the great record during the past 8 years, and we shall be pleased to join with them to achieve an even greater record in the future.

At the conclusion of my remarks I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record a statement made by the then Vice President of the United States on October 29, 1960, outlining the achievements of the Eisenhower administration.

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

STATEMENT OF NATURAL RESOURCES BY THE VICE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES ISSUED AT CHICAGO, ILL., OCTOBER 29, 1960—SUMMARY OF EISENHOWER RECORD

Endowed by our Creator with an abundance of natural resources, the people of

this Nation have forged an economy with the greatest productive capacity in history. Our citizens enjoy the highest standard of living ever attained in this world. The natural resources which supply this ever-expanding economy require our wisest and most vigorous public policy.

At the beginning of this century, a far-sighted Republican President—Theodore Roosevelt—inspired the American people as never before to support public programs leading to the wise use and judicious conservation of these raw materials. Today, if the free world is to have the instruments necessary to preserve liberty, and if we are to continue to achieve the growth the United States should have, we must renew our determination to manage, use, and improve our natural heritage for the benefit of future generations as well as our own.

"God has lent us the earth for our life," John Ruskin wrote in the century past. "It is a great entail. It belongs as much to those who come after us as to us, and we have no right, by anything we do or neglect, to involve them in any unnecessary penalties, or to deprive them of the benefit which was in our power to bequeath."

Those words stand true today.

A wise conservation policy cannot rest simply on the fear that the population of the world—or of the United States—will outstrip the earth's capacity to produce. Science and technology have already increased the productivity of our land and resources far beyond the demands now made on them, and far beyond the imaginings of our forefathers.

A wise policy, therefore, includes, along with preservation and orderly development, basic and applied research, conducted at a tempo which will insure against material shortages in our future.

Following such wise policies in the 1960's, we shall meet many challenges here at home: The challenge to avoid waste; to assure that we do not become a have-not nation; to better the living of our greatly growing number of people.

And broadening such policies, we shall meet challenges—many of them new—imposed by our international role. That role intensifies the demands on our own resources. And it impels us to seek means to put vast undeveloped resources in Latin America, Africa, and Asia to use in the free world's battle against poverty—one of the major battles in the great global struggle in which we are engaged.

WATER RESOURCES

In 1930, our per capita water requirements amounted to 530 gallons daily. Today we need twice as much. And by 1979, we shall need twice as much again.

The problem of assuring our growing country this swelling flood of fresh water is a problem local, regional, and national. Its solution requires an incessant and vigorous effort, undertaken by organizations both non-Federal and Federal, to impound water, irrigate land, control floods, and find an economical way to convert saline and brackish water to fresh.

WATER CONSERVATION

About one thing let us be clear at the outset: The United States must never suffer a crippling water shortage.

The only way to avert this possibility is to continue and expand what the United States now has underway—the greatest water conservation program in our history. At a cost now in excess of \$1 billion annually, the Eisenhower-Nixon administration has set a precedent-breaking pace in the authorization, construction, and development of water resources projects. Never before have so many such projects been launched.

Since 1953, 30 reclamation projects have been completed—an average of 4 per year—53 new projects or units have been author-

ized, and construction has been started on 49 new or supplementary projects. In the half century before 1953, only 87 projects were completed—fewer than 2 a year. Of all the money made available for Federal reclamation activities since Theodore Roosevelt signed the Reclamation Act in 1902, 1 dollar in every 3 has been appropriated during the Eisenhower-Nixon administration.

And these figures do not include the hundreds of flood control projects also initiated by this administration.

We have built this record of progress in the face of the failure of the opposition-controlled Congress to meet the appropriation figures in the President's annual budgets. In 5 out of the past 6 years, the Congress appropriated for reclamation less than he requested.

These facts are part of the refutation of the opposition's charge that the Republican water resource development program is one of no new starts. More of the refutation is in these facts: The phrase "no new starts" originated in 1947 with the Director of the Bureau of the Budget during the Truman administration, which launched that policy.

In the 5 fiscal years 1949-53, the Truman administration recommended the construction of only 6 new reclamation projects. In 3 of those years (1949-51), the administration recommended only one new start each year; in 1 year (1953), it recommended none. In all, the Truman administration had a total of 38 new starts; 18 requested by the administration, 20 added by the Congress.

By contrast, in 8 years the Eisenhower administration has had 49 new starts, 25 requested by the administration and 24 added by the Congress. The record is clear that the Eisenhower administration has actually initiated construction of 29 percent more projects than the Truman administration and has requested 39 percent more new starts than the Truman administration.

The future water resource development of the United States must include a host of varied programs and policies.

Along with major downstream flood control projects, increased emphasis should be given to programs of Federal assistance for small reclamation and watershed flood control projects initiated and constructed by non-Federal local districts.

There must be continued support of the historic policy of Congress preserving the integrity of State water right laws.

River basin or watershed committees should coordinate the investigation, planning, and development of water conservation projects; wherever practicable, these projects should incorporate facilities for predictable future needs.

And basin funds, which will assure provision for investigation and full beneficial development of each river from its source to the sea, should be authorized by Congress.

INLAND WATERWAYS

Since 1952, this Nation has maintained a rate of growth in inland waterway commerce which is without precedent in our history. The St. Lawrence Seaway—the greatest inland waterway in the world, which extends 2,342 miles into the heart of the North American Continent—stands as a monument to international cooperation and Republican determination after decades of frustrated effort.

The Corps of Engineers estimates that about \$8 billion would be required for all authorized and potential waterways. In proceeding to develop our waterways, uneconomic waterways should be deactivated, and, if possible, used for public recreation. To meet the estimated increased requirements for freight transportation, a definite schedule of priorities for the potential new waterways should be maintained, and modernization of existing waterways should proceed rapidly.

EVAPORATION CONTROL

Ground water and water once impounded can still be lost in astonishing quantities through evaporation or consumption by water-loving shrubs and weeds called phreatophytes. The encouraging results of experiments already made indicate that research on evaporation and phreatophyte control should be intensified.

POLLUTION CONTROL

Today our communities and industries are producing increasing and more complex wastes which are making water courses filthy and unusable.

A national program to prevent such pollution requires improved understanding of the types of wastes reaching our streams, and improved methods for their treatment. It requires more aggressive enforcement action to curb those communities and industries that are despoiling our rivers and other water courses. It requires public support of officials who are making sincere efforts to abate water pollution. It requires funds to build municipal waste treatment works, and expenditures by industry to cope with industrial wastes.

Recognizing the need for an effective attack on water pollution, the President in 1955 recommended a stronger and more permanent law than the Taft-Barkley Act of 1948. The administration's 1955 recommendations called for (1) the strengthening of Federal support of State water pollution control programs; (2) the authority to develop water quality standards to be applied to the interstate streams; (3) the broadening of enforcement authority of the Federal Government; (4) the intensifying of research on technical problems of stream pollution and its abatement.

In May of 1956 the Congress finally passed, and the President approved, Public Law 660. Remarkable progress has been made since that time in expanding our program to clean up the waters of America.

State water pollution control programs have been substantially expanded and strengthened by Federal grants and technical assistance and training.

Enforcement actions to prevent pollution of interstate waterways have been used in a dozen serious cases of interstate pollution. Already, conferences and public hearings on an interstate level have resulted in cleaning up more than 4,000 miles of streams. Action has been initiated to abate pollution from Federal installations.

Our research efforts, in universities and colleges, in industrial laboratories, and at Federal and State government installations, have been expanded.

Incentive grants for the construction of municipal sewage treatment plants have more than doubled the annual rate of such construction in the 5 years prior to 1956, when incentive funds were not available. For every \$1 of Federal incentive money spent, \$5 of local and State money has been put into sewage treatment plant construction since 1956.

Though much has been accomplished, much more remains to be done.

The first national conference on water pollution, scheduled to be held in December, will focus attention on the critical problem of assuring clean water for all purposes. It is clear now, however, that amendments to the existing Water Pollution Control Act should be sought so that its provisions can be extended to apply to all navigable waters.

When clearly needed, Federal assistance should be made available to local communities for pollution treatment facilities. Additionally, consideration should be given to measures that will encourage industries to follow good waste treatment practices.

With the increase in the complexity of wastes reaching our surface and ground waters, we must continue to seek out new

and improved and effective waste treatment processes. Our increased requirements for water emphasize the urgent need to increase support for basic research and development.

There is a related subject. The greater the number of our automobiles and buses and smokestacks, the greater the amount of pollution of the only element more important to human life than water—the air we breathe. Working with all interested agencies, the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare should continue its efforts to acquire new knowledge and develop new techniques for prevention and control of air pollution. The Surgeon General of the U.S. Public Health Service should be given authority to investigate and hold hearings on air pollution problems and to take action to abate pollution nuisances of interstate significance. Recommendations along these lines have been made to the Congress by the administration and should be acted upon at an early date.

In the past 8 years, the Eisenhower-Nixon administration, through research and experimentation, has reduced sevenfold the cost of saline water conversion. Even at the present cost of approximately \$1 per thousand gallons, thousands of communities will soon find it cheaper to convert salt water than to transport fresh water from distant sources. We shall continue to urge approval of legislation to expand this program—legislation not enacted by the last Congress despite the fact that its enactment was recommended by the administration and had broad bipartisan support in the Congress.

The goal before us is to discover a process so efficient that we may not only meet our own needs at a reasonable cost, but also help make the arid lands of the world bloom. The development of a low-cost method of converting sea water to fresh could help solve economic problems in many countries, such as Pakistan, Saudi Arabia, Israel, and Brazil.

Unfortunately, recent Congresses have failed to make available all the funds requested by President Eisenhower for this purpose. The times demand that the saline water program be accelerated. Toward this end, the experimental portion of the saline water program should be expanded, if necessary through the construction of a Federal laboratory for this purpose.

ELECTRIC POWER

In considering electric power, let us be clear once again about a basic pledge: Neither the United States nor any region of the United States must ever suffer, as it did under the Truman administration, a crippling shortage of electric power.

Since 1953, this Nation's electric power generating capacity has nearly doubled. Through cooperative efforts, "brownouts" have been eliminated. This achievement is the direct result of the elimination of stifling and needless controls. Imposed by past Democratic administrations, Federal preemption of waterpower sites prevented non-Federal public and publicly regulated utilities from responding to local demand; material controls made action doubly impossible.

But since 1953, the Federal Power Commission has received applications for non-Federal hydroelectric projects with a total capacity of more than 33 million kilowatts—an amount larger than in any comparable period in our history.

As a measure of our progress in the installation of power facilities, we might remember that the Soviet Union today has the installed capacity which we had in 1942, and that if it continues at its recent rate of growth, by 1975 it will have the capacity we had in 1955.

Projections for electric energy demand show that we shall probably need three times as much capacity in 1980 as we have now. All segments of the industry and govern-

ment will need to work as a team to meet this increase. Furthermore, by cooperative effort, such as the Northwest power pool, we should assure the fullest possible use of the capabilities of all elements of the power industry—public, private and Federal. And no power capacity should be wasted through failure to use facilities.

Federal hydropower activities are a direct result of water control and conservation construction. Energy generated as a byproduct of storage dams and reservoirs is marketed to help repay the Federal investment in water resource development. As a general rule, non-Federal agencies should construct steam plants. The Federal Government should, however, vigorously proceed to construct multipurpose projects such as the great upper Colorado storage project. And we should continue to stimulate non-Federal power agencies to expand at their current unprecedented rate.

Because an electric utility—public or private—is essentially a monopoly as a matter of economic necessity, privately owned utilities should continue to be strictly regulated in the public interest. Publicly owned utilities should be managed so as to be directly responsible to the people they serve. Neither public nor private utilities should be allowed to become mere tools for the benefit of a managerial class.

It is at the very root of our Federal system that the States and local communities have the full authority to determine whether their utilities are to be publicly or privately owned and operated. When Federal officials use their positions to attempt to control local decisions on these questions, they violate the spirit of the Constitution. Furthermore, American experience suggests that those closest to a problem are most likely to find a successful solution.

ATOMIC ENERGY

In the field of atomic energy, we shall support the teamwork principle, which has already led the world to major achievements. Republican efforts have led to the establishment of a 10-year program to continue the U.S. leadership in atomic power. Three civilian stationary nuclear powerplants are already in operation. Eight more are under construction, and another eight are planned for completion by 1965. All these plants together will have a generating capacity of more than 1.5 million kilowatts. Research and development must continue to receive strong emphasis.

The Rural Electrification Administration has enabled local REA-financed systems to meet the growing demand for electric and telephone service. For such service, the REA has my wholehearted support.

The REA was conceived as a legitimate instrument of Government to extend electrical service to rural areas. It has raised the standard of living throughout our farm-lands by virtue of the fact that an REA co-operative must accept a utility responsibility for potential consumers in its area without regard for profit—a responsibility the Federal Government should not have and one private industry cannot be compelled to accept. It should continue to make loans—more than one-third of the total have been made since 1953—at interest rates which take into consideration the REA's acceptance of this responsibility, a service which expands our markets for electrical appliances, increases the national standard of living, and makes our farms the envy of the world.

PREFERENCE TO PUBLIC AGENCIES

Another Federal policy—that of preference to Federal and public agencies in the disposal of federally generated power—has been vigorously followed by the present administration. This policy gives to Federal taxpayers the first benefit of Federal instal-

lations. We are opposed to repealing this preference or to eroding it away through administrative action.

EXOTIC POWER

We commend the electric energy industry for its continuing research in all the "exotic" power fields. Already it is possible to produce magnetohydrodynamic energy and to produce electricity from chemical or heat conversion. The Federal Government should, wherever necessary, stimulate and assist basic research in such fields to develop new sources of energy.

SOIL CONSERVATION AND LAND MANAGEMENT: MULTIPLE USE

The needs of grazing, timber, water, mining, and industrial activities should be met through multiple use of the public domain wherever consistent with the highest use of such lands. Project 2012, the Bureau of Land Management's long-range program for administering public lands, recognizes the growing value and importance of the remaining unreserved public domain. In following that program, priority should be given to classification and competitive sale of those limited amounts of land necessary to meet urban and industrial expansion in the West.

To public lands, there must be adequate public access. In addition, land exchange authorities should be used, consistent with antispeculation safeguards, to consolidate public land holdings.

Protection of our public domain requires continuous range improvement measures—detention dams, range seeding, brush control and adequate fire protection. The increased use of our land resources demands that these assets be rehabilitated and kept in top condition. A depleted range is as useless as a rundown battery, but both are capable of being restored for sustained use. Primarily, soil and moisture programs should assure preparation for variable use.

SOIL CONSERVATION

The management of our soils and that of our waters are, basically, inseparable. It is for this reason that emphasis has been given to watershed protection, and assistance and encouragement to the Nation's farmers and conservation agencies to use and maintain our soils in a manner so as to improve them and, at the same time, conserve our water resources.

The successful Great Plains conservation program should be extended to the whole Nation. This unique program has accelerated soil, water and grassland research. It has combined cost-sharing and technical assistance to help farmers and landowners adjust to climatic hazards. And it has strengthened the entire economy of the Nation. The program answers President Eisenhower's demand that a direct attack be made on the problems of the Great Plains. If we follow it, we shall not permit the Dust Bowl to return. We must not permit any area of this Nation to suffer because of the lack of a long-range permanent solution to conservation problems.

Above all, the Soil Conservation Service, which gives technical assistance to stimulate good soil conservation practices, must be given increased recognition for its vital role in America's future. There should be no penny pinching in the effort to preserve our soils, as well as our waters, forests, and other basic natural resources.

The principle of soil conservation does not recognize differences in ownership. The key to sound soil conservation lies in balanced and planned action on a watershed basis which applies equally to Government and private lands. Higher priorities have been assigned to private lands in getting soil and moisture programs underway. The time has come to step up our efforts in caring for Government lands in order to achieve the necessary balance. A job of this kind cannot be piecemeal.

COORDINATION OF RESOURCE EFFORTS

The advancement of conservation in the United States has given responsibilities to several agencies of the Federal Government. Coordination of their efforts is possible under the existing arrangement, as exemplified by recent joint conservation policy statements of the Secretaries of Defense and the Interior. What is lacking is a measure which would not only permit, but require, consistent policies and programs.

We should consider establishing a National Council on Resources and Conservation to assure coordinated consideration of national programs directed toward the wise conservation and development of our natural resources. Patterned after the National Security Council, the NCRC should be composed of the Secretaries of Agriculture, Defense, Health, Education, and Welfare, and Interior. Its permanent Chairman would be the Secretary of the Interior.

This Council would eliminate one of the fundamental weaknesses of our national resources policy machinery. All conservation policies—those affecting our soils, water, timber, minerals, wildlife, fisheries, etc.—would be related to one another by coordinated action. The proper balance between conservation, development and use will be maintained by combining coordination responsibility with the authority each member of the NCRC has in his individual capacity.

The NCRC will be responsible for developing uniform policies for protecting our natural resources and assuring their replenishment. It will be an agency not only of coordination but of action. Its membership will assure immediate institution of coordinated development programs. Furthermore, the NCRC would meet at least once monthly and put out periodic reports on its progress.

Basic to the operation of the NCRC would be the pooling of talent and effort to collect, analyze and interpret the basic data necessary to program for future resource development activities. The NCRC would prepare and present a comprehensive natural resources budgetary plan; information and programing detailed by basin and watershed committees would be correlated, and procedures and policies followed by such committees should be simplified through coordinated NCRC efforts. In addition, a permanent technical staff of the NCRC could explore means to eliminate inconsistencies or conflicts in Federal resource policies and initiate or prepare staff studies on suggestions for sound resource programs. One such suggestion, recently made by the League of Women Voters, is that a development loan fund be established to encourage the establishment of State or interstate agencies to undertake river basin development. Such a fund could stimulate local and regional initiative. It could also materially reduce interstate tension by fostering cooperation instead of conflict. After studying its impact upon going programs, the Council might well recommend to the President the creation of such a fund.

One significant distinction should be noted: Democrats in the Congress have suggested a Presidential advisory council be established—an additional level of bureaucracy, without authority or responsibility, to superimpose itself in an advisory capacity upon the present administrative apparatus. We need coordination, not the creation of a powerless new agency. We need to simplify existing review procedures, not complicate them by an advisory board without authority or responsibility.

RECREATION

The recreation potential of all public lands should be developed, where possible, under cooperative agreement with non-Federal recreation agencies. A current inventory of public lands available for recreation development will be maintained. To this end, a

commission of recognized conservation, resources, and land management experts should be established to inventory Federal lands now set aside for public purposes. This Commission's studies should determine the recreation reserve lands necessary to meet the Nation's future needs for parks, seashores, wildlife, and other recreational areas.

While some people attack the increased affluence of our society, it is a great satisfaction to realize that Americans in greater numbers than ever before today have the opportunity to live, travel, and enjoy recreation out of doors. Through hunting, fishing, boating, hiking, camping, bird watching, and nature study, millions upon increasing millions of Americans thus deepen their love of country and of the God-given magnificence of the expanses and scenic wonders of our section of this continent. These recreation enthusiasts more than pay their way in our economy—through increased demands for equipment, boats, station wagons, and tourist accommodations. Recreation expenditures amount to well over \$43 billion annually. Increased income and more leisure time will make the demands for recreational areas soar even more. Here again, the only solution is through the effective teamwork of all echelons of government.

The Federal Government must continue to make greater provision for recreational opportunities on public domain and forest lands. We have already established long-range programs for recreational development of our national park. Funds spent on rehabilitating the national parks during the first 4 years of Mission 66 exceeded the amounts spent by Democratic administrations for 13 years prior to 1953. But more action is needed. We must act quickly to save our seashore areas of national significance. Additional national park units, such as the Prairie National Park, should be added to the system.

Despite repeated urging by the administration, the Democratic-controlled Congress refused to add to our national park system new seashore areas at Cape Cod, Mass.; Padre Island, Tex.; Oregon Dunes, Oreg.; and Point Reyes, Calif. Prolonged hearings led to the adoption of recommendations to protect the valid interests of local agencies and preserve the seashore areas from destruction through commercialization. Yet because the Democrats in control of Congress did not act, we must go through the whole process once again. This unwarranted delay costs the taxpayers money because of increases in property values. And it prevents action to preserve this heritage for future generations.

Recreation opportunities should be integrated wherever possible with water resource developments, with the assurance of clean water to provide full enjoyment of these facilities. Toward this end, I shall recommend to the Congress the enactment of a Recreation Coordination Act. One of its principal provisions will require adequate consideration of recreation in the acquisition of land for water development projects.

All agencies of this administration have endorsed the principle of wilderness preservation. To this principle, sound and effective legislation should give effect.

Recognizing that our people's demands on our scenic and historical areas will surely increase in the years to come, we have pledged to sponsor a new program, Mission 76. This 15-year program will offer technical cooperation and grants to stimulate establishment and rehabilitation of local, State, and regional park and recreational facilities; it is a program necessary to prevent the destruction of existing facilities through overuse.

NATIONAL FORESTS

The U.S. Forest Service has moved rapidly to meet changing demands for forest

facilities. "Operation Outdoors" recognizes the legitimate demands of the public for wildlife, recreation, and wilderness uses in national forests in addition to timber production and watershed control.

Dependable fire protection through fire suppression and control work should be extended to all public forest lands. All agencies, public and private, must help to reduce the hazards caused by fire, pestilence, and disease. Increased research on the use of pesticides is necessary, however, and pest control methods should be thoroughly tested and understood before widespread use.

Our forests, public and private, are capable of providing sustained public benefits—recreation, supplies of forest products, and essential employment. Measures taken in the years to come will assure a continued favorable balance between the growth and cutting of America's forests. We must continue high quality forestry conservation to sustain maximum use of our timber resources without depletion.

FISH AND WILDLIFE

Following enactment of the administration-sponsored Fish and Wildlife Act of 1956, the Fish and Wildlife Service has acquired increased stature. Competent, well trained, career bureau chiefs now direct the efforts of the Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife and Commercial Fisheries. Long-range plans, now being reviewed by national conservation organizations, should be followed to completion under this new management pattern.

These long-range programs will be vigorously implemented if we have control of the new administration. The manner in which we have pursued our past pledges in these fields was demonstrated vividly in Salt Lake City recently when 15 of the leading national conservation organizations bestowed upon the Secretary of the Interior, Fred A. Seaton, a Distinguished Conservation Award. I am informed that Secretary Seaton is the first Cabinet officer ever given such recognition. This action represents, to me, widespread public support of Fred Seaton's actions which have led to the establishment of 23 new national wildlife refuge areas, stopped the diversion of duck stamp funds, and assured that all revenues from duck stamps are earmarked for wildlife habitat acquisition, and brought swift enactment of sweeping amendments to the Fish and Wildlife Coordination Act, which assure consideration of fish and wildlife improvement measures at the planning stage of water resource projects.

Wetland preservation, including the acquisition of key areas by Federal or State Governments, is mandatory.

To meet the critical need for wetland areas, a revolving loan fund should be established to be repaid by future duck stamp collections, and from revenues made available to States for habitat acquisition.

Also, we should seek congressional authorization to secure from private landowners wildlife management easements to provide encouragement to maintain wetlands. Much more could be done through coordinating soil bank activities with conservation and recreation objectives.

Sports fish have suffered similar losses of habitat. Maintenance of minimum conservation pools in reservoirs and minimum streamflows in connection with Federal water projects would increase their chances for survival. Further, we continue to urge recognition by the States of fish, wildlife, and recreation management and conservation as beneficial uses of water. Federal activities in the future must include increased research and means to preserve traditionally important spawning areas.

Primary assistance will be provided State and commercial fish hatcheries through greater emphasis on Federal research programs on fish disease, nutrition, and genetics.

COMMERCIAL FISHERIES

The United States has consistently produced more fish than any other country in the world. Our fishing industry produced a total catch of 5.1 billion pounds of fish in 1959, slightly less than the all-time record catch in 1956 of 5.25 billion pounds. Valued at \$342 million to the fisherman, when processed and delivered, the 1959 catch sold to the consumer for over \$1 billion. Almost 2 million people are directly dependent upon our fishing industry. We are also the world's largest importer of fishery products, the equivalent of over 2.5 billion pounds of fish and shellfish annually. We also export about 40 million pounds of fishery products.

Recent legislation signed by President Eisenhower will provide aid to depressed segments of the fishing industry to rebuild fishing fleets (which our laws require be constructed in the United States). We provide Federal assistance through loans for fishing vessel and gear repair where private loans are not available on a reasonable basis.

Research activities are opening new vistas for the commercial fishing industry. The increasing use of fishery products in medicines may have a substantial effect upon our daily lives. Increased Federal research in oceanography, biology, and the improvement of marketing and production is part of the long-range commercial fisheries program.

Our objective must be to conserve this resource and strengthen our commercial fishing industry. Our export market should be stimulated, perhaps through the establishment of foreign market development programs. And we should investigate the possibility of establishing a link between our fishermen and research workers similar to the Agricultural Extension Service, to aid fishermen in adapting to new methods and techniques. The fishery attaché program, thus far successful in Mexico and Japan, should be extended to other important fishing nations.

Our tariff structure for fishery products, based upon 1930 trade patterns, needs to be studied in relation to present trade patterns, which are substantially different from those existing 30 years ago. During the past 30 years, economic and technological changes have occurred which have altered the effectiveness of established duties. In addition, many imported fishery products with which our domestic industry must compete are produced at lower costs; many countries provide financial assistance in the form of subsidization, loans, and other aids. A study of the current tariff structure should be made to provide for modifications where necessary and to remedy disparities in classification and duties.

MINERALS

Our minerals industries provide this country's basic supplies for national security. Recent speeches of Democrats in the Congress indicate their continued adherence to the philosophy of the Truman administration, which held our minerals and oil and gas deposits would not be "washed or wasted away by neglect" and advocated "saving" them in the ground. The task force on economic opportunity and progress of the Republican committee on program and progress met this assertion head on in its report last year:

"While some of our needs can be met from abroad, national security requires the maximum practical effort to develop and wisely utilize our own resources. This is not simply a matter of having wealth in the ground. Even when some commodities are temporarily in excess supply—as has lately been the case with a number of domestic minerals—management and production organization must be kept at levels that will allow exploration and orderly development to be carried out. This is especially true since

technical change brings about a continuous realignment of the need for particular metals and minerals."

We need to stimulate our mining industries to keep pace with the space age. Depletion allowances are not only a longstanding element in mineral economics; they have demonstrated their value as a reasonable incentive for the development of the Nation's natural mineral resources. They should be maintained at present levels. In a few select instances, such as those of oil, shale, and coal to be used for synthetic liquid fuels, depletion allowances might be increased to encourage development of new minerals industries. In addition, the existing limitation on expensing exploration costs should be removed and replaced with a new limitation of \$100,000 per year per taxpayer without any other restrictions.

The expansion of research activity will promote the increased use of coal and improve the coal industry's competitive position. The Office of Coal Research, established under this administration, will do much, through a crash program for applied research, to help the industry drive forward.

As an effective means to assure full conservation and development of the latent resources of the country, as well as assisting State and local municipalities in their development programs, the Federal program of topographic and geologic mapping should be substantially accelerated.

Our strategic and critical stockpiles should be maintained and their objective constantly reviewed to assure our ability to meet national security requirements. To relieve the uncertainty of domestic mineral producers, stemming from the possibility of disposals from Government stocks of minerals and metals, consideration should be given to delegating to the Secretary of the Interior the authority to control all such disposals, and a means established for consultation with the affected producing industries.

We must increase the effort through international consultation to develop fuller awareness of the world supply and demand balance for mineral raw materials. In this way we could contribute to the increased stability of world minerals prices at satisfactory levels for the health of producing industries in the United States as well as free nations abroad.

Twice in the past 4 years, long-range minerals programs proposed by the administration were rejected by the Congress. We have, however, initiated a new minerals exploration program and increased the ability of small mines to use existing exploration expense deductions; much needs to be done to dovetail this program with the research activities necessary to the maintenance of healthy domestic mineral industries.

SUMMARY

We believe impartial historians will recognize the decade of the fifties as one which sustained conservation and resources development achievements on a scale unmatched in our history. Our objective for the sixties is intensified conservation and management for the better use of each of our resources. We must provide the support and incentives needed to meet the demands of the future. These demands will come from within—from our exploding population, which in its thrust toward higher and higher economic plateaus will call for more and more of the treasures of earth and river and sea. And these demands will come from without; from the presence of an implacable foreign foe and from the need of the free world for an America which, supremely strong in every way unrelentingly increases its strength in every way, year after year after year. As these demands far surpass any which this country has ever known, in meeting them we in our time can proceed toward victories which would have seemed incredible to past generations.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BENNETT. I yield.

Mr. DWORSHAK. The Senator from Utah has made a timely contribution toward clearing the misconception that partisan politics has been responsible for any lag or alleged lag in our water resource development program, especially in the Rocky Mountain area.

I have the privilege of serving on the Appropriations Committee subcommittee which handles the budget for the Bureau of Reclamation in the Interior Department, and also for the civil works program of the Army Engineer Corps. Therefore I am very well acquainted with what has been accomplished during the past 6 or 8 years.

Mr. BENNETT. Is it not also true that the Senator serves on the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs by which many programs for authorizations are considered?

Mr. DWORSHAK. Yes. I appreciate being reminded of that fact because there has been little if any partisanship displayed in the consideration of legislation authorizing these projects in the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

That is a point I wish to emphasize. While there may be some difference of opinion as to the expedition of some of these projects, in the Columbia Basin or in the Colorado River Basin, the record shows conclusively the good progress that has been made during that period.

The majority members of these committees, particularly the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER], who is chairman of the appropriations subcommittee which handles the public works budget, has done exceptionally fine work in trying to coordinate this resource development.

I wish to commend the Senator from Utah for his efforts to dissipate some misunderstanding which may result from the President's message, which obviously had political motivations.

I hope that in the years ahead we shall continue to have the close cooperation and coordination of the Members of Congress from our Western public land States, so that we may continue as rapidly as possible to develop fully the exceptional water and land resources which we possess.

Mr. BENNETT. I share the concern of my good friend, and I appreciate his comments.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, I should like to compliment the Senator from Utah on doing something that has long been overdue, namely, setting the record straight on reclamation starts, hydroelectric starts, flood control, and so forth. I know he speaks from deep interest and experience because of his long interest in the upper Colorado development.

I should like to say to my friend from Utah—to point up some additional arguments as to historic Republican interest in reclamation and hydroelectric development, and so forth—that every structure in Arizona, which had the first dam ever built under the Reclamation Act—and, by the way, we celebrate the

50th anniversary of the Theodore Roosevelt Dam on March 8—carries the name of a Republican President. Every reclamation project in the State of Arizona was built or started during the administration of the Republican Party. Most of the flood control projects fall into the same category.

So I am rather surprised that President Kennedy, whom I have known for many years to be a particularly accurate man, and interested in the accuracy of his statements, should have been beguiled into saying what he said yesterday, which I think was very unfortunate indeed.

FILLING OF VACANCY ON JOINT COMMITTEE ON INTERNAL REVENUE TAXATION

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. Mr. President, chapter 91 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954, covering the organization and membership of the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation, specifies that the joint committee shall be composed of 10 members, 5 of whom are members of the Committee on Finance of the Senate, 3 from the majority, and 2 from the minority party, to be chosen by the Committee on Finance.

A vacancy in the Senate membership was created through the retirement of the Honorable J. Allen Frear, former junior Senator from Delaware. I am pleased to announce that the Committee on Finance today unanimously approved the appointment of the Honorable RUSSELL B. LONG, junior Senator from Louisiana, to fill the existing vacancy.

The other Senate members of the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation are HARRY FLOOD BYRD, of Virginia; ROBERT S. KERR, of Oklahoma; JOHN J. WILLIAMS, of Delaware; and FRANK CARLSON, of Kansas.

THE PEACE CORPS

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, there is a growing interest among the citizens of our Nation to develop and foster the growth of a Peace Corps the purpose of which would be to train our youth for overseas work. This idea, though not a new one, appeals to me for if it is properly administered with the emphasis on selecting young men and women of intelligence and maturity such a program can maintain and promote the respect of our Republic in foreign countries. I say it is not a new idea for in my own State near Phoenix we have the independently financed American Institute for Foreign Trade which has for the past 15 years devoted itself to the post-graduate training of young Americans for careers abroad with U.S. international business firms and Government agencies.

The AIFT was and is the pioneer in this field, for it was here that in 1946 the original concept of a Peace Corps was born. It is still unique in practical training of its students. The Institute has been turning out select graduating classes averaging 250 a year until its alumni of about 3,000 today represents America's best trained and most highly

respected corps of good will ambassadors. This is private industry's own training ground for their corps of junior executives abroad.

Currently there are 1,000 AIFT graduates overseas with business or government in 78 countries. Another 1,000 are located in some domestic facet of international trade; and about another 1,000 are in apprentice training in U.S. companies that will soon promote them into careers with their overseas subsidiaries.

There is no institution of comparable stature in the United States where determined young men may so effectively prepare themselves for a career abroad. There is no like institution to which the major U.S. international business and banking firms—about 500—come so faithfully to recruit their potential junior executives. Actually, it was U.S. corporations which in the beginning helped significantly in the development of a three-part program which has made the AIFT graduate the most cosmopolitan and knowledgeable American anywhere overseas.

The American Institute for Foreign Trade each year accepts 300 pre-screened college graduates who receive intensive training in practical techniques of foreign trade, practical use of foreign languages, and contemporary cultures, attitudes, economics, politics, and psychology of nations abroad. Lectures in foreign trade and area studies are so authoritative and timely that students come to feel that they are living and working in a foreign land created almost to their specifications. Graduates have commented widely that they feel virtually indigenous within a few months after settling down in an overseas locale.

Although the Institute's placement office does not guarantee a job to any graduate, its placement record is unusually high. It is almost 80 percent. In recent years, American Institute has been unable to meet the demands of corporations for AIFT-trained specialists in fields such as engineering, chemistry, and accountancy.

The intellectual climate of the Institute is both vigorous and invigorating. It is not, however, a Valhalla for Phi Beta Kappas.

Its prescreening process departs from the idea of sifting exclusively intelligentsia per se from its applicants. At the Institute prescreening pays sharper need to general intelligence and attitude than to aptitude. Scholastic ability is accepted as a natural prerequisite and so the school authorities are able to focus attention on potential adaptability of applicants to adjust favorably to a foreign environment.

International companies trust the Institute's prescreening process because it produces stable, mature young men who, accepting postgraduate work and spending a substantial amount of money, prove the seriousness of their motivation toward an overseas career.

Wives also play an important role at the American Institute for Foreign Trade. Dr. William L. Schurz, director of area studies, and distinguished Latin American scholar, strongly urges wives

to take a course in world area and language on which their husbands are concentrating. Most of them follow his advice. Many companies have indicated their preference for young men whose wives will be almost as fully preoriented as they. Such women, say they, adjust more quickly and such quick adjustment makes a more effective and a happier employee. On the average, 50 percent of the AIFT student body is married. Wives pay no tuition.

Richard S. Roberts, newly installed 40-year-old vice president of the Institute, who has just returned from a brilliant business executive career spanning 12 years in South America, tells AIFT students he came back to his alma mater—class of 1948—to do whatever he can to assist in training of still more Institute graduates of the kind that are exercising so great an impact upon American business in, and American relation with, the world. Viewing the limited student body of 300, Roberts said he regretted that school facilities cannot take three times as many applicants.

Mr. President, the American Institute for Foreign Trade is a unique world center of learning in foreign trade. In round numbers, and much more literally than figuratively speaking, Phoenix, Ariz., is the world's training center for foreign trade. In all probability, more American-born men who become the business leaders of trade centers around the world in the next few years will have trained specifically for their foreign careers at American Institute for Foreign Trade than in any one other school.

I think that those who propose a peace corps program can do well to study the success of AIFT and be guided accordingly in their thinking and planning.

THE INADEQUACY OF THE AIRLIFT

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, the Washington Post editorial page has highlighted an important step forward taken by this administration, one in which the Senate is most interested, largely through the efforts of one of our Members. One of the earliest actions of the new administration was a move to reduce, in stopgap fashion, the disturbing inadequacy of our airlift. Secretary of Defense McNamara is asking for 53 more military air transport ships for early delivery for the same reason that Congress forced 50 modern transports into a reluctant department's budget last year—to hold together with bailing wire our hopelessly obsolete and inadequate military airlift in case of a brushfire war.

I congratulate the new administration on making some first steps to prepare us for such emergencies, but I want to thank especially the distinguished Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONROE], who has dinned airlift deficiency into our ears and into the newspapers time after time in recent years.

As chairman of a special subcommittee of the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee to investigate MATS and Aviation Subcommittee chairman of the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee, he has dramatized our lag in that committee, on the Senate floor,

in Appropriations Committee meetings, in interviews, and in articles. From 1955 to 1959, he worked to modernize the airlift through a partnership of the military and commercial lines, through contracting MATS business to civil carriers who thus would build up their cargo fleets in peacetime and make them available for defense in the event of an emergency.

Meanwhile the junior Senator from Oklahoma and his subcommittee inspected MATS bases and conferred with aircraft manufacturers, airlines, and others on the availability of a cargo plane suitable for both defense and civilian use. He and the distinguished Senator from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON] jointly wrote to the Secretary of Defense and reported to the Senate on the condition of our MATS fleet.

The Senator from Oklahoma has dreamed of developments in air cargo which would both strengthen the Nation's defense and open a business frontier which would expand the Nation's economy, but when many parts of the industry failed to support his guaranteed loan bill for air cargo, he turned to the Appropriations Committee to strengthen military airlift through modernizing equipment. Last year, Congress went beyond the President's budget recommendations in approving not only 50 new turboprop cargo planes for MATS but also funds for the development of a dual-purpose long-range plane configured for cargo. I am sure the Senator from Oklahoma would agree with the Washington Post that funds spent for stopgap improvements must not be allowed to dilute or delay this critical development work.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have the Post editorial printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

[From the Washington Post, Feb. 5, 1961]

MAKING DO

Defense Secretary McNamara's decision to order 53 more military air transport ships was wisely calculated, but it is a stopgap solution for a critical deficiency in airlift. The difficulty is that aircraft available for early delivery are far from ideally suited for long range strategic transport of men and material to the world's likely trouble spots.

The 30 Boeing C-135 jet transports to be delivered starting in June will give the Army its first jet troop carriers. These will be a useful addition to the mostly outmoded piston-engine fleet now available. But these jets will need long runways, which may not always be available. The 23 Lockheed turboprop planes also ordered will be in addition to 50 of these craft already on order with funds which Congress pressed on the administration last year. In various respects, these ships, too, fall short of modern airlift requirements, but they will be an improvement and they are available now.

The old administration ran the gamble that it might be possible to get by with minimum modernization of the present inadequate air transport fleet until the kind of ship that is really required is available. Funds for development were provided last year, and the civil and military authorities have recently launched a vigorous program aimed at providing a dual-purpose ship tailored to military needs. Above all, this program must go forward at maximum speed,

and funds spent on stopgap improvements in the fleet must not be allowed to dilute or delay this critical development work.

In the light of the grim prospect that two of more brushfire wars could break out in widely separated parts of the world simultaneously, the United States must get itself as near ready for such a contingency as it can. The McNamara order is designed to do this. We hope Congress will back it up with the required money while not losing sight of the need for a new departure in military airlift at the earliest practicable date.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Florida yield?

Mr. SMATHERS. I yield.

Mr. GOLDWATER. I, too, should like to compliment the new administration on having taken this step to increase and perfect our airlift capabilities. It has become more and more evident that we must have such capability in small or peripheral wars. In my opinion, we have not had this capability developed to the extent that it should have been developed. Although we have been fortunate in not having been engaged in any of those wars, that does not mean that we might not become engaged in one tomorrow.

As the Senator from Florida well knows, the last figures which were available on this matter showed our military airlift to be about 20 percent deficient on any D-day plus, probably, 1 or 2 days. I believe that condition has been alleviated to some extent.

However, I was happy to see that one of the first things to be done under the Kennedy administration was to increase the airlift. This will not only help us in time of war but will give the aircraft industry hope that there will be continued interest in the development of new craft. We need this development in the civilian fleet just as badly as we need it in the military fleet.

I thank not only the Kennedy administration for this interest—the Senator from Florida will realize that there will probably be more times when I will not thank the Kennedy administration—but I also thank the Senator from Florida for calling the information to our attention.

I join, too, in commending the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONROE] for his constant and dedicated interest in this matter.

Mr. SMATHERS. I thank the able Senator from Arizona. I am certain that the junior Senator from Oklahoma will deeply appreciate the Senator's commendation. The able Senator from Arizona is himself a splendid, experienced pilot—I think he is now a general in the Air Corps Reserve—and not only knows about this need from his own personal knowledge as a flier, but has given the subject much thought in connection with our Nation's defenses. I appreciate what he has said.

PRESIDENT'S MESSAGE ON NATURAL RESOURCES

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, before the Senate concludes its business for the day, and while the Senator from Arizona is in the Chamber, I should like to say that I have been interested, while sitting here for 4 hours today, in listen-

ing to the speeches which have been made with respect to the President's message on conservation. Two such speeches were made earlier today, one by the able junior Senator from California [Mr. ENGLE], and the other made by the distinguished Senator from Nevada or possibly the distinguished junior Senator from Utah, both highly commending the President's message on conservation.

Subsequent to those speeches, the distinguished senior Senator from Utah [Mr. BENNETT], made a speech in the nature of a criticism of the President's message on conservation.

We who come from east of the Mississippi River do not follow this subject with the same thoroughness with which Senators who come from west of the Mississippi ordinarily follow it. However, if I remember correctly, in the past 4 years the Senate has received several conservation messages and programs, which were actually approved by the Senate and the House of Representatives.

In each instance—if my recollection does not fail me, and now my memory is being refreshed from the RECORD—those public work bills were vetoed. On August 10, 1956, the bill was vetoed by the then President of the United States. On April 15, 1958, there was another veto of such a bill. The third one occurred in 1959, when the bill was vetoed by the President, although finally the veto was overridden—here in the Senate, by a vote of 72 to 23.

I merely say that I have not read the message of the present President of the United States with respect to the conservation program, except as it has been reported in the press. But from what I have read about it in the press, it seems to me, at least, that President Kennedy's position is a consistent one. In 1956 and in 1958 he voted for these programs, and he did so again in 1959. In 1959, he not only voted for that bill as it was passed by the Senate, but he also voted, subsequently, to override the veto.

So now he comes along with a program which, as I gather from reading the press, rather well expresses his belief that the country must go forward with the development of conservation programs, reclamation programs, flood control programs, and similar programs.

It seems to me that the record rather eloquently evidences that the previous occupant of the White House was not so much in favor of those programs as was demonstrated by his three specific vetoes.

So I do not know what all the argument is about, except that it appears to me that in what President Kennedy is recommending and urging on the Congress, he is being consistent.

Of course, a little later, as these matters are developed before the Committee on Public Works, and then come to us, we shall have an opportunity to cast our individual votes and to make our own personal expressions.

I am confident that this administration will pursue with vigor the recommendations it has made; and I cannot

help feeling that those who believe that we need programs of conservation, reclamation, flood control, and similar programs will be—as I am—generally encouraged by the message sent to Congress by President Kennedy.

Mr. President, in that connection I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Kennedy On Natural Resources," which was published today in the New York Times.

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

KENNEDY ON NATURAL RESOURCES

The bright promise of leadership exercised by President John F. Kennedy has been taking shape in the brief month since he was inaugurated; and few things he has said or done during these crowded weeks have more clearly revealed his breadth of vision in dealing with a major national policy question than his message to Congress yesterday on the coming crisis in the conservation and development of America's natural resources.

What he said about each of the separate resource problems was very much to the point, but the fact that the President grouped them in a coherent whole is what gave especial distinction to his treatment of this subject. His message showed him to be aware of the intolerable conflicts, duplications and rivalries that have for many years plagued the Federal Government's natural resource activities—he even listed some (but by no means all) of these conflicts—and he raises the hope that consistent policies based on the national welfare and not on specific vested interests will be established in these fields.

The most serious criticism we have of the broad policy statements in his message is that he led up to, but did not follow through with, a proposal that the natural resource functions of the Federal Government be grouped in one department, where they belong, instead of being scattered in innumerable separate little empires. But he did propose some executive and budgetary steps that should help to relieve if not cure this fundamental difficulty. A major reorganization in this area is an inescapable necessity. Meanwhile, the innovations he proposes in respect to coordinated direction, expert advice, scientific research, and budgetary controls all make sense.

If the President is inclined to be more enthusiastic than some of us are about big hydroelectric dam and giant flood control projects, he also laid welcome stress on less dramatic aspects of water control, such as flood-plain zoning and small watershed development.

His forest policy recognizes the serious danger of timber shortages despite optimistic statistics that have been put forth in recent years suggesting that all's well with our forest situation. The President's comments on "a program of balanced usage" for the public domain are sound; and we warmly welcome his endorsement of the pending wilderness-protection bill and of proposed new park areas. These recommendations will, we hope, be followed up by speedy action in a Congress moving under the leadership that Mr. Kennedy seems intent on giving it.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Florida yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. FELL in the chair). Does the Senator from Florida yield to the Senator from Arizona?

Mr. SMATHERS. I am happy to yield to my friend, the Senator from Arizona.

Mr. GOLDWATER. I think the Senator from Florida will find, if he examines the speeches made, today, in taking the President to task for his message of yesterday, that what irked the Republicans was not so much what he said, but what he openly inferred. He said flatly—although I do not know whether I now use his exact words—that President Eisenhower's lack of interest in this area had endangered lives and property.

Mr. President, I may suggest that if we wished to be equally political in connection with the presentation of a message, we might say that the last three Democratic Presidents endangered the lives and the property of the entire Nation, by not having had the country ready for war.

The Senator from Florida has referred to the vetoing of the famous "pork barrel" bills during the last several Congresses. I believe he will also recognize that the President stated that those bills contained provisions with which he would go along, but that the amounts called for were exceedingly large. Although I come from the West, I went along with the veto, although it meant the stopping of several flood-control projects in my own State. We in the West have never been particularly political in regard to the development of natural resources.

In fact, I think the Senator from Florida recognizes that probably there is no more harmonious committee on the Hill than the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. As a matter of fact, we might properly call it the old school tie committee, because all of those who serve on it are from the West and are familiar with these problems. However, despite our great interest in these problems and programs, we have not maintained that the Democrats have been derelict in the performance of their duties or that we have been outstanding in the performance of ours.

I may say the Republican administration has been more active in the field of the development of hydroelectric power programs and reclamation programs than were the Democrats, in their time.

Earlier I stated that every reclamation project developed in my State bears the name of a Republican President.

I do not think the recent message from the White House would have caused any particular feeling on our part if President Kennedy had not—in, I believe, one of his few moments of carelessness—insinuated that President Eisenhower should be charged with taking action which endangered lives and property, whereas actually there has been great activity in these fields; and, in fact, there would have been more if the Democratic-controlled Congress had not insisted on sending to the White House a bill which any American citizen must admit was stuffed full with a great many projects, on many of which feasibility studies had not even been made.

So I think the President was correct in vetoing those measures time and time again.

We merely wished to get the record straight and to encourage the President

to be a little more careful, hereafter, in his choice of language.

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, I appreciate the suggestions the Senator from Arizona has made.

I only point out that the pork barrel bill—as he and President Kennedy now call it, and say that any reasonable and sensible person would have recognized it to be such—was vetoed, and that both of them voted in favor of overriding President Eisenhower's veto of that bill; both of them were on the majority side in the Senate, when the vote on that question was 72 to 23. In fact, neither in the Senate nor in the House do those who voted to override that veto like to have it said that they were reckless when they voted to override it.

So I cannot help but think that those Members, who were elected to the House and to the Senate by their own constituents, and who have been reelected, have some judgment. Last year it was their judgment that the bill President Eisenhower vetoed should not have been vetoed, and thus they voted to override the veto.

It is obvious that if there continue to be vetoes of conservation and reclamation bills, it will be impossible to obtain appropriations for new projects and programs of that sort, and to have new programs approved, and there will not be as many new starts as we would like to have, or not as many as would have been begun if those bills had not been vetoed.

I do not propose to engage with my friend, the Senator from Arizona, in a debate as to who is right and who is wrong. Obviously, the existence of such a difference of opinion is the reason why there is a center aisle in this Chamber, dividing the two groups of seats of Senators. As between the two groups, there is supposed to be a difference of opinion and views, in regard to how such programs should be handled and run.

So far as concerns the language which was used by President Kennedy, perhaps in this particular area my friends on the other side of the aisle are a little sensitive about it.

Frankly, I do not believe that President Kennedy would try to say that, by virtue of this situation, there was a direct causation as regards the loss of lives.

All of us know that in the absence of flood control projects, lives can be lost. Yet all of us realize that the Government cannot build great numbers of such projects throughout the country at any one time; obviously, it is necessary for other matters, including the budget, to be considered.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Florida yield again to me?

Mr. SMATHERS. I am happy to yield.

Mr. GOLDWATER. That is precisely why President Eisenhower vetoed those bills—because they were so crammed full of projects which had not been studied as regards their feasibility—so much so that we could not tell whether they were needed, or were not needed.

The Senator from Florida has alluded to the fact that the Senate finally voted

to override President Eisenhower's veto. I may say that our judgment takes rather queer quirks in election years. Last year was an election year; and although I do not say my colleagues were influenced at all by the possibility of influencing a vote here or there by voting in favor of such a measure, nevertheless, on the two previous occasions when the bill was vetoed, they voted to sustain the veto; but last year—an election year—the veto was overridden, and the bill became law.

It will be interesting to see how many of the projects provided for in last year's bill will actually get underway.

I think the Senator from Florida will agree with me—and I say frankly that I do not know how he voted on the bill, last year; after all, that is his business—that it is not wise to authorize projects if we have no idea what they will cost.

Mr. SMATHERS. I would completely agree with the Senator from Arizona; and I would say the record shows that I voted to override the President's veto, whereas the able Senator from Arizona voted to sustain the President's veto; he was one of the 23 Senators who took that position.

Of course I am confident that he is satisfied that the judgment of all 23 of those Senators was the proper one, whereas I cannot help but feel that the judgment of the 72 Senators who voted in favor of overriding the veto was the proper one.

I believe that as a result of the election of a Democratic President, we are now going to have an expression of Democratic philosophy—which is, as I understand it, the philosophy of going forward, whenever feasible, in the development of any possible hydroelectric, reclamation, and flood control programs, in the belief that such programs protect the entire Nation and its property and its people.

I do not believe that the Republicans make such a claim. Perhaps they do. Maybe the Senator can tell me this; I did not know. I thought that, naturally, the Senator's position was, on the Republican side, that he did not advocate reclamation projects of the caliber and with the frequency, and so on, that we on the Democratic side did.

Mr. GOLDWATER. The record, I might say, will bear out the fact that Republicans not only have, but that there have been more reclamation starts under Republican administrations, to my understanding, than under Democratic administrations.

I may say I am happy to hear from my good friend from Florida that the Kennedy administration is going to carry on the philosophy of the Eisenhower administration in the development of our natural resources. We all want to see this done. I think the only place we will differ is in the field of public power, where we Republicans—and many Democrats, I may say, also—feel that where a private company is willing to spend millions of dollars in order to construct a large dam for hydroelectric purposes, there is no need for the Federal Government to get in the act.

I think we are finding ourselves to be pretty much in harmony.

The Senator from Florida has told me we are going to continue, as we did under the Eisenhower administration, toward full development. I told the Senator the only trouble with the Kennedy program is in being concerned with the lives and property which it is implied were endangered under the Eisenhower administration.

Mr. SMATHERS. I am sure my friend does not wish me to let stand uncontested the statement that we intend to carry on with the program of reclamation projects and natural resources programs carried on under the previous administration. I tried to point out that, to the best of my recollection, there were three vetoes of these types of bills by President Eisenhower, and the last veto in 1959, was overridden. The other two vetoes were not overridden.

So it is rather evident, from that fact, that we are not going to continue the policy of having those types of bills vetoed; so, obviously, we are not going to follow President Eisenhower's lead on that.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SMATHERS. I am happy to yield.

Mr. GOLDWATER. The Senator from Florida is talking about two different things, because the projects authorized and constructed under the so-called "pork barrel" bill, or the rivers and harbors bill, are construction projects that, in the main, come under the Corps of Engineers of the U.S. Army. What the Senator is also talking about, when he talks about new starts, is programs that come under the Bureau of Reclamation of the Department of the Interior. In this area, which is of real advantage to the people, and is needed in the West badly, the Republicans have a long and very successful and honorable history in reclamation and irrigation. Theodore Roosevelt was the father of the Reclamation Act in this country. Fifty years ago next March 18 we shall celebrate the opening of the Theodore Roosevelt Dam.

The Senator from Florida has tried to mix together flood control, navigation control, and other works, which, while very desirable in many parts of the country, are not comparable to what was contained in the intent of the message.

Mr. SMATHERS. I thank the Senator. I do not know that we could ever settle this discussion.

I stated at the outset, and I repeat in closing, that it was interesting to sit here today and hear the two commendatory speeches, and then the two critical speeches coming from my Republican friends.

As I said, I have not followed this particular subject with the close scrutiny with which I would like to have followed it, and with which I ordinarily do in subjects that more particularly pertain to my area and State; but I remember very well we had three reclamation bills—or perhaps I should not say reclamation bills, but public works bills—coming out of the Public Works Committee. The bill in 1956 was vetoed. The 1958 bill was vetoed. In 1959 the bill was vetoed. So we did not have anything getting

started or constructed by virtue of those particular programs.

There may have been other projects going along all the time, obviously, and for that we are grateful. Nevertheless, I am satisfied that, under President Kennedy, we are going to see more starts than we have seen previously. I am satisfied that in the area of reclamation we are going to see more activity and action than previously. It remains to be seen, but I earnestly hope and predict it.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL TUESDAY, FEBRUARY 28, 1961

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, if there is no further business to come before the Senate, in accordance with the order entered last Wednesday, I move that the Senate stand adjourned until 12 o'clock on Tuesday next.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 15 minutes p.m.), under the order of Wednesday, February 22, 1961, the Senate adjourned until Tuesday, February 28, 1961, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate February 24, 1961:

NORTH ATLANTIC TREATY ORGANIZATION

Thomas K. Finletter, of New York, to be the U.S. Permanent Representative on the Council of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, with the rank and status of Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary.

The following-named persons to the positions indicated:

RURAL ELECTRIFICATION ADMINISTRATION

Norman M. Clapp, of Wisconsin, to be Administrator of the Rural Electrification Administration for a term of 10 years.

COMMISSIONER OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Walter N. Tobriner, of the District of Columbia, to be a Commissioner of the District of Columbia for a term of 3 years, and until his successor is appointed and qualified.

U.S. ATTORNEY

Joseph D. Tydings, of Maryland, to be U.S. attorney for the district of Maryland for a term of 4 years, vice Leon H. A. Pierson.

IN THE NAVY

Having designated, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, section 5231, Rear Adm. Charles B. Martell, U.S. Navy, for commands and other duties determined by the President to be within the contemplation of said section, I nominate him for appointment to the grade of vice admiral while so serving.

OFFICE OF CIVIL AND DEFENSE MOBILIZATION

Frank Burton Ellis, of Louisiana, to be Director of the Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate February 24, 1961:

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

Robert E. Giles, of North Carolina, to be General Counsel of the Department of Commerce.

FEDERAL AVIATION AGENCY

Najeeb E. Halaby, of California, to be Administrator of the Federal Aviation Agency.

DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE AMBASSADORS

Bernard Gufler, of Washington, a Foreign Service officer of the class of career minister, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Finland.

Douglas MacArthur 2d, of the District of Columbia, a Foreign Service officer of the class of career minister, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Belgium.

Raymond A. Hare, of West Virginia, a Foreign Service officer of the class of career ambassador, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Turkey.

COAST AND GEODETIC SURVEY

Subject to qualifications provided by law, the following for permanent appointments to the grades indicated in the Coast and Geodetic Survey:

To be lieutenant (junior grade)

Harold E. McCall

To be ensigns

Donald B. Beach	Dee E. Kimbell
Richard B. Fallgren	David L. Osler
David A. Field	Charles K. Paul
Donald J. Florwick	Frederick W. Pierce
Gerald Fussell	John D. Reagan
Ronald K. Hanson	Nell H. Woodley

U.S. COAST GUARD

The following-named persons to the rank indicated in the U.S. Coast Guard:

To be captains

Douglas B. Henderson	Harold Land
Robert Wilcox	Mark A. Whalen
Chester R. Bender	William F. Cass
Richard R. Smith	Roger M. Dudley
Samuel G. Guill	Albert F. Wayne
Paul E. Trimble	Chester I. Steele
Russell R. Waesche	Clarence H. Waring, Jr.
Joseph P. Martin	Paul E. G. Prins
George W. Playdon	Edward P. Chester, Jr.
Thomas F. Epley	Larry L. Davis
Julius E. Richey	Roderick Y. Edwards
Frederick J. Statts	Arthur Pfeiffer
Alexander G. Moberg	John F. Kettler
James S. Muzzy	Benjamin F. Engel
Raymond W. Blouin	Robert Waldron
Kenneth W. Donnell	George T. Murati
Fred F. Nichols	James W. Williams
Theodore F. Knoll	William T. Corfield
Myron W. Caskey	Russell O. Foster
Forrest A. Tinsler	Charles L. Turner
Wayne L. Goff	James F. Phair
Ronald M. Freeman	Robert A. Copeland
Joseph A. Ciccolella	Clinton J. Maguire
Howard W. Schleiter	Roger B. Clark
Clarence N. Daniel	George W. Walker
Joseph W. Naab, Jr.	Frank D. Hilditch
Corliss B. Lambert	
Randolph Ridgely III	

To be commanders

Raymond W. Siegel	George J. Bodie
Harry A. Solberg	Emerson Hayes, Jr.
Robert O. Bracken	John W. McCurdy
John W. Hume	Warren F. Stevenson
Jack E. Forrester	Peter E. Gibney
Lewis R. Davison	Joseph R. Steele
John H. Hawley	Mitchell A. Perry
Carol L. Mason	Garth H. Read
Charles E. MacDowell	William E. Dennis
Elmer P. Mathison	Robert J. Lo Forte
Warren C. Mitchell	Owen W. Siler
Henry A. Campbell, Jr.	Robert B. Moore
Harold F. Lynch	Wallace C. Dahlgren
Armand J. Bush	Arthur Hancock
Lester A. Levine	Richard A. Pasciuti
John J. O'Meara	William S. Allan, Jr.
Glenn O. Thompson	Harry H. Carter
Eugene F. Walsh	Bernard E. Kolkhorst
Samuel E. Taylor	

To be lieutenant commanders

Douglas H. Clifton	David C. Porter
Allen C. Pearce	Abe H. Siemens

James H. B. Morton
Robert R. Hagan, Jr.
David D. Fritts
Oliver W. Harrison
Herbert J. Lynch
Leslie M. Greig
Christopher S. Chan-

garis
Casimir S. Rojeski
James R. Iversen
Philip M. Hildebrandt
Norman L. Scherer
Charles W. Berkman
Paul W. Welker
Loren V. Perry
Elmer Winbeck
Theodore L. Roberge
Nathan Vanger
Charles B. Martinson, Jr.

Leland O. Wilkie
John G. Milosic
Orville C. Hinnen
Olaf T. Sturdy
Harry S. Raleigh
Leo J. A. King
Thomas C. Pennock
Hugh E. McCullough
Hugh J. LeBlanc
Thurston L. Willis
David T. Haislip
Stanley L. Waitzfelder
Harold D. Muth
Jack E. Stewart
James C. Boteler
Richard L. Huxtable
Norman P. Welner
Rubin E. Young, Jr.
Fred J. Michelson
Richard C. Green
Wesley J. Quamme
William C. Akers
Donald D. Davison

Ivan C. McLean
Edward G. Taylor
Franklin F. Bohlk
John W. Cherry
Vincent J. Wernig
Franklin J. Miller
James G. Norman
Russell W. Lentner
Harold A. French
William H. Yates
Sam Pisciocchio
Robert D. Parkhurst
Otto F. Unsinn
Walter O. Henry
Verne D. Finks
William L. Aitkenhead
Charles F. Baker
James P. Stewart
James H. Swint
Shirl J. Stephany
Leslie D. High
Patrick G. H. Bursley
Frank E. Parker
Leland C. Batdorf
William F. Tighe, Jr.
Roy K. Angell
Robert C. Krulish
William J. Kirkley
Edward E. Chambers
Robert W. Johnson
Charles S. Marple
Wildred F. Raes
Albert H. Clough
Randolph Ross, Jr.
Robert W. Smith
David E. Perkins
Robertson P. Dinsmore
Alfred J. Tatman
George N. Wood
Albertus N. Schroeder, Jr.

To be lieutenants

William D. Harvey	Frank M. Sperry
John D. Franks	Cletus J. Walz
Bertrand J. Ronneberg	Robert F. Ewels
Kermit R. Meade	Edmond Janczyk
Paul A. Yost, Jr.	Peter J. DeLaat, Jr.
Henry H. Bell	Robert C. Branham
Philip C. Lutzi	Raymond H. Baetsen, Jr.
Richard F. Malm	Robert S. Lucas
Lambert J. Larson	Robert A. Carlston
Cortland G. Pohle, Jr.	John F. Lobkovich
John L. Klenk	David J. Linde
Earl A. Baker	Bruce W. Dewing
Swain L. Wilson	Robert B. Sims
Phillip B. Moberg	Gilbert P. Sherburne
Lawrence A. White	William J. Glass
Wilfred R. Bleakly, Jr.	Herbert W. Eley
John S. Phillips	John D. Castello
James P. Randle	Richard B. Brooks
John H. Fournier	Donald C. Thompson
Richard O. Haughey	James R. Kelly
Richard L. Jacobs	William S. Black
Louis L. Zumstein	Peter A. Morrill
Alfred P. Manning, Jr.	Clarence R. Gillett
George J. Roy, Jr.	Charles E. Jurgens
Robert W. Witter	Robert T. Platt, Jr.
John G. Martinez	John H. Byrd, Jr.
Ted L. Gannaway	Kenneth G. Wiman
Robert A. Moss	John D. Steinbacher
Richard M. Thomas	David F. McIntosh, Jr.
Daniel L. Muir	Glenn N. Parsons
Graham Hall	Robert V. Hackney
John L. Steinmetz, Jr.	Gerald O. Lesperance
Joseph P. Hratko	Robert G. Moore
Charles E. Martin	Melvin W. Hallock
Hugh C. Wyatt	William H. Clark, Jr.
Robert C. Powell	Carlton E. Russell
George E. Maloney	Leon D. Santman
Richard J. Knapp	Herbert G. Lyons
Robert Russell	Willie W. Thurmond, Jr.
Frederick P. Schubert	John F. Ellis
Robert B. Grant	Robert D. Peters
Norman S. Morrill	Warren D. Andrews
Byron W. Jordan	Alfred H. Walter
David M. Kaetzel	Edwin H. Daniels
Myron E. Welsh	Keith B. Schumacher

Ralph C. Hill
Charles E. Maithieu
Glenn F. Young
James E. Grabb
Edward C. Farmer, Jr.
Albert G. Stirling
Ernest E. Rowland, Jr.
David H. Howland
William D. Markle, Jr.
Donald C. Hintze
Bernard A. Hoyland
William E. Lehr, Jr.
Graeme Mann
Joseph M. Kelly
Hal F. Olson
Roger L. Madson
James A. Kearney
Walter W. Kohl, Jr.
James C. Irwin
Walter D. Fox
Harris A. Pledger, Jr.
William L. King
Donald D. Garnett
Vaughan W. Driggers
Jerome V. Flanagan

To be Lieutenants (junior grade)

Robert Farmer
Richard H. Wight
Martin H. Daniell, Jr.
Edwin L. Rahn
James Napier, Jr.
Hugh M. McCreery
John B. Mahon
Bobby C. Wilks

Thomas V. Volkie
Ronald D. Stenzel
Delmar F. Smith
Calvin P. Langford
Alvin J. Arnett
Harry J. Reckitt
James E. Hognestad
Horton E. Gafford

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

Herbert Frank York, of California, to be Director of Defense Research and Engineering.

DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY

Stephen Alles, of Maryland, to be Under Secretary of the Army.

EXPORT-IMPORT BANK

Harold Francis Linder, of New York, to be President of the Export-Import Bank of Washington, vice Samuel C. Waugh.

ATOMIC ENERGY COMMISSION

Glenn T. Seaborg, of California, to be a member of the Atomic Energy Commission for the remainder of the term expiring June 30, 1963.

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE

James M. Quigley, of Pennsylvania, to be an Assistant Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

John P. Duncan, Jr., of Georgia, to be an Assistant Secretary of Agriculture.

Frank J. Welch, of Kentucky, to be an Assistant Secretary of Agriculture.

U.S. ARMY

1. The following-named officer to be placed on the retired list in the grade indicated under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, section 3962:

To be general

Gen. Isaac Davis White, **XXXXXX**, Army of the United States (major general, U.S. Army).

2. The following-named officers under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, section 3066, to be assigned to positions of importance and responsibility designated by the President under subsection (a) of section 3066, in rank as follows:

Lt. Gen. James Francis Collins, **XXXXXX**, Army of the United States (major general, U.S. Army), in the rank of general.

Maj. Gen. Russell Lowell Vittrup, **XXXXXX**, U.S. Army, in the rank of lieutenant general.

The Army National Guard of the United States officers named herein for promotion as Reserve commissioned officers of the

Army, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, section 3385:

To be major generals

Brig. Gen. Charles Harvey Browne, Jr., **XXXXXX**.

Brig. Gen. Frederick Alvin Daugherty, **XXXXXX**.

Brig. Gen. Charles Adam Ott, Jr., **XXXXXX**.

Brig. Gen. Herbert Alfred Smith, **XXXXXX**.

Brig. Gen. Collin P. Williams, **XXXXXX**.

To be brigadier generals

Col. Arthur Disbrow Bertolett, **XXXXXX**, artillery.

Col. Thomas Sams Bishop, **XXXXXX**, Adjutant General's Corps.

Col. William Robards Buster, **XXXXXX**, artillery.

Col. Lincoln Maupin Cummings, **XXXXXX**, artillery.

Col. Chester Clarence Dawson, **XXXXXX**, armor.

Col. Angus Ellington Irely, **XXXXXX**, artillery.

Col. Ivan Edward Jackson, **XXXXXX**, artillery.

Col. Joseph Nicholas Langan, **XXXXXX**, infantry.

Col. Robert Francis Murphy, **XXXXXX**, artillery.

Col. Ralph Sheldon Phelps, **XXXXXX**, infantry.

Col. Francis Frederick Schweinler, **XXXXXX**, infantry.

Col. Cecil Lee Simmons, **XXXXXX**, infantry.

Col. Archibald Alexander Sproul, **XXXXXX**, infantry.

Col. Herbert Alpress Vernet, Jr., **XXXXXX**, infantry.

The U.S. Army Reserve officers named herein for promotion as Reserve commissioned officers of the Army, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, section 3384:

To be major generals

Brig. Gen. Francis Halsey Boland, Jr., **XXXXXX**.

Brig. Gen. Louis Dalhoff Burkhalter, Jr., **XXXXXX**.

Brig. Gen. Michael Joseph Galvin, **XXXXXX**.

Brig. Gen. Harold Friend Harding, **XXXXXX**.

Brig. Gen. William James Sutton, **XXXXXX**.

To be brigadier generals

Col. John George Cassidy, **XXXXXX**, infantry.

Col. Stanley Warren Connelly, **XXXXXX**, Ordnance Corps.

Col. Ian MacLeod Davidson, **XXXXXX**, Corps of Engineers.

Col. Therman Mc. Davis, **XXXXXX**, artillery.

Col. Sheldon Douglas Elliott, **XXXXXX**, Judge Advocate General's Corps.

Col. Robert Morse Ewing, **XXXXXX**, artillery.

Col. James Deming Hewett, **XXXXXX**, infantry.

Col. Harrie Stanley Keck, **XXXXXX**, infantry.

Col. Robert Paul Schulz, **XXXXXX**, artillery.

Col. Clifford Max Simmang, **XXXXXX**, artillery.

Col. Willard Webb, **XXXXXX**, armor.

The following-named officers for temporary appointment in the Army of the United States, to the grades indicated, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, sections 3442 and 3447:

To be major generals

Brig. Gen. Dwight Benjamin Johnson, **XXXXXX**, U.S. Army.

Brig. Gen. Frederick Robert Zierath, **XXXXXX**, Army of the United States (colonel U.S. Army).

Brig. Gen. William Jonas Ely, **XXXXXX**, U.S. Army.

Brig. Gen. Frank Hamilton Britton, **XXXXXX**, U.S. Army.

Brig. Gen. George Thigpen Duncan, **XXXXXX**, U.S. Army.

Brig. Gen. Joseph Hamilton McNinch, **XXXXXX**, Medical Corps, U.S. Army.

Brig. Gen. Robert Augur Hewitt, **XXXXXX**, U.S. Army.

Brig. Gen. Ray Joseph Laux, **XXXXXX**, U.S. Army.

Brig. Gen. John Lathrop Throckmorton, **XXXXXX**, Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Brig. Gen. Curtis James Herrick, **XXXXXX**, U.S. Army.

Brig. Gen. Lawrence Joseph Lincoln, **XXXXXX**, Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Brig. Gen. Theodore John Conway, **XXXXXX**, Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Brig. Gen. David Warren Gray, **XXXXXX**, Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Brig. Gen. Charles Henry Chase, **XXXXXX**, Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Brig. Gen. Thomas Ralph Yancey, **XXXXXX**, Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Brig. Gen. William Beehler Bunker, **XXXXXX**, Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Brig. Gen. John Gardner Shinkle, **XXXXXX**, Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Brig. Gen. James Hilliard Polk, **XXXXXX**, Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

To be brigadier generals

Col. Jackson Graham, **XXXXXX**, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U.S. Army).

Col. James Michael Illig, **XXXXXX**, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U.S. Army).

Col. Robert Rigby Glass, **XXXXXX**, U.S. Army.

Col. William Andrew Enemark, **XXXXXX**, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U.S. Army).

Col. James Edward Landrum, Jr., **XXXXXX**, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U.S. Army).

Col. William Roberts Calhoun, **XXXXXX**, U.S. Army.

Col. Howard William Doan, **XXXXXX**, Medical Corps, U.S. Army.

Col. Alan Beresford Todd, **XXXXXX**, Judge Advocate General's Corps, U.S. Army.

Col. Albert Ollie Connor, **XXXXXX**, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U.S. Army).

Col. Patrick Howard Devine, **XXXXXX**, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U.S. Army).

Col. William Bradford Rosson, **XXXXXX**, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U.S. Army).

Col. Robert Edward Peters, **XXXXXX**, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U.S. Army).

Col. Eugene Albert Salet, **XXXXXX**, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U.S. Army).

Col. Welborn Griffin Dolvin, **XXXXXX**, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U.S. Army).

Col. Kermit LeVelle Davis, **XXXXXX**, U.S. Army.

Col. James Howard Skeldon, **XXXXXX**, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U.S. Army).

Col. Robert George Fergusson, **XXXXXX**, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U.S. Army).

Col. John Edward Kelly, **XXXXXX**, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U.S. Army).

Col. Henry Kreitzer Benson, Jr., [XXXXXX], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U.S. Army).

Col. John Jarvis Tolson 3d, [XXXXXX], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U.S. Army).

Col. Richard Giles Stilwell, [XXXXXX], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U.S. Army).

Col. John Henry Chiles, [XXXXXX], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U.S. Army).

Col. Robert Francis Seedlock, [XXXXXX], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U.S. Army).

Col. Henry Mershon Spengler, [XXXXXX], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U.S. Army).

Colonel Travis Tabor Brown, [XXXXXX], U.S. Army.

Col. Charles Albert Symroski, [XXXXXX], U.S. Army.

Col. Milburn Nell Huston, [XXXXXX], U.S. Army.

Col. Horace Greeley Davison, [XXXXXX], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U.S. Army).

Col. Walter Thomas Kerwin, Jr., [XXXXXX], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U.S. Army).

Col. Hughes Lanier Ash, [XXXXXX], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U.S. Army).

Col. James Martin Worthington, [XXXXXX], U.S. Army.

Col. Ferdinand Joseph Chesarek, [XXXXXX], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U.S. Army).

Col. Edward Chrysostom David Scherrer, [XXXXXX], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U.S. Army).

Col. Charles Frederick Mudgett, Jr., [XXXXXX], U.S. Army.

Col. John Allen Beall, Jr., [XXXXXX], U.S. Army.

Col. William Pelham Yarborough, [XXXXXX], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U.S. Army).

Col. William Charles Haneke, [XXXXXX], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U.S. Army).

The nominations beginning Creighton W. Abrams, Jr., to be colonel, and ending Alfred W. Zerries, to be second lieutenant, which nominations were received by the Senate on February 6, 1961.

U.S. AIR FORCE

The nominations beginning George W. S. Abbey, to be captain, and ending Sally A. Souder, to be first lieutenant, which nominations were received by the Senate on January 31, 1961; and

The nominations beginning Paul R. Hanson, to be captain, and ending Orey L. Lake, to be second lieutenant, which nominations were received by the State on February 16, 1961.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

The 9999th Air Reserve Squadron

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. BARRY GOLDWATER

OF ARIZONA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, February 24, 1961

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, the 9999th Air Reserve Squadron has been formed on Capitol Hill for the benefit of Reserve officers of the Air Force. It meets regularly in room 1224 in the New Senate Office Building. Its formation will enable Air Force Reserve officers to earn points for retirement and promotion purposes.

So that other Members of Congress who are members of the Air Force Reserve may know of the formation of this unit, as well as staff members who may be members of the Air Force Reserve, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a statement I have prepared relative to this squadron.

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

STATEMENT BY HON. BARRY GOLDWATER, OF ARIZONA

The 9999th Air Reserve Squadron had its first training meeting in the auditorium of the New Senate Office Building on January 17, 1961.

I have the honor to be the commander of the 9999th Air Reserve Squadron which meets each Tuesday at 0800 in room 1224, New Senate Office Building. Members of Congress and staff members of congressional committees and individual Congressmen are eligible to join the squadron. Training here does not remove the reservist from his mobilization assignment. Training with this squadron provides not only an opportunity while in Washington to be a better informed Air Force reservist but also the opportunity to assure retention, promotion, and retirement.

At our first meeting we had the pleasure of receiving Gen. Thomas L. White, Air Force Chief of Staff, as our speaker. Gen-

eral White not only gave us an excellent status report on the U.S. Air Force but also expressed the views of Air Force reservists on Capitol Hill when he stated that the formation of this squadron was long overdue. General White has assured us that he and members of the Air Staff and major commands wish to assist in making members of this squadron the best informed reservists in the Air Force.

The squadron has been meeting for 6 weeks and in this period of training we have had outstanding speakers who have introduced us to some of the problems and some of the possible solutions facing the military forces at home and around the world.

In accordance with the U.S. Air Force concept that the best possible use of citizen airmen in our aerospace world is with an Air Reserve Force in being, the 9999th Air Reserve Squadron is training us to be able to step into our executive positions as highly qualified and knowledgeable as is humanly possible.

Speaking as a Reserve member of the Air Force, I urge all Air Force reservists in Congress or on the congressional staffs to join the 9999th to improve their knowledge so that they can make a greater contribution to our Nation and to the Air Reserve Forces.

Milwaukee Journal's Unique Editorial Board

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. WILLIAM PROXMIRE

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, February 24, 1961

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, the country has been repeatedly reminded of the high esteem in which the Milwaukee Journal is regarded nationally. It has been consistently rated as one of the handful of truly outstanding papers in America.

One of several important reasons for this is the remarkably painstaking effort that goes into the expression of

editorial position by this great newspaper.

Recently Paul Ringler, editorial editor of the Journal, told the Milwaukee Rotary Club how the uniquely responsible editorial page of the Journal is put together.

Mr. Ringler explained that the Journal has one of the largest editorial staffs in the country: Five editorial writers and one editorial editor, all of whom are thoroughly trained as reporters. As Ringler puts it:

Each editorial writer has his special fields. He also has secondary fields so that there are, at all times, two men who can handle any major subject. Here are the primary fields of one writer: Education (with athletics and recreation), veterans' affairs, conservation, agriculture, amusements, medical care and general safety, transportation, including railroads and aviation, civil defense, penology, corrections and delinquency and public health.

Mr. Ringler calls research by all odds the most time-consuming function of these five editorial writers. Research on the Journal consists of some imaginative extensions of inquiry—not simply trips to the Journal's morgue, but—in Mr. Ringler's words:

We try to keep one man or another traveling at all times. Last year we had men in Japan and Korea, Soviet Russia, and in the Middle East and Mediterranean areas. Two editorial writers attended both national political conventions at Los Angeles and Chicago. One was at the Governors' Conference at Glacier National Park. One attended the recent White House Conference on the Aging in Washington.

We have a man visiting the legislature at Madison almost every week. One makes regular trips into the State for material. Another makes regular Washington trips to renew contacts in the White House, the State Department and other departments and in Congress.

Mr. President, these are editorial writers—not reporters—who do all this extensive personal research so that Journal editorials will be based on as thorough and complete an understanding of the