

United States to Mrs. Harriet La Pointe Vanderver; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. PUCINSKI:

H.R. 4209. A bill for the relief of Giuseppe Bucchianeri; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4210. A bill for the relief of Stanislaw Wojewodzka Gorna; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4211. A bill for the relief of Alessandro Bottero; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4212. A bill for the relief of Herman F. and Elizabeth V. Berens; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4213. A bill for the relief of Jan Marchelewski; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4214. A bill for the relief of Marcella Bucchianeri; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SANTANGELO:

H.R. 4215. A bill for the relief of Mariano Cracolici; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4216. A bill for the relief of Luigi Lo Bue; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WIDNALL:

H.R. 4217. A bill for the relief of David Tao Chung Wang; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4218. A bill for the relief of Navroji (Nivi) D. Khandalavala; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WILLIAMS:

H.R. 4219. A bill for the relief of the estate of William M. Farmer; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ZELENKO:

H.R. 4220. A bill for the relief of Wong Kam Yun; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4221. A bill for the relief of Sylvia Abrams Abramowitz; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

56. By Mr. HOSMER: Petition of certain residents of the 18th Congressional District of California, requesting enactment by Congress of House Resolution 1826 to create a commission to be known as the Commission on Noxious and Obscene Matters and Materials; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

57. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the secretary, Culver City Bar Association, Los Angeles, Calif., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to recommending for favorable consideration two additional judges to the District Court of the United States for both the Northern and Southern Districts of California; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Encouragement of Voluntary Pension Plans by Self-Employed Individuals

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. WILLIAM C. CRAMER

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 9, 1961

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, I have again today introduced a bill to encourage the establishment of voluntary pension plans by self-employed individuals. This legislation is similar to the measures which I introduced in the 85th and 86th Congresses, and is identical with the bills previously passed by the House. It would permit self-employed individuals to take a current deduction for a limited amount of income invested in certain types of retirement annuity or trust. The investments would be treated as ordinary income when actually received in later years. This legislation is intended to achieve a greater equality of tax treatment between self-employed persons and employees.

Under the present law, a corporation can deduct from taxes money put into a qualified employee pension plan and the employee is not taxed on this money until he actually receives the retirement income in later years.

Unfortunately, the millions of self-employed persons were somehow overlooked when this provision was made in our 1942 tax law. Thus, these citizens are denied the opportunity to defer taxes on retirement savings.

This legislation would generally apply to persons who are subject to the tax on self-employment income—for social security purposes—including doctors, barbers, druggists, farmers, undertakers, lawyers, accountants, and other self-employed persons.

The bill would permit self-employed persons to take a deduction for a limited amount of income which they voluntarily place into a restricted retirement

plan. In general this deduction is limited to 10 percent of net income from self-employment, but not to exceed \$2,500 in any one taxable year and it may not exceed \$50,000 during the lifetime of the self-employed person.

If an individual is over 50 years of age on the effective date of the proposed act, the limitation on the annual deduction is increased by one-tenth for each year that his age exceeds 50. For example, if he is age 60, the annual limit on his deduction would be 20 percent of income, but not over \$5,000. No deduction is allowed for any year beginning after the taxpayer attains age 70.

Let us remove this discrimination against the self-employed. It is just as sound economically to remove this discrimination for the self-employed as it is for the employed individual.

The Members of the House twice have overwhelmingly passed legislation similar to this, and I sincerely hope that this Congress will pass such legislation early in this session.

Should a Senator Be Bound by His Party Platform?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. DODD

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, February 9, 1961

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, recently I had the opportunity to prepare for the Saturday Evening Post a statement on the question of party platforms and their relationship to Members of Congress. This statement was based upon a speech, before the New England Society, which dealt with the subject in considerable detail, and was inserted in the RECORD on January 5.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

the statement which appeared as a signed editorial in the Saturday Evening Post on January 28.

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

SHOULD A SENATOR BE BOUND BY HIS PARTY PLATFORM?

(By Senator THOMAS J. DODD, Democrat, of Connecticut)

What is a party platform? Is it a document written on tables of stone, commanding obedience by elected officials, regardless of their own beliefs or their obligation to their constituents?

If a platform is considered merely as a statement of principles, as an indication to the people of the general view within a party, as one avenue of guidance for elected officials, it has a valid place. But if the party platform is to become supreme, and if conformity to its dogma is to become the new test of political integrity and advancement, our present political system will suffer a paralyzing shock from which it will never recover. Elected representatives will cease to be responsible to their reason, their consciences and their constituents, and become responsible instead to party platforms, to political conventions and to that vague obstruction called the will of the people, as divined by party bosses. The forms of our Republic may linger on as picturesque relics of the past, but the substance of representative government will vanish.

I think we should take a good look at the platform-making process. As one who has testified before resolutions committees, served on them, presented planks to the national convention and campaigned repeatedly for public office, I have come to question the value of platforms, both as indicators of the public will and as significant factors in elections.

Those who serve on resolutions committees spend 4 or 5 dreary days listening to the pleas and demands of all the major and minor pressure groups in the country. This testimony is heard in an arenalike atmosphere to the tune of cheers, boos or the bored rustling of the watching crowd. While the show is going on out front, a small group in the backroom, composed largely of staff members who are not even convention delegates writes the party platform. In the end it is the product of the backroom that is rushed to the committee for adoption, often

in the wee hours of the morning under time pressure which permits no real chance to debate more than a few of the planks. The committee swiftly adopts a 400-point blueprint for the future, which is rushed to the convention floor for perfunctory ratification by voice vote. Under the latest innovation, the platform is not even read to the delegates before they pass on it. Instead they are shown a dramatized version, filmed weeks before the convention, which covers some of the highlights.

Conceived in a partisan atmosphere, patched together in headlong haste, adopted without deliberation, riddled with promises to self-seeking groups, pointed toward the winning of an election rather than the governing of a nation—party platforms represent our political process at its weakest point.

The American people have no real voice in platform making. Not one voter in a hundred ever sees the platform of either party, and those who do see them have no way of indicating whether they support or oppose specific provisions. The only way the people could truly be said to ratify platform planks would be to place each plank on the ballot, like referendum questions, to be voted up or down. A ridiculous process, you may think, an impossible burden on the voter. And so it would be. But is it not far more ridiculous to pretend that the people have passed upon a platform when they have not?

Under the American system, people vote not for platforms but for persons, on the basis of what they seem to be, what they have done and what they say they will do. The people control their representatives by accepting or rejecting them on election day, not by passing upon individual questions of policy.

A U.S. Senator should never be the controlled tool of a political platform. He is the representative of all the people of his State and a representative of the Nation. He has, as well, a duty to those who have gone before him and those who will come after him. His task essentially is the search for truth in matters of government. He can determine the truth only by studying each problem carefully and honestly, using all the resources of his office, and making an independent decision based upon his own judgment and conscience.

All the processes of the Senate are founded upon this view of representation. Exhaustive committee hearings and investigations, volumes of testimony, careful consideration of the mail of constituents, long days of debate—all presuppose that Senators will base their final judgment not on last year's party platform but on today's evaluation of the facts presented.

To study and restudy each issue in the light of increased knowledge and changing circumstances, to admit mistakes when shown wrong, to stand against the popular tide when convinced of being right, to measure the claim of each special interest against the claim of the national interest, to distinguish between the call of partisanship and the call of patriotism—this is the duty which history lays upon the members of this Congress and this administration.

The Boy Scouts of America: A Tribute

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PETER W. RODINO, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 9, 1961

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, February 7 through 13, 1961, mark Boy Scout

Week. It is a privilege to pay tribute to the boys and the adult leaders who comprise the Boy Scouts of America—an organization which has served this Nation with genuine distinction.

Scouting is not something by and for itself. It becomes a part of the community and a part of the organization or institution which sponsors each troop. The success of scouting in America has been no accident. The Boy Scouts of America, as a national organization, does not operate the packs, troops, or units. It provides a program which is available to citizens to use with their boys. This grassroot basis gives scouting a golden opportunity to serve the community. In turn it develops our youth into responsible and intelligent citizens.

Scouting began in America in 1910. Fortunately, from the beginning it has been recognized that to accomplish the aims of scouting, leadership must be given voluntarily by men and women who would see in scouting a real opportunity for service. It is with pride that we can record that adult leadership in scouting has been strong. It has proceeded with enthusiasm to assist our youth with the activities which constitute the program of scouting.

Boy Scout Week is a time to renew our hopes and faith in the youth of America. The continued development of our youth to be physically strong, mentally awake, and morally straight should not be a mere sidelight of desire. Development of our youth into citizens of character with high spiritual ideals and motives is essential if America is to fulfill its mission as a leader in a free world.

Lithuanian Independence Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PRESCOTT BUSH

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, February 9, 1961

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, on February 16, the 43d anniversary of Lithuanian independence will be commemorated. On this occasion, we in the free world should reflect on the sufferings of the Lithuanian people and of the populations of the other captive nations under Soviet tyranny. Let it be known that the aspirations for freedom of the people of Lithuania have not been forgotten.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a statement I have prepared on Lithuanian Independence Day be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

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

STATEMENT BY U.S. SENATOR PRESCOTT BUSH
On February 16, the 43d anniversary of Lithuanian independence will be commemorated. The people of Lithuania endured the oppressive rule of Russian autocracy for more than 100 years before it was overthrown by the 1917 revolution.

Early in 1918 they had their chance, seized upon it, proclaimed their independence on

February 16, and founded the Lithuanian Republic. By that act, the people of Lithuania once more took their destiny into their own hands, and for about two decades they enjoyed their freedom.

This happy period was brought to an abrupt end in 1940. Soon after the outbreak of World War II, Lithuanians were robbed of their freedom by the men in the Kremlin. Now the present leaders of communism in the Soviet Union proclaim themselves in favor of the efforts of those who seek to break the chains of colonialism. This is nothing but gross deceit. For we know that if it were a sincere statement, the captive peoples of Eastern Europe would have long ago been given the right to self-determination. Rather, the Soviet Union has tried, at every opportunity, to intensify its control over the satellite countries.

Since 1940, the people of Lithuania have not known freedom. Their stern taskmasters have imposed upon them the severest restrictions to their personal liberty. Deportations have been numerous and the people have been denied the right to practice their religion.

The only encouraging part of the tragedy is that these stout-hearted people still cling to their idea of freedom. They still cherish the hope that in the end their sacrifices will not be in vain, and that some day they will regain their freedom.

We pray that one day, in the not too distant future, their aspirations will be realized.

The Shame of Our Streams

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD E. LANKFORD

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 9, 1961

Mr. LANKFORD. Mr. Speaker, it is my privilege to join Congressman JOHN BLATNIK in the sponsorship of a water pollution control bill. I would like to pause at this point to once again pay tribute to the inspiring leadership my distinguished colleague from Minnesota has provided over the years in combating our Nation's most serious problem—the preservation of our water resources.

Beyond doubt, Public Law 660, the Federal Water Pollution Act, has been one of the most successful Federal incentive grant programs ever enacted by the Congress. Since the inception of the program, just a few short years ago, construction of local facilities has gone up from 60 to 75 percent over the previous 5-year average prior to the time grants were available. Significant as these accomplishments are, we are faced with clear evidence that we are still not doing enough and that if present trends continue, a serious crisis will develop by 1970 as our daily needs for water increase.

The State of Maryland has received over \$2½ million in Federal funds since 1957. This amount has resulted in the construction of \$11 million worth of sewage treatment facilities. The program in Maryland, I believe, is one of the finest examples of cooperative federalism. It has had the added effect in my State of creating a companion State grant program whereby any municipal corpora-

tion that is helped by the Federal grant is automatically entitled to an additional State grant.

Gov. J. Millard Tawes in his remarks in correspondence to me urging that I vote to override President Eisenhower's veto of H.R. 3610 of the last Congress stated:

The Federal Water Pollution Act of 1956 has put Maryland in a position where it can now see a solution to its pollution problems.

The increased authorizations called for in our bill are more than adequately justified by thoroughly documented studies of the problem that confronts us in our battle to conserve our water resources. The enforcement procedures which have been outlined in the past, I believe, will become even more effective with the suggested amendments contained in this bill.

Mr. Speaker, it is my great hope that water pollution legislation shall be made the first order of business. The time for study has ended.

Retired Military Pay Equalization

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. WILLIAM C. CRAMER

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 9, 1961

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, during the 85th Congress, we enacted a new military pay law, Public Law 85-422, designed to increase the incentive for careers in the military services and partially to compensate for the shrunken-dollar value. However, personnel retired after June 1, 1958, are included in the law, while personnel retired before that date are not so included.

Since the very beginning of the present military retirement system, it has been practically the undeviating policy that the pay of a retired officer be directly geared to the active-duty pay of an officer of the same rank and length of service. The Cordiner Committee recognized and endorsed this principle in its report and also recognized the fact that a departure from it would break faith with the individuals retired.

Public Law 85-422 established two pay scales for equal merit and equal service. Those officers who were retired prior to June 1, 1958, are paid by one scale and those retired on and after that date are paid by the other. Is this the reward of a grateful country for honorable and heroic service performed during three wars?

This law breaks faith with previously retired officers, and it is my opinion that this precedent will have an adverse effect on the retention rates of personnel now on active duty, thus destroying the principal objective of the law. As a matter of fact, it is contrary to the recommendations of the Cordiner Committee, which unanimously recommended that pay of those retired before the enactment of any new law be computed at the new in-

creased levels as the greatest single incentive for service careers.

Inevitably, many of our younger personnel, who should be encouraged to select service careers, will be deterred by this demonstrated retirement insecurity, with resultant larger personnel turnover. Thus, this matter affects the future caliber and esprit-de-corps of our military services, will be detrimental to national security, and, in the long run, extravagant in manpower and money.

Whereas Public Law 85-422, approved May 20, 1958, gives in general an increase of 6 percent for those officers retired before the effective date of the above law, June 1, 1958, and whereas Public Law 85-422 departs from the time-honored precept of granting to all retired service personnel the full advantages of each pay adjustment, and whereas there has always been an implied contract between the Government and its service personnel to the effect that retired personnel pay would be automatically adjusted as pay acts were revised, I wish to go on record as advocating the passage of immediate legislation, to be effective retroactively, which legislation will extend the full benefits of the new Pay Act, Public Law 85-422, to all retired service personnel without discrimination as to date of retirement.

At this time when high-class personnel is sorely needed for service careers, the encouragement for them to so choose is not there. The result in personnel turnover, caliber of personnel and esprit is not only costly but in my humble opinion extravagant.

Therefore, I urgently request the support of the membership of this House to correct this unwarranted and unjust discrimination and reestablish the time-honored policy regarding the computation of retired military pay.

President Makes Excellent Choice in Naming Rand Dixon Chairman of Federal Trade Commission

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JOE L. EVINS

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 9, 1961

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Speaker, the Kennedy administration is already distinguished by the abundance of high caliber and able leaders that the President has appointed to serve as his cabinet officers and in the various agencies and commissions. However, no position could have been filled with a more highly qualified man than that of the recently appointed Chairman of the Federal Trade Commission. In naming Mr. Paul Rand Dixon of Tennessee to this important post, President Kennedy made a most excellent and appropriate choice.

Mr. Dixon served with the FTC for several years and made an outstanding record with the Commission. He moved from the Commission to the Senate

Antitrust and Monopolies Subcommittee where as Counsel and Staff Director he compiled a most outstanding and notable record.

Mr. Dixon gained vast experience and insight into the operation of this Commission while on the Commission staff and displayed his dedication to the protection of the consuming public and the promotion of fair competition through his effective work as staff director of the Antitrust and Monopolies Subcommittee of the Senate. During his service with this subcommittee, some of the most dramatic and far-reaching disclosures ever made by a committee of the Congress were brought to the public attention. Mr. Dixon is an able lawyer, dedicated in his devotion to the public interest and public service.

Mr. Speaker, I am most pleased that President Kennedy appointed Mr. Dixon as Chairman of this important Commission. I predict a record of dedicated service and a performance of which the President and the people of the Nation will be proud.

The Congress Will Respond

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. SILVIO O. CONTE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 9, 1961

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an article from the Kiwanis magazine of February 1961 by the Honorable KARL E. MUNDT, Senator from South Dakota, entitled "The Congress Will Respond." It is a lucid appraisal of the 87th Congress by a distinguished Member:

THE CONGRESS WILL RESPOND

The 87th Congress is the first in many years to begin operations with a so-called undivided Government. It finds the Democratic Party enjoying control over both Legislative Houses and the White House. This fact brings to mind a number of significant questions, not the least of which are: Will this bring about more responsible government? Will it reduce the role of the Republican Party to that of a negative, nagging, antagonistic opposition, and thereby subvert the direction of our national purpose to petty squabbles along party lines?

In attempting to answer these questions, one must, it seems to me, appeal to history. In our own history, the history of America, we find that both systems of government—divided and undivided—have been made to work effectively. Then, too, there have been instances where each has failed. In my own experience of 22 years in the U.S. Congress, I have found that successful government has been attained because of—and not in spite of—sound, responsible party politics.

There can be no doubt that both parties want a better America, a prosperous America, one that continues to move ahead. The difference between the two parties do not really concern goals, but how best to attain these goals; it is a difference not of ends but of means. And, more often than not, much of our national legislation is the result of working out these differences through debate and compromise to achieve good government and a productive, free America.

The key to disagreement in majority and minority government is responsibility. When accepted and practiced, responsibility brings to the Nation united effort working for the national good. And responsibility in government has a peculiar way of making itself felt. It is for this reason that, as the 87th Congress opens with a new President in the White House, I am not seriously alarmed at the prospect of congressional divisiveness along party lines. For when the chips are down on issues of major significance, responsibility will, as it always has in the past, emerge. And it is my conviction that, as usual, it will cross party lines.

This is not to say that there will be no major differences over the role government is to play in the future. But, at the same time, these differences do not stand in the way of progressive programs, for responsibility rests with the President as well as with Congress. A President cannot afford to launch programs that are not, so to speak, "in tune with the times." This has, of course, happened, and it has usually been accompanied with a resultant change in the White House. It has also happened in Congress. But here, too, the American voter asserted his responsibility—when the politician has not asserted his—by stepping into the polling booth and removing from public office those officials who trifled with the national interest by playing politics in the legislature.

And here is the main reason why I expect the 87th Congress to be a typical Congress, a Congress that will be responsible. I refer to the voter. Responsibility begins and ends with the voter. It is still the greatest system devised for successful and productive government. For in our renowned check-system of government, the voter is the final check. If responsibility is not exercised where laws are made, then it will surely be exercised by private citizens on the home front where lawmakers are made.

Twentieth Anniversary of the USO

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT N. GIAIMO

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 9, 1961

Mr. GIAIMO. Mr. Speaker, on February 4, the United Service Organizations, Inc., known to millions as USO, celebrated its 20th anniversary. For a fifth of a century USO has served the needs of our service men and women and through them the cause of world peace.

USO was organized in 1941 as a federation of six voluntary civilian organizations designed to meet the religious, spiritual, social, welfare, recreational, and educational needs of the men and women called to serve in the Armed Forces. In hot war and in cold it has admirably performed this task. It provides counseling services, information on travel and housing, recreational facilities and religious instruction to name but a few of its services to millions of young men and women who have served our military service since its founding.

USO was conceived and has developed as a vehicle through which the American people can translate their concern, interest, and appreciation for our servicemen into practical, everyday action. For the millions in the armed services

USO provides a bit of home away from home. It is a bridge between military and civilian life; a way through which those who are physically removed from hometown and family can have a part of home brought to them.

I am happy to join with others in commemorating USO's anniversary. USO stands as an unmatched example of American citizens and citizen soldiers cooperating in the task of maintaining world peace.

The 51st Anniversary of the Boy Scouts of America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DURWARD G. HALL

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 9, 1961

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, this week the Nation is observing the 51st birthday of the Boy Scouts of America. It has been my great pleasure to be associated with this organization for the past 41 years and most recently as the vice chairman, region 8, Boy Scouts of America. Therefore, I am anxious that we recognize the great voluntary movement from which will come the leaders of tomorrow. Yesterday morning 12 of the highest type young men our Nation has produced reported to their Congressmen and 200 representative citizens on scouting's progress in 1960. They expressed appreciation especially to this body for what it has done to help write the record of scouting.

One has but to read the history of the Boy Scouts of America to recognize the splendid things they have done for the United States of America. Their record in peace and war merits the fullest recognition and support from all Americans. They have proven that organized youth can be a vital force in strengthening the traditions and principles that we all hold so dear.

Counting a membership of 5,164,000 active participants at the present time, and an alumni of over 35 million, the Boy Scouts have proved, too, that the volunteer principle is still vital in our social structure. The dedicated volunteers in scouting—over 1,300,000 of them who guide and direct the boys in their activities, and the handful of 3,500 dedicated individuals who make a career as Scout executives deserve our thanks.

Scouting has not become an organization unto itself. Rather, it has evolved its rich program—so appealing in fun, romance, and adventure to boys—for use by the churches, schools, service clubs, industrial bodies, labor organizations, and farm groups to use as a part of their programs for youth. This has been a vital reason for the great success of the scouting movement.

Scouting has exposed millions of Americans to one of the finest ethical codes ever developed—the Scout oath and the Scout law. Thus, it has become a movement with strong national purpose,

a movement dedicated to building love of God and country in American youth, a movement dedicated to building strong and able citizens.

Joseph A. Brunton, Jr., chief Scout executive, introduced the 12 Scouts from scouting's 12 regions. He reiterated a belief held by millions of Americans: "The development of our youth to be physically strong, mentally awake, and morally straight—to be citizens of character, with high spiritual ideals and motives—is not just a desirable thing; it is essential if America is to fulfill its mission as a leader in the free world."

With confidence in the Boy Scouts of America, in its contribution to physical fitness, character building, and citizenship training, as an aid to the home, church and school, we must go forward with it aggressively.

We must keep in mind the vast and increasing numbers of youth growing up in the years before us and safeguard the future of our country by adequately training them to be spiritually minded, dedicated citizens who must in large measure guarantee freedom to the future, not only for America but for all the world.

The 64th Congress on June 15, 1916, granted a charter to the Boy Scouts of America. Ellsworth Augustus, president of the Boy Scouts of America, reminded us yesterday that three of our number were in that Congress; namely, the Honorable Speaker of the House, SAM RAYBURN of Texas, the Honorable CARL VINSON of Georgia, and the Honorable CARL HAYDEN of Arizona. On this day as we recognize scouting's 51st anniversary, we can well pause to pay tribute to these men who personally shared in linking the Congress with the Boy Scouts of America.

To Provide for National Cemeteries in the Central West Coast Area of the State of Florida

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM C. CRAMER

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 9, 1961

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing a bill to provide for national cemeteries in the central west coast area of the State of Florida.

In introducing this bill, my primary interest is that those who served their country and have passed on shall be honored by our Nation with a final resting place in keeping with the great and valiant service that they have paid our Nation.

The Department of the Army, in its study of the national cemetery system, has recommended that Florida be served with additional cemeteries. At the present time, two national cemeteries are available to veterans in my State. The fact that one of them is located in the upper western corner of Florida means that many families, whose sons and

fathers can be, at best, provided a last resting place, must go to the expense of paying transportation of last remains for hundreds and hundreds of miles. The other cemetery, the St. Augustine National Cemetery, is closed to future interment.

It will be noted that in my bill I have designated the central west coast area of the State of Florida. This is done because of its close proximity to the center of veterans' population of the State, which in 1946 amounted to 250,000 and in 1960 more than doubled that amount. It is anticipated that within the next 10 years the veterans' population of Florida will again double, straining all available veterans' services, and in the case of national cemeteries we will be completely outdated.

I would urge congressional action at the very earliest opportunity to properly provide and serve, firstly, as recommended by the Army report, and, secondly, as demanded by the Nation's highest increasing veterans' growth.

In considering possible locations, I suggest the use of certain grounds available at the Bay Pines Veterans Hospital, and I respectfully suggest that this be considered along with other locations.

John Foster Dulles Diplomatic Academy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. WILLIAM C. CRAMER

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 9, 1961

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing a bill providing for the establishment of a U.S. Diplomatic Academy to prepare this country for waging an aggressive battle against communism and on the peace front throughout the world.

Our diplomats must be trained in the mores and folkways—the customs and habits—the likes and dislikes, as well as the languages, of the countries in which they represent this country.

My bill encompasses the training and education of students at the academy concerning all aspects of the international Communist conspiracy so they can be more useful to their Government in defeating the aims of this conspiracy. My bill is also designed to meet the present and anticipated needs of the United States for adequately trained officers and employees in the diplomatic service of the United States.

In principle, I subscribe wholeheartedly to the objective of the Freedom Commission and Academy legislation to counteract the Communist organizational weapons, but I am convinced that we must add the positive action of providing a general diplomatic training school in which our future diplomats can learn in a few years some of what John Foster Dulles learned and techniques in diplomacy he developed in a lifetime. He had no opportunity to go to one source, to one fountainhead of general diplomatic learning, to fit himself for his task.

Mr. Dulles knew, perhaps better than any living man, the ever present danger that we face from an alien scheme of life. He was worried that we were not devoting our full energy as we should have to fight back against the subversive weapons used by the Leninists of today.

In his book "War and Peace," Mr. Dulles said:

There may come a time in the life of a people when their work of creation ends. That hour has not struck for us. We are still vital and capable of great endeavor. Our youth are spirited, not soft or fearful. Our religious heritage and our national tradition are not forgotten.

If our efforts are still inadequate, it is because we have not seen clearly the challenge and its nature. As that is more clearly revealed, we shall surely respond. And as we act under the guidance of a righteous faith, that faith will grow until it brings us into the worldwide fellowship of all men everywhere who are embarked on the great adventure of building peacefully a world of human liberty and justice.

In a study published in January of 1952 by the Rand Corp., "The Organizational Weapon," it was stated:

The Communists are winning because they have developed a new form of power struggle, a new dimension of political warfare, which makes it possible for them to get to the people in each target nation and to control or manipulate them in ever-increasing numbers in the interest of the Soviets. As long as the Communists can do this and we cannot counteract it, our own diplomacy and aid programs will be largely undercut, while those of the Soviet Union and Red China will achieve success all out of proportion for the money spent.

John Foster Dulles pointed the war with the accuracy of a bombsight.

Without further delay the Department of State should be authorized to establish a diplomatic school modeled after our service academies. The school can be started at once to counteract the Communists and to train free world diplomats to carry the message of peace aggressively to all peoples in all lands.

I therefore urge that Congress take fast action on this subject and authorize immediately the creation of the John Foster Dulles Diplomatic Academy for Peace.

Edward Fields, Inc.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. JOHN V. LINDSAY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 9, 1961

Mr. LINDSAY. Mr. Speaker, I should like to call the attention of my colleagues to a grand and generous gesture made by Edward Fields, Inc., of New York, a firm which manufactures rugs of high quality.

Edward Fields, Inc., has donated a magnificent carpet for the diplomatic reception room of the White House. This rug, created by the Edward Fields designers, Marion V. Dorn and Louis B. Fisher in association with the Fine Arts Commission, is oval in shape and 26 by

36 feet in dimension. Its design incorporates the symbols of all 50 States and it has 50 stars around the border. The rug is valued at wholesale cost of approximately \$13,000.

This generous gift for the beautification of the Executive Mansion is in fact a gift to the whole Nation, for which grateful acknowledgment is due by the American people and by their elected representatives.

An Open Letter to All Midwest Farmers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. BEN F. JENSEN

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 9, 1961

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, I have for many years listened and read articles by the hundreds of so-called professional economists and analysts of our economy, and I have listened to the speeches of some of my colleagues, both in the House and Senate, prescribing their cure for all our economic ills. Yes, and the President in his state of the Union speech to Congress on January 31, 1961, failed in my long-studied opinion to come to grips with the basic cause of our economic problems.

Most every one of those I have above referred to seems to forget that never have we had a lengthy recession or a depression in the United States of America when the purchasing power of our farmer dollar was worth 100 cents in buying power. What then is the solution to the problem of the unemployed, the farmer himself, and the merchant and industry of every nature? Let us take a good clear look at the record. Records prove that when the farmer's dollar is worth 100 cents at the counter he buys more than twice as many dollars' worth of manufactured goods on an average annually than do other Americans on an average annually. That being a fact, then one needs not wonder why we have so many unemployed in the hard goods industries, such as automobiles, farm tractors, trucks, and expensive steel goods of every nature, as well as in many other industries. The pure and simple reason is that the farmers' dollar has for many past years on an average been worth only 80 cents in purchasing power and you may be sure the present economic condition will continue until the farmer's dollar is at par in purchasing power with the price of goods he would like to buy, and would buy if his dollar was at par value. We must stop dreaming up and adopting more of these costly ineffective remedies that cost billions, and cure nothing. Records will also prove that the farmers of the corn and wheat growing, and hog and cattle raising sections of America are the best customers of such goods, as tractors, trucks, and farm machinery, lumber, woven wire, steel posts, and so forth. Facts are, that when their dollar is at par value, the farmers of the Bread Basket of the United States of America

buy more dollars' worth of such manufactured goods than do the farmers in all the other States of the Union combined, which means work for the factory worker, business for the merchant and industry, and in proportion to the farmers' ability to buy.

All of these facts must be taken into account, and the solution of this all-important problem put into effect.

Many Members of Congress agree with me, both Republicans and Democrats, as do a majority of the farmers of the Midwest, and some economists in and out of the Department of Agriculture, that the best, the quickest, and cheapest way to solve most of our economic ills is for Congress to pass a liberal payment-in-kind law for the producers of the wheat, corn, and all other feed grains, which will pay these farmers sufficiently to warrant them to take good productive land out of production until production and consumption is again in balance, and the farmer's income is on a profitable higher stabilized basis.

During the last session of Congress I joined nine of my colleagues in introducing a farm bill which provided for the necessary legislation as set out above. I am sorry that neither the House or the Senate agriculture committees saw fit to even give our bill a hearing. But let me assure you, Mr. Speaker, that we will never give up the fight. We have re-introduced our bill in this session, and I am pleased to say that more Members will introduce companion bills and all of us propose to press for its adoption during this session; to do less would render us unworthy of our place as servants of the people.

Here again are the main provisions of our bill, which I have explained in an open letter to all the farmers of the Midwest.

AN OPEN LETTER TO ALL MIDWEST FARMERS

DEAR FRIENDS: Here is good news for Midwest farmers if our bill is made the law of the land.

As all farmers know, during the past two wars your Government urged, yes pleaded with, you to produce, produce. You did produce beyond all expectations, to your everlasting credit. The wars were won, to a great degree because our side had the greatest supply of food, feed, and fiber.

But we did not alter our farm program to fit our peacetime economy.

As our Republican candidate, Richard Nixon, says, "The Government got our farmers into this mess, now it is the Government's duty to help them out of it."

The costly price-depressing surpluses of wheat, corn, and all feed grains in CCC storage must be materially reduced before you farmers can receive your fair share of the national income. Every schoolboy knows that.

So the question becomes "How can that be done?" Here is the answer devised by 10 Midwestern Republican Congressmen, JENSEN, HOEVEN, GROSS, SCHWENDEL, and KYL of Iowa, ANDERSEN, QUIE, NELSEN, and LANGEN of Minnesota, and WEAVER of Nebraska.

For many months this group spent much time and deep study writing a farm bill, which was introduced in the last session of Congress. I shall explain herein the main provisions of our plan in as few words as possible.

Realizing first of all that we do not have the votes in Congress to pass a farm bill

calling for cash payments which would run into billions of dollars, we took the most acceptable recourse left to us, payment-in-kind. Our present stocks are great, and furthermore, are already paid for.

Our plan is an amendment to and not a substitute for any part of the present plan. Hence you may still seal grains just as you do now, and the Conservation Reserve section of the Soil Bank Act would be retained as at present.

Here are the additional benefits our plan provides for you:

First, our plan is voluntary. But to be so, very liberal payments in kind must be offered in order to make it profitable enough for farmers to participate.

1. You would have the opportunity to idle up to 50 percent of your previous 3 years' average acres of wheat, corn, oats, rye, barley, grain sorghum, soybeans, and flaxseed; and for each idled acre below the said 3-year average you will receive bushel for bushel from CCC stocks according to the historical production capability of the idled land. This record of production is maintained by the county ASC office.

2. A negotiable Government certificate will be issued to you which you as a co-operating farmer may either sell for cash or take the grain for your own use. In either event the grain will be taken out of CCC storage by someone, used up, and be gone forever, with no grain grown in its place on those idle acres. If low feed value corn is accepted, then you will receive more bushels in proportion to its feed value.

3. As soon as our plan is made law, all feed grains and wheat will go up in price, and all livestock, poultry, and egg prices will rise in turn. Thus all farm prices will stabilize on a much higher level. Hence it is not too much to expect that for each acre of corn so taken out of production in Iowa, our farmers will actually receive an average of not less than \$70 per acre, with no production costs. Likewise it is a good insurance policy.

Our bill provides that CCC stocks cannot be sold below 105 percent of full parity, to protect you against dumping and driving down prices on the open market.

This happened last year when the demand for oats was strong because of a small crop. The CCC disposed of its stock of oats at 63 percent of parity, costing oats farmers millions of dollars. This must not happen to all grain farmers.

Now, in conclusion, I assure you that almost every Member of Congress from the Middle West, be he Republican or Democrat, will push hard for our plan. Most of them helped us during the last session.

Sincerely yours,

BEN F. JENSEN,
Congressman, Seventh Iowa District.

Greetings to the Estonian National Committee

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. JAMES ROOSEVELT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 9, 1961

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, in greeting you on the 43d anniversary celebration of Estonian Independence Day I sincerely share your sentiments for a free and independent Estonia. The joys of February 24, 1918, have been short lived, but I am indeed pleased to know that the spirit of freedom, the love of liberty,

which brought about the birth of the Estonian Republic 43 years ago is very much alive in today's Communist-dominated Estonia. Through their unstinted sacrifices, and with the aid of their friends and sympathizers, the Estonian people will again regain their freedom. Just as their sufferings under czarist autocracy schooled them in adversity, so the more tyrannical and almost unbearable yoke of Communist totalitarianism steels them in their struggle against their oppressors. Let us pray for the victory of their righteous cause and for their freedom.

An Industry Broadcaster Speaks Up

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. OREN HARRIS

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 9, 1961

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, Mr. W. Lincoln Faulk, manager of station WCKB, Dunn, N.C., recently addressed a letter to me enclosing statements expressing his views with respect to certain important issues which had been considered by the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

In view of the importance of the views expressed by Mr. Faulk, I hope they will be read by all broadcasters and others who are interested in improving broadcasting in the United States.

Mr. Faulk's letter addressed to me, his statements, and my reply letter to Mr. Faulk read as follows:

DUNN, N.C., January 24, 1961.

HON. OREN HARRIS,
Chairman, House Commerce Committee,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: I have followed your hearings and have read your reports on the regulatory agencies with a great deal of interest. I must say that I agree, in the main, with your findings and believe you have been both fair and impartial. As a broadcaster, I am really happy that some steps are being taken both by the new administration and the Congress to improve broadcasting for our country. I think, too, that most of those who may dissent will be largely those who wish to operate mainly in their own interests before the public interest.

In this connection, I have prepared some statements for our own Carolina delegation, and I thought maybe you would like to see them, too. Hence, I enclose a couple.

Sincerely yours,

A. LINCOLN FAULK,
Manager.

IN SUPPORT OF THE PROPOSED 3-YEAR OWNERSHIP REQUIREMENT

(By A. Lincoln Faulk, manager, WCKB, Dunn, N.C.)

I am an independent broadcaster, and by observation and experience strongly urge the proposed 3-year ownership rule for the following reasons:

1. I have been with one station for 14 years, from its beginning, and it is my experience that it took us more than 3 years to gain community confidence and acceptance. It took us more than 3 years of trial and error to find the kind of programing and service which best served the community.

We are still searching for better means and ways to operate in the public interest.

2. Those who are after the fast dollar usually operate as absentees, or they come into the community, operate with all kinds of rates, with unqualified personnel, limited staffs, and little concern for public interest. Such operators often resort to the spectacular to gain momentary audiences and inflated coverages, and then unload the property while it has a puerile and inflated value. Exorbitant claims are made on and off the air, many unjustified or proven, with many practices open to question of honesty and integrity.

3. I do not believe that speculative ownership can operate in the interest of the public nor the industry as a whole.

4. It is obvious that in many cases transfers were obtained without any honest intention of the transferees to operate the station other than for speculation.

5. I do not interpret free enterprise to mean irresponsibility to the public trust of a public facility.

6. I am sure that the rule could be adopted with exceptions made for hardship cases or acts of God.

7. I am sure that the 3-year ownership rule will provide a much better type of broadcaster and therefore result in better broadcasting.

Certainly, a better control at the point of ownership and new station licenses will help to correct many present weaknesses in broadcasting.

MY CONCEPTIONS OF THE DUTIES OF THE FCC (By A. Lincoln Faulk)

I believe that the FCC was instituted to represent the interests of the public and to protect those interests from abuses and misuses. Therefore, its first responsibility is to the public and to the Congress which brought it into being.

I believe that the FCC has the power and duty to look into programing at all times, and, short of censure, use its power to influence programing in the public interest. It should not be more concerned with quality of signals than with quality of programs. To me, what is heard is as important as is how it's heard.

I believe the FCC should recognize that an applicant's financial abilities can and will affect the kind of signal, performance, and the programs he broadcasts.

I feel the Commission should keep a watchful eye on multiple ownerships which tend to monopolize media of mass communications.

I favor a curb on the apparent use of broadcast facilities for mere speculation. I am in favor of the proposed 3-year ownership rule. It is not possible to reconcile the use of the broadcast facility as a speculative football and the public interest.

I would reemphasize that the privileges of broadcasting also demand assumption of the responsibilities inherent.

I believe the Commission should be free from network and big station pressures, and that just as the Commission must represent the public, it should also be responsive to the largest segment of the industry—the small, medium, and independent broadcasters.

I believe the Commission can obtain healthier broadcasting by powers of influence and suggestion, by eliminating antiquated rules, by more direct forms and less theory, by simplification and clarification of current rules, and by proper and uniform enforcement of these rules.

I feel the Commission has power and rules sufficient, and that they should be applied realistically in broader aspects to bring both private rights and public interest in more complete balance. It should

view the spectrum of broadcasting under conditions of the present instead of 25 years ago, and make use of the vast experience available from responsible broadcasters throughout the entire industry.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., January 31, 1961.
Mr. W. LINCOLN FAULK,
Manager, Station WCKB,
Dunn, N.C.

DEAR MR. FAULK: I have your letter of January 24, 1961, enclosing a statement in support of the proposed 3-year ownership requirement of radio station licensees and a statement outlining your conception of the duties of the Federal Communications Commission.

It is certainly refreshing to find broadcasters like yourself express views at variance with views rather frequently expressed by publications and organizations which purport to speak for the broadcasting industry as a whole.

It is my hope that other broadcast licensees will form independent judgments on the subjects discussed in your statements.

With best wishes for your continued success in the field of broadcasting,

Sincerely yours,

OREN HARRIS,
Chairman, Committee on Interstate
and Foreign Commerce.

Spectacular Louisiana Mardi Gras Ball Here Next Saturday Night—Inaugu- rated in 1946

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF HON. EDWIN E. WILLIS

OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 9, 1961

MR. WILLIS. Mr. Speaker, it was back in 1946 during the Mardi Gras season that the Louisianians in Washington who were thinking about the carnival in New Orleans and wishing they could be there decided to do the next best thing—bring Mardi Gras to the National Capital. About 200 of their number gathered in the Congressional Room of the then new Statler Hotel and inaugurated what has become a leading social event of Washington, bringing national and international publicity for Louisiana—the famed Mardi Gras ball.

The attendance in 1946 will have grown to a turnaway throng of 1,500 when the 1961 ball is staged next Saturday night, February 11, in Sheraton Hall of the Sheraton Park Hotel. So colorful, spectacular, and outstanding has this occasion become that a great number of calls for tickets must be turned down each year because of the increasing demand.

The Mardi Gras ball presents queens of Louisiana's festivals, 26 of whom will participate this year, together with 12 maids. Midshipmen from the U.S. Naval Academy will serve as their escorts.

Each year, honors are paid to a major Louisiana industry and Saturday night's observance will stress the very important role of oil and gas in the State's

progress. Past Mardi Gras balls have saluted sugar, rice, forestry, waterways, sweetpotato, and other resources.

Ruling over this year's ball will be G. M. "Jake" Anderson, of Shreveport, La., petroleum executive, and Miss Rita Katherine Long, daughter of Senator and Mrs. Russell B. Long and a junior at University High School in Baton Rouge, La.

The queen will be presented to her king by the Ambassador to the United States from France, M. Herve Alphan. The list of other notables who are to attend will be headed by Vice President and Mrs. LYNDON B. JOHNSON and will include members of the Cabinet, Senate, House of Representatives, Armed Forces, and other dignitaries from Washington and from Louisiana.

As queen, Miss Long will have as her maids, the Misses Jan Adcock, Monroe, La.; Mary Elizabeth Allen, Lafayette, La.; Helen Anne Bienvenu, St. Martinville, La.; Dianne DeFranceaux, Washington; Annette Ducote, Cottonport, La.; Arna Victory Fernandez, Washington; Jean Marie Gremillion, Abbeville, La.; Sandra Hartke, Indiana; Linda Elaine King, Washington; Sandra Newman, Washington; Frances Voorhies, St. Martinville; Sandra Weaver, Jonesville, La.

Members of the King's Committee are N. H. Wheless, Jr., Shreveport; Joe T. Dickerson, Washington; Harold F. Moses, New Orleans; W. E. Wilson, Shreveport; Harold Skinner, Houston, Tex.; Roy Sessums, New Orleans; Sims Regard, Baton Rouge; L. T. Vice, Washington; Keith Pyburn, Shreveport; John Sprague, Washington; McVea Oliver, Monroe.

The Louisiana festival queens who will be presented at the ball and the festivals they represent:

Miss Claudia Adams of Bogalusa, queen of Roses, Rose Festival, Bogalusa.

Miss Shirline Ardoin of Kaplan, queen of Vermilion Fair and Livestock Show, Kaplan.

Miss Jacquelin Bland of Mansfield, queen of Louisiana State Future Farmers of America, Baton Rouge.

Miss Leona Boudreaux of Jefferson Island, queen of Delcambre Fishing Industry, Delcambre.

Miss Jay Browning, queen of Louisiana Gulf Coast Oil Exposition, Lafayette.

Miss Celia Chachere of Lafayette, queen of Southwest Louisiana Mardi Gras, Lafayette.

Miss Suzanne Doty of Marksville, queen of Louisiana Livestock and Pasture Festival, Marksville.

Miss Virginia Flick of New Orleans, queen of News Orleans Floral Trail.

Miss Marva Glover, queen of Holiday in Dixie, Shreveport.

Miss Emmaline Hebert of Breaux Bridge, queen of Crawfish Festival, Breaux Bridge.

Miss Patricia Henry of Morgan City, queen of Louisiana Shrimp Festival, Morgan City.

Miss Debbie Ann LaBove of Sweet Lake, queen of Fur and Wildlife Festival, Cameron.

Miss Pat Landry of Belle Chasse, queen of Orange Festival, Buras.

Miss Lynda Larson of New Iberia, queen of Louisiana Sugar Cane Festival, New Iberia.

Miss Sandra McElwee of Haynesville, queen of the Louisiana Farm Bureau Federation, Baton Rouge.

Miss Virginia O'Brien of St. Martinville, queen of the International Rice Festival, Crowley.

Miss Lynda Pote of Shreveport, queen of North Louisiana Delta Festival.

Miss Elaine Perron of Abbeville, queen of Louisiana Dairy Festival and Fair, Abbeville.

Miss Frances Richardson, queen of Louisiana Paper Festival, Bogalusa.

Miss Billie Sue Riordan of Bernice, queen of Louisiana Peach Festival, Ruston.

Miss Ann Robert, queen of Ozone Camellia Association, Slidell.

Miss Jerri Roberts of Joyce, queen of Louisiana Forest Festival, Winnfield.

Miss Eathel Ann Seal, queen, Sweetheart of American Legion, Bogalusa.

Miss Brenda Rita Thibodeaux of Church Point, queen of Louisiana Yambilee Festival, Opelousas.

Miss Mittie Sue Ticac of Maringouin, queen of Louisiana Market Poultry Show, Alexandria.

Miss Anne Waites of Delhi, queen of Cotton Festival, Ville Platte.

The festival queens, accompanied by other Louisianians, arrived by plane today for a busy round of events climaxed by the ball Saturday night. Friday morning there will be a sightseeing tour and a visit to the White House where they will be photographed with the President and a presentation of Louisiana camellias will be made to the First Lady. A luncheon in the Old Supreme Court Building in the Capitol, as guests of the Louisiana Congressional Delegation, will follow and there will be a dinner dance in the Blue Room of the Shoreham Hotel Friday night for the queens, maids, and their escorts. Also scheduled for Friday night is the King's Hour when his majesty of the 1961 Mardi Gras Ball will greet his loyal subjects during a reception from 6:15 to 7:45 in the Burgundy Room of the Sheraton Park.

I have the honor of serving as this year's chairman of the ball. President Felix M. (Dan) Broussard of the Louisiana State Society of Washington is again in general charge of arrangements.

The ball, highlighted as usual by the Krewe of Louisianians, will present a romantic chapter out of Louisiana's past with its theme, "Jean Lafitte, the Pirate." In keeping with the theme, the 100-member Krewe will be garbed in the swashbuckling attire of the buccaneers of yesteryear and will parade before backgrounds duplicating some of the famous settings of old New Orleans.

Featured in the pageant will be the authentic Dixeland jazz music of the Dukes of Dixeland, natives of New Orleans.

Louisianians from the Third District, which I have the privilege of representing in Congress, who are already in Washington or due to arrive here for the ball and other events include:

Mr. and Mrs. Frederick Nehrbass, Lafayette; Mr. and Mrs. Drew Cornell, Lafayette; Ed Kyle, Morgan City; Mr.

and Mrs. Pete Guarisco, Morgan City; Chief Justice John B. Fournet of the Louisiana State Supreme Court and Mrs. Fournet; Miss Eugenie Voorhies, St. Martinville; Miss Sylvia Louise Bienvenu, St. Martinville; Miss Judy Coleman, St. Martinville; State Senator and Mrs. A. O. Rappelet, Galliano; Mr. and Mrs. C. T. Kief, Galliano; Mr. and Mrs. Vincent Lopresto, Houma; Mr. and Mrs. Joe Chachere, Lafayette; Mr. and Mrs. Martin W. O'Brien, St. Martinville; Mrs. Jeff Bienvenu, St. Martinville.

Boy Scouts of America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWIN B. DOOLEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 9, 1961

Mr. DOOLEY. Mr. Speaker, on Wednesday February 8 I was privileged to attend a breakfast in Washington of the Boy Scouts of America, labeled the "1961 Report to the Nation Scout". My host was 15-year-old George L. Ashley of 3 Woody Lane, Larchmont, N.Y., an Eagle Scout representing region two which includes New York, New Jersey, and Puerto Rico.

Young Ashley, known as Luke, began his indoctrination into scouting as a Cub Scout 7 years ago. He is now a junior assistant scoutmaster in troop 4 sponsored by the Larchmont Lions Club. He is in the Siwanoy-Bronx Valley Council, Boy Scouts of America.

Luke is recording secretary of his lodge in the Order of the Arrow, scouting's national brotherhood of honor campers. He was junior assistant scoutmaster of his troop at the Fifth National Jamboree last year at Colorado Springs, Colo. He enjoyed wilderness camping at the Philmont Scout Ranch at Cimarron, N. Mex. He has the distinction of having hiked the Appalachian Trail from Connecticut to the New Jersey line.

Luke attends the local high school in my home town of Mamaroneck, N.Y., where he has been vice president of the student council, secretary of his class, and student council representative. His extracurricular activities consist of participation in the school's glee club, football, basketball, and track.

He has earned the God and Country Award, a church award for special study and service in his faith. He is a member of the Methodist Youth Fellowship and has been in his church choir for two years. Like his distinguished father, Luke plans to be a lawyer.

At the breakfast meeting Luke and 11 other Scouts, virtually all of whom were Explorer Scouts (all except Luke, the youngest of the group) addressed the Congressional Representatives and Senators and other guests who were present. They told in forthright and excellent fashion of the benefits of Scouting and of their joy in being part of this tremendously exciting and constructive enterprise. Some of the boys expressed the feeling of the group in explaining how

grateful they were to live in a land of freedom, and all of them were keenly aware of the virtues which our country affords its citizens. Luke spoke convincingly and well.

Some of them told of how, at the jamboree at Colorado Springs, where thousands of boys congregated with Scouts from other countries in all parts of the world, there was a spirit of real rapport and understanding despite the barrier of language. Signs and smiles bridged the gaps of oral communication and made it possible for the American boys to offer hospitality to their colleagues from distant lands.

One boy pointed out how, on Sunday morning, a hush came over the camp as thousands upon thousands of boys crisscrossed the huge camp area on their way to their respective church services. Services were held in some 13 denominations, but each boy respected the other's choice of worship. That, pointed out one youngster, is the American way.

Forty-six years ago, under President Wilson, the Congress of the United States granted the first charter to a youth organization; namely, the Boy Scouts of America. At that time the total number of Scouts was minimal contrasted to today's 5 million boys who are enjoying the benefits of this great organization. Its three objectives of build, serve, and achieve, sum up cryptically the fine task it is performing.

Last year it was my pleasure to visit Camp Siwanoy in Westchester County, N.Y., the area from which Luke Ashley hails. The camp is ideally located and splendidly administered and provides an opportunity for boys from Westchester County to enjoy the invigorating experience of outdoor life. This year, I am told by a reliable source, a science camp is going to be established at Siwanoy which will be the last word in the modern approach to the highly technical age in which we live. A number of foundations have manifested an interest in this science camp and it may well set a pattern for Scout camps of the future.

The Federal Government Should Collect Fair and Reasonable Charges for Use of Inland Waterways, Navigation Improvements, Constructed, Maintained, or Operated With Federal Funds

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 9, 1961

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, at the second session of the last Congress, I introduced H.R. 12395, a bill to establish the Inland Navigation Commission and to authorize the provision and collection of fair and reasonable charges for use of inland waterway navigational improvements that have been, or are being, constructed, maintained, or operated by means of Federal funds.

No action was taken on that bill in the 86th Congress, although gratifying public interest in it was demonstrated.

The proposal to reimburse the taxpayers by imposing reasonable user charges on those few who directly benefit by enormous public expenditures for domestic transportation facilities, is one that Congress should not treat lightly. The economic strength of this country would have been immensely increased if Congress, through the enactment of that bill, had recognized—and halted—the tremendous and irreparable economic waste that necessarily results from the policy of providing capital for inland waterway operators in the form of free transportation facilities.

Accordingly on January 3, 1961, I introduced H.R. 586, which is identical to the bill introduced by me in the last Congress except for necessary changes in dates. The need for such a bill is even greater today than it was in the early part of 1960. Railroad employment, railroad earnings and railroad ability to handle the transportation necessities that would arise from any national emergency have all fallen off from what they were even in May of last year when I introduced H.R. 12395. This is manifestly bad both for the economic welfare and the national security of our country. This bill, I am convinced, is a means for strengthening both by requiring those who receive special commercial benefits from public funds to pay for the cost of what they receive. In this, I am not suggesting that any favors be granted to railroads or railroad employees. This is not a railroad relief bill; it is a bill for relief of the American taxpayer and relief of the Nation's transportation economy. What I am suggesting is that a major step be taken, by means of the waterway user charge bill, toward a sound fiscal and transportation policy. If this could be done, three major beneficial effects would inevitably follow. First, the transportation facilities of the Nation would more and more tend to be used on the basis of their economic value to the Nation, since the true cost of transportation services would more nearly be reflected in their price. Second, the already overburdened taxpayer would no longer be compelled to contribute millions of dollars of capital to be put to use by others for commercial gain. Third, the Federal Treasury would be reimbursed by those profiting from the public expenditure.

This is not to say that I am opposed to inland waterway improvements for navigation. My position is quite a simple one. If navigational improvements are worthwhile, they can and should be paid for by those who benefit from them. If the use of these improvements is not worth their cost, then we are deluding ourselves and wasting public funds when we authorize such so-called improvements—as we do year after year—and appropriate the tremendous sums required to pay for them. When we do this we are using public tax money desperately needed for public purposes, applying it to the benefit of a few of our citizens who are able to pay for their benefits and at the same time weakening

the remainder of our transportation system. Mr. Speaker, this is folly of the most tragic kind.

I will not at this time go further into the purpose and effects of H.R. 586 but I expect to do so at more length in the near future. Meanwhile, I urge that H.R. 586 be considered seriously by this House. In times such as these when international crises spring up without warning in every quarter of the globe, many of them calling for immense expenditures in the direct interest of national security, we cannot longer afford the luxury of pouring money into inland waterway transportation without requiring that it be repaid.

The New Frontier in Perspective

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN KYL

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 9, 1961

Mr. KYL. Mr. Speaker, the late start in legislative deliberations has given us all an opportunity to evaluate our position—to better know where we are and whither we are tending so we might better know what to do and how to do it. There is much to consider, for there has been a tremendous outpouring of spoken and printed material designed to condition the Congress and the people for almost any eventuality. Any void in the information has been filled by a willing team of journalists who have been more lobbyist than reporter. The time has come to put things in proper perspective.

This situation is nothing new. In those years when the executive leadership has changed, there has been an unsettled period when problems seem greater and solutions more difficult. Casual perusal of campaign speeches before presidential elections and the first utterances of new Presidents after inauguration will show that every such period has been called one of great crisis—the most trying times in history. Collectively, the Presidents of this Nation have been amazingly capable men of immense integrity. All have been, and I am sure, will continue to be, men of honor, with a consuming desire to be notable leaders. Though some may have seemed less political, all have been politicians, the product of our political system. In varying degrees, all have recognized the fact that if there is no job to be done, no record of achievement can be established. A little exaggeration has always been present, if not on the part of the new President, certainly on the part of his political associates. And this exaggeration is possible because, constituted as this Nation is, it has always had problems and will always have problems. But no detractors can obscure the fact that this social, political, and economic system has presented more individual satisfaction through spiritual and material blessings

than ever before seen on this globe. Indeed, the system itself creates an ever-increasing scope of desires.

Our ailments must not be minimized. The Nation must be informed—but it need not be informed in a manner which gives aid and comfort to those bent on destroying us. Certainly, a people can be unified through faith and confidence much longer than they can be prompted by fright. The cry of "Wolf! Wolf!" is no stimulus to action in the fact of inconsistency. Real burdens are neglected when genuinely serious needs are hidden among fabrications added for total propaganda effect. Leaders become suspect in their legitimate purpose when they say in the month of October that 17 million people go to bed hungry every night in our blessed land, and in January following they report that "the American people eat better than any people in the history of the world."

The people wonder when they are told in October that a serious missile gap gives all military superiority to the adversary and then our leaders determine one day in February that there is in fact no missile gap. Next day the announcement is declared premature. The Nation has a right to wonder how an executive staff can be reduced through addition of more members, or how the merit status of civil service might be better served through personal, political scrutiny of promotions by a department head. They are entitled to know how additional billions can be spent without proportionate increases in the tax burden of the present and future generations. The man who pays, knows that a tax by any other name is still a tax, even though Government officials cloak the obvious with such phrases as, "The Treasury will be reimbursed for this expenditure of about a billion dollars through raising the limits of income covered in present law." Puzzled citizens are wondering how 6 percent of the world's population which lives in this chaotically depressed Nation can support the other 94 percent of the world in its quest for better education, better industrial growth, and better life in general. We wonder about the state of national politics when Cabinet members say public projects are a legitimate club to force legislators into line and that the nonconformist will soon be a man of extinction.

As long as there are human needs which are not being met, we must be constructively concerned. Every good American wants the best for his country. We want the same things, but our approaches are different. We should represent any implication that if we do not accept the modus operandi of the Chief that we are not interested in people. I would also hope we can all agree that in seeking solutions to our problems we do not abandon or destroy the very system which has secured our multitudinous blessings.

Our current difficulties both real and imagined have been abundantly proclaimed. We have had recommended new methods of solution, methods which sometimes depart from what many Americans consider the traditional way

of economics, society, and government. Most of the solutions suggested involve greater participation of the Federal Government, in many instances replacing activity of individuals, private groups, or our smaller political subdivisions. Proponents of these new solutions usually say the Government must act because other means have failed, and where there is no call to action from the people, a carefully designed public opinion program creates the desire. "If the people do not know what is good for them—if the States do not know what is good for them, we will tell them." "We don't know what you want but we know what we want and you shall have it."

This is why it seems we have more solutions than problems. This is why someone must explain that all change is not progress.

Mr. Speaker, many of us are worried when the Chief Executive says that in the next 4 years, we shall have to test anew whether a nation organized and governed such as ours can endure and says the outcome is by no means certain. Many of us would like an elaboration on that theme. Does the Chief Executive know something of subversion not generally known? Does he foresee governmental controls of prices, wages, production, and consumption—or abolition of local government? These are not idle worries, for has not a confidant of the Chief Executive said we must adopt the welfare state as a means of avoiding Communist domination? There are many of us, Mr. Speaker, who think such a policy of adoption is similar to an injection of live virus. We fear metastasis of this governmental cancer—this little dose of socialism.

We fear the political doctors have prescribed cures without diagnosing the disease. It is not enough to speak of needs, for naming is not explaining. One cannot logically approach solution of problems without knowing the causes of those problems. What are the causes and what are the symptoms? Then, the suggested remedy must prove practical and beneficial. The solution of one problem must not create another.

We have heard of the symptoms—retarded growth of gross national profit, joblessness, depressed areas, insufficient income for the aged. Is it not possible that these very problems exist because we have already placed too much emphasis on big government and big government spending? Is it not possible that much of the low morals in government is the result of moving too much authority too far from the people? What has caused the inflation which robs the aged? Is not a terrible national debt of \$190 billion also a danger sign? Is it a sign of national health to have 40 million people getting checks worth \$40 billion from the Federal Government? Does history teach that when the government becomes all things to all people, there is no freedom?

There are, unfortunately, some Americans who think that political discussions require something less than truth—or at least that truth may be subverted to cleverness—that false impressions

created by semantics somehow are not as false. Thus, others of us are dismayed when our opposition says, "We are engaged in a battle between those who are contented and those who are concerned." This impression must be corrected: This is not a struggle between the contented and the concerned, but between those concerned with the sensation of short-range solution for political gain and those concerned with the perpetual welfare of this great free Nation and the generations of Americans to come.

It should be unnecessary to say again that when the Government spends it must either tax or defer payment to future debt. The Federal Government cannot give anything it does not first take away from the people now or charge to future generations. Yet, we frequently hear the argument that the Federal Government must undertake some purely intrastate project because the States cannot afford to do the job. Is it foolish to ask how the States collectively can afford to pay for the local programs they cannot afford individually?

One thing which makes Federal spending so popular is lack of fortitude on the part of local officials who want the honey of local projects without the sting of local taxes. These local officials can only share the blame. The Federal Government has continually usurped the taxing authority necessary to local support and local control. No, there are no magicians in Washington who can give something for nothing.

At this time, as always, the Federal Government can take constructive steps to alleviate temporary economic distress. But in the final analysis, genuine prosperity is created only from development of that atmosphere which is conducive to expansion of free enterprise. This involves vital considerations of individual initiative and individual rights. It is not a heartless policy. It is realistic. This is certainly no time to preach that risk capital and reasonable profit are profane terms of the inhumane. To hold any other policy is to adopt the discredited systems and philosophies of those who seek to destroy us.

Would it be better then, to take steps to rebuild and to strengthen, and to actively promote the economic system which has brought this Nation to abundance? Was there ever a time we could cease inspiring a faith in free government, free social life and free enterprise?

Yes; we must be realistic. And this involves recognizing that it is politically expedient to seek the quick solution which is all take and no give. Simultaneously, I plead that we remember it has always been impossible to trade personal liberty for immediate economic security or what seems like economic security, and retain either. It is good to have the bird in the hand, but the bird dies quickly, and the birds in the bush are most elusive.

In this body we deal with vast problems of 180 million people in 50 States and additional areas. Perhaps this realization sometimes overwhelms us and causes us to overlook the simple truths. I know, for instance, that as an individual, in my own personal life, I cannot

spend more than I have or there will be dire consequences. Does this same evaluation apply to states and nations?

In our personal lives we admire the neighbor who knows restraint and who teaches that opportunity is more blessed than security. For opportunity allows us to go as high as our own ambitions and self reliance will let us, while security always connotes a leveling to a stage lower than most thinking, ambitious people would choose. There is, after all, an equality in communism or socialism—but it is an equality which results from pushing the top down—not from lifting up the bottom.

Interpreting governmental affairs in this fashion is not irrelevant, for we have assigned to the government our individual responsibility for our moral acts and our economic welfare. How much of the breakup in family life itself can be traced to this transfer of responsibility? What has governmental action done to the institution of family life? The answer is usually clouded by someone's hurried allusion to the difference between legal and moral responsibility but this evasion does not erase the commentary that while one mother still feels the responsibility to care for six growing children, six grown children have no responsibility for one mother. There was an era of our history framed and captioned "the era of dollar diplomacy," and historians of the future may label ours the period of "dollar morality."

I cannot agree that the Federal Government must, or can, replace the responsibility of an individual to himself, the family to its members, the village to its residents, or the State to its citizens.

All of us still give lip service to saving the American way of life, but too many no longer can identify either what it is they are trying to save or explain why they are trying to save it. No constructive assistance is presented by people in government, official or ex officio, who proclaim that we can save freedom by substituting a welfare state. We cannot believe that the American way of life is a bad dream, and the only way we can avoid the nightmare of communism is to be soothed by the same poison in a smaller dose.

The greatness of this Nation is still in the independent, self-reliant, individual citizen. We cannot continue to destroy the free nature of this individual as a contributing citizen without in the end, destroying the collective freedom of all our people.

New Agriculture Secretary Expected To Break Down Milk Barriers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALBERT H. QUIE

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 9, 1961

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Speaker, I have on many occasions called the attention of my fellow Members to the gross inequi-

ties which exist in many parts of our country that prevent the distribution and sale of milk from the Midwest due to artificial sanitary regulations. Many times communities adopt so-called sanitation laws which are designed, purely and simply, to prevent milk products of the highest sanitation levels and standards from competing with local producers. I review this situation with my fellow Members at this time because I believe we have a right to expect a drastic change in the system following the appointment of the former Governor of Minnesota, Orville L. Freeman, as the administration's Secretary of Agriculture.

During Secretary's Freeman's 6-year tenure of office as Governor of Minnesota, he has repeatedly gone on record as opposing artificial sanitary regulations which are designed as economic barriers against the free transportation and sale of milk on an interstate basis. One of the Secretary's recent statements was delivered on Thursday, April 28, 1960, before the Subcommittee on Health and Safety, Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

At that time, Secretary Freeman was testifying on behalf of H.R. 3840, a bill which provided that milk produced and handled in accordance with the high standards of the Public Health Service model ordinance and code cannot be excluded from any interstate market on health grounds.

Perhaps the most accurate way to clearly understand Secretary Freeman's position on these sanitary laws is simply to quote what he had to say before the subcommittee. His testimony was several pages long, but I will select the pertinent sections to demonstrate his stated position.

Governor FREEMAN. Minnesota's presence at these hearings represents part of a continuing program aimed at the ultimate elimination of artificial barriers to the interstate sale of milk and milk products. It has been my privilege to serve as Governor of Minnesota for 5½ years. I am now in the middle of my third term. And from the very beginning we have been deeply concerned with this problem. I went to our legislature during the first term in which I served as Governor urging appropriation for the purpose of trying to further this struggle, both in terms of the appropriate legal remedies and also in terms of bringing to the attention of people around the United States that in the long run artificial barriers were not sound and that all people suffered as a product of them.

Secretary Freeman then reviewed the overall problem of sanitary milk barriers, pointing out the inequities that existed then and still exist now. He stated that Minnesota had attempted to break down these barriers in legal proceedings. He added:

Nonetheless, I think that actions in the courts have commanded attention and created a broader base of public understanding in this matter.

We in Minnesota, too, in addition, I might add, to our concern with just the sanitary codes as such, have been concerned with what we believe to be some abuses of the milk market ordering structure as well. I would emphasize that we certainly do not oppose milk market orders properly drawn

and administered to insure continuity of supply for both consumer and producer, but where they again set up tariff walls and artificially high pricing structures and divert parts of our economy at a cost to the total Nation into inefficient production, we feel that here too, as in the case of sanitary regulations, the Nation as a whole pays a price that is unnecessary.

The Secretary then reviewed the historical basis of free trade among the States and concluded his prepared comments as follows:

Discriminatory trade barriers and economic reprisals have no place in America. The prosperity of the midwestern dairy farmer depends on his right to reach markets in those areas of the country where live the great mass of our urban population who are his customers. I urge the protection of that right and also the furtherance of that right of the consumer by the enactment into law of H.R. 3840.

During questioning following his statement, Secretary Freeman also said:

While I certainly agree that the correction of the abuses in the milk market structure is enormously difficult and the complexities of the marketing of milk have more than baffled me, I sincerely believe that the first step to unwinding this complicated ball of wax is the very obvious, and simple, and clear, and unanswerable one that we ought to be able to sell and not be stopped by phony sanitary regulations, and that is the first step in clearing up the whole mess.

It is because of Secretary Freeman's definite position and emphasis on breaking down these artificial sanitary barriers that I believe now we have a right to expect action from him since he is in a position now of being able to change policy and influence legislation. For my part, I already have pending bills along the same general direction of eliminating milk barriers, and in view of Secretary Freeman's position, I believe we have a right to expect effective action on this matter—and soon.

Tenth Anniversary of the Circle in the Square

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN V. LINDSAY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 9, 1961

Mr. LINDSAY. Mr. Speaker, on February 26 the Circle in the Square Theater, located at 159 Bleeker Street, New York City, will celebrate its 10th anniversary. It is entirely appropriate that the event should be marked with a celebration in which the New York community will salute the extraordinary accomplishments that have been wrought by the theater and its cofounders and coproducers, Theodore Mann and Jose Quintero.

Just 10 years ago the theater was founded and since then it has made a marked impact on the living theater in New York. It has been an inspiration to Broadway and off Broadway alike

and has been enthusiastically acclaimed by critics the world over. Indeed, the Circle in the Square Theater has become one of the cultural strongholds in New York, and therefore, in the country, and has set a high standard for the theatrical community to emulate.

The Square's current attraction, "The Balcony," has been a prize-winning success.

Since the Circle in the Square first presented their revival of "Dark of the Moon" in February of 1951, a total of 20 plays—18 of them directed by Jose Quintero, all of them coproduced by Theodore Mann—have been presented by and at the Circle.

In the Square Theater outstanding productions of important plays by such playwrights as Eugene O'Neill, Thornton Wilder, Tennessee Williams, Truman Capote, John Steinbeck, Brendan Behan, Alfred Hayes, and Jean Genet have been among Messrs. Mann and Quintero's applauded presentations.

Artists of such now recognized stature as Geraldine Page, Jason Robards, Jr., George Scott, Coleen Dewhurst, and Clarice Blackburn have emerged with enhanced reputations from their appearances under the auspices of Messrs. Mann and Quintero at the Circle in the Square. In fact, Miss Page, now in Hollywood filming Tennessee Williams' "Summer and Smoke" for Paramount Pictures was catapulted to stardom with her Circle in the Square appearance in this play. By coincidence, Jason Robards, Jr., another graduate to fame from the Circle in the Square, is also in Hollywood at the present time costarring with Lana Turner in "By Love Possessed."

Nor have playwrights and actors been the only ones who have enhanced the reputation of the Circle in the Square Theater and had their reputations further enhanced through their presentation by the Circle. Jose Quintero, now recognized as a major director on or off Broadway, is a product of the Circle in the Square as well as one of its cofounders and coproducers. And David Hays, now recognized as one of Broadway's outstanding scenic artists, was first represented in the New York theater through his design for the production of the Circle in the Square's presentation of "Cradle Song." He followed this with the design for the Circle's revival of Eugene O'Neill's "The Iceman Cometh" at the Circle, which opened the way to Broadway for him, when the Circle in the Square team of Mann and Quintero achieved Broadway history with their presentation of Eugene O'Neill's "Long Day's Journey Into Night," which virtually made a clean sweep of the theater's awards, including Pulitzer Prize, Critics Circle, Page One and other awards for best play, best director, best actor, the year it was presented.

While Messrs. Mann and Quintero made a staggeringly successful foray on Broadway as coproducers of "Long Day's Journey Into Night," with Jose Quintero directing as well as coproducing this multiple prize winner, the off Broadway

Circle in the Square remains the home base for their mutual and individual operations. Quintero has "left home" to direct other Broadway theater as well as to stage opera at the Metropolitan Opera and productions at the New York City Center as well as his now current first film. And Mann has produced a Christmas concert at Carnegie Hall for each of the past several years. But, whatever else they do, the Circle in the Square Theater is their home. And home is where they keep coming back to work. February 26 will mark the tenth anniversary of their theatrical and artistic home, the Circle in the Square Theater.

I have talked about the importance of the living theater in this Chamber on other occasions. I have introduced and am seeking support for legislation designed to relieve the living theater of the burdensome 10-percent admissions tax, as part of a combined effort to improve the environmental conditions under which the living theater must operate if it is to survive. Therefore, I am pleased to bring to the attention of my fellow Members of the House of Representatives this story of an off Broadway theater in my home district, which must be encouraged not only for itself, but for the benefit of the entire theater culture of the United States.

The Christian Amendment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK M. CLARK

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 9, 1961

Mr. CLARK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following roundtable discussion sponsored by the Christian Amendment Movement:

Mr. President, the following roundtable discussion is part of a series of 52 programs, sponsored by the Christian Amendment Movement, 804 Penn Avenue, Pittsburgh 21, Pa., and which is being carried on some 100 stations in the United States at the present time. Dr. A. J. McFarland, field representative of the movement acts as moderator and introduces the program.

Dr. A. J. McFARLAND. Friends, this program is different than most programs to which you have been listening on this series. We are in Washington, D.C., at our National Capitol, where there are facilities for broadcasting a program such as this, and seated before the microphone are three of our esteemed National Representatives: the Honorable FRANK M. CLARK, of Pennsylvania; the Honorable D. R. MATTHEWS, of Florida; and the Honorable J. FLOYD BREEDING, of Kansas. They are appearing on this program because they believe that a Christian amendment should be added to our National Constitution, and they are supporting this movement in various ways here on Capitol Hill. They are ready to tell you why they believe that the adoption of this amendment will be a good thing for our country.

But before these esteemed gentlemen speak, we want to read the three sections of the proposed amendment so you will know

the real purpose of this broadcast, and what these gentlemen are endorsing.

"THE AMENDMENTS

"Section 1: This Nation devoutly recognizes the authority and law of Jesus Christ, Saviour and Ruler of nations, through whom are bestowed the blessings of Almighty God;

"Section 2: This amendment shall not be interpreted so as to result in the establishment of any particular ecclesiastical organization or in the abridgment of the rights of religious freedom, or freedom of speech or press, or of peaceful assemblage;

"Section 3: Congress shall have power in such cases as it may deem proper to provide a suitable oath or affirmation for citizens whose religious scruples prevent them from giving unqualified allegiance to the Constitution as herein amended."

This amendment is definitely nonpartisan, and nondenominational. In a recent Congress six Senators and Representatives introduced this Christian amendment resolution, and three were Democrats and three were Republicans. So this amendment has absolutely nothing to do with the political parties, nor has it anything to do with the church. It is strictly a citizens movement.

In the constitution of the Christian Amendment Movement, the first section reads: "The Christian Amendment Movement is an association of American citizens who are united in the effort to bring the United States of America to an acknowledgment of the Lord Jesus Christ, by an amendment to the Constitution of the United States."

Thus this movement is a movement of citizens, and there is a place in this movement for every citizen of this Nation who believes that Christ deserves the supreme honor of being placed first in our Nation and in our Government.

But we want you to hear from our esteemed Representatives. We want them to tell you who they are, the State and district they represent and then go right ahead and tell you how they feel about this proposed Christian amendment. The first one I am going to ask to speak is the Honorable D. R. MATTHEWS.

Hon. D. R. MATTHEWS. Thank you very much, sir, and as you have said, my name is D. R. MATTHEWS and I am the Congressman from the Eighth District of Florida. I believe in the amendment we are discussing, because after being in Congress for 4 years now, I am convinced that we cannot solve the problems of this world unless we go to the spiritual leadership of Jesus Christ. I am particularly pleased with the fact that in this proposed amendment we have the proper protection for our minority groups, and as you have indicated there is a separation of church and state.

Dr. A. J. McFARLAND. Thank you very much, Congressman Matthews. The next Member of Congress whom you will hear is the Honorable FRANK M. CLARK.

Congressman FRANK M. CLARK. My name is FRANK M. CLARK, a Member of Congress from the 25th District of Pennsylvania. I am happy to join with my colleagues in Congress who are endorsing the Christian amendment. Our country is a Christian nation and if we are to combat the evil forces of communism we must put Christ into a proper perspective in our national life. The Christian amendment will help to make this a Nation under God. The Christian amendment is nondenominational so should have the support of all.

Dr. A. J. McFARLAND. Thank you, Congressman CLARK, of Pennsylvania. The third member is my own Representative, the Honorable J. FLOYD BREEDING, of Kansas.

Congressman J. FLOYD BREEDING. My name is J. FLOYD BREEDING, Representative of the Fifth District of the Sunflower State of

Kansas. It is indeed a privilege to speak in behalf of the proposed Christian amendment. It has been my privilege to introduce this legislation seeking that the Nation shall devoutly recognize the authority and law of Jesus Christ. I believe that most people want the word of God included in our Constitution. Recent events have shown that nations which reject God tend to make gods of themselves and become inhuman tyrants. If Christ were put at the foundation of our Government it would be the greatest thing that has happened in our Nation since the Constitution was written. "Other foundation can no man lay, than that is laid, which is Jesus Christ." Thus it is fitting and proper that the Constitution be amended to acknowledge Jesus Christ as our King and Saviour.

Dr. McFARLAND. Thank you very much, Congressman BREEDING, and each of you gentlemen for those fine testimonies in regard to the proposed Christian amendment.

I wonder how many realize just how serious a thing it is that our Nation has left all acknowledgment of Christ out of our Constitution.

It was my privilege recently, to attend a worship service in the National Presbyterian Church here in Washington, D.C. Just across the aisle from where I sat was a pew bearing the name of Associate Justice William M. Strong on the nameplate at the end. He was a former Justice of the Supreme Court of the United States. Congressman MATTHEWS would you read for us what Associate Justice William Strong had to say about the omission of God from our Constitution. He said this back in 1871 but it is still just as true today as the day it was written.

Congressman MATTHEWS (reading): "There is no political document so all important to the American people as the Constitution of the United States. All customs, laws, and all forms of administration are shaped by it. Our statesmen are learning their Americanism, as to its letter and spirit from that great instrument. That is as it should be; this was intended from the beginning.

"But at the same time, it is a serious matter if that Constitution should be found wanting in any principle or matter of fact. Error in the Constitution will work as powerfully as truth, and what is left out of it may one day be formally declared un-American. And one such serious matter there is; one unnecessary and most unfortunate omission. God and Christianity are not once alluded to, although the Constitution is itself the product of a Christian civilization, and purports to represent the mind of a Christian people. Hence, it is that all laws of this country in favor of a Christian morality are enacted outside the Constitution; they rest only on the basis of what is called common law and as matters seem to be going, it will soon be discovered and decreed that common law is only another name for custom which has no binding force. And then where are we? In atheism, corruption and anarchy."

Dr. McFARLAND. Thank you Congressman MATTHEWS for reading that statement by Justice William Strong. It seems to me that Justice Strong was doing some very serious thinking when he penned those words. I was especially impressed with his statement: "Error in the Constitution will work as powerfully as truth, and what is left out of the Constitution may one day be formally declared un-American."

Congressman CLARK, what is your reaction to that statement?

Congressman CLARK. It seems to me that that is proving true right here in America today. We live under a government that is honest. We pay our debts. Our Government is truthful. What it says it will do, it does. Our Government is generous. We

give billions to help needy people around the world. Our Government has many splendid moral qualities, but Uncle Sam is not a Christian. He has made no profession of his faith in Jesus Christ.

And if we consider the people of this country, we will find that for the most part they follow their Government. They are honest, truthful, just, generous, but the rank and file of the people of America are not aggressively Christian.

Dr. McFARLAND. Congressman BREEDING let us follow the Honorable William Strong's statement a little further. He says, "What is left out of the Constitution may one day be formally declared un-American." Haven't you found that even good Christian people look upon the placing of this Christian amendment in our Constitution as un-American?

Congressman BREEDING. I am afraid that is true. Our country has long been known as the melting pot of the world, and our Nation is made up of many creeds, colors and races of people, and we have gloried in this almost to the complete exclusion of Jesus Christ and His law. We can show these people our early civil documents, with their Christian emphasis; we can remind them that almost every State constitution acknowledges God in some way but they will still say that to place an acknowledgment of Jesus Christ in our Constitution is not the American way.

Dr. McFARLAND. I have heard any number of people say, "Isn't it too bad that all acknowledgment of God was omitted from our Constitution when it was written?" Then they usually follow with the inference that it is too late now. Well, it isn't too late, and if ever there was a need for this Christian amendment that time is now. But these people do have a point when they say that this acknowledgment should have been put in at the first, for it is extremely hard to amend the Constitution of the United States.

The first Senator to introduce this Christian amendment resolution in recent years, the late Senator Arthur Capper, of Kansas, warned us to get ready for the long pull. He said the Christian amendment would not go through soon, but he told us to continue to have the bill reintroduced into each Congress, and someday it would go through. He wrote our office a letter after he had introduced this legislation saying, "I am strong for your Christian amendment resolution."

I suppose that the reason some people hesitate to support this amendment is because they fear it would bring about a union of church and state.

Congressman CLARK, so that everyone will know the exact position of the sponsors of this amendment in reference to this matter of church and state I wish you would read from the constitution of the movement the section on the basic principles of the Christian Amendment Movement.

Congressman CLARK. I will be glad to do it. I am quoting now from the constitution of the movement. "In the light of Holy Scripture and history we hold these principles to be true:

"1. That church and state having their origin from God, are both divine institutions;

"2. That church and state are distinct and separate in the exercise of their appropriate and divinely prescribed powers, and therefore control of the church by the state, or control of the state by the church, is contrary to the divine design;

"3. That church and state in their respective spheres are subject to the authority of the Lord Jesus Christ as head of the church and the divinely appointed Ruler of nations;

"4. That church and state are equally obligated to acknowledge the authority of the Lord Jesus Christ;

"5. That the failure of nations to acknowledge the sovereignty of the Lord Jesus Christ as King of kings must inevitably result in national ruin;

"6. That in order to endure and prosper as a nation, the United States of America must confess the Lord Jesus Christ as Saviour and King."

Dr. McFARLAND. Congressman BREEDING, does the church have a monopoly on Christ, or is He also King and Ruler of nations?

Congressman BREEDING. No; the churches have no monopoly on Christ. He belongs to all the churches which profess His name, but He also belongs to the nations. He is King of Kings, the Prince of Peace, the Governor among the nations, and we are told in the Bible "The government shall be upon His shoulder" (Isaiah 9: 6).

Dr. McFARLAND. Another question, Congressman MATTHEWS. God is acknowledged in almost all State constitutions; does this unite any church with any of those States?

Congressman MATTHEWS. No; certainly it does not. That doesn't mean that we have the uniting of church and state at all, but rather we have a very specific separation of the church and the state as we should have in all our various States.

Dr. McFARLAND. Over in Europe we find a union of church and state in many of those countries. What would be the difference between what they have there, and what we would have here if we had this Christian amendment?

Congressman CLARK, maybe you can help us out on that.

Congressman CLARK. There, they have chosen some denomination and have made that denomination the established, or state church. Now to do that three things had to take place. All the property of that established church was put in the name of the state. All of the ministers or workers in that state church were paid out of the taxes, and third, the governments of the state and that established church were more or less fused. None of these three things are in any way involved when our Nation adopts the Christian amendment.

Dr. McFARLAND. Congressman MATTHEWS, in this connection, a word should be said about the first amendment to the Constitution of the United States, which reads: "Congress shall make no law respecting the establishment of religion or prohibiting the free exercise thereof."

Congressman MATTHEWS. A splendid statement in reference to that appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on January 24, 1956, introduced by the Honorable Ralph E. Flanders. It said:

"The first amendment is designed to prohibit the control of government by any religious organization as the state religion of this country, and also to remove from government the power to discriminate against persons and institutions on the grounds of their religious belief. It does not mean that the state is to be irreligious, nor that it is to be indifferent to the religious practices of its people. It does not mean to infer that the state is purely secular, utterly removed from the sanctions of moral law and order. If we can conceive of our Government as a human institution only, we will approach the situation where the supreme authority in our Government will be the ability of the majority to enforce its will even to the infringement of the basic rights of the minority."

Dr. McFARLAND. Congressman BREEDING, we know that most any bill that goes through Congress causes debate, and any bill that is debated on the floor of Congress is given a great deal of publicity on radio, TV, newspapers, et cetera. Do you feel that such discussion about our spiritual needs would be a good thing?

Congressman BREEDING. I most certainly do, and I think when this bill gets to the floor of the House there will be a lot of favorable discussion in regard to it.

Dr. McFARLAND. Thank you, Congressman BREEDING, and each of you gentlemen for your part on this roundtable, and it has been a real privilege to have been on this panel with you, and we hope we may appear together again sometime.

We are sure, radio friends, that these gentlemen will continue to uphold Christian ideals here in Washington, let us continue to uphold them before the throne of grace. Every member of this panel believes in the salvation of the individual, and we all believe that there is none other name under heaven given among men whereby any of us can be saved; but we also believed the Bible when it says, "blessed is the nation whose God is the Lord."

May God's blessing be upon you gentlemen as you continue to lead forth here in Washington. Friends, let us support these gentlemen by writing to our Senators and Representatives, and tell them to get behind this great cause. Urge them to do all they can to move this bill out of the Judiciary Committee and on to the floor of the House and the Senate. Inform your friends and neighbors about this movement, and let us keep this cause moving across this country. May God bless the Christian Amendment Movement in our prayers.

Water Pollution Control Act Amendments of 1961

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. JOHN A. BLATNIK

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 9, 1961

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Speaker, after months of painstaking and careful work the Senate Select Committee on National Water Resources, under the able leadership of Senator ROBERT KERR, of Oklahoma, issued its report on national water resources on January 30, 1961.

In discussing the nature of the national water problem the committee points out that—

Demands (for water) are projected to increase to 559 billion gallons a day, or 51 percent of streamflow by 1980, and to 888 billion gallons a day, or 81 percent of streamflow by year 2000. At first glance, the projected demand appears to approach frighteningly near the limit of the Nation's available water supply and it will be necessary to vigorously expand programs for water resources development if this demand is to be met. It must be remembered, however, that these are withdrawals, and that, necessary as it may be to provide for them, most of this water is returned to the stream, and can be reused many times, provided steps are taken to maintain its quality.

Mr. Speaker, the key to the maintenance of water quality is water pollution control. As stated in the supplemental views of the Kerr committee report:

The greatly increasing volume of pollution discharged into our waterways, and the increasing burden of new contaminants, exceed the capabilities of treatment by known methods. It is therefore essential that a

crash program of pollution abatement research be undertaken immediately to provide practical methods for protecting water quality.

Three additional lines of action must be vigorously prosecuted: (1) Increased quantities of water must be supplied for dilution during low river stages through construction of reservoirs to store the flows, and by other flow regulation works, (2) the number and capacity of facilities for waste treatment must be greatly increased so that discharges into the Nation's waterways will be within tolerable limits of the stream's capacity. This will require, among other things, a doubling or tripling of the present Federal water pollution control program, and (3) municipalities and industries must refrain from discharging wastes that degrade water quality beyond tolerable limits. This restraint must be either self-imposed, or to the extent required in the public interest, it will have to be provided by legal sanctions. Acceptable progress in these lines of action will be costly and will require continuing and often onerous subordination of individual convenience to the public good. It is clear, however, that the American people, virtually without exception, are insistent that the Federal Government take the lead in bringing about unified action at all levels to accelerate progress in cleaning our water supply. To provide this leadership is now a first task of the Federal Government.

The United States has very little option about whether to undertake this responsibility—it is a matter of either proceeding expeditiously or sustaining major limitations and setbacks in the economy and health of the Nation. There is, of course, abundant justification and precedent for Federal leadership in this area. At stake are national security, public health, interstate commerce, and opportunities for full employment and economic prosperity.

These four short paragraphs set forth the case for an effective program of Federal water pollution control better than it has ever been stated before. I have today introduced a bill providing for such a program, Mr. Speaker, and am hopeful of its early consideration and enactment.

The Federal Water Pollution Control Act Amendments of 1961, H.R. 4036, contains four major provisions: (1) Increased financial assistance to communities for the construction of waste treatment facilities, (2) strengthened Federal enforcement procedures, (3) expanded water pollution research, and (4) improved State and Federal administration of pollution control programs and activities.

FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE TO COMMUNITIES

Under existing law there is authorized \$50 million annually in Federal grants to communities to assist them in the construction of needed waste treatment facilities. This program has been in operation since 1956. During the 5 years immediately preceding enactment of the program (1952-56) contract awards for sewage treatment plant construction averaged \$222 million. During the first year of the program, 1957, contract awards increased to \$351 million—a 58 percent increase. In 1958, total contract awards reached \$389 million—a 75 percent increase over the previous 5-year average. In 1959 and 1960, contract awards have leveled off at the \$350 million level, somewhat below the 1958 rec-

ord due to the steel strike and general public construction cutbacks. Still, over the past 4 years contract awards for sewage treatment plant construction have averaged almost \$360 million annually—an increase of 62 percent over the 5-year average before Federal financial assistance became available.

Under the construction grant program, as of January 31, 1961, a total of 2,581 grant offers have been made aggregating \$213 million. These in turn supported construction projects having eligible costs totaling \$1,245,400,000. In other words, a Federal investment of \$213 million has stimulated local investments of over \$1 billion. Every Federal dollar expended has been matched by over \$4.50 in local funds—a truly remarkable record.

Despite the great progress made as a result of Federal financial assistance, much more remains to be done. Construction since 1957 has been largely offset by new needs and the number of needed projects remains, as it was in 1957, at more than 6,000 sewage treatment plants. According to the Public Health Service Inventory of Municipal and Industrial Waste Facilities, nearly 2,900 new plants are required for 19.5 million people in communities now discharging raw untreated sewage. There are 1,100 new plants needed for 3.4 million people in communities where existing treatment works are inadequate or obsolete and require replacement. Another 1,630 communities need additions and enlargements of existing inadequate plants to provide satisfactory treatment for 25 million persons.

Is it any wonder, Mr. Speaker, that a technical report to the Senate Select Committee contains the following warning:

Unless the country is ready to take measures to deal with water pollution on a far greater scale than at present, it appears that many streams will become putrescent and rivers will be open sewers.

In addition to the backlog of treatment plant needs, population growth will continue to create new needs. If municipalities are to catch up by 1970, they will have to spend an average of \$600 million a year to eliminate the backlog, provide for new population, and to replace plants that will become obsolete. We come nowhere near this level of expenditure at the present time despite the 62 percent increase in construction since 1956. In order to stimulate construction up to the \$600 million a year figure H.R. 4036 authorizes an increase in Federal financial assistance from the present \$50 million annually to \$125 million annually and an increase in the total grant authorization from \$500 million to \$1.25 billion. Maximum grants per project are increased from 30 percent of the cost of the project or \$250,000, whichever is smaller, to 30 percent of the cost of the project or \$600,000, whichever is smaller. Projects serving more than one municipality will receive proportionately higher grants.

Based on the experience of the present program which has stimulated over \$4 in local contributions for every Federal

grant dollar, it can be estimated that the proposed program will result in the construction of projects having a total cost of approximately \$600 million—or exactly the national needs.

This construction program will be a boon, also, to many small communities hard hit by unemployment. We already have an inventory of 362 sewage treatment plant projects located in areas of substantial unemployment. The total estimated cost of these plants is over \$280 million and the estimated on-site payroll on such projects is over \$85 million for 14,200 estimated total man-years of labor. These are projects, ready to go, which can put people to work and contribute to the betterment of the water quality of our Nation's lakes and streams.

FEDERAL ENFORCEMENT PROCEDURES

Under existing law, the Surgeon General and the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare have authority to enforce the control of pollution of interstate waters, but only when it endangers the health and welfare of persons in a State other than that in which the pollution discharge originates. In such a case, the Surgeon General can, on his own initiative, or at the request of an affected State, institute certain Federal enforcement procedures calculated to procure abatement of the discharge.

First, he calls a conference of State and interstate agencies involved to discuss the occurrence of interstate pollution. An attempt is made to secure abatement at this stage of the proceedings.

Second, if no abatement is secured as a result of the conference, the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare calls a public hearing before a hearing board for the purpose of making a finding of interstate pollution, assessing progress toward its abatement, and in the event effective progress is not made, making recommendations to secure abatement of such pollution.

Third, if the recommendations of the Secretary are not followed within a reasonable time he requests that Federal court action be taken by the Attorney General. Such court action can be taken only with the consent of the State or States wherein the pollution is discharged or the State or States where the health or welfare of persons is endangered.

Under this procedure the Public Health Service has initiated a number of enforcement actions. These have been effective but the limited enforcement jurisdiction of the Federal Government makes it impossible to do an even better job. The present law, for instance, excludes from enforcement jurisdiction the greater part of the Great Lakes and their tributaries, the coastal waters of the Nation, many important coastal streams, intrastate water bodies such as the Detroit River, those of Florida and all rivers, streams, lakes and coastal waters of Alaska, Hawaii, and the Virgin Islands and Puerto Rico. International boundary streams such as the St. Lawrence, Ni-

agara, lower Colorado, and Rio Grande Rivers are untouchable under the act, leaving the discharge a moral responsibility to a neighboring nation, to the solicitude of a bordering State or an international creature of a treaty with that nation. The same situation exists as to international streams flowing across the northern and southern borders of the United States into our international neighbors. Examples are the Red River of the north in Minnesota, Lake Champlain in New York, Souris and Riviere Rivers in North Dakota, and the Flathead and Kootenai Rivers in Montana.

The degree of exclusion is graphically illustrated by the following figures derived from a recent study. They show that there are 1,080 municipalities discharging wastes in 845 intrastate navigable water bodies. Other interesting figures illustrative of the exclusion are that, of the estimated 26,000 water bodies in the United States, there are only an estimated 4,000 of an interstate nature.

It is obvious, Mr. Speaker, that the present limited enforcement jurisdiction does not permit sufficient latitude to accomplish fully the intents and purposes of the act; namely, the conservation of water resources for the use and benefit of the Nation. We must face the fact that present jurisdiction does not extend to many important segments of some of the major waterways of the country. In addition to the illustrations above, the Missouri River from the Kansas State line to just about St. Louis is an untouchable area under the act. The greater part of the Hudson River is excluded, as are important reaches of the Tennessee, Columbia, Colorado, and Merrimack Rivers.

The enforcement provisions of H.R. 4036 are intended to correct this situation. It does so by making Federal enforcement procedures available whenever there is pollution affecting the health and welfare, whether or not there is interstate pollution. Federal jurisdiction in this kind of pollution situation, however, would be exercised only upon request by a State or by a municipality, with State concurrence.

This is not a sweeping takeover by the Federal Government in the field of pollution control, Mr. Speaker. It merely makes available to the States the resources, facilities, and power of the Federal Government's enforcement procedures in a case involving pollution of navigable waters. Such an extension of Federal authority would serve to improve serious pollution situations which are also of great national importance although not endangering the health or welfare of persons in a State other than that in which the discharge originates.

In addition to expanding Federal enforcement jurisdiction, H.R. 4036 provides for clarifying and strengthening the role of the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare in the enforcement process by providing that the findings and recommendations of the hearing boards—after the public hearing—shall be the Secretary's findings and recom-

mendations except to the extent modified by him and by providing for the issuance of an order—instead of a notice—by him for abatement of any pollution found to exist. To afford adequate protection for the parties of interest, the bill provides that an appeal from the order can be taken to the U.S. court of appeals and the court's review would be on the record. However, if an appeal is not taken within 60 days the Secretary's order would become final. Such orders will be enforced by U.S. district courts in civil actions brought by the Attorney General at the request of the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare.

Other provisions dealing with Federal enforcement procedures make discharges from Federal installations subject to administrative findings and recommendations in Federal water pollution abatement actions conducted by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, H.R. 4036 establishes a \$25 million enforcement construction grants fund to be available for financially hard-pressed communities which might be required to construct treatment facilities as a result of Federal enforcement action. These funds would be available over and above the regular State allotment of construction grant funds.

POLLUTION CONTROL RESEARCH

Four members of the Senate Select Committee called for a crash program of pollution abatement research to be undertaken immediately to provide practical methods for protecting water quality. The full committee recommended an expanded program of applied research for water conservation with special emphasis to research on improved waste treatment methods.

Water pollution research is of prime importance. It provides the fundamental intelligence on the causes of water pollution. Although existing law recognizes research as a basic Federal water pollution control responsibility, present levels of research have remained low.

To stimulate Federal research in this field H.R. 4036 authorizes the establishment of field laboratory and research facilities including the establishment of regional laboratories throughout the country. The problems of water pollution vary from region to region and we must begin to zero in on the particular pollution problems of the different sections of the country if they are to be solved. This can best be done in research facilities located in the area near institutions of higher learning.

H.R. 4036 also authorizes special study of Great Lakes pollution problems.

STATE AND FEDERAL ADMINISTRATION

Under existing law, \$3 million in grants for States and interstate agencies is authorized to assist them in meeting the costs of establishing and maintaining adequate water pollution control programs. These are matching grants with the States required to provide from one-third to two-thirds of the costs of their programs. In the more than 4 years

these Federal grants have been in operation they have stimulated and encouraged significant progress in State and interstate water pollution control programs. Among the effects of these grants on State programs have been increased appropriations, technical and supporting staff, water quality monitoring activities, stepped-up enforcement and expanded research.

Despite this progress, the current State and interstate expenditure rate of \$10.6 million must be increased in order to make a significant impact on the Nation's pollution problem in the next decade. Lack of current data on the condition of waters in most of the States, information on industrial wastes, and new control techniques, as well as the qualified personnel to carry them out, remain serious problems. Continued Federal financial support of State and interstate water pollution control programs is essential to consolidate and build upon the gains stimulated by the first 5 years of the grant program. The present program expires June 30, 1961. H.R. 4036 authorizes the extension of this grant program on an indefinite basis with an increase in Federal participation from \$3 million to \$5 million.

To administer this ambitious undertaking by the Federal Government to clean up the Nation's waterways, Mr. Speaker, H.R. 4036 authorizes the establishment of a new operating agency within the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare to be known as the Water Pollution Control Administration.

It is apparent on its face that this legislation goes far beyond the usual public health legislation in that it assigns to an agency of the Federal Government the responsibility for controlling water pollution to conserve water for all uses—propagation of fish and aquatic life and wildlife, recreational purposes, industrial and agricultural—including irrigation—supplies, and other legitimate purposes, as well as public water supplies and protection of the public health. In short, water pollution is no longer primarily a health problem. It is a resource problem with health overtones and I have therefore reached the conclusion that the administration of the program should be upgraded by the establishment of an independent operating agency within the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. I do not intend that my proposal be taken as criticism in any way of the present administration of the program by the Public Health Service. They have done an admirable job, and are to be commended. However, it is time to move on in the fight against water pollution and all it entails. This goes far beyond the area of environmental health. It gets to the core of our very existence as a world power. Such a problem requires the concentrated and undivided attention that only a new operating agency can give it.

Mr. Speaker, I intend to hold public hearings on this legislation in the very near future and am hopeful that this year a truly adequate pollution control program will be adopted by the Congress.